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FOREWORD

The Hungarian Labour Market Yearbook series was launched in 2000 by the Institute of Economics of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences with support from the National Employment Foundation. The yearbook furnishes the present-day characteristics of the Hungarian labour market and of the Hungarian employment policy, and features an in-depth analysis of a topical issue each year. From the outset, the editorial board has striven to deliver relevant and useful information on trends in the Hungarian labour market, the legislative and institutional background of employment policy, and up-to-date findings from Hungarian and international research studies to civil servants, staff of the Employment Service, municipalities, NGOs, public administration offices, education and research institutions, the press and electronic media.

The research published in the yearbook series should provide a good source of knowledge for higher education on the topics of labour economics and human resources management. The yearbook series presents the main characteristics and trends of the Hungarian labour market in an international comparison using available statistical information, conceptual research and empirical analysis in a clearly structured and easily accessible format.

Continuing our previous editorial practice, we selected an area that we considered especially important from the perspective of understanding Hungarian labour market trends and the effectiveness of evidence-based employment policy. The yearbook has four main parts.

The Hungarian labour market in 2015

Economic trends relevant for the labour market were on the whole favourable in 2015. The Hungarian economy returned to sustained economic growth, with a GDP growth of nearly 3%, compared to 3.6% in 2014. Household incomes continued to increase, leading to an increase in consumption and consequently to the creation of new jobs. The number of persons in employment continued to grow in 2015, although not at the rate of the previous year. The yearly average exceeded 4 million 210 thousand, which was 110 thousand higher than the year before and reached the highest value since the start of the labour force survey in 1992. The employment rate of 63.9% in the 15–64 age group shows a 9 percentage point improvement compared to year 2010, the nadir of the crisis (although nearly 2 percentage points of this are attributable to a decrease in the denominator), closing the gap on the European average.

The favourable results are partly due to significant state intervention. The labour demand of businesses also considerably increased over the past two years.
Companies with at least five employees had to take active steps to fill 1.5 of 100 vacancies. The number of vacancies used as an indicator predicting economic boom (and the number of jobs to be filled) reached pre-crisis levels.

A paradigm shift in addressing unemployment created the segregated labour market of public works participants. Their numbers in 2015 were nearly 200 thousand on average, equal to 25% of the number of those employed in the public sector. Although the social acceptance of public works has improved a lot, forms facilitating reintegration to the open labour market have not yet been established. The pace of labour migration has not slowed down either. The three major target countries continue to be Austria, Germany and the United Kingdom but the structural characteristics of migrants differ according to country. In addition to regional imbalances in supply and demand, more attractive wages abroad greatly contributed to the lack of a qualified workforce in more and more professions in 2015. The unemployment rate decreased significantly in both 2014 and 2015; however, regional differences in this respect have become even more striking. Young adults leaving school education at the age of 16 with at most a lower-secondary qualification emerged onto the labour market in 2015 without any prospects other than the not too attractive public works.

Gross earnings increased by more than 4% in 2015 and the nominal wage reached 245 thousand HUF. The increase was slightly below this in the private sector and it was non-regular wage components, not representing long-term commitment, that were more dynamic. Earnings in the public sector were mainly influenced by the carry-over effect of a salary increase for teachers, in addition to a pay rise for police officers in July and the salary supplement for healthcare and social professionals. Since there were no changes to the rates of income tax and social security contributions, net earnings and gross earnings increased at the same rate, which – together with a 99.9% consumer price index – resulted in a 4.2% increase in real earnings. Family tax relief generated an extra 6 thousand HUF for families on average – according to model calculations, employees with at least three dependents retained 51 thousand more of their gross salaries than those not granted the tax relief.

In Focus

In 2015, In Focus addresses the issue of international migration. The decision was based on the series of events of recent years: while a few years ago it was the number of Hungarian emigrants increasing steadily from a considerably low level, since 2015 it has been the wave of refugees arriving in Europe that turned the spotlight on international migration and the role Hungary plays in it. International migration becomes deeply embedded in the labour market processes of the countries concerned: it has an impact on the level and structure of employment as well as on relative wage levels. When analysing emigration, the labour market related motivation of the decision to emigrate as well
as the short and long term consequences are to be considered. Immigration, on
the other hand, raises the question of what impact a (potentially) large influx
of immigrants has on the employment and wage levels of the residents of the
recipient country. Most of the studies of the publication deal with processes
directly affecting Hungary.

The introductory study of Ágnes Hárs provides an overview of emigration, re-
turn migration and immigration by investigating the Hungarian situation in
a regional context, comparing it to the situation in the other new EU member
states. The main finding of the statistics-based analysis is that although Hun-
gary joined the east-west migration of Europe with some delay, after a signifi-
cant increase it has now achieved a medium emigration level, which is, however,
not balanced by immigration.

The two major chapters following the introductory study examine emigration
from and immigration to Hungary separately. The second chapter, on emigra-
tion, contains studies with varied approaches and data sources, which predom-
inantly present consequences in an indirect way. (Expected) Impacts on the
labour market may be inferred from the extent and dynamics of emigration as
well as the social composition of the emigrants. These factors are investigated
by several studies of the publication. Endre Sik and Blanka Szeitl present the
changes in emigration intentions, i.e. the so-called migration potential. Studies
by Zsuzsa Blaskó and Irén Gödri as well as Ágnes Hárs and Dávid Simon focus
on completed migration. While the former presents the social and demographic
composition of the wider population emigrating from Hungary relying on sev-
eral data sources, the study by Ágnes Hárs and Dávid Simon analyses in detail,
on the basis of the Labour Force Survey, the composition of a smaller but im-
portant group of migrants – those undertaking employment abroad. A special
and, in respect of social consequences, significant group among the people un-
tertaking employment abroad consists of those who leave their family, includ-
ing underage children at home. The number of families involved in this type
of migration is specified in the boxed text by Zsuzsa Blaskó and Laura Szabó.

Studies focusing on a specific professional section of the labour market instead
of a heterogeneous group further deepen the understanding of the expected
impacts of emigration on the labour market. The two studies on the migration
of doctors (analysed by Ágnes Hárs and Dávid Simon as well as by Júlia Varga)
provide a detailed and accurate picture of how, and as a result of what factors,
doctors emigrated from Hungary over the past decade and a half. The boxed
text by Moreh Christian focuses on the Hungarians that have emigrated to the
United Kingdom, presenting the main trends of migration from Hungary to
the United Kingdom and the labour market characteristics of Hungarian im-
migrants living there.

Apart from detrimental effects, migration may also have positive impacts
on the countries of origin. These include earnings sent home by emigrants,
which are often significant at national level as well as the human capital accumulated by migrants abroad and then invested on return at home. The analysis by László Kádi presents the changes in the volume of money sent home by Hungarian emigrants whilst also covering the difficulties of measuring it. Ágnes Horváth gives a summary outline on the return migration to Hungary and provides the main conclusions of research undertaken in other countries of the region in this field. The same issue is addressed in the boxed text by Judit Kálmán, which reviews the international findings on public policies supporting return migration.

The third chapter discusses immigration and the impacts on the labour markets of recipient countries. Studies describing Hungarian tendencies rely on the data from the census. Irén Gödri identifies the factors affecting the labour market opportunities of immigrants to Hungary and how these opportunities differ between the various groups of immigrants. Her analysis reveals that the labour market indicators of immigrants in Hungary do not lag behind those of the Hungarian population – moreover, due to the composition (mainly due to higher educational attainment) of the group, they even exceed them. The findings are further interpreted by the boxed text by Róbert Károlyi, which states that this difference in employment is explained not only by the composition of the migrant cohort but also by the specific impact of some of their characteristics on the labour market. The boxed text by János Kolló reveals that – although the labour market advantage of immigrants in the 15–64 age group over the Hungarian population is the exception rather than the rule in Europe – when examining a broader age group, the increasing number of immigrants decisively contributed to the significant increase in employment in several European countries before the crisis.

The literary review by Katalin Bördös, Márton Csillag and Anna Orosz summarises the findings of surveys into the impact made by immigrants on the employment rate and wage levels of employees within the recipient countries. According to these, the short-term impact of immigration on the labour market is insignificant and there are mainly positive effects in the long run. The analysis of international data by Dániel Horn and István Kónya, examines the relationship between cultural and economic assimilation. The survey of 16 countries confirms the conclusion prognosticated by the study of Irén Gödri: linguistic assimilation is an important predictor of the labour market success of immigrants. In the final study of In Focus, Judit Tóth presents and explains the most important legal terms emerging in the discourse on migration.

When compiling In Focus, the aim was to present the ever-changing tendencies of migration up until a time as close as possible to the date of publication. In several cases it entailed the analysis of data which had only just emerged at the beginning of 2016. In other cases, however, the authors had to go back to the census of 2011 in order to get answers for some questions. This of course raises
the question of the timeliness of data but we decided to include these analyses because of the importance of the issues addressed.

The studies included in the publication do not directly reflect on the refugee crisis that Europe currently faces for the following two reasons. The studies of In Focus analyse the impact of migration on the labour market and in this respect it is irrelevant whether the immigrant wishing the find employment in a country arrives as a refugee or as an economic migrant. On the one hand, the expected impacts on the labour market are similar in both cases and they are determined by the same factors – consequently, the conclusions of the studies of In Focus investigating the conditions of the integration of immigrants also apply to the labour market integration of refugees. On the other hand, as mentioned before, the publication focuses on movements that are relevant for the labour market and concern Hungary. And the majority of refugees arriving in Europe either bypass Hungary or, even if they arrive in the country, most do not wish to settle down and find employment here.

Changes in labour policy tools (May 2015 – March 2016)

There were no significant changes in the policies affecting the labour market between May 2015 and March 2016. The most significant change in the institutional system is that a new client profiling system was introduced in 2016, which is expected to help to better target labour market programmes. A more significant government measure, which is, however, only announced as a plan is the transformation of vocational secondary schools into vocational “gymnasia” and vocational schools into vocational secondary schools – which would entail the decrease in the share of general knowledge subjects and would, in this way, limit opportunities to access higher education.

The budget of public works, the largest labour market programme, continued to increase in 2016. There were slight amendments made to the programme in order to raise the number of participants obtaining jobs on the open labour market. To further support this trend, the wages of public works participants has not changed, while the minimum wage was raised by 5.7 per cent in January 2016 (at the time of near-zero inflation). Finally, new active labour market programmes, primarily financed from EU funds, have been launched for supporting the long-term unemployed and young job seekers in finding employment. However, the public funding of NGOs assisting the rehabilitation of disabled job seekers has not been resolved and thus these services will be accessible to fewer clients from 2016 onwards.

Statistical data

This chapter, in the same structure as in previous years, provides detailed information on the major economic tendencies, the characteristics of the population, labour market participation, employment rate, unemployment, inactivity, wag-
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es, education, labour demand, regional imbalances, migration, labour relations and welfare benefits as well as an international comparison of selected labour market indicators of the period since the political changeover.

The data presented here have two main sources: on the one hand, the regular institutional and population surveys of the Central Statistical Office – the Labour Force Survey, institution-based labour statistics, and the labour force account; on the other hand, the register of the National Employment Service and its data collections: the unemployment register database, short-term labour market forecast, wage tariff surveys, and the Labour Relations Information System of the Ministry for National Economy. More information is provided on these data sources at the end of the statistical section. In addition to the two main data providers, the Central Administration of National Pension Insurance has provided the data on old age and disability pensions and assistance. Finally, some tables and figures are based on information from the online databases of the Central Statistical Office, the National Tax and Customs Administration and the Eurostat.

All tables and figures can be downloaded in Excel format following the links provided. All tables with labour market data published in the Hungarian Labour Market Yearbook since 2000 are available to download from the following website: http://adatbank.krtk.mta.hu/tukor_kereso.
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THE HUNGARIAN LABOUR MARKET IN 2015

TAMÁS BAKÓ & JUDIT LAKATOS
**ECONOMIC BACKGROUND**

According to preliminary data, the growth rate of Hungarian GDP was nearly 3 per cent in 2015. The impressive growth was to a great extent due to an accelerated usage of EU funds, the strong economic performance of our main European partners and low oil prices, which also made it possible to finance the utility cost reduction programme of the government. About two-thirds of the foreign trade surplus is linked to services, especially to tourism, transportation and to a lesser extent to computing and information technology (Central Bank, 2016).

The domestic engine of economic recovery was industry and services on the production side, and exports, in addition to the rise in consumption, on the use side. However, disadvantaged groups and those living exclusively on social welfare and public works do not benefit from increased consumption. Nor was the significant gap in incomes and consumption reduced in 2015. Since such a high influx of EU funds is not to be expected in the long run, the maintenance of growth will become a challenge. Our lag in growth potential compared to other countries of the region increased according to the 2016 country report of the European Commission (EC, 2016). The report attributes it to low productivity, the weakness of innovation, insecurity concerning the private sector and special taxes in certain sectors deterring investment.

The impressive increase in the employment rate improved the contribution of labour to growth in spite of the adverse changes in the age composition of the population. Significant factors of the changes in employment indicators include the structural reforms of recent years, especially the reform of the unemployment benefit scheme, the expansion of eligibility for public works programmes and the strong restriction on early exit to the labour market. In principle the lowering of the obligatory school age from age 18 to 16 is also included here but its effect is not yet apparent.

The current key sectors maintain a medium development level but the focussed development of fields with high R + D potential is missing – and its prerequisites in terms of training are not fulfilled either. Central European countries, including – and to an increasing extent – Hungary, have to face the negative impacts of labour market migration due to the significant wage differences. It not only results in labour shortages in certain professions but it mainly concerns to a greater extent the professionally experienced and the more entrepreneurial, i.e. those who are also more needed in Hungary. Nevertheless, it is also obvious that the share of those who were unemployed earlier is higher among the commuters than among those employed in Hungary (Bodnár–Szabó, 2014).
LABOUR FORCE DEMAND AND SUPPLY

The size of the age group 15–64, constituting the labour force, was 60 thousand lower in 2015 than a year ago, which had both demographic causes (births and deaths) and the negative balance of international migration. The retirement age is raised continuously, and in this way an age group of nearly 150 thousand increases the headcount of those supposed to be present in the labour market. The potential labour supply is further augmented – although less significantly – by two factors: the lowering of the obligatory schooling age to 16 and the elimination of the restrictions on employment whilst receiving child benefits. Thus the improvement of the employment rate in 2015 was partly due to changes in the denominator of the ratio (the fall in the size of the 15–64 age group), while the measures expanding the potential supply increased the numerator (Figure 1).

Figure 1: The number of persons employed (left axis) and the employment rate of the age group 15–64 (right axis), 2009–2015


The number of employees had already reached the pre-crisis level in 2013, while in 2014 the labour force survey of the Central Statistical Office (CSO) reported a further significant increase of 208 thousand, about one-quarter of which was due to the expansion of eligibility of participation in public works. In 2015, even though not at the rate of the previous year, the number of those in employment rose further. On a yearly average, their numbers exceeded 4 million 210 thousand, which was 110 thousand higher than the previous year and reached the highest value since the start of the labour force survey in 1992. The employment rate of 63.9% in the 15–64 age group shows a 9 percentage points improvement compared to 2010, the nadir of the crisis (although nearly 2 percentage points of this are attributable to a decrease in the denominator), closing the gap on the European average.
– similarly to previous years – resulted from three factors but the significance of these in 2015 was somewhat different from the previous years.

1. The domestic primary labour market has become the most important factor of growth. According to the labour force survey of CSO, 62 thousand more persons found a job here than the year before. This coincides with the labour statistics of institutions\(^3\) which registered a 54 thousand increase in the headcounts of businesses with more than five employees, employing a total of 1,910,000 persons.

The increase in headcounts in manufacturing, the largest branch of economic activity employing 646.6 thousand people exceeded the average of the private sector by 0.2 percentage point; however, changes in headcounts differed widely among sectors. In the automotive industry it increased by an outstanding 7.4 per cent and by 6.2 per cent in the industry group of rubber, plastic and non-metallic mineral product production. At the same time, textile, clothing, leather and leather product manufacturing as well as wood processing, paper production and printing were significant sectors with decreasing headcounts.

As for the sectors with more than one-hundred thousand employees, there was a 3 per cent rise in retail (in spite of the shops staying closed on Sundays) and vehicle repair: this entailed a 4.4 rise in full time employee numbers and a fall in part time employees. Headcounts in the administrative and support sectors grew by 4.9 per cent and in the construction sector by 1.3 per cent compared to the previous year.

Concerning sectors with lower headcounts, accommodation, rental and catering experienced an exceptional rise of 6.6 per cent due to the increase in household purchasing power and the better performance of tourism, while employers with more than five employees in the professional, scientific and technical sector saw an even higher growth of 6.9 per cent.

In the state sector, there were 0.5 per cent more employees in “regular positions” (i.e. not as public works participants), in total 698 thousand, than the year before. Most of this increase happened in public administration, defence and compulsory social security, while healthcare and social welfare experienced a decrease.

2. Public works significantly contributed to both the expansion of employment in 2015 and the current high level (as well as to the impressive unemployment figures) – although to a lesser extent than in the previous two years (Figure 2). According to the labour force survey, an average of 212 thousand worked in this category in 2015, 36 thousand more than in the previous year.\(^4\) The annual report of the Ministry of the Interior in charge of public works programmes includes an average headcount of 208.1 thousand, while according to the data of the Central Statistical Office, 192 thousand participated in public works, a 5 per cent rise on the previous year. The important role

\(^3\) The statistics of institutions relies on the number of jobs and not the number of persons employed; however, the two figures are identical among businesses.

\(^4\) The headcounts data of CSO, and especially the yearly increase, are higher than the more reliable data calculated from the registry of the Ministry of the Interior. The main reason for this is probably the imprecise recall of respondents (recall error). Regular participants to public works, who are usually registered job seekers between the closure of a programme and the start of a new programme do not necessarily accurately remember their status during a specific week, and it is also possible that they also consider themselves public works participants in between programmes. Uncertainty is further increased if instead of the person concerned another adult member of the household provides information.
of public works in the employment rate and indirectly in living standards is even better described by Ministry of the Interior statistics, revealing that in 2015 there was already a total of 348 thousand people participating in public works for at least one day (but typically 6–10 months). More than one-third (36.2 per cent) of the registered unemployed exited the system to enter public works but this share among unskilled workers was over 40 per cent.5

Figure 2: The monthly numbers of public works participants in the state sector (left hand axis) and of employees of businesses and not-for-profit organisations (right hand axis) 2011–2015 (thousand persons)

Source: Monthly labour reports.

Although it is obvious that income from public works is higher than the income from employment substitution support (which has been stagnating for years) and helps to maintain basic skills required for working, experience from recent years and several research studies show that it does not open up re-entry to the primary labour market (Csoba–Nagy, 2012, Köllő–Scharle, 2012, Cseres-Gergely–Molnár, 2015). In 2015, 65 per cent of funds aimed at tackling unemployment was spent on public works programmes, while little funding was allocated for programmes more efficiently supporting re-entry to the labour market. The labour market of public works is highly segregated in all respects, including regionally: in December 2015, one in three public works participants lived in either Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén or Szabolcs-Szatmár Bereg county. Opinions regarding the expansive public works projects are mixed. The most recent country report by the European Union expressed that “The public works scheme has contributed to a fall in unemployment (and improves the employment rate), but it does not seem to sufficiently improve the employability of the participants, ... does not sufficiently support the reintegration of participants into the open labour market. This risks lock-

---

5 This indicator is the so-called public works rate, comparing the number of public works participants to the total number of public works participants and registered job seekers (Ministry of Interior, 2016).
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...ing participants into the scheme.” (EU, 2016, p. 3. and p. 46.) Another important critical remark of the report, though only indirectly related to public works, is that the social welfare system is unable to protect the most vulnerable, that education does not help to reduce the gap in social disparities and unemployment benefits are granted for the shortest time in the EU and on average are not enough to assist in finding a new job. The expansion of public works has a significant impact on labour market figures not only in terms of general indicators but also from several other aspects (e.g. employment rate by educational attainment or regions).

3. The third, and less known dimension of employment growth is taking up employment abroad. In the 2015 labour force survey of the CSO, 111 thousand respondents (11 per cent more than the year before) said that they were working in another country, most of them in Austria, and based on their permanent address (counties near the border are strongly overrepresented) a significant part of them is likely to commute or work in seasonal jobs (Table 1). Germany came second and typically this is where main earners work while supporting their families at home. The third most important target country is the United Kingdom but obviously only a section of Hungarians working and living there are recorded in the Hungarian statistics. It may be due to the high share of young people, who are not regarded as part of the household by their parents any longer and also due to difficulties in maintaining two homes because of the distance from Hungary.

Table 1: The number of respondents declaring a job abroad in the Hungarian labour force survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>17,463</td>
<td>22,866</td>
<td>29,820</td>
<td>44,702</td>
<td>44,102</td>
<td>52,684</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>11,347</td>
<td>13,682</td>
<td>23,771</td>
<td>28,630</td>
<td>29,723</td>
<td>31,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>7,662</td>
<td>8,200</td>
<td>8,931</td>
<td>8,293</td>
<td>6,503</td>
<td>9,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other EU country</td>
<td>9,549</td>
<td>12,465</td>
<td>12,927</td>
<td>10,973</td>
<td>13,319</td>
<td>12,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other country</td>
<td>3,513</td>
<td>4,137</td>
<td>4,940</td>
<td>4,777</td>
<td>6,094</td>
<td>5,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49,534</td>
<td>61,350</td>
<td>80,389</td>
<td>97,375</td>
<td>99,741</td>
<td>111,057</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Authors’ calculations based on CSO labour force survey.

These three countries together accounted for over 82 per cent of the Hungarians working abroad. This figure is exactly the same as the one regarding Hungarians living for at least one year in the country concerned in the European Labour Force Survey (EU–LFS), but the proportions among the three target countries are markedly different from those presented in the CSO labour force survey. The Austrian survey records less than half the number of Hungarians working in Austria as the number recorded in the Hungarian survey, which proves that a significant part of Hungarians working in Austria are commuters without an Austrian address. As for the Hungarians working...
in Austria the data of the two surveys may be added up. The figures of the German labour force survey are more than two and a half times more than the Hungarian survey but the two populations probably overlap to a larger extent than in the case of Hungarians working in Austria, since those working in Germany have to have a residence there. The largest difference between the two data series is in the case of the United Kingdom. While the Hungarian survey indicates a stagnating headcount of 7–9 thousand for the past five years, the equivalent UK statistics reveal four times as many Hungarian employees in 2011 and eight times as many in 2014.

Compared to 2011, the number of Hungarians reporting a job abroad also doubled in the Hungarian labour force surveys, just as it did in the EU labour force surveys between 2011 and 2014. However, in addition to differences between proportions, there is also a considerable difference in absolute terms: while the Hungarian labour force survey signals an increase of 47 thousand, the EU statistics show an increase of nearly 90 thousand between 2011 and 2014. In addition, a study by Varga (2015) warns that for medical doctors leaving the profession is an equally serious problem as their finding a job abroad.

The labour demand of businesses has also increased over the past two years. Companies with at least five employees took active steps to fill 1.5 of out of every 100 vacancies. The number of vacancies used as an indicator predicting economic recovery (and the number of jobs to be filled) reached pre-crisis levels. Nevertheless, the number of vacancies over time no longer follows the earlier pattern (involving a high level of vacancies due to retirements in the first quarter, which later gradually decreases), because in 2015 there was a further increase after the first quarter (Figure 3).

![Figure 3: Vacancies in the private sector, 2006–2015 (thousand persons)](image)

Source: Statistics of institutions on vacancies.
UNEMPLOYMENT AND THE POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL LABOUR FORCE

The fall in the number of the unemployed followed the rise in the number of employees with some delay (Figure 4). While the number of employees grew continuously from 2010 and reached pre-crisis levels in 2013, the number of the unemployed hardly changed until 2012. Even the fall that started in 2013 was below what would have been expected on the basis of the employment growth, since the expansion of public works also encouraged some of the earlier inactives to enter the labour market. This continuous influx had finished by 2015 and the number of the unemployed according to the ILO definition declined to a yearly average of 307.8 thousand in the labour force survey of the CSO, which implies a 6.8 per cent unemployment rate. Partly due to the government intervention to increase the employment rate, the Hungarian unemployment rate was now in the most favourable one-third of the European ranking. The number of the registered unemployed decreased from 422 thousand to 378 thousand in 2015 and the number of those defining themselves as unemployed in the labour force survey also fell to the level characteristic of the first half of the 2000s.

Figure 4: The number of registered job seekers, the unemployed according to ILO definition and those defining themselves as such, 2006–2015

Source: National Employment Service/Ministry for the National Economy, CSO labour force survey.

The number of the so-called ILO unemployed continued to decrease from all important aspects. There were on average nearly 20 thousand fewer unemployed men and 16 thousand fewer unemployed women in 2015 than a year earlier. While as a result of the crisis the unemployment rate of men exceeded that of women, from 2013 on the figure has been again higher among women and the difference is increasing. In 2015, the unemployment rate for men was 6.6 per cent as opposed to the 7 per cent for women. The youth unemploy-
ment rate declined from 20.4% per cent to 17.3 per cent but still nearly one in five unemployed is younger than 25. While in many countries youth unemployment results from seeking employment alongside studying, in Hungary the majority of the young unemployed is characterised by early school leaving and a consequent difficulty in finding a job. In spite of the decrease in youth unemployment, the share of NEET young adults (young people not in employment, education or training) is still high.

The number of the unemployed with a maximum of a lower secondary education, similarly to those with a (upper) secondary school leaving certificate, who are also regarded in the labour market as unskilled, hardly decreased in 2015, while the number of those who finished vocational school fell by 13 thousand, and of those who finished vocational secondary school the numbers showed a fall of nearly 10 thousand. The fact that it was mainly those with a vocational upper secondary qualification who benefited from the decrease in unemployment (in addition to higher education graduates, who have an insignificant share in the unemployed) coincides with the finding that the number of employees of businesses employing a large number of persons with these qualification types increased to the greatest extent. The unemployment rate decreased in all regions but – similarly to the employment rate – it did not have an impact on the considerable differences among the regions (Figure 5).

Figure 5: Unemployment rates in the regions of Hungary, 2006–2015

Source: CSO labour force survey.

The average length of unemployment was 18.5 months both in 2015 and in the preceding year; however, the share of the long-term unemployed fell from 49.5 per cent to 48 per cent, that is, the length of job-search for the long term unemployed increased (Figure 6).

The public works scheme has a stronger and more direct influence on the number of registered job seekers than on the ILO-unemployed. It is underpinned by the fact that in March, when the number of public works participants was the lowest as a result of the end of programmes that had started in the previous year, the number of registered unemployed rose to a yearly peak.
The effect of the reforms of the benefit system in 2011 (cutting back the job seeking benefit period to three months, limiting eligibility for job seeker’s assistance to persons having not more than five years to work before retirement, linking income-tested benefits to participation in public works programmes and in other active programs) were already effective by 2014 but did not influence tendencies in 2015. 57 thousand were eligible to job seeker’s benefits payable only to those insured, which is roughly the same as in the previous year, while regular social assistance was granted to 5 per cent fewer beneficiaries – the same as the increase in the number of public works participants.

In addition to the unemployed meeting the criteria of formal definitions (e.g. ILO-unemployed or registered job seeker), a considerable number are on the labour market who could (would) become employed if certain conditions were in place. The Eurostat defines potential additional labour force not covered by the ILO-unemployment definition as the following three categories: 1. The underemployed, who work part time but wish to work full time instead, 2. Job seekers unable to start work within two weeks 3. Jobless persons available for work but not seeking work for some reason. The potential additional labour force included 623.4 thousand in 2014 and 535.4 thousand in 2015, including 74.5 thousand who were underemployed. If adding the underemployed to the 460 thousand persons defining themselves as unemployed, the result equals the exact number of the potential additional labour force. The two data series indicate that although in principle there is a nearly half-million surplus on the supply side, yet because of their special circumstances, some of these people can only take up employment with difficulty or indeed cannot take up employment at all.
2 million 48 thousand of the working age population (aged 15–64) were not economically active in 2015 for various reasons, which is 5.9 per cent less than the year before (*Table 2*). The size of the largest category of these, the old age pensioners and annuitants was influenced by the incremental increase of the retirement age, while the size of the group of students was affected – in addition to demographic changes – by the lowering of the compulsory school age and the willingness to enter higher education, which was lower than in previous years. Because of the restrictions on the eligibility to unemployment benefits in cash, the number of those inactive on such payments decreased, while the expansion of the public works programmes and the economic recovery provided opportunities for a larger number of so-called other inactives to enter the labour market.

*Table 2: The number of inactives aged 15–64 by gender and the reason for inactivity*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>thousand persons</td>
<td>percentage</td>
<td></td>
<td>thousand persons</td>
<td>percentage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old age pensioner, annuitant</td>
<td>316.6</td>
<td>475.4</td>
<td>792.0</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>92.8</td>
<td>91.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient of childcare benefits</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>236.9</td>
<td>240.0</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>100.9</td>
<td>101.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient of unemployment benefits</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>69.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>345.1</td>
<td>343.7</td>
<td>688.8</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>98.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient of care allowance or orphans’ benefit</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>111.2</td>
<td>107.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other inactive</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>138.0</td>
<td>229.3</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>92.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total of inactives aged 15–64</td>
<td>797.3</td>
<td>1250.3</td>
<td>2047.7</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>94.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: CSO labour force survey.

**EARNINGS**

As regards the regulation of earnings, there are three segments of the economy: 1. the private sector, 2. the public sector and 3. public works, which is different in terms of wage determination (wages are solely determined by government decrees).

1. Gross earnings in the private sector (including non-profit organisations and majority-state-owned entities such as the Hungarian Post or the Hungarian State Railways) are shaped by the wage policies and business profits of economic organizations as well as the less significant wage agreements, the only single central intervention being the setting of the minimum wage. (*Figure 7*).

The minimum wage (or rather the guaranteed minimum wage) grew by 3.4 per cent in 2015 (the former to a monthly gross of 105 thousand, while the latter to monthly gross of 122 thousand HUF), which was slightly lower than the 3.9 per cent on average characteristic of the private sector. Nevertheless, av-
Average wages in the private sector and the minimum wage have been increasing at the same rate since 2013. This ensures that the lag of employees working in low-wage professions does not increase, and also that small businesses, where wages constitute only a part of the remuneration, pay taxes and contributions on at least the minimum wage and in this way their employees are entitled to various benefits (sickness benefit, old-age pension) based on increasingly higher contributions. However, the relatively high minimum wage reduces the chances of unskilled, low-productivity job seekers finding employment on the primary labour market thereby forcing them to accept low-paying public works permanently, which basically does not set performance requirements.

Despite 2015 being a successful year on the whole, the increase in earnings in the private sector was 0.4 percentage point lower than the year before. Similarly to the previous year, the significance of non-regular wage components did not increase. In 2014, in addition to the 3.8 per cent rise in regular earnings, non-regular earnings grew by 10.3 per cent compared to the previous year, while the same indicators were 3.7 per cent and 6.5 per cent in 2015 respectively. In 2015, non-regular wage components, accounting for 8 per cent of total earnings, amounted to 21.1 thousand HUF on average in the segment of the private sector reviewed. Its significance was outstanding in the electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply sector (17.0 per cent), in the finance and insurance professions (13.6 per cent) and was even higher in the crude oil processing and coke production sector (19.6 per cent) within the processing industry. As for manual workers, non-regular wage components accounted for 5 per cent of their total earnings, while for non-manual (white-collar) workers it accounted for 10.1 per cent. (The 2.15-fold difference between the earnings of manual and non-manual workers in the private sector in 2015 would only be 2.05-fold if non-regular wage components were shared equally between the two groups.)
In the economic sectors characterised by the dominance or exclusivity of the private sector, the highest earnings are traditionally in the finance and insurance professions, with an average monthly gross salary of 494.0 thousand HUF (Figure 8). This is followed by IT and communication (460.3 thousand HUF) and by the electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning sector (438.6 thousand HUF). In the processing industry, where earnings are average, coke production and crude oil processing came first, with an average monthly gross salary of 644 thousand HUF, followed by the pharmaceuticals industry with 440.2 thousand HUF. The latter was four times as high as the average of the lowest paying branch of the processing industry – textile, clothing, leather and leather products manufacturing (160.1 thousand HUF).

**Figure 8: Gross earnings in the major sections of the private sector, 2015**

(THOUSAND HUF)

Although working conditions and the characteristics of work are more homogeneous in non-manual jobs than in manual jobs, more or less the same sectoral proportions are seen in manual and non-manual jobs; however, the relative earnings levels in a section also depend on the proportions of the two workforce categories. Thus although the electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning section was only in third place in the ranking of economic sectors in 2015, the gross earnings of both manual and non-manual workers were the highest (331 thousand HUF and 540 thousand HUF respectively). While average wages in trade vehicle repair were below the average of the private sec-
tor both in their levels and rate of increase, several big supermarket chains were forced to raise wages in the last third of the year due to increasing labour shortages. The flight of trade workers mainly resulted from the lower wages due to Sunday shop closure, the extra workload due to increased traffic on Friday and Saturday as well as the draining effect of higher earnings and better working conditions in the processing industry.

2. The public sector, employing 698 thousand people on average in 2015 is regulated centrally. The basic elements of the remuneration system established in the 1990s have been unchanged since 2008, while some of the bonuses (such as the guaranteed 13th month salary) have been terminated. Recently there have been frequent wage adjustment measures, often in an ad hoc manner, focusing on certain groups of employees as well as the removal of certain restrictions. Since these changes are partial, occasionally they create tension even within a workplace.

A good example is the introduction of the teacher promotion system, which (although accompanied by significant increase in requirements) noticeably raised teachers’ salaries, while the salaries of other staff working in the same institutions did not change. From the autumn of 2013 the salary of teachers, while from July 2015 the salary of law enforcement staff was raised to a great extent. The latter was an average of 30 per cent, which is to be followed by a 5 per cent annual pay rise until 2019, that is, similarly to the introduction of the teachers’ promotion system, its effect will continue to be felt in the rate of salary increases of the following years. Several other measures (with less significant effects) have been implemented, typically involving certain groups of social welfare and healthcare workers. These fields have been suffering from labour shortages for years and neither the extent nor the way of implementing the wage adjustment (instead of raising the basic salaries, social welfare workers received a wage supplement in 2014, and extra compensation in 2015, similarly to healthcare workers, neither of which implies long-term commitment) was enough to stop the drain. Low-paying and not family friendly occupations are not popular with young people, therefore the retirement of the large age groups born in the first half of the 1950s (which is accelerated even more by the so-called 40-year rule for female workers), will further aggravate the already serious situation.

As a result of measures of recent years, the difference between the average wages of the private and public sectors has decreased. At a 6.3 per cent rate of increase, the gross earning of public sector employees was 256.4 thousand HUF on average in 2015, not including public works participants. This was only seven thousand HUF lower than the average of the private sector but the differences between the various occupational groups and the lag of public sector areas are still significant. Due to the method applied for wage adjustment, the significance of non-regular wage components also increased in

---

7 In case of government institutions, where the same person might work at several locations, the actual number of employees is lower than the number of jobs. Compared to the data of the tax authority, there is a difference of tens of thousands.

8 The system is far from perfect: e.g. the promotion levels have not yet been adjusted to the raised retirement age.
the public sector (similarly to the private sector): as opposed the 5.9 per cent increase in regular wages, they showed a 14.1 per cent rise in 2015 compared to the previous year.

As for the important sections of the public sector, the earnings of healthcare workers only increased by 2.3 per cent in spite of the extra compensation at the end of the year. The net salaries of 22 thousand manual workers was below one-hundred thousand HUF (99.1 thousand HUF) and the average pay of 78 thousand, mostly highly qualified non-manual workers was 157.9 thousand HUF. In the social welfare field earnings grew above average but this did not improve the net wage gap (the average net salary of manual workers was 86.1 thousand HUF, while that of non-manual workers was 114.6 thousand HUF). Employment in education was in the mid-range both in terms of average earnings and the rate of increase in 2015 (net salaries were 93.3 thousand and 140.3 thousand at a 5.2 per cent rate of increase), while the field including public administration, defence and obligatory social insurance, employing a total of 255 thousand persons, and with highly heterogeneous activities, experienced a 7.9 per cent increase in earnings. (The increase was especially high for manual workers – 16.2 per cent – owing to a special pay rise for law enforcement officers.) Thus the average net salaries of manual workers rose to 171.8 thousand, while that of the non-manual workers rose to 205.7 thousand HUF.

3. Public works is a different sector in terms of wage determination, since wages are solely determined by government decrees. In 2015, the salary of a “standard” public works participant was defined as 79,155 HUF, the salary of skilled participants working in low headcount positions was 101,480 HUF, and the salary of team leaders was 111,660 HUF. The average gross salary of public works participants was 79,756 HUF, which implies a net salary of 52 thousand HUF. As opposed to the two previous years, in 2015 the salary of public works participants (and consequently their average pay) did not increase as much as the minimum wage (there was an average rise of 2.2 per cent), but the difference is still not enough for a job with a minimum wage to be a real alternative to local public works without real performance requirements.

Fringe benefits – components providing a direct income for workers, e.g. cafeteria – basically did not change compared to the previous year (they amounted to a monthly average of 13.9 thousand HUF in the private sector and 12.3 thousand HUF in the public sector). Sectoral differences in fringe benefits are even higher than in salaries. While annual fringe benefits in the highly paid pharmaceutical industry amount to 730 thousand HUF, in the low-paid social welfare profession they did not even reach 34 thousand HUF.

Similarly to 2014, there were no changes in income tax rates and social security contributions in 2015 and in this way net earnings and gross earnings increased at the same rate. Net wages equalled 65.5 per cent of gross wages on
average, which is significantly more favourable than before 2011. The main beneficiaries of the tax reforms are obviously the high earners. So that the net salaries of low-paid workers do not decrease because of the phase-out of certain allowances, businesses had to supplement the salaries themselves (although they were eligible for bridging funds). This problem was regulated uniformly in the public sector. As a result of wage adjustment measures and the fluctuation of the workforce the number of employees concerned decreased continuously, but even in 2015 nearly 180 thousand received a monthly average of 9,600 HUF so-called social benefit for this reason (and 9,300 HUF for a few thousands in the non-profit sector), which is not part of the salary but a supplement.

Most of the contribution society makes to the costs of child rearing is through tax reliefs. For families with one or two children it was 62,500 HUF per child monthly until 2015, while for families with three or more children it was 206,250 HUF. From 2014 low-paid employees were able to deduct it from the pension contribution or the healthcare contribution. According to model calculations, in 2015 the net salary of the minority of employees with at least three dependents was 51 thousand HUF higher than that of those (the majority) who were not granted the tax relief. (Table 3).

### Table 3: Net and real earnings calculated with the family tax relief, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of dependent children</th>
<th>Net earnings/month/person (HUF)</th>
<th>Net earnings</th>
<th>Real earnings*</th>
<th>Share of employees by number of children (percentage)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 child</td>
<td>158,945</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 child</td>
<td>166,002</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 children</td>
<td>185,827</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 or more children</td>
<td>209,639</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Calculated at the 99.9% consumer price index in 2015.

Source: CSO (2016) p. 6, Table 7.
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INTRODUCTION

This year, *In Focus* addresses the issue of the position of Hungary in the processes of international migration and how these processes (may) affect the labour market. The decision is justified by a series of events over the recent years. First, after a long period of a relatively low level of emigration the number of emigrants from Hungary started a steady and continuous increase around 2007, while in 2015 the massive wave of refugees arriving in Europe drew attention to international migration, and the possible consequences of immigration.

International migration is deeply embedded in the labour market processes of the countries affected; it has an impact on the level and structure of employment as well as on wage levels. From the perspective of the sending country, in the case of *emigration*, labour market-related motivations as well as the short- and long-term consequences of decreasing labour-supply must be considered. At the same time, *immigration* can also influence level of employment and wage levels in the receiving country.

The studies presented here intend to place Hungary in the context of international migration, both as a sending and as a (potential) receiving country. The first paper by Ágnes Hárs provides an overview of the processes of emigration, return migration and immigration to and from Hungary from a comparative perspective, looking both at the regional context and comparing to other EU Member States. A key conclusion of the throughout statistical analyses here is that although Hungary was somewhat late in joining in the recent East-West migration flows within Europe, after a substantial growth, annual emigration has by now reached the regional average and is not at all compensated for by immigration.

Following the first overview, Chapter 2 is analysing the main tendencies of *emigration* from Hungary in the past decade, focusing mainly on consequences in the labour market. The studies of Chapter 3. then take the perspective of the receiving country, and analyse the labour market consequences of *immigration*. Several studies in this chapter provide experiences from countries outside Hungary. This is because (so far) experience on the impact of immigration in Hungary is limited due to the relatively low number of immigrants in the country.

For the time being there is a shortage of standard labour market studies that would directly analyse the consequences of emigration in Hungary. The reasons are twofold: on the one hand, appropriate data is missing, on the other hand these processes are still relatively recent for causal relationships to be established. Therefore, the chapter on emigration includes a number of stud-
ies that explore the labour market implications indirectly, using a variety of approaches and methods. The (likely) labour market effects can be inferred from the extent and dynamics of emigration as well as from the social composition of emigrants. Various studies in this volume apply this approach. *Endre Sik* and *Blanka Szeitl* present the development of migration intentions, the so-called migration potential. Although migration potential is not directly related to realised migration, nevertheless it helps to understand the potential extent of future migration and the likely composition of emigrants. On the other hand, studies by *Zsuzsa Blaskó* and *Irén Gödri*, as well as by *Ágnes Hárs* and *Dávid Simon* address realised migration. While the former study presents the social and demographic composition of the general migrant population from Hungary using a variety of data sources, the study by *Hárs* and *Simon* examines changes in the number and composition of a narrower but nevertheless important group of emigrants – labour migrants – based on data from labour force surveys. A small but important group, particularly in terms of social consequences, is constituted by emigrants who go abroad for work, leaving behind a family with children. The boxed text by *Zsuzsa Blaskó* and *Laura Szabó* presents information on the number of families affected by this type of migration in Hungary.

Studies that focus on a specific subgroup rather than the entire heterogeneous group of emigrants help to better understand the expected labour market implications of emigration. Two studies in this chapter therefore concentrate on the submarket of medical doctors (*Ágnes Hárs* and *Simon Dávid*, and *Júlia Varga*) providing a detailed and accurate picture of the tendencies and the influencing factors in the emigration of medical doctors over the past 15 years in Hungary. The boxed text by *Christian Moreh* in turn focuses on a geographical segment: it is looking on Hungarian migrants in the United Kingdom. This study presents the main migration trends from Hungary to the United Kingdom as well as the labour market characteristics of Hungarians in the UK.

Although often neglected, emigration might also have positive effects on the sending country. These include remittances sent home by the emigrants (potentially contributing to the country’s GDP to a significant extent), and also human capital accumulated abroad and consequently invested at home by returning migrants. *László Kajdi’s* analysis presents the development of the volume of remittances sent home by Hungarian emigrants and also addresses measurement challenges. *Ágnes Horváth’s study* provides an overview on return migration to Hungary and also presents the main conclusions from research studies on the topic from other countries of the region. The boxed text by *Judit Kálmán* addresses the same issue by reviewing the international experiences from return migration policies. These latter studies further refine the simplistic dichotomy of emigration and immigration. This is especially im-
important because – as it clearly emerges from the introductory study by Ágnes Hárs as well as from Christian Moreh’s piece – it is highly misleading to discuss emigration as a one-way process. Today’s migration flows in Europe are especially characterised by fluidity, a series of out-, return and also remigrations.

Chapter 3 addresses immigration by looking at the potential labour market effects in the receiving countries. Irén Gödri applies population census data to show what factors shape the employment chances of immigrants in Hungary and how labour market chances differ across different groups of immigrants. The analysis suggests that the labour market indicators of immigrants in Hungary are not only comparable to those of the total population but they even surpass them. The labour market advantages of the immigrants according to this study are mainly due to their composition, most importantly to their high average level of education. These findings are further nuanced by Róbert Károlyi’s boxed text, which argues that the employment differentials between immigrants and those born in Hungary can not only be linked to differences in their composition but also to the particular labour market implications of their social and demographic characteristics. János Köllő’s boxed text puts these findings into a wider context. It shows that although the labour market advantages of immigrants compared to the national population among the 15–64-year olds found in Hungary are rather exceptional in Europe, when a wider cohort is being looked at we find that the increase in the number of immigrants has in fact contributed to the growth of employment in a number of European countries before the economic crisis to a significant extent.

The literature review by Katalin Bördös, Márton Csillag and Anna Orosz summarises the findings from a range of studies that examine the impact of immigrants on employment and wage level in receiving countries. These suggest that the short-term impact of immigration on the labour market is negligible, while the long-term effects tend to be positive. In their empirical study Dániel Horn and István Kónya examine the relationship between cultural and economic assimilation using international survey data. Their findings on 16 countries confirm the conclusion (suggested also by Irén Gödri) that linguistic assimilation is a key predictor of labour market success among immigrants.

The last chapter of In Focus by Judit Töth presents and explains the key legal categories used in the discourse on migration.

When editing In Focus we aimed at presenting the constantly moving flows of migration based on data as up-to-date as possible. In some cases this meant that the analysis given here is based on data that just became available at the beginning of 2016. However, in other cases authors had to return to the 2011 Population Census in order to answer particular questions (e.g. on the situation of immigrants in Hungary). Naturally, this raises the issue of timeliness; however considering the significance of the topics in question and the
lack of more recent data, we decided that we cannot avoid returning to these datasources.

The studies in this volume do not directly reflect upon the refugee crisis Europe is currently facing. The reasons for this are two-fold. First, from a labour market perspective it makes no difference whether immigrants looking for work have arrived in the country as refugees or as (economic) migrants. Assuming that other factors are equal, the potential labour market implications are similar and are also being shaped by similar factors in both cases. Therefore the findings of In Focus studies exploring issues around the integration of immigrants are also valid for the labour market integration of refugees. Second, as highlighted earlier, In Focus addresses migration flows affecting Hungary that are relevant from a labour market perspective. For the time being however, the masses of refugees arriving in Europe either completely avoid Hungary or if they enter the country they use it as a transit route and do not wish to settle and find employment here.
1 EMIGRATION AND IMMIGRATION IN HUNGARY
AFTER THE REGIME CHANGE – BY INTERNATIONAL
COMPARISON
ÁGNES HÁRS

After regime change, border restrictions were lifted, the state control of foreign travel ended, and the countries of Eastern Europe again became part of the international migration flows – although to a differing extent. In Hungary, increasing emigration over the last nearly ten years and the large wave of refugees since 2015 directed public discourse and attention to the phenomenon of migration. Public debates focused on low outmigration and the lack of migration propensity just over ten years ago, and prior to that on the relatively high immigration by regional comparison.

What is the real extent of emigration in Hungary, when and how did it change, and what position does the country occupy within the increasing Eastern European emigration? Does immigration offset emigration? This introductory chapter examines the changes observed in Hungary using descriptive statistics, and contrasts these to processes that have taken place in other Eastern European countries. Using comparative statistics it is shown how migration developed in other Eastern European countries, where factors that determine migration changed in a similar way and context. The first, longer part of the chapter examines emigration, the second part discusses immigration, and the final part draws out some relevant conclusions for Hungary.

Outmigration from Eastern European countries

Changes and expectations

The return to the permeability of borders after regime change created new opportunities in immigration, emigration and return migration for residents of Eastern European transition countries. Migration was no longer a one-off and unidirectional occurrence. Instead, with open borders constant flow, out- and return migration became natural. Due to the substantial economic disparities among regions, economists in the early 1990s – after earlier controls on foreign travel had been lifted – predicted a strong migration pressure and flows from Eastern European transition countries towards more developed regions of the world (Layard et al., 1992). The unifying of Europe and the possibility of the opening up of European Union labour markets for nationals of Eastern European countries created East-West migration expectations within Europe and it triggered actual migration from Eastern Europe towards the more developed countries in Europe already during the period of preparation. The gradual dismantling of administrative barriers to mobility
made it easier – and thus encouraged – movement within Europe compared to other regions, and also reduced the financial and non-financial burden associated with migration.

The possibility of free movement in reality meant the freedom of labour allocation – as set out in Harris & Todaro’s classic model – within the single European labour market via migration (Harris–Todaro, 1970). Studies that estimated the extent and characteristics of migration based on GDP differentials between economies (Bauer–Zimmermann, 1999, Boeri–Brücker, 2001, Dustmann et al., 2003), as well as those that explored migration intentions and possibilities, predicted large variations in mobility across countries. The majority of studies examined the economic impact the gradually increasing access to the labour market (Boeri–Brücker, 2005, Baas–Brücker, 2008) and then actual migration (Kahanec–Zimmermann, 2010, Kahanec, 2013) on receiving countries. In the potential receiving countries regulations controlling migration, particularly restrictions on employment, put limitations on the freedom and intensity of processes, while the period preparing for European Union accession was characterised by labour migration regulated by bi-lateral agreements (Hárs, 2003). When a free market in labour commenced in 2004, a strong flow of labour migration began towards possible destinations.

According to the Accession Treaty of the European Union the 15 EU Member States could restrict the free movement of labour from the eight new Member States (EU–8), with the exception of Malta and Cyprus for a period of up to seven years. Only three countries opened up their labour market in May 2004: the United Kingdom, Ireland and Sweden. The majority of the countries took partial advantage of the seven-year transitional period and opened their labour markets gradually, while Germany and Austria bordering the Eastern regions of the European Union took full advantage of the transitional period, postponing free movement of labour until May 2011. During the transition period there were restrictions on the employment of EU–8 nationals in the affected countries. After the accession of Romania and Bulgaria in 2007, only the EU–8 countries opened up their labour market (with the exception of Hungary) for Romanian and Bulgarian workers, followed by Denmark, Greece, Portugal, Spain, and Hungary two years later. The other EU Member States delayed the introduction of free movement until 2014.

The following will examine the intensity of this process, the size of migration, as well as differences between countries, composition and trends.

About the data

The international comparison of emigration is made harder by the limited availability and reliability of data. Immigration statistics are available in destination countries, and outmigration from sending countries can be estimated using so-called mirror statistics – the stock of migrants in receiving countries. Therefore, for the extent of emigration cumulative mirror statistics were calculated by destination country – on the basis of available data on the num-
ber of outmigrants from particular countries. In the period after the regime change, a large proportion of emigration from Eastern European countries took place within Europe, and this has especially been the case since the EU’s enlargement. Therefore it is probably not too flawed to limit the analysis of outmigration in the post-regime-change period to East-West migration flows within the EU.¹

The global (UN and OECD) data sources include migration defined on the basis of birth country. This shows a much higher migrant population than statistics calculated on the basis of nationality and also includes a significant migrant population from outside Europe, which can be misleading. Around 70–90 per cent of people born in the EU–8+2 countries and living in the main destination countries outside Europe (United States, Canada, Australia, and Turkey in the case of Bulgaria) emigrated a long time ago and were already citizens of the receiving country in 2000.² Between 2000 and 2015 The EU was the main destination of outmigration, and overall, the share of EU nationals increased by 20–30 per cent in the emigrant population.³

Two data sources were used to calculate cumulative mirror statistics by sending country: the 2011 population census and the annual statistics on the number of migrants from the EU–8 + 2 to the EU–15 by country.⁴ The analysis focuses on long-term (intended to be more than a year) emigration. The emigrant population was defined as nationals of particular countries living abroad, supposing that this better captures recent emigrants with stronger links to their native countries. The cumulative mirror statistics were calculated from databases available on-line, by identifying nationals for each sending country who were registered in an EU–15 country, and then these values were added.⁵ The census data is more reliable, it indicates the emigrant population in 2011 (foreign nationals living in the particular country). The annual population data are from the register of migrants who live a particular country. This is suitable for longitudinal analysis, although there are gaps in the data; however, by filling in these gaps the data can be made suitable for comparative analysis.

Mirror statistics can be calculated using annual matrices generated from the number of people relocating from specific sending countries to more developed EU countries for a longer period of time (usually at least one year). Given that the matrices must be complete and the online databases have gaps in various countries, data had to be computed and harmonised with the relevant population censuses. To fill in the matrices, data reported by Fic et al. (2011) was used up to 2011, and corrected using the updated Eurostat data. Missing data from the last three years was imputed using the appropriate methods from that source. Missing information on people living in the United Kingdom was imputed by estimating the annual increase on the basis of national insurance numbers (NINO) issued to new migrants. Migration was assumed to be constant in countries where migration was small and not increasing. Even accounting for a small bias in the estimated values, the dataset provides a good estimate of trends. Migrants cannot be accurately harmonised in the data on migrant population obtained this way due to differences in data collection between the countries. However, this is not a problem for comparisons because that is the same year after year for each country.

¹ The rules of free movement within the European Union also differ from migration in other directions, therefore it is useful to analyse it separately. For sake of completeness EEA countries with a similar labour market status, primarily Norway and Switzerland, were also included in the analysis where possible.
² Author’s calculation on the basis of OECD DIOC database.
³ Based on the UN migration database.
⁴ Despite the obvious opportunity, we did not use European Labour Force Survey (EU–LFS) data to calculate mirror statistics, because they are available only in an anonymised format by nationality and place of birth of migrants.
⁵ Population census data available from: ec.europa.eu.
In the absence of good comparative data for migration flows, changes in migration are approximated using the traditional method and changes in stock are compared at different points in time; thus the data is limited to the description of the – ever changing – population of those legally residing and settled abroad at that particular time. This underestimates the total – short- or long-term – migrant population, and it cannot capture the totality of those involved in migration. The figures therefore provide the lower estimate of the number of long-term emigrants. The statistical comparison examines the extent of emigration and ratios. Motivations for emigration, composition and impact can be analysed on the basis of targeted research.

**The size of the emigrant population**

*Figure 1.1* shows the Eastern European migrant population residing in Western Europe by sending country in 2011, displaying pre- and post-2000 emigrants separately. The analysis of the post-2000 period provides a more accurate estimate for the size of the migration flow. Part a) of *Figure 1.1* shows the size of the emigrant population calculated on the basis of censuses in 2000 and 2011: the increase is substantial in this period. In terms of numbers, East-West emigration is completely dominated by outmigration from Poland and Romania.

*Figure 1.1: Emigrant population from the EU–8 + 2 countries to the EU–15 and two EEA countries before and after 2000, by nationality, 2011*

- a) Emigrant nationals from EU–8 + 2 countries in 17 European states
- b) The number of EU–8 + 2 national emigrants in 17 European countries as a percentage of the population of their country of nationality

Note: The two EEA countries: Norway and Switzerland.
Source: Author’s calculation based on 2011 population census data from the specific countries.

From the perspective of sending countries, the key question is what proportion of a country’s population lives abroad. These proportions, relative to the size of the population in the 2011 Census, are depicted in part b) of *Figure*
The majority of those living abroad in 2011 arrived after 2000; the outmigration of the population was the highest in Latvia, Lithuania, as well as Bulgaria and Romania in the period 2000–2011. In Poland – despite the sizeable emigrant population – the rate of outmigration was moderate, alongside Estonia and Slovakia somewhat lagging behind, and it was low in the Czech Republic, Slovenia and also Hungary.

Above, the number of emigrants has been compared to the total population of each country using cumulative mirror statistics. However, the censuses suggest that 85–90 per cent of the emigrant population is aged 50 years or younger in all countries and therefore it is more accurate to compare the emigration rate to the under-50 population of the sending country. This way, the emigration rate is nearly one and a half times higher. In 2011 15 per cent of the Romanian working age population aged 15–49 years lived in Western Europe, and the same figure was 12 per cent among Lithuanians, nine per cent among Latvians and Bulgarians, more than six per cent among Estonians and Poles, and two to four per cent among Czechs, Slovaks, Slovenes, and Hungarians.

The census-based cumulative mirror statistics also show that the majority of the emigrant population is economically active, which is indicative of labour migration in line with earlier forecasts. The economic activity of migrants aged 15–64 years from Eastern Europe well exceeded the average activity rate of 60 per cent in the EU–15 after 2000. The activity rate of Latvian, Lithuanian, Polish, Slovak, and Hungarian emigrants was especially high (around 80 per cent), however the rate of Romanians and Bulgarians was not much lower either (76–77 per cent). The activity rate of Czech emigrants stood at 75 per cent, and that of Estonians and Slovenians was somewhat lower (71–73 per cent).

The dynamics of outmigration on the basis of changes in the number of people residing abroad

The observed country rates give a snapshot of the extent of migration from certain Eastern European countries in 2011. The cumulative mirror statistics calculated on the basis of population statistics indicate changes in outmigration over time. The data does not show how many people moved away and how many returned, but it does show net outmigration and how it changed. The proportion of the emigrant population within the national population by year and country is depicted on Figure 1.2. There was a rapid increase from each country after EU accession. While the proportion of Eastern Europeans living in Western Europe appeared to be around 1–2 per cent of the national populations according to statistics in 2004, this share increased in nearly all countries after 2004. However, the rate of the increase varies across countries. Outmigration is especially intense from Romania, and among the Baltic countries from Latvia and Lithuania. They are followed by Poland, Es
tonia, and Bulgaria where outmigration is smaller but it is still sizeable and continuous. The Slovak emigration rate gradually fell behind, while that of Hungary increased to a similar level. The level of Czech and Slovene emigration remains low. 

Figure 1.2: The share of EU–8 + 2 nationals resident in EU–15 countries as a percentage of the population of their country of nationality (as on Jan 1st of each year)

The last 15 years can be divided into distinct phases: the period before the accession of the EU–8 countries (before 2004), the initial years of rapid growth in migration up to the crisis (2004–2008), the crisis (2008–2010), and finally the opening up of German and Austrian labour markets (after 2010). Although the rapid growth was briefly interrupted by the crisis, the trends seem fairly constant and the intensity of outmigration differed between countries in the different periods. Figure 1.3 shows annual average changes in emigration as a proportion of the total population of the country of nationality over time, calculated from cumulative mirror statistics.

There had been varying degrees of outmigration from the majority of EU–8 countries already before EU accession; however this suddenly soared after 2004, slowed down everywhere during the crisis, and then accelerated again after 2010. In the EU–8, the intense growth observed prior to the crisis continued in the Baltic countries; however in Poland and especially in Slovakia – where the economic developments were favourable – it remained below pre-crisis levels. The Czech Republic and Slovenia were largely unaffected by outmigration. The situation was also similar in Hungary at the time of accession; however migration intensified after 2010. The processes in Bulgaria and Romania are somewhat different. Outmigration was already substantial in both countries at the time of their accession to the EU in 2007, this in-
Outmigration from Hungary – unlike that from other countries – started late. The strong pull effect created by EU accession had a limited impact in Hungary; the crisis and its consequences, the reforms with inevitable cuts in the second half of the 2000s, as well as the measures of the ruling government since 2010 all combined together to encourage migration (Hárs, 2013). Although the size of emigration remained well below the high emigration rates observed in other countries within the favourable context of EU enlargement – on average around 0.4 per cent or more of the national population annually – it did however reach the rates that characterise countries with medium-intensity outmigration: an average rate of 0.2 per cent on an annual basis. Migration to the EU–15 represented 3.1 per cent of Hungary’s population at the beginning of 2014, according to cumulative mirror statistics. After EU accession, between 2004 and 2014, the proportion of the Hungarian population living abroad increased by 2.2 per cent. Outmigration increased steadily after 2007 and started to accelerate after 2010; the rate of those who have moved abroad increased by 1.6 per cent between 2010 and 2014. The increase in the rate of outmigration observed after 2007 was moderate; however, unlike in the Czech Republic or Slovenia, it did not stop during the crisis. This modest increase was also noted in the Hungarian literature (see e.g. Blaskó et al., 2014, Hárs–Simon, 2015).

According to the most reliable estimates calculated on the basis of information from the Personal Data and Address Register of the Central Office for Administrative and Electronic
Public Services (KEK KH), 335 thousand people in the population aged 18–49 years were settled abroad at the beginning of 2013 (KSH NKI, 2013). For the total population this represents approximately 3.4 per cent. Differences between the two estimates for a similar time period are adequately explained by differences in the content of the data, in particular the fact that the computed mirror statistics are limited to the main EU–15 region due to technical issues. The mirror statistics provide a lower estimate of outmigration, namely how many people are settled in the EU–15.

**Migration, labour market, economic expectations**

Outmigration from the new EU Member States was primarily motivated by employment: work propensity and activity of emigrants was consistently high (Kahanec et al., 2010). In addition to the potential wage gain associated with the economic differences between countries, the unfavourable labour market situation (the level of unemployment) in Eastern Europe, and economic prospects, country-specific characteristics also shaped the process of emigration.

*Figure A1.1 of Appendix A1* at the end of this chapter shows the changes of the main factors influencing outmigration in Eastern Europe by country, based on stylised facts: changes in unemployment indicate the labour market effect and annual GDP changes illustrate the economic prospects. The effect of substantial wage differentials between countries is assumed to be constant based on Oblath (2014).

The structure of the economy transformed during the regime change and masses of jobs disappeared. Unemployment was high and employment prospects were unfavourable in most of the EU–8 countries during the first half of the 2000s. Outmigration quickly ensued in the context of high unemployment – over 10 per cent in the Baltic countries and in excess of 20 per cent in Poland and Slovakia – and the opportunities created by the free movement of labour and virtually unlimited labour demand in receiving countries. The high unemployment level started to decrease rapidly, however it soared again in the Baltic countries heavily affected by the crisis. This boosted migration again, which alleviated unemployment once more. The effect of the crisis was more moderate in Poland and Slovakia also stabilised relatively quickly; the net increase in outmigration slowed down, to which return migration also contributed. The fall in unemployment was accompanied by economic growth in Poland, the Baltic countries and Slovakia (Kaczmarczyk et al., 2010, Hazans–Philips, 2010).

However, migration was not the cause, the improvement of economic indicators was determined by the economic growth cycles of these countries and the opportunities for outmigration simply coincided with these processes. Detailed analyses of labour market selection have also demonstrated for Poland and the Baltic States that labour over-supply fell as a result of migration and equilibrium in the labour market improved over the long run. This lead to a tighter labour market, where labour supply

---

10 The country studies that explore the impact and structure of outmigration in detail, also consider further issues such as demographic consequences, structural differences, as well as short- and longer term impacts (Kaczmarczyk et al., 2010, Hazans–Philips, 2010, Hazans, 2013). These are not discussed here in detail due to limitations of space, only stylised facts are presented.
decreased, wages increased, and the conditions for modernisation of the economy were created (ibid).

The unfavourable labour market situation of Romania and Bulgaria had already set off a rapid outmigration before their EU accession in 2007; however this was not accompanied by a notable improvement in the economy: the GDP stagnated and outmigration was steadily increasing (Mereuta, 2013).

Heavy migration created structural deficits in the labour market, the impact of which depends on the structure of outmigration and the selection of migrants. Improvements in the economy or the labour market can be followed by return migration; the missing workforce can be replaced by return migration and immigration (this would be especially important in the Baltic States, where intense outmigration was sustained over a period of time). However, the return migration programmes of these Eastern European countries did not prove successful and immigration policies are also modest (Hazans, 2013, Kaczmarczyk et al., 2010, Kaczmarczyk, 2013, Mereuta, 2013).

In Hungary (as well as the Czech Republic and Slovenia that are not included in Figure A1.1), however, unemployment was low and outmigration moderate in the period following accession. Around 2010 the increase and consistently high levels of unemployment (adjusted by workfare) started to have an effect, while, as illustrated by the stagnation of the GDP, economic prospects did not improve either. The short history of Hungarian migration is closest to the Romanian and Bulgarian models in Eastern Europe: besides the stagnating economy and unfavourable labour market prospects, additional country-specific factors also influenced emigration. This suggests a steadily increasing migration in the short run. There is no prospect of economic changes that would realise the economic benefits of migration, would lead to market equilibrium and to the structural modernisation of the economy.

**Direction and patterns of migration flows**

Migration flows, the net increase of annual migration by country are examined on the basis of mirror statistics (leaving out the Czech Republic and Slovenia again – see Figure A1.2, Appendix A1).

The direction of migration was determined by the migration opportunities that opened up following accession and the economic attractiveness of destination countries, as well as regional effects. The economic attractiveness and immediate opening up of the United Kingdom’s (and Ireland’s) labour market reshuffled the emigration patterns of EU–8 countries within a short period of time. Germany became one of the main destination countries everywhere, although the effect of restrictions on migration in the transition period is apparent prior to 2011; however, its attraction has been gradually increasing since that time. The direction of emigration from Romania and Bulgaria was different, towards the Mediterranean region.
The heavy migration shown earlier creates a double-hump graph in the Baltic States and Poland; the direction of migration was predominantly the United Kingdom and Ireland (in the case of Estonia the neighbouring Finland) in the first wave after 2004. After the crisis migration to Ireland stopped. The intense outmigration from Slovakia after 2004 was also heading towards the United Kingdom, and then it decreased gradually. Initially, the main destination country of Romania and Bulgaria was Spain (in the case of Romania also Italy to a smaller extent). Accession to the EU in 2007 quickly increased migration from Romania to Italy and from Bulgaria to Greece; however, the economic crisis in the following year shifted these directions.

Outmigration from Hungary was somewhat different from the mainstream: besides its low intensity it was also initially characterised by diversity. The main destination of the rapidly growing migration after 2010 became the United Kingdom. After the German and Austrian labour markets fully opened up in 2011 there was also a substantial increase in migration towards Germany, the traditional destination country of Hungarians. Overall, the intensity of outmigration is similarly large in both directions, and emigration to Austria has also substantially increased.

Does immigration offset outmigration?

Immigration flows also started as the borders opened up in Eastern European countries after regime change. Among the motivating factors the economic pull effect of migration, tradition, networks, and the receiving environment were all important (Wallace–Stola, 2001). The expectations of economic growth in the post-regime change period strengthened the potential of these countries to attract immigrants. The migration process of Mediterranean countries served as a model, where outmigration turned into immigration (Peixoto et al., 2012). Arango (2012) describes the transformation of Eastern European countries into a destination for immigrants – alongside the old immigration countries from Western Europe and the new ones from the South – from a general theoretical perspective. Similarly to the previous section, this part presents immigration to Eastern European countries – with special attention to Hungary – in international comparison using descriptive statistics.

Data

The analysis uses census data and, similarly to the previous section, it examines long-term – for more than a year – residents by nationality, which provides a better estimate of recent immigration.11 Shorter-term trends and flows are not visible, however population censuses provide more reliable rates for small samples.12

---

11 Immigration defined on the basis of nationality excludes new citizens naturalised on the basis of ethnicity from the migrant population.
12 The labour market survey is suitable for the analysis of immigration where the size of the migrant population is large enough; however, due to low levels of immigration and the inadequate weighting of the sample it does not measure the immigration of Eastern European countries reliably. For methodological difficulties see CSO (2015). Similarly to the previous section, census data of EU Member States available online was used to compare immigration.
Immigration – numbers and expectations

Figure 1.4 shows the share of foreign nationals and those who arrived after 2000 within the total national population. The latter provide a more valid picture of recent migration. The rates are determined by the migration processes of each country. Three groups of countries were distinguished: Northern and Western Europe, Southern Europe, and Eastern Europe. In the first, the rate of immigration varies across countries; however a substantial long-term migrant population had already accumulated in all of these countries prior to 2000 and the influx has continued after 2000 as well. However, in the majority of Eastern European countries the proportion of the immigrant population is low. The real extent of the influx was influenced by historical changes and ethnic rearrangements prior to 2000; therefore the number of immigrants after 2000 gives a better estimate of actual migration and it shows that the increase in immigration has been very low in the majority of countries since 2000. Drbohlav et al. (2011) examined migration flows and stocks in detail using the cases of Poland, the Czech Republic and Hungary. The authors described immigration in Eastern Europe in the late 2000s as a slowly growing “embryonic” process, where changes are visible but small. Hungary, after substantial immigration in the years of regime change, fitted into the regional trend of moderate immigration (Hárs, 2010).

Figure 1.4: Proportion of foreign nationals in the total population, total and post-2000 immigration in the EU states, 2011 (percentage)

Note: Luxembourg’s outlying number is not displayed in full, it is shown by a number at the top of the column. Immigration data for Estonia and Latvia also include non-citizen ethnic Russians, this shows virtual immigration (see Lagzi, 2008).

Source: Author’s calculation on the basis of 2011 population census data in the specific countries.

Combined with modest immigration, as has been shown in the previous section, the rate of outmigration was significant and increasing rapidly in the
majority of Eastern European countries. Substantial outmigration can bring about shortages in the labour markets, and thus trigger immigration alongside an increase in local wages. Based on the short history of emigration, it can be concluded that although the wage effect exists, there is no visible immigration.

Figure 1.5 displays outmigration and immigration together in the EU–8 countries (and for comparison in the five, newly emerged destination countries in the EU). The change of trends seems obvious: immigration was more substantial in Eastern European countries where there was no outmigration. Slovenia and the Czech Republic were basically unaffected by emigration; however, the extent of immigration is comparable to rates observed in immigration countries. The picture is very clear in the new receiving countries: immigration was substantial in all of these countries and outmigration stopped after 2000. The processes are not simultaneous, immigration started with migration transformation, and can even be temporarily reversed if the economic conditions change.\(^\text{13}\)

![Figure 1.5: Immigration of foreign nationals after 2000 and the outmigration of local nationals in the EU–8 and the five new receiving EU states, 2011](image)

Source: Author’s calculation based on 2011 population census data in the specific countries.

**Conclusion**

The descriptive statistical analysis of migration by international comparison has shown that the rapidly growing rate of outmigration from – the latecomer – Hungary is (for now) below that of countries where this process had started earlier. Changes in the stock of migrants observed over time in the study could have taken place alongside smaller and larger migration flows. When the migration pressure is strong, it is often assumed that the rapidly increasing outmigration is a unidirectional process. The overestimation of factors encouraging outmigration and the rejection of issues encouraging or forcing return migration are often behind this assumption. From the analysis of data of the main destination countries it can be concluded that in ad-

\(^{13}\) The migration transformation of Mediterranean countries is discussed in detail by Peixoto et al. (2012).
dition to outmigration, the level of return migration is also substantial (see also Chapter 2.7 of In Focus).

Besides increasing outmigration, the level of immigration to Hungary is modest similarly to other countries in the region. The heavy influx observed at the time of the regime change plummeted (and the data used for the analysis does not distinguish naturalised immigrants). Previous research and the other chapters of In Focus present the structure and labour market implications of immigration, as well as its potential economic role.
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Appendix A1

Figure A1.1: Changes of the migration rate, annual GDP growth, and the unemployment rate, percentage

Source: Outmigration rate: Figure 1.2, unemployment rate and annual GDP change: Eurostat.
Figure A1.2: Changes in the number of EU–8 nationals migrating to EU–15 countries by destination country, thousand people, as on January 1
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Note: The graphs show the trends in migration numbers from 1998 to 2014 for each country.
2 EMIGRATION

2.1 MIGRATION INTENTIONS IN CONTEMPORARY HUNGARY

ENDRE SIK & BLANKA SZEITL

The indicator of migration intention (or potential) measures the intention or plan of finding work abroad or of emigration.¹ The indicator is no more than a simple rate, the proportion of a given population planning emigration.² From a labour market perspective, migration potential can be considered a supply-side approach and as such it is not suitable to estimate the probability of labour mobility because the labour market is more strongly influenced by the demand side. Therefore it can rather be considered as an early predictive information (Gödri–Feleky, 2013) on the size and the composition of future supply.³

This study aims to answer two questions:

1. How has migration potential developed in the Hungarian society since the 1990s?
2. What are the factors most strongly associated with the development of migration intentions in 2015/2016?⁴

The analysis is carried out separately for the three different types of migration intention distinguished by timeframe and/or purpose (short- and long-term employment and emigration) to avoid the equalising effect caused by excessive aggregation.⁵

Figure 2.1.1: Migration potential of the Hungarian population between 1993 and 2016 (percentage)


Figure 2.1.1 shows that the migration potential of the Hungarian population increased both in terms of short- and long-term labour migration plans by the early 2000s compared to the 1990s. Following a peak in 2012 it declined until 2014 and has remained around 9–11 per cent with very little variation.
since then. The proportion of those considering emigration hardly changed prior to 2005 and then fluctuated between five and six per cent until 2014. In 2015 the share of those planning to emigrate doubled, then slightly decreased by 2016. The cumulated value of migration potential has not changed greatly since its peak in 2012; it fluctuated between 13 and 16 per cent between 2013 and 2016.

As regards the migration propensity of different social groups, previous research has shown that this is higher than average where opportunities (young age, more human and network capital) and pressures (discontent, pessimism, discrimination) mutually strengthen each other (Sik-Simonovits, 2002, Sik-Örkény, 2003). Table 2.1.1 shows the factors influencing short- and long-term labour migration as well as emigration.

**Table 2.1.1: Factors affecting the likelihood of migration potential by timeframe of migration (2015/2016 joint database, N = 3,919, logistic regression odd ratios)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Short-term</th>
<th>Long-term</th>
<th>Emigration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pseudo $R^2$ (percentage)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group (reference category: aged over 65 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18–28 years</td>
<td>10.42*</td>
<td>14.2*</td>
<td>6.44*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29–38 years</td>
<td>4.17*</td>
<td>6.10*</td>
<td>3.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39–53 years</td>
<td>2.49*</td>
<td>2.29*</td>
<td>0.49**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (reference category: female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2.14*</td>
<td>2.01*</td>
<td>1.81*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region (reference category: Central Hungary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Transdanubia</td>
<td>2.83*</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Hungary</td>
<td>2.23*</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of settlement (reference category: town)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>1.79**</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City (county capital)</td>
<td>0.51**</td>
<td>0.57*</td>
<td>0.36*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity: Roma</td>
<td>1.71**</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attends church</td>
<td>1.36**</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fidesz – Hungarian Civic Alliance voter</td>
<td>0.61*</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jobbik – Movement for a Better Hungary voter</td>
<td>1.70*</td>
<td>1.41**</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK – Democratic Coalition voter</td>
<td>1.98**</td>
<td>1.75***</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uses the Internet</td>
<td>1.57**</td>
<td>1.55**</td>
<td>1.85*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home owner</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.61*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owns other property</td>
<td>1.54**</td>
<td>1.97*</td>
<td>1.71**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gets by with careful budgeting</td>
<td>0.66*</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial situation likely to improve</td>
<td>1.67*</td>
<td>1.81*</td>
<td>1.76*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good financial situation</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.71***</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No financial difficulties</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education – vocational qualification</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.54**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Only odd ratios that are significant at least once are presented in cells. Categories that are not significant in any of the cases: Central Transdanubia, Central
For all three types of migration plans, the likelihood of migration potential is significantly increased if the respondent is young and male. The effect of internet use, property ownership and belief in the improvement of one’s financial situation have a similarly strong effect in increasing migration potential (and cover all three types); while living in cities, home ownership and support for the governing (Fidesz) party reduce migration potential.

As regards short-term labour migration, those who live in Budapest, Western Transdanubia or the Northern Great Plain, have Roma ethnic background, support the Democratic Coalition (a leftist party) (also applies for long-term labour migration) or Jobbik (an radical rightwing party), or attend church are more likely than others, while those who only get by with careful budgeting are less likely to consider migration.

Plans for long-term labour migration as well as for emigration differ from the above picture in that a good financial position (or a vocational qualification in the case of emigration) decrease this type of migration potential.

The larger sample size of the joint database allows for a more detailed analysis of the destinations of migration intentions (*Table 2.2.2*).

*Table 2.1.2: Distribution of destination countries among those planning either a short- or a long-term labour migration or emigration (2015/2016, in decreasing order of destination country by short-term migration intentions, percentage)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Short-term migration</th>
<th>Long-term migration</th>
<th>Emigration</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Netherlands</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbouring countries to Hungary (except Austria)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other European countries</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USA</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-European countries</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-European countries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The full sample is the group of countries (up to three destination countries) indicated by respondents for all three types of migration.

As has been shown by other studies, Austria (mainly for short-term labour migration), Germany (particularly for long-term labour migration) and the United Kingdom were the main destinations of people planning migration (Nyírő, 2013).

Table 2.1.3 examines whether the composition of factors influencing short- and long-term labour migration as well as emigration intentions differ across Austria, Germany and the United Kingdom.\(^6\)

Table 2.1.3: Factors influencing the likelihood of choosing a specific destination country by timeframe of migration in the case of Austria, Germany, and the United Kingdom (2015/2016 database, logistic regression odd ratios)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of settlement (reference category: village)</th>
<th>Short-term migration potential N = 381</th>
<th>Long-term migration potential N = 475</th>
<th>Emigration N = 326</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>3.94*</td>
<td>7.5*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town</td>
<td>2.08**</td>
<td>1.99**</td>
<td>3.24**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region (reference category: Central Hungary)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Transdanubia</td>
<td>0.14*</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Transdanubia</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>2.63**</td>
<td>3.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Hungary</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.33**</td>
<td>4.92**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Great Plain</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>5.74*</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Great Plain</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.17*</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (reference category: 54–65 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29–38 years</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.34**</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (reference category: degree)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational qualification</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary education</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>2.15***</td>
<td>0.23*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home ownership (no)</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.53**</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roma ethnicity (no)</td>
<td>0.39**</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: All models include only those respondents who are planning a given type of migration. Only odd ratios that are significant at least once are presented in cells. Categories that are not significant in any of the cases: county capital, Central Transdanubia, Central Hungary, church attendance, car ownership, graduate, 18–28 years, 39–53 years.

In the case of short-term labour migration intentions, it clearly appears that the choice of destination country is strongly influenced by regional location. This is not surprising given that cross-border commuting is also included in short-term labour migration, and this is most viable from regions nearer to the destination country. Even among those considering emigration, living in Western Transdanubia increases the likelihood of choosing Germany or the
United Kingdom. Emigration to Austria and Germany is much more likely from Budapest than from any other part of the country and home owners are less likely to consider employment in Austria. As regards to short-term migration plans, being Roma somewhat reduces the short-term migration potential to Austria, while younger (but not the youngest) individuals and those with secondary education would prefer to go to Germany.

Long-term employment in Austria is mainly intended by those from towns and the most disadvantaged regions. Those with a vocational qualification are twice as likely to plan long-term employment in Germany (on the other hand, they are very unlikely to consider working in the United Kingdom); while being Roma strongly increases, and owning a home decreases the likelihood of long-term migration to Austria.
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2.2 THE SOCIAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC COMPOSITION OF EMIGRANTS FROM HUNGARY

ZSUZSA BLASKÓ & IRÉN GÖDRI

The demographic and social composition of emigrants has important implications for the countries affected. For sending countries the impact on the labour market is crucial, which is largely shaped by the age, education and previous labour market status and experience of those moving away. The emigration of the educated and of those with professional qualifications can have negative implications for the economic growth of the country. Furthermore, the demographic implications (that also have an impact on the labour market in the long run) following from the age, family status as well as the number of existing and future children of the emigrants must also be considered. Although losses in the human capital might be compensated by return migration in the long run (see Chapter 2.7 of In Focus on this), in the short term the effects are predominantly negative.

The analysis of the social and demographic composition of emigrants of a country poses a number of methodological difficulties. Available data sources typically do not cover the total population to be studied only different – partly overlapping – groups; the data is not sufficiently detailed, often not reliable enough and not up-to-date. In what follows we provide a brief overview of available data sources on the number of Hungarians living/work ing abroad, the main advantages as well as limitations of these. Then, based on these data emigrant profiles are presented using descriptive statistics. Finally a more nuanced picture of the composition of emigrants is drawn up using multivariable analysis of data from a sample survey.

Data sources

The 2011 Population Census distinguished two groups of the population residing abroad: those temporarily (up to 12 months) and those permanently (more than 12 months) residing abroad. For the former group, the same information was recorded as for the population residing in Hungary (using the same personal questionnaire); while for those living abroad permanently, only their number was recorded on the dwellings questionnaire (therefore their regional distribution is known). However, individuals who moved abroad with their whole household and have their real estate in Hungary either unoccupied or rented out, were not necessarily recorded in the Census.¹

¹ Obviously, the Population Census does not provide information on those emigrants who have left the country on a permanent basis (i.e. they no longer have a registered address in Hungary).
ing or working in a destination country for an extended period of time tends
to be more accurate than the registration of emigrants in a sending country.
Furthermore – unlike the Census – mirror statistics also include those resid-
ing abroad with their entire household. Eurostat collates and publishes the
immigration statistics of EU Member States on an annual basis. These in-
clude as immigrants individuals who are planning to stay in the destination
country for at least 12 months and are officially registered. Immigrants from
a country of origin can be listed by citizenship as well as by country of birth.
However, the scope of recorded attributes is rather limited: it only allows for
an analysis by sex and age group.

A specific group of those living abroad, namely labour migrants – those
working abroad for at most 12 months and are aged 15–74 years – are re-
corded by the Labour Force Survey (LFS) of the Central Statistical Office
on a regular, quarterly basis.²

Two – recent – sample surveys also provide information on emigration. The
Turning Points of the Life Course study between November 2012 and February
2013 used a sample of 8,917 individuals aged 18–49 years and with a regis-
tered address in Hungary (the sample was selected from the National Register
of Addresses). The study was conducted by the Hungarian Demographic
Research Institute. In those cases, when the individual in the sample could
not be found at the given address, the interviewers attempted to find out the
reason for their absence. In a large number of cases the reason identified was
residence abroad (they were either not visiting home during the time period
of the survey or if they were, they responded that they lived abroad). In these
cases the interview included the reasons for living abroad, as well as the des-
tination country. Furthermore, sex, age and the location of the registered ad-
dress of these individuals were registered (Kapitány–Rohr, 2014).³

The other survey – the Hungarians abroad study – was also conducted
around the same time and it was linked to the Labour Force Survey in the first
quarter of 2013 as part of the SEEMIG (Managing Migration and Its Effects
in South-East Europe) project. This survey was also conducted by the Demo-
graphic Research Institute. It collected more detailed data on emigrants than
the Turning Points of Life Course study and compared to other data collec-
tions, it included a wider range of emigrants. In the 27 thousand households
included in the sample, the survey identified 1,606 emigrants – individuals
living abroad (i.e. residing outside Hungary most of the time) at the time of
data collection – who were either members of these households (former or
current) or siblings of household members (Blaskó–Gödri 2014, Blaskó, 2015).

The composition of emigrants based on the 2011 Population Census

The 2011 Population Census recorded 70,059 individuals resident abroad for
less than 12 months – and thus considered part of the permanent population

---

² For more information on this data source and key conclusions see Chapter 2.5 of In Focus on
labour migration by Ágnes Hárs and Dávid Simon.
³ The main findings of the Turning Points of Life Course study relating the composition of emi-
grants coincide with findings from other data sources, therefore, due to limitations of space they
are not presented here.
of Hungary. Males are heavily overrepresented (65 per cent) in this population, and even more so (70 per cent) among the 35- to 59-year-olds – the group with the highest level of labour market activity. As regards the composition of the group by age, the usual characteristics of the migrant population can be observed: younger age groups are overrepresented among both sexes compared to their share in the total population; in particular women aged 20 to 34 and men aged 20 to 44 years (see Figure 2.2.1). By contrast, the share of under-15s is low and that of over-65s is negligible. Due to the young age profile, the share of singles is higher than in the total population: 62 per cent of women and 50 per cent of men aged 15 years or over were unmarried, while the same figures in the total population were 27 per cent and 39 per cent, respectively. The gender differences in the pattern of short-term (or at least intended short-term) migration are highlighted by the fact that 43 per cent of male temporary migrants aged 15 years or over were husbands or cohabiting partners in a household left behind, while only 20 per cent of females were wives or cohabiting partners.

Figure 2.2.1: Age distribution of the population resident abroad for less than 12 months and the total population


The selection of migrants by level of education is especially important from the perspective of the sending country. Women temporarily living abroad were characterised by a considerably higher-than-average education: among the 18–64 year olds 80 per cent had at least secondary education, while among the 25–64 year old, 42 per cent held a higher education degree (compared to 60 per cent and 24 per cent in the respective age groups of the total population) (Figure 2.2.2). Among men, neither indicators of education were particularly high; however, in both age groups the share of those with a vocational qualification was well above average. This indicator was especially high among those aged between 35 and 55 years and those from villages (57–60 per cent, and 56 per cent respectively). Holding a higher education degree was most frequent among younger females aged between 25 and 34 years (47–51 per cent).

4 Nearly two thirds lived in just three destination countries: Germany (33 per cent), the United Kingdom (16 per cent) and Austria (14 per cent); considerably lower but not negligible is the share of those residing in the Netherlands (5 per cent) and Italy (4 per cent).
cent), and it was also frequent among males and females from Budapest (46 per cent, and 56 per cent).

**Figure 2.2.2:** Distribution of the male and female population aged 25–64 years resident abroad for less than 12 months by level of education and labour market status

The distribution of temporary migrants by economic activity (*Figure 2.2.2*) shows that emigration from Hungary is predominantly employment-related. Eighty-six per cent of those aged 15–64 years, and 91 per cent of the 25–64-year olds were employed (while the same figures in Hungary were 57 and 64 per cent). The employment rate of 25–64-year-old men was especially high (96 per cent). Women in the same age group were also most likely to be employed (80%), but a significant share (11 per cent) of dependents were also present here.

According to the Population Census the share of those with foreign citizenship (9.6 per cent) as well as those born outside Hungary (8.8 per cent) is higher in the population resident abroad than in the total population (where these are 2.3 per cent and 3.9 per cent respectively). This seems to corroborate the relationship that emerges from other data as well, namely previous experience of migration increases the likelihood of a subsequent migration, and it also indicates the higher migration propensity of the foreign-born population as well as their weaker attachment to Hungary (*Blaskó–Gödri, 2014*).

**The composition of emigrants based on mirror statistics**

Based on aggregated data from mirror statistics, there were approximately 330 thousand Hungarian nationals living in European destination countries at the beginning of 2014 (*Gödri, 2015*). These sources reveal very little information on the socio-demographic composition of this group, only their distribution by sex and age is known. According to this, the picture of a group

---

5 Compared to temporary migrants, long-term migrants were even more concentrated in the three main destination countries: 38 per cent lived in Germany, 23 per cent in the United Kingdom and 14 per cent in Austria; followed by Switzerland and the Netherlands with much smaller shares.
that is younger than the population of Hungary emerges, characterised by a slight male-majority (55 per cent). However, there are major differences in the composition of migrant population by destination country.

Men are considerably over-represented (62 per cent) among Hungarian citizens living in Germany and somewhat over-represented (52–56 per cent) in the United Kingdom, Ireland and the Scandinavian countries. By contrast, the large majority (72 per cent) of those in Italy are female, and there are also slightly more women (53–55 per cent) among those who live in Austria, the Netherlands, Spain and Belgium. All destination countries are characterised by a young age-composition; the share of 20–39-year olds was between 51 and 68 per cent in all the main destination countries, while in Hungary this was only 28 per cent. The share of young people was especially high in the new destination countries, such as the Netherlands and Ireland; while in more traditional destinations (Germany, Austria and Switzerland) older age groups were relatively better represented (Figure 2.2.3). In the United Kingdom – although the Eurostat database does not include information on age – the picture of a very young migrant population emerges (see K2.2.1 text box).

Figure 2.2.3: Age distribution of Hungarian nationals in main destination countries and the total population in Hungary (January 1, 2014)

Note: The figure includes main destination countries (where at least 7.5 thousand Hungarian nationals lived); for Austria the only available data is from 2013; the United Kingdom is not included due to missing data.
Source: Eurostat database (last updated: January 28, 2016).

The number of Hungarian-born population is higher in most receiving countries – particularly in more traditional destination countries – than the number of Hungarian nationals. These groups are characterised by a sex distribution similar to what was described above (the female majority is even more marked in Italy, 75 per cent); however their age distribution is considerably older. Among those living in Austria the share of over-65s (21 per cent) is sim-
ilar to that in Hungary, while in Switzerland it is much higher (31 per cent), and it is also around 13 per cent in Italy and the Netherlands. Out of the main destination countries, only in Ireland is the age composition of Hungarian nationals and Hungarian-born population similar, which indicates the presence of a relatively new (post-2004) migration wave here.

**The composition of emigrants based on the Hungarians abroad study**

In the followings a detailed analysis is provided based on the sample of Hungarian citizens aged 20–59 years from the SEEMIG survey, *Hungarians abroad*. In this age group there were 1,198 individuals in the sample who emigrated after 1989, and out of this 618 people did so after 2009. In line with data from other sources, this population also appears young and economically active. In terms of education, those with no more than lower secondary education are strongly under-represented (6 per cent), while those with higher education – both college and university – are over-represented (college: 20 vs 12 per cent; university: 13 vs 8 per cent in the population of Hungary). The share of males and females is virtually identical among those who emigrated after 1989 and it is also very similar among post-2009 migrants, although this latter group is characterised by a slight male majority.

In order to examine the net effects of inter-related social and demographic characteristics multivariable analysis – logistic regression – was used, whereby those residing abroad were compared to the population resident in Hungary. Models were estimated for the entire after-1989 emigrant population followed by separate analyses of the sub-group that emigrated after 2009. The results of the analyses are presented in Table 2.2.1.

The main finding of the analysis from a labour market perspective is that education in itself is a key factor associated with the likelihood of emigration. The higher level of education found among emigrants is not caused by the fact that they come from a younger and more educated population. Even after controlling for age (and other characteristics), it still holds that those with vocational training or secondary education are two and a half times more likely, while graduates are nearly five times more likely to emigrate compared to those with at most lower secondary education. However, the over-representation of graduates is declining somewhat over time: among post-2009 emigrants the odds ratio of graduates drops to below four.

The effect of age among post-1989 emigrants shows a particular reversed U shape: compared to the 20–29-year olds those aged 30–39 years are significantly more likely, while those aged 40–49 years somewhat less likely, and those over 49 years significantly less likely to live abroad. However, the increased likelihood of the 30–39-year olds can be attributed to the time passed since migration (i.e. those who migrated in their twenties have also aged). This is also supported by the fact that no significant difference is found in

---

6 The detailed description of this analysis can be found in Blaskó–Gödri (2014).
7 For detailed findings see Table F1, Blaskó–Gödri (2014), p. 303.
of those in their 20s and those in their 30s if we look at the

**Table 2.2.1: Factors associated with the likelihood of living abroad among 20–59 year olds (odds ratios of logistic regression models)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory variables</th>
<th>Post-1989 emigrants</th>
<th>Post-2009 emigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex (reference category: female)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.17**</td>
<td>1.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (reference category: aged 20–29 years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>1.27***</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.46***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–59</td>
<td>0.34***</td>
<td>0.23***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education (reference category: at most lower secondary)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training school</td>
<td>2.70***</td>
<td>2.70***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary school</td>
<td>2.69***</td>
<td>2.35***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>4.77***</td>
<td>3.72***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>5.13***</td>
<td>3.59***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status (reference category: unmarried)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0.70***</td>
<td>0.53***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>0.76**</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Place of birth (reference category: Hungary)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Hungary</td>
<td>2.02***</td>
<td>2.66***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex × age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male × 30–39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male × 40–49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male × 50–59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex × education (reference category: female × education)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male × vocational training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male × secondary education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male × college</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male × university</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex × marital status (reference category: female × marital status)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male × married</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male × widowed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male × divorced</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2log likelihood</td>
<td>9702.90</td>
<td>6020.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cox &amp; Snell $R^2$</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke’s $R^2$</td>
<td>0.144</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Controlled for region and type of settlement of last known address before emigration.
Significant at ***1 per cent, **5 per cent, *10 per cent.
Unsurprisingly, married people are less likely to move abroad than the unmarried, while being born abroad increases the likelihood of emigration. Concerning gender differences: controlling for other factors SEEMIG data also show the slight over-representation of men for the period as a whole as well as for the most recent years. However, this result is further refined by Model 3 that incorporates interaction effects into the model. These estimations make it possible to establish the likelihood of emigration for smaller, specific sub-groups of the population. The results show that only in some sub-groups are men more likely to emigrate than women. These include: people aged 30–39 years, those with a vocational qualification, as well as the married and the divorced.

The multinomial regression analysis (Blaskó–Gödri, 2014) also highlights the differences in the composition of migrants by destination country. According to this, compared to other emigrants, those moving to the United Kingdom are more likely to be unmarried and young and less likely to have a vocational qualification. At the same time migrants to Germany are more likely to have a vocational qualification, be older, and married.

Conclusions

Our analyses based on various data sources have shown that Hungarian emigrants from the past decade(s) are on average more educated, younger, more likely to be unmarried than the total population. Also, males are somewhat overrepresented among them. We have also found that these features are still characteristic of emigrants even when other factors are controlled for. However, behind the general picture there are important and marked differences between migrant groups, either by destination country or according to other characteristics. As regards selection by education, which is key from a labour market perspective, the different data sources clearly and unanimously indicate the over-representation of skilled workers and graduates among emigrants. However, while some of the sources (Population Census, Labour Force Survey) suggest the dominance of skilled workers, data from the SEEMIG survey indicate that graduates are the most overrepresented group. These discrepancies are probably due to differences in the migration strategies of different educational groups, and can be explained by the uneven representation of the different emigrant sub-populations in the various statistics. The SEEMIG data (which indicates the strong migration activity of graduates) does not include cross-border commuters (or only those who do not travel very often between the two countries and spend most of their time abroad), but it includes those who moved abroad with their whole household. (The large majority of respondents in the sample had been living abroad for well over a year at the time of the survey.) By contrast, data sources that suggest a stronger presence of skilled workers and a smaller share of graduates tend to
include (more) temporary migrants with strong links to households in Hungary. The Population Census includes people who were away temporarily – for less than 12 months – but their household members lived in Hungary at the time of the census. The sample of the Labour Force Survey includes individuals – among them many cross-border commuters – who have been working abroad (for up to 12 months) and whose household members live in Hungary. This suggests that the two groups who have the most-sought after labour market knowledge and skills – skilled workers and graduates – pursue different migration strategies: graduates are more characterised by longer-term migration, together with their family, while skilled workers are overrepresented among short-term temporary migrants who retain their link to Hungarian households as well as among cross-border commuters.\(^8\)

\[8\] This is also supported by various indirect information. SEEMIG data show that skilled workers are more likely to financially support a household in Hungary on a regular basis than graduates (Blaskó, 2015). The findings presented in Chapter 2.5 of In Focus also resonate with this: Blaskó and Szabó show that two thirds of migrants leaving children behind have a vocational qualification.
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2.2.1 Hungarian immigrants in the United Kingdom

CHRIS MOREH

For Hungarian citizens working abroad the United Kingdom is currently the second most important country of destination after Germany. In the seven years following the 2004 European Union accession – the period when the British labour market, in contrast to that of most other Western European countries, fully opened up for Hungarian workers – the number of immigrants originating from Hungary rose by 39,400. However, the greatest increase was registered in the following years: the number of Hungarian immigrants entering the National Insurance (NI) system between January 2011 and December 2015 was 48 percent higher than the number of those registering in the 2004–2011 period (DWP, 2016).

Hungarian migration trends differ from that of citizens of other countries in the region (Figure 2.2.1.1). Compared to pre-EU-accession levels, since 2003, migration from the Baltic States has followed a “double-humped” trajectory, while migration from the Central-Eastern European countries that joined the EU in 2004 mainly developed along a “single-humped” pattern peaking in 2007. From this pattern the mobility of those originating from Hungary has begun to deviate during 2008. In this year the relative rate of immigration from the other countries began to decline, while the immigration of Hungarian workers stabilised at 14,000 per year (twentyfold the pre-Accession annual levels), then began visibly increasing between 2010 and 2013, while since 2014 we witness a slight moderation. Today the immigration rate of Hungarians is the highest among those who became EU citizens at the same time as them, overtaken only by that of Romanian citizens who have had unrestricted access to the labour market since January 2014.

Figure 2.2.1.1: Patterns of Central-Eastern European migration in the United Kingdom (annual increments, 2002 = 100 percent)

According to our estimates – the methodology of which relies on an inferential procedure based on contrasting a Census 2011 dataset with NI data (for details see Moreh, 2014: 147–150) – at the beginning of 2016 the number of usually resident Hungarians in the United Kingdom exceeded 94,000, which is more than double of the 44,877 Hungarian citizens registered in the Census (Figure 2.2.1.2).
Although the British statistical sources do not permit the measurement of migration flows, (since there is no reliable data on the number of those leaving the country), the method used for estimating the number of Hungarian immigrants also allows us to make some inferences in this respect. Accordingly, if we compare the number of those who arrived after January 2004 and were still present on Census day with the number of NI numbers issued during the same period, we find that overall 50 percent of those issued with a National Insurance number were still present in 2011 at the time of the Census. However, 63 percent of those who obtained a NI number between 2004 and 2007 were still present, while of those who were registered during 2007–2010 and after 2010 only 45 and 47 percent (respectively) were present on the day of the Census. We can think of the proportion of those who had left in the meantime as the ‘onward migration rate’ or ‘mobility rate’, although other factors must have also contributed to the disparity noted above.

It is possible that among those who obtained a National Insurance Number during the three years following EU Accession there were many who had arrived earlier with plans of long-term settlement, but did not qualify to apply for a NINo before. This hypothesis is supported by the fact that a similar disparity also characterises the development of the ‘mobility rate’ of Polish migrants. In the case of Poles, 80 percent of those who arrived between 2004 and 2007 were present in 2011, compared to only 45 percent of those who arrived during 2007–2010, and 58 percent of those arriving between January 2010 and the day of the Census. Overall, however, as we can see, Hungarian migrants are more ‘mobile’ than the Poles.

There is a lack of reliable statistical data regarding Hungarian immigrants’ labour-market incorporation. However, the comparative analysis of the Quarterly Labour Force Survey (UK–LFS) data series containing unique household data for the years 2008–2015 highlights some important character-
istics.\(^1\) It is noteworthy, first of all, that among the Hungarians included in the sample the ratio of under-16s is 14 percent, which is similar to that observed among ‘old-EU’ national groups (EU–15), but lower than in other ‘new-EU’ groups (EU–11) among whom the rate of those younger than 16 is 22 percent.

Restricting our sample to those aged 16 to 64 we find that the economic activity rate of immigrants originating from Hungary is somewhat higher than that of those from other ‘new’ member states, which is due mostly to the difference in the number of those economically ‘inactive’ who are ‘looking after the family home’ (Table 2.2.1.1). At the same time, among the economically active, the percentage of those self-employed is lower, which can be accounted for by the higher rates observed among Romanian and Bulgarian workers for whom it was difficult to obtain employee status before 2014. Furthermore, the unemployment rate – according to the International Labour Organisation (ILO) definition – is also the lowest in the case of Hungarian migrants in our sample.

| Table 2.2.1.1: Economic activity between 2008 and 2015 among the 16–64 year olds (percentage) |
|---------------------------------|-----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| Hungarian | UK | EU–15 | EU–11* | Other foreign nationals | Total |
| Active | 82.5 | 71.7 | 72.6 | 80.5 | 61.0 | 71.5 |
| – Employee | 73.3 | 61.7 | 61.8 | 67.6 | 52.8 | 61.4 |
| – Self-employed | 9.2 | 9.6 | 10.5 | 12.7 | 7.7 | 9.6 |
| ILO unemployed | 4.7 | 5.1 | 5.4 | 5.0 | 6.9 | 5.1 |
| Inactive | 12.8 | 23.2 | 22.0 | 14.5 | 32.1 | 23.4 |
| – Inactive (student) | 4.0 | 4.9 | 6.3 | 3.9 | 10.6 | 5.2 |
| – Inactive (looking after family home) | 5.8 | 5.5 | 6.4 | 7.7 | 12.6 | 5.9 |
| – Inactive (retired) | 0.2 | 4.4 | 2.6 | 0.3 | 1.1 | 4.2 |
| – Inactive (other) | 2.7 | 8.4 | 6.7 | 2.6 | 7.8 | 8.2 |
| Total | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 | 100.0 |
| N | 446 | 422,526 | 8,559 | 9,270 | 19,766 | 460,567 |

* EU–11 refers to the countries that joined the European Union in 2004 and 2007, without Hungary.
Source: UK–LFS.

Looking at employment broken down by main industries we find that more than one quarter of Hungarians in the UK are employed in one of the subdivisions of the ‘hotels and restaurants’ sector, a rate more than twice higher than in the case of those from EU–11 countries (Table 2.2.1.2). The ratio of health and social workers is also notably higher among Hungarians compared to other migrants from Central-Eastern Europe, while the percentage of those employed in manufacturing and construction is considerably lower. In respect to the latter industries, as we can see, Hungarian migrants in our sample are rather following the patterns of those from ‘old-EU’ member states.

---

\(^1\) Since the number of Hungarians in each quarterly dataset is very low, in order to maximise the number of cases in our sample we have decided to aggregate data for the 2008–2015 period. However, aggregating data from each quarter is limited by the rotational panel sampling design of the LFS by which each selected household remains in the survey over five consecutive quarterly waves, while at the same time new households are introduced so that between any consecutive quarters there is an overlap of about 80 percent. Consequently, in order to work with unique cases, only every fifth quarter was included in the analysis, proceeding backwards from the latest available survey (July–September 2015). This method yielded a total of 527 unique cases (Hungarian national respondents).
Table 2.2.1.2: Active workers by main industry sectors between 2008 and 2015 (percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry Sectors</th>
<th>Hungarian</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>EU-15</th>
<th>EU-11*</th>
<th>Other foreign nationals</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hotels and restaurants</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale, retail and motor trade</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate, renting and business activities</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and social work</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport, storage and communication</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other community, social and personal</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>366</td>
<td>312,660</td>
<td>6,337</td>
<td>7,430</td>
<td>12,077</td>
<td>338,870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* EU–11 refers to the countries that joined the European Union in 2004 and 2007, discounting Hungary.

Source: UK–LFS.
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2.3 LABOUR MIGRATION, CROSS-BORDER COMMUTING, EMIGRATION

Factors explaining the employment-related emigration of Hungarians and changes since EU accession

ÁGNES HÁRS & DÁVID SIMON

Emigration and employment

Since Hungary’s accession to the European Union in 2004 Hungarians have had freedom of employment in European countries, their employment opportunities have expanded, and the cost of working abroad has decreased. In principle, it is possible to take up employment abroad under the same conditions as in Hungary, although the characteristics of labour demand and regulations of the host country must be taken into account. There has been an array of studies exploring the attraction of working abroad and its implications for the labour market, the push and pull factors influencing decisions, the selective nature of migration, and the social and individual factors beyond the economic and labour market explanations (Hazans-Philips, 2010, Kahanec, 2013, Kahanec et al., 2010, Kahanec-Zimmermann, 2010, Kacz-marczyk, 2010, Massey et al., 1993).

The intended permanence of migration, its costs in terms of working time, job difficulty, and sacrifices for private life result in a diversity of employment patterns for migrants. One-way migration and variable, circular forms of migration and cross-border commuting co-exist and characterise the range of migration and labour market strategies of emigrants. Some migrants move away in the hope of financial security or for other reasons, and plan for a long-term future abroad, while others consider working abroad as temporary or instrumental means – as defined by Piore (1971) – of earning money. There are no definitive and sharp boundaries between groups, there are many variations. However, it is possible to distinguish between labour migrants and those who decide to settle abroad, based on factors associated with migration and its impact. This study examines labour migration: what groups are affected and how this has changed over time. Its impact on the Hungarian labour market can be estimated based on the description of migration.

Data and methods of analysis

Labour migrants in the Labour Force Survey

A clearly defined segment of emigration is labour migration. The CSO’s Labour Force Survey (LFS) offers a unique possibility to examine the factors associated with labour migration on a large dataset using individual-level data

1 See Chapter 2.2 of In Focus by Zsuzsa Blaskó and Irén Gödri on people moving away.
and detailed explanatory models. On the basis of data available in the LFS, labour migration is analysed using the cases of individuals *working abroad*.

In the Labour Force Survey if the answer for the question on the location of the employer is not Hungary, then the response “abroad” is recorded alongside the name of the country. This question applies to those who are currently working abroad, or whose last job (within the previous eight years) was abroad. The group of those who previously worked abroad is heterogeneous and not reliable, therefore the current analysis focuses on individuals currently working abroad. Those identified by the LFS as working abroad only include people with a household in Hungary (that could be reached by LFS interviewers) but excludes those whose families have moved abroad either recently or in the past. People who live abroad but are not in employment, as well as refusers are not part of the sample either.  

From the LFS it is possible to identify workers who are still connected to the Hungarian labour market via their families but are employed abroad. In the following analysis this sub-group of migrants is referred to as *labour migrants*. It is assumed that those who work abroad do this as an alternative to employment in Hungary. This study presents findings for this population for the period between 2004, the year of accession to the EU, and the end of 2014.

**Characteristics of the sample**

The number of labour migrants has been increasing steadily, similarly to the trends described in other studies based on other sources of data; however the increase appears to be slowing down towards the end of the period. This is shown by part a) of *Figure 2.3.1*: the right axis depicts the development of total labour migration, the left axis represents trends by destination country.

**Figure 2.3.1: Trends in labour migration and distribution by destination country**

![Figure 2.3.1](image-url)

Source: labour migration: LFS; mirror statistics: authors’ calculation based on Chapter 1, In Focus; work history abroad 2004–2014: LFS ad hoc module, 2nd quarter, 2014.

Labour migrants represent a particular group: the share of those working in Austria is high in the total sample, while the share of those working in the United Kingdom is low, and declining towards the end of the period. The
characteristics of labour migration are examined in comparison to two data sources: the mirror statistics show the increase in the stock of Hungarian nationals residing abroad between 2004–2014, the supplementary questions of the LFS in the 2nd quarter of 2014 show non-commuters who lived and worked abroad for at least six months between 2004–2014 (the latter obviously includes only those who were residing or had a household in Hungary at the time of the survey). Despite their different composition, the groups are comparable by destination country and the percentages are shown by part b) of Figure 2.3.1.

In this comparison, the share of labour migrants in Austria is extremely high and the share of those in the United Kingdom is very low in our sample. The supplementary questions of the LFS on work history in the period between 2004–2014 also indicate that the share of those who worked or are still working in the United Kingdom is low. This suggests that the share of whole households moving to the United Kingdom is higher than in the case of other destination countries – the LFS only includes those who have a household in Hungary. This assumption is also supported by Blaskó (2014) and Blaskó et al. (2014) who attempted to estimate long-term emigration. Both studies concluded that a high proportion of long-term emigrants live in the United Kingdom. The assumption is also in line with the fact that labour migration was initially low, then stagnating and declining by the end of the period, which might be explained by the growing number of people emigrating to the United Kingdom.

The exceptionally high share of labour migrants in Austria is explained by a high level of cross-border commuting; however, non-commuting labour migration is also significant. The LFS does not have any variables that would allow us to distinguish cross-border commuters from other labour migrants. Cross-border commuting can be estimated for the 2nd quarter of 2014. Based on the supplementary questions and the basic variables of the LFS it is possible to compare the work history of labour migrants as well as non-migrants. The supplementary questionnaire excluded commuters, therefore it is possible to distinguish non-commuters (those who lived and worked as well as those who worked abroad for at least six months) and those who did not reside abroad but are labour migrants, thus cross-border commuters. This is presented in Table 2.3.1. Sixty percent of the labour migrant population were not commuters, (out of this 53 percent worked abroad for at least six months); 40 percent were cross-border commuters. The share of commuters was over 60 percent in Austria and considerably lower in other destination countries.

Employment can be stable either with or without cross-border commuting; although the average duration of employment is below the Hungarian average (nine years), but these are people working abroad long-term.5 The average duration of employment with the current employer was longest in Austria.

5 The average duration of employment was calculated for the first quarters of 2010–2015 – a period characterised by increasing labour migration – based on LFS data. As the number of labour migrants increases, the average duration of employment decreases, although of course the length of employment of new labour migrants is uncertain.
in focus: international migration

(4.6 years), in Germany 3.7 years, in the United Kingdom 2.4 years and also relatively high, 4.2 years in other EU countries.

Table 2.3.1: Commuting and non-commuting labour migrants (percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work history abroad between 2004 and 2014</th>
<th>Labour migration by destination country</th>
<th>Total labour migrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Germany</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived and worked abroad</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of this: lived and worked abroad for at least 6 months</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cross-border commuter (did not live abroad but labour migrant)</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total labour migrants</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Method of analysis

Logistic regression models were used to explore the factors that explain labour migration as opposed to employment in Hungary, and how these changed in the period between EU accession and the end of 2014 in regard to total labour migration and main destination countries (Austria, Germany, United Kingdom, and other EU and EEA countries). The equation of our model for all destination countries was as follows:

\[
\ln \left( \frac{p}{1-p} \right) = b_0 + b_1 X_{nem} + b_2 X_{kor} + b_3 X_{iszk}^2 + b_4 X_{fogl.kat} + b_5 X_{fogl.visz} + b_6 X_{szerz} + b_7 X_{call.munkaidő} + b_8 X_{fogl.statk.evé} + b_9 X_{régő} + b_{10} X_{szül.orsz} + b_{11} X_{nyngd.házttag} + b_{12} X_{segélyezett.házttag} + b_{13} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t + b_{14} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{19} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t + b_{20} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{21} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{22} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{23} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{24} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{25} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{26} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{27} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{28} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{29} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{30} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{31} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{32} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{33} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{34} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{35} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{36} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{37} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{38} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{39} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{40} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{41} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{42} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{43} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{44} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{45} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{46} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{47} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{48} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{49} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{50} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{51} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{52} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{53} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{54} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{55} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{56} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{57} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{58} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{59} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{60} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{61} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{62} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{63} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{64} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{65} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{66} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{67} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{68} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{69} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{70} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{71} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{72} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{73} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{74} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{75} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{76} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{77} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{78} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{79} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{80} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{81} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{82} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{83} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{84} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{85} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{86} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{87} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{88} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{89} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{90} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{91} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{92} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{93} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{94} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{95} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{96} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{97} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{98} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{99} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{100} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots) + b_{101} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^t^2 + b_{102} X_{segélyezett.házttag}^2 + (\ldots)

where \( p \) denotes the proportion of labour migrants in the total population under study (i.e. total number of employees in Hungary and labour migrants), as well as by destination country.

Demographic variables

\( X_{nem} \): sex (reference category: males)
\( X_{kor} \): age (centred on workers in Hungary)
\( X_{iszk} \): highest level of education (reference category: no more than primary education)

Labour market variables

\( X_{fogl.kat} \): profession (reference category: machine operator or unskilled job)
\( X_{fogl.visz} \): type of employment (reference category: employee)
\( X_{szerz} \): type of contract (reference category: open-ended)
The models’ goodness of fit was examined using multiple methods. The creators of the commonly used Hosmer–Lemeshow test argue that for large samples even minor departures from the proposed model appear as significant errors (Paul–Pennell–Lemeshow, 2013). In addition to this, the Link test (Pregibon, 1980) – also sensitive to sample size – and the ROC (Receiver Operating Characteristic) analysis – unrelated to sample size – were used alongside the c statistic to examine the models’ goodness of fit. Furthermore, the value of Nagelkerke’s pseudo-$R^2$ is also presented for each model (goodness-of-fit parameters are summarised in Table 2.3.2). Based on the c statistic each model is at least acceptable; according to the Link test the explanatory power of the models is significant and they show a slight (although in some cases significant due to the sample size) departure from the goodness-of-fit. The Hosmer–Lemeshow test is significant but this is not considered a problem in the light of the above. The value of Nagelkerke’s pseudo-$R^2$ for the models ranged from 0.19 to 0.26.

The constant of the models is significant in all cases, however change over time independent from other factors is only significant for the total sample – showing that, all other conditions being equal, the probability of labour migration is increasing at a growing rate. The results of the models are presented via changes in marginal probabilities and marginal effects over time (when change over time is not significant, the odds ratio is presented). For marginal probabilities, the estimated probability of labour migration or employment
in a particular country is presented for the total population (employees in Hungary and labour migrants).

**Table 2.3.2: Goodness-of-fit parameters of the models**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total sample</th>
<th>Austria</th>
<th>Germany</th>
<th>United Kingdom</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>c-statistic</td>
<td>0.849</td>
<td>0.812</td>
<td>0.802</td>
<td>0.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link test: model explanatory power</td>
<td>2.610***</td>
<td>2.253***</td>
<td>2.350***</td>
<td>1.633***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Link test: departure from goodness-of-fit</td>
<td>0.994</td>
<td>1.020***</td>
<td>1.013***</td>
<td>1.010***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hosmer–Lemeshow test(^a)</td>
<td>17.12(8)*</td>
<td>24.92(8)**</td>
<td>84.63(8)***</td>
<td>106.90(8)***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke’s (R^2)</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.271</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>0.262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) In parentheses: degree of freedom. Significance level: ***1 percent, **5 percent, *10 percent.

**Factors affecting labour migration and their changes over time**

All labour migrants and those in three main destination countries (Austria, Germany and the United Kingdom) were analysed. The total sample also shows the effect of a more heterogeneous labour migration to other EU countries (and to a lesser extent outside the EU); however this is not discussed here in detail. Labour migration appears highly selective according to main destination country; the effect of individual and demographic factors, employment and household characteristics are presented together for each destination country as well as total labour migration.

**The effect of individual and demographic factors**

Women are half as likely as men to work abroad, and this has not changed significantly over time. The odds are similar to the total sample in Austria, somewhat lower in Germany (0.4), while in the United Kingdom sex has no significant effect on labour migration.

The probability of labour migration changes with age. In the full sample the effect of age did not change significantly over time: up to the age of 39 years the marginal probability of labour migration is increasing, then it declines (in 2014 it was 0.55 percent at the age of 25, and 0.8 percent at 39 years). Because change over time was found to be significant in the model (see earlier), the marginal probability of labour migration is growing at an increasing rate annually (at the end of 2010 the marginal probability of labour migration for 25-year-olds was just under 0.15 percent and 0.2 percent for those aged 39, in 2013 these were 0.4 and 0.55 percent respectively). In Austria the effect of age was similar to that in the full sample, while in Germany there was no significant effect. The marginal probability of labour migration also changed over time in the United Kingdom: during the years of the downturn the average age was rising; however, more recently labour migrants have become increas-
ingly younger. In 2004, the year of EU accession, the marginal probability of labour migration was highest at the age of 30, in 2009 at the age of 33, in 2010 at the age of 33–34, in 2011 at the age of 35, in 2012–2013 at the age of 34, and at the end of 2014 at the age of 32.

Place of birth is associated with propensity for mobility: people born outside Hungary were more mobile than those born in Hungary. Their odds were 4.8 times higher and this did not change significantly over time. At the end of 2014, all other conditions being equal, being born outside Hungary increased the probability of labour migration by 1.3 percentage point in the total sample. In 2014 the same effect was 0.64 percentage point for working in Austria and 0.2 percentage point for Germany. The size of the marginal effect increased rapidly in both countries, but especially in Austria, after 2011.

In the full sample of labour migrants, the probability of working abroad increases significantly with education (Figure 2.3.2). This was stable over time, with the exception of vocational education, for which the probability of labour migration grew at an increasing rate.

**Figure 2.3.2: The effect of education on labour migration, marginal probability (percentage)**

Reference category: no more than primary education.
Total sample: significant over time: vocational training school not significant over time: general secondary education, secondary education with vocational qualification, tertiary education.
Austria: significant over time: all variables.
Germany: not significant over time: vocational training school, not significant: general secondary education, secondary education with vocational qualification, tertiary education.
United Kingdom: significant over time: general secondary education, secondary education with vocational qualification, tertiary education, not significant: vocational training school.

Selectivity by destination country is strong: for Austria all education levels that are higher than primary education significantly increase the probability of labour migration. After 2011 – when the Austrian labour market fully opened for Hungarian nationals – the increase was substantial and by the end of 2014 the marginal probabilities for all non-primary education levels were largely similar to each other and significantly exceeded the probability of labour migration of those with no more than primary education. In Germany – all other conditions being equal – the labour migration of those with vocational training school was increasing significantly. In the United Kingdom the steady increase in the labour migration of those with secondary and tertiary education stopped, and even started to decline among people with general secondary education. This suggests that these groups are increasingly opting for long-term emigration. Similar changes can be observed in the marginal probability of labour migration for these with secondary vocational qualification. The probability of labour migration was lower for skilled, semi-skilled and unskilled workers (people with vocational training school or primary education); however it was growing in line with increasing labour migration.

The region of residence has a significant effect on the probability of labour migration in the full sample, and only Northern Hungary remained unchanged in the studied period (Figure 2.3.3).

The probability of labour migration is by far highest in Western Transdanubia and is growing at an increasing rate: here, all other conditions being equal, the probability of labour migration was 4.5 percent at the end of 2014. The marginal probabilities of labour migration in Southern and Western Transdanubia were lower, nevertheless increasing steadily; similar trends can be observed in Northern Hungary. The marginal probabilities of labour migration were low in the Northern and Southern Great Plain, with a slowing rate of increase.

Based on the region of residence, labour migration is highly selective by destination country. The marginal probability of labour migration to Austria is by far the highest in Western Transdanubia (4.5 percent at the end of 2014); it is more than four times higher than the marginal probabilities in other Transdanubia regions. This suggests that the regional labour market is a strong incentive to work in Austria and cross-border migration plays an important role (more than 80% of labour migrants in Western Transdanubia region work in Austria).

Migrant labour in Germany also seems selective by region, although less so than in the case of Austria. All other conditions being equal, the marginal probability of labour migration is highest in Northern Hungary and Southern Transdanubia, and this effect is stable over time. This suggests long-term relations, traditional cooperation, or even organised recruitment in these re-
regions. The marginal probability of labour migration to Germany is increasing by a lesser rate in other regions, with the exception of the Northern Great Plain where it is declining.

Figure 2.3.3: The effect of the region of residence on labour migration, marginal probability (percentage)

Reference category: Central Hungary.
Total sample: significant over time: Central Transdanubia, Western Transdanubia, Northern Great Plain, Southern Great Plain, Southern Transdanubia, not significant over time: Northern Hungary.
Austria: significant over time: Northern Hungary, Northern Great Plain, Southern Transdanubia, not significant over time: Central Transdanubia, Western Transdanubia, not significant: Southern Great Plain.
Germany: significant over time: Central Transdanubia, Northern Great Plain, Southern Great Plain, not significant over time: Western Transdanubia, Southern Transdanubia, Northern Hungary.
United Kingdom: significant over time: Northern Great Plain, Western Transdanubia, Southern Transdanubia, Northern Hungary, Southern Great Plain, not significant over time: Central Transdanubia.

In the case of the United Kingdom, there is no evidence of clear regional selectivity. The marginal probability of labour migration is increasing faster in Central Hungary than in any other region; however, overall, regions have a very small effect on the marginal probability of labour migration.

The effect of labour market factors

In the case of labour migration, professions requiring a vocational qualification increase the prospect of working abroad most of all (Figure 2.3.4). In the total sample, the marginal probability of labour migration among skilled
workers – all other conditions being equal – was 1.3 percent at the end of 2014; and the effect did not change significantly over time. White-collar professions did not have a significant effect on the probability of labour migration.

**Figure 2.3.4: The effect of profession on labour migration, marginal probability (percentage)**

Reference category: machine operator, unskilled.

Total Sample: **significant over time**: skilled professions, **not significant**: managerial professions requiring tertiary qualifications, non-manual professions requiring tertiary or secondary qualifications.

Austria: **significant over time**: non-manual professions requiring tertiary or secondary qualifications, **not significant over time**: managerial professions requiring tertiary qualifications, skilled professions.

Germany: **significant over time**: skilled professions, **not significant**: managerial professions requiring tertiary qualifications, non-manual professions requiring tertiary or secondary qualifications.

United Kingdom: **significant over time**: all variables.

In Austria, the marginal probability of skilled professions increased and that of non-manual professions decreased the marginal probability of labour migration compared to the reference group of machine operators and unskilled professions. Skilled professions – all other conditions being equal – increase the probability of labour migration the most in Germany as well, although this effect is slowing over time. A somewhat different picture emerges for the United Kingdom: compared to unskilled and machine operator professions, all other professions diminish the marginal probability of labour migration. However, apart from managerial professions that require tertiary qualifications, marginal probabilities for all other professions converged and were largely identical by the end of 2014.
The type of employment also affects the probability of labour migration. Casual employment, with all other conditions being equal, increases the probability of labour migration compared to employee status in the total sample: by just over 0.05 percentage point, at the end of 2010, by 0.02 percentage point at the end of 2012, and by nearly 0.8 percentage point at the end of 2014. In Austria, casual employment also increases the likelihood of labour migration at a growing rate (at the end of 2014 marginal probability was 0.4 percent). In Germany the marginal probability of this was more modest (0.1 percent) and stable over time. There was no significant effect in the United Kingdom.

Another hypothesis has been that a previous unfavourable labour market situation – unemployment or difficulties in returning or entering the labour market after education or looking after children – increase the probability of labour migration. However, contrary to our expectations – with all other conditions being equal – being out of work in the previous year reduces the probability of labour migration among those working abroad. (Figure 2.3.5).

Figure 2.3.5: The effect of labour market status in the previous year on labour migration, marginal probability (percentage)

Reference category: employed.
Total sample: not significant over time: unemployed, other (parental leave, pension, in education, etc.).
Austria: significant over time: other (parental leave, pension, in education, etc.), not significant over time: unemployed.
Germany: not significant over time: unemployed, not significant: other (parental leave, pension, in education, etc.).
United Kingdom: significant over time: unemployed, not significant: other (parental leave, pension, in education, etc.).
In the total sample, the marginal probability of labour migration is reduced by being unemployed or any other labour market status in the previous year compared to the reference group of those in employment. At the end of 2014 the marginal probability of labour migration was 0.5 for those who had been unemployed in the previous year, 0.7 percent for other labour market status (on parental leave, in education), and 0.9 percent for those who had been in employment. Previous labour market status has a similar effect in Austria and Germany; however the other labour market status reduces marginal probability of labour migration in Austria only after 2011. There seems to be no difference in marginal probabilities in the United Kingdom.

The acceptable working time – the opportunity cost of labour migration – increases the probability of labour migration, but the effect is very weak. An additional working hour, with all other conditions being equal, increased the probability of labour migration by just under 0.035 percent at the end of 2014. The effect increases over time: at the end of 2010 longer working hours meant less than a 0.01 percent increase in probability. In Austria the effect is very small and decreasing over time, in Germany and the United Kingdom it is also small and stable over time.

The effect of household characteristics

The number of dependants in the family, including younger or older children, benefit-recipients as well as old-age pensioners can also influence decisions around labour migration (Figure 2.3.6).

In the total sample of migrants, the number of pensioners and benefit recipients increased the likelihood of labour migration after EU accession and reduced it in the years of the economic crisis. By the end of the period the trend changed once more, and it again increased the probability of labour migration; however, its marginal effect was very small: an additional pensioner or benefit recipient in the household equally increased the probability of labour migration by 0.04 percent at the end of 2014. However, the number of children did not have a significant effect. In Austria, the number of children aged 0–6 years and benefit recipients significantly reduced labour migration, while the effect of other inactives was not significant. In Germany, where labour migration was highest from the most disadvantaged regions from a labour market perspective, both the number of pensioners and benefit recipients substantially increased the probability of labour migration. This effect was increasing rapidly over time after 2011, when the German labour market fully opened to migrants from accession countries. An additional pensioner in the household increased the probability of labour migration by 0.12 percent, an additional benefit recipient by 0.1 percent. In the United Kingdom, every inactive family member decreased the probability of labour migration.
Figure 2.3.6: The effect of household composition on labour migration, marginal probability (percentage)

Total sample: *significant over time*: number of pensioners in the household, number of benefit recipients in the household, *not significant*: number of children aged 0–6 years, number of children aged 7–18 years.

Austria: *not significant over time*: number of children aged 0–6 years, number of benefit recipients in the household, *not significant*: number of children aged 7–18 years, number of pensioners in the household.

Germany: *significant over time*: number of pensioners in the household, number of benefit recipients in the household, *not significant*: number of children aged 0–6 years, number of children aged 7–18 years.

United Kingdom: *significant over time*: number of children aged 7–18 years, number of pensioners in the household, *not significant over time*: number of children aged 0–6 years, number of benefit recipients in the household.

Conclusion

This study has examined the factors affecting labour migration, a clearly defined segment of migration. It has been shown that alongside demographic factors, regional selection and the type of profession had the most important effect on labour migration. The analysis of changes over time has highlighted that the rapid increase of labour migration in itself increases the marginal probability of working abroad for all those in the sample. In fact, this was found to be the strongest effect, while the effect of specific factors often remained unchanged over time. Labour migration represents a stable and long-term strategy for skilled migrants in Austria and Germany. Labour migration towards the United Kingdom is somewhat different: here more highly educated labour migrants are more likely to work in semi-skilled or skilled professions; therefore overeducation is probably very common. It has been
shown that another aspect of migration (not discussed here) is relocation, which would complement the picture that has emerged here based on the analysis of labour migration. In addition to the destination countries presented here, labour migration to other EU countries is also fairly substantial but more heterogeneous, characterised by trends found in the United Kingdom, as well as those in Germany and Austria.
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2.3.1 Migrants with left-behind children in Hungary

According to a comprehensive report (EC, 2012) of the organisation Children Left Behind (www.childrenleftbehind.eu) it is estimated that at the beginning of the 2010s, some half a million children lived left behind by one or more abroad-working parents in the European Union. The majority of these children lived in Romania and Poland, but from other sources it is known that Bulgaria, as well as some countries outside the EU, such as Moldova are also seriously affected (Blaskó, 2016). Although the number of emigrants in Hungary does not reach a level as high as in the countries just mentioned, the increase in emigration here makes the examination of this issue undoubtedly relevant. Studies pointing at significant detriments to the child’s well-being (as measured for example by progress in school or state of health) associated with the absence of the parents underline the importance of the problem.¹ These detriments occur notwithstanding the positive income effect of the remittances enjoyed by the households. Negative impacts on the children can not only appear in the absence of the mother: some of the studies do not even differentiate as to which parent is abroad; while other studies are looking at the impacts of the father’s absence.

Our brief analysis presents some first estimations on the extent of emigration with left-behind children in Hungary based on Population Census data from 2011.² Following to the logic of the Census, we distinguish between two cases: when parents (one or both) are away temporarily or permanently. In the first case, families raising children younger than 18 were considered as affected when it was clear that either one of the parents or both of them were (temporarily) living abroad. In these cases it was possible to identify single-parent families (when even this only parent was abroad), looking at a relatively wide range of information on the individuals concerned. In the case of permanent residence abroad (lasting over a year), strict assumptions had to be applied, as in their cases the census only contains dwelling-level data not broken down by individual. Therefore, a family was considered as having left-behind child(ren) due to permanent migration of one parent if they lived in a dwelling from which at least one individual was living abroad, while the family affected had only one parent present, and the marital status of this parent was “in partnership”. We considered a family to have two parents resident abroad permanently if an individual under the age of 18 was living in the household with no parent (but possible with other relatives or other non-related grown-up persons) and the dwelling had at least two individuals resident abroad. It is possible however that the individuals attached to the dwelling but living abroad are in fact not the parents of the child in the household; therefore our figures concerning permanent absence of the parents in two-parent families should be considered as an upper estimate.

Our analysis is therefore focusing on families raising one child or more under 18 living in Hungary: a total of 1,056,674 families in 2011. According to our estimates 11,064 of these were missing one or both parents due to temporary residence abroad (a maximum of one year as reported by the respondents). Besides, the number of families (or households) with at least one parent permanently (for over a year) abroad was estimated at 2,947.


² We currently have access to two data sources at our disposal for the study of left-behind children in Hungary: one is the 2011 Population Census; the other is the CSO’s Labour Force Survey (LFS) for the first quarter of 2013, supplemented by data from the SEEMIG survey. As we have shown elsewhere (Blaskó, 2015), the data from the LFS–SEEMIG dataset is for the most part similar to the census; however, somewhat higher. Since these estimates are more uncertain, they are not presented here.
Most of the affected families are two-parent families with the father working abroad (in 10,002 cases temporarily; in 2,391 permanently). All in all, only 413 two-parent families were identified, where the mother was engaged in temporary foreign employment, and a further 211 in which the mother was permanently abroad. The number of families raising children under the age of 18 in which both parents reside abroad was 530. We also found a relatively small number of cases in which a single parent went abroad for work.³

The number of children affected by parental migration is obviously higher than the number of affected families. In total, 18 thousand children aged 18 or younger had one or both of their parents temporarily abroad at the time of the 2011 Census. Out of this, 16,721 children had their father and 1063 their mother abroad, while 245 children were missing both of their parents. Of the children affected, 36 per cent had not yet reached school age (2.3.1.1. table). A total of 296 children aged six years or younger had a mother living abroad either alone or together with the father (single mothers included). Considering also the number of children with one or two parents permanently abroad (4,361) we can estimate that in Hungary altogether approximately 22 thousand children are potentially affected by consequences of parental migration.

Table 2.3.1.1: The number of families / households raising children in Hungary and the number of children by parents’ migration status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Families</th>
<th>Children aged</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Both parents live with the family</td>
<td>811,017</td>
<td>559,977</td>
<td>1,137,743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-parent family, parent lives in the household</td>
<td>231,991</td>
<td>93,845</td>
<td>256,365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-parent family, the father lives temporarily abroad</td>
<td>10,002</td>
<td>6,164</td>
<td>13,321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-parent family, the mother lives temporarily abroad</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>435</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both parents live temporarily abroad</td>
<td>185</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-parent family, father only, who lives temporarily abroad</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-parent family, mother only, who lives temporarily abroad</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-parent family, father lives permanently abroad</td>
<td>2,391</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>2,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-parent family, mother lives permanently abroad</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-parent family, both parents live permanently abroad</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>na.</td>
<td>na.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,057,019</td>
<td>661,519</td>
<td>1,411,519</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Households living with children under the age of 18, without parents, in which at least two individuals from the home are residing abroad.

** Dwellings and households included.

Source: 2011 Census.

³ We concluded that the number of parents who were temporarily abroad was significantly higher than the number of those permanently abroad. This could be a sign that the parents do not accept work that would mean leaving their children behind for over a year. However it is also possible that because the “temporarily abroad” census category is somewhat vaguely defined, those who are drawn to choosing it might be those who want to see their family as a unit despite one parent being away. Although in general the census does not reliably “capture” those permanently abroad, in our case is not a real issue as the analysis here focuses on families and households having strong bonds with Hungary.

Families opting for parental migration are not evenly distributed across the country (Figure K2.3.1.1). Compared to the national average, the proportion of two-parent families choosing to work abroad (for one or both parents) is considerably higher in Tolna county (1.6 per cent), but it is also relatively high in Borsod-Abáuj-Zemplén, Veszprém and Baranya. Considering the number of cases, the highest figure can also be found in Borsod (the poorest county in Hungary), where more than 1,600 families live geographically separated by migration. The lowest rates were observed in Pest county and Győr-Moson-
Sopron – both among the economically most developed counties in the country. Interestingly, only Budapest had essentially the same number of fathers being temporarily and permanently absent.  

Data on individual characteristics is only available for the temporarily absent fathers. Our results confirm earlier findings from the literature: migration that leaves a family behind is almost without exception motivated by employment. The employment rate of fathers from two-parent families in our sample is 99 per cent, while the same figure for mothers is 87 per cent. It is noteworthy that a large majority of fathers – almost two thirds (64 per cent) – have vocational training.

Figure 2.3.1.1: The number of different types of transnational two-parent families broken down by county, in order of decreasing proportion

Source: 2011 Census.
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2.4 CHANGES IN THE EMIGRATION RATES OF MEDICAL DOCTORS BETWEEN 2003 AND 2011

JÚLIA VARGA

In most countries there are difficulties in the measurement of the flows of out-migration of medical doctors primarily because of the lack of reliable data, especially time-series data of emigration. Outflows are usually estimated by the number of applications for the recognition of medical diplomas in foreign countries. Nevertheless, these data have limited reliability regarding the international mobility trends of doctors because not everyone applying for such licenses or those who are planning to leave their home country will actually leave. Also, individuals may apply more than once, and this may cause overestimates of actual flows. Furthermore, not all countries systematically request these certificates, and many of those who work abroad do so on a part-time basis while also being employed in their countries of origin (Wismar, 2011). Types of mobility and employment of immigrant doctors have become more diverse over recent decades, including short-term contracts, part-time work and weekend medical services and this makes the measurement of physicians’ migration even more challenging (Glinos, 2014). Most of the earlier research on the emigration of Hungarian medical doctors used the number of applications for certificates of recognition of diplomas to estimate changes in the out numbers. (Eke et al. 2009, Eke et al., 2011, Balázs, 2012). Some other studies used survey data to analyze the intention of out-migration of doctors (Girasek–Eke–Szócska, 2009).

The research presented in this chapter employed a large-scale, merged, individual-level panel dataset to investigate how the probability of emigration of Hungarian medical doctors changed between 2003 and 2011. The sample is drawn from a large, longitudinal dataset covering 50 percent of Hungary’s population aged 5–73 in 2003. The data collects information from registers of the Pension Directorate, the Tax Office, the Health Insurance Fund, the Office of Education, and the Public Employment Service. The dataset makes it possible to follow out-migration, attrition and other employment status changes of Hungarian medical doctors month by month at the individual level between 2003 and 2011. Each person in the sample is followed from January 2003 until December 2011 or until his/her exit from the social security system (for reasons of death or permanent emigration). Our data contains information on demographics (age, gender), educational attainment (for those with at least one unemployment spell), employment status, occupation code, wages for the occupation codes, and transfer receipt. We also have data on the region of residence of the individual and their sector of employment.
Out of the source sample a medical doctors’ subsample was created. All individuals were included in the medical doctors’ subsample whose occupation code was “medical doctor, general practitioner”, “medical doctor, specialist doctor” or “medical doctor, dentist” according to the Hungarian Occupational Classification system for at least one month between January 2003 and December 2011. We have data for 18,654 individuals.¹

With the help of the detailed information on labour market status and other data concerning the individuals, five status groups could be distinguished: (1) those working as a physician or dentist in Hungary, (2) out-migrated, (3) exited the profession (attrition), (4) exited employment (related to inactivity, unemployment), or (5) died.

Those Hungarian citizens who register abroad have an obligation to notify the Hungarian authorities that they have left the country (deregister), but many emigrants omit this duty. First, we classified to the group of ‘out-migrated’ those who reported their move abroad in Hungary. We also wanted to identify those who had not deregistered. So, in addition, in the out-migrated group were placed all individuals who for at least four successive months were neither registered as employed in the database of the Pensions Directorate, nor were labelled in the database of the Health Insurance Fund as being in receipt of inpatient care sickness benefit, and who during that period had neither received any other kind of benefits (unemployment assistance, childcare pension, old age pension or other kind of pensions) nor had been registered as studying in full time education, or had died during this period.

In other words, the classification covered those individuals who ‘disappeared’ from the system. The other possible reason for the disappearance, which is becoming unregistered unemployed is practically non-existent among medical doctors in Hungary. So, it is very likely that using the presented method we were able to identify the non-deregistered emigrants with a good degree of accuracy.

Further restrictions were placed on the process of determining the non-deregistered emigrants. Only those medical doctors were signed as out-migrated who had worked as a physician or dentist in at least three successive months before the ‘disappearance’. Also, we did not categorise those medical doctors as emigrants whose ‘disappearance’ lasted exactly from the beginning of January until the end of December in a given year and who had worked in the same workplace in the months preceding the disappearance as after the return. In such cases we assumed that the employer failed to report the individual for the given year to the Pensions Directorate. In the case of some of the omitted observations it is possible that the individuals have in fact entered employment abroad on a yearly fixed-term contract. Due to these restrictions, we give a lower bound estimate on emigration. As a consequence, in the first and last three months of the observation period the number of out-migrated

¹ Detailed description of the sample see in Varga (2015).
is likely to be an underestimate, as only the notified out-migrated could be identified in these months.

To analyse the changes in the out-migration of medical doctors we used time-to-event analysis. The time-to-event analysis is a set of statistical methods for analysing longitudinal data where the outcome variable is the time passed until the occurrence of an event of interest. The event is defined as the transition from one state to another as, in our case, the quitting of the Hungarian health workforce for different reasons. Because those who leave the health workforce may do it for various mutually exclusive reasons, (out-migration, attrition, exit from employment or death) we used competing risk models (Fine and Gray, 1999). A competing risk is defined as an event whose occurrence precludes or alters the probability of occurrence of the main event under examination. (In our case, the individual either emigrates, or goes on to a job outside the health sector, becomes inactive or unemployed or dies.) The Fine and Gray model defines separate sub-hazard functions for each event. The subdistribution hazard is the immediate risk of leaving the profession on account of a particular cause, given that the subject has not left the job before as a result of the given cause.

The independent variables in our models were: gender, age, region of residence (according to the 2003 year classification), a dummy variable indicating whether the individual was a general practitioner or a specialist doctor versus a dentist, and the relative labour income of the individual – that is the average labour income of the person in the preceding months as a ratio of the average national labour income during the same period (calculated from the source sample). The income from employment of medical doctors also contains any informal payments the individual doctor listed in their tax statement. It might be that some tax statements include only a part of the real amount of such payments. We could not address the problem of such possible hidden income in this study.

As the different observable characteristics might have a different effect on the probability of emigration at various points of the life-cycle we conducted the analysis for the whole sample and also for subsamples of five age groups: younger than 31 years old, 31–40 years old, 41–50 years old, 51–60 years old and 61–70 years old. Medical doctors older than 70 years were included in the whole sample, but we did not conduct a separate analysis for them.

The competing risk analysis was performed for all the competing events. In the following we present the results only for emigration. Figure 2.4.1 shows the cumulative incidence functions of out-migration for the whole sample and the different age groups as predicted by the competing risk models. The cause-specific cumulative incidence function gives the proportion of doctors at time \( t \) who have left the profession for a given cause (in that case because of out-migration), accounting for the fact that the job can also be left for other reasons (attrition, exiting employment, or death).

---

2 For detailed result see Varga (2015).
For the entire sample the following can be observed in the changes of emigration of medical doctors. Between January 2003 and March 2010, 7 percent of practising physicians left the country. Until March 2010, there was a steady outflow which speeded up after March 2010 and was followed by a further acceleration after May 2011. Between March 2010 and April 2011, another 5 percent of Hungarian medical doctors left the country. The increase in May 2011 shows the effect of the end of the transitional period of restrictions on the free movement of labour from EU8 countries to Austria and Germany. The reasons for the speed-up after March 2010 need further investigation.
The changes of the probability of out-migration for the different age groups show the following: between January 2003 and December 2011 the 31–40 year old group of medical doctors moved abroad in the largest proportion. By the end of the period discussed, 14 percent of them had found a job abroad. Nearly the same ratio of 51–60 year old medical doctors had moved abroad, but the dynamics of outflow were different in the two groups. Just after the EU accession the 51–60 year old doctors had left the country at the fastest pace: between May 2004 and January 2007 10 percent of them had left the country. It was probable that they could take advantage of their previous professional contacts to find suitable jobs. After this period the outflow of the 51–60 year old group stopped until March 2010. The pace of their out-migration increased again with a further increase after the 101st month, which marks the end of the transitional period of restrictions on the free movement of labour from the EU8 countries to Austria and Germany. Between March 2010 and December 2011 an additional 4 percent of the 51–60 year old medical doctors found a job abroad.

The outflow of the 31–40 year old group on the other hand was steady until the end of March 2010. Until that time 7 percent of this group went abroad. After March 2010 the outflow speeded up and the end of the transitional period of restrictions also increased the probability of out-migration in this age-group. Between March 2010 and December 2011 a further 7 percent of the 31–40 year old medical doctors found a job abroad.

The dynamics of the outflow among the youngest medical doctors – younger than 31 years old – was very similar to that of the 31–40 years old group. Until March 2010 there was a steady outflow and 7 percent of the most inexperienced doctors went abroad, after which the outflow accelerated followed by a further increase after the end of the transitional period of restrictions on the free movement of labour in this age-group as well. Between March 2010 and December 2011 a further 5 percent of the youngest doctors went abroad.

The 41–50 year old medical doctors left the country in the lowest proportion. Until March 2010, only 4 percent of them had left the country, but their rate of emigration also increased first after March 2010 with a further increase after May 2011. 6 percent of them left the country between March 2010 and December 2011.

Table 2.4.1 summarises the results of the separate competing risk models for out-migration, the subhazard rates for the whole sample and the age-group specific subsamples. A subhazard rate greater than 1 implies an increased probability of out-migration while a rate less than 1 implies a decreased probability. For instance, in the model for the whole sample, the subhazard rate is 1.29 indicating that the likelihood of emigration of men is 29 per cent higher than for women. Similarly, a one-year increase in the age of the medical doctor will decrease the probability of emigration by 2 per cent (the subhazard rate is 0.98).
Table 2.4.1: Competing risk models (subhazard rates) – out-migration
(Competing risks: attrition/exit from employment/death)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Subhazard rates</th>
<th>Whole sample</th>
<th>30 years old</th>
<th>31–40 years old</th>
<th>41–50 years old</th>
<th>51–60 years old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Male = 1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.29*</td>
<td>1.56*</td>
<td>1.79*</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.98*</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relative labour income</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.88*</td>
<td>0.47*</td>
<td>0.61*</td>
<td>0.88*</td>
<td>1.09**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Transdanubia</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Regions: Central Transdanubia/Southern Transdanubia/Northern Hungary/Northern Great Hungary/Northern Great Plain/Southern Great Plain</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Practitioner or Specialist doctor</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>2.37*</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.68*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reference category: female, dentist, Region: Central Hungary.
Significant at **5 per cent, *10 per cent, ns: not significant.

The results show that for the whole sample men out-migrate with a higher probability than women. In the entire sample, there is no significant difference in the likelihood of out-migration of physicians and dentists. There are no regional differences either. Relative labour income has a significant effect on the emigration decisions of medical doctors: those whose labour income is lower compared to the national average emigrate with a higher probability than those whose relative employment income is greater. The results of the competing risk models for the different age-groups show that among young doctors (younger than 31 years old and 31–40 years old), men out-migrate with a higher probability than women. In the age-group of the 41–50 year old, there is no significant difference in the likelihood of out-migration between males and females. Among the 51–60 year old medical doctors women out-migrate with a higher probability than men. As for the effect of the relative labour income the following can be observed: those young physicians and dentists (younger than 31 years old and 31–40 years old) whose relative employment income is lower, emigrate with a higher probability, suggesting that in their decisions to out-migrate income situation plays a decisive role. The size of the effect decreases as we move on towards the older age-groups meaning that the influence of other factors is greater for the oldest. Those 51–60 year old medical doctors go abroad with a larger probability whose relative labour income is greater than that of the other doctors of the same age and with similar other observed characteristics. It does not mean that income does not have a role in the out-migration decisions but rather suggests that the more successful older medical doctors go abroad with a larger probability. There are significant differences in the likelihood of out-migration in some of the age groups between physicians and dentists. The 31–40 year old
physicians move abroad with a probability twice as high as that of the dentists. Among the 51–60 year old group physicians out-migrate with a 32 percent smaller chance than physicians.
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The strong increase in the demand for medical doctors has accelerated doctor migration over recent decades. Medical professionals from Eastern Europe have gradually joined this global process and the migration of Eastern European doctors to Western Europe intensified after EU accession (Kaczmarczyk, 2006, Dumont–Zurn, 2007, Glinos et al., 2014, Merçay et al., 2015). Statistics and data sources suitable to describe doctor migration are slowly catching up with the interest surrounding this issue (Buchan et al., 2014, Dumont–Zurn, 2007, Merçay et al., 2015). This is also characteristic of the study of doctor migration in Hungary and estimates are used to make up for the absence of data. There is no reliable register of the number of doctors in Hungary.\(^1\) The uncertainty means that the number of doctors is potentially over- or underestimated, and it is assumed that doctors who are no longer in the register have emigrated.\(^2\) Research on migration potential and studies using the number of applications for official certifications generally do not measure actual outmigration (flow) either, but only the intention to migrate (Balázs, 2012, Csernus et al., 2013, Eke et al., 2009, 2011). Obviously, both methods overestimate the actual outmigration of doctors and disregard the possibility of return migration. The number of migrant doctors (stock) can be estimated on the basis of mirror statistics on the number of Hungarian doctors registered abroad. This also allows us to quantify the extent of outmigration of doctors from Hungary: in 2012 approximately 3,250 doctors, 9–11 percent of the total number of doctors in Hungary, lived abroad.\(^3\) The total number of doctors in Hungary can be estimated at around 30,000 on the basis of data from the National Institute for Quality- and Organisational Development in Healthcare and Medicines\(^4\) on the number of publicly employed doctors, CSO data on general practitioners, and expert estimates on the number of doctors working exclusively in the private health sector. Based on mirror statistics, information is available on the stock of Hungarian migrant doctors in Germany, the United Kingdom, and Sweden (OECD, 2015); the number of licenses issued in these three countries constitute up to 60 percent of the total number of licenses issued (Katona, 2015) and the number of Hungarian doctors working abroad was estimated on the basis of this.

Methods of analysis, data

Unlike previous estimation-based studies, this research was based on a direct survey of medical practitioners working abroad in order to investigate the

---

\(^1\) The number of registered doctors also includes those that are not practising, while the survey on doctors in state hospitals does not include private doctors (general practitioners, dentists, doctors only working at private clinics) who are not registered separately.

\(^2\) Varga’s (2015) estimate confirms that career attrition is higher than international labour migration.

\(^3\) Varga’s estimate in Chapter 2.4 uses a different dataset and a narrower comparison group (rather than the total population of doctors), and by disregarding the possibility of return migration, the estimated migration rate is higher.

\(^4\) In Hungarian: Gyógyszerészeti és Egészségügyi Minőség- és Szervezetfejlesztési Intézet.
factors that explain the migration of doctors. Data collection was conducted from the spring of 2014 to the winter of 2015. The study examined the period between 2000 and 2015. The analysis looked at two groups of participants: doctors affected by migration, namely those who worked abroad for at least one week at any time during the period of 2000–2015, and – as a control group – those who have never worked abroad. To recruit doctors currently working abroad the method of network sampling was used and members of social networking sites dedicated to doctors working abroad made up the initial sample. On the social networking site a sample was selected using the method of reweighted random walk (Gjoka et al. 2010), a form of respondent-driven sampling (Salganik, 2006). The size of the obtained sample does not differ substantially from that in commonly-used multi-stage sampling (the effect of sampling design – the differing selection probabilities – can be estimated at around 2%), where it might be even smaller due to the relative size of the sample to population (approximately 7% in this segment). Doctors in Hungary who have never worked abroad were surveyed using a random sample stratified on region and type of employment, and the data was weighted on these as well as age group. In the case of doctors currently working in Hungary who also worked abroad previously, the above sampling method was used to screen participants and those who met the inclusion criteria (i.e. worked abroad between 2000–2015) were invited to respond to the survey. The survey was administered as an online questionnaire for all participants. The unweighted composition of the sample is as follows: 736 doctors who have worked only in Hungary, 154 doctors who are currently working in Hungary but worked abroad previously, and 196 doctors currently working abroad.

Motivations for working abroad

The motivating factor considered most important for migration, wage gain, was examined using multiple questions in this study. To measure expected wage gain for those working in Hungary, the actual net earnings in Hungary and the expected earnings abroad for those with comparable experience were used. For those working abroad we used the actual earnings abroad and the expected earnings in Hungary for someone with comparable experience; and the real value of earnings abroad was operationalised as the ratio of living expenses abroad and in Hungary. To ensure that previous employment abroad does not bias the results, only data for people currently working abroad and those who have never worked outside Hungary were analysed. The mean values of factors determining net wage gain are shown in Table 2.5.1. Doctors working exclusively in Hungary consider monthly net pay higher in their profession than doctors working abroad. (This difference is probably also explained by the fact that doctors working abroad are younger.) The two groups perceive the difference in pay between Hungary and abroad similarly.
Doctors working abroad earn approximately six times the estimated pay in their profession in Hungary. The actual average pay of doctors in Hungary exceeds the estimated average. The difference in living expenses between Hungary and abroad is somewhat overestimated by doctors in Hungary. Overall, the computed real wage gain is estimated to be slightly higher by doctors in Hungary, however the difference is not significant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Doctors working exclusively in Hungary</th>
<th>Doctors currently working abroad</th>
<th>Test statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Standard error</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly net pay in their profession for someone with comparable experience in Hungary according to respondent (thousand forints)</td>
<td>299.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>219.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total current income of respondent (thousand forint)</td>
<td>326.8</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>1389.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of foreign and Hungarian pay estimated by respondent</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>6.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratio of foreign and Hungarian living expenses estimated by respondent</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computed real wage gain (thousand forints)</td>
<td>407.8</td>
<td>23.31</td>
<td>374.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The value of 1000 HUF is around Euro 3.01.

In addition to wage gain, other important factors can also influence the migration of doctors. Out of these, working and living conditions are considered here. The following factors were examined: (1) opportunities for professional development, (2) opportunities for career progress, (3) research opportunities, (4) attraction and interest of the job, (5) further training, (6) opportunities to obtain further professional qualifications, (7) professional relationships (relationship with manager, team work), (8) job opportunities in the profession, (9) personal relationships (relatives, friends), health care (access, costs), (10) official and financial administration (use of language, traditions), (11) safety, (12) housing and living conditions (13) leisure, (14) pay level in profession, (15) provision of equipment, (16) working conditions and physical state of the workplace, (17) reconciliation of working time with private life.

For each factor respondents were asked whether they considered Hungary or the preferred foreign country as more favourable. The perceived importance of each area was also measured and used to weigh each factor. Figure 2.5.1 compares the views of doctors working exclusively in Hungary and doctors working exclusively abroad.
Figure 2.5.1: Perception of factors affecting employment (in order of increasing mean values)

- Pay level in profession
- Provision of equipment
- Working conditions, physical state of the workplace
- Reconciliation of working time with private life
- Opportunities for professional development
- Job opportunities in profession
- Professional relationships
- Research opportunities
- Attraction and interest of job
- Housing and living conditions
- Opportunities for career progress
- Opportunities for further training, obtaining further professional qualifications
- Safety
- Leisure
- Health care (access and cost)
- Official and financial administration (use of language, traditions)
- Personal relationships

Note: The mean values of factors weighted by individual importance, five-point scale where –2 means that it is much better in Hungary and +2 means that it is much better in the preferred foreign country. The asterisk indicates factors where the difference is not significant (in all other cases it is significant).

There were no major differences between the two groups. The only significant differences between doctors working exclusively in Hungary or abroad were found for factors that were perceived similarly in Hungary and abroad. In 12 out of the 17 factors considered here, doctors working abroad perceived the situation abroad more favourably than doctors in Hungary, and only three factors were perceived as significantly worse, namely: 1. working conditions and the physical state of the workplace, 2. research opportunities and 3. leisure.

Reasons for working abroad and its impact

Logistic regression models were used to examine the effect of individual factors on the probability of working abroad. The outcome variable was employment abroad versus employment in Hungary and the estimated marginal probabilities are presented here. The model applies for those currently working abroad and doctors who have never worked outside Hungary. An estimated 12 per cent of Hungarian doctors are working abroad.\(^5\)
The basic model examined the effect of expected real wage gain on the probability of working abroad. For a better fit, the model uses the logarithm of the real wage gain. The basic model was controlled for sex, profession (doctor or dentist), time since graduation (and its square), the status of specialist qualification, and preferred destination country. The model showed a good fit and had adequate explanatory power (Hosmer & Lemeshow test: $p = 0.351$; Nagelkerke’s pseudo $R^2 = 0.291$).

According to the model, doctors would be willing to take up employment abroad even without a wage gain. Any additional wage gain increases the probability of working abroad at a diminishing rate, which finally converges to 90% from the very high 3.5 million forints per month. All control variables were significant. Time since graduation initially slightly increases the probability of working abroad, then 10 years after graduation it starts to reduce it, and its effect returns to around zero toward the end of one’s career (Figure 2.5.2).

**Figure 2.5.2: Effect of real wage-gain expectations and time since graduation on the probability of working abroad**

![Graph showing the effect of expected real wage gain and time since graduation on the probability of working abroad]

Men, those without specialist qualification, and doctors were more likely to take up employment abroad than women, those with a specialist qualification, and dentists. Those indicating Germany as a preferred destination country are most likely to work abroad, while among those who indicate a preference for the United Kingdom or Scandinavian countries, all other conditions being equal, the probability of working abroad is 14–17 percentage points lower (Table 2.5.2).

The model was expanded in two directions: on the one hand additional factors related to working abroad were considered, as well as factors relevant from the perspective of the Hungarian labour market.

The main results of the expanded model (see the 17 factors listed previously) are presented in Figure 2.5.3.

Of the indices for working and living conditions, five factors are significant. In terms of further education opportunities as well as official and financial
administration, a more favourable perception of the preferred country is associated with a higher probability of employment abroad. In terms of the other three factors, the relationship is negative.

Table 2.5.2: The effect of some control variables on the probability of working abroad

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Wald-statistic</th>
<th>Significance</th>
<th>Probability of working abroad</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profession</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dentist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialist qualification</td>
<td>15.54</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destination (preferred) country</td>
<td>22.68</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scandinavia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other countries</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2.5.3: Marginal effect of the perception of working and living conditions on employment abroad

The effect of wage gain is smaller in this model. Doctors would rather prefer to work abroad than in Hungary when the wage gain is 630 thousand forints or more. As wage gain increases so does the probability of employment abroad. This difference suggests that the effect of wage gain is not independent from the expected living conditions (however, this could not be tested here due to the small sample size). The effect of time since graduation is also somewhat different: the probability of working abroad peaks approximately seven years after graduation and then starts to fall sharply (by year 20 it drops to a third of the maximum).
The negative effect of the perception of working conditions and research opportunities can be explained by the fact that doctors working abroad ceteris paribus consider these as more unfavourable than doctors working in Hungary.\(^7\) In other words, doctors working in Hungary have a more idealised picture of the situation abroad. The situation is probably similar in the case of the reconciliation of working and private life as well; however the size of the sample did not allow the identification of significant differences.

The last model attempts to estimate the effects of a further two factors in addition to the basic model: the region of residence in Hungary and specialist qualification (Figure 2.5.4).

**Figure 2.5.4: The effect of region and specialist qualification on employment abroad**

Note: The lines indicate the standard error of estimation.

There are considerable differences between regions. The probability of working abroad from Southern Transdanubia is smaller, while from Central and Western Transdanubia as well as the Northern Great Plain it is higher than the general tendency (Hárs–Simon, 2015). The probability of migration is high in particular among pathologists and anaesthesiologists, and those without a specialist qualification. It is well-known that the low income of pathologists and anaesthesiologists from ‘parasolvency’ might explain their higher migration propensity. By contrast, among general practitioners the probability of employment abroad is below average. (The model has adequate fit and good explanatory power: Hosmer & Lemeshow-test: \(p = 0.420\); Nagelkerke’s pseudo \(R^2 = 0.379\).)

**Conclusions**

The pay advantage of working abroad is seen as considerable by doctors: respondents estimated a more than six-fold wage gain. However, the computed
net real-wage gain was just over two-fold. As regards working and living conditions, there are few potential motivations for doctors to return to Hungary; in most areas doctors working abroad perceived the situation in Hungary as less favourable than their counterparts working in Hungary. However, our model suggests that even a modest pay increase could reduce the probability of labour migration. This is particularly important for those at the beginning of their career prior to professional qualification, because the probability of labour migration falls sharply later on. It is also important to improve the quality of training and further education because the model estimates suggest this would also reduce the probability of migration. Apart from professional considerations, making official and financial administration easier could potentially encourage people to stay in Hungary, suggesting difficulties with general bureaucracy in Hungary.
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2.6 REMITTANCES TO HUNGARY AND HOW TO MEASURE THEM

LÁSZLÓ KAJDI

In parallel with the gradually growing number of emigrants leaving Hungary, it has become increasingly important to analyse the extent to which the remittances of emigrants contribute to the livelihood of Hungarian households and the growth of the domestic economy. In the case of countries with a large emigrant population it is common that these money flows are considered to be important sources; thus these countries strive to utilize these remittances to the largest possible extent and channel them to development funds. In Hungary it is only recently that a significant increase in remittances has emerged and this now makes it worthwhile to examine the best avenues for their use, despite the paucity of available relevant data.

The World Bank (2015) publishes data based on macroeconomic estimations, which can serve as a basis for the analysis of the volume of these flows. Due to their aggregate level however, they do not facilitate a detailed examination of the topic. Among others there is no information on the number and socio-economic status of the receiving households, how these money flows are transferred to Hungary and in which ways they are utilized. This subchapter introduces the information at our disposal regarding remittances to Hungary, and also the various measurement techniques available together with their strengths and weaknesses.

Measurement problems of remittances

Since the phenomenon of remittances is rather complex from the socio-economic point of view, its measurement also requires a comprehensive approach. From the measurement’s point of view one of the main factors is whether the money is sent home via an electronic payment method, which is easier to track, or if it is remitted by means of a barely detectable private cash transfer. The cost of electronic transfers and the development level of the financial infrastructure in the countries affected can have a great influence on this. In some cases (not so much in Europe) the identification of the actual receiving country is hindered by the fact that remittances are sent to a neighbouring country due to the low level of security or the lack of a proper financial infrastructure, and transferred in cash to the actual receiving destination (Sander–Maimbo, 2005). Another problem is that it is quite difficult to identify the actual remittance transactions among the otherwise easier recordable electronic transfers. In other words, it is not clear how to define the proper transaction...
value limit and how other types of transactions, such as business or touristic transfers can be filtered out.

In line with IMF (2009) recommendations to reduce measurement errors it is worthwhile to use several data sources when measuring remittances. The parallel application of different data compilation methods facilitates the compilation of the most reliable datasets and the reduction of disadvantages of using one single particular data source.

To reduce the costs of measurement, regular data on cross-border electronic money transfers can be obtained with the help of administrative data sets and the data collected by central banks or national statistical offices from payment service providers (e.g. banks). The drawback of this method is that it is not capable of measuring informal personal cash transfers and the distinction between remittances and money transfers for other (e.g. business) purposes is also problematic. Defining a transaction value limit can partly solve this problem; however, the proper definition of the limit can be a difficult task and heavily influences the results.

Another possible solution is the use of household sample surveys, which provide direct information on receiving households. Thus more detailed data can be collected on the amount, the transferring method and the frequency of remittances, as well as on the characteristics of the receiving households. Nonetheless the execution of such surveys is significantly more resource demanding than the collection of administrative data, furthermore the non-response rate can be considerably high due to the sensitivity of the topic. Since the regional distribution of receiving households is often uneven in the population, the inclusion of the appropriate number of households in the survey can require special sampling techniques.

The two main techniques mentioned can be completed using estimation procedures, which support the low resource demand calculation of relatively reliable results from data with an inappropriate quality level. The other advantage of estimations is that they can be flexibly fitted to the specific features of the country or the statistical data sources. However, the validation of these results and the criteria used for the calculation can be difficult, since they are usually based on the opinion and presumptions of experts in the field.

Remittances to Hungary

The World Bank publishes the most complete dataset on the volume of remittances, which is based on the compensation of employees and the personal transfer categories of the current account of affected countries. These current account data are amended using estimation procedures in order to identify money flows between sending and receiving countries (Ratha–Shaw, 2007). According to the published data, the amount of remittances sharply increased globally after the millennium; the amount of USD (583 billion) sent in 2014...
(World Bank, 2015) shows a more than four-and-a-half-times growth compared to the level in the year 2000. The World Bank (Maimbo–Ratha, 2005) and additionally the IMF (IMF, 2009) draw attention to the fact that remittances show much lower volatility compared to Foreign Direct Investments, and their volume does not depend on the economic situation of the receiving country, thus these money flows can serve also as a reliable resource in times of economic recessions.

Several research studies examined worldwide the factors which influence the amount of the money transferred. Among these there are country-specific factors (e.g. how close is the relationship between the family members and how it influences remittances), but general features can also be identified. For instance, the time period spent abroad by the emigrant heavily influences the amount of money transfers according to IMF (2009) analyses. In the case of short-term migration, the amount of remittances is usually higher compared to that of those who utilize their income in order to establish a new life in their new country. Other research studies (Chimhowu–Piesse–Pinder, 2005) proved that women support their families in home countries more reliably than men. Nonetheless the economic situation in the country where the emigrant works is less important, since these countries normally have developed welfare systems, where the social transfers compensate for the decrease in incomes (Ratha, 2005).

Considering remittances to Hungary over the last 15 years (World Bank, 2015) it appears that after a remarkable increase in 2004 presumably in connection with accession to the EU, since 2009 a new ascending period has commenced. This is in line with the significantly growing number of emigrants from Hungary during this period (Figure 2.6.1). In terms of absolute numbers this means that the USD 280 million sent to Hungary in the year 2000 has become sixteen-times higher after 15 years and in 2014 was almost USD 4,500 million (4,473 million).

In remittances as a share of GDP the same trend appears. In the first couple of years after joining the EU remittances constituted 1.5–2 percent of the GDP, but due to the sharp rise which commenced in 2010, the latest data from 2014 shows a figure of more than 3 percent.

For the originating countries of transfers the main target countries of emigrant Hungarians can be considered the most important areas also from the remittances point of view (Figure 2.6.2). Among these Germany is the biggest source country, from where more money was sent in 2014 (USD 952,2 million) than from the United Kingdom (USD 396,3 million) and Austria (USD 365,1 million) together. The United States and Canada are also major sending countries, which is even more important from the aspect that emigration to these countries was not within the focus of recent studies. Other main source countries of remittances are Australia, Switzerland, Sweden and Slovakia.1

---

1 Remittances from Hungary are around USD 1–1.5 billion since 2006, which is approximately one quarter of the received money transfers. Contrary to remittance inflows, no significant growth appeared in the amount of money sent from Hungary, and after the economic crisis in 2008 it even decreased. These transfers are mainly not connected to the current, especially economically motivated migration, but rather to the continuous support of Hungarian national relatives abroad, which might explain the relatively stable value of these money flows.
In addition to using current account data, the household sample survey of the SEEMIG project, which examined the migration processes of the South-eastern European countries, represented another approach. The survey (see Blaskó–Jamalia, 2014) was based on the regularly undertaken (quarterly) Labour Force Survey, which had the main goal of achieving representative results using special sampling techniques on the characteristics of the emigrant Hungarian population. In the framework of the survey remittances were also analysed, which showed that one quarter of emigrant Hungarians send money transfers to a Hungarian household.

**Conclusion**

The issue of remittances is a complex phenomenon with several social, economic, and demographic aspects, thus the examination of these money transfers and the obtaining of reliable results imply several difficulties. According to
the published data of the World Bank, in the case of Hungary a major growth occurred both in the amount of remittances and in their share of GDP. In 2014 the USD 4.5 billion amount of remittances constituted 3.2 per cent of the GDP, which is significant in the Hungarian current account as well. This stresses the importance of further analyses. In order to achieve this a special household survey with a large sample size dedicated to the topic would be extremely useful. Data from a sample survey would be important to get a clear picture on the socio-demographic features of the receiving households, but this data can serve as a basis for the more reliable application of administrative data sources and estimation procedures with lower costs.
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2.7 RETURNd MIGRANTS*
ÁGNES HORVÁTH

Migration is not necessarily a one-way movement. According to empirical data, a substantial proportion of economic migrants (20–50 per cent) spend less than five years in the destination country – they either return to the sending country, or migrate further. Thus, the scale of return migration is significant; therefore it is important whether its effects on the sending (and receiving) countries are positive or negative.

The monitoring of return migrants is only possible with a considerable delay and has a limited scope to capture their exact magnitude; therefore the impact on receiving and sending countries is difficult to quantify. The share of return migrants can be estimated on the basis of flow data; however data are not harmonised across receiving countries and do not provide detailed information on the main characteristics of migrants. Therefore, knowledge on return migration mainly comes from targeted research.

Generally, returners can make positive contributions to the economy of their origin by sharing their experience and/or savings accumulated abroad. Both emigration and return migration are selective (this is referred to as double selection), therefore much more detailed information would be necessary on migration flows in both directions in order to assess the impact of return migration (i.e. the net impact of emigration). The sending country can benefit most from return migration if there is a positive selection of returners among emigrants. A further condition for potential beneficial effects is that returners find employment or start a business at home matching their experiences gained abroad, and spend their savings on increasing either human or physical capital.

Who returns and why?

According to the OECD’s estimate (2008) the rate of return or onwards migration is between 20–75 per cent annually, and it is highest within the first five years after emigration. However, there is a considerable variation in the rate of remigration across countries. The development gap between the sending and receiving countries is negatively associated with the rate of remigration. Furthermore, economic cycles also have an important effect: recessions tend to affect migrants more; they are more likely to return or migrate further during economic downturns (Bijwaard–Wabba, 2014). Papademetriou–Terrazas (2009) however, argue that the economic and social structure of the sending country have a larger effect on the decision to return than the cyclical position of the receiving country.

*I am grateful to Katalin Bodnár for her constructive criticism and valuable contribution.
The motivations of return migration are diverse, and – as in the case of emigration – can change over time and multiple causes can be present at the same time. They can also be classified into “push” (related to the receiving country) and “pull” (related to the sending country) factors. The main push factors in the receiving country are job-finding probability, the probability of finding a job utilising the migrant’s qualifications, the earnings and available savings, as well as the success and degree of integration (for example whether the individual has a spouse, where they live, whether they own a property). The pull factors include the economic and political circumstances, job opportunities in the sending country, the potential “gain” from the accumulated experiences after return, as well as personal preferences (OECD, 2008, Dustman et al., 2011). Nevertheless, there can be many other motives for return migration, for example returning after retirement is also common.

The importance of individual factors that determine the magnitude of return migration is also shaped by the motives of emigration. According to Roy’s standard model of international migration (Roy, 1951) return migrants tend to be negatively selected from positively-selected migrants (i.e. the worst from the best) and positively selected from negatively-selected migrants (i.e. the best of the worst) (Borjas, 2014). If the purpose of emigration is long-term settlement in a country with higher income levels, then return migration is caused by the failure of the original intention and returners will be negatively selected: those would return who are unemployed or on low income in the destination country, or are less integrated in the receiving country and more integrated in the sending country (Constant–Massey, 2002). However, if migration is planned to be temporary from the outset, then those employed and on a higher income or with savings are the ones likely to return, thus the returners will be positively selected from the emigrants.

The two types of migration are present concurrently, which might explain the U-shaped relationship between income, age, education and the probability of return migration demonstrated by empirical studies (OECD, 2008, Bijwaard–Wahba, 2014). However, according to Pungas et al. (2012), over-education, rather than education, plays a role in the propensity to return (for example in the case of Estonians working in Finland). Alongside the experiences and savings accumulated by returnees, their capacity to innovate and become actors of change also determines whether return migration can foster development in the sending country (Cassarino, 2004). Nevertheless, there is a lack of empirical data on this.

Return migration to Central and Eastern Europe

Following the accession of Central and Eastern European (CEE) countries to the European Union in 2004, the intensification of migration meant that an increasing number of people acquired experiences abroad before the finan-
cial crisis. Then migration was predominantly temporary: for the majority of migrants the planned and actual duration of stay abroad was less than one to two years (Randveer–Room, 2009, Blanchflower–Shadforth, 2009). Before the economic downturn, the majority of migrants took up employment in low-skilled jobs, which might explain the temporary character of migration (Zaiceva–Zimmermann, 2013).

After 2008, many expected a decrease in emigration and an increase in return migration due to the economic downturn in the old Member States (Martin–Radu, 2012). Although there were sending countries where this happened temporarily (e.g. Poland, Slovakia), there are also examples of the opposite (i.e. Latvia). Overall, East-West migration continued to increase and it was further intensified by Germany and Austria fully opening up their labour markets in 2011.

Available data on CEE countries and empirical studies confirm that the extent of return migration is substantial. Martin–Radu (2012) estimated that the proportion of those who had spent at least six months working abroad ranged from 2.6 to 9.1 per cent in CEE countries in 2006–2008. The authors analysed data from the European Labour Force Survey (EU–LFS) from 2002 to 2007 in five countries: the Czech Republic, Poland, Lithuania, Hungary and Romania and found that the majority of returnees were male, and that singles as well as those with secondary education and graduates were over-represented among them compared to the non-migrant population. In most CEE countries returnees were positively selected compared to both emigrants and those staying abroad. Controlling for individual characteristics, the results show that returnees were more likely to become inactive or start a business than non-migrants.

Zaiceva–Zimmermann (2013) examined return migrants after 2008 and they also found that returnees are usually positively selected, namely they are more educated than the non-migrant or the non-returning migrant population. This is also supported by the fact that the majority of migrants returning to Central and Eastern Europe at the beginning of the crisis were actually employed 12 months earlier in the receiving country. However, the authors highlight that return can also be temporary and returnees might leave again when the economy takes an upturn again in the receiving countries. Individual country analyses also tend to show that the labour market integration of returnees is by-and-large successful – with the exception of Poland, where the unemployment rate is higher among return migrants than in the non-migrant population (OECD, 2013, Kahanec–Kureková, 2014).

The rate of return migrants from Germany to CEE Member States (EU–8 + 2) declined around 2010, primarily due to the increase in the number of migrants from EU–8 + 2 (Figure 2.7.1). According to data from the German Immigration Office, the rate of migrants from Germany to Central and Eastern Europe relative to migrants from CEE to Germany was relatively stable.
by sending country prior to 2008; it then increased in some countries. Since 2010 the share of returnees, as well as the differences between the EU–8 + 2 countries, declined substantially, primarily due to the increase in the number of migrants to Germany. Despite the lower return rate, the share of those with experience abroad increased within the EU–8 + 2 populations, because the size of the potential pool (i.e. those migrating to Germany) also increased.

![Figure 2.7.1](attachment:Figure_2.7.1.png)

**Figure 2.7.1: Migration from Germany to EU–8 + 2 Member States relative to migration from those countries to Germany (percentage)**


Note: The figure shows migrants by country of origin and destination. Migrants from countries of origin to Germany or from Germany to destination countries might not be citizens of either the country of origin or the destination country.


**Return migration to Hungary**

Hungary became a net receiving country during the early years of the post-communist regime change: the combined number of Hungarians who returned from emigration, the immigration of ethnic Hungarians from neighbouring countries together with the ethnic groups from the former Yugoslavia exceeded the number of those leaving the country during the 1990s to a substantial extent. In this period there was also a net immigration of Hungarian citizens due to low emigration coupled with high return migration (primarily of the retired). Table 2 of Ambrosini et al. (2015) shows that the rate of return migration relative to gross migration was the highest in Hungary (1.34) out of the nine East-Central European countries[^1] included in the analysis, in the period between 1990 and 2000 according to UN data.

The net migration of Hungarian nationals turned into negative in the early 2000s temporarily and then again during the 2008 crisis. Moreover, from 2002 to 2007 the return rate was already well below the average of the CEE countries according to the European Social Survey (ESS) database (Martin–Radu, 2012). The number of emigrants exceeded the number of Hungarian returnees during the financial crisis, albeit the fact that the number of Hungarian-born migrants increased both in absolute and relative terms among returnees: it more than doubled between 2005 and 2011 compared to the period before the 2000s (*KSH*, 2016).

[^1]: Albania, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Latvia, Poland and Romania.
It is not possible to determine the exact rate of return migration on the basis of available data. However, on the basis of mirror statistics and official Hungarian statistics, the share of return migrants to Hungary can be estimated at 25–42 per cent of emigration in the years following the crisis. Nevertheless, it is important to emphasise that the share of returnees is difficult to measure and might change over time.

Between 2001 and 2012 each year on average over 70 per cent of Hungarian nationals working abroad chose either Germany, Austria or the United Kingdom as a destination country. The share of the three countries reached 81% in 2014 (KSH, 2014, Table 8.2.25), therefore the largest number of returnees can also be expected from these. Detailed national statistics are available for Germany and Austria to analyse the number of returnees. According to official data, Hungary was a net sending country in the period between 2001 and 2012 towards both countries. The number of emigrants from Hungary to both Austria and Germany became typically higher after 2008. However, while the rate of returnees from Austria has been gradually increasing since 2007, in the case of Germany it has been steadily declining since its peak in 2007 (Figure 2.7.2).

**Figure 2.7.2: Migrants from Hungary (thousand people) and the rate of return migration in Germany and Austria**

Note: Emigrants are stock, return migrants are flow data.

Based on various comparative studies it can be concluded that the characteristics of Hungarian returnees do not significantly differ from those of their Central and Eastern European counterparts. Returning to Hungary is a deliberate choice for a large number of Hungarians working abroad. Compared to migrants from other CEE countries, Hungarians typically spent more, shorter periods abroad (Hárs, 2009). Smoliner et al. (2011) highlights that the majority of migrants from Hungary are male, and according to Hárs (2009) the share of males could have reached up to 75 per cent in 2008–2009, therefore males were also over-represented among return migrants. According to the most recent data, from 2014 on, there are still more male returnees than fe-
male; however their share is substantially lower, 56 per cent (KSH, 2014, Table 8.2.24). Co et al. (2000) showed that male return migrants in Hungary could not achieve a wage premium relative to their non-migrant counterparts, however female returnees, who tended to find employment in the financial sector, achieved up to 40% higher salaries than those who stayed in the country. Martin–Radu (2012) found that Hungarian return migrants had tended to be positively selected in the period prior to the crisis (they were younger and more highly qualified than the general population), with the addition that returnees were more likely to become self-employed than employed after their return. According to the same survey, a common characteristic of self-reported returnees was that they typically either lived in a long-term relationship or were married, and were much less likely to be childless compared to those staying abroad (69% vs 44%). They got a job and worked typically full time both abroad and in Hungary following their return. Returners highlighted the opportunity for higher earnings and career development as the main motives for working abroad. The main reasons for returning among Hungarian respondents were clearly the separation from family and friends.

Conclusions

With the massive rise in the number of Hungarian migrants between 2010 and 2014, the number of Hungarian returnees has also increased. Hungarian returnees, similarly to other Central and Eastern European migrants, are typically positively selected: they are younger and more educated than the non-migrant population and it seems that their labour market integration has also been successful. The increase in the number of returnees might have also mitigated the negative impact of the “brain drain” to some extent in the period following the crisis; however, there is no information whether returnees are also positively selected relative to the population permanently settled abroad.
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2.7.1 Public policies encouraging return migration in Europe

Judit Kálmán

Following a brief international outlook, this paper takes stock of public policy interventions that respond to mobility flows within Europe and encourage return migration. As motivations for migration and repatriation as well as the characteristics of migrants and returning migrants are diverse, the objectives and tools of government interventions intending to influence these processes also vary. Policy interventions concentrate mainly on the repatriation of highly qualified emigrants (brain regain) and aim to utilize the skills and experiences of returnees in promoting innovation-based economic development and competitiveness. Return programmes can either be focusing on the labour market only or have an integrated approach, involving multiple public policy areas. Table 2.7.1.1 summarises their main characteristics.

Table 2.7.1.1: Main types and characteristics of public policy programmes promoting return migration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target group</th>
<th>Reintegration (reactive intervention)</th>
<th>Promotion of return (active intervention)</th>
<th>Policies for retention of human capital (proactive)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rationale</td>
<td>Returned migrants</td>
<td>Potential returnees</td>
<td>Potential emigrants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimizing social tensions and costs</td>
<td>Maximizing benefits of return migration</td>
<td>Emigration prevention, loss minimisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>associated with return</td>
<td>(through the social-, economic-, demo-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>graphic- and financial capital of the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>returnee)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>Reintegration of returnees into society</td>
<td>Promotion of return migration and assistancewith the process</td>
<td>Prevention of (skilled) worker outmigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Place</td>
<td>Sending country</td>
<td>Receiving country</td>
<td>Sending country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>After return</td>
<td>Before/during return migration</td>
<td>Before emigration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time</td>
<td></td>
<td>Training, support, consulting, practical</td>
<td>Through education and development policies,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Method</td>
<td></td>
<td>information services (telephone, website),</td>
<td>economic policy – not via administrative barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>individual mentoring, PR-campaign, raising</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>awareness of potential benefits of returning home</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Edited by author based on Kovács et al. (2014).

Beyond diaspora policies, there are many successful, complex return migration-repatriation initiatives in many countries around the world – for example in China, India and Taiwan (UNDP, 2007; Jonkers, 2008; Méssáros, 2010). Already in the 1960s, Taiwan and Korea tried to entice the return of its highly educated citizens who had embarked on international careers by offering excellent research opportunities, high salaries and other incentives. China has also been following this model for some time, in addition to the government's attempt to involve the diaspora community. For a long time India did not promote remittances at all, but nowadays it aims to encourage diaspora investment and return of its emigrants through the reduction of bureaucracy, business-friendly policies and by the liberalisation of exchange rates. At the same time Taiwan, concentrating on building relationships and promoting investments, created business and industrial parks, and sought to entice its researchers and engineers to return home with the lure of attractive jobs, as well as advanced infrastructure, housing, and schools (OECD, 2008). A number of other countries – for example, some South American and African countries – have long operated similar scholarship programmes and government programmes encouraging the return of their highly qualified citizens.
In comparison with these Asian and Latin American countries, Eastern European countries discovered the economic possibilities of return migration policies relatively late and utilised the potential of brain regain programmes to a lesser extent. Several migrant return initiatives have been launched in Central and Eastern Europe, including Hungary (Table 2.7.1.2). The majority of the programmes began 4–5 years following EU accession (Kaczmarczyk, 2013), even though in many of the affected countries massive outmigration had started years before. This is all the more surprising as such programmes can be co-financed by the EU (European Return Fund, Cohesion Policy).

1 Because they are relatively recent, but also for the absence of proper outcome indicators, it is not yet possible to measure their long-term impacts.

2 One of the reasons for this is the conflict between goals, principles and instruments at different levels of government. At the EU level, the free movement of labour is one of the main pillars of the common market, as well as a common economic interest, while at the level of Member States this mobility has a range of negative consequences presented earlier, which might also differ across Member States.

### Table 2.7.1.2: Return, reintegration, and retention initiatives in Eastern Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Programme type</th>
<th>Main objective</th>
<th>Duration</th>
<th>Instruments/Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Guidance and Counselling for Migrants and Returnees</td>
<td>Transnational (6 EU Member States)</td>
<td>Re-employment, reintegration</td>
<td>Consulting, know-how and exchange of experience for returnees</td>
<td>2009-2011</td>
<td>Re-migration toolkit, online library creation, surveys. Seven meetings in the partner countries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Povroty.gov.pl Programme</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Reintegration, Re-employment</td>
<td>Information provision, assistance with reintegration for Poles living abroad</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Website, Reintegration and re-employment of returnees, job placement, incentives for becoming entrepreneurs, tax incentives, reduction of bureaucratic restrictions. Combined with Polish Employment Service job recruitment portal since July 2011 Website, information campaign, job brokerage, promoting business start-up, tax breaks (!), elimination of bureaucratic barriers (recognition of qualifications, one-stop-shop administration, elimination of dual taxation), support for the reintegration of children - national programme, jointly coordinated by various government departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Masz Plan na powrót?” (Do you have a plan for return?)</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>reintegration</td>
<td>Provision of information for Poles abroad intending to return</td>
<td>2008-2008</td>
<td>Provision of information for Poles abroad intending to return Website, information campaign, job brokerage, promoting business start-up, tax breaks (!), elimination of bureaucratic barriers (recognition of qualifications, one-stop-shop administration, elimination of dual taxation), support for the reintegration of children - national programme, jointly coordinated by various government departments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homing Plus Programme</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Encouraging return, re-employment, reintegration</td>
<td>Supporting the return of young Polish researchers (as well as doctoral students)</td>
<td>2010-2010</td>
<td>Max.80 thousand Polish zloty (cc.18500 EUR) research grant/year, 5,000 zloty (cc. 1170 EUR) monthly pay for researchers. Warsaw (Mazowie region) – training, business plan preparation, 6-month financial incubation support: target group - primarily those aged over 45 years, women, and people being returned due to unemployment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>„Zostań w Polsce – swoim szefem!” (Be your own boss – stay in Poland!)</td>
<td>Poland – regional programme</td>
<td>Encouraging return</td>
<td>Supporting business start-up, self-employment of returnees</td>
<td>2010-2011</td>
<td>Warsaw (Mazowie region) – training, business plan preparation, 6-month financial incubation support: target group - primarily those aged over 45 years, women, and people being returned due to unemployment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wracajdopolski.pl (ReturntoPoland.pl)</td>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>Promotion of return</td>
<td>Encouraging the return of highly qualified Polish migrants (mainly from the UK)</td>
<td>2007-2011</td>
<td>Polish and British Chamber of Commerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Programme type</td>
<td>Main objective</td>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Instruments/Outcomes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Return support”</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Promotion of return, reintegration</td>
<td>Financial assistance for Estonians returning from abroad after more than 10 years</td>
<td>2004</td>
<td>Up to 2,000 EUR/person, very few people qualify due to strict eligibility criteria (36–242 people/year) – criteria: more than 10 years spent abroad, retained links, official registration.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Talents back Home”</td>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>Promotion of return, re-employment</td>
<td>Information service for young Estonians (students) living abroad intending to return home</td>
<td>2010–2012</td>
<td>Job brokerage, information campaign, website – operated by the Estonian Chamber of Commerce and Industry, funded by the EU (ESF), following a successful campaign only 27 people returned home in the programme.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEDIT</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Promotion of return, re-employment</td>
<td>Information provision for Romanians living in Italy with the intention of returning home</td>
<td>2009–2011</td>
<td>Romanian Employment Service in partnership with the Italian counterpart, funded by the EU (ESF), information services, job brokerage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romanian Office for Romanians Living Abroad</td>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>Diaspora policy, maintaining links</td>
<td>Preserving the identity of Romanians living abroad, links with the mother country</td>
<td>1995–2003</td>
<td>Language courses, Romanian school classes abroad, financial assistance for diaspora communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opening up opportunities for Returned Georgian Migrants</td>
<td>Czech Republic, Georgia</td>
<td>Reintegration, re-employment</td>
<td>Supporting return of Georgian migrants</td>
<td>2003–2014</td>
<td>Creation of an employment service and job brokerage centre in Tbilisi, assistance, information campaign in the Czech Republic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migracia SK</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Return, retention</td>
<td>Creation of policies to reduce “brain drain”, awareness raising</td>
<td>2009–2014</td>
<td>Website, organising the “Day of Slovaks Abroad” and conference, building relationships with Slovak organisations abroad</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Slovensko Calling”</td>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>Return, reintegration, re-employment</td>
<td>Information for Slovaks living abroad, encouraging return and re-employment</td>
<td>2009–2014</td>
<td>Job search website, media campaign, public debates, activities abroad, publication of a Guide for returning Slovaks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungarian Academy of Science Momentum (Lendület) Programme</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Return, re-employment, retention</td>
<td>Encouraging the return and retention of outstanding Hungarian researchers and young talent from abroad, as well as attracting young researchers from abroad</td>
<td>2009–2014</td>
<td>Funding for researchers and research groups, initiation of quality research infrastructure in Hungary. 100+ research projects received funding prior to 2015, increasing resources – currently 400 mn HUF (1.3 mn EUR)/year budget</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SROP</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Return, re-employment, retention</td>
<td>Encouraging the return of talented Hungarian researchers in the areas of natural, technical and life sciences, as well as mathematics</td>
<td>2013–2014</td>
<td>Funding of research centres and research groups for more experienced researchers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Markusovszky Scholarship (Károly Than scholarship)</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Retention</td>
<td>Preventing the emigration of doctors and pharmacists</td>
<td>2011–2014</td>
<td>Gradually increasing resources (840 mn HUF – 2.73 mn EUR budget in 2016), fellowships for graduated resident specialists and pharmacists, a net grant of 100 thousand HUF – 325 EUR per month, eligibility criteria apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Come Home Youth”</td>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>Return, reintegration, re-employment</td>
<td>Encouraging the return of young Hungarians working in the United Kingdom</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>100 mn HUF – 0.325 mn EUR, complex programme, website, telephone hotline, information campaign, counselling, training, job brokerage, housing assistance</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These initiatives have diverse objectives\(^3\) and target groups but for the most part they encourage the return of researchers, doctors, i.e. generally highly skilled individuals. However, they remain to be quite fragmented, have a strong labour market focus, and are less coordinated with other public policies. Thus, comprehensive, complex and well-resourced initiatives for return migration (perhaps with the exception of the Polish ‘Masz Plan na powrót’ complex programme) are still missing in Central and Eastern Europe. Regarding the territorial focus of these programmes, the majority of them focus on a single country while there are relatively few projects that cover two or more states,\(^4\) and there are hardly any EU-wide programmes (except the Marie Curie Programme). However, without the coordination of these interventions and their harmonisation with EU policies the true single European labour market cannot exist, even though that is an aim for increased EU competitiveness.

Unfortunately, information available to evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency of these programmes is rather unreliable. The raw figures on the number of returnees, which are often reported, do not reveal the effectiveness of the programmes because they lack either natural or artificial comparison (which would tell us what would have happened in the absence of the programme). We are not aware of any rigorous, scientific evaluations on return migration policies in the region – although apart from the lack of data, the rather short time since these were launched in Central and Eastern Europe must also be noted.

However, the available figures suggest that the impact of Eastern European return migration policies remains, for the time being, rather marginal; these programmes can encourage the return, or prevent the emigration of, only a very small minority of skilled young adults (Barcevicius et al., 2012, OECD, 2013).\(^5\) The effectiveness of these policy interventions is largely dependent on the general economic and social situation in the mother country,\(^6\) the characteristics of migrants and the migration pattern\(^7\) – reliable information and data on which is still very limited or missing. As member states have conflicting interests both with each other and with the European Economic Area, the EU-level coordination of these policies is imperative and should also take the perspective of the economic competitiveness of Europe into account. The creation of the common European Migration Policy has been overdue since the 2009 Lisbon summit, even though it would be important not only from current security policy perspectives but also to facilitate the better management of intra-EU mobility processes and their consequences.

---

3 Poland and Latvia launched these policies due to the labour market losses caused by massive outmigration, while Romania started trying to control the extent of emigration as a result of pressure from receiving country governments.

4 Examples for the latter are the bilateral “Opening Up Opportunities” Czech Republic – Georgia project, and the “Guidance and Counselling for Migrants and Returnees” transnational project implemented by Slovakia and the Czech Republic.

5 For example see Chapter 2.4 and Varga (2016) on the increase in the migration of Hungarian doctors after 2010.

6 To prevent emigration and facilitate remigration, the key issues in the sending countries would be general economic growth, social progress and the creation of a business-friendly environment. In Eastern Europe, in particular the reduction of the tax burden on employment related income, diminishing inactivity percentages, the reduction of red tape and bureaucracy, i.e. the creation of a business- and investment-friendly environment would be important.

7 The case of Latvia illustrates that the emigration propensity of the highly skilled increases at times of economic decline and these people often do not wish to return. Therefore, it is not only difficult to encourage return migration, but also remittances as well as the extent of human capital transfer – one of the often cited positive effects of migration – are somewhat also uncertain. However, in Poland for example the return rate is relatively high, but returnees are more likely to become unemployed than those who stayed at home, which again does not constitute proper human capital transfer. Using data from Poland, Latvia, Hungary, and Romania Barcevicius et al. (2012) have found that foreign work experience was an advantage mainly for the highly educated following return. This highlights the importance of more detailed data on specific migration patterns (OECD, 2013).
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3 IMMIGRATION

3.1 THE LABOUR MARKET INTEGRATION OF IMMIGRANTS IN HUNGARY – AN ANALYSIS BASED ON POPULATION CENSUS DATA

IRÉN GÖDRI

The economic and labour market integration of immigrants is a challenge to several European countries. The labour market indicators of both foreign-born populations – especially those born outside the European Union – and their offspring born in receiving countries, the so-called second generation, are generally worse than those of the native population (with few exceptions). 1

Although the role of immigration in the replacement of labour force and thereby in economic growth, in the reduction of old-age dependency ratio and in the sustainability of the pension system is an argument often made in favour of immigration, it must be admitted that it can only be achieved through the successful labour market integration of immigrants. However, the lower than average employment rate of immigrant populations (especially among women) may create further “dependence” in receiving countries (Coleman, 2004) and put additional burdens on the social welfare system of the country concerned. Although immigrants, especially from less developed third countries, are likely to be in a worse labour market situation than the native population in most European countries, there are significant differences according to country of origin (and also ethnic groups) (Münz, 2008, Keeley, 2009, Koopmans, 2016).

The indicators of labour market integration and the factors influencing them

Labour market integration is one of the key elements of the integration of immigrants in the receiving society, which may be an important step towards social and cultural integration. Labour market integration is most often measured by employment rate and unemployment rate, i.e. to what extent these indicators converge to those of the native population over time spent in the receiving country. These two indicators not only embody two different approaches to labour market integration but also indicate the two possible causes of segregation: low employment rate may be due to high share of immigrants not entering the labour market (i.e. not trying to find work) and in this case their activity rate is also low, while the high unemployment rate reveals that a lot of entrants to the labour market do not find a job.

The aforementioned indicators are the core indicators of labour market integration and are also included in the Zaragoza Declaration adopted in 2010.
However, successful integration does not only involve access to jobs but also the adequate utilisation of the human capital of immigrants, employment in the primary segment of the labour market as well as rights and opportunities on the labour market equal to those of the receiving population (Eurofound 2008). Accordingly, there are further important indicators of integration in the case of those employed: overqualification (the proportion of employees with qualifications higher than those required for their position) and wage levels (compared to the wages of similar occupational groups in the receiving population). Attention should also be paid as to what extent immigrants are present on the secondary labour market characterised by low wages, bad working conditions, a high degree of uncertainty and the lack of mobility prospects, or choose employment provided by ethnic businesses (or self-employment). In the case of the unemployed and other inactive groups, important indicators of labour market exclusion include the extent of long-term unemployment (the proportion of job seekers who have been out of work for at least one year) and involuntary inactivity, which is the proportion of those among the inactive population who are available for work but have given up active job search (and thus are not included among the unemployed) (OECD/European Union, 2015).

The labour market integration of immigrants varies according to receiving countries and the immigrant cohorts arriving at different times (Keeley, 2009, Borjas, 2015). The success of integration is influenced by several factors: on the one hand, the institutional conditions of the destination country (migration and labour market regulations), general economic, labour market and social conditions as well as the integration policy or lack thereof; on the other hand, the composition of the immigrant population, the causes and circumstances of migration as well as the presence and position of the immigrant (ethnic) population in the receiving country. The composition of immigrants in terms of educational attainment and qualification is especially important for labour market integration. However, a survey conducted in 2010 found that the demographic characteristics and human capital of various immigrant groups only partly explain their disadvantageous labour market position, while certain socio-cultural factors play a more significant role: speaking the language of the host country, media consumption in this language, social contacts with natives or attitudes concerning gender roles (Kooijmans, 2016). The time spent in the receiving country is also decisive: over time, labour market indicators usually improve, which is linked to acquiring the so-called country specific skills and the improvement of language skills.

**Research questions, data source**

The study aims at analysing the labour market situation of immigrants in Hungary compared to the Hungarian population. The descriptive analysis

---

2 The latter mainly has significance for ethnic businesses.
3 The successful integration of immigrants and the positive impact of immigration on the labour market and economy are mainly expected if the composition of the immigrant population in terms of qualifications meets the labour needs of the receiving country.
examines the major indicators of labour market integration (activity rate, employment rate, unemployment rate) in the working age (15–64) population, highlighting differences according to gender, age group and educational attainment on the one hand, and differences between the various ethnic groups on the other. In addition, it briefly discusses the prevalence of self-employment (ethnic businesses) and the issue of over-qualification. The multivariable analysis investigates factors influencing the probability of being employed, especially the role of foreign place of birth and foreign citizenship as well as the role of country of origin, length of residence, citizenship, nationality and the Hungarian language skills among the foreign-born population.¹

The analysis is based on data from the 2011 Population Census. The census is the most comprehensive data source on immigrants: it constitutes a comprehensive cross-sectional database of both foreign-born population and foreign citizens staying for over 12 months in the country, which provides unique opportunities for detailed analysis. At the same time, it enables the comparison of the integration indicators of immigrants with the corresponding indicators of the native population surveyed at the same time and in the same way. Nevertheless, it has a disadvantage: it takes place every ten years, thus it is only able to reveal large scale changes.

Definition of the immigrant population

Identifying immigrants on the basis of their citizenship or birthplace results in two populations differing in size and composition. Foreign citizens living in the country constitute only part of the immigrant population and mainly represent those who arrived in recent years. In Hungary, where the rate of naturalisation is high, the immigrant population is significantly underestimated if based on the number of foreign citizens. Furthermore, the population of foreign citizens also includes the children of foreign citizens born in Hungary who have not yet obtained Hungarian citizenship (i.e. the so-called second generation) and the Hungarian-born who emigrated and after obtaining foreign citizenship returned to Hungary (they typically have dual citizenship). The foreign-born population is a wider group of immigrants including also immigrants who arrived earlier and obtained citizenship. The 2011 census counted 143,197 persons with foreign citizenship and 383,236 persons born abroad; 78.4 of the former and 69.5 per cent of the latter was aged between 15 and 64. In the following, general labour market indicators are presented for both foreign citizens and the foreign-born population, while the more detailed analysis is only provided for the latter.

The labour market situation of immigrants

According to both earlier research and the most recent data, Hungary is among the few European countries where the labour market indicators of immi-
grants in the 15–64 age group are on the whole better than those of the native population (Hárs, 2010, Gödri, 2011, Eurostat, 2015). This peculiarity is also observed in the 2011 census data (Table 3.1.1).

Table 3.1.1: The labour market indicators of foreign citizens, the foreign-born and the total population aged 15–64 (per cent)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Dependent</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Activity rate</th>
<th>Unemployment rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Foreign citizens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU–27 citizen</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third-country citizen</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign-born</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In EU–27 member states</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In third-countries</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The group of the foreign citizens contains those with only a foreign citizenship but not those with dual (foreign and Hungarian) citizenship.
Source: Census 2011, author’s calculations.

Both the employment rate and the activity rate are higher in the foreign population, especially among those born abroad, than in the total population, while the unemployment rate is significantly lower (6.5 per cent and 8.7 cent as opposed to 12.7 per cent). The employment rate of immigrants from EU member states (in both immigrant groups) exceeds that of third-country immigrants but the unemployment rate is lower in the case of the latter. It is because the share of dependents, who do not even enter the labour market, is high among third-country immigrants (especially among foreign citizens: it is 23 per cent).

Gender is an important differentiating factor. Figure 3.1.1 reveals that the difference in employment between genders is more marked in the case of immigrants – especially among foreign citizens – than in the total population. The unemployment rate, which does not differ according to gender in the total population, is also higher in the case of women in both immigrant groups. At the same time, the activity rate of women with foreign citizenship is lower than that of women in the native population, which is due to the high rate of dependents.

The labour market indicators of immigrants – similarly to the native population – also differ as regards age groups. The highest employment rate is seen among men aged 30–49 and women aged 40–54 but it is also above average among men aged 25–29 and 50–54 as well as women aged 25–39 (Figure 3.1.2).

7 The better labour market indicators of immigrants are primarily explained by their composition: the majority – especially prior to 2008 – arrived from neighbouring countries and were of Hungarian ethnicity. In this way they had no linguistic or cultural obstacles to labour market integration. Their demographic composition was also different from the native population: they were younger and more highly qualified on average.
8 The difference in labour market situation by gender among immigrants is confirmed by analysis of earlier census data too (see Gödri, 2011).
Compared to the native population, it is conspicuous that the employment rate of both foreign-born and foreign citizen males is higher in all age groups over 30, and the difference increases over age 50. As for women, the employ-
ment rate is higher only in age groups over 40 and among foreign-born persons (except for the age group 60–64, where also among foreign citizens), however, the differences are smaller than among men.

Unemployment mainly concerns young persons below age 25 and is especially high among women aged 15–19. The unemployment rate is lower for both genders and all age groups of immigrants – particularly among foreign citizens – than in the total population and the differences are larger among men.

Comparison of the share of the economically active population also reveals an important difference: while the activity rate among foreign citizen males lags behind the total population only in the 20–29 age group (mainly as a result of migration for study purposes), the activity rate of foreign citizen females is lower even in the 30–59 age group than that of women in the receiving population.

Educational attainment greatly determines labour market prospects. In the immigrant population – similarly to the total population – indicators for economic activity improve with higher educational attainment: the employment rate increases and the unemployment rate declines (Figure 3.1.3). Significant differences between the foreign and native populations are only seen at lower educational attainment levels – clearly in favour of immigrants: the employment rate of immigrants with vocational training is slightly higher, while that of those with a lower educational attainment is significantly higher than the relevant indicators of the total population, while their unemployment rate is lower.

Figure 3.1.3: Labour market indicators of foreign citizens, the foreign-born and the total population aged 25–64 by educational attainment

For immigrants, there is a higher risk of devaluation of qualifications. The return on qualifications obtained abroad is usually lower and labour market
inequalities between the foreign-born and native populations increase with educational attainment (OECD/European Union, 2015). In Hungary the employment rate of immigrants with higher education degree is hardly lower than that of the total population and their unemployment rate is also identical (in the case of foreign citizens even slightly lower – Figure 3.1.3). However, over-qualification – the share of highly educated employees employed in jobs that require low or medium-level qualifications – is higher among immigrants: while it is 12.4 per cent in the 25–64 age group of the total population, it is 14.9 per cent in the foreign-born population and 18.4 per cent among foreign citizens (in the latter group it is 19.7 per cent among women). Over-qualification is dependent on age (and age-related earlier experience), country of origin and the type of higher education qualification and there is a good chance it decreases with time spent in the receiving country.

**Differences in labour market indicators according to country of origin**

Behind the overall better labour market situation of foreign-citizens and foreign-born population living in Hungary, as compared to the native population, there are considerable differences according to the country of origin. This has already been revealed by the findings of the 2001 census (Gödri, 2011) and earlier research conducted among different migrant groups (see Kováts, 2013).

After the EU accession of Hungary, there has been diversification according to countries of origin: since 2009, more than half of immigrants have not come from neighbouring countries. As a result, the foreign-born population registered in the 2011 census contains 32 groups according to country of birth with at least one-thousand members each – as opposed to the 17 such groups in 2001. These 32 countries of origin account for 95 per cent of the entire foreign-born population. These groups are remarkably heterogeneous not only in terms of social and demographic composition but also as regards Hungarian language skills, date of arrival, obtaining Hungarian citizenship and place of residence within the country. Accordingly, the labour market situation of immigrants is also characterised by “remarkable differences”, “diversity” and “strong disparities” (Kováts, 2013, Hárs 2015).

While the employment rate in the total foreign-born population aged 15–64 is 65.5 per cent, in the case of various countries of origin it ranges from 40.5 per cent (Greece) to 79.5 per cent (China). The activity rate also varies to a large extent (between 41 per cent and 81 per cent). The variation of these indicators across countries in the more economically active 25–64 age group is also substantial. Employment rates by gender (Figure 3.1.4.a) reveal the higher employment rate of men in the case of all groups by countries of origin. However, while in certain foreign-born groups (e.g. the Chinese and
Vietnamese) women also have a high employment rate, in other groups the high employment rate of men is accompanied by very low employment rate of women (e.g. the Syrians), or the employment rates of both men and women are lower than in the native population (e.g. the Swiss and Dutch).

**Figure 3.1.4.a: Labour market indicators of the foreign-born population aged 25–64 by country of birth and gender (employment rate)**

The variance of unemployment rates is even more striking (**Figure 3.1.4.b**); however, in most ethnic groups (with the exception of Russian and Ukrainian women and Nigerian men) the unemployment rate of both genders is lower – and in the majority of cases significantly lower – than the rate of the total population. Nevertheless, the low employment rate of women is not accompanied by a high unemployment rate in all groups, which implies that many of them do not even enter the labour market. It is also confirmed by the large share of dependents in various groups of women (e.g. Syrian, Norwegian, South-Korean, Japanese, Iranian, Israeli and Turkish women), which may be partly due to traditional female roles and partly other causes related to motivations and the circumstances of migration.
The above figures also indicate that although the employment indicators of immigrants from EU member states are on the whole better than those of immigrants from third countries, there are considerable differences even among countries within the two groups.

Another important indicator of the labour market integration of immigrants is the share of self-employed and entrepreneurs, which shows to what extent and in which migrant groups setting up (ethnic) businesses is widespread instead of entering the primary labour market. In the establishment of migrant businesses – and the formation of ethnic enclaves – cultural factors and ethnic networks also play a role, in addition to the constraints due to the lack of language skills, difficulties in getting one’s qualifications acknowledged or difficulties in finding employment because of discrimination.

Based on the census, in 2011 the proportion of self-employed and entrepreneurs in the 25–64 age group of the foreign-born population was somewhat higher (10 per cent) than in the total population (8 per cent), however, in certain ethnic groups it was outstandingly high: among the Vietnamese (34 per cent), the Chinese and the Syrian (27 per cent) as well as the Turkish (18 per cent). In these groups the share of those working as members of a company were also high in addition to self-employed entrepreneurs, thus,
on the whole, 35–60 per cent of those employed presumably worked in the so-called *ethnic economy* and in this way their integration does not imply entering the primary labour market of the receiving country. Other studies reveal that these enterprises typically conduct trade, and not manufacturing, activities (*Várhalmi*, 2013).

**Factors explaining the probability of being employed**

In the following we provide a multivariable analysis on:

1. How employment prospects in the active age group of the total population are influenced by a foreign birthplace and foreign citizenship, after controlling for socio-demographic composition (gender, age, educational attainment) and place of residence (region, type of settlement).

2. How employment prospects in the active age group of the foreign-born population are influenced by country of origin, the length of time since arrival, holding Hungarian citizenship, ethnicity (Hungarian vs non-Hungarian) and Hungarian language skills, also after controlling for socio-demographic composition and place of residence. The aim is to examine to what extent the differing probability of being employed of various ethnic groups are explained by their composition in terms of the above characteristics or whether these country-specific peculiarities exist regardless of the above characteristics.

The factors determining the probability of employment have been analysed using logistic regression. The value of the dependent variable is 1 if the interviewee was in employment and 0 if he/she was either unemployed or dependent (but not in education). The aim of this definition was to also include hidden (passive) unemployment, which in the case of immigrants – especially immigrant women – is often masked by the dependent status.

The findings indicate that within the 25–64 age group of total population – after controlling for socio-demographic composition and place of residence – both foreign citizenship and foreign birthplace have a modest (though significant) impact on the probability of employment: the former slightly increases, while the latter decreases this (*Table 3.1.2*).

It seems that the better labour market indicators (higher employment rate) of the foreign citizens and foreign-born population are in fact due to their composition – mainly their higher educational attainment. However, when examining the impact of the two factors in the gender-based models, it becomes clear that both foreign citizenship and foreign birthplace improves the employment prospects of men but reduces the employment prospects of women. This implies that immigrant women (regardless of their socio-demographic composition and place of residence) are more likely to be excluded from the labour market than both immigrant men and native women – even though it is not reflected by their unemployment rate. In addition to gender inequalities, in the case of some ethnic groups it may result from cultural and
social norms as well as traditional gender roles which limit the labour market opportunities and strategies of women.

Table 3.1.2: The effect of foreign citizenship and foreign birthplace on the probability of being employed in the population aged 25–64 (the odds ratios of logistic regression models)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory variables and categories</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (reference category: men)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>women</td>
<td>0.763***</td>
<td>0.763***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group (reference category: 25–29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>1.449***</td>
<td>1.449***</td>
<td>1.503***</td>
<td>1.404***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>1.620***</td>
<td>1.620***</td>
<td>1.493***</td>
<td>1.781***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–54</td>
<td>1.691***</td>
<td>1.690***</td>
<td>1.397***</td>
<td>2.031***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–59</td>
<td>1.581***</td>
<td>1.580***</td>
<td>1.341***</td>
<td>1.867***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–64</td>
<td>1.848***</td>
<td>1.847***</td>
<td>1.726***</td>
<td>1.993***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment (reference category: lower secondary education at most)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training school</td>
<td>2.406***</td>
<td>2.405***</td>
<td>2.575***</td>
<td>2.307***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary</td>
<td>3.865***</td>
<td>3.865***</td>
<td>4.165***</td>
<td>3.706***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>7.991***</td>
<td>7.993***</td>
<td>8.299***</td>
<td>7.946***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign citizenship</td>
<td>1.079***</td>
<td>1.550***</td>
<td>1.817***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign birthplace</td>
<td>0.975***</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.243***</td>
<td>0.812***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke $R^2$</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Controlled for the region and type of settlement of the residence. Significant at ***0.1 per cent, **1 per cent, *5 per cent.

In the followings, the variables length of time since arrival and the country of origin (covering twelve countries) have first been added to the above model explaining the employment prospects of the foreign-born population (Table 3.1.3).\textsuperscript{10} Subsequently, the variables of citizenship, ethnicity and Hungarian language skills were added one by one.

Since integration is usually a longer process, the length of time spent in the receiving country is an important factor, which is confirmed by the findings: with the length of time since arrival the probability of employment increases. Compared to those who arrived two years ago, immigrants living in Hungary for 6–10 years are 60 per cent more likely to be employed, while those living in Hungary for 20 years are twice as likely to be employed. Differences by country of origin are also conspicuous: compared to the Romanian-born population, the probability of employment of the Chinese-born is twice as high, that of the Vietnamese-born is 80 per cent higher and that of the Slovakian-born is 20 per cent higher. At the same time, immigrants born in Germany, Ukraine, Serbia have slightly lower, and those born in Russia, Nigeria, Syria or Iran have significantly lower probability of employment.

\textsuperscript{10} Since the date of arrival was unknown in the case of some of the foreign-born persons, in order not to reduce the sample, the category “not known” was included in the variable. The twelve countries of origin included in analysis cover 85 per cent of the age group concerned of the foreign-born population.
Table 3.1.3: Factors influencing the probability of being employed in the 25–64 age group of the foreign born population (the odds ratios of logistic regression models)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory variables and categories</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 5</td>
<td>Model 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>men</td>
<td>women</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (reference category: men)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Women</td>
<td>0.523**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age group (reference category: 25–29)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30–39</td>
<td>1.185***</td>
<td>1.402***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40–49</td>
<td>1.207***</td>
<td>1.360***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50–54</td>
<td>1.115***</td>
<td>1.214***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55–59</td>
<td>0.937*</td>
<td>0.846***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60–64</td>
<td>0.879**</td>
<td>0.734***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment (reference category: lower secondary education at most)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational training school</td>
<td>1.577***</td>
<td>1.618***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper secondary</td>
<td>2.063***</td>
<td>2.133***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>3.775***</td>
<td>4.234***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long has been living in Hungary (reference category: maximum 2 years)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3–5 years</td>
<td>1.334***</td>
<td>1.274***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10 years</td>
<td>1.608***</td>
<td>1.438***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–15 years</td>
<td>1.616***</td>
<td>1.386***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16–20 years</td>
<td>1.760***</td>
<td>1.298***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 20 years</td>
<td>1.961***</td>
<td>1.249***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not known</td>
<td>6.866***</td>
<td>4.758***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country of origin (reference category: Romania)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>0.690***</td>
<td>0.644***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>0.862***</td>
<td>0.860**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>1.196***</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>0.618***</td>
<td>0.848**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russia</td>
<td>0.388***</td>
<td>0.592***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China</td>
<td>1.991***</td>
<td>2.773***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>1.769***</td>
<td>1.505**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>1.390*</td>
<td>0.412***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>0.530***</td>
<td>0.577**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syria</td>
<td>0.468***</td>
<td>n. s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>0.408***</td>
<td>0.366***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.580***</td>
<td>0.671***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke $R^2$</td>
<td>0.110</td>
<td>0.078</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Controlled for the region and type of settlement of the place of residence. Significant at ***0.1 per cent, **1 per cent, *5 per cent level, n.s.: not significant.

Differences by the date of arrival and country of origin did not change even when – in addition to socio-demographic composition – differences in ethnicity (Hungarian vs non-Hungarian), holding Hungarian citizenship or Hungarian language skills were taken into account. Nevertheless, these characteristics also have significant impacts: both Hungarian ethnicity and acquiring Hungarian citizenship increases (by 20 per cent and 15 per cent re-
respectively), while the lack of Hungarian language skills reduces (by 35 per cent) the probability of employment. Although acquiring the citizenship of the host country is an important step in the integration process, and in general the employment rate of naturalised immigrants is higher and they work in better jobs than foreign citizens, the causal link is not always one-directional, since successful integration may also increase the chances of obtaining citizenship. Speaking the language of the host country is also crucial for successful integration, though it does not necessarily play a role in employment in ethnic enterprises.

As for control variables, educational attainment has the greatest impact (higher education degree holders have four times as high a probability of employment than those with lower secondary education) and gender differences are also considerable: the employment probability of women is half of the employment probability of men.

Since the labour market integration of women is (also) influenced by specific factors, it is advisable to examine the effects of the above factors in separate, gender-based models. These reveal that the length of time since arrival has a more marked impact on the employment probability of women than on that of men, and differences according to countries are even more distinct here (Table 3.1.3, Model 6). The higher probability of employment applies to both genders in the case of Chinese-born and Vietnamese-born immigrants, although it is more marked in the case of Chinese men. However, the higher employment probability of the Slovakian-born population only applies to women. In contrast, a Turkish birthplace – although not significant on the whole – increased employment probabilities for men and reduced them for women. Similarly, the lower chance of employment of the Syrians is only significant and considerable in the case of women. All these indicate that there must be specific cultural patterns and labour market strategies behind the disadvantaged employment situation of Turkish and Syrian women (even when compared to men from the same countries), especially because the employment rate of men is considerably above the average in both groups and ethnic businesses are also widespread. Another important difference by gender is that both Hungarian ethnicity and acquiring Hungarian citizenship improved employment prospects only for women (by 30 per cent and 25 per cent respectively) and the lack of Hungarian language skills halved the probabilities of employment only in their case.
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3.1.1 Why do immigrants in Hungary have better employment figures?

RÓBERT KÁROLYI

As it is shown in the main body of the text, the employment rate of those born abroad is higher than that of those born in Hungary. The aim of this analysis is to reveal the components of the difference between the rates.

Regression analyses so far have indicated that if school attainment, age and place of residence of individuals are taken into account, the employment chances of the population born abroad do not, or do not significantly differ from those of the population born in Hungary. That is, the differences are mainly explained by the differences in the composition of the two groups. It is good practice to analyse the difference by a method that allows the observed variables to have different impacts between the groups. It is important because the difference between the employment rates may not only be due to differences in composition but also due to the dissimilar ways that certain characteristics contribute to the employment rate of the groups. The difference in average outcomes of certain groups can be decomposed into components using the Oaxaca–Blinder decomposition method (Blinder, 1973, Oaxaca, 1973). In the following analysis, the employment rates of the immigrant and native populations are compared, relying on a version of this method.

First the probability of employment is estimated by the method of least squares separately for each group. Level of education, age, family status and other individual factors are taken into account. As a result of the estimation, the difference in the employment rates of the immigrant and recipient populations may be decomposed into components as follows:

\[
\Delta E = E_i - E_h = (c_i - c_h) + \\
+ \sum_{z=1}^k \frac{\bar{x}_i^z + \bar{x}_h^z}{2} (\beta_i^z - \beta_h^z) + \\
+ \sum_{z=1}^k \frac{\beta_i^z + \beta_h^z}{2} (\bar{x}_i^z - \bar{x}_h^z),
\]

where \(i\) signifies the immigrant and \(h\) signifies the Hungarian population, \(c\) represents the constants of the estimations, \(\bar{x}\) is the average of the variables, \(\beta\) is the estimated coefficients and \(k\) is the number of variables.

The first term of the right side of the equation is the constant effect, the second is the parameter effect and the third is the composition effect. The difference between the constants \((c_i - c_h)\) is interpreted as the effect of unobserved factors, i.e. the difference that would be seen if the groups were identical both in terms of their composition and their estimated parameters (Galasi, 2002). The parameter effect is the difference between the estimated coefficients. It shows how much the difference would be between the rates if the constants were the same and the composition of the two groups was identical in terms of the variables examined. The composition effect is the part of the difference which is due to the difference between the averages of the variables. It indicates the difference between the employment rates of the two groups that would be observed if the probability of their employment were influenced to the same extent by the various factors and the constant were also the same.

Two foreign-born groups are identified: one contains individuals born in Romania, Slovakia, Serbia or Ukraine (indicated as ‘From neighbouring countries’ in the Table), while the other category contains all others born outside Hungary. Our analysis mainly regards the latter as immigrant population. This differentiation is important since the migration to Hungary from neighbouring countries has special characteristics.\(^1\) Table 3.1.1 presents the employment rates of the groups in the 25–64 age group.

The employment rate of immigrant men is 11–12 per cent higher and the employment rate of immigrant women is higher by 5–8 per cent than that of the local population. In the group arriving from neighbouring countries, the rates are higher (although not much higher among men) than the rates of other immigrants.

\(^1\) See e.g. Gödri (2010), (2011). Dissimilar motivations and migratory patterns justify differentiating this group from other immigrant groups.
Table 3.1.1.1: Employment rates according to place of birth (percentage)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Hun. born in HU</th>
<th>From neighbouring countries</th>
<th>Other foreigners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Women’s employment rate</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>60.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men’s employment rate</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>79.3</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: 25–64 age group. The complete samples do not contain individuals whose birthplace is unknown and pupils in full-time education. Source: Author’s calculations based on the census in 2011.

Table 3.1.1.2 shows the parameter and composition effects calculated on the basis of the estimated models. At the top of the table, the total parameter and composition effects are shown and then aggregated by variable groups. It is remarkable that – although most of the difference may be explained by differences in composition in each case – the values of parameter and constant effects imply that it is not necessarily the differences in composition that play the most important role in the advantage of immigrants.

When interpreting the constant and parameter effects, please note that the constant equals to the estimated employment probability of unmarried individuals aged 25–29, with a lower secondary qualification (8 years of schooling), living in a city in Central Hungary. The differences in this group are extreme. With these characteristics, immigrants from neighbouring countries have a nearly 15 percentage point higher and immigrants from third countries a 16–22 percentage point higher probability of employment. It offers the first important conclusion: there must be a considerable difference between the immigrant and recipient populations in the unobserved variables or their effects. Significant differences between the constants are coupled by strong negative parameter effects. The most significant in each case is the role of educational attainment. It is apparent that the composition of immigrants as regards educational attainment is more advantageous (especially of women) but the increase in their educational attainment does not increase the probability of employment as much as in the Hungarian-born population. This results in a parameter effect relevant for the analysis: a 10 and 6 percentage point negative parameter effect for the advantage of women and men from non-neighbouring countries respectively.

Table 3.1.1.2: Results of the Oaxaca–Blinder decomposition (effects in percentage points)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Other foreigners</th>
<th>From neighbouring countries</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>women</td>
<td>men</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregated ΔE</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>11.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>7.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>-20.21</td>
<td>-12.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference in constants</td>
<td>21.80</td>
<td>16.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest level of education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>-10.08</td>
<td>-6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>-3.66</td>
<td>3.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married/with a cohabiting partner</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
<td>0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>-4.59</td>
<td>-4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of children</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Region and type of settlement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>-3.27</td>
<td>-3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English or German language skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Composition</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parameter</td>
<td>-2.27</td>
<td>-2.56</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The age composition of each group is also more favourable than that of the Hungarian population. Women from neighbouring countries have a 3.39 percentage point higher employment rate than the local ones solely due to their younger age. However, there are negative parameter effects to be observed among women. This is caused by the fact that the employment of immigrant women increases less and then decreases more as they grow older compared to the recipient population. However; there are positive
parameter effects for immigrant men: their employment probability decreases to a lesser extent than that of Hungarian-born men as they become older.

In the variable group married or with a cohabiting partner the educational attainment and economic activity of the spouse/partner are also controlled for. The composition of the groups shows no significant differences in marital status. However, among immigrants, the presence of a spouse/cohabiting partner does not increase the probability of employment as much as in the case of Hungarians and also the partner’s higher educational attainment does not necessarily increase the probability of employment. This causes a slightly higher than 4 percentage point negative parameter effect for immigrants from non-neighbouring countries.

The employment probability of immigrant women decreases to a lesser extent with the number of children than that of Hungarian-born women. Moreover, among immigrant women, the probability of employment increases with the number of children aged 3–6. Altogether they have a 3.66 percentage point advantage because their labour market participation is less sensitive to the number of children of various ages in the household.

Variables concerning the place of residence have negative parameter- and positive composition effects. A larger share of immigrants live in Budapest or Central Hungary, where employment chances are better: this results in a moderate but positive composition effect. Nevertheless, when immigrants leave Central Hungary, their employment probability decreases more than it does for Hungarians which causes a negative parameter effect over 3 percentage points.

The decomposition of the difference between the employment rates raises the following important questions: why are unskilled immigrants significantly more likely to be employed than the unskilled Hungarians and why does educational attainment have less significance in the employment prospects of immigrants? These questions are probably explained by self-selection. On the one hand, even among the lower-qualified it is probably the more talented that decides to move to Hungary. On the other hand, a Hungarian-born lower-qualified person is more likely to have a more extensive network and more stable environment, is more familiar with the system of social welfare and other benefits than an immigrant and therefore the alternative costs of undertaking employment may also be higher for those born in Hungary. However, these factors are less important for higher-qualified immigrants. They are more likely to have savings and do not have so strong incentives as an often more vulnerable low-qualified immigrant.

Overall, the analysis leads to the conclusion that the differences in composition do not fully explain the apparent employment gap between immigrants and Hungarian-born populations. The constant effect indicates that unobserved variables also have significant positive effects on the employment advantage of immigrants; nevertheless, it should be noted that the difference in constants depends on the reference groups. The composition in terms of the observed characteristics also has a positive effect on the employment advantage of immigrants but differences in the effects of these characteristics reduce this advantage, almost completely neutralising the huge difference from reference groups.
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3.1.2 The role of immigration in the European “employment miracles”

JÁNOS KÖLLŐ

In the decade preceding the financial and economic crisis, level of employment significantly expanded in several European countries. According to the European Labour Force Survey (EU–LFS), the largest increase was experienced in Spain, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands and Finland. Table 3.1.2.1 indicates the rates of increase based on the longest available comparable time series of the decade prior to the crisis. For better comparison, the relevant data of Hungary are also included.

Table 3.1.2.1: Employment in the fastest growing European labour markets and in Hungary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Employment in thousand persons</th>
<th>Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>start of period</td>
<td>end of period</td>
<td>thousand persons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>1999–2008</td>
<td>2,331</td>
<td>2,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>1999–2008</td>
<td>7,384</td>
<td>8,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>1999–2008</td>
<td>1,555</td>
<td>2,082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>1998–2008</td>
<td>13,806</td>
<td>20,243</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author’s calculations based on the microdata of the EU–LFS.

In the followings, we examine what role the changes in the numbers and employment rate of immigrants played in the overall growth. The increase in aggregate employment is broken down to two factors, and we differentiate between six groups (groups of young adults, the elderly and the middle-aged according to qualification levels, immigrants). For more details on the procedure see Köllő (2013).

The composition effect measures by how many persons total employment would have increased due to changes in the headcounts of a certain group if the employment rate of the group had remained at the level it held at the middle of the reference period both during the base period and the reference period. Parameter change measures by how many persons total employment would have increased due to changes in the employment rate of a group, if the headcounts of the group had remained at the level it held at the middle of the reference period both during the base period and the reference period.

The data refers to a population aged 15–74 living locally, i.e. persons who stay or wish to stay in the country concerned for more than a year. Long-term immigrants of the countries concerned are defined on the basis of their countries of birth and the time they spent in the recipient country. In several countries and at several points in time only one of the two variables is available. In the case of Finland, Ireland, the Netherlands and Hungary, persons born in another country are considered immigrants, while in Spain and Italy persons not staying in the country since their birth are considered to be immigrants. An employee is defined as someone working at least one hour paid work during the week before the week of the survey or did not working any hours but was temporarily away from their existing job. Three qualification levels and 12 age groups are distinguished within the population aged 15–74. The EU–LFS relies on so-called grossing-up weights: considering the dimensions of sampling, it assigns a weight to each individual, which indicates how many other similar persons that individual represents. The sum of the weights equals the total population. All aggregates defined in terms of persons are measured with the appropriate sum of weight.

Figure 3.1.2.1 shows the results of breaking down the increase to factors. It is conspicuous that the increasing number of immigrants played a significant role in Finland and the Netherlands and a decisive role in the other three countries – and also that the increasing employment rate of immigrants contributed to the growth in aggregate employment.

Table 3.1.2.2 compares employment rates at the end of the reference period – the start of the crisis. The employment rate of immigrants in the Netherlands is lower than that of the local population for both men and women – and the lag is even more significant if their age and educational attainment are also taken into account.
In the other countries immigrants have the same or higher employment rate than the local population and it is true for both genders (except for the Finnish female population). However, it is also revealed that the majority or, if Italy and Spain are not taken into account, the whole of the difference is explained by the younger age and somewhat higher qualification level of immigrants. In the case of identical gender,
qualification level and age, the employment rate of
immigrants is lower than the average in three of the
five EU–15 countries included in the survey and is
only slightly higher than the average in Italy and
Spain. The Hungarian data have a pattern similar
to the southern European one.¹

Table 3.1.2.2: The employment rate of immigrants compared to the native population in 2008
(population aged 15–74, estimated difference in percentage point)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controls:</th>
<th>Men</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men and women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>-3.4”</td>
<td>-6.2”**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>7.0”***</td>
<td>-5.5”***</td>
<td>7.0”***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>19.2”***</td>
<td>-6.0”***</td>
<td>12.8”***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>8.3”***</td>
<td>-0.1””</td>
<td>15.1”***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>4.1”***</td>
<td>1.1””</td>
<td>3.8””</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Differences are estimated using probabilistic regression. The uncontrolled equation only con-
tains one binary variable: immigrant (yes–no). The controlled equations also contain 11 age groups, 2 qualification levels, and the equation concerning both genders contains one binary variable (man).:
The cases have been weighted by analytical weights.
The estimated differences are significant at †††1 per cent, ‡‡‡5 per cent, ‡10 per cent level.
Source: Author’s calculations based on the microdata of the EU–LFS for 2008. For the definitions
see Köllő (2013).

In conclusion, immigration played a key role in
the fastest growing European labour markets
during the decade prior to the crisis. The increasing
number of immigrants contributed to the growth
in aggregated employment more than any oth-
er factors in the Netherlands, Ireland, Italy and
Spain – while the employment rate of the immi-
grant population also increased. In Finland this
had just a slightly less significant (positive) im-
pact than the increase in old-age activity. The em-
ployment rate of immigrants was below average
in 2008 only in the Netherlands; in other coun-
tries it reached (Finland) or significantly exceed-
ed that. This advantage, however, was almost en-
tirely caused by composition effects: the share of
those in the best working age is higher in the im-
migrant population, the majority of them are men
and except for the Netherlands, they have higher
qualification levels.
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3.2 THE IMPACT OF IMMIGRATION ON THE LABOUR MARKET SITUATION OF THE EMPLOYEES OF RECIPIENT COUNTRIES IN EUROPE – SUMMARY OF EMPIRICAL FINDINGS

KATALIN BÖRDŐS, MÁRTON CSILLAG & ANNA OROSZ

This Sub-chapter examines the impact of immigration on the labour market situation of the employees of recipient countries in Europe, relying on empirical economic studies published in the past fifteen years.

According to the simplest theoretic model of the labour market, a wave of immigration increases the labour supply of recipient countries, which reduces wage levels and expands employment in the short run. This model assumes that the labour force is homogeneous, i.e. immigrants are perfect substitutes for the employees of the recipient country. However, according to economic theory, migration does not lead to reduction in average wages in the long run: it may result in the expansion of employment, since the utilisation of cheaper production factors (employees) reduces the production costs and increases the profit of businesses, which in turn encourages more investment, increases the employment rate and wages.\(^1\) Our summary asks the question: does empirical research shed light on whether immigration reduces the wages or employment rate of employees in the recipient country?

**The short-term impact of immigration**

Bratsberg et al. (2014) examined, using a skills-group approach,\(^2\) how immigration influenced the wages of local male employees between 1993 and 2006 in Norway. The authors estimated the effects of the country of origin of immigrants. Their study concludes that if the share of immigrants increases in a “quasi” labour market defined by educational attainment and age, the wages and employment rate of recipient country employees fall. This is primarily due to migrants from other Scandinavian countries, who probably compete directly with Norwegian employees. Immigrants from other developed countries have a smaller effect, while immigrants from developing countries have no negative effect on wages. The authors found that a one per cent increase in the number of immigrants from other Scandinavian countries reduces the wages of Norwegian men by 0.35 per cent within a year.

Empirical studies on Germany point out the peculiarities of the German labour market in the 1980s and 1990s: due to central wage negotiations and strong trade unions, wages in the German economy changed slowly and relatively inflexibly. Thus the labour market primarily adapted to shocks through changes in the employment rate.

---

\(^1\) We are thankful to Ádám Török and Balázs Váradi for providing useful comments on earlier versions of the manuscript; although any errors are our own.

\(^2\) For more details on the theoretical background see e.g. Borjas (1999).

\(^2\) Skills-group approach defines the labour market, where employees compete with one another, by the dimensions of skills relevant for the labour market. For more details on the methodology see Borjas (2003).
Bonin (2005) examines the impact of immigration on the labour market situation of men from the mid-1970s to 1997, applying a skills-group approach. He defines immigrants as non-German citizens, that is, German nationality individuals arriving from Eastern Europe in the 1990s in great numbers are included among the native population. Glitz (2012), on the other hand, investigates the influx of German nationality immigrants from Eastern Europe, combining both a regional and a skills-group approach.

Bonin (2005) did not observe adverse impacts on the level of employment, although when only the period from 1990 to 1997 is considered, there is a slight but significant crowding out effect: a 10 per cent rise in the share of immigrants increased the probability of unemployment among the Germans by 1.5 per cent on average. The negative wage effect was also small: a 10 per cent increase in the share of immigrants reduced the wages of the native population by less than 1 per cent on average. The findings of Glitz (2012) indicate that the influx of German nationality immigrants did not influence wages but had an adverse impact on the employment rate of the local population: among men, the entry of every 10 immigrants caused the job loss of 3.1 local employees on average, which mainly affected young and older workers.

Ortega–Verdugo (2014) used a skills-group approach to study the impact of (mostly unskilled) immigrants in France between 1968 and 1999 on the wages of French male employees. The findings showed that immigration has a positive correlation with wages and employment rates. However, this was due to significant changes in the wage structure in the period under study – irrespective of immigration –, which meant that differences between the wages of the low-qualified and highly qualified decreased considerably. The authors also point out that due to increasing immigration, French and immigrant employees of similar age and educational attainment shifted to dissimilar professions and French employees worked increasingly in high-skill positions.

Based on individual longitudinal data, Ortega–Verdugo (2015) examined the impact of unskilled migration during the period from 1976 to 2007 on the labour market situation of male French manual workers. The authors observe that in the micro-regions and occupations where the share of immigrants grew, the wages of French workers decreased, notably in the service and especially in the construction sector. Accordingly, if the share of immigrants within manual workers increased by 10 percentage point in a micro-region, the (median) wage of French employees fell by 1.3 per cent in the service sector and by 3.6 per cent in the construction sector, while the decrease was not significant in the processing industry. However, this negative effect was mitigated by two tendencies. Firstly, high ability French workers (especially in the processing industry) moved to other positions. Secondly, less competent French workers moved from micro-regions with a high influx of immigrants.

3 The area-based approach is based on comparing the labour market of regions of a country characterised by a high influx of immigrants with regions with low immigration levels. The method can only be applied if the influx is not dependent on the labour market prospects of the regions concerned. If this prerequisite is not fulfilled, researchers usually use the methods of the 'difference in differences' or instrumental variables. For more details on the methodology see Grossman (1982).
In Spain, the number of African and South American immigrants, typically lower qualified than the Spanish workforce, increased to nearly 11-fold between 1991 and 2005. Carrasco et al. (2008) used a skills-group approach to estimate the impact of immigration on the wages and employment rate of the native population between 1991 and 2011. The analysis only revealed a negligible significant effect on wages: a ten per cent increase in the number of immigrants resulted in a 0.2 per cent fall in the wage levels of the native population.

In the 1990s, more than three million immigrants arrived in Israel, which increased the population of the country by 12 per cent in a decade (Friedberg, 2001). More than one-third of immigrants arrived from former Soviet Union Republics. Applying a skills-group approach, both Friedberg (2001) and Cohen-Goldner–Paserman (2006) reached the conclusion that immigration did not have a negative impact on the labour market situation of the Israeli population.

According to Friedberg (2001), immigration had a positive impact on Israeli wages: a 10 per cent rise in the share of immigrants in a given profession raised the wages of the local employees by 7.4 per cent on average. Cohen-Goldner–Paserman (2006) found that the increased share of immigrants had no or negligible impact on the probability of losing jobs among men (a 10 per cent increase only raised the probability by 0.49 per cent maximum), while in the case of women – especially in the public sector – it lead to decrease in the likelihood of job-loss. Both studies point out the phenomenon that immigrants typically obtained lower-wage and/or higher-turnover jobs despite possessing higher qualifications and several years of work experience in their country of origin. Consequently, not even immigrants and locals with a similar educational attainment and work experience are close substitutes – they rather complement one another.

Turkey is the country most affected by the present wave of refugees. Immigration is uneven among Turkish regions: the majority of Syrian refugees are concentrated in regions near the Turkish-Syrian border. The impacts of the wave of refugees are investigated by several studies, all of them relying on the regional approach. As for their educational attainment, Syrian refugees do not differ much from the population of the southern, typically underdeveloped, Turkish regions, therefore it is possible to start from the simplifying assumption that Syrian refugees may become direct competitors of Turkish employees (Ceritoglu et al., 2015).

Del Carpio–Wagner (2015) reports that the crowding out effect of Syrian workers is significant: the entry of ten Syrian refugees to the local labour market causes the job loss of about three Turkish workers, which affects primarily the employment of women and low-qualified employees as well as of non-registered workers. However, this strong crowding out effect is tempered by
a significant internal out-migration effect. Average wages remained unchanged but, because of changes in the composition of employees, wages decreased in some segments (e.g. informal sector, low-qualified, women). The findings of the study are consistent with the conclusions of Akgündüz et al. (2015) and Ceritoglu et al. (2015).

The medium- and long-term impact of immigration

Cattaneo et al. (2013) analysed what happens to local employees in two to four years following the point when the proportion of immigrants in their profession increases substantially, based on individual longitudinal data from the period of 1995–2001 from 11 countries of the European Union. The authors conclude that neither domestic migration nor the loss of jobs of local employees increased as a result of immigration. Moreover, the (monthly) wages of local employees slightly (though statistically not significantly) improved with immigration. What is the cause of this favourable tendency? According to the authors’ findings, if the proportion of immigrant employees rises by ten percentage point in a profession, the probability of local employees being promoted grows by 16 per cent within two years and by 20 per cent within four years. Although the probability of promotion also increased in manual and simple non-manual professions, the impact was more pronounced in (non-management) professions requiring higher education qualifications.

A similar conclusion has been reached by D’Amuri–Peri (2014), by analysing data from 15 Western European countries relating to the period from 1996 to 2010, using a skills-group approach. The authors examined the job quality of local employees and quantified whether they have monotonous/manual or complex/intellectual tasks. The findings indicate that the employees of the 15 countries are not driven out from work by immigrants; on the contrary, they are promoted to positions with more complex tasks. According to the authors, this confirms that immigrants – since they are not proficient in the language of the recipient country – can mainly take up monotonous/manual jobs and in this way labour supply expands in these occupations. This raises the value of complex/intellectual occupations which are complementary to manual jobs, and local employees shift to those. The authors also checked whether labour market institutions (e.g. the stringency of labour regulations) influences the extent to which local employees are promoted to higher positions as a result of immigration. It seems that stringent legal frameworks slowed down this adaptation process. Such an institutional system especially reduced the promotion prospects of low-skilled employees and it primarily had adverse effects in the years of the recent economic crisis.

Foged–Peri (2013) examined the impact of the influx of refugees that intensified in the 1990s in Denmark – the country with one of the most flexible labour markets of Europe – following the outcomes of local employees
until 2008. Since the educational attainment of refugees was low, only the career of local employees with a maximum of an upper secondary school leaving qualification was mapped. The findings clearly showed that the influx of refugees had a positive impact, which spread gradually and fully materialized some five-six years after the settlement of the refugees. In micro-regions with a high proportion of refugees, a larger share of native employees were promoted, their wages increased and their employment rates did not fall even when compared local employees with a similar background living in micro-regions with a small share of refugees. The influx of refugees particularly favourably affected the career of younger employees and those with a versatile skill-set. In practice, in five years following the influx of refugees, the wages of young workers were four per cent higher in micro-regions where the share of refugees increased by one per cent.

Ruist (2013) focused on the effect of the influx of refugees from regions hit by (civil) war, using data from the period from 1998 to 2007 and an area-based approach, in Sweden. The findings suggest that the influx of refugees did not have an impact on the employment rates of the Swedes or earlier immigrants from high-income countries; however, it significantly increased the probabilities of job loss for earlier immigrants from medium- and low-income countries: every ten new refugees forced eight earlier immigrants out of the labour market.

The number of immigrants grew significantly in the United Kingdom between 1975 and 2005; however, as opposed to many European countries, a large proportion of immigrants were relatively highly qualified, especially in the period from 1995 to 2005. Two studies found that immigration had no significant impact on the average wage of local employees; it only influenced the distribution of wages (Manacorda et al., 2012 and Dustmann et al., 2013). Both papers point out that immigrants of similar age and educational attainment are not close substitutes of local employees – but rather complement them, which is supported by the fact that they work in different industries and positions. Manacorda et al. (2012) show that the newly arriving immigrants only had a negative impact on the wages of earlier immigrants but their influx increased the wages of native employees. Dustmann et al. (2013) estimated directly how immigration affected the distribution of wages in the regions of the United Kingdom between 1997 and 2005. Their results revealed that only the wages of low-wage earners decreased as a result of immigration, that of mid- and high-earners increased. Thus a one per cent rise in the share of immigrants increased the average wage of local employees by 0.2 per cent.

The study of Ortega-Verdugo (2014) on Spanish immigration offers a possible explanation for why many papers find only negligible wage effects even in the case of large-scale immigration. The study applies the area-based approach and examines the period 2000–2006. The findings reveal that total employ-
ment grew considerably in the regions concerned. The authors found that neither the employment rate nor the wages of Spanish employees decreased as a result of immigration. The reason for this is that businesses utilise the abundant production factor (unskilled labour) more intensively: 45–75 per cent of the surplus workforce became employed through this channel. The study also describes another form of adaptation: a 10 per cent increase in the number of female immigrants increased the employment rate of Spanish women with higher education qualifications by 2.2 percentage points, that is, female immigrants typically replaced local female workers in the field of household services. Due to the increased employment of highly qualified women, demand for workforce in household services grew and in this way the pressure on the wages of the low-qualified eased.

Table 3.2.1. below summarises the empirical findings reviewed. It is clear that while the short-term effects of immigration on the labour market situation of the native population are mixed, there are typically positive effects in the long run.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3.2.1.: Summary of empirical findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Short-term effects</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mid- and long-term effects</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The findings of Ortega-Verdugo (2015) only apply to male employees having an upper secondary school leaving qualification at most.

**The findings of Foged-Peri (2013) only apply to male employees having an upper secondary school leaving qualification at most.
Conclusion

According to the literature we reviewed, immigration has a negligible short-term impact on the labour market situation of local employees. How and to what extent it impacts various groups depends on the competences of immigrants: their school attainment and foreign language skills. In the past 25 years, immigrants to Europe usually did not substitute native employees because of their relatively low level of these competences – and this is especially true for refugees. In this respect, researchers generally found a significant negative impact only in contexts where immigrants arrived from groups that are culturally similar to local employees. Immigration significantly affected industries and professions adversely in the short run which are characterised by simple manual work (such as construction or agriculture).

Immigration in the medium term already exerts positive or no effects on the labour market situation of local employees. This is due to two tendencies. On the one hand, businesses dynamically adapt to the increased supply caused by immigration and switch to technologies relying to a larger extent on unskilled labour. On the other hand, the relative value of complex/intellectual professions – which are in a complementary relationship with the relatively simple manual work undertaken by immigrants – increases and local employees shift to them. Consequently, immigration leads to a more efficient division of labour; local employees transfer to higher grade positions and thus their earnings increase. The extent of the latter tendency and how fast the positive effect of immigration is exerted greatly depends on the institutional framework and the flexibility of the labour market.
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3.3 DETERMINANTS OF THE CULTURAL INTEGRATION OF IMMIGRANTS

DÁNIEL HORN & ISTVÁN KÓNYA

Introduction

The cultural integration (assimilation) of immigrants is crucial for the evaluation of the economic and social effects of immigration. Economic assimilation is the phenomenon where immigrants fit into the labor market of the host country and find jobs that suit their skills and qualifications. This is usually the end of a process, whose speed and completion has been examined in many studies.1

Parallel and closely related to labor market integration is the cultural assimilation of immigrants. This includes the learning of the language and acquiring the norms of the host country, which helps immigrants not only to get ahead more easily on the labor market but also in their social interactions. Cultural assimilation is an important factor in the labor market and economic integration of immigrants (Borjas, 2013, and Chiswick–Miller, 2015), but it can also have significant welfare consequences for both immigrants (Angelini et al., 2015) and natives (Lazear, 1999 and Kónya, 2007) on its own.

Imagined or real differences in values, cultural frictions and actual costs of integration that originate from language differences have a significant impact on how immigrants are perceived, and are ultimately important determinants of immigration policy. Studying cultural assimilation is harder and more complex than analyzing economic assimilation. Because of the various aspects, there is room for both methods based on qualitative information, interviews, case studies, and also statistical methods using standardized databases.

In this section, we examine the individual and group level determinants of language learning, which is perhaps the most important element of cultural assimilation. As a starting point, we can mention Kónya (2007), which analyzed assimilation in a theoretical model, and documented empirical results – using English knowledge as a measure of assimilation – for the United States. The model in Kónya (2007) – which derives results for integration – weighs the costs and benefits of cultural assimilation. The model’s main mechanism is that since cultural interaction has increasing returns to scale, larger immigrant groups assimilate less.

On the other hand, the immigrant composition of the host country depends on the attributes of the sending and receiving countries, such as geographical distance, relative development or common history. Therefore, cultural assimilation can indirectly – through group size – be explained by country characteristics. Besides these, individual attributes are also important, like education, age or time spent in the host country. In this study, we empirically examine the impact of individual and group characteristics on cultural integration.

---

Similar to Kónya (2007), we analyze a somewhat narrow, but well-documented measure of cultural assimilation, which is the language skill of immigrants. How well an immigrant speaks the language of the host country is perhaps the most important indicator of integration. It is also likely that language learning is highly correlated with other indicators of cultural assimilation. A great advantage of the measure is that it is relatively easy to observe, and can be found one way or another in many international databases.

Among the available databases, we use the OECD Programme for International Assessment of Adult Competencies (PIAAC) survey, which was conducted between 2008 and 2013. The PIAAC database contains representative samples for the age group 16–65 in the 23 participating countries, where the sample size is between 5 and 8 thousand individuals. Out of the full sample of 152 thousand, we use those 5–6 thousand persons who are first generation immigrants in Europe and came from an origin country where the official language is different from that of the host country. The data has information on language skills, and we also know the immigrants’ country of origin, the time of arrival and many other individual characteristics. To measure language skills, we use a measure that asks immigrants for the language they use at home. We consider immigrants “strongly assimilated” if they – as non-native speakers – switched to the language of the host country. Given our measure, we concentrate on the immigrant group whose native tongue is different from the official language of the host country so that acquiring the latter is the result of a conscious assimilation decision.

An issue with our definition of strong assimilation is that in the control group there are immigrants who use their native tongue at home, but not in their social interactions. These people should also be considered as assimilated, but unfortunately, we cannot identify them in our data because the PIAAC does not ask direct questions about language proficiency. Due to the heterogeneity of the control group we are likely to underestimate the impact of language learning. In 2017, we will have access to the ad-hoc immigrant module of the European Labor Force Survey (EU-LFS), which was recorded in 2014 and asks directly about language proficiency. It is important to emphasize, however, that because our estimates are lower bounds, whenever we find a significant effect these can be considered quite robust.

Our study is closely related to two recent publications that document various aspects on the cultural assimilation of immigrants. The OECD/EU (2015) book presents detailed information on immigrants into OECD and EU countries. Besides measures on the labor market, family, religion and political issues, there is also information on language skills and reading competencies. Algan et al. (2012) is another detailed study of the assimilation of European immigrants. The chapters summarize the experience of individual countries, using mostly data from the EU-LFS. In addition, the last chapter of the books con-
holds cross-country comparisons using the *European Social Survey*. Compared to the descriptive statistics found in these two books, our multi-variable analysis tries to systematically identify the main determinants behind assimilation.

**Basic statistics of immigrants**

As a first step, we present some basic statistics from our database. Although PI-AAC contains a few advanced, non-European host countries, we concentrate on Europe. The reasons for this are partly missing data (United States, Canada), and the small number of immigrants (Japan, South Korea). Also, readers of this volume are likely to be more interested in European results. Overall, we use data from 16 countries, these are: Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Ireland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom.

*Figure 3.3.1* shows the population share and main categories of European immigrants by the host country. Based on the country of origin, we separate within European migration (“EU”) from immigration from outside Europe (“non-EU”). This classification should correspond to the cultural distance between countries/regions. Since in the subsequent analysis we measure cultural assimilation with acquired language proficiency, it is also important to know the fraction of immigrants whose native tongue is different from the official language of the host country. Therefore, the figure differentiates “native” and “non-native” immigrants. In our subsequent analysis, we naturally concentrate on the latter but show their weight among immigrants here.

Overall, we see the following on *Figure 3.3.1*.

1. There are huge differences among European countries in population share of immigrants. In Western European countries migrants typically make up 10–15% of the population, while in Eastern Europe the share is much lower.

2. The majority of immigrants in European countries come from within the continent. Only France and Spain, with large former colonies, are significant exceptions.

3. The share of non-native immigrants is significant primarily in Western Europe. Roughly half of first-generation immigrants in our sample are non-native migrants. Based on the numbers, in Eastern Europe linguistic – and presumably cultural – assimilation is not an important problem.

*Table 3.3.1* shows summary statistics about non-native immigrants, native immigrants, and non-immigrants. In most attributes there are no major differences between native and non-native immigrants. The former arrived earlier into the host country and have marginally more education. Compared to non-immigrants, immigrants are somewhat younger, and their other attributes are practically the same as those born in the host country, although there are somewhat more immigrants with either uneducated or highly educated parents.

---

2 Unfortunately Hungary did not participate in the survey. For Germany the country of origin of immigrants is not available, so we cannot use German data either.

3 We define native immigrants as those whose mother tongue is the same as the language of the PIAAC competence survey, which is always the same as (an) official language of the host country. Therefore, whoever speaks an official but minority language is also a native immigrant. Such a group is, for example, the Russian language minority in Estonia.

4 In Estonia we see a large immigrant share because of the earlier inflow of the Russian speaking part of the population.

5 Although Hungary is not included in the PIAAC sample, we can find language information in the EU-LFS 2014 migration survey. Based on this, 79.5% of first generation immigrants in Hungary are native Hungarian speakers, and another 10.4% speaks the language fluently. *Source*: Eurostat, LFS, 2014 ad hoc module on immigration.
Linguistic assimilation

As we have stressed already, we study the individual and group level determinants of strong assimilation, where a non-native immigrant fully switches to
the language of the host country. Based on the economics literature (for example Kónya, 2007) we assume that linguistic assimilation is – at least partially – the result of a rational decision. Since language learning is an investment, the immigrant weighs its costs and benefits. Costs presumably decline with general skills and human capital, and they increase with age. Benefits are expected to rise with time spent in the host country, and with general skills.

Based on Kónya (2007) we also expect that larger immigrant groups assimilate less. Kónya (2007) traces group size to the cost-benefit analysis of immigration: the bigger wealth differences between two countries, the easier to move, and the smaller cultural differences between the countries, the larger groups from the same sending country will be in the host country. Kónya (2007) verifies these hypotheses in the 5% sample of the United States Census.

Since our database containing European countries is relatively small and heterogeneous – with respect to not only the sending but also the host countries –, we cannot study country characteristics in detail. We examine two specifications that are less data intensive than what can be found in Kónya (2007). In the first specification, we study how the size of the immigrant group influences linguistic assimilation, besides individual characteristics. In the second specification we group countries of origin into regions, and see if there are differences in linguistic assimilation based on the sending region. In both cases, we control for individual characteristics and carry out the estimation with or without host country fixed effects.

Table 3.3.2 shows the results. Columns (1) and (2) use only individual characteristics. It is clear that immigrants who are more educated and who have been longer in the host country have a higher probability to switch to the language of the country. Older immigrants are less likely to assimilate, but point estimates are typically not significant, so we omit these from the table. The likelihood to assimilate is significantly higher for women, the difference being 8–9 percentage points. This could be due to mixed marriages, but we think of these also as strong assimilation. Our results are therefore consistent with economic intuition: the linguistic assimilation of immigrants is influenced by its costs and benefits.

From group level variables we first look at the effect of group size. Columns (3) and (4) indicate that larger groups are less likely to assimilate. Both the raw effect and the effect filtered from individual controls are negative and significant. The point estimate means that when the size of an immigrant group grows from 0 to 7.5 percent (the upper limit of the size of groups in the sample), linguistic assimilation falls by 3.75 percentage points. It is interesting, however, that after including a host country fixed effect, group size is no longer significant, and changes signs [column (5)]. This indicates a large degree of heterogeneity among European countries along this dimension. Unfortunately, we cannot carry out a more detailed analysis, due to our small sample.
### Table 3.3.2: Determinants of linguistic assimilation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
<th>(5)</th>
<th>(6)</th>
<th>(7)</th>
<th>(8)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>speak the language of the host country at home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (years)</td>
<td>0.0123***</td>
<td>0.0131***</td>
<td>0.0133***</td>
<td>0.0131***</td>
<td>0.0118***</td>
<td>0.0123***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.00262)</td>
<td>(0.00230)</td>
<td>(0.00229)</td>
<td>(0.00228)</td>
<td>(0.00249)</td>
<td>(0.00232)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years since immigration: 6–10</td>
<td>0.0890***</td>
<td>0.0803***</td>
<td>0.0854***</td>
<td>0.0799***</td>
<td>0.0910***</td>
<td>0.0784***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0255)</td>
<td>(0.0256)</td>
<td>(0.0263)</td>
<td>(0.0256)</td>
<td>(0.0262)</td>
<td>(0.0249)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years since immigration: 11–15</td>
<td>0.179***</td>
<td>0.171***</td>
<td>0.168***</td>
<td>0.171***</td>
<td>0.171***</td>
<td>0.163***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0241)</td>
<td>(0.0248)</td>
<td>(0.0256)</td>
<td>(0.0247)</td>
<td>(0.0207)</td>
<td>(0.0203)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years since immigration: 15+</td>
<td>0.351***</td>
<td>0.351***</td>
<td>0.341***</td>
<td>0.350***</td>
<td>0.366***</td>
<td>0.359***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0298)</td>
<td>(0.0285)</td>
<td>(0.0289)</td>
<td>(0.0282)</td>
<td>(0.0318)</td>
<td>(0.0306)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ education: at least one secondary</td>
<td>0.0256</td>
<td>0.0353*</td>
<td>0.0254</td>
<td>0.0354*</td>
<td>0.0346</td>
<td>0.0326</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0194)</td>
<td>(0.0206)</td>
<td>(0.0193)</td>
<td>(0.0249)</td>
<td>(0.0212)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents’ education: at least one tertiary</td>
<td>0.0200</td>
<td>0.0340*</td>
<td>0.0232</td>
<td>0.0353*</td>
<td>0.0190</td>
<td>0.0283</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0231)</td>
<td>(0.0185)</td>
<td>(0.0183)</td>
<td>(0.0252)</td>
<td>(0.0194)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>0.0870***</td>
<td>0.0850***</td>
<td>0.0860***</td>
<td>0.0850***</td>
<td>0.0869***</td>
<td>0.0820***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0198)</td>
<td>(0.0185)</td>
<td>(0.0197)</td>
<td>(0.0185)</td>
<td>(0.0193)</td>
<td>(0.0185)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Size of immigrant group (% of population)</td>
<td>-0.00503**</td>
<td>-0.00443***</td>
<td>0.0276</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.00209)</td>
<td>(0.00149)</td>
<td>(0.0219)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabic countries</td>
<td>-0.166**</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td>-0.125**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0733)</td>
<td>(0.0716)</td>
<td>(0.0601)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South and West Asia</td>
<td>-0.221***</td>
<td>-0.173***</td>
<td>-0.200***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0364)</td>
<td>(0.0299)</td>
<td>(0.0287)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latin-America and the Caribbean</td>
<td>-0.0704</td>
<td>-0.00986</td>
<td>-0.0252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0744)</td>
<td>(0.0685)</td>
<td>(0.0575)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub-Saharan Africa</td>
<td>-0.0414</td>
<td>0.0583</td>
<td>0.0294</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0487)</td>
<td>(0.0428)</td>
<td>(0.0370)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and Oceania (poor countries)</td>
<td>-0.0582</td>
<td>0.00555</td>
<td>-0.00839</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0546)</td>
<td>(0.0469)</td>
<td>(0.0441)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Asia</td>
<td>-0.182**</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0814)</td>
<td>(0.0811)</td>
<td>(0.0949)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Asia and Oceania (rich countries)</td>
<td>0.157**</td>
<td>0.152**</td>
<td>0.128**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0772)</td>
<td>(0.0589)</td>
<td>(0.0598)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East-Central Europe</td>
<td>-0.193***</td>
<td>-0.154***</td>
<td>-0.190***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0475)</td>
<td>(0.0391)</td>
<td>(0.0313)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.00686</td>
<td>-0.00187</td>
<td>0.438***</td>
<td>0.0294</td>
<td>-0.177</td>
<td>0.522***</td>
<td>0.0926*</td>
<td>0.123**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.0387)</td>
<td>(0.0333)</td>
<td>(0.0212)</td>
<td>(0.0453)</td>
<td>(0.137)</td>
<td>(0.0341)</td>
<td>(0.0554)</td>
<td>(0.0502)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>5,627</td>
<td>5,627</td>
<td>6,495</td>
<td>5,627</td>
<td>5,627</td>
<td>5,825</td>
<td>5,473</td>
<td>5,473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.095</td>
<td>0.121</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.122</td>
<td>0.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Binary age group variable</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host country fixed effect</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Robust standard errors clustered at the immigrant group level in parentheses; weights correcting for sampling differences that are normalized to add up to one within countries are used.

***1 percent, **5 percent, *10 percent level significance.
The other group level variable is the region of origin. Columns (6)–(8) show effects with or without individual controls, and when host country fixed effects are taken into account. The omitted region is Western Europe and North America; coefficients should be interpreted relative to migrants from this region. Our results show that immigrants from other regions are less likely to speak the language of the host country. The exception is developed East Asia, but we have a very small sample size. Most of Asia and Eastern Europe are strongly negative and significant. On the other hand, Sub-Saharan Africa and Latin America are less negative and not significant.

These results basically confirm that immigrants from less distant regions, who come more easily and in larger numbers, assimilate less. The effects are large: the probability of strong assimilation is 10–15 percent lower for an immigrant from Eastern Europe than for an immigrant from Western Europe. Unfortunately, a more detailed analysis is not possible here either, but we think it is worthwhile to study individual and group level determinants of cultural assimilation further.

**Labor market outcomes**

As we discussed in the Introduction, the literature considers linguistic assimilation to be an important determinant of the labor market integration of immigrants. We look at this channel in Table 3.3.3. In two specifications each, we examine how individual characteristics and language proficiency influence (1) labor market and school participation, and (2) whether the interviewee had a paid job in the previous 12 months.

The regressions confirm the importance of both individual characteristics and language proficiency on the labor market. The likelihood of labor market/school participation and employment increases with education, and with years since immigration. The latter result is economic assimilation, according to which it takes time for immigrants to get ahead on the labor market of the host country. Interestingly, parental education strongly influences labor market/school participation, but not the likelihood of paid employment. This may be caused by the fact that children of more educated parents are likelier to be in school, which increases the school participation of the young in this social stratus.

The effect of language proficiency is positive, both on participation and on employment. The value of the parameter is somewhat above 4 percent, if we control for host country fixed effects; this is how likelier strongly assimilated immigrants are to participate in the labor market/school or to be employed.

---

6 We therefore look at those who either got a job, or were at school – in contrast to those who were either unemployed or inactive. This is the opposite of the NEET indicator used in statistics (not in education, employment or training).
Table 3.3.3: Determinants of labor market integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>(1)</th>
<th>(2)</th>
<th>(3)</th>
<th>(4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Labor market participation</td>
<td>Paid work last year</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Speak host country language at home</td>
<td>0.0339**</td>
<td>0.0434***</td>
<td>0.0348***</td>
<td>0.0415***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0136)</td>
<td>(0.0128)</td>
<td>(0.0135)</td>
<td>(0.0134)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (years)</td>
<td>0.0148***</td>
<td>0.0157***</td>
<td>0.0242***</td>
<td>0.0265***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10</td>
<td>(0.00217)</td>
<td>(0.00185)</td>
<td>(0.00336)</td>
<td>(0.00289)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years since immigration:</td>
<td>0.00702</td>
<td>0.0187</td>
<td>0.0567**</td>
<td>0.0569**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–10</td>
<td>(0.0119)</td>
<td>(0.0123)</td>
<td>(0.0268)</td>
<td>(0.0284)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years since immigration:</td>
<td>-0.0107</td>
<td>-0.0116</td>
<td>0.0535*</td>
<td>0.0482</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11–15</td>
<td>(0.0202)</td>
<td>(0.0218)</td>
<td>(0.0292)</td>
<td>(0.0341)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years since immigration:</td>
<td>-0.0225</td>
<td>-0.0351**</td>
<td>0.111***</td>
<td>0.0990***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15+</td>
<td>(0.0163)</td>
<td>(0.0150)</td>
<td>(0.0216)</td>
<td>(0.0276)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' education: at least one secondary</td>
<td>0.0495***</td>
<td>0.0417***</td>
<td>0.0215</td>
<td>0.00923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0125)</td>
<td>(0.0121)</td>
<td>(0.0157)</td>
<td>(0.0147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents' education: at least one tertiary</td>
<td>0.0989***</td>
<td>0.0778***</td>
<td>0.0310**</td>
<td>0.0196'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0141)</td>
<td>(0.0120)</td>
<td>(0.0132)</td>
<td>(0.0116)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 20–24</td>
<td>0.0370</td>
<td>0.0410</td>
<td>0.0515</td>
<td>0.0524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0308)</td>
<td>(0.0310)</td>
<td>(0.0357)</td>
<td>(0.0365)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 25–29</td>
<td>-0.0286'</td>
<td>-0.0213</td>
<td>0.0676***</td>
<td>0.0703***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0173)</td>
<td>(0.0172)</td>
<td>(0.0187)</td>
<td>(0.0197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 30–34</td>
<td>-0.0469***</td>
<td>-0.0418***</td>
<td>0.0802***</td>
<td>0.0804***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0147)</td>
<td>(0.0153)</td>
<td>(0.0174)</td>
<td>(0.0175)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 35–39</td>
<td>-0.0408''</td>
<td>-0.0380''</td>
<td>0.0796***</td>
<td>0.0787***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0167)</td>
<td>(0.0176)</td>
<td>(0.0260)</td>
<td>(0.0258)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 45–49</td>
<td>-0.0379</td>
<td>-0.0345</td>
<td>0.0683''</td>
<td>0.0719''</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0272)</td>
<td>(0.0289)</td>
<td>(0.0267)</td>
<td>(0.0265)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 50–54</td>
<td>-0.0624***</td>
<td>-0.0655***</td>
<td>0.0340</td>
<td>0.0289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0204)</td>
<td>(0.0201)</td>
<td>(0.0261)</td>
<td>(0.0257)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 55–59</td>
<td>-0.178***</td>
<td>-0.172***</td>
<td>-0.0949***</td>
<td>-0.0892***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0304)</td>
<td>(0.0291)</td>
<td>(0.0331)</td>
<td>(0.0330)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age: 60–64</td>
<td>-0.390***</td>
<td>-0.390***</td>
<td>-0.283***</td>
<td>-0.282***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0375)</td>
<td>(0.0358)</td>
<td>(0.0450)</td>
<td>(0.0446)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woman</td>
<td>-0.104***</td>
<td>-0.102***</td>
<td>-0.153***</td>
<td>-0.152***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0111)</td>
<td>(0.0108)</td>
<td>(0.0179)</td>
<td>(0.0183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>0.697***</td>
<td>0.690***</td>
<td>0.389***</td>
<td>0.370***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.0298)</td>
<td>(0.0308)</td>
<td>(0.0551)</td>
<td>(0.0570)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>5,623</td>
<td>5,623</td>
<td>5,627</td>
<td>5,627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>0.138</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.129</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Robust standard errors clustered at the immigrant group level in parentheses; weights correcting for sampling differences that are normalized to add up to one within countries are used.

***1 percent, **5 percent, *10 percent level significance.
Summary

Our study measured the impact of individual and group level characteristics on linguistic assimilation. We also showed how language proficiency influences the labor market status of immigrants. Although there are many other aspects of cultural assimilation, we think that language proficiency is a fundamental ingredient. Our analysis supports earlier findings in the literature, which argue that cultural assimilation can be the result of rational decisions. An indication for this is that the size of an immigrant group is related to the extent of language learning, or cultural assimilation: larger groups are less likely to assimilate. We also showed that cultural assimilation strongly influences economic assimilation. Those non-native immigrants who speak the language of the host country at home are 3–4 percent more likely to participate in the labor market or education, or to have found paid employment in the 12 months preceding the survey.

Because of the limitations of the database, we used a particularly strong indicator of cultural assimilation, the language used at home. Once the migration module of the EU-LFS becomes available, we would like to repeat the analysis using a question on the knowledge of the language of the host country. We expect that this further study will confirm our current findings, and will highlight even more the importance of cultural (linguistic) assimilation.
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4. TERMINOLOGY IN MIGRATION

TÓTH JUDIT

Terms used in studies of labour migration across borders require some explanation based on the consensus of experts and/or national, European as well as international regulation. For this reason a comprehensible summary of each relevant term is given with an indication of its legal grounds.

**ALIEN POLICING** • As a separate branch of public administration this has its own body with specific procedural rules. The OIN, police and the security agencies have competence on entry, residence, limitation on free movement, authorisation and preparatory work in the nationality procedure of EEA nationals, third country nationals and their family members.

**ASYLUM SEEKER** • Third country national or stateless person applying for international protection pending the final decision regarding asylum and shall be furnished with a residence permit issued on the basis of a humanitarian reason. The applicant is entitled to be employed inside the refugee camp or in any other place as determined by the public employer for a maximum of nine months following the submission of the application. After this period the individual would need a labour permit issued through a standard authority procedure should they wish to be employed for a longer period.

**EEA NATIONAL** • Citizens of party states in the EEA and EU together with nationals of other stipulated states with the EC/EU, (hereinafter together: EEA national), are entitled to enjoy the freedom of movement and residence as well as employment. This may not however generate a disproportionate burden for the national social system. Moreover, the health insurance and self-subsistence of the EEA national shall be provided during his/her residence in another party state. (The material resources of welfare are proper if the monthly personal income exceeds the lawful minimum old age pension level in the family or if the EEA national has received social aid for no longer than three months.)

The EEA national shall notify his residence and address in Hungary to the next regional office of OIN if they intend to stay more than 90 days. The EEA national obtains a registration document that is valid for an undefined period (together with a valid travelling document or identity card).

On ceasing employment the EEA national can retain the right to residence if they are undergoing medical treatment and incapable to work due to an accident or occupational disease, or if they are registered as a job seeker, or attending professional training as a precondition of their occupation or remunerated work in practice. If the remunerated work were to be in excess of one year the individual retains the right to residence for an undefined period. When a shorter employment period ends, the maximum allowable stay in Hungary means the length of granted job seeking benefit but no more than six months.
The EEA national and their family members acquire the right to permanent residence (permanent residence card) if they have resided lawfully and continuously for at least five years, or their child was born here. It provides a stable employment relationship. The family member of a Hungarian national acquires permanent residence if they have been living in a joint household for at least one year or in marriage living under the same roof for at least two years. In absence of the preconditions for staying or employment, the EEA national obtains permanent residence if they are entitled to receive an old age pension or if they become incapable of work due to an accident or occupational disease. If the EEA national employee dies before they can acquire the right to permanent residence, a family member having resided continuously for at least two years is eligible to the right to permanent residence here. The same applies if the breadwinner’s death is caused by an accident or occupational disease.

**Emigrant** • Hungarian national and lawfully residing foreigner has a fundamental right to leave Hungary. The Hungarian national must notify his leaving the country for a period longer than three months to the municipal clerk and returning their address card unless they wish to continuously pay the contribution to the health care fund. The emigrating person can avoid the double payment of the contribution if they can prove that they are paying the contribution in another Member State of the EEA. However, their payment of tax is contrary to the national regulation in the absence of the notification and return of the address card to the responsible Hungarian authority.

**Employed migrant with simplified labour contract** • A third country national can be employed in seasonal agricultural work on the basis of a simplified, standard labour contract while a migrant with an immigration permit (long-term migrant) can also be employed in tourism and occasional work. The ‘seasonal work’ covers plant cultivation, afforestation, stockbreeding, fishing and hunting, the logistics and packaging of agricultural production; employment at professional tourism service and transport providers that does not exceed 120 days within one calendar year between the same parties is also covered. The occasional work (for instance being an ‘extra’ in the production of a film) denotes employment for a defined period that is no longer than 5 consecutive days, 15 days in a month or 90 days within one calendar year. If a migrant worker is eligible for the social insurance in another state (due to international, bilateral social or labour agreement or if they are covered by the social coordination between EEA states) and it is properly documented, the public revenues shall not be paid by the employer; in this event the employee is excluded from the pension, accident health care and job-seeking benefits in Hungary.

**EU Blue Card** • The card holder as a third country national is authorized to be employed in a qualified work role and reside in Hungary or in another Member State of the EU. If the applicant meets the professional qualification
requirement and the monthly wage is not below 120–150 percent of the officially published gross monthly wage level in the given occupational branch in the country in the penultimate year (as an example, according to the Central Statistical Office data from 2014 the national average gross wage per month for an obstetrician or physician would be at least 285,240 HUF or 356,550 HUF), the Card may be issued.

Furthermore the applicant has to be registered in the social insurance system and register their place of residence in Hungary. If the applicant is a holder of an EC residence permit issued by another Member State or a seasonal labour visa, the application for a Card shall be denied. The Card is valid up to the fourth month from the end of the person’s employment but must at least be valid for a minimum of one year and a maximum of four years which may be extended on occasion to four years. The card holder cannot be employed in any other occupation authorized on the grounds of the national labour market test for the first two years. The card holder is eligible for family unification.

**FAMILY MEMBER** • During the existing family relationship a family member can enter, reside and work in Hungary. The foreign family member may joint the breadwinner (sponsor) thereby acquiring a family unification visa, residence permit or registration card. The immigration of family members means a limited labour force due to the restrictive conditions of unification that are controlled by the OIN (for instance, evidence is required regarding a valid family tie established before their departure and that the marriage is not for convenience. Subsistence and accommodation for the whole family is ensured in Hungary or for a dependent family member in need of personal assistance).

The circle of family members and conditions of their entry and residence are different as determined by the legal position of the sponsor living in Hungary. They would be a recognised refugee, a settled/long term migrant, a lawfully employed third country national, a Hungarian national or a person with the right to free movement. For instance, a recognized refugee’s spouse, a minor (including an adopted and/or a foster child) or his parent or responsible guardian (if the recognized refugee is a minor) may request the same legal status if they arrive together in Hungary and their family relationship has been established prior to arrival.

**FOREIGN STUDENT IN WORK** • A regular student does not need labour authorisation for a part-time job if that student is employed in a labour practice that is organised by an international student association for a third country national being enrolled with a home country tertiary education institute, or lawfully attending a vocational, grammar or artistic school or a tertiary education institute that is seated in Hungary. This permit exemption is applicable only during the student relationship. Moreover a student of elementary, secondary or tertiary education in the ambit of bilateral exchange programs can be employed freely if they have an attestation from the responsible min-
ister of the sending and admitting states. Third country national students participating in the labour/vocational practice in the frame of the Comenius, Erasmus, Leonardo da Vinci or Grundtvig Programs can also work without labour authorisation. The labour market test in the authorisation procedure is not required for a third country national apprentice if the vocational training period in Hungary does not exceed three months in a calendar year.

**FOREIGN VOLUNTEER** • If an adult third country national intends to work in Hungary without remuneration, they can obtain a residence permit issued for voluntary work provided they hold a reception contract with a Hungarian organisation in accordance with the legal rules on public voluntary work. This contract has to define the accommodation, nutrition, liability insurance, health care and proper instructions that are provided by the receiving organisation for the volunteer. The maximum period of validity of the contract determines the length of the residence permission but can not exceed a period of two years. The residence permit issued is not extendable. If a Hungarian national works as a posted volunteer of a Hungarian civil organisation abroad, they also need a finalised contract in order to access certain reimbursements of their individual expenses.

**ILLEGALLY EMPLOYED MIGRANT** • This covers a foreign person performing remunerated work employed without registration, a third country national employed in a different position or under different conditions than those determined in labour authorisation or without a valid residence permit – all can be considered as illegal work. It is a grave violation of law if the individual is employed under severe exploitation – including racial or gender discrimination – derogating the guarantees for lawful employment, in particular in the context of the dignity, the physical or the health security requirements of workers. Upon proposal of the court a residence permit on the grounds of humanitarian reasons shall be given for such a third country national even in the absence of preconditions of staying if they were being employed under grossly exploitative conditions, or without a valid residence authorisation in the country or if it is a minor being employed. Victims of exploitation and illegal work have the right to claim for the payment of a proportional wage at the court. The employer of an illegally employed migrant shall be subjected to the criminal procedure (with reference to the violation of Art.209 and 256 in the Penal Code).

**INTEGRATION OF MIGRANTS** • Recognised refugees and subsidiary protected migrants may enjoy certain services for social integration (such as a language course, accommodation, job-seeking service and self-subsistence benefits), while other migrants are not eligible to access these supports. They can conclude a social integration contract including services with the OIN for a maximum of two years and this is implemented with the assistance of a local municipal family care unit or a civil organisation. The benefits based on the integration contract are provided for a family in need and is controlled
by the OIN. Should the contract be seriously breached all supports and benefits may be withdrawn by the OIN.

**Jobseeker Migrant** • National treatment shall be ensured for a third country national with a residence permit that is issued in a combined procedure as determined in the Act on entry and stay of third country nationals in Hungary (2007) in the area of job seeking registration and accession to the unemployment benefit if they were employed for at least six months here. Similarly, any other lawfully employed migrant becoming unemployed is eligible for accession to the job seeking benefit – if the prior working period meets the requirement in Hungary – and that of the labour services. If the employment period of an EEA national exceeds one year, their right to residence is undefined but in the case of a shorter prior working period they can stay in the country until the end of the period of applied job seeking benefit but for at least for six months. A job seeking migrant can receive unemployment benefit, support before the pension and cost contributions of seeking work if they meet the labour law requirements (for instance, fulfilled social insurance period, cooperation with labour authority).

**Key Personnel** • This covers the employee of a foreign invested company in Hungary that is not a responsible leader of the company according to the Civil Code but directs or supervises the entire firm (including entitlements of the employer) or at least some units of the company that are under the direct governance or supervision of the owner, highest authority or responsible leader, as well as an employee with a high level qualification (specific occupation, technical or outstanding knowledge) that is necessary for the basic profile of the service, technology or administration in the company. The employee can benefit from the exception in the labour authorisation process if they have had a worker/employee position at the foreign invested company according to the national law of the seat country for at least one year prior to the application.

**Lawfully Employed Migrant** • Recognised refugees, subsidiary protected persons and settled/long-term migrants (with an open-ended residence permit) as well as migrants with the right to free movement and residence shall be treated as nationals in employment and so can work without permission. National treatment may be limited only through act or government decree (for instance, determining certain jobs that can be filled only by nationals). Employment is free without authorisation for posted, delegated or rented/hired worker of a non-Hungarian seated company providing services transnationally or for private contractual work at a Hungarian employer. Professional athletes, directing persons and working members in the supervisory board of a partly foreign invested company as well as clergy in church related roles as determined by its internal rules also can be employed without permission.

Other migrants shall obtain a labour permit to be employed unless a governmental decree regulates otherwise. Their residence permit issued for re-
munerated work is valid up to three years which can be extended on occasion by a further three years. Permission shall be denied if foreigners are excluded from the jobs through concern due to the high unemployment rate and characteristics of local job seekers. The first step of the procedure is a preliminary agreement on the job between the employer and the potential employee that defines the scope of the activities, the working time and the remuneration of the worker. This agreement is considered a binding job offer and possessing the permit the parties have to conclude the labour contract. These two steps are mandatory for lawful employment. If the employee has a residence permit issued for family unification the agreement with the employer may be valid for up to five years, up to four years if a third country national applies for an EU Blue Card, up to 6–12 months for a migrant with a residence permit issued on humanitarian grounds, and up to two years for all other labour migrants. An application for a labour permit can be refused taking into account the conditions, such as the fine for unlawful employment that was implied the employer within one year, or if the employment of a migrant is not necessary or applicable due to the ongoing training programmes or because of staff redundancies or of strikes at the business, or if the defined wage would be below the national average wage level (not exceeding 80 percent of the average monthly wage amount).

The labour permit shall identify the data regarding the employer, the place of work, the scope of the activities, the SNOJ code of the job and the period of employment. The government office can withdraw the permission that was issued in a single (non-combined with residence authorisation) procedure if the employment breaks down, it is terminated, the working conditions are changed relating to the permission, or when the employee cannot meet lawful residence or combined permission. For instance, employment is considered unlawful if the job is taken up at a different employer than that indicated in the permit, or the location of the work or the scope of activities is not the same as defined in the permit. The permit issued in a combined procedure is valid for up to two years and renewable on occasion for a further two years.

**Migrant** • This gathering term from the daily discourses does not exist in legal provisions. If you can read it in our text it means only a person in mobility but his legal status (national, long-term migrant, EEA national, third country national, refugee etc.) shall be indicated in addition.

**Migrant with right to free movement** • The EEA national – as a Hungarian national – together with their family members joining and following them to Hungary, their relatives belonging to the wider family whose entry and residence is authorized by the OIN (including the dependent of the Hungarian national, person living in the same household with the sponsor for at least one year, or has been cared for health reasons by the sponsor, or
was living together in the household of the sponsor as a dependent or as cared person prior to departure) have the right to free movement in the Member States of the EEA and the EU.

OFFICE OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY AFFAIRS (OIN) • Under the auspices of the Ministry of the Interior the OIN is a central alien policing authority with seven regional and 24 desk offices. It is entitled to decide visa, residence, asylum, expulsion, statelessness and nationality authorisation including the claims for registration of EEA nationals and their family members, employment, issuing passport of, and integration contract with, third country nationals. A judicial review of its decision may be requested to the administrative court.

PLACEMENT AND LABOUR AGENCY • The Labour Authority or private entities provide various services for job seekers and workers, for instance, EURES as the job portal of the EU is introduced by coordinators. Private placement and labour agencies are entitled to transmit job offers lawfully if entrepreneurs are registered at the governmental office. The registration demands infrastructural, legal and personnel requirements (reception desk and proper communication facilities, skilled advisor, legitimized jobs according to the national law in the destination country are ensured), and a deposit from the entrepreneur shall be given if foreign job offers are transmitted. Fee, cost or charge must not be accounted for labour services to job seekers.

POSTED WORKER • A worker from a company seated in a Member State of the EEA that is posted to Hungary for a contractual, service or undertaking project task does not need a labour authorisation if the work does not exceed two years. He remains inside the social security and labour law regime of that Member State as the employee posted up to two years, and similarly, a delegated worker from Hungary to another EEA state remains inside the Hungarian social and health care system for up to two years. However, his dual taxpaying shall be avoided on the basis of the place of his permanent registered residence and it is that which determines the competence of the national tax office. If his work does not finish within two years the national health care fund may extend this posted worker position.

RECOGNISED REFUGEE • A third country national or stateless person can be recognised as a refugee if they are not admitted by another state but by returning to their country of origin or of habitual residence would face a well founded fear of persecution on the grounds of race, national or ethnic origin, religion or conviction, political opinion or membership of a special social group and there being no basis of exclusion for public order or security reasons. In this way a refugee can be removed exceptionally from the country but their recognition as a refugee may be withdrawn for a gross violation of law and national security tolerating their temporary presence in the country. A refugee can be employed freely with the exception of a job and position that
requires Hungarian citizenship (for instance, to become mayor, governmental official, judge or policeman). Recognised refugees shall be furnished with identity card and address card.

**REGISTERED MIGRANT WORKER** • A migrant worker entitled to the right to free movement and residence as well as a third country national that is exempted from the labour authorisation – including the recognised refugee, subsidiary protected person, settled/long-term migrant – shall be registered at the labour authority. The employer’s note shall contain the number of employed persons, their age, qualification, nationality, the SNOJ code, the employment relation, family membership of the employee, the statistical code of the employer and the date of beginning or termination of the employment. The labour authority (governmental office) approves the notice (made in time) and keeps the up-to-date list of this employment data.

**REMITTANCE** • There is no limitation of the minimum or maximum amount of gross/net salary of people that shall be spent or utilised in Hungary differing from other states. It means that foreign migrants can use freely their own incomes but their subsistence, accommodation and standard well-being shall be provided during their lawful residence in Hungary.

**REMUNERATED WORK** • Persons with the right to free movement and residence exceeding three months would establish their income and lawful residence in Hungary by remunerated work if they are not to become a relevant burden to the social service system contributing to the health care fund. This work may include employment or other economic activity in a hierarchical relationship that is compensated for by wage or by self-employment individually undertaking the economic activity and paying the social and health care contributions or their other activities that are managed as an owner, manager, representative or supervisory board member of a corporate, cooperative or other legal entities for honorarium. A third country national can be at remunerated work only in possession of the EU Blue Card, or a residence permit issued for the purpose of work, for humanitarian reasons, for family unification, for studies or if holding a seasonal labour visa.

**RETURNEE** • A Hungarian national has the right to return at any time to Hungary even with an expired travelling document without sanction. This fundamental right does not depend on their registered or permanent residence in Hungary but without proper document of payment to the mandatory health care contribution – either in Hungary or in another Member State of the EU – it shall be reimbursed (dating back to the previous five years) and paid as public revenue to the Treasury up to 12th day in every month.

**SEASONAL FOREIGN WORKER** • A migrant with a seasonal labour visa is entitled to enter on one or more occasions and to stay in Hungary exceeding 90 days within 180 days but no more than six months in employment. There is no appeal if the visa application is denied or the issued visa is withdrawn.
The ministry responsible maintains registration on seasonal labour permits issued for agricultural work, and its prolongation over six months per annum is excluded. However the seasonal worker can work this six month period in several parts. The labour market test shall be made in the authorisation process on the grounds of prior submitted labour demand (indicated vacancy) but checking whether Hungarian labour force is available is neglected if the foreign seasonal worker’s claim does not exceed 60 days work.

STATELESS PERSON • A stateless person is not considered as a national on the grounds of legal rules or practice in any state thus cannot gain access to the protection, authorisation or identity documents. De facto statelessness of a foreigner is indicated in alien police documentation but means no specific right or entitlement despite the status of settled/long-term migrant or recognized refugee. However, among de facto stateless persons there are many asylum-seekers and migrant workers. A small part of stateless persons may be recognised de jure and furnished with a humanitarian residence permit, labour authorisation and travelling document that allows leaving and return to Hungary before its expiration. The OIN makes the decision on statelessness status in some dozens of cases per annum.

SUBSIDIARY PROTECTED MIGRANT • A subsidiary international protection can be granted for a third country national including stateless person if such person does not meet the requirement of refugee recognition but there is a risk of serious harm should they return to the country or origin or if protection is not available in the country of origin while exclusionary reasons for public order or security are not applicable in their case. The subsidiary protected migrant may access an identity and address card while residing in Hungary and this status may extend to a joint applicant family member.

THIRD COUNTRY NATIONAL • The non-national of Hungary or Member States of the EU or EEA is a foreigner.

TOLERATED MIGRANT • Upon the request of the asylum unit, the alien policing directorate of the OIN may recognise the third country national as a tolerated migrant if his expulsion is prohibited because the applicant would face torture, inhuman or degrading treatment, or capital punishment in their home country on the grounds of race, religion, national or ethnic origin, political views or membership of a specific social group, in absence of another safe state admitting him. On applying for a labour permit for employment outside the refugee camp, the claim would be supported by the OIN on humanitarian grounds and their application shall not be tested regarding the labour market supply or demand.

YEARLY QUOTA • The maximum number of third country nationals for whom a labour permit would be issued in Hungary for a calendar year is determined by the minister responsible for employment policy. His decree defines not only the total number of foreign employees in the country but also
its amount in each sector and region. This quota was 59,000 to the year of 2015 based on the monthly average number of indicated vacancies in the labour offices.

Applied legal sources

Act I of 2007 on entry and residence of persons in Hungary entitled to the right to free movement, Government Decree No.113 of 2007, May 24 on executive rules of the Act;
Act IV of 1991 on promotion of employment;
Government Decree No.445 of 2013, November 22 on the non-single labour authorisation of third country nationals, exemptions and expert opinion issued by the governmental offices at county level and lawful employment of third-country nationals without permission, their registration and reimbursement of their unpaid wage;
Government Decree No.355 of 2007, Dec 23 on transitional provisions implemented by the Hungarian Republic on the persons with right to free movement,
Act LXXV of 2010 on employment on the grounds of simplified labour contract;
Act LXXX of 2007 on asylum and Government Decree No.301 of 2007, Nov 9 on asylum procedure and support for refugees;
Government Decree No.181 of 2007, July 6 on accreditation of institutes admitting third-country nationals for the purpose of research and on conditions of the admission contract;
Ministerial Decree issued by the Minister of the Economy No.44 of 2011, Dec 16 on the minimum lawful monthly salary for a third country national employed with EU Blue Card;
Ministerial Decree issued by the Minister of the Economy No.19 of 2015, July 3 on the maximum number of employable third country nationals in the given calendar year in Hungary;
Resolution issued by the Central Statistical Office No.7 of 2010, Apr 23 on the Statistical Nomenclature of Occupations and Jobs (SNOJ);
2011/98/EU, Dec 13, Directive of the European Parliament and the Council on a single application procedure for a single permit for third-country nationals to reside and work in the territory of a Member State and on a common set of rights for third-country workers legally residing in a Member State;
96/71/EC, Dec 16, Directive of the European Parliament and the Council concerning the posting of workers in the framework of the provision of services;
2014/36/EU, February 26, Directive of the European Parliament and the Council on the conditions of entry and stay of third-country nationals for the purpose of employment as seasonal workers (it shall be transposed to the national law up to 30 Sept 2016);
2014/66/EU, May 15, Directive of the European Parliament and the Council on the conditions of entry and residence of third-country nationals in the framework of the intra-corporate transfer (to be transposed to the national law prior to 29 Nov 2016);
2009/52/EC, June 18, Directive of the European Parliament and the Council providing for minimum standards on sanctions and measures against employers of illegally staying third-country nationals;
LABOUR MARKET POLICY TOOLS
(MAY 2015 – MARCH 2016)

ÁGOTA SCHARLE
The chapter only includes policy tools whose regulation underwent substantive changes between May 2015 and March 2016. Tools operating without changes and the legal regulations applicable to them are described in detail in earlier issues of the Labour Market Yearbook.¹

1 INSTITUTIONAL CHANGES

1.1 The system of vocational education and training is transformed

The Ministry of National Economy merged the schools taken over from the Klebelsberg Institution Maintenance Centre into vocational education and training centres in July 2015.² The centres were granted educational and financial autonomy, while the schools operating as units of the centres were granted partial financial autonomy.³

According to government plans, vocational secondary schools will be turned into vocational “gymnasia”, while vocational schools will become vocational secondary schools in the school year 2016/2017.⁴ Vocational gymnasia will offer two vocational qualifications in addition to the secondary school leaving certificate, while vocational secondary schools will provide vocational training followed by preparation for the secondary school leaving certificate.⁵ However, the share of general knowledge subjects will decrease significantly in both school types.

1.2 The National Office for Rehabilitation and Social Affairs (NORSA) is transformed

According to press reports, the government is planning to dissolve or transform several financially autonomous institutions of the sector, in order to reduce bureaucracy. These reports state that – similarly to the National Labour Office, merged into the Ministry for National Economy in 2015 – the National Office for Rehabilitation and Social Affairs will be integrated in the Ministry for Human Capacities.⁶ The general and financial management of services supporting the integration of disabled job seekers in the labour market, so far managed by NORSA, is expected to be taken over not by the Ministry but by another government agency, for example the Equal Opportunities of Persons with Disabilities Non-profit Ltd. The local administrative offices of NORSA were already taken over by the metropolitan and county level government offices in April 2015.⁷

1.3 The professional autonomy of local labour offices decreases

The competence of local government offices was expanded and as a result the employer’s rights over the staff of local labour offices were transferred from

---

¹ For last years’ analysis see Cseres-Gergely–Varadovics (2015).
² 146/2015. (VI. 12.) kormányrendelet.
³ The vocational training centres have been established. Ministry for the National Economy, 30 June 2015.
⁴ The government have decided on transforming vocational education and training. Ministry for the National Economy, 9 April 2015.
⁵ The transformation of the vocational education and training system aims at improving the quality of education. Ministry for the National Economy, 29 January 2016.
⁷ Government decree 70/2015. (III. 30.)
the heads of employment departments of county level government offices to
the heads of local government offices in April 2015.8

2 BENEFITS

2.1 The amount of unemployment benefits

The minimum and maximum of job seeker’s allowance was raised in line with the
rise in the minimum wage in January 2016. The amount of the employment sub-
stitute support (a flat rate, means tested allowance) for the long-term unemployed
did not change. The wage of public works participants did not increase either.9

2.2 Changes in disability benefits

The review of eligibility to disability benefit, launched in 2012, is progressing
more slowly than originally planned. In order to accelerate the process, the
NORSA was authorised in September 2015 to include experts not employed
by the government in the review committees and if supplementary health or
ability assessments are needed, these may be outsourced to independent ser-
vice providers.10 For the sake of further simplification, review committees
may decide not to examine an individual if earlier expert opinions state that
their condition is incurable. Finally, after August 2015, individuals reaching
retirement age in five years may be granted exemption from the review if the
regular review took place during that five-year period.11

3 SERVICES

3.1 New client profiling system

Following a lengthy preparation period, the new client profiling system was
launched in the local labour offices in January 2016. The essence of the project
financed from the EDIOP (Economic Development and Innovation Opera-
tional Programme) 5.1.1. scheme12 is to place clients in one of three categories
on the basis of questionnaires completed by them. The first includes those
who are capable of finding employment on their own, the second those who
need assistance in finding employment, while members of the third category
are recommended for participation in a public works programme.

3.2 Reporting vacancies to the mayors

A new law effective from 13 July 2015 enables employers to register their sea-
sonal labour demand locally, at the mayor’ office, between 1 May and 31 Oc-
tober (provided they opt for simplified employment).13 The aim of the meas-
ure was to encourage employers to register summer seasonal jobs and in this
way to increase the number of jobs in the open labour market offered by lo-
cal labour offices to the long-term unemployed (or public works participants).

8 Ministerial order 7/2015. (III.
31.) on the organisational and
operational regulations of the
metropolitan and county gov-
ernment offices.
(VIII. 24.).
10 Government decree 247/2015.
(IX. 8.).
11 Act CXXXIII of 2015.
12 Preparations were financed
from the SROP 1.3.1. pro-
gramme.
13 Act CXII of 2015.
4 ACTIVE LABOUR MARKET TOOLS AND COMPLEX PROGRAMMES

4.1 The expansion of public works

In addition to increased budgets, the range of those eligible to participate was also expanded: since 1 August 2015, persons who submitted a claim to be recognised as a refugee, protected persons and beneficiary of subsidiary protection as well as third-country nationals who are obliged to stay at a place designated by immigration authorities may also participate in public works programmes.\(^{14}\)

In accordance with the objectives of public works for 2016, the gradual expansion of the Start Programme has to be continued and the opportunity of longer term employment ensured (for the planned increase in expenses see Table A1 in the Annex). In order to better target the programme, the relevant government decree specifies the list of “municipalities of high priority in respect of public works”.\(^{15}\)

The government allocated 27 billion HUF for the training of 50 thousand public works participants in the EDIOP 6.1.1. scheme published in August 2015.\(^{16}\)

4.2 Measures supporting the integration of public works participants in the open labour market

Regulations have been amended in the summer of 2015 and then at the start of 2016 to increase the share of public works participants entering the open labour market. Pursuant to the new regulations effective from 13 July 2015,\(^{17}\) participants rejecting simplified employment and those whose additional employment is terminated either by themselves as employees (or by the employer) with immediate effect may be excluded from public works.

Since January 2016, a new, positive incentive, “allowance for finding employment” has been granted for former public works participants who have found a job in the primary labour market.\(^{18}\) The amount of the allowance is the same as the amount of employment substitution support payable for the period from the termination of public works participation to the date until the public works programme was supposed to last if the individual did not find employment.

In order to improve access to training and services supporting labour market integration, it has been regarded as public works participation “if the public works participant engages in training improving his/her adaptability to the labour market or (...) a maximum of three days of labour market service annually” since 13 July 2015.\(^{19}\)

The Ministry in charge announced that a new programme was launched on 1 February 2016 with a budget of 3 billion HUF (cf. the total budget of 340 billion HUF of public works for 2016), which is planned to facilitate the integration of 20–25 thousand public works participants in the primary labour market.\(^{20}\)

---

\(^{14}\) Act CXXVII of 2015.
\(^{15}\) Government resolution 1040/2016. (II. 11.).
\(^{16}\) Call for applications EDIOP 6.1.1-15. In euros, the amount of the budget is around 90 million (the HUF/EUR exchange rate is around 300).
\(^{17}\) Changes in the law relating to public works. 30 July 2015.
\(^{18}\) Government decree 328/2015. (XI. 10.) on the “allowance for finding employment” for public works participants.
\(^{19}\) Act CXI 2015.
\(^{20}\) New programmes to boost employment to start in the first half of 2016. Ministry for the National Economy, 5 January 2016.
4.3 A new programme for supporting the long-term unemployed to enter employment

The new EDIOP 5.1.1 scheme published in April 2015 – similarly to earlier SROP schemes – supports the training and wage subsidies of the long-term unemployed as well as providing the services and tools encouraging their self-employment. The primary target groups of the scheme are young people aged 25–30 looking for their first job, job seekers with low qualifications and those looking for employment for at least six months, persons returning to the labour market after parental or filial leave, job seekers aged over 50 and those exiting public works. The total budget of the scheme for the 2015–2018 period is 102 billion HUF.

4.4 The Youth Guarantee programme

The Youth Guarantee programme announced in autumn 2014 was launched in March 2015, with the same content but financed from different sources in the convergence regions and in Central Hungary (from EDIOP 5.2.1 and the Competitive Central Hungary Operational Programme (CCHOP) 8.2.1 respectively). The local labour offices provide tailor-made mentoring and active tools for young people aged 15–25 not in education or employment. As a first step, job seekers registered for at least six months are eligible to participate in the programme.

The programme guarantees that young job seekers get a quality offer within six months (and within four months later in the future). For unqualified young adults it may involve obtaining a qualification and for the qualified it may be work experience in the private sector, which is supported by the employment service by offering 100 per cent wage subsidies for 90 days (without an obligation for the employer to retain the young worker) and by reimbursing the costs of travelling to work.

Participation in public works does not qualify as a quality offer, that is, the local labour office cannot offer a public works contract for the participants of the programme; however, if the young job seeker asks for it they can enter public works. Wage subsidies can also be provided in the Youth Guarantee programme: 70 per cent of the wage and employers’ contribution (social contribution tax) for a period of eight months but in this case the employer is obliged to retain the employee for a further four months. The programme supporting the self-employment of young job seekers, also related to the Youth Guarantee, was launched in January 2016.

4.5 Funding for not-for-profit providers of rehabilitation was terminated

EDIOP 5.3.8., completed in July 2015, funded the development and operation of 61 new and 33 old service providers in order to facilitate the labour market.
integration of disabled job seekers. In addition to capacity building, the programme also included methodology development: the unified methodology for providing labour market services and a service analysis system have been developed, which help to measure the performance of labour market service providers according to unified criteria.

However, the new service providers involved did not receive state funding after the end of the programme and some of them have to date discontinued offering their services. The 33 “old” service providers were granted state funding until the end of March 2016. In the coming years, the government is planning to finance not-for-profit service providers from the Human Resource Development Operational Programme (HRDOP) and CCHOP; however, these programmes have not yet commenced.

4.6 Expansion of the Job Protection Action Plan

Although it is not managed by local labour offices, the Job Protection Action Plan, operated by the National Tax and Customs Administration, basically functions as a wage subsidy programme. The programme, which started in 2013, reduced the wage costs of employers by more than 135 billion HUF in 2015 and in this way supported the employment of 326 thousand employees aged over 55, 290 thousand employees with low qualifications, employed in unskilled jobs, 160 thousand young people looking for first-time employment, 40 thousand mothers with small children and 30 thousand long-term unemployed persons.24

Since July 2015, the Job Protection Action Plan has also covered agricultural employees aged 25–55, involving 20 thousand employees until the end of the year.25

5 POLICY TOOLS AFFECTING THE LABOUR MARKET

5.1 The personal income tax rate continues to decrease

The flat rate personal income tax rate fell from 16 to 15 per cent in January 2016.

5.2 The minimum wage increases

The State Secretary of the Ministry for National Economy in charge of labour market and training, representing the government, concluded an agreement on the minimum wage with three employers’ organisations and two trade union confederations. Accordingly, the minimum wage in 2016 is 111 thousand HUF gross (compared to 105 thousand HUF in the previous year), while the guaranteed minimum wage is 129 thousand HUF gross (compared to 122 thousand HUF in 2015).26 The wage for public works has not been raised (monthly 79,155 HUF gross).

25 Burdens of employers reduced by 135 billion through the Job Protection Action Plan. Ministry for the National Economy, 8 February 2016.
26 The ‘guaranteed minimum wage’ applies to jobs that require at least secondary education.
Annex

Table A1: Expenditures and revenues of the employment policy section of the national budget, 2011–2015 (mHUF)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Active subsidies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and training subsidies</td>
<td>25,774.8</td>
<td>22,017.2</td>
<td>25,105.9</td>
<td>27,000.0</td>
<td>28,120.8</td>
<td>14,000.0</td>
<td>16,172.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Co-financing of EU-funded employ-ability (and adaptability) projects</td>
<td>3,970.7</td>
<td>6,967.0</td>
<td>16,279.6</td>
<td>17,130.0</td>
<td>17,130.1</td>
<td>11,064.6</td>
<td>3,808.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public works⁴</td>
<td>59,799.8</td>
<td>131,910.7</td>
<td>171,053.4</td>
<td>231,105.3</td>
<td>225,471.1</td>
<td>270,000.0</td>
<td>340,000.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SROP 1.1. Labour market services and support</td>
<td>19,754.4</td>
<td>29,772.3</td>
<td>33,804.9</td>
<td>41,000.0</td>
<td>35,790.1</td>
<td>7,500.0</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SROP 1.2. Employment stimulation normative support</td>
<td>9,774.8</td>
<td>16,250.1</td>
<td>14,477.3</td>
<td>3,200.0</td>
<td>1,080.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursement of social security contribution relief</td>
<td>5,147.7</td>
<td>4,784.1</td>
<td>3,277.5</td>
<td>5,000.0</td>
<td>551.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pre-financing labour market programmes for 2014–2020</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10,000.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>49,200.0</td>
<td>54,700.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vocational and adult training subsidies</td>
<td>27,921.1</td>
<td>16,516.0</td>
<td>18,736.2</td>
<td>26,400.0</td>
<td>24,725.9</td>
<td>16,000.0</td>
<td>13,819.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Passive expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job seekers' allowances</td>
<td>124,543.2</td>
<td>64,067.2</td>
<td>51,819.9</td>
<td>56,000.0</td>
<td>49,235.0</td>
<td>50,000.0</td>
<td>47,000.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer to Pension Insurance Fund</td>
<td>1,221.5</td>
<td>907.0</td>
<td>961.3</td>
<td>313.9</td>
<td>451.6</td>
<td>400.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Payment of wage guarantee subsidies</td>
<td>5,363.0</td>
<td>6,606.6</td>
<td>5,487.8</td>
<td>6,000.0</td>
<td>4,178.5</td>
<td>6,150.0</td>
<td>4,950.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Expenditures on operations</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,472.8</td>
<td>1,600.0</td>
<td>2,418.3</td>
<td>3,050.0</td>
<td>3,283.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Debt management expenditures (technical)</td>
<td>303.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>389.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Balance keeping and risk assessment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Supplementary subsidies for employers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5,222.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Sectoral subsidy for minimum wage raise</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7,000.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Other expenditures</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total expenditures</td>
<td>283,661.3</td>
<td>305,121.1</td>
<td>349,498.9</td>
<td>424,749.2</td>
<td>389,162.1</td>
<td>427,364.6</td>
<td>484,177.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Revenues of SROP measures</td>
<td>26,247.6</td>
<td>42,827.3</td>
<td>51,276.1</td>
<td>46,000.0</td>
<td>39,776.7</td>
<td>43,000.0</td>
<td>51,700.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. Other revenues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenues, regional</td>
<td>734.2</td>
<td>559.0</td>
<td>602.3</td>
<td>750.0</td>
<td>1,507.8</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenues, national</td>
<td>1,316.8</td>
<td>1,113.6</td>
<td>1,376.8</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>2,537.1</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other revenues from vocational and adult training</td>
<td>781.2</td>
<td>1,020.1</td>
<td>692.6</td>
<td>650.0</td>
<td>216.8</td>
<td>800.0</td>
<td>800.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Vocational training contribution</td>
<td>49,415.5</td>
<td>80,352.5</td>
<td>60,398.7</td>
<td>57,071.1</td>
<td>60,910.8</td>
<td>63,134.0</td>
<td>56,996.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Redemption of wage guarantee subsidies</td>
<td>977.8</td>
<td>792.0</td>
<td>1,046.1</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>934.5</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td>1,000.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Debt management revenues (technical)</td>
<td>303.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Part of health insurance and labour market contributions payable to the National Employment Fund</td>
<td>186,596.3</td>
<td>127,096.6</td>
<td>125,614.6</td>
<td>125,041.5</td>
<td>135,819.4</td>
<td>141,772.9</td>
<td>150,476.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Funding from the national budget</td>
<td>64,000.0</td>
<td>71,273.8</td>
<td>20,000.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>8,449.0</td>
<td>95,000.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part of the social contribution tax payable to the National Employment Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>67,284.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contribution related to the Job Protection Action Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>91,542.7</td>
<td>95,936.7</td>
<td>95,936.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total revenues</td>
<td>330,373.0</td>
<td>392,319.4</td>
<td>352,549.9</td>
<td>327,449.3</td>
<td>337,639.8</td>
<td>360,697.6</td>
<td>463,742.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pending items(^{a})</td>
<td>202.0</td>
<td>270.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>-964.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes in deposits</td>
<td>46,913.7</td>
<td>87,468.6</td>
<td>-2,086.4</td>
<td>-97,300.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>330,596.9</td>
<td>393,040.4</td>
<td>351,560.1</td>
<td>424,749.2</td>
<td>389,162.1</td>
<td>427,364.6</td>
<td>484,177.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At 2011 prices (deflated by a consumer price index)</td>
<td>330,596.9</td>
<td>371,845.2</td>
<td>320,117.2</td>
<td>380,295.4</td>
<td>348,432.8</td>
<td>383,403.9</td>
<td>434,807.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) Contains public works expenditures in 2011, and the expenditures of the Start work programme after 2011.

\(^{b}\) It contains the revenues from the European Globalisation Adjustment Fund in 2011.

Source: Acts on the budget of the relevant years (plan) and the implementation of the budget (http://kfib.hu/hu/torvenyek-zarszamadasok); in the case of 2013 the 153 779.8 is corrected with the provisions of government decrees 1507/2013. (VIII. 1.) and 1783/2013. (XI. 4.) (an extra 26 118 million funding for public works); in the case of the 2014 plan the 183 805.3 is corrected with the provisions of government decree 1361/2014. (VI. 30.) (an extra 47 300 million funding for public works).
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ONYF Central Administration of National Pension Insurance [Országos Nyugdíjbiztosítási Főigazgatóság]
TB Social Security Records [Társadalombiztosítás]

EXPLANATION OF SYMBOLS

( – ) Non-occurrence.
(... ) Not available.
(n.a.) Not applicable.
(... ) Data cannot be given due to data privacy restrictions.
### Table 1.1: Basic economic indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>GDP</th>
<th>Industrial production</th>
<th>Export</th>
<th>Import</th>
<th>Real earnings</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Consumer price index</th>
<th>Unemployment rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>128.9</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>104.6</td>
<td>108.4</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>87.8</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>128.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>118.1</td>
<td>121.7</td>
<td>120.8</td>
<td>101.5</td>
<td>101.0</td>
<td>109.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>103.7</td>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td>100.3</td>
<td>109.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>104.5</td>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>105.9</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>113.6</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>109.1</td>
<td>110.1</td>
<td>109.2</td>
<td>101.3</td>
<td>104.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>107.8</td>
<td>118.4</td>
<td>115.2</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>106.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td>106.8</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>103.8</td>
<td>109.9</td>
<td>118.0</td>
<td>114.4</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>100.7</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>107.9</td>
<td>115.8</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>99.3</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>100.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>104.3</td>
<td>100.8</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>106.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>97.7</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>100.7</td>
<td>110.6</td>
<td>116.9</td>
<td>115.1</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>109.9</td>
<td>106.7</td>
<td>102.4</td>
<td>100.7</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>98.2</td>
<td>100.7</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>101.9</td>
<td>101.1</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>101.7</td>
<td>101.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>103.7</td>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>106.9</td>
<td>108.8</td>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>102.9</td>
<td>107.5</td>
<td>107.9</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>104.3</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Data adjusted for seasonality and variations in the number of workdays. After 1996 there was a change in the methodology for accounting the undivided service fee of financial intermediation. Previous year = 100. The method of measurement changed in 2014 with the adoption of ESA2010 (European System of National and Regional Accounts). See also: [http://www.ksh.hu/docs/hun/xftp/idoszaki/gdpev/gdpevelo13.pdf](http://www.ksh.hu/docs/hun/xftp/idoszaki/gdpev/gdpevelo13.pdf).

b 1990–2000: those with more than 5 employees, 2001–: excluding water and waste management, including businesses with fewer than 5 employees. Previous year = 100.

c Volume index. Previous year = 100.

d Previous year = 100.


Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent01_01](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent01_01)
Figure 1.2: Annual GDP time series (2000 = 100%)

Source: Eurostat.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena01_02

Figure 1.3: Employment rate of population aged 15-64

Source: Eurostat.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena01_03
Table 2.1: Population

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>In thousands</th>
<th>1992 = 100</th>
<th>Annual changes</th>
<th>Population age 15-64, in thousands</th>
<th>Demographic dependency rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total population</td>
<td>Old age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>10,375</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>6,870.4</td>
<td>0.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>10,221</td>
<td>98.5</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>6,961.3</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>10,098</td>
<td>97.3</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>6,940.3</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>10,077</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>6,931.8</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>10,066</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>6,932.4</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>10,045</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>6,912.7</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>10,031</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>6,898.1</td>
<td>0.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10,014</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>-0.1</td>
<td>6,874.0</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>9,986</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>6,857.4</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>9,932</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>6,815.7</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>9,909</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>6,776.3</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>9,877</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>6,719.7</td>
<td>0.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>9,856</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>6,664.2</td>
<td>0.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* January 1st. The data for 1990 is based on the census. Those for 2000–2011 are estimates based on the 2001 census and demographic data (reference date 2001.02.01.). Those for 2012–2015 are estimates based on the 2011 census (reference day 2011.10.01.) and demographic data.

b (population age 0–14 + 65 and above) / (population age 15–64)

c (population age 65 and above) / (population age 15–64)

Source: KSH STADAT (2015. 07. 03. version)

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent02_01

Table 2.2: Population by age groups, in thousands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>0-14</th>
<th>15-24</th>
<th>25-54</th>
<th>55-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>Total years old</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2,130.5</td>
<td>1,445.5</td>
<td>4,231.4</td>
<td>1,193.5</td>
<td>1,373.9</td>
<td>10,374.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,729.2</td>
<td>1,526.5</td>
<td>4,291.4</td>
<td>1,143.4</td>
<td>1,531.1</td>
<td>10,221.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,579.7</td>
<td>1,322.0</td>
<td>4,409.1</td>
<td>1,209.2</td>
<td>1,577.6</td>
<td>10,097.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,553.5</td>
<td>1,302.0</td>
<td>4,399.8</td>
<td>1,230.0</td>
<td>1,590.7</td>
<td>10,076.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,529.7</td>
<td>1,285.9</td>
<td>4,393.9</td>
<td>1,251.5</td>
<td>1,605.1</td>
<td>10,066.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,508.8</td>
<td>1,273.3</td>
<td>4,377.1</td>
<td>1,262.3</td>
<td>1,623.9</td>
<td>10,045.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,492.6</td>
<td>1,259.9</td>
<td>4,346.1</td>
<td>1,292.0</td>
<td>1,640.3</td>
<td>10,030.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,476.9</td>
<td>1,253.4</td>
<td>4,293.7</td>
<td>1,326.9</td>
<td>1,663.5</td>
<td>10,014.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,457.2</td>
<td>1,231.7</td>
<td>4,257.7</td>
<td>1,367.8</td>
<td>1,671.3</td>
<td>9,985.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,440.3</td>
<td>1,214.1</td>
<td>4,164.6</td>
<td>1,437.0</td>
<td>1,675.9</td>
<td>9,931.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,430.9</td>
<td>1,196.4</td>
<td>4,144.8</td>
<td>1,435.0</td>
<td>1,701.7</td>
<td>9,908.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,425.8</td>
<td>1,172.8</td>
<td>4,123.8</td>
<td>1,423.2</td>
<td>1,731.8</td>
<td>9,877.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,427.2</td>
<td>1,147.1</td>
<td>4,112.6</td>
<td>1,404.5</td>
<td>1,764.2</td>
<td>9,855.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* January 1st. The data for 1990 is based on the census. Those for 2000–2011 are estimates based on the 2001 census and demographic data (reference date 2001.02.01.). Those for 2012–2015 are estimates based on the 2011 census (reference day 2011.10.01.) and demographic data.

Source: KSH STADAT (2015. 07. 03. version)

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent02_02
Figure 2.1: Age structure of the Hungarian population, 1980, 2015

Source: KSH.
Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena02_01
Table 2.3: Male population by age groups, in thousands\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>0-14</th>
<th>15-24</th>
<th>25-59</th>
<th>60-64</th>
<th>65+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1,090.4</td>
<td>740.3</td>
<td>2,366.9</td>
<td>259.9</td>
<td>527.5</td>
<td>4,984.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>885.0</td>
<td>780.9</td>
<td>2,403.8</td>
<td>224.8</td>
<td>570.8</td>
<td>4,865.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>809.5</td>
<td>674.6</td>
<td>2,480.0</td>
<td>252.2</td>
<td>576.8</td>
<td>4,793.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>796.7</td>
<td>664.0</td>
<td>2,493.7</td>
<td>249.3</td>
<td>580.9</td>
<td>4,784.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>784.5</td>
<td>655.4</td>
<td>2,503.7</td>
<td>249.4</td>
<td>586.1</td>
<td>4,779.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>773.9</td>
<td>649.2</td>
<td>2,501.3</td>
<td>252.5</td>
<td>592.8</td>
<td>4,769.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>765.8</td>
<td>642.7</td>
<td>2,497.0</td>
<td>258.4</td>
<td>599.2</td>
<td>4,763.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>757.7</td>
<td>640.4</td>
<td>2,488.8</td>
<td>261.7</td>
<td>608.3</td>
<td>4,756.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>747.6</td>
<td>629.7</td>
<td>2,480.4</td>
<td>274.7</td>
<td>611.5</td>
<td>4,743.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>739.5</td>
<td>623.1</td>
<td>2,449.9</td>
<td>294.1</td>
<td>617.9</td>
<td>4,724.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>734.7</td>
<td>614.4</td>
<td>2,439.4</td>
<td>297.0</td>
<td>630.5</td>
<td>4,716.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>732.2</td>
<td>602.1</td>
<td>2,419.1</td>
<td>305.3</td>
<td>644.7</td>
<td>4,703.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>732.8</td>
<td>589.1</td>
<td>2,395.1</td>
<td>319.1</td>
<td>659.7</td>
<td>4,695.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) January 1st. The data for 1990 is based on the census. Those for 2000–2011 are estimates based on the 2001 census and demographic data (reference date 2001.02.01.). Those for 2012–2015 are estimates based on the 2011 census (reference day 2011.10.01.) and demographic data.

Source: \textit{KSH STADAT} (2015. 07. 03. version)

Online data source in xls format: \url{http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent02_03}

Table 2.4: Female population by age groups, in thousands\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>0-14</th>
<th>15-24</th>
<th>25-59</th>
<th>55-59</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>years old</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>1,040.1</td>
<td>705.2</td>
<td>2,144.4</td>
<td>327.6</td>
<td>1,172.5</td>
<td>5,389.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>844.3</td>
<td>745.6</td>
<td>2,170.5</td>
<td>334.8</td>
<td>1,261.3</td>
<td>5,356.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>770.2</td>
<td>647.4</td>
<td>2,221.9</td>
<td>341.7</td>
<td>1,323.1</td>
<td>5,304.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>756.8</td>
<td>638.6</td>
<td>2,213.0</td>
<td>356.6</td>
<td>1,327.0</td>
<td>5,292.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>745.1</td>
<td>630.6</td>
<td>2,206.8</td>
<td>369.6</td>
<td>1,335.0</td>
<td>5,287.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>734.9</td>
<td>624.1</td>
<td>2,194.5</td>
<td>373.2</td>
<td>1,349.1</td>
<td>5,275.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>726.8</td>
<td>617.2</td>
<td>2,176.0</td>
<td>381.8</td>
<td>1,366.1</td>
<td>5,267.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>719.2</td>
<td>613.1</td>
<td>2,145.5</td>
<td>396.8</td>
<td>1,382.8</td>
<td>5,257.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>709.6</td>
<td>601.9</td>
<td>2,124.0</td>
<td>404.4</td>
<td>1,401.9</td>
<td>5,241.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>700.8</td>
<td>590.9</td>
<td>2,079.5</td>
<td>416.2</td>
<td>1,419.9</td>
<td>5,207.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>696.2</td>
<td>582.0</td>
<td>2,066.5</td>
<td>411.2</td>
<td>1,436.9</td>
<td>5,192.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>693.6</td>
<td>570.7</td>
<td>2,052.7</td>
<td>395.5</td>
<td>1,461.5</td>
<td>5,174.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>694.4</td>
<td>558.0</td>
<td>2,043.2</td>
<td>370.2</td>
<td>1,494.0</td>
<td>5,159.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) January 1st. The data for 1990 is based on the census. Those for 2000–2011 are estimates based on the 2001 census and demographic data (reference date 2001.02.01.). Those for 2012–2015 are estimates based on the 2011 census (reference day 2011.10.01.) and demographic data.

Source: \textit{KSH STADAT} (2015. 07. 03. version)

Online data source in xls format: \url{http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent02_04}
### Table 3.1: Labour force participation of the population over 14 years, in thousands*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pensioner</td>
<td>Full time</td>
<td>On child care leave</td>
<td>Other inactive</td>
<td>Inactive total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>4,887.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>300.8</td>
<td>370.1</td>
<td>259.0</td>
<td>339.7</td>
<td>1,269.6</td>
<td>6,157.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>4,534.3</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>284.3</td>
<td>548.9</td>
<td>249.7</td>
<td>297.5</td>
<td>1,380.4</td>
<td>5,977.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>4,270.5</td>
<td>253.3</td>
<td>335.6</td>
<td>578.2</td>
<td>259.8</td>
<td>317.1</td>
<td>1,490.7</td>
<td>6,014.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>3,898.4</td>
<td>434.9</td>
<td>392.7</td>
<td>620.0</td>
<td>262.1</td>
<td>435.9</td>
<td>1,710.7</td>
<td>6,044.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>3,689.5</td>
<td>502.6</td>
<td>437.5</td>
<td>683.9</td>
<td>270.5</td>
<td>480.1</td>
<td>1,872.0</td>
<td>6,064.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>3,633.1</td>
<td>437.4</td>
<td>476.5</td>
<td>708.2</td>
<td>280.9</td>
<td>540.7</td>
<td>2,006.4</td>
<td>6,076.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3,571.3</td>
<td>410.0</td>
<td>495.2</td>
<td>723.4</td>
<td>285.3</td>
<td>596.1</td>
<td>2,100.0</td>
<td>6,081.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3,546.1</td>
<td>394.0</td>
<td>512.7</td>
<td>740.0</td>
<td>289.2</td>
<td>599.4</td>
<td>2,141.2</td>
<td>6,081.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3,549.5</td>
<td>342.5</td>
<td>542.9</td>
<td>752.0</td>
<td>289.0</td>
<td>599.9</td>
<td>2,183.8</td>
<td>6,075.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3,608.5</td>
<td>305.5</td>
<td>588.8</td>
<td>697.0</td>
<td>295.5</td>
<td>565.7</td>
<td>2,147.0</td>
<td>6,061.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3,701.0</td>
<td>283.3</td>
<td>534.7</td>
<td>675.6</td>
<td>295.3</td>
<td>549.8</td>
<td>2,055.4</td>
<td>6,039.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3,745.9</td>
<td>261.4</td>
<td>517.9</td>
<td>721.7</td>
<td>281.4</td>
<td>571.4</td>
<td>2,092.4</td>
<td>6,099.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3,742.6</td>
<td>231.7</td>
<td>516.3</td>
<td>717.9</td>
<td>286.6</td>
<td>601.6</td>
<td>2,122.4</td>
<td>6,096.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3,719.6</td>
<td>225.7</td>
<td>507.1</td>
<td>738.3</td>
<td>286.8</td>
<td>593.0</td>
<td>2,125.2</td>
<td>6,080.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3,719.0</td>
<td>239.6</td>
<td>485.0</td>
<td>730.7</td>
<td>286.9</td>
<td>595.0</td>
<td>2,097.6</td>
<td>6,056.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3,663.1</td>
<td>247.2</td>
<td>480.5</td>
<td>739.8</td>
<td>282.4</td>
<td>622.4</td>
<td>2,125.1</td>
<td>6,035.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3,653.9</td>
<td>296.0</td>
<td>449.7</td>
<td>740.8</td>
<td>278.6</td>
<td>590.3</td>
<td>2,059.4</td>
<td>6,009.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,680.1</td>
<td>309.9</td>
<td>416.1</td>
<td>811.4</td>
<td>261.1</td>
<td>524.3</td>
<td>2,012.9</td>
<td>6,002.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3,649.5</td>
<td>303.7</td>
<td>413.2</td>
<td>822.7</td>
<td>273.9</td>
<td>519.7</td>
<td>2,029.5</td>
<td>5,982.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3,596.3</td>
<td>315.5</td>
<td>394.7</td>
<td>814.3</td>
<td>282.2</td>
<td>549.0</td>
<td>2,040.2</td>
<td>5,952.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3,480.9</td>
<td>403.1</td>
<td>360.3</td>
<td>805.7</td>
<td>282.0</td>
<td>578.4</td>
<td>2,026.4</td>
<td>5,910.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,435.8</td>
<td>450.1</td>
<td>336.6</td>
<td>805.4</td>
<td>275.9</td>
<td>558.1</td>
<td>1,976.0</td>
<td>5,861.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3,430.1</td>
<td>440.9</td>
<td>296.4</td>
<td>783.8</td>
<td>280.7</td>
<td>557.9</td>
<td>1,932.0</td>
<td>5,789.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,498.6</td>
<td>447.0</td>
<td>260.1</td>
<td>769.6</td>
<td>263.2</td>
<td>484.3</td>
<td>1,777.2</td>
<td>5,722.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3,551.1</td>
<td>415.7</td>
<td>247.6</td>
<td>737.3</td>
<td>255.4</td>
<td>466.4</td>
<td>1,706.7</td>
<td>5,673.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3,720.7</td>
<td>317.5</td>
<td>222.3</td>
<td>701.2</td>
<td>237.8</td>
<td>412.5</td>
<td>1,573.8</td>
<td>5,612.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3,782.1</td>
<td>281.3</td>
<td>197.3</td>
<td>688.8</td>
<td>240.0</td>
<td>368.1</td>
<td>1,494.2</td>
<td>5,557.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Annual average figures.

Note: Up to the year 1999, weighting is based on the 1990 population census. From 2000 onwards the 2001 population census is used in its original form. After the 2011 Census the post-2000 population weights have been updated using the new census data.

Data on 'employed' includes conscripts and those working while receiving pension or child support. The data on students for 1995–97 are estimates.

'Other inactive' is a residual category calculated by deducting the sum of the figures in the indicated categories from the mid-year population, so it includes the institutional population not observed by MEF. The population weights have been corrected using the 2011 Census data.


Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent03_01](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent03_01)
Table 3.2: Labour force participation of the population over 14 years, males, in thousands*  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Pensioner, other inactive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2,750.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>173.8</td>
<td>196.3</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>469.2</td>
<td>3,219.7</td>
<td>265.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2,524.3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>188.4</td>
<td>284.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>554.1</td>
<td>3,116.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2,351.6</td>
<td>150.3</td>
<td>218.7</td>
<td>296.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>115.0</td>
<td>631.7</td>
<td>3,133.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2,153.1</td>
<td>326.2</td>
<td>252.0</td>
<td>302.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>174.8</td>
<td>730.9</td>
<td>3,147.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2,029.4</td>
<td>311.5</td>
<td>263.2</td>
<td>346.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>203.3</td>
<td>815.4</td>
<td>3,156.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2,013.4</td>
<td>270.0</td>
<td>277.6</td>
<td>357.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>239.6</td>
<td>878.0</td>
<td>3,161.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2,012.5</td>
<td>259.3</td>
<td>282.2</td>
<td>367.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>237.8</td>
<td>892.3</td>
<td>3,164.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2,007.4</td>
<td>242.4</td>
<td>291.9</td>
<td>372.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>248.3</td>
<td>916.3</td>
<td>3,166.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2,018.0</td>
<td>212.2</td>
<td>306.0</td>
<td>377.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>251.6</td>
<td>936.7</td>
<td>3,166.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2,015.5</td>
<td>186.5</td>
<td>345.4</td>
<td>350.4</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>264.2</td>
<td>961.0</td>
<td>3,163.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2,068.4</td>
<td>170.3</td>
<td>312.7</td>
<td>338.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>261.5</td>
<td>917.2</td>
<td>3,155.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,086.0</td>
<td>158.2</td>
<td>315.2</td>
<td>358.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>261.7</td>
<td>939.2</td>
<td>3,183.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,087.6</td>
<td>141.6</td>
<td>311.0</td>
<td>353.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>283.2</td>
<td>951.9</td>
<td>3,181.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,080.4</td>
<td>137.3</td>
<td>307.5</td>
<td>370.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>273.4</td>
<td>956.2</td>
<td>3,173.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,073.5</td>
<td>137.6</td>
<td>293.6</td>
<td>367.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>288.1</td>
<td>953.9</td>
<td>3,165.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,052.7</td>
<td>136.2</td>
<td>293.5</td>
<td>371.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>300.2</td>
<td>969.5</td>
<td>3,158.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,050.7</td>
<td>158.2</td>
<td>278.8</td>
<td>375.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>288.8</td>
<td>948.8</td>
<td>3,157.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,078.4</td>
<td>163.4</td>
<td>258.9</td>
<td>404.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>249.6</td>
<td>916.6</td>
<td>3,158.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,067.4</td>
<td>162.5</td>
<td>261.8</td>
<td>410.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>248.8</td>
<td>924.9</td>
<td>3,154.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,033.6</td>
<td>172.7</td>
<td>261.2</td>
<td>408.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>264.6</td>
<td>938.8</td>
<td>3,145.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,961.9</td>
<td>230.3</td>
<td>240.1</td>
<td>409.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>288.7</td>
<td>942.2</td>
<td>3,134.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,929.5</td>
<td>259.5</td>
<td>228.7</td>
<td>410.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>287.1</td>
<td>930.7</td>
<td>3,119.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,950.9</td>
<td>248.7</td>
<td>203.7</td>
<td>397.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>286.8</td>
<td>892.0</td>
<td>3,091.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,979.2</td>
<td>257.9</td>
<td>187.7</td>
<td>395.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>238.8</td>
<td>826.3</td>
<td>3,063.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,022.2</td>
<td>234.4</td>
<td>169.5</td>
<td>375.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>232.0</td>
<td>780.9</td>
<td>3,037.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2,120.3</td>
<td>173.1</td>
<td>151.3</td>
<td>352.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>200.9</td>
<td>707.7</td>
<td>3,001.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,152.1</td>
<td>152.1</td>
<td>133.7</td>
<td>345.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>181.4</td>
<td>663.3</td>
<td>2,967.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Annual average figures.

Note: Up to the year 1999, weighting is based on the 1990 population census. From 2000 onwards the 2001 population census is used in its original form. After the 2011 Census the post-2000 population weights have been updated using the new census data.

Data on 'employed' includes conscripts and those working while receiving pension or child support. The data on students for 1995–97 are estimates.

'Other inactive' is a residual category calculated by deducting the sum of the figures in the indicated categories from the mid-year population, so it includes the institutional population not observed by MEF. The population weights have been corrected using the 2011 Census data.


Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent03_02
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Pensioner</th>
<th>Full time student</th>
<th>On child care leave</th>
<th>Other inactive</th>
<th>Inactive total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>2,137.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>127.0</td>
<td>173.7</td>
<td>259.0</td>
<td>240.6</td>
<td>800.4</td>
<td>2,937.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2,010.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>264.7</td>
<td>248.5</td>
<td>217.3</td>
<td>826.3</td>
<td>2,860.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>1,918.9</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>116.9</td>
<td>281.8</td>
<td>258.3</td>
<td>201.9</td>
<td>858.9</td>
<td>2,880.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>1,745.3</td>
<td>171.7</td>
<td>140.8</td>
<td>317.6</td>
<td>260.5</td>
<td>261.4</td>
<td>979.9</td>
<td>2,896.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>1,660.4</td>
<td>191.1</td>
<td>174.3</td>
<td>337.0</td>
<td>268.5</td>
<td>276.8</td>
<td>1,056.6</td>
<td>2,908.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>1,619.7</td>
<td>167.4</td>
<td>198.9</td>
<td>351.1</td>
<td>277.2</td>
<td>301.1</td>
<td>1,128.3</td>
<td>2,915.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>1,558.8</td>
<td>150.7</td>
<td>213.0</td>
<td>356.0</td>
<td>280.4</td>
<td>358.3</td>
<td>1,207.2</td>
<td>2,917.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>1,538.7</td>
<td>151.6</td>
<td>220.7</td>
<td>367.2</td>
<td>285.9</td>
<td>351.1</td>
<td>1,224.9</td>
<td>2,915.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>1,531.5</td>
<td>130.3</td>
<td>236.9</td>
<td>374.4</td>
<td>287.5</td>
<td>348.3</td>
<td>1,247.1</td>
<td>2,908.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>1,593.0</td>
<td>119.0</td>
<td>243.4</td>
<td>346.6</td>
<td>294.5</td>
<td>301.5</td>
<td>1,186.0</td>
<td>2,898.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>1,632.6</td>
<td>113.0</td>
<td>222.0</td>
<td>336.8</td>
<td>291.1</td>
<td>288.3</td>
<td>1,138.2</td>
<td>2,883.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1,659.9</td>
<td>103.2</td>
<td>202.7</td>
<td>363.5</td>
<td>277.3</td>
<td>309.7</td>
<td>1,153.2</td>
<td>2,916.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1,655.0</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>205.3</td>
<td>364.5</td>
<td>282.3</td>
<td>318.3</td>
<td>1,170.4</td>
<td>2,915.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,639.2</td>
<td>98.4</td>
<td>199.6</td>
<td>368.0</td>
<td>281.8</td>
<td>319.6</td>
<td>1,169.0</td>
<td>2,906.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,645.6</td>
<td>102.0</td>
<td>191.4</td>
<td>362.8</td>
<td>282.6</td>
<td>306.9</td>
<td>1,143.7</td>
<td>2,891.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,610.2</td>
<td>111.0</td>
<td>186.8</td>
<td>368.6</td>
<td>277.8</td>
<td>322.2</td>
<td>1,155.4</td>
<td>2,876.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,603.2</td>
<td>137.8</td>
<td>170.9</td>
<td>365.4</td>
<td>272.8</td>
<td>301.5</td>
<td>1,110.6</td>
<td>2,851.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,601.7</td>
<td>146.5</td>
<td>157.2</td>
<td>407.3</td>
<td>257.1</td>
<td>274.7</td>
<td>1,096.3</td>
<td>2,844.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,582.1</td>
<td>141.2</td>
<td>151.4</td>
<td>412.5</td>
<td>269.8</td>
<td>270.9</td>
<td>1,104.6</td>
<td>2,827.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,562.7</td>
<td>142.8</td>
<td>133.5</td>
<td>406.0</td>
<td>277.5</td>
<td>284.4</td>
<td>1,101.4</td>
<td>2,806.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,519.0</td>
<td>172.7</td>
<td>120.2</td>
<td>396.7</td>
<td>277.6</td>
<td>289.7</td>
<td>1,084.2</td>
<td>2,775.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,506.3</td>
<td>190.6</td>
<td>107.9</td>
<td>395.1</td>
<td>271.3</td>
<td>271.0</td>
<td>1,045.3</td>
<td>2,742.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,479.2</td>
<td>192.2</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>385.9</td>
<td>277.1</td>
<td>271.1</td>
<td>1,040.0</td>
<td>2,698.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,519.4</td>
<td>189.1</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>374.0</td>
<td>259.0</td>
<td>245.5</td>
<td>950.9</td>
<td>2,659.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1,528.9</td>
<td>181.3</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>361.7</td>
<td>251.6</td>
<td>234.4</td>
<td>925.8</td>
<td>2,636.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>1,600.4</td>
<td>144.4</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>348.7</td>
<td>234.8</td>
<td>211.6</td>
<td>866.1</td>
<td>2,610.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>1,630.0</td>
<td>129.2</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>343.7</td>
<td>236.9</td>
<td>186.7</td>
<td>830.9</td>
<td>2,590.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Annual average figures.

Note: Up to the year 1999, weighting is based on the 1990 population census. From 2000 onwards the 2001 population census is used in its original form. After the 2011 Census the post-2000 population weights have been updated using the new census data.

Data on ‘employed’ includes conscripts and those working while receiving pension or child care leave. The data on students for 1995–97 are estimates.

Other inactive is a residual category calculated by deducting the sum of the figures in the indicated categories from the mid-year population, so it includes the institutional population not observed by MEF. The population weights have been corrected using the 2011 Census data.


Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent03_03](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent03_03)
### Table 3.4: Labour force participation of the population over 14 years, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Pensioner</th>
<th>Full time student</th>
<th>On child care leave</th>
<th>Other inactive</th>
<th>Inactive total</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>79.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent03_04](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent03_04)

### Figure 3.1: Labour force participation of population for males 15–59 and females 15–54, total


Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2013ena03_01](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2013ena03_01)
Table 3.5: Labour force participation of the population over 14 years, males, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population of males 15–59</th>
<th>Population of males 60 and above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pensioner</td>
<td>Full time student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>72.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent03_05

Figure 3.2: Labour force participation of population for males 15–59


Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena03_02
### Table 3.6: Labour force participation of the population over 14 years, females, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Pensioner</th>
<th>Full time student</th>
<th>On child care leave</th>
<th>Other inactive</th>
<th>Inactive total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>Unemployed</th>
<th>Pensioner, other inactive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>72.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>85.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>55.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>85.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>84.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>58.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent03_06](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent03_06)

---


Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena03_03](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena03_03)
Table 3.7: Population aged 15–64 by labour market status (self-categorised), in thousands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In work</td>
<td>3,834.4</td>
<td>3,852.2</td>
<td>3,862.5</td>
<td>3,831.6</td>
<td>3,769.3</td>
<td>3,681.5</td>
<td>3,660.3</td>
<td>3,690.1</td>
<td>3,748.4</td>
<td>3,824.5</td>
<td>4,039.5</td>
<td>4,159.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>451.0</td>
<td>488.2</td>
<td>470.4</td>
<td>450.2</td>
<td>476.7</td>
<td>591.3</td>
<td>670.7</td>
<td>675.8</td>
<td>700.4</td>
<td>666.5</td>
<td>538.8</td>
<td>454.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students, pupils</td>
<td>783.8</td>
<td>792.0</td>
<td>846.3</td>
<td>861.1</td>
<td>863.7</td>
<td>854.8</td>
<td>854.6</td>
<td>842.2</td>
<td>811.2</td>
<td>772.5</td>
<td>733.5</td>
<td>710.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioner</td>
<td>800.3</td>
<td>755.6</td>
<td>622.9</td>
<td>592.2</td>
<td>635.6</td>
<td>627.6</td>
<td>599.3</td>
<td>582.0</td>
<td>630.3</td>
<td>613.6</td>
<td>557.5</td>
<td>477.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>370.4</td>
<td>359.7</td>
<td>506.8</td>
<td>554.4</td>
<td>525.8</td>
<td>498.9</td>
<td>488.4</td>
<td>455.1</td>
<td>356.7</td>
<td>337.7</td>
<td>317.7</td>
<td>318.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On child care leave</td>
<td>274.7</td>
<td>272.4</td>
<td>275.5</td>
<td>286.2</td>
<td>295.0</td>
<td>293.0</td>
<td>289.3</td>
<td>290.2</td>
<td>265.0</td>
<td>259.1</td>
<td>237.0</td>
<td>236.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>134.6</td>
<td>115.2</td>
<td>111.9</td>
<td>104.0</td>
<td>101.9</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>104.3</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>91.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of work for other reasons</td>
<td>178.4</td>
<td>160.0</td>
<td>107.7</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>101.7</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>81.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,826.3</td>
<td>6,814.7</td>
<td>6,807.3</td>
<td>6,789.4</td>
<td>6,771.6</td>
<td>6,753.8</td>
<td>6,736.0</td>
<td>6,718.5</td>
<td>6,694.1</td>
<td>6,646.8</td>
<td>6,587.7</td>
<td>6,530.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Males</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In work</td>
<td>2,082.8</td>
<td>2,088.3</td>
<td>2,106.3</td>
<td>2,095.3</td>
<td>2,056.8</td>
<td>1,993.3</td>
<td>1,958.0</td>
<td>1,985.4</td>
<td>2,009.3</td>
<td>2,065.1</td>
<td>2,186.4</td>
<td>2,256.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>247.7</td>
<td>265.2</td>
<td>251.6</td>
<td>242.0</td>
<td>255.8</td>
<td>333.6</td>
<td>375.6</td>
<td>372.2</td>
<td>382.9</td>
<td>364.4</td>
<td>283.7</td>
<td>241.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students, pupils</td>
<td>391.1</td>
<td>398.5</td>
<td>418.3</td>
<td>428.4</td>
<td>431.7</td>
<td>430.6</td>
<td>432.7</td>
<td>427.2</td>
<td>416.1</td>
<td>393.4</td>
<td>366.9</td>
<td>354.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioner</td>
<td>322.5</td>
<td>304.5</td>
<td>234.9</td>
<td>217.4</td>
<td>243.4</td>
<td>246.2</td>
<td>245.6</td>
<td>243.7</td>
<td>254.9</td>
<td>236.7</td>
<td>209.7</td>
<td>167.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>184.5</td>
<td>178.7</td>
<td>243.0</td>
<td>269.4</td>
<td>257.9</td>
<td>238.2</td>
<td>234.6</td>
<td>215.7</td>
<td>177.1</td>
<td>161.6</td>
<td>152.5</td>
<td>152.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On child care leave</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of work for other reasons</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>80.1</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,329.1</td>
<td>3,328.4</td>
<td>3,320.2</td>
<td>3,314.9</td>
<td>3,309.6</td>
<td>3,304.2</td>
<td>3,298.9</td>
<td>3,294.4</td>
<td>3,292.2</td>
<td>3,272.1</td>
<td>3,246.7</td>
<td>3,222.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Females</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In work</td>
<td>1,751.6</td>
<td>1,763.9</td>
<td>1,756.3</td>
<td>1,736.3</td>
<td>1,712.4</td>
<td>1,688.2</td>
<td>1,702.2</td>
<td>1,704.7</td>
<td>1,739.1</td>
<td>1,759.4</td>
<td>1,853.1</td>
<td>1,903.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>203.3</td>
<td>223.0</td>
<td>218.8</td>
<td>208.3</td>
<td>220.9</td>
<td>257.6</td>
<td>295.1</td>
<td>303.6</td>
<td>317.5</td>
<td>302.1</td>
<td>255.0</td>
<td>213.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students, pupils</td>
<td>392.7</td>
<td>393.5</td>
<td>428.0</td>
<td>432.7</td>
<td>432.0</td>
<td>424.2</td>
<td>421.9</td>
<td>415.0</td>
<td>395.1</td>
<td>379.0</td>
<td>366.6</td>
<td>356.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioner</td>
<td>477.8</td>
<td>451.1</td>
<td>388.0</td>
<td>374.8</td>
<td>392.2</td>
<td>381.4</td>
<td>353.7</td>
<td>338.2</td>
<td>375.4</td>
<td>376.9</td>
<td>347.8</td>
<td>310.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>185.9</td>
<td>181.0</td>
<td>263.9</td>
<td>285.0</td>
<td>267.9</td>
<td>260.7</td>
<td>253.8</td>
<td>239.5</td>
<td>179.6</td>
<td>174.1</td>
<td>165.2</td>
<td>166.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On child care leave</td>
<td>269.8</td>
<td>266.3</td>
<td>269.9</td>
<td>261.9</td>
<td>289.4</td>
<td>287.3</td>
<td>282.6</td>
<td>285.7</td>
<td>260.9</td>
<td>255.0</td>
<td>233.8</td>
<td>233.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>127.3</td>
<td>127.6</td>
<td>109.7</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>97.2</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>82.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of work for other reasons</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>42.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,497.2</td>
<td>3,486.3</td>
<td>3,487.1</td>
<td>3,474.5</td>
<td>3,462.1</td>
<td>3,449.6</td>
<td>3,437.1</td>
<td>3,424.1</td>
<td>3,401.9</td>
<td>3,374.7</td>
<td>3,341.1</td>
<td>3,307.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KSH MEF.
Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent03_07](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent03_07)
Table 3.8: Population aged 15–64 by labour market status (self-categorised), per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In work</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students, pupils</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioner</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On child care leave</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of work for other reasons</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Males

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In work</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students, pupils</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioner</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On child care leave</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of work for other reasons</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In work</td>
<td>50.1</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students, pupils</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioner</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disabled</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On child care leave</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out of work for other reasons</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KSH MEF.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent03_08
### Table 4.1: Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>In thousands</th>
<th>1992 = 100</th>
<th>Annual changes</th>
<th>Employment ratio&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>5,458.2</td>
<td>133.7</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>65.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>4,880.0</td>
<td>119.5</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>59.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>4,520.0</td>
<td>110.7</td>
<td>-7.4</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>4,082.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-9.7</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>3,827.0</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>-6.2</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>3,751.5</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>-2.0</td>
<td>44.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>3,678.8</td>
<td>90.1</td>
<td>-1.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>3,648.2</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>3,646.4</td>
<td>89.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>3,697.8</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>3,811.4</td>
<td>93.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3,849.1</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3,883.3</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3,883.7</td>
<td>95.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>45.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3,921.9</td>
<td>96.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3,900.4</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>45.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3,901.5</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,928.4</td>
<td>96.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3,902.0</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3,848.3</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>-1.4</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3,747.8</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>-2.6</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,732.4</td>
<td>91.4</td>
<td>-0.4</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3,759.0</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,827.2</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>45.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3,892.8</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>4,100.9</td>
<td>100.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>48.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4,210.5</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Per cent of the population over 14 years of age.


Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_01](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_01)

### Figure 4.1: Employed

![Employed](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena04_01)


Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena04_01](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena04_01)
Table 4.2: Employment by gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Share of females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In thousands</td>
<td>1992 = 100</td>
<td>In thousands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>3,015.8</td>
<td>136.0</td>
<td>2,442.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>2,648.0</td>
<td>119.4</td>
<td>2,232.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>2,442.0</td>
<td>110.1</td>
<td>2,078.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>2,218.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>1,864.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>2,077.0</td>
<td>93.6</td>
<td>1,750.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>2,055.0</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>1,696.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>2,049.6</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>1,629.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>2,036.3</td>
<td>91.8</td>
<td>1,611.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>2,043.5</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>1,602.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>2,041.7</td>
<td>92.0</td>
<td>1,656.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>2,103.1</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>1,708.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2,122.4</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>1,726.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,128.7</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>1,754.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,125.6</td>
<td>95.8</td>
<td>1,758.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2,126.5</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>1,795.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2,117.3</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>1,783.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,116.1</td>
<td>95.4</td>
<td>1,785.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2,138.6</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>1,789.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2,129.3</td>
<td>96.0</td>
<td>1,772.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>2,093.6</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>1,754.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2,025.1</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>1,722.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,992.5</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>1,739.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2,021.0</td>
<td>91.1</td>
<td>1,738.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2,048.8</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>1,778.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2,103.7</td>
<td>94.8</td>
<td>1,789.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>2,220.5</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>1,880.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2,283.5</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>1,927.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_02

Figure 4.2: Employment by gender

Source: 1990–91: KSH MEM, 1992–: KSH MEF.
Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena04_02
### Table 4.3: Composition of the employed by age groups, males, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>15–19</th>
<th>20–24</th>
<th>25–49</th>
<th>50–54</th>
<th>55–59</th>
<th>60+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>68.9</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1990: Census based estimates. 2000–: KSH MEF.  
Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_03](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_03)

### Table 4.4: Composition of the employed by age groups, females, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>15–19</th>
<th>20–24</th>
<th>25–49</th>
<th>50–54</th>
<th>55+</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>69.1</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 1990: Census based estimates. 2000–: KSH MEF.  
Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_04](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_04)
### Table 4.5: Composition of the employed by level of education, males, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>8 grades of primary school or less</th>
<th>Vocational school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>College, university</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Since 1999, slight changes have occurred in the categorisation system by highest education level.
Source: 1990: Census based estimates. 2000–: KSH MEF.
Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_05](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_05)

### Table 4.6: Composition of the employed by level of education, females, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>8 grades of primary school or less</th>
<th>Vocational school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>College, university</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Since 1999, slight changes have occurred in the categorisation system by highest education level.
Source: 1990: Census based estimates. 2000–: KSH MEF.
Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_06](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_06)
Table 4.7: Employed by employment status, in thousands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Member of cooperatives</th>
<th>Member of other partnerships</th>
<th>Self-employed and assisting family members</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3,255.5</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>129.4</td>
<td>407.1</td>
<td>3,829.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3,313.6</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>118.9</td>
<td>404.4</td>
<td>3,868.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3,337.2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>109.9</td>
<td>401.0</td>
<td>3,870.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3,399.2</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>114.7</td>
<td>399.4</td>
<td>3,921.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3,347.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>136.6</td>
<td>407.8</td>
<td>3,900.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3,367.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>146.7</td>
<td>381.7</td>
<td>3,901.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,428.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>366.7</td>
<td>3,928.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3,415.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>123.9</td>
<td>357.9</td>
<td>3,902.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3,378.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>120.9</td>
<td>346.4</td>
<td>3,848.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3,274.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>131.7</td>
<td>338.7</td>
<td>3,747.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3,272.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>137.6</td>
<td>319.3</td>
<td>3,732.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3,302.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>133.3</td>
<td>321.2</td>
<td>3,759.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3,378.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>144.3</td>
<td>302.5</td>
<td>3,827.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>3,453.9</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>156.6</td>
<td>279.0</td>
<td>3,892.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3,652.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>157.3</td>
<td>288.0</td>
<td>4,100.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3,753.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>150.3</td>
<td>304.7</td>
<td>4,210.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Conscripts are excluded. The participants of winter-time training programs within the Public Works Program are accounted as employees.
Source: KSH MEF.
Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_07](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_07)

Table 4.8: Composition of the employed persons by employment status, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Employees</th>
<th>Member of cooperatives</th>
<th>Member of other partnerships</th>
<th>Self-employed and assisting family members</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>85.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>86.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>86.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>87.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>88.3</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>89.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Conscripts are excluded.
Source: KSH MEF.
Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_08](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_08)
Table 4.9: Composition of employed persons by sector*, by gender, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and fishing</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and quarrying</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and storage</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food service activities</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and communication</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and insurance activities</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate activities</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific and technical activities</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and support service activities</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration and defence; compulsory social security</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human health and social work activities</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment and recreation</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* By TEÁOR’08.
Source: KSH MEF.
Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_09](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_09)

Table 4.10: Employed in their present job for 0–6 months, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: MEF, IV. quarterly waves.
Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_10](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_10)
Table 4.11: Distribution of employees in the competitive sector\textsuperscript{a} by firm size, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Less than 20</th>
<th>20-49</th>
<th>50-249</th>
<th>250-999</th>
<th>1000 and more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>22.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>27.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>23.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>24.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>25.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>24.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Firms employing 5 or more workers.
Source: \textit{NFSZ BT}.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_11

Table 4.12: Employees of the competitive sector\textsuperscript{a} by the share of foreign ownership, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>100%</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>71.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Firms employing 5 or more workers.
Source: \textit{NFSZ BT}.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_12

Figure 4.3: Employees of the corporate sector by firm size and by the share of foreign ownership

Source: \textit{NFSZ BT}.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena04_03
### Table 4.13: Employment rate of population aged 15–74 by age group, males, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>15–19</th>
<th>20–24</th>
<th>25–49</th>
<th>50–54</th>
<th>55–59</th>
<th>60–64</th>
<th>65–74</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>80.9</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>49.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>81.6</td>
<td>68.2</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>81.9</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>57.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td>82.5</td>
<td>70.1</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>83.4</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>81.0</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>81.5</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>57.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>82.6</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>86.6</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *KSH MEF.*


### Table 4.14: Employment rate of population aged 15–74 by age group, females, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>15–19</th>
<th>20–24</th>
<th>25–49</th>
<th>50–54</th>
<th>55–59</th>
<th>60–64</th>
<th>65–74</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>42.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>43.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>44.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>43.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>46.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>43.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>43.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>45.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>48.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *KSH MEF.*

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_14](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_14)
Table 4.15: Employment rate of population aged 15–64 by level of education, males, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>8 grades of primary school or less</th>
<th>Vocational school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>College, university</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>76.8</td>
<td>68.3</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>77.4</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>85.8</td>
<td>62.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>75.7</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>86.9</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>85.6</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>84.3</td>
<td>62.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>64.2</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>59.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>60.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>84.4</td>
<td>61.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>85.3</td>
<td>63.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>71.2</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>67.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>73.2</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>70.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KSH MEF.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_15](http://www.b pdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_15)

Figure 4.4: Activity rate by age groups, males aged 15-64, quarterly

Source: KSH MEF.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena04_04](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena04_04)
Table 4.16: Employment rate of population aged 15–64 by level of education, females, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>8 grades of primary school or less</th>
<th>Vocational school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>College, university</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>76.9</td>
<td>47.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>60.8</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>49.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>58.1</td>
<td>78.1</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>51.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>50.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>50.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>74.3</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>56.6</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>52.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>60.4</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>28.7</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: KSH MEF.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent04_16

Figure 4.5: Activity rate by age groups, females aged 15-64, quarterly

Source: KSH MEF.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena04_05
### Table 5.1: Unemployment rate by gender and share of long term unemployed, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Share of long term unemployed*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>43.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>54.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>48.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>49.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>46.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>45.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>46.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>46.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>48.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>50.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>49.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>50.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Long term unemployed are those who have been without work for 12 months or more, excluding those who start a new job within 90 days.

Note: Conscripted soldiers are included in the denominator.

Source: KSH MEF.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_01](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_01)

---

### Figure 5.1: Unemployment rates by gender

![Unemployment rates by gender](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena05_01)

Source: KSH MEF.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena05_01](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena05_01)
**Table 5.2: Unemployment rate by level of education, males, per cent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>8 grades of primary school or less</th>
<th>Vocational school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>College, university</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *KSH MEF.*

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_02](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_02)

**Table 5.3: Composition of the unemployed by level of education, males, per cent**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>8 grades of primary school or less</th>
<th>Vocational school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>College, university</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>34.0</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *KSH MEF.*

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_03](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_03)
Table 5.4: Unemployment rate by level of education, females, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>8 grades of primary school or less</th>
<th>Vocational school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>College, university</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *KSH MEF.*

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_04](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_04)

Table 5.5: Composition of the unemployed by level of education, females, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>8 grades of primary school or less</th>
<th>Vocational school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>College, university</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>34.2</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *KSH MEF.*

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_05](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_05)
Figure 5.2: Intensity of quarterly flows between labour market status, population between 15–64 years

Note: The calculations were carried out for the age group between 15-64 based on KSH labour force survey microdata. The probability of transition is given by the number of people who transitioned from one status to the other in the quarter, divided by the initial size of the group in the previous quarter, which were then corrected to preserve the consistency of stock flows. The red curves show the trend smoothed using a 4th degree polynomial.

Source: KSH MEF.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena05_02
Table 5.6: The number of unemployed\(^a\) by duration of job search, in thousands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>1-4</th>
<th>5-14</th>
<th>15-26</th>
<th>27-51</th>
<th>52</th>
<th>53-78</th>
<th>79-104</th>
<th>105-124</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>[&lt;1]</td>
<td>[1-3]</td>
<td>[4-6]</td>
<td>[7-11]</td>
<td>[12]</td>
<td>[13-18]</td>
<td>[19-24]</td>
<td>[24+]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>96.4</td>
<td>110.7</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>432.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>74.8</td>
<td>87.9</td>
<td>120.5</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>492.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>429.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>93.2</td>
<td>404.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>388.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>328.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>44.5</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>293.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>284.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>261.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>231.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>237.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>241.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>250.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>295.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>310.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>304.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>317.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>410.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>74.7</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>93.7</td>
<td>462.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>70.7</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>103.7</td>
<td>458.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>100.9</td>
<td>466.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>97.1</td>
<td>430.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>82.7</td>
<td>335.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>298.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Not including those unemployed who will find a new job within 30 days; since 2003: within 90 days.

Source: *KSH MEF*.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_06](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_06)
Figure 5.3: Unemployment rate by age groups, males aged 15-59, quarterly

Source: KSH MEF.
Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena05_03

Figure 5.4: Unemployment rate by age groups, females aged 15-59, quarterly

Source: KSH MEF.
Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena05_04
### Table 5.7: Registered unemployed\(^a\) and LFS unemployment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Registered unemployed</th>
<th>LFS unemployed, total</th>
<th>LFS unemployed, age 15-24</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In thousands</td>
<td>In thousands</td>
<td>In thousands</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>507.7</td>
<td>416.5</td>
<td>114.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>500.6</td>
<td>400.1</td>
<td>106.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>470.1</td>
<td>348.8</td>
<td>95.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>423.1</td>
<td>313.0</td>
<td>87.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>409.5</td>
<td>284.7</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>390.5</td>
<td>262.5</td>
<td>70.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>364.1</td>
<td>232.9</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>344.7</td>
<td>238.8</td>
<td>56.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>357.2</td>
<td>244.5</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>375.9</td>
<td>252.9</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>409.9</td>
<td>303.9</td>
<td>66.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>393.5</td>
<td>318.2</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>426.9</td>
<td>312.1</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>442.3</td>
<td>326.3</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>561.8</td>
<td>417.8</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>582.7</td>
<td>469.4</td>
<td>78.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>582.9</td>
<td>466.0</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>599.1</td>
<td>473.2</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>527.6</td>
<td>441.0</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>422.4</td>
<td>343.3</td>
<td>67.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>378.2</td>
<td>307.8</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Since 1st of November, 2005: database of registered jobseekers. From the 1st of November, 2005 the Employment Act changed the definition of registered unemployed to registered jobseekers.

Note: The denominator of registered unemployment/jobseekers’ rate in the economically active population on 1st January the previous year.

Source: Registered unemployment/jobseekers: NFSZ; LFS unemployment: KSH MEF.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_07](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_07)

### Figure 5.5: Registered and LFS unemployment rates

Note: Since 1st of November, 2005: database of registered jobseekers.

Source: Registered unemployment/jobseekers: NFSZ; LFS unemployment: KSH MEF.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena05_05](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena05_05)
Table 5.8: Composition of the registered unemployed\textsuperscript{a} by educational attainment, yearly averages, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 grades of primary school or less</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>42.0</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational school</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational secondary school</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar school</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Since 1st of November, 2005: registered jobseekers. From the 1st of November, 2005 the Employment Act changed the definition of registered unemployed to registered jobseekers.

Source: NFSZ.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_08

Table 5.9: The distribution of registered unemployed school-leavers\textsuperscript{a} by educational attainment, yearly averages, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 grades of primary school or less</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>37.7</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>43.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational school</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>16.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational secondary school</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar school</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Since 1st of November, 2005: registered school-leaver jobseekers. From the 1st of November, 2005 the Employment Act changed the definition of registered unemployed to registered jobseekers.

Source: NFSZ.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_09
Table 5.10: Registered unemployed by economic activity as observed in the LFS, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>LFS-unemployed</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Employed</th>
<th>LFS-unemployed</th>
<th>Inactive</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>33.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>34.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The data pertain to those who consider themselves registered jobseekers in the KSH MEF. Those who reported that their last contact with the employment centre was more than two months ago were filtered from among those who reported themselves as registered unemployed.

Source: KSH MEF.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_10

Table 5.11: Monthly entrants to the unemployment register*, monthly averages, in thousands

|--------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|      |
| First time entrants | 11.2 | 11.2 | 10.4 | 10.0 | 10.5 | 10.8 | 8.6  | 8.0  | 7.1  | 8.3  | 7.2  | 6.6  | 7.5  | 7.3  | 6.3  | 5.5  |
| Previously registered| 42.9 | 45.8 | 45.6 | 44.8 | 47.3 | 50.0 | 42.2 | 43.4 | 46.9 | 60.7 | 58.1 | 64.3 | 62.0 | 58.2 | 63.1 | 52.1 |
| Together          | 54.1 | 57.0 | 56.0 | 54.8 | 57.8 | 60.7 | 50.8 | 51.4 | 54.0 | 69.0 | 65.3 | 70.9 | 69.5 | 65.5 | 69.4 | 57.6 |

* Since 1st of November, 2005: database of jobseekers. From the 1st of November, 2005 the Employment Act changed the definition of registered unemployed to registered jobseekers.

Source: NFSZ REG.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_11

Figure 5.6: Entrants to the unemployment register, monthly averages, in thousands

Source: NFSZ REG.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena05_06
Table 5.12: Selected time series of registered unemployment, monthly averages, in thousands and per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered unemployment</td>
<td>390.5</td>
<td>364.1</td>
<td>344.7</td>
<td>357.2</td>
<td>375.9</td>
<td>409.9</td>
<td>393.5</td>
<td>426.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which: School-leavers</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>33.8</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>40.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non school-leavers</td>
<td>364.4</td>
<td>337.4</td>
<td>316.2</td>
<td>325.9</td>
<td>342.2</td>
<td>369.1</td>
<td>354.7</td>
<td>386.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>209.7</td>
<td>196.4</td>
<td>184.6</td>
<td>188.0</td>
<td>193.3</td>
<td>210.4</td>
<td>200.9</td>
<td>219.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>180.8</td>
<td>167.7</td>
<td>160.1</td>
<td>169.2</td>
<td>182.6</td>
<td>195.5</td>
<td>192.5</td>
<td>207.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 years old and younger</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td>75.6</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>80.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual workers</td>
<td>321.2</td>
<td>302.0</td>
<td>286.3</td>
<td>296.2</td>
<td>308.5</td>
<td>336.2</td>
<td>321.9</td>
<td>319.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non manual workers</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>62.1</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment benefit recipients</td>
<td>131.7</td>
<td>119.2</td>
<td>114.9</td>
<td>120.0</td>
<td>124.0</td>
<td>134.4</td>
<td>151.5</td>
<td>134.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment assistance recipients</td>
<td>143.5</td>
<td>131.2</td>
<td>113.4</td>
<td>116.2</td>
<td>120.4</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>121.8</td>
<td>133.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares within registered unemployed, %</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-leavers</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>18.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 years old and younger</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>82.1</td>
<td>82.0</td>
<td>81.8</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual workers</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outflow from the Register</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>48.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which: school-leavers</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered unemployment</td>
<td>442.3</td>
<td>561.8</td>
<td>582.7</td>
<td>582.9</td>
<td>559.1</td>
<td>527.6</td>
<td>422.4</td>
<td>378.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which: school-leavers</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non school-leavers</td>
<td>400.9</td>
<td>512.5</td>
<td>530.1</td>
<td>529.9</td>
<td>497.6</td>
<td>461.6</td>
<td>367.8</td>
<td>331.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>228.3</td>
<td>297.9</td>
<td>305.0</td>
<td>297.1</td>
<td>275.8</td>
<td>267.7</td>
<td>214.2</td>
<td>187.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>214.0</td>
<td>263.9</td>
<td>277.7</td>
<td>285.8</td>
<td>283.3</td>
<td>259.9</td>
<td>208.2</td>
<td>190.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 years old and younger</td>
<td>75.9</td>
<td>104.3</td>
<td>102.8</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>101.1</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual workers</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non manual workers</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment benefit recipients</td>
<td>136.5</td>
<td>202.1</td>
<td>187.7</td>
<td>159.9</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment assistance recipients</td>
<td>147.5</td>
<td>156.0</td>
<td>167.8</td>
<td>182.1</td>
<td>200.3</td>
<td>184.4</td>
<td>132.4</td>
<td>126.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares within registered unemployed, %</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School-leavers</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>49.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 years old and younger</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual workers</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flows, in thousands</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>65.3</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>69.4</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflow to the Register</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which: school-leavers</td>
<td>51.3</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>62.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outflow from the Register</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\* Since 1st of November, 2005: registered jobseekers. (The data concern the closing date of each month.) From the 1st of November, 2005 the Employment Act changed the definition of registered unemployed to registered jobseekers.
Since 1st of November, 2005: jobseeker benefit recipients. From September 1st, 2011, the system of jobseeking support changed.

Only recipients who are in the NFSZ register. Those receiving the discontinued income support supplement were included in the number of those receiving income support supplement up to the year 2004, and in the number of those receiving regular social assistance from 2005 to 2008. From 2009, those receiving social assistance were included in a new support type, the on call support. This allowance was replaced by the wage replacement support from January 1, 2011, then from September 1, 2011, the name was changed to employment substitution support.

Relative index: registered unemployment rate in the economically active population. From 1st of November, 2005, registered jobseekers' rate in the economically active population.

The new IT system introduced at the NFSZ in 2008 made the methodological changes possible:
1) The filtering out of those returning after, or starting a break from, the number of those entering or leaving the different types of jobseeking support. The main reasons for a break are, - work for short time periods, receipt of child support (GYES) or TGYÁS, or involvement in training.
2) Taking into account in the previous period the number of those entrants, for whom the first accounting of the jobseeking support was delayed due to missing documentation.

2008 data, comparable to 2009: 141.5 thousand people.
Source: NFSZ REG.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_12

Table 5.13: The number of registered unemployed\(^a\) who became employed on subsidised and non-subsidised employment\(^b\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>Persons</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidised employment</td>
<td>170,464</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>198,974</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>282,673</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>261,631</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>359,962</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>351,550</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>278,875</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-subsidised employment</td>
<td>255,356</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>317,622</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>299,716</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>261,581</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>237,795</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>204,887</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>177,960</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>425,820</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>516,596</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>582,389</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>523,212</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>597,757</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>556,437</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>456,835</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Since 1st of November, 2005: registered jobseekers. From the 1st of November, 2005 the Employment Act changed the definition of registered unemployed to registered jobseekers.
\(^b\) Annual totals, the number of jobseekers over the year who were placed in work. It reflects the placements at the time of their exit from the registry.
Source: NFSZ.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_13
Table 5.14: Benefit recipients and participation in active labour market programmes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Unemployment benefit</th>
<th>Regular social assistance</th>
<th>UA for school-leavers</th>
<th>Do not receive provision</th>
<th>Public work</th>
<th>Retraining</th>
<th>Wage subsidy</th>
<th>Other programmes</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In thousands</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>In thousands</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>In thousands</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td>In thousands</td>
<td>Per cent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>214.8</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>118.4</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>111.8</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>107.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>107.6</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>109.5</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>105.1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>117.0</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>118.4</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>117.7</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>112.9</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>128.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>133.1</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>120.7d</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>127.8</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>102.8</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>151.9</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>159.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>163.5</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>122.8</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>168.2</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>202.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>185.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>156.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>192.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>169.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>123.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>110.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>125.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Since 1st of November, 2005: jobseeker benefit recipients. From September 1, 2011, the system of jobseeking support changed.

b Only recipients who are in the NFSZ register. Those receiving the discontinued income support supplement were included in the number of those receiving income support supplement up to the year 2004, and in the number of those receiving regular social assistance from 2005 to 2008. From 2009, those receiving social assistance were included in a new support type, the on call support. This allowance was replaced by the wage replacement support from January 1, 2011, then from September 1, 2011., the name was changed to employment substitution support.

c Up to the year 2008 the number financed from the MPA Decentralized Base, since 2009 the number financed from MPA, TAMOP.

Public-type employment: community service, public service, public work programmes.
Wage subsidy: wage subsidy, wage-cost subsidy, work experience acquisition assistance to career-starters, support for employment of availability allowance recipients, part-time employment, wage support for those losing their job due to the crisis.
Other support: job preservation support, support to would-be entrepreneurs, contribution to costs related to commuting to work, job creation support, jobseeker’s clubs.

The new IT system introduced at the NFSZ in 2008 made the methodological changes possible:

1) The filtering out of those returning after a break or starting a break from the number of those entering or leaving the different types of jobseeking support. The main reasons for a break are work for short time periods, receipt of child support (GYES) or TGYÁS, or involvement in training.

2) Taking into account in the previous period the number of those entrants, for whom the first accounting of the jobseeking support was delayed due to missing documentation.

2008 data, comparable to 2009: 134.1 thousand people.

In 2013, 18.1 thousand trainees were simultaneously involved in public works programmes.

Note: The closing numbers from October of each year. For the percentage data, the sum of those registered and those taking part in labour market programmes ≈100.0.

Source: NFSZ.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_14

Table 5.15: The ratio of those who are employed among the former participants of ALMPs\(^a\), per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Active labour market programmes</th>
<th>2000(^b)</th>
<th>2001(^b)</th>
<th>2002(^b)</th>
<th>2003(^b)</th>
<th>2004(^b)</th>
<th>2005(^b)</th>
<th>2006(^b)</th>
<th>2007(^b)</th>
<th>2008(^b)</th>
<th>2009(^c)</th>
<th>2010(^c)</th>
<th>2011(^c)</th>
<th>2012(^c)</th>
<th>2013(^c)</th>
<th>2014(^c)</th>
<th>2015(^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suggested training programmes(^d)</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>42.6</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>54.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepted training programmes(^e)</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>50.9</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>58.8</td>
<td>63.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retraining of those who are employed(^f)</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>90.4</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>92.3</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>87.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support for self-employment(^g)</td>
<td>89.4</td>
<td>89.2</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>87.6</td>
<td>83.6</td>
<td>73.1</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>76.3</td>
<td>81.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wage subsidy programmes(^h)</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>62.6</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>90.9</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>70.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience programmes(^i)</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>66.6</td>
<td>66.3</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further employment programme(^j)</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>78.4</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>70.9</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>77.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) The data relate to people having completed their courses successfully.
\(^b\) Three months after the end of programmes.
\(^c\) Six months after the end of programmes.
\(^d\) Suggested training: group training programmes for jobseekers organized by the NFSZ.
\(^e\) Accepted training: participation in programmes initiated by the jobseekers and accepted by NFSZ for full or partial support.
\(^f\) Training for employed persons: training for those whose jobs are at risk of termination, if new knowledge allows them to adapt to the new needs of the employer.
\(^g\) Support to help entrepreneurship: support of jobseekers in the amount of the monthly minimum wage or maximum HUF 3 million lump sum support (to be repaid or not), aimed at helping them become individual entrepreneurs or self-employed.
\(^h\) Wage support: aimed at helping the employment of disadvantaged persons, who would not be able to, or would have a harder time finding work without support. The data on wage subsidies and labour cost subsidies exclude the programs supporting job seeking school leavers and student work during summer vacation.
\(^i\) Work experience-gaining support: the support of new entrants with no work experience for 6-9 months, the amount of the support is equal to 50-80% of the wage costs. The instrument was discontinued after December 31, 2006. In 2009 they reintroduced the work experience gaining support for skilled new entrants, for employers who ensure employment of at least 4 hours a day and for 365 days. The amount of the support is 50-100% of the wage cost. Monitoring for the first exits is available from 2011. The program supporting the school to work transition of skilled school leavers was abolished in 2014.
\(^j\) Further employment programmes: to support the continued employment of new entrants under the age of 25 for 9 months. Discontinued from December 31, 2006.

Source: NFSZ.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_15
Table 5.16: Distribution of registered unemployed\textsuperscript{a}, unemployment benefit recipients\textsuperscript{b} and unemployment assistance recipients\textsuperscript{c} by educational attainment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Registered unemployed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 grades of primary school or less</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational school</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational secondary school</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar school</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment benefit recipients\textsuperscript{d}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 grades of primary school or less</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>24.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational school</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>37.4</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>33.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational secondary school</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar school</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment assistance recipients\textsuperscript{c}</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 grades of primary school or less</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>56.4</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational school</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational secondary school</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar school</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Since 1st of November, 2005: registered jobseekers. From the 1st of November, 2005 the Employment Act changed the definition of registered unemployed to registered jobseekers.

\textsuperscript{b} Since 1st of November, 2005: those receiving jobseeking support. From the 1st of September 2011, the system of jobseeking support changed.

\textsuperscript{c} Only recipients who are in the NFSZ register. Those receiving the discontinued income support supplement were included in the number of those receiving income support supplement up to the year 2004, and in the number of those receiving regular social assistance from 2005 to 2008. From 2009, those receiving social assistance were included in a new support type, the on call support. This allowance was replaced by the wage replacement support from January 1, 2011, then from September 1, 2011, the name was changed to employment substitution support.

\textsuperscript{d} After 1st of November, 2005: jobseeking support. Does not contain those receiving unemployment aid prior to pension in 2004. From the 1st of September 2011, the system of jobseeking support changed.

\textsuperscript{e} The new IT system introduced at the NFSZ in 2008 made the methodological changes possible:
1) The filtering out of those returning after or starting a break from the number of those entering or leaving the different types of jobseeking support. The main reasons for a break are, - work for short time periods, receipt of child support (GYES) or TGYÁS, or involvement in training.
2) Taking into account in the previous period the number of those entrants, for whom the first accounting of the jobseeking support was delayed due to missing documentation.

The right-hand column of 2008 contains the 2008 data in a form comparable to the 2009 data.

Note: Data from the closing date of June in each year.

Source: NFSZ.

Online data source in xls format: \url{http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_16}
### Table 5.17: Outflow from the Register of Beneficiaries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total number of outflows</th>
<th>Of which:</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Total number of outflows</th>
<th>Of which:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>became employed, %</td>
<td>benefit period expired, %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>327,486</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>251,889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>322,496</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>232,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>320,132</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>2008&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>261,573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>325,341</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>345,216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>308,780</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>65.1</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>352,535</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>303,288</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>329,728</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>297,640</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>368,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>308,027</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>328,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>329,738</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>300,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>234,273</td>
<td>33.2</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>296,171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> The new IT system introduced at the NFSZ in 2008 made the methodological changes possible:
1) The filtering out of those returning after or starting a break from the number of those entering or leaving the different types of jobseeking support. The main reasons for a break are - work for short time periods, receipt of child support (GYES) or TGYÁS, or involvement in training.
2) Taking into account in the previous period the number of those entrants, for whom the first accounting of the jobseeking support was delayed due to missing documentation.

The row of 2008<sup>a</sup> contains the data from 2008 in the form comparable to the 2009 data.

Source: NFSZ.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_17](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_17)

### Table 5.18: The distribution of the total number of labour market training participants<sup>a</sup>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Groups of training participants</th>
<th>2000</th>
<th>2001</th>
<th>2002</th>
<th>2003</th>
<th>2004</th>
<th>2005</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants in suggested training</td>
<td>52,198</td>
<td>53,447</td>
<td>46,802</td>
<td>45,261</td>
<td>33,002</td>
<td>29,252</td>
<td>36,212</td>
<td>32,747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants in accepted training</td>
<td>30,949</td>
<td>32,672</td>
<td>31,891</td>
<td>28,599</td>
<td>19,406</td>
<td>9,620</td>
<td>7,327</td>
<td>5,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Step Forward (OFS) programme</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-employed participants together</td>
<td>83,147</td>
<td>86,211</td>
<td>78,693</td>
<td>73,859</td>
<td>52,407</td>
<td>38,872</td>
<td>43,539</td>
<td>38,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which: school-leavers</td>
<td>22,131</td>
<td>20,592</td>
<td>19,466</td>
<td>18,320</td>
<td>12,158</td>
<td>9,313</td>
<td>1,365</td>
<td>1,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed participants</td>
<td>5,026</td>
<td>5,308</td>
<td>4,142</td>
<td>9,036</td>
<td>7,487</td>
<td>4,853</td>
<td>3,602</td>
<td>3,467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>88,173</td>
<td>91,519</td>
<td>82,835</td>
<td>82,895</td>
<td>59,894</td>
<td>43,725</td>
<td>47,141</td>
<td>42,250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2014&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>2015&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Participants in suggested training</td>
<td>48,561</td>
<td>41,373</td>
<td>50,853</td>
<td>32,172</td>
<td>43,438</td>
<td>22,574</td>
<td>10,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants in accepted training</td>
<td>4,939</td>
<td>8,241</td>
<td>6,853</td>
<td>2,495</td>
<td>2,446</td>
<td>22,574</td>
<td>1,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Step Forward (OFS) programme</td>
<td>59,347</td>
<td>11,169</td>
<td>2,316</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-employed participants together</td>
<td>112,847</td>
<td>80,783</td>
<td>57,706</td>
<td>34,667</td>
<td>45,884</td>
<td>132,587</td>
<td>200,466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which: school-leavers</td>
<td>18,719</td>
<td>21,103</td>
<td>12,030</td>
<td>7,935</td>
<td>9,976</td>
<td>106,333</td>
<td>31,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed participants</td>
<td>37,466</td>
<td>12,496</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>908</td>
<td>716</td>
<td>631</td>
<td>827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150,313</td>
<td>73,279</td>
<td>60,358</td>
<td>35,575</td>
<td>46,600</td>
<td>133,218</td>
<td>201,293</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> The data contain the number of those financed from the NFA decentralized employment base, as well as those involved in training as a part of the HEFOP 1.1 and the TÁMOP 1.1.2 programmes.

<sup>b</sup> The data include public works participants simultaneously involved in training (88,004 public works participants in 2013, 143,275 public works participants in 2014, 50,124 public works participants in 2015).

Source: NFSZ.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_18](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_18)
Table 5.19: Employment ratio of participants ALMPs by gender, age groups and educational attainment for the programmes finished in 2015, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By gender</th>
<th>Non-employed participants</th>
<th>Supported self-employment</th>
<th>Wage subsidy programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suggested training</td>
<td>accepted training</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>53.9</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By age groups</th>
<th>Non-employed participants</th>
<th>Supported self-employment</th>
<th>Wage subsidy programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>suggested training</td>
<td>accepted training</td>
<td>total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-20</td>
<td>45.3</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>45.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>52.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-29</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>54.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-29 together</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-34</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-39</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-44</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-54</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>69.8</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>By educational attainment</th>
<th>Non-employed participants</th>
<th>Supported self-employment</th>
<th>Wage subsidy programme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than primary school</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>54.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>84.2</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational school for skilled workers</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational school</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>56.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational secondary school</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technicians secondary school</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>80.0</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar school</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>54.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>47.6</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55.4</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes all kinds of wage subsidies except financial support for student work during vacation.
* Survival rate.
Note: 6 months after the end of each programme.
Source: NFSZ.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_19](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_19)

Table 5.20: Distribution of the average annual number of those with no employment status who participate in training categorised by the type of training, percentage

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved qualification</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>78.7</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>78.3</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>72.9</td>
<td>71.5</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>71.6</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>53.3</td>
<td>59.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-approved qualification</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>43.2</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign language learning</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NFSZ.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_20](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_20)
Table 5.21: The distribution of those entering training programmes by age groups and educational level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Groups</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-24</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>52.4%</td>
<td>46.5%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>43.8%</td>
<td>43.7%</td>
<td>47.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-49</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>8.3%</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50+</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>14.0%</td>
<td>16.6%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By level of education, %

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than primary school</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>2.7%</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>34.4%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>49.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational school</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>22.7%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational and technical secondary school</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>9.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grammar school</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>7.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, university</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The drastic decrease in the number of training programmes offered was due to the centralization of decision-making regarding the financing of training programmes, and the concurrent new requirement according to which only training programmes with a verifiable direct effect on employment were approved. Due to these, the number of preventative and general knowledge training programmes among those supported decreased. The majority of training participants were enrolled within the framework of EU programmes. The significant growth in the number of trainees, during and following 2012, was predominantly explained by the inclusion into training of public works participants. The data for 2013 and 2014 make a distinction between those and other trainees.

Source: NFSZ.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_21](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent05_21)
Table 6.1: Annual changes of gross nominal and net real earnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Gross earnings (HUF)</th>
<th>Net earnings (HUF)</th>
<th>Gross earnings index</th>
<th>Net earnings index</th>
<th>Consumer price index</th>
<th>Real earnings index</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>13,446</td>
<td>10,108</td>
<td>128.6</td>
<td>121.6</td>
<td>128.9</td>
<td>94.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>38,900</td>
<td>25,891</td>
<td>116.8</td>
<td>112.6</td>
<td>128.2</td>
<td>87.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>46,837</td>
<td>30,544</td>
<td>120.4</td>
<td>117.4</td>
<td>123.6</td>
<td>95.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>57,270</td>
<td>38,145</td>
<td>122.3</td>
<td>124.1</td>
<td>118.3</td>
<td>104.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>67,764</td>
<td>45,162</td>
<td>118.3</td>
<td>118.4</td>
<td>114.3</td>
<td>103.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>77,187</td>
<td>50,076</td>
<td>116.1</td>
<td>112.7</td>
<td>110.0</td>
<td>102.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>87,750</td>
<td>55,785</td>
<td>113.5</td>
<td>111.4</td>
<td>109.8</td>
<td>101.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>103,554</td>
<td>64,913</td>
<td>118.0</td>
<td>116.2</td>
<td>109.2</td>
<td>106.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>122,481</td>
<td>77,622</td>
<td>118.3</td>
<td>119.6</td>
<td>105.3</td>
<td>113.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>137,193</td>
<td>88,753</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>114.3</td>
<td>104.7</td>
<td>109.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>145,523</td>
<td>93,715</td>
<td>106.1</td>
<td>105.6</td>
<td>106.8</td>
<td>98.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>158,343</td>
<td>103,149</td>
<td>108.8</td>
<td>110.1</td>
<td>103.6</td>
<td>106.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>171,351</td>
<td>110,951</td>
<td>108.2</td>
<td>107.6</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>103.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>185,018</td>
<td>114,282</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>95.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>198,741</td>
<td>121,969</td>
<td>107.4</td>
<td>107.0</td>
<td>106.1</td>
<td>100.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>199,837</td>
<td>124,116</td>
<td>100.6</td>
<td>101.8</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>97.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>202,525</td>
<td>132,604</td>
<td>101.3</td>
<td>106.8</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>101.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>213,094</td>
<td>141,151</td>
<td>105.2</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td>103.9</td>
<td>102.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>223,060</td>
<td>144,085</td>
<td>104.7</td>
<td>102.1</td>
<td>105.7</td>
<td>96.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>230,714</td>
<td>151,118</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>101.7</td>
<td>103.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>237,695</td>
<td>155,717</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>103.0</td>
<td>99.8</td>
<td>103.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>247,784</td>
<td>162,300</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>104.2</td>
<td>99.9</td>
<td>104.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent06_01

Figure 6.1: Annual changes of gross and net real earnings

Source: KSH IMS (earnings) and consumer price accounting STADAT (2015. 02. 20. version).

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena06_01
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 6.2.a: Gross earnings ratios in the economy, HUF/person/month</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and fishing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and quarrying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and storage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food service activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and insurance activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific and technical activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and support service activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration and defence; compulsory social security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human health and social work activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment and recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other service activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National economy, total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Business sector</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Budgetary institutions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The data are recalculated based on the industrial classification system in effect from 2008.
Source: KSH mid-year IMS.
Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent06_02a](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent06_02a)
Table 6.2.b: Gross earnings ratios in the economy, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry and fishing</td>
<td>65.2</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>66.1</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>71.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>73.6</td>
<td>74.5</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>76.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and quarrying</td>
<td>108.3</td>
<td>111.2</td>
<td>109.7</td>
<td>113.5</td>
<td>122.1</td>
<td>115.5</td>
<td>119.5</td>
<td>120.9</td>
<td>121.2</td>
<td>120.7</td>
<td>117.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>92.2</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>104.6</td>
<td>106.4</td>
<td>106.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning</td>
<td>153.5</td>
<td>155.2</td>
<td>159.0</td>
<td>161.8</td>
<td>172.7</td>
<td>179.6</td>
<td>178.2</td>
<td>181.1</td>
<td>178.0</td>
<td>177.8</td>
<td>177.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply, sewerage, waste management and</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>89.6</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>94.7</td>
<td>93.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remediation activities</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>73.7</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>79.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>84.8</td>
<td>85.4</td>
<td>86.4</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>91.7</td>
<td>92.4</td>
<td>95.3</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>94.3</td>
<td>92.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td>98.6</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>96.9</td>
<td>96.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicles and motorcycles</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>64.4</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and insurance activities</td>
<td>182.4</td>
<td>179.0</td>
<td>177.8</td>
<td>180.2</td>
<td>183.5</td>
<td>181.7</td>
<td>184.4</td>
<td>183.9</td>
<td>184.9</td>
<td>189.0</td>
<td>185.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate activities</td>
<td>220.9</td>
<td>234.4</td>
<td>211.1</td>
<td>217.2</td>
<td>213.9</td>
<td>214.0</td>
<td>214.5</td>
<td>206.2</td>
<td>204.2</td>
<td>204.1</td>
<td>199.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific and technical</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>84.9</td>
<td>86.1</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>98.3</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>92.1</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>126.8</td>
<td>124.3</td>
<td>132.4</td>
<td>141.5</td>
<td>146.6</td>
<td>146.9</td>
<td>142.4</td>
<td>148.4</td>
<td>138.9</td>
<td>145.1</td>
<td>148.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and support service activities</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>75.2</td>
<td>74.0</td>
<td>74.6</td>
<td>71.9</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>73.4</td>
<td>77.3</td>
<td>79.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration and defence; compulsory</td>
<td>131.0</td>
<td>130.1</td>
<td>136.9</td>
<td>134.7</td>
<td>117.4</td>
<td>120.2</td>
<td>118.7</td>
<td>110.8</td>
<td>112.2</td>
<td>110.2</td>
<td>113.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security</td>
<td>114.6</td>
<td>111.6</td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td>102.9</td>
<td>97.6</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>90.6</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>103.4</td>
<td>104.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>91.0</td>
<td>88.6</td>
<td>86.5</td>
<td>85.5</td>
<td>80.7</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>72.2</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>59.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human health and social work activities</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>94.2</td>
<td>99.4</td>
<td>92.5</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>88.8</td>
<td>90.3</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>94.0</td>
<td>95.0</td>
<td>86.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment and recreation</td>
<td>84.5</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>83.0</td>
<td>79.5</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>74.1</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>78.9</td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other service activities</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National economy, total</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Business sector</td>
<td>93.8</td>
<td>94.9</td>
<td>95.9</td>
<td>96.6</td>
<td>100.2</td>
<td>102.1</td>
<td>102.3</td>
<td>104.8</td>
<td>105.0</td>
<td>106.3</td>
<td>105.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Budgetary institutions</td>
<td>115.1</td>
<td>113.2</td>
<td>111.5</td>
<td>110.2</td>
<td>109.9</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td>95.5</td>
<td>89.7</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The data are recalculated based on the industrial classification system in effect from 2008. Source: KSH mid-year IMS.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent06_02b](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent06_02b)
Table 6.3: Regression-adjusted earnings differentials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0.1490</td>
<td>0.1500</td>
<td>0.1550</td>
<td>0.1790</td>
<td>0.1500</td>
<td>0.1550</td>
<td>0.1570</td>
<td>0.1560</td>
<td>0.1330</td>
<td>0.1240</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than primary school</td>
<td>-0.3900</td>
<td>-0.4800</td>
<td>-0.4010</td>
<td>-0.4390</td>
<td>-0.3970</td>
<td>-0.5750</td>
<td>-0.5110</td>
<td>-0.5360</td>
<td>-0.4860</td>
<td>-0.5240</td>
<td>-0.5430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary school</td>
<td>-0.3670</td>
<td>-0.3730</td>
<td>-0.3800</td>
<td>-0.4170</td>
<td>-0.4010</td>
<td>-0.4540</td>
<td>-0.4290</td>
<td>-0.4220</td>
<td>-0.4170</td>
<td>-0.4150</td>
<td>-0.3540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational school</td>
<td>-0.2650</td>
<td>-0.2750</td>
<td>-0.2840</td>
<td>-0.2920</td>
<td>-0.2770</td>
<td>-0.3050</td>
<td>-0.2810</td>
<td>-0.2640</td>
<td>-0.2660</td>
<td>-0.2260</td>
<td>-0.1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College, university</td>
<td>0.5870</td>
<td>0.5900</td>
<td>0.5810</td>
<td>0.5620</td>
<td>0.5580</td>
<td>0.6190</td>
<td>0.6220</td>
<td>0.6160</td>
<td>0.5750</td>
<td>0.6000</td>
<td>0.5980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated labour market experience</td>
<td>0.0237</td>
<td>0.0238</td>
<td>0.0252</td>
<td>0.0255</td>
<td>0.0248</td>
<td>0.0259</td>
<td>0.0267</td>
<td>0.0256</td>
<td>0.0238</td>
<td>0.0244</td>
<td>0.0069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Square of estimated labour market experience</td>
<td>-0.0004</td>
<td>-0.0004</td>
<td>-0.0004</td>
<td>-0.0004</td>
<td>-0.0004</td>
<td>-0.0004</td>
<td>-0.0004</td>
<td>-0.0004</td>
<td>-0.0004</td>
<td>-0.0004</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public sector</td>
<td>0.1600</td>
<td>0.1130</td>
<td>0.0876</td>
<td>-0.0009</td>
<td>0.0257</td>
<td>-0.1260</td>
<td>-0.1450</td>
<td>-0.1680</td>
<td>-0.2800</td>
<td>-0.2600</td>
<td>-0.0622</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the results indicate the earnings differentials of the various groups relative to the reference group in log points (approximately percentage points). All parameters are significant at the 0.01 level. The region parameters can be seen in Table 9.6.

Reference categories: female, with leaving certificate (general education certificate), not in the public sector, working in the Central-Transdanubia region.

Source: NFSZ BT.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent06_03](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent06_03)

Figure 6.2: The percentage of low paid workers by gender, per cent

Source: NFSZ BT.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena06_02](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena06_02)
Table 6.4: Percentage of low paid workers\(^a\) by gender, age groups, level of education and industries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>By gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By age groups</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-24</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-54</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55+</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By level of education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 grades of primary school or less</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>40.1</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>38.7</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational school</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary school</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher education</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>By industries(^b)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture, forestry, fishing</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>41.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, repairing</td>
<td>42.8</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport, storage, communication</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial intermediation</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>26.2</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration and defence, compulsory social security</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health and social work</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>23.2</td>
<td>24.0</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>19.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Percentage of those who earn less than 2/3 of the median earning amount.


Source: NFSZ BT.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent06_04
Figure 6.3: The dispersion of gross monthly earnings

Source: NFSZ BT.
Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena06_03

Figure 6.4: Age-income profiles by education level in 1998 and 2014, women and men

Source: NFSZ BT.
Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena06_04
Figure 6.5: The dispersion of the logarithm of gross real earnings (2014 = 100%)

Source: NFSZ BT.
Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena06_05
Table 7.1: School-leavers by level of education, full-time education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary school</th>
<th>Vocational school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>College, university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>119,809</td>
<td>49,232</td>
<td>43,167</td>
<td>14,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>164,614</td>
<td>54,933</td>
<td>53,039</td>
<td>15,963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>122,333</td>
<td>57,057</td>
<td>70,265</td>
<td>20,024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>120,529</td>
<td>54,209</td>
<td>73,413</td>
<td>22,128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>116,708</td>
<td>46,868</td>
<td>75,564</td>
<td>24,411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>113,651</td>
<td>42,866</td>
<td>77,660</td>
<td>25,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>114,302</td>
<td>38,822</td>
<td>73,965</td>
<td>27,049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>114,250^a</td>
<td>35,500^a</td>
<td>72,200^a</td>
<td>29,843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>114,200^a</td>
<td>33,500^a</td>
<td>70,372</td>
<td>29,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>113,923</td>
<td>26,941</td>
<td>69,612</td>
<td>30,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>117,747</td>
<td>26,620</td>
<td>71,944</td>
<td>31,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>113,179</td>
<td>25,519</td>
<td>77,025</td>
<td>32,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>115,626</td>
<td>25,198</td>
<td>77,527</td>
<td>29,871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>114,240</td>
<td>24,427</td>
<td>76,895</td>
<td>29,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>108,889</td>
<td>17,967</td>
<td>77,527</td>
<td>29,059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>106,426</td>
<td>19,289</td>
<td>68,453</td>
<td>28,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>102,798</td>
<td>20,138</td>
<td>78,004</td>
<td>36,064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>103,643</td>
<td>20,693</td>
<td>77,930</td>
<td>38,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>96,825</td>
<td>20,720</td>
<td>76,354</td>
<td>35,433</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>92,254</td>
<td>29,299</td>
<td>73,802</td>
<td>36,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>88,913</td>
<td>21,948</td>
<td>68,407</td>
<td>37,089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>87,102</td>
<td>21,684</td>
<td>69,148</td>
<td>39,226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015^b</td>
<td>89,034</td>
<td>21,348</td>
<td>65,326</td>
<td>41,083</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

^a Estimated data.
^b Preliminary data.

Note: Primary school: completed the 8th grade. Other levels: received certificate. Excluding special schools, from the year 2000 excluding special education. College, university: from 2007 including graduates in BA/BSc, MA/MSc and undivided (joint bachelor and master courses) training.

Source: EMMI STAT.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent07_01

Figure 7.1: Full time students as a percentage of the different age groups

Source: EMMI STAT.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena07_01
Table 7.2: Pupils/students entering the school system by level of education, full-time education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary school</th>
<th>Vocational school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>College, university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>125,665</td>
<td>87,932</td>
<td>83,939</td>
<td>22,662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>117,000(*)</td>
<td>33,900(*)</td>
<td>90,800(*)</td>
<td>54,100(*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>112,144</td>
<td>34,210</td>
<td>92,322</td>
<td>56,709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>112,345</td>
<td>33,363</td>
<td>94,223</td>
<td>57,763</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>114,020</td>
<td>33,394</td>
<td>92,817</td>
<td>59,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>101,021</td>
<td>32,645</td>
<td>93,469</td>
<td>59,783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>97,810</td>
<td>33,114</td>
<td>96,181</td>
<td>61,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>95,954</td>
<td>32,732</td>
<td>95,989</td>
<td>61,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>98,766</td>
<td>31,897</td>
<td>92,957</td>
<td>55,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>97,345</td>
<td>32,774</td>
<td>90,667</td>
<td>52,755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>97,083</td>
<td>34,177</td>
<td>87,731</td>
<td>61,948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>95,469</td>
<td>35,177</td>
<td>88,644</td>
<td>68,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>96,455</td>
<td>35,420</td>
<td>83,025</td>
<td>70,954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>98,013</td>
<td>36,954</td>
<td>78,090</td>
<td>67,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>105,075</td>
<td>34,927</td>
<td>83,198</td>
<td>46,931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>99,048</td>
<td>31,976</td>
<td>82,532</td>
<td>44,867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015(*)</td>
<td>95,519</td>
<td>30,287</td>
<td>84,143</td>
<td>43,080</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Estimated data.
* Preliminary data.

Note: Excluding special schools, from the year 2000 excluding special education. College, university: from the 2005/2006 school year including first year students in BA/BSc, MA/MSc and undivided (joint bachelor and master courses) training. Figures on entrants to bachelor and master programs before and after the 2013/2014 Autumn semester are not comparable.

Source: EMMI STAT.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent07_02](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent07_02)

Figure 7.2: Flows of the educational system by level

Source: EMMI STAT.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena07_02](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena07_02)
### Table 7.3: The number of full time pupils/students by level of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary school</th>
<th>Vocational school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>College, university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>905,932</td>
<td>124,615</td>
<td>420,889</td>
<td>184,071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>893,261</td>
<td>123,069</td>
<td>426,384</td>
<td>193,155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>874,296</td>
<td>123,206</td>
<td>437,909</td>
<td>204,910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>854,930</td>
<td>123,008</td>
<td>438,496</td>
<td>212,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>828,594</td>
<td>121,815</td>
<td>441,002</td>
<td>217,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>800,635</td>
<td>119,520</td>
<td>443,166</td>
<td>227,118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>783,948</td>
<td>122,973</td>
<td>441,886</td>
<td>224,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>765,822</td>
<td>123,640</td>
<td>439,957</td>
<td>224,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>752,896</td>
<td>128,479</td>
<td>443,078</td>
<td>222,564</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>736,977</td>
<td>129,076</td>
<td>438,892</td>
<td>218,057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>729,000</td>
<td>129,250</td>
<td>428,122</td>
<td>218,304</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>725,068</td>
<td>117,356</td>
<td>413,531</td>
<td>214,320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>730,664</td>
<td>104,925</td>
<td>388,717</td>
<td>209,208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>731,575</td>
<td>92,389</td>
<td>370,764</td>
<td>203,576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16*</td>
<td>728,604</td>
<td>80,346</td>
<td>363,378</td>
<td>195,419</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Preliminary data.

Note: Excluding special education schools, from the 2000/2001 school year excluding special education. From the 2001/2002 school year, students in grades 5-8 who attend a 6 or 8 year secondary general school are included in the number of high school students. College, university: from the 2005/2006 school year, includes students in BA/BSc, MA/MSc and undivided (joint bachelor and master courses) training.

Source: **EMMI STAT**.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent07_03](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent07_03)

### Table 7.4: The number of part-time pupils/students by level of education

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Primary school</th>
<th>Vocational school</th>
<th>Secondary school</th>
<th>College, university</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001/02</td>
<td>2,793</td>
<td>2,453</td>
<td>95,231</td>
<td>129,167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002/03</td>
<td>2,785</td>
<td>3,427</td>
<td>93,172</td>
<td>148,032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003/04</td>
<td>3,190</td>
<td>3,216</td>
<td>93,322</td>
<td>162,037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004/05</td>
<td>2,766</td>
<td>3,505</td>
<td>90,321</td>
<td>166,174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005/06</td>
<td>2,543</td>
<td>4,049</td>
<td>89,950</td>
<td>163,387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006/07</td>
<td>2,319</td>
<td>4,829</td>
<td>91,035</td>
<td>151,203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007/08</td>
<td>2,245</td>
<td>5,874</td>
<td>83,008</td>
<td>132,273</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008/09</td>
<td>2,083</td>
<td>4,983</td>
<td>74,008</td>
<td>115,957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009/10</td>
<td>2,035</td>
<td>6,594</td>
<td>70,124</td>
<td>105,511</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010/11</td>
<td>1,997</td>
<td>8,068</td>
<td>76,404</td>
<td>99,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011/12</td>
<td>2,264</td>
<td>10,383</td>
<td>74,204</td>
<td>98,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012/13</td>
<td>2,127</td>
<td>12,776</td>
<td>72,808</td>
<td>85,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013/14</td>
<td>2,587</td>
<td>12,140</td>
<td>70,588</td>
<td>73,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014/15</td>
<td>2,548</td>
<td>9,946</td>
<td>66,522</td>
<td>67,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015/16*</td>
<td>2,293</td>
<td>9,685</td>
<td>63,345</td>
<td>64,110</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Preliminary data.

Note: College, university: from the 2005/2006 school year, including students in BA/BSc, MA/MSc and undivided (joint bachelor and master courses) training.

Source: **EMMI STAT**.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent07_04](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent07_04)
## Table 7.5: Number of applicants for full-time high school courses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Admitted as a percentage of applied</th>
<th>Applying</th>
<th>Admitted</th>
<th>Admitted as a percentage of the secondary school graduates in the given year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>33,339</td>
<td>14,796</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>77.2</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>44,138</td>
<td>15,420</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>29.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>46,767</td>
<td>16,818</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>88.2</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>48,911</td>
<td>20,338</td>
<td>41.6</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>59,119</td>
<td>24,022</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>99.1</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>71,741</td>
<td>28,217</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>104.6</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>79,805</td>
<td>29,901</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>116.3</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>86,548</td>
<td>35,081</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>123.2</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>79,369</td>
<td>38,382</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>108.1</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>81,924</td>
<td>40,355</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>108.4</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>81,065</td>
<td>43,629</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>104.4</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>82,815</td>
<td>44,538</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>112.0</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>82,957</td>
<td>45,546</td>
<td>54.9</td>
<td>114.9</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>84,380</td>
<td>49,874</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>119.8</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>88,978</td>
<td>52,552</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>127.8</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>87,110</td>
<td>52,703</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>121.1</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>95,871</td>
<td>55,179</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>125.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>91,583</td>
<td>52,863</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>118.9</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>84,262</td>
<td>53,983</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>109.6</td>
<td>70.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>74,849</td>
<td>50,941</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>66,963</td>
<td>52,081</td>
<td>77.8</td>
<td>97.8</td>
<td>76.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>90,878</td>
<td>61,262</td>
<td>67.4</td>
<td>116.5</td>
<td>78.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>100,777</td>
<td>65,503</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>129.3</td>
<td>84.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>101,835</td>
<td>66,810</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>133.4</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>84,075</td>
<td>61,350</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>113.9</td>
<td>83.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>75,392</td>
<td>56,927</td>
<td>75.5</td>
<td>110.2</td>
<td>83.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>79,765</td>
<td>54,688</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>115.4</td>
<td>79.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>79,255</td>
<td>53,069</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>121.3</td>
<td>81.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Including students applying and admitted to BA/BSc, MA/MSc and undivided (joint bachelor and master courses) training. From 2008 students applying and admitted in repeated, spring and autumn admission procedures altogether.

Source: EMMI STAT.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent07_05](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent07_05)
### Table 8.1: The number of vacancies\(^a\) reported to the local offices of the NFSZ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of vacancies at closing date</th>
<th>Number of registered unemployed(^b) at closing date</th>
<th>Vacancies per 100 registered unemployed(^b)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>14,343</td>
<td>227,270</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>21,793</td>
<td>556,965</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>34,375</td>
<td>671,745</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>35,569</td>
<td>568,366</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>28,680</td>
<td>507,695</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>38,297</td>
<td>500,622</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>42,544</td>
<td>470,112</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>46,624</td>
<td>423,121</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>51,438</td>
<td>409,519</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>390,492</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>45,194</td>
<td>364,140</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>44,603</td>
<td>344,715</td>
<td>12.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>47,239</td>
<td>357,212</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>48,223</td>
<td>375,950</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>41,615</td>
<td>409,929</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>41,677</td>
<td>393,465</td>
<td>10.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>29,933</td>
<td>426,915</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>25,386</td>
<td>442,333</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>20,739</td>
<td>561,768</td>
<td>3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>22,241</td>
<td>582,664</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>41,123</td>
<td>582,868</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>35,850</td>
<td>559,102</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>51,524</td>
<td>527,624</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>69,316</td>
<td>422,445</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>73,122</td>
<td>378,181</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Monthly average stock figures.

\(^b\) Since 1st of November, 2005: registered jobseekers.

Source: NFSZ.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent08_01](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent08_01)

### Figure 8.1: The number of vacancies reported to the local offices of the NFSZ

Source: NFSZ.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena08_01](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena08_01)
### Table 8.2: Firms intending to increase/decrease their staff, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Intending to decrease</th>
<th>Intending to increase</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Intending to decrease</th>
<th>Intending to increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1994 I.</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>2002 I.</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>39.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994 II.</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>2002 II.</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 I.</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>2003 I.</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>38.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995 II.</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>2003 II.</td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 I.</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>2004 I.</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>39.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996 II.</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>2005 I.</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 I.</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>2006 I.</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997 II.</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>2007 I.</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 I.</td>
<td>23.4</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>2008 I.</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998 II.</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>2009 I.</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>26.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999 I.</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>2010 I.</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999 II.</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>2011 I.</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 I.</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>2012 I.</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>29.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000 II.</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>2013 I.</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>30.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 I.</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>2014 I.</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001 II.</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>2015 I.</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* In the period of the next half year following the interview date, in the sample of NFSZ PROG, since 2004: 1 year later from the interview date.

Source: NFSZ PROG.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent08_02](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent08_02)

### Figure 8.2: Firms intending to increase/decrease their staff

Source: NFSZ PROG.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena08_02](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena08_02)
Table 9.1: Regional inequalities: Employment rate\textsuperscript{a}

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Central Hungary</th>
<th>Central Transdanubia</th>
<th>Western Transdanubia</th>
<th>Southern Transdanubia</th>
<th>Northern Hungary</th>
<th>Northern Great Plain</th>
<th>Southern Great Plain</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>58.4</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>57.2</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>47.5</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>53.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>46.3</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>52.7</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>45.6</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>45.7</td>
<td>45.2</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>52.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>53.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>55.3</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>60.6</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>63.7</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>62.3</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>53.6</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>63.3</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>53.4</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>50.2</td>
<td>53.8</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>61.4</td>
<td>62.8</td>
<td>51.0</td>
<td>50.4</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>57.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>61.6</td>
<td>50.8</td>
<td>49.4</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>56.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>61.3</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>55.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>57.0</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>54.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>49.9</td>
<td>54.1</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>61.7</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>55.5</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>62.7</td>
<td>60.7</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>58.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>64.3</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>58.6</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>61.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>59.0</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>63.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{a} Age: 15–64.

Source: \textit{KSH MEF}.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent09_01](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent09_01)

Figure 9.1: Regional inequalities: Labour force participation rates, gross monthly earnings and gross domestic product in NUTS-2 level regions


Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena09_01](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena09_01)
### Regional Inequalities: LFS-based Unemployment Rate

Table 9.2: Regional inequalities: LFS-based unemployment rate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Central Hungary</th>
<th>Central Transdanubia</th>
<th>Western Transdanubia</th>
<th>Southern Transdanubia</th>
<th>Northern Hungary</th>
<th>Northern Great Plain</th>
<th>Southern Great Plain</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Age: 15–74.
Source: KSH MEF.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent09_02](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent09_02)

**Figure 9.2: Regional inequalities: LFS-based unemployment rates in NUTS-2 level regions**

![Diagram of regional inequalities in 1993 and 2015](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena09_02)

Source: KSH MEF.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena09_02](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena09_02)
### Table 9.3: Regional differences: The share of registered unemployed relative to the economically active population, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Central Hungary</th>
<th>Central Transdanubia</th>
<th>Western Transdanubia</th>
<th>Southern Transdanubia</th>
<th>Northern Hungary</th>
<th>Northern Great Plain</th>
<th>Southern Great Plain</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>12.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Since 1st of November, 2005: the ratio of registered jobseekers. From the 1st of November, 2005 the Employment Act changed the definition of registered unemployed to registered jobseekers.

b The denominator of the ratio is the economically active population on January 1st of the previous year.

Source: NFSZ REG.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent09_03](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent09_03)

### Figure 9.3: Regional inequalities: The share of registered unemployed relative to the economically active population, per cent, in NUTS-2 level regions

Source: NFSZ REG.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena09_03](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena09_03)
Table 9.4: Annual average registered unemployment rate\(^a\) by counties, per cent\(^b\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baranya</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bács-Kiskun</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Békés</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>20.9</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csongrád</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fejér</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Győr-Moson-Sopron</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hajdú-Bihar</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heves</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komárom-Esztergom</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nógrád</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somogy</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolna</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vas</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veszprém</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zala</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Since 1st of November, 2005: the ratio of registered jobseekers. From the 1st of November, 2005 the Employment Act changed the definition of registered unemployed to registered jobseekers.

\(^b\) The denominator of the ratio is the economically active population on January 1st of the previous year.

Source: NFSZ REG.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent09_04

Figure 9.4: Regional inequalities: Means of registered unemployment rates in the counties, 2015

Source: NFSZ REG.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena09_04
Table 9.5: Regional inequalities: Gross monthly earnings\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Central Hungary</th>
<th>Central Transdanubia</th>
<th>Western Transdanubia</th>
<th>Southern Transdanubia</th>
<th>Northern Hungary</th>
<th>Northern Great Plain</th>
<th>Southern Great Plain</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>114,637</td>
<td>87,078</td>
<td>83,668</td>
<td>74,412</td>
<td>77,714</td>
<td>73,858</td>
<td>73,591</td>
<td>90,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>132,136</td>
<td>100,358</td>
<td>96,216</td>
<td>86,489</td>
<td>88,735</td>
<td>84,930</td>
<td>84,710</td>
<td>103,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>149,119</td>
<td>110,602</td>
<td>106,809</td>
<td>98,662</td>
<td>102,263</td>
<td>98,033</td>
<td>97,432</td>
<td>117,672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>170,280</td>
<td>127,819</td>
<td>121,464</td>
<td>117,149</td>
<td>124,074</td>
<td>121,661</td>
<td>120,406</td>
<td>135,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>170,280</td>
<td>127,819</td>
<td>121,464</td>
<td>117,149</td>
<td>124,074</td>
<td>121,661</td>
<td>120,406</td>
<td>135,472</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>192,962</td>
<td>147,646</td>
<td>145,771</td>
<td>136,276</td>
<td>139,761</td>
<td>131,098</td>
<td>130,406</td>
<td>157,770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>212,001</td>
<td>157,824</td>
<td>156,499</td>
<td>144,189</td>
<td>152,521</td>
<td>142,142</td>
<td>143,231</td>
<td>171,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>245,931</td>
<td>185,979</td>
<td>174,273</td>
<td>160,624</td>
<td>164,430</td>
<td>164,430</td>
<td>164,430</td>
<td>198,078</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>254,471</td>
<td>187,352</td>
<td>182,855</td>
<td>169,615</td>
<td>169,441</td>
<td>169,441</td>
<td>169,441</td>
<td>203,859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>264,495</td>
<td>197,774</td>
<td>183,454</td>
<td>173,696</td>
<td>162,455</td>
<td>162,455</td>
<td>162,455</td>
<td>207,456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>279,073</td>
<td>215,434</td>
<td>202,189</td>
<td>196,566</td>
<td>191,222</td>
<td>191,222</td>
<td>191,222</td>
<td>230,073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>296,089</td>
<td>228,974</td>
<td>219,972</td>
<td>200,359</td>
<td>198,087</td>
<td>198,087</td>
<td>198,087</td>
<td>240,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>306,890</td>
<td>234,443</td>
<td>230,142</td>
<td>205,020</td>
<td>203,859</td>
<td>203,859</td>
<td>203,859</td>
<td>245,210</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Gross monthly earnings (HUF/person), May.

Note: The data refer to full-time employees in the budgetary sector and firms employing at least 5 workers, respectively.

Source: NFSZ BT.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent09_05](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent09_05)

Table 9.6: Regression-adjusted earnings differentials

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Central Hungary</th>
<th>Western Transdanubia</th>
<th>Southern Transdanubia</th>
<th>Northern Hungary</th>
<th>Northern Great Plain</th>
<th>Southern Great Plain</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>0.0729</td>
<td>-0.0067</td>
<td>-0.1610</td>
<td>-0.1320</td>
<td>-0.1660</td>
<td>-0.1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>0.0739</td>
<td>-0.0200</td>
<td>-0.1500</td>
<td>-0.1400</td>
<td>-0.1550</td>
<td>-0.1550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>0.0903</td>
<td>-0.0378</td>
<td>-0.1120</td>
<td>-0.0950</td>
<td>-0.1170</td>
<td>-0.1070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>0.0493</td>
<td>-0.0542</td>
<td>-0.1220</td>
<td>-0.1200</td>
<td>-0.1400</td>
<td>-0.1410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>0.0648</td>
<td>-0.0313</td>
<td>-0.1410</td>
<td>-0.0953</td>
<td>-0.1400</td>
<td>-0.1270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>0.0291</td>
<td>-0.0372</td>
<td>-0.1310</td>
<td>-0.1010</td>
<td>-0.1450</td>
<td>-0.1390</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>0.0660</td>
<td>-0.0214</td>
<td>-0.1400</td>
<td>-0.0874</td>
<td>-0.1380</td>
<td>-0.1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>0.0636</td>
<td>-0.0840</td>
<td>-0.1420</td>
<td>-0.1290</td>
<td>-0.1590</td>
<td>-0.1450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>0.0446</td>
<td>-0.0904</td>
<td>-0.1750</td>
<td>-0.1350</td>
<td>-0.1920</td>
<td>-0.1660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>0.0791</td>
<td>-0.0464</td>
<td>-0.1270</td>
<td>-0.1210</td>
<td>-0.1420</td>
<td>-0.1490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>0.0693</td>
<td>-0.0748</td>
<td>-0.1380</td>
<td>-0.1270</td>
<td>-0.1710</td>
<td>-0.1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>0.1060</td>
<td>-0.0306</td>
<td>-0.0810</td>
<td>-0.0059</td>
<td>-0.0884</td>
<td>-0.0944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>0.0676</td>
<td>-0.0443</td>
<td>-0.0791</td>
<td>-0.0102</td>
<td>-0.1320</td>
<td>-0.1240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>0.0415</td>
<td>-0.0544</td>
<td>-0.1190</td>
<td>-0.0110</td>
<td>-0.1620</td>
<td>-0.1350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0.0239</td>
<td>-0.0436</td>
<td>-0.1180</td>
<td>-0.1080</td>
<td>-0.1320</td>
<td>-0.1250</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: the results indicate the earnings differentials of the various groups relative to the reference group in log points (approximately percentage points). All parameters are significant at the 0.01 level.

Reference category: women, with leaving certificate (general education certificate), not in the public sector, working in the Central-Transdanubia region.

Source: NFSZ BT.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent09_06](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent09_06)
Figure 9.5: The share of registered unemployed relative to the population aged 15–64, 1st quarter 2007, per cent

Note: The ratio of registered unemployed was calculated using the following method: number of registered unemployed divided by the permanent population of age 15-64. The number of registered unemployed is a quarterly average. The permanent population data is annual.
Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena09_05

Figure 9.6: The share of registered unemployed relative to the population aged 15–64, 1st quarter 2015, per cent

Note: The ratio of registered unemployed was calculated using the following method: number of registered unemployed divided by the permanent population of age 15-64. The number of registered unemployed is a quarterly average. The permanent population data is from the year 2014 (since 2015 data is not yet available).
Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena09_06
Figure 9.7: The share of registered unemployed relative to the population aged 15–64, 3rd quarter 2007, per cent

Note: The ratio of registered unemployed was calculated using the following method: number of registered unemployed divided by the permanent population of age 15-64. The number of registered unemployed is a quarterly average. The permanent population data is annual.
Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena09_07

Figure 9.8: The share of registered unemployed relative to the population aged 15–64, 3rd quarter 2015, per cent

Note: The ratio of registered unemployed was calculated using the following method: number of registered unemployed divided by the permanent population of age 15-64. The number of registered unemployed is a quarterly average. The permanent population data is from the year 2014 (since 2015 data is not yet available).
Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ena09_08
### Table 9.7: Regional inequalities: Gross domestic product

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Central Hungary</th>
<th>Central Transdanubia</th>
<th>Western Transdanubia</th>
<th>Southern Transdanubia</th>
<th>Northern Hungary</th>
<th>Northern Great Plain</th>
<th>Southern Great Plain</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thousand HUF/person/month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,380</td>
<td>1,397</td>
<td>1,547</td>
<td>1,107</td>
<td>991</td>
<td>1,023</td>
<td>1,113</td>
<td>1,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>2,802</td>
<td>1,502</td>
<td>1,757</td>
<td>1,239</td>
<td>1,090</td>
<td>1,126</td>
<td>1,209</td>
<td>1,714</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>3,005</td>
<td>1,729</td>
<td>2,017</td>
<td>1,348</td>
<td>1,214</td>
<td>1,256</td>
<td>1,307</td>
<td>1,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>3,332</td>
<td>1,958</td>
<td>2,142</td>
<td>1,358</td>
<td>1,363</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>1,454</td>
<td>2,079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>3,615</td>
<td>2,098</td>
<td>2,206</td>
<td>1,471</td>
<td>1,426</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>1,534</td>
<td>2,227</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>3,949</td>
<td>2,183</td>
<td>2,417</td>
<td>1,544</td>
<td>1,521</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>1,609</td>
<td>2,397</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>4,218</td>
<td>2,348</td>
<td>2,478</td>
<td>1,618</td>
<td>1,586</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>1,666</td>
<td>2,540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>4,462</td>
<td>2,433</td>
<td>2,612</td>
<td>1,831</td>
<td>1,853</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>1,805</td>
<td>2,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>4,396</td>
<td>2,190</td>
<td>2,454</td>
<td>1,802</td>
<td>1,897</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>1,732</td>
<td>2,620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>4,480</td>
<td>2,350</td>
<td>2,685</td>
<td>1,828</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td>1,753</td>
<td>1,753</td>
<td>2,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>4,561</td>
<td>2,504</td>
<td>2,862</td>
<td>1,904</td>
<td>1,830</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>1,890</td>
<td>2,821</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>4,687</td>
<td>2,546</td>
<td>2,909</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>1,867</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>1,966</td>
<td>2,886</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>4,893</td>
<td>2,721</td>
<td>3,064</td>
<td>2,058</td>
<td>1,920</td>
<td>2,103</td>
<td>2,103</td>
<td>3,039</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>5,162</td>
<td>2,941</td>
<td>3,414</td>
<td>2,167</td>
<td>2,062</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>2,280</td>
<td>3,262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Central Hungary</th>
<th>Central Transdanubia</th>
<th>Western Transdanubia</th>
<th>Southern Transdanubia</th>
<th>Northern Hungary</th>
<th>Northern Great Plain</th>
<th>Southern Great Plain</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>157.5</td>
<td>92.7</td>
<td>102.7</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>73.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>163.4</td>
<td>87.7</td>
<td>102.6</td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>70.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>159.9</td>
<td>91.9</td>
<td>107.3</td>
<td>71.7</td>
<td>64.6</td>
<td>66.8</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>159.9</td>
<td>94.4</td>
<td>103.5</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>65.4</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>162.0</td>
<td>94.5</td>
<td>99.6</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>69.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>164.5</td>
<td>91.3</td>
<td>101.3</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>165.8</td>
<td>92.6</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>67.2</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>65.6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>165.4</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>97.5</td>
<td>67.9</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>167.7</td>
<td>83.7</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>60.9</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>66.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>165.1</td>
<td>87.2</td>
<td>100.1</td>
<td>67.6</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>161.5</td>
<td>88.7</td>
<td>102.0</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>60.2</td>
<td>64.8</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>162.6</td>
<td>88.4</td>
<td>101.4</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>161.0</td>
<td>89.5</td>
<td>100.8</td>
<td>67.7</td>
<td>61.1</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>158.2</td>
<td>90.2</td>
<td>104.7</td>
<td>66.4</td>
<td>62.4</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The data on 2000-2012 have been retrospectively revised following ESA2010 standards (European System of National and Regional Accounts).
Source: KSH.
Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent09_07](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent09_07)

### Table 9.8: Commuting

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Working in the place of residence</th>
<th>Commuter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in thousands</td>
<td>per cent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>3,848.5</td>
<td>76.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>3,380.2</td>
<td>74.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>2,588.2</td>
<td>70.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2,625.1</td>
<td>68.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>2,462.8*</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes those working abroad but classified by the respondents of LFS as household members.
Source: NSZ, microcensus.
Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent09_08](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent09_08)
Table 10.1: Strikes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of strikes</th>
<th>Number of persons involved</th>
<th>Hours lost, in thousands</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1995a</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>172,048</td>
<td>1,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>26,978</td>
<td>1,192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21,128</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4,573</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10,831</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,276</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1,425</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>24,665</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>64,612</td>
<td>186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8,633</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3,134</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3,263</td>
<td>133.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1,885</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Teachers strikes number partly estimated.
Source: KSH strike statistics.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent10_01

Table 10.2: National agreements on wage increase recommendations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>OÉT – from 2013 VKF – Recommendations</th>
<th>Actual indexes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>108.5</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>108.0</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>4.5 % real wage growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>107.0–108.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>106.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>104.0–105.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>105.5–108.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>105.0–107.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>103.0–105.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>real wage preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>104.0–106.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>no wage recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>real wage preservation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>103.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>103.0–104.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Average increase rates of gross earnings from recommendations by the National Interest Reconciliation Council (OÉT) and the Permanent Consultation Forum of the Business Sector and the Government (VKF, from 2013 onwards). Previous year = 100.
b Mean real wage index.
Source: KSH, NGM.

Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent10_02
### Table 10.3: Single employer collective agreements in the business sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of agreements</td>
<td>1,025</td>
<td>1,033</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>1,027</td>
<td>962</td>
<td>966</td>
<td>959</td>
<td>942</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>951</td>
<td>950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of persons covered</td>
<td>513,118</td>
<td>489,568</td>
<td>532,065</td>
<td>467,964</td>
<td>432,086</td>
<td>448,138</td>
<td>448,980</td>
<td>442,723</td>
<td>448,087</td>
<td>443,543</td>
<td>458,668</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NGM, Employment Relations Information System.
Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent10_03](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent10_03)

### Table 10.4: Single institution collective agreements in the public sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of agreements</td>
<td>1,750</td>
<td>1,435</td>
<td>1,711</td>
<td>1,710</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>1,751</td>
<td>1,744</td>
<td>1,735</td>
<td>1,736</td>
<td>1,734</td>
<td>798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of persons covered</td>
<td>228,080</td>
<td>203,497</td>
<td>224,246</td>
<td>222,547</td>
<td>225,434</td>
<td>224,651</td>
<td>222,136</td>
<td>261,401</td>
<td>260,388</td>
<td>259,797</td>
<td>301,430</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NGM, Employment Relations Information System.
Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent10_04](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent10_04)

### Table 10.5: Multi-employer collective agreements in the business sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of agreements</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of persons covered</td>
<td>92,196</td>
<td>86,079</td>
<td>83,117</td>
<td>80,506</td>
<td>222,236</td>
<td>221,627</td>
<td>202,005</td>
<td>204,585</td>
<td>173,614</td>
<td>219,050</td>
<td>299,487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NGM, Employment Relations Information System.
Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent10_05](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent10_05)

### Table 10.6: Multi-institution collective agreements in the public sector

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of agreements</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of persons covered</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>238</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NGM, Employment Relations Information System.
Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent10_06](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent10_06)

### Table 10.7: The number of firm wage agreements a, the number of affected firms, and the number of employees covered

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of agreements</td>
<td>298</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>785</td>
<td>905</td>
<td>888</td>
<td>863</td>
<td>874</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of persons covered</td>
<td>169,639</td>
<td>151,022</td>
<td>171,259</td>
<td>100,206</td>
<td>377,677</td>
<td>414,522</td>
<td>416,562</td>
<td>415,751</td>
<td>422,887</td>
<td>384,182</td>
<td>424,914</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Until 2008, the data relate to the number of ‘wage agreements’ concerning the next year’s average wage increase, in the typical case. In and after 2009, the figures relate to resolutions within collective agreements, which affect the remuneration of workers (including long-term agreements on wage supplements, bonuses, premia, non-wage benefits and rights and responsibilities connected with wage payments).

Source: NGM, Employment Relations Information System.
Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent10_07](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent10_07)
Table 10.8: The number of multi-employer wage agreements\(^a\), the number of affected firms, and the number of covered companies and employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of agreements</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of companies</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>2350</td>
<td>2460</td>
<td>2199</td>
<td>2219</td>
<td>1096</td>
<td>2886</td>
<td>2885</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of persons covered</td>
<td>35039</td>
<td>42817</td>
<td>33735</td>
<td>40046</td>
<td>191258</td>
<td>211753</td>
<td>180131</td>
<td>19013</td>
<td>160092</td>
<td>208128</td>
<td>289154</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Until 2008, the data relate to the number of ‘wage agreements’ concerning the next year’s average wage increase, in the typical case. In and after 2009, the figures relate to resolutions within collective agreements, which affect the remuneration of workers (including long-term agreements on wage supplements, bonuses, premia, non-wage benefits and rights and responsibilities connected with wage payments).

Source: NGM, Employment Relations Information System.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent10_08](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent10_08)

Table 10.9: The share of employees covered by collective agreements, percent\(^a\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industries</th>
<th>Multi-employer collective agreements in the business sector(^b)</th>
<th>Single employer collective agreements in the national economy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mining and quarrying</td>
<td>6.37</td>
<td>5.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>12.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply</td>
<td>69.28</td>
<td>70.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities</td>
<td>25.15</td>
<td>24.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>98.93</td>
<td>98.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>6.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and storage</td>
<td>15.27</td>
<td>15.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food service activities</td>
<td>94.28</td>
<td>93.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and communication</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and insurance activities</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>5.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate activities</td>
<td>39.78</td>
<td>16.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific and technical activities</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>4.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and support services activities</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>6.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration and defence; compulsory social security</td>
<td>_ _ _</td>
<td>_ _</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>4.79</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human health and social work activities</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment and recreation</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other service activities</td>
<td>19.86</td>
<td>19.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Percentage share of employees covered by collective agreements.

\(^b\) In the observed period only a single multi-employer collective agreement was in effect in the public sector.

Source: NGM, Employment Relations Information System, Register of Collective Agreements.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent10_09](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent10_09)
Table 10.10: Single employer collective agreements in the national economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industries</th>
<th>Number of collective agreements</th>
<th>The number of employees covered by collective agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and quarrying</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and storage</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food service activities</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and communication</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and insurance activities</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate activities</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific and technical activities</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and support service activities</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration and defence; compulsory social security</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>1,293</td>
<td>1,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human health and social work activities</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment and recreation</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other service activities</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National economy, total</td>
<td>2,706</td>
<td>2,707</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: *NGM*, Employment Relations Information System, Register of Collective Agreements.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent10_10](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent10_10)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industries</th>
<th>The number of firms covered by the multi-employer collective agreements</th>
<th>The number of employees covered by multi-employer collective agreements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agriculture</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mining and quarrying</td>
<td>604</td>
<td>601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electricity, gas, steam and air conditioning supply</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water supply; sewerage, waste management and remediation activities</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wholesale and retail trade; repair of motor vehicles and motorcycles</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>125</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transportation and storage</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation and food service activities</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information and communication</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial and insurance activities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real estate activities</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional, scientific and technical activities</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative and support service activities</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public administration and defence; compulsory social security</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human health and social work activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts, entertainment and recreation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other service activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National economy, total</td>
<td>2,354</td>
<td>2,309</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a In the observed period only a single multi-employer collective agreement was in effect in the public sector.

b Multi-employer collective agreements are those concluded and/or extended by several employers or employer organizations.

Source: NGM, Employment Relations Information System, Register of Collective Agreements.

### Table 11.1: Family benefits

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tax credit for families&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Child benefit&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Regular child protection allowance&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Wage related maternity benefit&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Flat rate maternity benefit&lt;sup&gt;d&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average monthly amount, HUF</td>
<td>Average number of recipient families</td>
<td>Average monthly amount, HUF</td>
<td>Average number of recipient families</td>
<td>Average monthly amount, HUF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>6,979</td>
<td>924,263</td>
<td>12,596</td>
<td>6,633,000</td>
<td>58,676</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>9,392</td>
<td>122,883</td>
<td>21,637</td>
<td>1,269,000</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>23,031</td>
<td>1,224,000</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>24,524</td>
<td>1,245,900</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>24,442</td>
<td>1,224,000</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>24,528</td>
<td>1,190,707</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>24,491</td>
<td>1,167,640</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>24,257</td>
<td>1,149,796</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>23,674</td>
<td>1,113,581</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Introduced in 1999. Beginning in 2006, this became a part of family benefits, only families with 3 or more children are entitled to tax credits to the amount of 4,000 HUF per child. The system of family tax credit changed in 2011. The deduction from the base of personal income tax is Ft 62,500 in the case of one dependent and Ft 206,250 in the case of three or more dependents.

<sup>b</sup> Annual mean. From 1999 to November 8, 2002, the child care benefit includes the family allowance and schooling support. Beginning in 2002, the benefits paid in the 13th month are included as well.

<sup>c</sup> Annual average. Was in use from 1998 to 2005.

<sup>d</sup> Annual average.

Source: NAV, KSH Welfare Statistics.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent11_01](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent11_01)

### Table 11.2: Unemployment benefits and average earnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Insured unemployment benefit and other non-means tested benefits&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>Means tested unemployment assistance</th>
<th>Net monthly earnings, HUF&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average monthly amount, HUF</td>
<td>Average number of recipients</td>
<td>Average monthly amount, HUF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>43,344</td>
<td>109,095</td>
<td>23,771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>46,208</td>
<td>96,463</td>
<td>25,705</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>49,454</td>
<td>97,047</td>
<td>27,347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>51,831</td>
<td>152,197</td>
<td>23,117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>50,073</td>
<td>125,651</td>
<td>27,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>52,107</td>
<td>110,803</td>
<td>25,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>63,428</td>
<td>62,380</td>
<td>21,943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>68,730</td>
<td>48,019</td>
<td>22,781</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>69,720</td>
<td>42,23</td>
<td>22,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>72,562</td>
<td>40,576</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Average of headcount at the end of the month.

<sup>b</sup> The average net wage refers to the entire economy, competitive sector after 2001: firms with at least 4 employees.


Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent11_02](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent11_02)
### Table 11.3.a: Number of those receiving pension\(^a\), and the mean sum of the provisions they received in January of the given year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Old age pension</th>
<th></th>
<th>Disability pension under and above retirement age</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of recipients</td>
<td>Average amount before increase, HUF</td>
<td>Average amount after increase, HUF</td>
<td>Number of recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>1,664,062</td>
<td>43,368</td>
<td>47,561</td>
<td>789,544</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>1,657,271</td>
<td>50,652</td>
<td>54,905</td>
<td>799,966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>1,637,847</td>
<td>57,326</td>
<td>60,962</td>
<td>806,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>1,643,409</td>
<td>63,185</td>
<td>67,182</td>
<td>808,107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>1,658,387</td>
<td>69,145</td>
<td>72,160</td>
<td>806,147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>1,676,477</td>
<td>74,326</td>
<td>78,577</td>
<td>802,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>1,716,315</td>
<td>81,975</td>
<td>87,481</td>
<td>794,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>1,731,213</td>
<td>90,476</td>
<td>93,256</td>
<td>779,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>1,719,001</td>
<td>94,080</td>
<td>98,804</td>
<td>750,260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>1,700,800</td>
<td>99,644</td>
<td>104,014</td>
<td>721,973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>1,959,202(^b)</td>
<td>99,931</td>
<td>104,610</td>
<td>302,990(^c)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Pension: Excludes survivors pensions. From 2012 onwards, the disability pensions of persons older than the mandatory retirement age are granted as old-age pensions.

\(^b\) From 2012 onwards, the disability pensions of persons older than the mandatory retirement age are granted as old-age pensions.

\(^c\) Excludes persons older than the mandatory retirement age.

Source: ONYF.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent11_03a](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent11_03a)

### Table 11.3.b: Number of those receiving pension\(^a\), and the mean sum of the provisions they received in January of the given year, from 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of benefit</th>
<th>Number of recipients 2013</th>
<th>Average amount before increase, HUF 2013</th>
<th>Average amount after increase, HUF 2013</th>
<th>Number of recipients 2014</th>
<th>Average amount before increase, HUF 2014</th>
<th>Average amount after increase, HUF 2014</th>
<th>Number of recipients 2015</th>
<th>Average amount before increase, HUF 2015</th>
<th>Average amount after increase, HUF 2015</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Old age pension</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- old age pension of persons above the mandatory retirement age(^b)</td>
<td>1,900,661</td>
<td>1,925,103</td>
<td>1,894,897</td>
<td>109,841</td>
<td>112,700</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>115,521</td>
<td>115,416</td>
<td>118,194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- pension for women entitled to retire before the mandatory age after having accumulated at least 40 accrual years</td>
<td>90,166</td>
<td>105,172</td>
<td>122,253</td>
<td>109,830</td>
<td>114,035</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>115,474</td>
<td>116,753</td>
<td>117,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- old age pension of persons younger than the mandatory retirement age</td>
<td>9,301</td>
<td>6,851</td>
<td>5,755</td>
<td>188,664</td>
<td>200,081</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>198,473</td>
<td>204,882</td>
<td>210,014</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Pension: Excludes survivors pensions. From 2012 onwards, no old-age pension is granted to persons younger than the mandatory retirement age. Exceptions are pensions for women having accumulated 40 or more accrual years.

\(^b\) From 2012 onwards, the disability pensions of persons older than the mandatory retirement age are granted as old-age pensions.

Source: ONYF.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent11_03b](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent11_03b)
### Table 11.4.a: Number of those receiving social annuities for people with damaged health, and the mean sum of the provisions they received after the increase, in January of the given year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Temporary annuity</th>
<th>Regular social annuity</th>
<th>Health damage annuity for miners</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of recipients</td>
<td>Average amount, HUF</td>
<td>Number of recipients</td>
<td>Average amount, HUF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>11,523</td>
<td>26,043</td>
<td>200,980</td>
<td>17,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>12,230</td>
<td>30,135</td>
<td>203,656</td>
<td>19,907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>11,949</td>
<td>33,798</td>
<td>207,300</td>
<td>21,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>13,186</td>
<td>36,847</td>
<td>207,091</td>
<td>22,773</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>14,945</td>
<td>40,578</td>
<td>195,954</td>
<td>23,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>19,158</td>
<td>42,642</td>
<td>184,845</td>
<td>25,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>21,538</td>
<td>46,537</td>
<td>170,838</td>
<td>27,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>21,854</td>
<td>47,096</td>
<td>159,146</td>
<td>27,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>20,327</td>
<td>47,060</td>
<td>148,704</td>
<td>27,645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>16,448</td>
<td>47,096</td>
<td>139,277</td>
<td>27,588</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disability pensions and temporary provisions for disability groups 1-2, granted prior to 2012, have been transformed to ‘disability allotments’. The provisions for permanent social benefit recipients born before 1955 have also been transformed to ‘disability allotments’. Disability pensions and permanent social benefits granted before 2012 to the members of disability group 3 have been transformed to ‘rehabilitation allotment’. The conditions of these provisions will be set in the framework of a complex revision of entitlement and eligibility.

Source: ONYF.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent11_04a](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent11_04a)

### Table 11.4.b: Number of those receiving social annuities for people with damaged health, and the mean sum of the provisions they received after the increase, in January of the given year, from 2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support for disabled persons</th>
<th>Number of recipients</th>
<th>Average amount before increase, HUF</th>
<th>Average amount after increase, HUF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- disability provision for persons older than the mandatory retirement age</td>
<td>444,014</td>
<td>418,617</td>
<td>404,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- disability provision for persons younger than the mandatory retirement age</td>
<td>41,162</td>
<td>52,186</td>
<td>44,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- rehabilitation provision</td>
<td>209,264</td>
<td>198,312</td>
<td>217,625</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- rehabilitation benefit</td>
<td>178,112</td>
<td>161,761</td>
<td>140,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- annuity for miners with damaged health</td>
<td>13,265</td>
<td>4,153</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disability pensions and temporary provisions for disability groups 1-2, granted prior to 2012, have been transformed to ‘disability allotments’. The provisions for permanent social benefit recipients born before 1955 have also been transformed to ‘disability allotments’. Disability pensions and permanent social benefits granted before 2012 to the members of disability group 3 have been transformed to ‘rehabilitation allotment’. The conditions of these provisions will be set in the framework of a complex revision of entitlement and eligibility.

Source: ONYF.

### Table 11.5: The median age for retirement and the number of pensioners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pension</th>
<th>2006</th>
<th>2007</th>
<th>2008</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2010</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old age and similar pensions</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>46,093</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>62,015</td>
<td>57.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability and accident-related disability pension</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>18,488</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>15,837</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation annuity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>64,581</td>
<td>56.2</td>
<td>78,852</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old age and similar pensions</td>
<td>59.8</td>
<td>33,134</td>
<td>59.7</td>
<td>50,878</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability and accident-related disability pension</td>
<td>50.6</td>
<td>23,045</td>
<td>51.1</td>
<td>19,032</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation annuity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>56.1</td>
<td>56,179</td>
<td>57.4</td>
<td>69,910</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Together</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old age and similar pensions</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>79,227</td>
<td>58.7</td>
<td>112,893</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability and accident-related disability pension</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>41,533</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>34,869</td>
<td>51.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation annuity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>120,760</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>147,762</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Females</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old age and similar pensions</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>84,922</td>
<td>59.2</td>
<td>52,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pension for women entitled to retire before the mandatory age after having accumulated at least 40 accrual years</td>
<td>57.6</td>
<td>54,770</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>26,639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability and accident-related disability pension</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>8,667</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation annuity</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>4,386</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>97,975</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Males</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old age and similar pensions</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>43,240</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>20,630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability and accident-related disability pension</td>
<td>51.9</td>
<td>10,673</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation annuity</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>4,102</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>58,015</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Together</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old age and similar pensions</td>
<td>59.1</td>
<td>128,162</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>73,124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability and accident-related disability pension</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>19,340</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation annuity</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>8,488</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>155,990</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Preliminary data.

Note: The source of these statistics is data from the pension determination system of the ONYF (NYUGDMEG), so these do not include the data for the armed forces and the police.

Data on MÁV is included from 2008. The data on 2012-2014 have been revised and may differ from those in earlier publications.

Source: ONYF.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent11_05](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent11_05)
### Table 11.6: The number of those receiving a disability annuity and the mean sum of the provisions they received after the increase, in January of the given year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of recipients</th>
<th>Average amount, HUF</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number of recipients</th>
<th>Average amount, HUF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>26,350</td>
<td>20,931</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>31,263</td>
<td>33,434</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>27,058</td>
<td>23,884</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>31,815</td>
<td>33,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>27,923</td>
<td>25,388</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>32,314</td>
<td>33,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>28,738</td>
<td>27,257</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>32,560</td>
<td>33,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>29,443</td>
<td>28,720</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>32,463</td>
<td>33,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>30,039</td>
<td>30,219</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>32,497</td>
<td>33,422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>30,677</td>
<td>32,709</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>32,528</td>
<td>34,034</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ONYF.

Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent11_06](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent11_06)

### Table 11.7: Newly determined disability pension claims and detailed data on the number of newly determined old-age pension claims

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Disability and accident-related disability pensions</th>
<th>Old-age and old-age type pensions&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>From the total: at the age limit</th>
<th>From the total: under the age limit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>55,558</td>
<td>18,071</td>
<td>29,526</td>
<td>47,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>54,645</td>
<td>28,759</td>
<td>14,267</td>
<td>43,026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>52,211</td>
<td>30,209</td>
<td>25,719</td>
<td>55,928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>48,078</td>
<td>32,574</td>
<td>13,574</td>
<td>46,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>44,196</td>
<td>35,940</td>
<td>36,684</td>
<td>72,624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>36,904</td>
<td>34,207</td>
<td>47,531</td>
<td>81,738</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>34,991</td>
<td>51,037</td>
<td>62,168</td>
<td>113,205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>19,832</td>
<td>25,912</td>
<td>39,423</td>
<td>65,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>21,681</td>
<td>37,468</td>
<td>51,968</td>
<td>82,936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>24,094</td>
<td>37,994</td>
<td>13,719</td>
<td>51,133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>19,340</td>
<td>43,240</td>
<td>84,922</td>
<td>128,162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>20,630</td>
<td>52,494</td>
<td>73,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>21,628</td>
<td>40,283</td>
<td>61,911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>18,422</td>
<td>38,920</td>
<td>57,342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>20,044</td>
<td>38,701</td>
<td>58,745</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Before 2012 old-age type pensions include: old-age pensions given with a retirement age threshold allowance (early retirement), artists’ pensions, pre-pension up until 1997, miners’ pensions. From 2012 onwards the data include the recipients of allowances substituting (abolished) early retirement pensions.

<sup>b</sup> Preliminary data.

Note: Pensions disbursed in the given year (determined according to the given year’s rules). The source of these statistics is data from the pension determination system of the ONYF (NYUGDMEG), so these do not include the data for the armed forces and the police. The data on 2012-2014 have been revised and may differ from those in earlier publications.

Source: ONYF.

Table 11.8: Retirement age threshold

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Birth year</th>
<th>Calendar year</th>
<th>I.</th>
<th>II.</th>
<th>I.</th>
<th>II.</th>
<th>I.</th>
<th>II.</th>
<th>I.</th>
<th>II.</th>
<th>I.</th>
<th>II.</th>
<th>I.</th>
<th>II.</th>
<th>I.</th>
<th>II.</th>
<th>I.</th>
<th>II.</th>
<th>I.</th>
<th>II.</th>
<th>I.</th>
<th>II.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1950</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1951</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952 I.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>66.5</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1952 II.</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68.5</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954 I.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1954 II.</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956 I.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59.5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956 II.</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1957</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60.5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1959</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>61.5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Those persons are entitled to receive an old age pension who are at least of the age of the old age pension threshold indicated in the legislature – marked grey in the table – relevant to them (uniform for men and women), who have fulfilled the required number of years of service, and who are not insured. In the case of old age pension, the minimum service time is 15 years. The table displays the old age pension age threshold in the case of a "representative person". The cells show the age, based on the calendar year, of a person born in the given year.

Women who have accumulated at least 40 accrual years are entitled to a full old age pension, regardless of their age. Following December 31, 2011 (legislature number CLXVII/2011) no pension can be granted prior to the old-age threshold. At the same time, the legislature continues to provide previously determined allowances under different legal titles (pre-retirement age provision, service salary, allotments for miners and ballet dancers).

Prior to 2012, early retirement pensions included the following allowances: early and reduced-amount early retirement pensions, pensions with age preference, miner's pension, artist's pension, pre-retirement age old age pension of Hungarian and EU MP's and mayors, pre-pension, service pension of professional members of the armed forces.


Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent11_08
### Table 12.1: The mean, minimum, and maximum value of the personal income tax rate, per cent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Mean tax burden, per cent</th>
<th>minimum</th>
<th>maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>18.89</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>18.63</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>18.86</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>18.10</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010(^a)</td>
<td>16.34</td>
<td>21.59</td>
<td>40.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011(^a)</td>
<td>13.78</td>
<td>20.32</td>
<td>20.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012(^b)</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) In 2010 the nominal tax rate was 17% for annual incomes lower than 5,000,000 HUF. For incomes higher than 5,000,001 HUF it was 850,000 HUF plus 32% of the amount exceeding 5,000,000 HUF. In 2011, the nominal tax rate was 16%. The joint tax base is the amount of income appended with the tax base supplement (equal to 27%).

\(^b\) In 2012 the nominal tax rate was 16%. The joint tax base is the amount of income appended with the tax base supplement.

The amount of the tax base supplement:

- does not need to be determined for the part of the income included in the joint tax base that does not surpass 2 million 424 thousand HUF,
- should be determined as 27% of the part of the income included in the joint tax base that is over 2 million 424 thousand HUF.


Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent12_01](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent12_01)
Table 12.2: Changes in the magnitude of the tax wedge in the case of minimum wage and the temporary work booklet (AMK)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Minimum wage, HUF/month</th>
<th>Minimum wage, HUF/day</th>
<th>net, HUF/month</th>
<th>net, HUF/day</th>
<th>HUF/month</th>
<th>HUF/day</th>
<th>AMK public burden, HUF/day</th>
<th>AMK tax wedge, %</th>
<th>Total wage cost, HUF/day</th>
<th>Simplified employment, Ft/day</th>
<th>Seasonal agricultural tourism work, Ft/day</th>
<th>Tax wedge, simplified employment, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>899</td>
<td>17,258</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>30,297</td>
<td>1,369</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,295</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>1,037</td>
<td>18,188</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>34,538</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,338</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>1,175</td>
<td>20,213</td>
<td>931</td>
<td>38,963</td>
<td>1,746</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>1,731</td>
<td>2,794</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>1,843</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>1,382</td>
<td>58,400</td>
<td>2,638</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>1,600</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>36,750</td>
<td>1,694</td>
<td>71,250</td>
<td>3,226</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>2,304</td>
<td>42,750</td>
<td>1,970</td>
<td>70,200</td>
<td>3,191</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>2,442</td>
<td>45,845</td>
<td>2,113</td>
<td>74,205</td>
<td>3,376</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>2,627</td>
<td>49,305</td>
<td>2,272</td>
<td>79,295</td>
<td>3,572</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>62,500</td>
<td>2,880</td>
<td>54,063</td>
<td>2,491</td>
<td>85,388</td>
<td>3,910</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>65,500</td>
<td>3,018</td>
<td>53,915</td>
<td>2,485</td>
<td>89,393</td>
<td>4,095</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>3,180</td>
<td>56,190</td>
<td>2,589</td>
<td>94,065</td>
<td>4,310</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>71,500</td>
<td>3,295</td>
<td>57,815</td>
<td>2,664</td>
<td>97,403</td>
<td>4,464</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>73,500</td>
<td>3,387</td>
<td>60,236</td>
<td>2,776</td>
<td>94,448</td>
<td>4,352</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>2,972</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Wage paid at the amount in accordance with the gross daily minimum wage column and in the case of work performed with a temporary work booklet. The basis for the comparison with the minimum wage is the assumption that employers pay temporary workers the smallest possible amount.

b According to regulations pertaining to the first half of 2009.

c From April 1st, 2010, the temporary work booklets and the public contribution tickets were discontinued, these were replaced by simplified employment.

Note: The tax wedge is the quotient of the total public burden (tax and contribution) and the total wage cost, it is calculated as: tax wedge = (total wage cost – net wage)/total wage cost.


Based on calculations of Ágota Scharle.
Table 12.3: The monthly amount of the minimum wage, the guaranteed wage minimum, and the minimum pension, in thousands of current-year HUF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Monthly amount of the minimum wage, HUF</th>
<th>As a percentage of mean gross earnings</th>
<th>As a ratio of APW, %</th>
<th>Guaranteed skilled workers minimum wage, HUF</th>
<th>Minimum pension, HUF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990. II. 1.</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>4,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991. IV. 1.</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992. I. 1.</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>5,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993. II. 1.</td>
<td>9,000</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>6,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994. II. 1.</td>
<td>10,500</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>7,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995. III. 1.</td>
<td>12,200</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>37.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>8,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996. II. 1.</td>
<td>14,500</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997. I. 1.</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>11,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998. I. 1.</td>
<td>19,500</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999. I. 1.</td>
<td>22,500</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>15,350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000. I. 1.</td>
<td>25,500</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>16,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001. I. 1.</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>18,310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002. I. 1.</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>54.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>20,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003. I. 1.</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>21,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004. I. 1.</td>
<td>53,000</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>23,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005. I. 1.</td>
<td>57,000</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>24,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006. I. 1.</td>
<td>62,500</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>52.3</td>
<td>68,000</td>
<td>25,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007. I. 1.</td>
<td>65,500</td>
<td>35.4</td>
<td>49.3</td>
<td>75,400</td>
<td>27,130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008. I. 1.</td>
<td>69,000</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>49.5</td>
<td>86,300</td>
<td>28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009. I. 1.</td>
<td>71,500</td>
<td>35.8</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>87,500</td>
<td>28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010. I. 1.</td>
<td>73,500</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td>89,500</td>
<td>28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011. I. 1.</td>
<td>78,000</td>
<td>36.6</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>94,000</td>
<td>28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012. I. 1.</td>
<td>93,000</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>54.3</td>
<td>108,000</td>
<td>28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013. I. 1.</td>
<td>98,000</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>114,000</td>
<td>28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014. I. 1.</td>
<td>101,500</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>57.7</td>
<td>118,000</td>
<td>28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015. I. 1.</td>
<td>105,000</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>122,000</td>
<td>28,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016. I. 1.</td>
<td>111,000</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>129,000</td>
<td>28,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Up to the year 1999, sectors employing unskilled labour usually received an extension of a few months for introducing the new minimum wage.

The guaranteed wage minimum applies to skilled employees, the minimum wage and the skilled workers minimum wage are gross amounts.

The minimum wage is exempt from the personal income tax from September 2002. This policy resulted in a 15.9% increase in the net minimum wage.

APW: mean wage of workers in the processing industry, based on the NFSZ BT. In 1990, the data is the previous year’s data, indexed (since there was no NFSZ BT conducted in 1990).


Table 12.4: The tax burden on work as a ratio of tax revenue and earnings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Tax burden on work as a ratio of tax revenue(a), %</th>
<th>Implicit tax rate(b)</th>
<th>Tax wedge on 67% level of mean earnings</th>
<th>Tax wedge on the minimum wage(c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>52.4</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992</td>
<td>54.8</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1993</td>
<td>54.4</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994</td>
<td>53.7</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1995</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1996</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1997</td>
<td>54.2</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>53.1</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1999</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>48.7</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>48.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>47.8</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>36.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>49.7</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>40.6(d)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>49.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>..</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) Tax burden on work and contributions as a ratio of tax revenue from all tax forms.
\(b\) The implicit tax rate is the quotient of the revenue from taxes and contributions pertaining to work and the income derived from work.
\(c\) The tax wedge is the quotient of the total public burden (tax and contribution) and the total wage cost, it is calculated as: tax wedge = (total wage cost – net wage)/total wage cost.
\(d\) The tax wedge of the minimum wage is the 2009 annual mean (the contributions decreased in June).
Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent12_04
### Table 13.1: Employment and unemployment rate of population aged 15–64 by gender in the EU, 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Employment rate</th>
<th>Unemployment rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>males</td>
<td>females</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>75.1</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>58.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>65.9</td>
<td>59.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>66.2</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>77.9</td>
<td>62.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>76.6</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>77.6</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>75.3</td>
<td>68.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>60.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>59.3</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>69.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>60.1</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>57.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>69.9</td>
<td>66.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>68.0</td>
<td>66.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>71.3</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>57.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>76.2</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>78.0</td>
<td>69.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>47.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>66.9</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>53.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>62.9</td>
<td>52.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>77.0</td>
<td>74.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>69.5</td>
<td>55.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>69.2</td>
<td>61.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-28</td>
<td>70.8</td>
<td>60.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Online data source in xls format: [http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent13_01](http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent13_01)
Table 13.2: Employment composition of the countries in the EU\(^a\), 2015

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Self employed(^a)</th>
<th>Part time</th>
<th>Fixed term contract</th>
<th>Agriculture</th>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>Market services</th>
<th>Non market services(^c)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>30.1</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>16.2</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>40.7</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Kingdom</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>35.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>37.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>27.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>35.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>25.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>44.8</td>
<td>31.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>23.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>42.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>28.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>32.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>21.9</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>25.3</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Romania</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>45.9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>16.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>38.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>26.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>25.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EU-28</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\) Per cent of employment, except for employees with fixed-term contracts: per cent of employees.

\(^{b}\) Includes the members of cooperatives and business partnerships.

\(^{c}\) One-digit industries O-U.


Online data source in xls format: http://www.bpdata.eu/mpt/2016ent13_02
DESCRIPTION OF THE MAIN DATA SOURCES

The data have two main sources in terms of which office gathered them: the regular institutional and population surveys of the Hungarian Central Statistical Office (CSO, in Hungarian: Központi Statisztikai Hivatal, KSH), and the register and surveys of the National Employment Service (in Hungarian: Nemzeti Foglalkoztatási Szolgálat, NFSZ).

MAIN DATA SOURCES OF THE KSH

Labour Force Survey – KSH MEF

The KSH has been conducting a new statistical survey since January 1992 to obtain ongoing information on the labour force status of the Hungarian population. The MEF is a household survey which provides quarterly information on the non-institutional population aged 15–74. The aim of the survey is to observe employment and unemployment according to international statistical recommendations based on the concepts and definitions recommended by the International Labour Organization (ILO), independently from existing national labour regulations or their changes.

In international practice, the labour force survey is a widely used statistical tool to provide simultaneous, comprehensive, and systematic monitoring of employment, unemployment, and underemployment. The survey techniques minimise the subjective bias in classification (since people surveyed are classified by strict criteria), and provide freedom to also consider national characteristics.

In the MEF, the surveyed population is divided into two main groups according to the economic activity performed by them during the reference week (up to the year 2003, this was always on the week containing the 12th of the month): economically active persons (labour force), and economically inactive persons.

The group of economically active persons consists of those in the labour market either as employed or unemployed persons during the reference week.

The definitions used in the survey follow ILO recommendations. According to these, those designated employed are persons who, during the reference week worked one hour or more earning some form of income, or had a job from which they were only temporarily absent (on leave, illness, etc.).

Work providing income includes all activities that:
- result in monetary income, payment in kind, or
- that were carried out in the hopes of income realized in the future, or
- were performed without payment in a family business or on a farm (i.e. unpaid family workers).

From the survey’s point of view the activities below are not considered as work:
- work done without payment for another household or institution (voluntary work),
- building or renovating of an own house or flat, internships tied to education (not even if it is compensated),
- housework, including work in the garden. Work on a person’s own land is only considered to generate income if the results are sold in the market, not produced for self-consumption.

Persons on child-care leave are classified – based on the 1995 ILO recommendations for transitional countries determined in Prague – according to their activity during the survey week.

Since, according to the system of national accounting, defense activity contributes to the national product, conscripts are generally considered as economically active persons, any exceptions are marked in the footnotes of the table. The data regarding the number of conscripts comes from administrative sources. (The retrospective time-series based on CSO data exclude conscripted soldiers. This adjustment affects the data until 2003, when military conscription was abolished.)

Unemployed persons are persons aged 15–74 who:
- were without work, i.e. neither had a job nor were at work (for one hour or more) in paid employment or self-employment during the reference week,
– had actively looked for work at any time in the four
weeks up to the end of the reference week,
– were available for work within two weeks following
the reference week if they found an appropriate job.
Those who do not have a job, but are waiting to start
a new job within 30 days (since 2003 within 90 days)
make up a special group of the unemployed.
Active job search includes: contacting a public or
private employment office to find a job, applying to an
employer directly, inserting, reading, answering adver-
sishments, asking friends, relatives or other methods.
The labour force (i.e. economically active population)
comprises employed and unemployed persons.
Persons are defined economically inactive (i.e. not
in the labour force) if they were neither employed in
regular, income-earning jobs, nor searching for a job,
or, if they had searched, had not yet started work. Pas-
sive unemployed are included here - those who would
like a job, but have given up any active search for work,
because they do not believe that they have a chance of
finding any.
The MEF is based on a multi-stage stratified sample
design. The stages of sampling are defined as follows:
primary sampling units (PSUs) are enumeration dis-
tricts (EDs) and secondary sampling units (SSUs) are
dwellings in settlements with 15,000 or more inhabit-
ants, while PSUs are settlements, SSUs are EDs and ul-
timate sampling units are dwellings in all other cases.
In the MEF sample design strata are defined in terms
of geographic units, size categories of settlements and
area types such as city centres, outskirts, etc.
The size of the sample means that the main indica-
tors of the labour market are representative in terms
of regions (NUTS2) as well. The quarterly MEF sam-
ple includes a sample of three randomly selected dwell-
ings, and labour market information is collected from
one household each month. From 1998, the quarterly
sample contains about 33,000 households and 66,000
persons. The sample has a simple rotation pattern: any
household entering the sample at some time is expected
to provide labour market information for six consecu-
tive quarters, then leave the sample permanently. The
intersection of the samples of two consecutive periods
tend to be less than the 5/6th that would be obtained
at a 100 per cent response rate.
Since 2003, the weights used to make the sample
representative are based on the 2001 census popula-
tion record base. At the same time, the 2001–2002 data
was recalculated and replaced as well. The LFS-based

time series published in this volume use the following
weighting schemes: (i) in 1992-1997 the weights are
based on the 1990 Census (ii) in 1998-2001 the weights
based on the 1990 Census have been corrected using
data of the 2001 Census (iii) in 2002-2005 the weights
are based on the 2001 Census (iv) from 2006 onwards
the weights based on the 2001 Census have been cor-
rected using the 2011 Census.

Institution-Based Labour Statistics – KSH IMS
The source of the earnings data is the monthly (annual)
institutional labour statistical survey. The sample frame
covers enterprises with at least 5 employees, and public
and social insurance and non-profit institutions irre-
spective of the staff numbers of employees.
The earnings data relate to the full-time employees
on every occasion. The potential elements of the pre-
vailing monthly average earnings are: base wage, al-
lowances (including the miner’s loyalty bonus, and the
Széchenyi and Professor’s scholarships), supplementary
payments, bonuses, premiums, and wages and salaries
for the 13th and further months.
Net average earnings are calculated by deducting
from the institution’s gross average earnings the em-
ployer’s contributions, the personal income tax, ac-

cording to the actual rates (i.e. taking into account the
threshold concerning the social security contributions
and employee deductions). The personal income tax is
calculated based on the actual withholding rate applied
by the employers when disbursing monthly earnings
in the given year.
The size and direction of the difference between the
gross and the net (after-tax) income indexes depends
on actual annual changes in the tax table (tax brack-
etes) and in the tax allowances. Thus the actual size of
the differences are also influenced by the share of indi-
viduals at given firms that fall outside the bracket for
employee allowances.
The indexes pertain to the comparable sample, tak-
ing changes in the definitions, and of the sample frame
into account. The KSH traditionally publishes the main
average index as the earnings growth measure. Thus
the indicator of change in earnings reflects both the
changes in the number of observations and the actual
earnings changes simultaneously. The change of net
real earnings is calculated from the ratio of net income
index and the consumer price index in the same period.
Non-manual workers are persons with occupa-
tions classified by the standardized occupational
code (FEOR) in major groups 1–4., manual workers are persons with occupations classified in major groups 5–9.

**KSH Strike statistics**

The CSO data cover strikes with at least 10 participants and token strikes lasting for at least 2 hours.

**Labour Force Accounting Census – KSH MEM**

Before the publication of the MEF, the annual MEM gave account of the total labour force in the time period between the two censuses.

The MEM, as its name shows, is a balance-like account that compares the labour supply (human resources) to the labour demand at an ideal moment (1 January). Population is taken into account by economic activity, with a differentiation between statistical data of those of working age and the population outside of the working age. Source of data: Annual labour survey on employment since 1992 of enterprises and of all government institutions, labour force survey, census, national healthcare records, social security records, and company registry. Data on unemployment comes from the registration system of the NFSZ.

**Other data sources**

Census data were used for the estimation of the employment data in 1980 and 1990. The aggregate economic data are based on national account statistics, the consumer’s and producer’s price statistics and industrial surveys. A detailed description of the data sources are to be found in the relevant publications of the KSH.

**MAIN NFSZ DATA SOURCES**

**Unemployment (Jobseekers’) Register Database – NFSZ-REG**

The other main source of unemployment data in Hungary – and in most of the developed countries – is the huge database containing so called administrative records which are collected monthly and include the individual data of the registered unemployed/jobseekers.

The register actually includes all jobseekers, but from these, at a given point of time, only those are regarded as registered unemployed/jobseekers who:

– had themselves registered with a local office of the NFSZ as unemployed/jobseekers (i.e. he/she has no job but wishes to work, for which they seek assistance from the labour market organisation).

– at the time of the examination (on the final day of any month), the person is not a pensioner or a full-time student, does not receive any rehabilitation provision or benefit, and is ready to co-operate with the local employment office in order to become employed (i.e. he/she accepts the suitable job or training offered to him/her, and keeps the appointments made with the local employment office’s placement officer/counselor/benefit administrator).

If a person included in the register is working under any subsidised employment programme on the closing day, or is a participant of a labour market training programme, her/his unemployed/jobseeker status is suspended.

If the client is not willing to co-operate with the local office, he/she is removed from the register of the unemployed/jobseekers.

The data – i.e. the administrative records of the register – allow not only for the identification of date-related stock data, but also for monitoring flows, inflows as well as outflows, within a period.

The database contains the number of decrees pertaining to the removal or suspension of jobseeking benefits, the number of those receiving monetary support based on accounting items, support transactions, the exact date of entry and exit and the reason for the exit (for example, job placement, the end of entitlement, disqualification, entry into a subsidized employment programme, etc.), as well as the financial data of jobseeking benefits (for example, average monthly amount, average support paid for the number of participants on the closing date, for exiters, and those who found placement).

The jobseeking benefit register can also monitor the average duration of the period of benefit allocation and the average monthly amount of the benefits allocated.

For the period between 1991 and 1996, the register also contains the stock and flow data of the recipients of new entrant’s unemployment benefit. Between 1997–2005, the system also contained the recipients of pre-retirement unemployment benefit.

Jobseeking allowance recipients: from September 1, 2011 the conditions for determining and disbursing the jobseeking allowance changed. The two phases of the jobseeking allowance were discontinued and the period of entitlement decreased from 270 days to 90 days. Jobseekers needed to have at least 360 days of worktime counting towards entitlement in the 5 years prior to becoming a jobseeker (prior to September 1, 2011, this was 365 days in the previous 4 years). Its amount is 60% of...
the allowance base, but maximum the amount of the smallest mandatory wage on the first day of the entitlement (allowance base: the monthly average amount from the four calendar quarters preceding the submission of the application).

Jobseeking assistance recipients: from September 1, 2011 the conditions for determining and disbursing the jobseeking assistance changed. The “a” and “b” type of benefit were discontinued, jobseekers can still request the “c” type of benefit under the title of pre-retirement jobseeking benefit, but the period of entitlement (and depletion) of at least 140 days decreased to 90 days.

Regular social assistance recipients: those from among the regular registered jobseekers who are of active age and are in a disadvantaged labour market position, and who receive social assistance to complement or substitute their income. From January 1, 2009, those receiving regular social assistance were included in two categories: regular social assistance recipients, and recipients of on call support. This support was replaced by a new type of assistance, the wage replacement support from January 1, 2011, then from September 1, 2011, the name was changed to employment substitution support. (Legislation III. of 1993 pertaining to social management and social assistance).

Based on the records of labour demand needs reported to the NFSZ, the stock and flow data of vacancies are also processed and published for each month. Furthermore, detailed monthly statistics of participation in the different active programmes, number of participants, and their inflows and outflows are also prepared based on the assistance disbursed.

The very detailed monthly statistics – in a breakdown by country, region, county, local employment office service delivery area and community – build on the secondary processing of administrative records that are generated virtually as the rather important and useful “by-products” of the accomplishment of the NFSZ’s main functions (such as placement services, payment of benefits, active programme support, etc.).

The NFSZ (and its predecessors, i.e. NMH, OMK – National Labour Centre, OMMK and OMKMK) has published the key figures of these statistics on a monthly basis since 1989. The denominators of the unemployment rates calculated for the registered unemployed/jobseekers are the economically active population data published by the KSH MEF. It is mainly the different conceptual approach, definition, and the fundamentally different monitoring/measuring methods that account for this variance.

**Short-Term Labour Market Projection Surveys – NFSZ PROG**

At the initiative and under the coordination of the NFSZ (and its legal predecessors), the NFSZ PROG has been conducted since 1991, twice a year, in March and September, by interviewing over 7,500 employers. Since 2004 the survey is conducted once a year, in the month of September.

The interviews focus on the companies’ projections of their material and financial processes, their development and human resource plans, and they are also asked about their concrete lay-off or recruitment plans, as well as their expected need for any active labour market programmes.

The surveys are processed from bottom up, from the service delivery areas, through counties, to the whole country, providing useful information at all levels for the planning activities of the NFSZ.

The survey provides an opportunity and possibility for the regions, the counties and Budapest to analyse in greater depth (also using information from other sources) the major trends in their respective labour markets, to make preparations for tackling problems that are likely to occur in the short term, and to effectively meet the ever-changing needs of their clients.

The forecast is only one of the outputs of the survey. Further very important “by-products” include regular and personal liaison with companies, the upgraded skills of the placement officers and other administrative personnel, enhanced awareness of the local circumstances, and the adequate orientation of labour market training programmes in view of the needs identified by the surveys.

The prognosis surveys are occasionally supplemented by supplementary questions and sets of questions to obtain some further useful information that can be used by researchers and the decision-makers of employment and education/training policy.

From 2005, the surveys are conducted in cooperation with the Institute for Analyses of the Economy and Entrepreneurship of the Hungarian Chamber of Industry and Commerce (in Hungarian: Magyar Kereskedelmi és Iparkamara Gazdaság- és Vállalkozás Kutató Intézet, MKIK GVI), with one additional benefit being that
with the help of the surveyors of the Institute, the sample size has increased to nearly 8,000.

**Wage Survey Database – NFSZ BT**

The NFSZ (and its legal predecessors) has conducted since 1992, once a year, a representative survey with a huge sample size to investigate individual wages and earnings, at the request of the Ministry of National Economy (and its legal predecessors).

The reference month of data collection is the month of May in each year, but for the calculation of the monthly average of irregularly paid benefits (beyond the base wage/salary), 1/12th of the total amount of such benefits received during the previous year is used.

In the competitive sector, the data collection only covered initially companies of over 20 persons; it was incumbent on all companies to provide information, but the sample includes only employees born on certain dates in any month of any year.

Data collection has also covered companies of 10–19 since 1995, and companies of 5–9 have been covered since 2000, where the companies actually involved in data collection are selected at random (ca. 20 per cent), and the selected ones have to provide information about all of their full-time employees.

Data on basic wages and earnings structure can only be retrieved from these surveys in Hungary, thus it is, in practice, these huge, annually generated databases that can serve as the basis of the wage reconciliation negotiations conducted by the social partners.

In the budgetary sector, all budgetary institutions provide information, regardless of their size, in such a way that the decisive majority of the local budgetary institutions – the ones that are included in the TAKEH central payroll accounting system – provide fully comprehensive information, and the remaining budgetary institutions provide information only about their employees who were born on certain days (regarded as the sample).

Data has only been collected on the professional members of the armed forces since 1999.

Prior to 1992, such data collection took place in every third year, thus we are in possession of an enormous database for the years of 1983, 1986 and also 1989.

Of the employees included in the sample, the following data are available:

- the sector the employer operates in, headcount, employer’s local unit, type of entity, ownership structure
- employee’s wage category, job occupation, gender, age, educational background.

Based on the huge databases which include the data by individual, the data is analysed every year in the following ways:

- Standard data analysis, as agreed upon by the social partners, used for wage reconciliation negotiations (which is received by every confederation participating in the negotiations).
- Model calculations to determine the expected impact of the rise of the minimum wage.
- Analyses to meet the needs of the Wage Policy Department, Ministry of National Resources, for the analysis and presentation of wage ratios
- Analyses for the four volume statistical yearbook (total national economy, competitive sector, budgetary sector, and regional volumes).

The entire database is adopted every year by the KSH, which enables the Office to also provide data for certain international organisations, (e.g. ILO and OECD). The NGM earlier the NMH also regularly provides special analyses for the OECD.

The database containing the data by individual allows for a) the analysis of data for groups of people determined by any combination of pre-set criteria, b) the comparison of basic wages and earnings, with special regard to the composition of the different groups analysed, as well as c) the analysis of the dispersion of the basic wages and earnings.

Since 2002, the survey of individual wages and earnings was substantially developed to fulfill all requirements of the EU, so from this time on it serves also for the purposes of the Structure of Earnings Survey (SES), which is obligatory for each member state in every fourth year. One important element of the changes was the inclusion of part-time employees in the sample since 2002.

SES 2002 was the first, and recently the databases of SES 2006 and 2010 were also sent to the Eurostat in anonymized form in accordance with EU regulations.
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