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1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Defining the Problem

Aside from mainstream mobility analyses, which are mostly based on national surveys and examine rates of mobility, there is a growing body of literature that focuses on how mobile people experience mobility (e.g. Friedman 2016, Gardner et al. 2018, Li 2015, Mallman 2018, Naudet 2018, Reay, 2002, Reay et al. 2009a). The sociological approach which focuses on the subjective experience of social mobility is connected to a "sociology of critical capacity", that is, "sociology which recognises the actors' legitimate capacity to justify their actions and make sense of them." (Naudet 2018: 14.) This perspective concentrates on the way of narration in which actors develop discourses about their actions (Naudet 2018).

In general, studies on the subjective experience of social mobility rely on the analytical framework of Bourdieu (see e.g. Friedman 2016, Mallman 2018, Reay, 2002, Reay et al. 2009). The use of Bourdieu’s analytical tools to study social mobility is not self-evident since he was not involved in research that directly examined social mobility, and he is often characterised as a sociologist of ‘reproduction’ and ‘inheritance’ who ignores the significance of mobility. However, the Bourdieusian framework can offer analytical and methodological tools to study social mobility. Friedman and Savage (2018: 67.) argue that “Bourdieu’s sensitivity to time and temporality, his interest in accumulation, his awareness of the cultural and subjective, as well as structural components of mobility, as well as his multidimensional approach offers a highly productive way of taking forward a wide-ranging account of social mobility.”

The thesis applies the habitus concept of Bourdieu which enables to link the objective and subjective features of social mobility because individuals are not external to the “…mobility which they might or might not undergo (…), mobility in fact inheres within people: it is fundamentally experienced on a daily basis.” (Friedman – Savage 2018: 76.). By using the concept of habitus, “the ways in which the social world is incorporated into the physical and mental dispositions –we might say the selves – of social actors” (Lawler – Payne 2018: 2-3.) can be captured. Habitus inheres the adaptation to (changing) social circumstances. Social reality “exists… twice, in things and in minds, in habitus and field, outside and inside of
agents.” (Bourdieu – Wacquant 2002: 127.)

Lawler and Payne (2018: 2) propose that a “newer conceptualisation of class, based on Bourdieusian insights about capitals, cultures, and habitus, can offer fresh insights into mobility outcomes”. To study this, it is necessary to expand the field of mobility research with detailed, small-scale, qualitative studies which can reveal the complexity of mobility trajectories, processes, and consequences, and which have the potential to create connections to parallel fields such as social identity, gender, life course, family relations, community dynamics, employment, and migration. The study of personal narratives of mobility offers a new level of analysis that shows the detail, complexity and variety of social processes which are behind national mobility rates, and helps us to understand how social mobility is experienced and perceived by different social groups. (Lawler – Payne 2018).

Public discourses often regard upward mobility as a clearly progressive force and aim of society that is unequivocally beneficial for the individual (Friedman 2016, Lawler – Payne 2018, Naudet 2018, Payne 2017). However, there is a line of research (e.g. Abrahams – Ingram 2016, Cole – Omari 2003, Friedman 2016, Hochschild 2003), which starts from Sorokin’s dissociative thesis (1959), drawing attention to the fact that upward mobility at the level of the individual is more complicated than to consider it a purely positive phenomenon (Lawler – Payne 2018, Naudet 2018). These studies highlight that upward mobility – leaving a class and joining another class – has a cost in terms of psychological well-being. There are only a few studies (Naudet 2018, Abrahams – Ingram 2016) that focus on how people experiencing social mobility try to decrease the tension between their group of origin and the new social group.

This study examines under what conditions upward mobility of Hungarian first in family graduates is associated with psychological and emotional costs – that is, causes the (temporal) destabilisation of habitus. Then it explores how the first generation Roma graduates develop a stable Roma identity, and make sense of their mobility trajectory given that their mobility is usually more costly than that of members of majority society according to our results. That is, this study enables us to examine the subjective experience of upward mobility and reveal possible intersections between ethnicity and class. To date, only a limited number of studies (e.g. Durst – Bereményi 2021, Cole – Omari 2003, Hochschild 2003, Naudet 2018, Reay et al. 2001, Shahrokni 2015, 2018) investigated the upward mobility experience of stigmatised minority groups. Furthermore, many studies’ sample consists of college or university students while our research concentrates on the period after higher education enabling us to focus on the
actual outcomes of mobility.

1.2 Research Questions, Aims, and Relevance

The purpose of this thesis is to analyse the subjective experience of mobility of Roma and non-Roma first in family graduates in Hungary. On the one hand, it examines under what conditions education-driven upward mobility entails higher psychological and emotional costs. On the other hand, it studies how first in family Roma graduates make sense of their mobility trajectory. That is the goal of this study is to examine the intertwined effects of class and ethnicity in forming individuals’ movement across the social space. Furthermore, the theoretical aim of the thesis is to formulate suggestions for the modification and expansion of the Bourdieusian habitus concept based on our empirical results.

To answer our questions qualitative interviews were conducted with Roma and non-Roma first in family graduates. The empirical base of the first part of the study consists of 166 interviews, while the second part is based on 48 interviews. The interview data were analysed by qualitative content analysis, using Atlas TI software.

The aim of this study is to enrich the literature on the experience of social mobility of stigmatised minority groups. Our findings may help us to understand how complex is the experience of upward mobility for Roma graduates in Hungary. The objective of the study is to contribute to filling the gap that can be observed in the literature (aside from Naudet 2018) as regards analysing the mobility experience of disadvantaged minority groups from a comparative perspective. Much of the current literature on successful Roma pays almost exclusive attention to examining young people who are still participating in higher education. Furthermore, little is known about the outcomes of the upward mobility of Roma graduates in Hungary, because much of the current literature on successful Roma focuses on examining young people who are still participating in higher education (Nyíró – Durst 2018).
1.3 Structure of the Study

The thesis starts with a literature review on the concept of habitus and its critique as well as empirical studies on the use of habitus in the field of mobility research. It also includes a chapter on the research of successful Roma in Hungary. The second chapter presents the research background, it has three parts: the first is the sociodemographic characterisation of the target group (first generation Roma and non-Roma graduates), the second one offers an overview of mobility trends in Hungary in the past decades, and the third one is about the situation of Roma in the education and labour market in Hungary. The fourth chapter describes the methodology of the study: the research questions, aims, the sample and the conceptualisation of habitus are presented. The fifth chapter concerns the empirical results of the thesis. Finally, the last chapter concludes the study by summarising the main results and presenting the theoretical and practical implications of it.
2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

2.1 Sociological research on the personal and social consequences of upward mobility

The mainstream quantitative research regarded social mobility as vertical mobility and operationalised it as a movement between broad occupational groups. Their main method is editing standard mobility tables and making descriptive analyses. These studies use highly aggregated data and employ simple measures (Mayer – Müller 1971, Payne 2018, Friedman – Savage 2018). Mayer and Müller (1971) were among the first to claim that mobility research neglected the field of the subjective aspects of individual’s movement: perception of the structure, satisfaction with status, mobility norms and values and aspirations.¹ 20 years later, Higginbotham and Weber (1992) were still criticizing the literature on mobility because it does not examine the contexts and subjective experiences of social mobility. Similarly, Payne (2018) emphasised that the dominant sociological mobility paradigm paid little attention to the questions about the causal processes and consequences of mobility. In the next section, those alternatives to the mainstream mobility research will be introduced that focus on the personal and social consequences of upward mobility.

Sorokin introduced the dissociative thesis in 1927 according to which social mobility dislocates individuals from their familiar social environment and they have to adjust to new norms, values, and expected behaviours that cause difficulties. Thus social mobility has a permanent detrimental influence on mental health and individual well-being (Sorokin 1927, Ellis–Lane 1967, Goldthorpe 1980, Houle–Martin 2011, Friedman 2013, Vastagh 2020). According to Sorokin, social mobility requires a “corresponding accommodation of body, mind, and reactions” (Sorokin 1927: 508, cited by Daenekindt 2017: 16) because habits, attitudes, and

¹ A model of mobility research is introduced by Mayer and Müller (1971) that has three elements, and one of them is the study of the meaning of social mobility at the level of individuals. This approach examines mobility as social locomotion from the perspective of individuals and it has to study the following fields: “the subjective meaning of social mobility: mobility experience, aspirations, mobility cognitions, values and norms; the interrelations of individual movements in various role spheres; the connection between social mobility and status inconsistency or incongruence; the effects of social mobility on interpersonal relationships and vice versa; and the treatment of social mobility as a process, i.e. as sequences of specific positions, roles and statuses for which occupational career, is but one example” (Mayer – Müller 1971: 152.)
preferences learned in the social position of origin may not be appropriate in the social position of destination. The author claims that this process of accommodation is an inevitable part of the experience of mobility and it is uprooting and detrimental to the individual (Daenekindt 2017). Because the mobile individual is never totally able to overcome the effect of the social position of origin, that person “is doomed to think and to look at the world through the glasses of his ‘social box’” (Sorokin 1927: 509 cited by Daenekindt 2017: 16). The need the adaptation to the new social status position that results in dissociation (Daenekindt 2017).

Similarly, Durkheim (1951) states that social mobility leads to marginal, alienated individuals, who are detached from the culture and community of their origin and that of their destination. This detachment from society results in stress (Ashford 1990). Durkheim found that both downward and upward mobility are associated with the rise of suicide rate because the number of those individuals who find themselves in anomic situation increase (Durkheim 1951). According to the hypothesis of Janowitz and Curtis, the social consequences of occupational mobility explain these mental problems. The authors claim that social mobility has a destructive effect on the primary group structures (like family, friendship). Furthermore, they believe that tensions within the primary group will be the highest for families with long-range downward and upward mobility, while the stress will be low for stable or moderately mobile families; and it will be higher in the case of intragenerational mobility compared to intergenerational mobility (Lipset et al. 1959). Jackson and Marsden (1963), Musgrove (1963) and later Stacey (1967) and Sennett and Cobb (1976) all demonstrated that the upwardly mobile often experienced problems of ‘isolation’, ‘vulnerability’ and ‘mental disorder’.

In North American sociology, a weaker form of the dissociative thesis appeared as status inconsistency (status crystallisation) (Payne 2018). This literature demonstrated that status ambiguities, which are the possible results of social mobility, lead to negative personal and social consequences. For instance, Segal et al. (1970) found that status inconsistency (and thus social mobility) results in lower self-evaluation, Jackson (1962) pointed out that it causes anxiety, Lenski (1956) demonstrated its relationship with social withdrawal, and Geschwender (1968) found that it leads to social isolation.

Another approach, the ameliorative hypothesis is formulated within the framework of reference group theory (Merton 1957). This hypothesis raises that the disruptive effect of upward mobility can be ameliorated or completely avoided by prior experiences. It supposes that anticipatory socialisation is the usual mechanism for realising social mobility. That is, the lower-class
individuals, who have already absorbed (through anticipatory socialisation) the values, norms and judgemental standards of the middle-class to which they aspire to join easily become accepted by that part of the society. However, according to Merton, upward mobility is a detrimental experience regarding one’s class of origin because the individual becomes gradually alienated from the attitudes, values, and interactions of their group of origin (Ellis – Lane 1967).

Although the work of Goldthorpe focused on structural changes in mobility, he conducted a few research (e.g. Goldthorpe 1980) on the subjective dimensions of mobility. In 1980, he collected 246 life-history notes and studied how these men made sense of their mobility (or immobility). The author found that the upwardly mobile respondents were very satisfied with their upward trajectories. The research concluded that mobility is a positive force at both the individual and societal levels (Friedman 2013). Friedman (2013) raises the possibility that these results of Goldthorpe were an artefact of his research design.

Studies (e.g. Lawler 1999) have also been conducted that examined the specificity of the female mobility experience (Friedman 2013). The book of Mahony and Zmroczyk’s (1997) Class Matters collects essays on the uneasy trajectory of female academics from working-class origins through to success in the academy (Hey, 1997; Reay, 1997; Skeggs, 1997). While other studies (e.g. Reay 2002, Ingram 2011) focused on the particular experiences of upwardly mobile males.

The first discussions and analyses of the subjective experience of ethnic minorities’ upward mobility emerged around the early 1990s with the work of Higginbotham and Weber (1988, 1992). They examined how race and gender shape the class experience of upward mobility for African American and white women. Similarly, Neckerman et al.(1999), Hochschild (2003), and Cole – Omari (2003) studied the role of race/ethnicity in the process of social mobility. These studies emphasise that upward mobility usually entails more costs for the members of ethnic minorities compared to those of the majority society. Loury et al. (2005) investigated how ethnic relationships may act to inhibit social mobility. Rollock et al. (2011) demonstrated how upwardly mobile Black Caribbeans are often forced to abandon accents and other markers of their ‘blackness’ to become accepted in the white-dominated middle-class.

However, several quantitative studies found no support for the dissociative thesis. For example, Marshall and Firth’s (1999) cross-national survey demonstrated that mobility is not associated with ‘dissatisfaction’. Similarly, Houle and Martin (2011), Daenekindt (2017) and Chan (2017)
do not find confirmation for the dissociative thesis by using data from large-scale surveys. While the findings of other studies (e.g. Hadjar – Samuel 2015) support the idea of dissociative effects in terms of negative influences of intergenerational upward mobility on subjective well-being.

In the last decades, a new approach to research on subjective experiences of social mobility appeared in British sociology that is inspired primarily by the work of Bourdieu. This research agenda relies primarily on the theory of habitus, in particular the concept of divided habitus. Early examples of this line of research include the paper of Reay (1997b), Lawler (1999), Horvat and Antonio (1999), and Bland (2004). In recent years, there has been an increasing amount of studies (e.g. Reay et al. 2009a, 2009b, Ingram 2011, Abrahams – Ingram 2013, Lee – Kramer 2013, Friedman 2013, 2016, Lehmann 2014, Shahrokni 2015, 2018, 2019, Reay 2015, Naudet 2018,) that rely on Bourdieu's theoretical framework when examining the subjective dimension of social mobility. An important book in this research line is Bourdieu: The Next Generation. The development of Bourdieu’s intellectual heritage in contemporary UK sociology was created by the Bourdieu Study Group of the British Sociological Association in 2016. Several studies (Burke 2016, Morrin 2016, Ingram – Abrahams 2016) of this book use the Bourdieusian concept to examine the experience of social mobility at a micro level. In 2018, a book called Social Mobility for the 21st Century was published that includes important contributions (Mallman 2018, Gardner et al. 2018, Friedman – Savage 2018) to this research line as well. The editors of the book (Lawler – Payne 2018) argue that the Bourdieusian concept of capitals, cultures, and habitus can add to the understanding of social mobility. Furthermore, they support the expansion of mobility research with detailed, small-scale, qualitative studies which are able to reveal the complexity of mobility trajectories, processes, and consequences.

Mobility is not a central theme in Bourdieu’s sociology and he is seen as a researcher of ‘reproduction’ and ‘inheritance’ rather than ‘change’ that raises the question of why it is worth turning to Bourdieu’s concept of habitus when examining the effects of social mobility on individuals. Sociological research conceptualises mobility in terms of occupational access (that is, classes). This neglects the prior endowments (the propulsive forces) that individuals bring with them into occupations, and how these accumulated resources act as constraints that structure the possibilities of the present and future action. The Bourdieusian concept is better able to capture this complexity. First, habitus allows for a much more detailed and joined-up understanding of the role of history and temporality in understanding social mobility (Friedman – Savage 2018). Habitus helps to conceptualise how the mobile individual’s past can shape their
present. It demonstrates how elements of their bodily ‘hexis’ (e.g. accent, pronunciation, vocabulary, posture, taste) may always bear the imprint of their class origins (Friedman 2013). Second, Bourdieu’s approach to class position is multidimensional – highlighting that can class positions can only be fully understood as a sum of economic, cultural, and social capital available to the individual (Lawler – Payne 2018, Friedman – Savage 2018). That is, Friedman and Savage emphasise that a complete understanding of mobility trajectories needs to take into consideration several indicators of origin and destination. Third, the concept of habitus allows linking the objective structures and subjective dimensions of mobility. (Friedman – Savage 2018).

In sum, although studies into the subjective experience of mobility have never been the main focus of the research in social mobility, has a long history. In the last two decades, several Bourdieu-inspired qualitative investigations emerged, and this dissertation contributes to this line of research.

2.2 Bourdieu’s habitus concept

Habitus is probably Bourdieu’s most influential and cited concept, however it is often criticized and misunderstood (Maton, 2008; Yang, 2013; Asimaki – Koustourakis 2014; Fáber, 2018). As Maton (2008: 49) writes it: ‘…habitus is (…) one of the most misunderstood, misused and hotly contested of Bourdieu’s ideas. It can be both, revelatory and mystifying, instantly recognisable and difficult to define, straightforward and slippery. In short, despite its popularity, “habitus” remains anything but clear.’


Bourdieu defines habitus in a variety of ways, which also contributes to the confusion around
the concept, with the most cited definition being the following: ‘The conditionings associated with a particular class of conditions of existence produce habitus, systems of durable, transposable dispositions, structured structures predisposed to function as structuring structures, that is, as principles which generate and organize practices and representations...’ (Bourdieu, 1990: 53)

Nash interprets the Bourdieusian concept of habitus as follows: The habitus is (...) a system of durable dispositions inculcated by objective structural conditions, but since it is embodied, a habitus develops a history and generates its practices, for some period of time, even after the original material conditions which gave rise to it have disappeared. The internalised principles of the habitus are the principles that structure the culture. In this sense, habitus is internalised structure and the physical embodiment of objective structure’ (Nash, 1999: 184).

In Ritzer’s interpretation: ‘Habitus are the “mental, or cognitive structures” through which people deal with the social world. People are endowed with a series of internalised schemes through which they perceive, understand, appreciate, and evaluate the social world. It is through such schemes that people both produce their practices and perceive and evaluate them. Dialectically, habitus are »the product of the internalisation of the structures« of the social world (Bourdieu, 1989: 18, cited by Ritzer, 2010: 530-531). In fact, we can think of habitus as »internalised, ‘embodied’ social structures« (Bourdieu, 1996: 468, cited by Ritzer, 2010: 530-531). They are something like a “common sense”. They reflect objective divisions in the class structure, such as age groups, genders, and social classes. A habitus is acquired as a result of long-term occupation of a position within the social world’ (Ritzer, 2010: 530-531)

In what follows, some elements of the definition of the Bourdieusian habitus concept will be explained. According to it, the habitus is a system of dispositions. Bourdieu provides several meanings of dispositions: ‘It expresses first the result of an organizing action, with a meaning close to that of words such as structure; it also designates a way of being, a habitual state (especially of the body) and, in particular, a predisposition, tendency, propensity, or inclination.’ (Bourdieu, 2013: 214) According to Jenkins the definition of disposition is too broad: ‘…a spectrum of cognitive and affective factors: thinking and feeling, to use Bourdieu’s own formulation, everything from classificatory categories to the sense of honour.’ (Jenkins, 2016: 43.)

---

2 Elsewhere Bourdieu (2016: 43.) defines habitus as ’a system of dispositions, that is of permanent manners of being, seeing, acting and thinking, or a system of long-lasting (rather than permanent) schemes or schemata or structures of perception, conception and action.
According to the abovementioned definition habitus is a system, because as Bourdieu (2016: 47) points out: ‘the habitus of determinate person – or of a group of persons occupying a similar or neighbouring position in social space – is in a sense very systematic: all the elements of his or her behaviour have something in common, a kind of affinity of style, like the works of the same painter…’ That is, habitus highlights the unity of human behaviour, its best example is the lifestyle: different areas of life (e.g. fertility, artistic tastes, political opinion has a kind of unity. However, Bourdieu emphasises that this does not mean that human behaviour is monolithic. (Bourdieu 2016). ‘It is very open, very diverse, but within limits, and the idea of lifestyle is suited to express this loose systematicity which characterises human behaviour.’ (Bourdieu, 2016: 45)

On the one hand, the dispositions guide action, aspirations and in general, perception. That is, the habitus – as a ‘structuring structure’- structures how individuals perceive the social world and act in it (King, 2000; Yang, 2013). In other words, habitus helps to shape one’s practices (Maton 2008). On the other hand, the dispositions derive from early socialisation experiences when the internalisation of objective structures (one’s social position) occurs. Therefore habitus is a ‘structured structure’ (Swartz, 1997). The objective structures are internalised through the perception and appreciation of the possibilities that characterize the members of a social class or status group, as Bourdieu writes: ‘…the dispositions are durably inculcated by the possibilities and impossibilities, freedoms and necessities, opportunities and prohibitions inscribed in the objective conditions…’ (Bourdieu, 1990: 54). Put differently, habitus is structured by one’s past and present conditions such as family socialisation and educational experiences (Maton, 2008).

The definition emphasises that habitus is durable. Bourdieu highlights that the internalisation of objective structures occurs primarily during early socialisation. The habitus integrates the new experiences with past experiences, but it is dominated by the earliest ones. Early experiences are of particular importance because habitus has a defensive strategy: it resists change in a way that it selects the new information which are in accordance with its accumulated information (Bourdieu, 1990). Bourdieu argues: ‘Through the systematic ‘choices’ it makes among the places, events and people that might be frequented, the habitus tends to protect itself.

---

3 I use action as the synonyme of practice.
from crises and challenges by providing itself with a milieu to which it is as pre-adapted as possible…” (Bourdieu, 1990: 61). However habitus can be changed by history, that is, by new experiences, education and training, but this process is slow (Bourdieu 2016). Furthermore, it typically does not involve the fundamental change in primary dispositions (Swartz, 1997). Bourdieu (2016: 45.) emphasises that: ‘dispositions are long-lasting: they tend to perpetuate, to reproduce themselves, but they are not eternal’. As Bourdieu writes, habitus can modify to a limited extent: “it (…) is as remote from creation of unpredictable novelty as it is from simple mechanical reproduction of the original conditioning” (Bourdieu, 1990: 55). A central controversial question related to the Bourdieusian habitus conception is to what extent habitus is able to change. This issue is addressed in detail in Chapter 2.5.1.

Bourdieu’s above-mentioned definition also highlights that the habitus is transposable, that is transferable from one field to another (Maton, 2008; Ritzer, 2010; Yang, 2013).

In sum, according to the definition, habitus is

- a product of social conditions (a ‘structured structure’),
- it is systematic, that is, human behaviour has a unity due to the habitus
- it is composed of dispositions
- durable (but not unchangeable)
- a scheme of perception, conception and action (a ‘structuring structure’).

Bourdieu refers to habitus as a ‘practical sense’ or a ‘feel for the game’: ‘The habitus is this kind of practical sense for what is to be done in a given situation what is called in sport a "feel" for the game, that is, the art of anticipating the future of the game which is inscribed in the present state of play.’ (Bourdieu 1998: 25.) That is, the habitus makes it possible to predict events and react unconsciously to them: ‘having the feel for the game is having the game under the skin; it is to master in a practical way the future of the game; it is to have a sense of the history of the game. While the bad player is always off tempo, always too early or too late, the good player is the one who anticipates, who is ahead of the game. Why can she get ahead of the flow of the game? Because she has the immanent tendencies of the game in her body, in an incorporated state: she embodies the game.’ (Bourdieu 1998: 80-81). That is, habitus operates as the “fell for the game” of sportspersons: the rules of the game are acquired through socialisation, they know what you need to adjust to, however, what they do in a particular situation depends on the “fell for the game”, the ability to improvise (Hadas 2001).

In the next section additional elements of the habitus concept will be highlighted which are
relevant and important to my research. Bourdieu emphasises that habitus is the product of history (Bourdieu, 1990). Besides a person’s individual history, the whole collective history of the person’s family and class constitutes the habitus (Reay, 2004). Bourdieu distinguishes between individual habitus and class habitus. The latter “…could be regarded as a subjective but non-individual system of internalised structures, common schemes of perception, conception and action…” (Bourdieu, 1990: 60). Those who belong to the same social class have similar habitus, but not exactly the same because of the particular position within the social class and the singularity of the person’s social trajectory (Bourdieu, 1990).

Another relevant characteristic of habitus is that it “…has an infinite capacity to generating thoughts, perceptions, expressions and actions. Its only limits are set by the particular historical and social conditions of its production.’(Bourdieu 1990: 55.) In other words, Bourdieu (1990) highlights the generative nature of habitus: it engenders an endless number of thoughts, perceptions, expressions and actions.

Bourdieu underlines that habitus functions “below the level of consciousness and language, beyond the reach of introspective scrutiny and control by the will” (Bourdieu, 1996:466). It manifests itself in our most automatic gestures or in unconscious use of our body for example in the way we eat, walk or talk. (Bourdieu, 1996). The lack of a cognitive aspect of habitus has been raised by a number of critics (e.g. Reay 2004, Sayer 2004) and they recommend broadening its conceptualisation because it would allow us to “…grapple analytically with aspects of identity such as our personal and political commitments that current conceptualisations of habitus marginalise.” (Reay 2004: 438) My study also argues that cognitive aspects of habitus should be included in the concept (see Chapter 2.5.4.).

Another important feature of habitus is that it is embodied, that is, habitus has not only mental but also bodily dimensions (Swartz, 1997; Reay, 2004). The internalisation of the objective structures is both a cognitive and a corporeal process. The chances of success and failure common to a social class are inscribed mentally and physically as well. The bodily dimensions of habitus show up in physical manner and style (e.g. posture and stride) (Swartz, 1997).

Bourdieu regards the internalisation of the objective structures through socialisation as a straightforward and nonproblematic process. The result of the process is a habitus which faithfully reflects the objective conditions under which it was initially produced (Swartz, 1997, Fäber 2018, Hadas 2019): According to Bourdieu (1990: 55) ‘as an acquired system of
generative schemes, the habitus makes possible the free reproduction of all the thoughts, perceptions and actions inherent in the particular conditions of its production – and only those. Swartz (1997) highlights that the assumption of Bourdieu is that if an individual’s or group’s habitus is not in accordance with the objective conditions then it is not due to the deficient early formation of habitus, rather it is the result of the subsequent adaptations of habitus to new structural conditions. However, a great deal of cognitive psychology and survey research found that early socialisation experiences are characterized by miscalculation and distortion. Individuals and groups frequently misunderstand the sentiments, thoughts, and actions of others.

An important new definition of habitus is provided by Hillier and Rooksby (2015). According to the authors habitus can be defined as a ’sense of one’s (and others’) place and role’ in the world in one’s lived environment. (…) Habitus is an embodied, as well as cognitive, sense of place. (Hillier – Rooksby 2002: 21) It is related to making a social position ‘homey’, that is, with the acquisition and internalisation of a social position (Németh 2020).

2.3 Bourdieu’s concept of capital, social space and field

The habitus does not act alone, according to Bourdieu, practices are the product of the relations between habitus, capital and field (Maton, 2008). Before this relationship will be explained, the concept of capital, social space and field will be introduced.

Bourdieu distinguishes three types of capital: economic capital, social capital and cultural capital. Economic capital is defined as ‘goods that are directly and immediately convertible into money (which makes them quantifiable)’ (Bourdieu, 1986: 16). In addition, he identified three forms of cultural capital. First, the embodied state refers to the ‘long-lasting dispositions of the mind and body’ (Bourdieu, 1986: 17). The cultural capital in the embodied state requires an acquisition process, which takes time and must be invested personally. Second, the objectified state is defined as the possession of cultural goods (e.g. pictures, books, dictionaries, instruments, machines, etc.)’ Third, the institutionalized state is the form of educational qualifications (Bourdieu, 1986). Moreover, social capital is the ‘membership of a group’ that is, ‘the aggregate of the actual or potential resources which are linked to possession of a durable network of more or less institutionalized relationships of mutual acquaintance and recognition’
Bourdieu (1986) emphasises that the three forms of capital are convertible, although economic capital is a prerequisite for the other two forms. That is, social and cultural capital are the ‘transformed, disguised forms of economic capital’ (Bourdieu, 1986: 24). The conversion of the different forms of capital is not equally realisable: economic capital is easier to convert into cultural capital and social capital than vice versa (Yang, 2013).

Bourdieu defines social space as ‘the set of all possible positions that are available for occupation at any given time or place. Since Bourdieu’s theory of practice is a relational one, these possible positions are defined in relation to each other.’ (Hardy 2014: 229.). The positions within the social space are created by the forms and amounts of economic and symbolic capital, and by the relative value of the various compositions and volumes of those capitals. There is a distinction between the recognised positions and the occupied positions. There are always positions that are not occupied. Thus, different actors with diverse amounts and compositions of capital will have a set of available positions that are limited by their capital and by their choices on the desirability of any particular position (Hardy 2014).

This social space is visualised in diagrams where the vertical axes representing the volume of capital possessed and horizontal axes representing capital composition – the balance between economic (CE) and cultural capitals (CC) (Hardy 2014).

1. Pierre Bourdieu’s social space

The social space is constituted by the habituses of agents in it, and their positions in social space influence their aspirations. This shapes their trajectories and strategies. (Reed-Danahay 2020). ‘Habitus is not an attribute of an autonomous individual, but of a person who is positioned in
social space and whose value, power, and trajectory within that social space can only be understood in a relational sense, in relationship to other habituses within the social space.’ (Reed-Danahay 2020: 8.)

According to Bourdieu, a field is a social arena where struggles and manoeuvres take place over different types of resources or stakes (capitals) and access to them (Jenkins, 2006). ‘Fields are defined by the stakes which are at stake – cultural goods (life-style), housing, intellectual distinction (education), employment, land, power (politics), social class, prestige or whatever…’ (Jenkins: 2006: 52). The social world consists of many semi-independent fields (e.g. artistic, religious, higher education) and all of them have their own specific logic (Ritzer, 2010).

Jenkins (2006) highlights that the Bourdieusian definition of field puts social relations at the centre of social analysis: ‘…a network, or configuration, of objective relations between positions. These positions are objectively defined, in their existence and in the determinations they impose upon their occupants, agents or institutions, by their present and potential situation (situs) in the structure of the distribution of species of power (or capital) whose possession commands access to the specific profits that are at stake in the field, as well as by their objective relation to other positions.’ (Bourdieu – Wacquant, 1992: 97) That is, a field is a ‘structured system of social positions’ (Jenkins, 2006: 53); and these positions can be occupied by individuals or institutions. Fields are structured internally by power relations. The relation between the positions – domination, subordination or equivalence (homology) – depends on the access to resources (capitals) that are at stake at the given field (Jenkins, 2006).

Bourdieu elaborated three steps to analyse fields. The first step is to grasp the given field’s relationship with the field of power (politics) since that field has primacy over others in any society. The second task is to map the objective structure of the positions within the given field. The third step is to analyse the habitus of the agents who occupy the different types of positions of the field (Jenkins, 2006; Ritzer, 2010).

Social space indicates ‘the sum total of occupiable social positions at any one time and place’ (Hardy 2014: 231). By contrast, field is ‘a particular subset of the available positions, given coherence by the shared interests, activities and dispositions of the participants’ (Hardy 2014: 231).
2.4 The theory of practice

In *Distinction*, Bourdieu (1996: 101) provides an equation to summarize the relationship of habitus, capital and field:

\[ ([\text{habitus}) (\text{capital})] + \text{field} = \text{practice} \]

This equation emphasises that the practices are the result of interaction between agents’ habitus, their capital and their field, not the independent effect of one of any of these three elements (Swartz, 1997; Maton, 2008; Yang, 2013). However, Swartz (1997) stresses that the equation obscures more than it clears up the exact relationship between the terms. This is because it is not clear whether habitus and capital are interactive terms while field is additive or the formulation only suggests that empirical research needs to take into account all three factors (that is, operation signs between the terms are irrelevant).

As Maton (2008: 51) interprets the formulation: ‘practice results from relations between one’s dispositions (habitus) and one’s position in a field (capital), within a current state of play of that social arena (field).’ That is, the relation between these two structures – habitus and field – is what produces practices. Therefore, according to Maton (2008), in order to understand practices, the relationship between habitus and field should be studied. The two structures are homologous – their social logic is the same – and they mutually shape each other. They are both developing, so the relations between them are dynamic and partial: they do not fit together completely. Thus the relationship between the structure of a field and the habitus of its actors could fit or mismatch to varying degrees. For instance, if we imagine a social situation in which we feel comfortable (like a “fish in water”), then that means that our habitus matches the logic of the social field. While in a situation in which we feel uncomfortable and awkward (like a “fish out of water”), then there the structuring of our habitus does not fit that of the field (Maton, 2008).

Maton (2008) points out that the relationship between habitus and field is further complicated by the fact that they mutually constitute each other: the field structures the habitus, while the agents’ understanding of their field is based on their habitus. As Bourdieu (1992: 127; cited by Maton, 2008) notes: ‘On one side it is a relation of conditioning: the field structures the habitus…On the other side, it is a relation of knowledge or cognitive construction. Habitus contributes to constituting the field as a meaningful world.’ In the following section, I will introduce how Maton (2008) interprets the above quote in less formal terms. Habitus
encompasses ways of acting, feeling, thinking and being. It includes how we take our past journey with us, how this history affects our present conditions and how we decide to implement certain actions and not others. We are constantly faced with decisions about actions and beliefs throughout our lives. The range of our possibilities depends on our actual position in the given social field, but at the same time which of these possibilities are visible to us is the result of our past experiences. In sum, the actions we choose to take depends on the range of available opportunities (it is defined by our current context), the range of opportunities visible to us, and on our habitus.

2.5 The challenges of using habitus in relation to the study of social mobility

2.5.1 The accusation of determinism

Several authors (e.g. Jenkins 2006; Alexander 1995) highlight that Bourdieu was not able to overcome the dichotomy between objectivism and subjectivism by introducing the concept of habitus. Critics have argued that the concept of habitus is deterministic and reductionist, since Bourdieu always concludes that individuals are constrained by social structures and reduces all aspects of social life to the economic structure (Fuchs, 2003; Fáber, 2018).

Fáber (2018) highlights that those who accuse Bourdieu of determinism, use two different meanings of the term, which are often mixed up with each other. According to one view, Bourdieu’s approach is deterministic, because it excludes the possibility of social change. While, the other approach emphasises that the source of changes is never the actor in the Bourdieusian theory, since individuals have no influence on their lives. Thus the social relations do not change, but are constantly reproduced.

According to Alexander (1995) Bourdieu also regards the dispositions of the habitus as the result of economic and social processes. ‘What we have here is a materially reflective rather than culturally mediated conception of socialisation and family life . . . The theory of practice, then, is nothing other than a theory of the determination of practice’ (Alexander 1995: 137, 140, cited by Fuchs 2013: 390). That is, the objective (material) conditions produce the habitus, which determines practices.
Jenkins (2006) raises the issue that the Bourdieusian habitus concept excludes the possibility of change both at the individual and collective levels. The problem of change is related to the question of what kind of relationship is assumed between the subjective habitus and the objective world of other people and things. According to Jenkins (2006), Bourdieu is opaque on this issue, since at least three different views can be identified: ‘objective conditions produce the habitus, the habitus is adjusted to objective conditions, and there is a reciprocal or dialectical relationship between them’ (Jenkins 2006: 49). The three approaches assume varying degrees of social change, however, all of them suppose that habitus is resistant to major social changes (Jenkins 2006; Fáber 2018). The dispositions are durable since they are learned habitually and unreflexively during childhood, they adjust to the objective conditions, and they become embodied (Jenkins 2006).

King (2000) also agrees that habitus is inadequate to explain social change. In his view: ‘if the habitus were determined by objective conditions, ensuring appropriate action for the social position in which any individual was situated, and the habitus were unconsciously internalised dispositions and categories, then social change would be impossible. Individuals would act according to the objective structural conditions in which they found themselves, and they would consequently simply reproduce those objective conditions by repeating the same practices’ (King 2000: 427).

Swartz (1997) raises the same issue: the system of relations between the structures and practices is circular: the objective structures (the possibilities and impossibilities of an individual in a given social position) are internalised and then transformed into dispositions (aspirations and expectations) that produce action that tends to reproduce the objective structure.

However, several authors (e.g. Fuchs 2003; Hilgers 2009; Fáber 2018) take the view that Bourdieu’s concept is not deterministic. For instance, Fuchs (2003) claims that Bourdieu uses the conception of economic processes in a quite broad sense: it also includes symbolic and political production besides material production. However, numerous authors misinterpret this conception of Bourdieu and therefore they – mistakenly – accuse him of economic determinism and reductionism. Fuchs (2003) maintains that the relationship between habitus and objective conditions is also misunderstood by several authors. The claim that habitus is the product of economic and social processes, that is, conditioned by objective conditions, not only means that it is conditioned by economic (in the traditional sense) aspects, but also political and cultural ones. Social structures not only limit but enable the invention of the habitus. The habitus
provides ‘conditioned and conditional freedom’, it is ‘remote from the creation of unpredictable novelty’ and from ‘simple mechanical reproduction of the initial conditionings’ (Bourdieu, 1977: 95, cited by Fuchs, 2003: 393). Fuchs (2003) also emphasises that according to Bourdieu habitus goes together with indeterminacy and uncertainty, thus the same habitus can result in different actions. In sum, according to Fuchs, Bourdieu’s suggestion ‘…is not mechanical determinism, but that habitus both enables the creativity of actors and constrains ways of acting’ (Fuchs, 2003: 394).

Fuchs (2003) claims that Bourdieu does not imagine the relationship between social structures and actors as objective conditions mechanically determining actions, but as mutually influencing each other. That is, Bourdieu emphasises not only the internalisation of externality (i.e. habitus incorporates the objective conditions) but the externalisation of internality (i.e. agents create social structures). ‘Hence society is not statistic but a permanent development process that involves the connectedness of actors and structures’ (Fuchs, 2003: 396).

Hilgers (2009) also agrees that Bourdieu’s habitus theory is not deterministic since it is compatible with a conception of freedom. According to Hilgers (2009), Bourdieu’s treatment of habitus implies three principles that exclude determinism: ‘(1) the production of an infinite number of behaviours from a limited number of principles, (2) permanent mutation, and (3) the intensive and extensive limits of sociological understanding’ (Hilgers, 2009: 730). The first (1) principle states that the habitus is able to generate a limited number of behaviours based on a limited number of principles. This implies that an infinite variation of practices is possible for an individual. The second (2) principle says that habitus is constantly changing because it is exposed to different contexts and situations. This entails that habitus is relatively malleable throughout the path of an individual. The third (3) principle states that the different elements that have shaped and are shaping habitus can only be grasped approximately. This principle implies that it is not possible to completely understand the elements that shape habitus.

According to Hilgers (2009), if there is a structural affinity between individuals whose objective conditions are similar, we must still admit that everyone’s relationships to contexts will be divergent. Because of this diversity and permanent mutation, the effects of habitus are not determinate. This is especially true in modern societies where individuals are exposed to a wider variety of contexts.

Fáber (2018) also agrees that the accusation of determinism towards the Bourdieusian theory is
unfounded, that is, his concept includes the possibility of social change. He points out that in Bourdieu’s theory the mechanisms of the reproduction of social relationships are a more central topic than that of change, simply because the former better characterises the social world according to the empirical research. Mechanism of reproduction needs to be revealed in order to make them visible and breakable. Furthermore, Bourdieu emphasises that the purpose of sociology can only be to explore social mechanisms, because a sociologist would have no duty in a world governed by social laws – where everything is predetermined.

Fáber (2017, 2018) raises several arguments against the accusation of determinism. First, Bourdieu does not assume the over-determination of practices, since uncertainty has a significant role in individuals’ life even in traditional societies.

Second, habitus is not determined by objective conditions, because (1) habitus depends on the context (thus the same habitus can lead to different practices), (2) habitus is continuously confronted with objective reality and although it is more likely that the habitus adapts to objective conditions, it is also possible that it defies them, and (3) actors can control their own habitus through awareness of their constraints and reflexivity. Fáber also highlights that Bourdieusian theory does not exclude the possibility of social change. Bourdieu states that there is an ongoing struggle between dominant and dominated agents in a given field. The exact reproduction of power and class relations is unlikely since the aim of the dominated agents is to modify these relations.

Third, ‘another important reason why habitus cannot be deterministic and why it is very unlikely that the subjective dispositions accurately reproduce the objective conditions is that – due to a certain hysteresis effect – it can (if at all) adapt to the objective social structure with a certain delay. In this case the anticipatory function of habitus does not work properly, and it necessarily entails a non-adaptation or mal-adaptation to conditions, which means that this adaptation will either be inadequate or inefficient, resulting in an under or overestimation of the freedom of action.’ (Fáber 2017: 445).

Fourth, according to Fáber (2018), Bourdieu’s own case also supports that despite habitus is durable, it can be shaped and changed through certain efforts (e.g. reflexivity). The habitus limits practices but it does not predetermine an individual’s social trajectory because the actors’ possibilities – enabled and limited by the habitus – can be broadened as a result of growing awareness. This awareness can be achieved by external help (a sociologist’s intervention) or internal factors (reflexivity).

Fifth, Fáber (2018) points out that the Bourdieusian language also indicates statistical relations
rather than deterministic ones. For example, Bourdieu writes: ‘being the product of a particular class of objective regularities, the habitus tends to generate all the "reasonable", "common-sense" behaviours’ (cited by Fáber, 2017: 447; Bourdieu, 1990: 55). Fáber (2018) highlights that Bourdieu frequently uses the expression ‘tend to’ in order to avoid determinism which implies that social relations are not deterministic in his view.

Sixth, although habitus is determined in a certain sense, it also enables improvisation and innovation (Fáber, 2018)

Seventh, individuals社会化 is never perfect and complete, thus their habitus is never perfectly adjusted to the social conditions within which its internalisation occurred. Furthermore, actors often wrongly interpret the social reality in which they live and they tend to accept their conditions as taken for granted (Fáber, 2017). That is, habitus is not completely determined by objective circumstances.

Finally, Fáber (2018) highlights that Bourdieu believed in the possibility of mobilizing agents that is why he intended to reveal their situation to them and tried to draw their attention that they can change it. If there were no possibility for social change then these efforts of Bourdieu would be senseless.

In sum, Fáber (2017: 450) argues ‘…that even though Bourdieu’s sociological approach does not leave much room for individual agency, neither does it exclude or deny the possibility of social change or even collective political mobilisation. Even though the Bourdieusian theory is well aware of the fact that to a large extent structural constraints determine agents’ actions, it still encourages them to become actors of their own lives through a specific process of (social) self-reflection.’

Alternatively, Yang (2013) claims that the Bourdieusian habitus concept can be further developed in such a way as to make social change possible. She argues that Bourdieu attempted to challenge the determinist criticism by introducing 'reproduction strategy’, 'reflexivity’ and the 'hysteresis effect’ into his sociology, but these attempts were not convincing. Despite these efforts, his theory remains ‘…a circular system in which aspirations adjust to opportunities, habitus matches the field, strategy follows reproduction, individual fate is fixed in a class trajectory and class trajectories contribute to the overall social stability. (Yang, 2013: 1537).

Yang shows that the circle of Bourdieu’s determinist and structuralist account of social reality could be broken by integrating certain theoretical innovations into his social theory. Four specific conditions must be met in order to incorporate the mechanism of social change.

The first condition of change is the mismatch between habitus and field. The mismatch ‘…is
when social agents enter a field that is outside of their class trajectory.’ (Yang, 2013: 1531). In these cases, there is a potential for raising individuals’ consciousness. The further the distance between one’s primary habitus and that of the new field, the stronger the contrast will be, and the more likely it is that conscious awareness and strategic calculation will replace unconscious actions, and this results in the complete transformation of the primary habitus. In such cases, individuals are constantly observing and consciously correcting their behaviour to “fit” the new field. The greater the distance between an individual’s habitus and that expected by the new field, the easier it is to identify differences, but the longer it takes for the habitus to transform (Yang, 2013).

According to Yang (2013), the second condition for change is to fully recognise the power of explicit pedagogy. Bourdieu claims that the acquisition of habitus occurs through imperceptible familiarisation and the explicit inculcation is just an aside. In contrast, Yang (2013) argues that explicit pedagogy is just as important as implicit pedagogy in acquiring a new habitus. The main difference between explicit and implicit pedagogy is that the former entails ‘strategic calculation’. Indeed a ‘strategic plan’ of what needs to be inculcated is indispensable during the process of acquiring a new habitus. That is, a secondary habitus, which is substantially different from the primary habitus, can be acquired through intentional and strategic learning with practical familiarisation.

The third condition for change to take place is reflexivity. According to Bourdieu, reflexive thinking is exclusive to sociologists (or scientists in general), that is, laypeople do not possess the ability to be reflexive (Yang 2013). While Yang (2013) raises the possibility that reflexivity is not just a characteristic of academics, but of everyone in the modern era. In Chapter 2.5.4. I will detail this topic and argue that reflexivity should be included in the concept of habitus.

The last condition of change is an open system that provides possibilities (Yang 2013). Yang (2013) emphasises that the inherent characteristics of the social fields have changed in modernity. Cultural pluralism and the extraordinary diversity of today results in a world full of opportunities and risks. The boundaries between fields are blurred, which promotes aspirations and social mobility. Power relations have become less polarized and more complex. The three modes of capital and rules that define a given field have changed substantially compared to those of a decade ago. As a result, those who were previously disadvantaged in a specific field,
may now be able to enter it and achieve success. That is, the mismatch between habitus and field is more frequent in the modern era than before. According to Yang (2013) the mismatch between habitus and field may occur through individuals’ strategic calculation, or through the collapse of the conflictual fields.

In sum, according to Yang (2013: 1536) ‘change can only happen when there is an open system that provides possibilities; there also have to be ‘interrupters’ who take advantage of that open system; and, lastly, ‘reflexivity’ has to overtake the inertia generated by the dysfunctional habitus when the interrupters enter the new field.’

According to Bourdieu, regarding habitus as a fate or a destiny is a misinterpretation. He underlines that the idea of ‘the vicious circle of structure producing habitus which reproduces structure ad infinitum is a product of commentators.’ (Bourdieu, 2016: 45.). First, this closed circle is a specific case where the objective conditions in which the habitus was created and the objective conditions in which it operates are similar to each other. Secondly, habitus is not a principle of repetition (Bourdieu 2016). Instead, habitus has a generative capacity: ‘it is a structured principle of invention, similar to a generative grammar able to produce an infinite number of new sentences according to determinate patterns and within determinate limits’ (Bourdieu, 2016: 46.). That is, habitus creates innovations and improvisations within certain limits (Bourdieu 2016). Finally, according to Bourdieu ‘ in all the cases where dispositions encounter conditions (including fields) different from those in which they were constructed and assembled, there is a dialectical confrontation between habitus, as structured structure, and objective structures.’ (Bourdieu, 2016: 46.). This means that, habitus

- shapes the objective structures according to its own structure (‘structuring structure’) while
- is restructured, modified by the objective structure (‘structured structure’) (Bourdieu 2016).

Thus, Bourdieu argues that habitus changes continuously in rapidly changing societies, but this change is limited by the original structure of the habitus (Bourdieu 2016).

Bourdieu highlights that the notion of field and the relationship between field and habitus also include the principle of dynamism. Struggles and competitions take place in the fields which generate change. In turn, within these fields, agents act according to their position (which is determined by their capital) and their habitus. The agents’ actions, feelings, words etc. originate
from the conflict between dispositions and positions, which are usually mutually adjusted, but sometimes also disparate or even contradictory (Bourdieu 2016). According to Bourdieu, innovation may occur in such cases: ‘… when people en porte à faux, misfits, who are put into question by structures (operating through positions) are able to challenge the structure, sometimes to the point of remaking it.’ (Bourdieu, 2016: 47.). That is, in order to explain the artistic or intellectual revolutions, the habitus of the revolutionary agent, the field with which she or he was confronted and the dynamic relationship between them should be taken into account (Bourdieu 2016).

2.5.2 The role of ethnicity

Although Bourdieu does not apply the habitus concept to the analysis of racial and ethnic disadvantages, several authors (e.g. Reay 2004, Bonilla-Silva et al. 2007, Sallaz 2010) believe that habitus is also influenced by racial differences (besides the class position) has led them to extend the Bourdieusian concept by introducing a racially-constituted habitus.

Richards (2020) criticises the Bourdieusian analysis of capital, habitus and field because it focuses exclusively on class differences while forgetting the discussion of race and racism and the intersectionality of class and race. According to Richards (2020), Bourdieu’s cultural capital theory has a white-centred class-based master narrative which legitimises and perpetuates ‘the assumption that racial differences are secondary manifestations of class-based structures’ (Richards 2020: 2.). In other words, it considers inequality as a one-dimensional phenomenon when it emphasises the significance of class-based stratification and minimises the relevance of race identity and racial oppression. Race-based studies that apply the cultural capital framework (e.g. Dumais et al. 2012; Kalmijn – Kraaykamp 1996; Lee – Kao 2009; Roscigno – Ainsworth-Darnell 1999) dispraise experiences with racial discrimination and the effect of these experiences in developing a racialised habitus, despite the fact that race and racism are their central themes.

Richards (2020) claims that race-conscious studies within the cultural capital framework should apply multidimensional analyses which recognise race and class and their intersectional effect. The author proposes a race-conscious model to cultural capital research whose central question is how racial stratification influences the cultivation, transmission, and activation of cultural capital on the individual and institutional levels, and draws attention to the adverse effect of the
lack of racial literacy.

Whiteness scholars define racism not as individual race prejudice but as encompassing economic, political, social and cultural structures, actions and beliefs that systematize and perpetuate an unequal distribution of privileges, resources and power between white people and people of colour (DiAngelo 2011, Yosso 2005). This unequal distribution benefits whites and disadvantages people of colour overall as a group.

For Whiteness scholars, the term ‘Whiteness’ and ‘white’ is not to describe a discrete entity (for example, skin colour alone) but to signify a constellation of social processes and practices. It delineates a location of unearned structural advantage, and of race privilege (DiAngelo 2015). In this sense, Whiteness as an analytical notion, refers to the specific dimensions of racism that serve to elevate White people over people of colour. Therefore, whiteness refers to a set of social, political and cultural practices that are historically produced and shaped. These practices are usually unmarked and unnamed and are inseparable from systems of injustice (Allen 1996, for Hungary see Kovai 2017, Horvath 2012). They are intrinsically linked to the dynamic relations of domination (DiAngelo 2011).

For the purpose of this study, an important insight of Whiteness studies is that white people are taught to see themselves as individuals rather than as part of a racially socialised group (DiAngelo 2015). In this sense whiteness is unracialised identity. This frees white people from the psychic burden of race in a racialised society (DiAngelo 2011).

Although Whiteness studies were born in the U.S. society, their structural approach makes the concept of Whiteness a heuristic analytical tool in the context of Romany Studies too. We can argue, that although previous scholars did not use this particular term in their analysis of the reasons behind the Roma’s multidimensional disadvantages in Hungarian society, they indeed followed the same line of thinking when they shed light on the social process of an ‘ethnic ceiling’ (Szalai 2018), or “ethnic penalty”, be it in the education sector (Szalai 2018), or on the labour market (Kertesi 2015, Köllő 2015).

Apart from the above thesis of the Whiteness studies, it is unavoidable to use the insights of the theory of intersectionality to interpret our empirical findings. Scholars exploring the process of social mobility argue that in the context of changing class an intersectional lens is crucial (Friedman and Laurison 2019, Lawler – Payne 2018, Payne 2018, for Hungary, see Kóczé 2011, just to mention a few). There is a bunch of academic studies documenting the distinctiveness
and particular difficulty of upward mobility for women and for members of racial-ethnic minority groups (Skeggs 1997, Neckerman et al. 1999, Reay 2009). These studies vividly demonstrate how class origin ‘haunts’ (Morrin 2016) and casts a long shadow over people’s lives (Skeggs 1997, Friedman 2015, Friedman 2016, Ingram – Abrahams 2016). As does gender and race. However, class, gender and race (along with many other aspects of social divisions) do not operate as separate and mutually exclusive axes of inequality. They almost always work together and produce a qualitatively new, intersectional position in the social system of domination. This is basically the key insight of the theory of intersectionality. The term was coined by Crenshaw (1993) and later further developed by black feminists (Collins 1993) to draw attention to the complex interplay between gender, class and race.

Roma academics and non-Roma activists and scholars of Romany Studies also found this term useful to describe the aggravating effect of the intersecting inequalities and structural discriminations that the Roma have to face in their everyday lives (Kóczé 2009, Vincze 2012, Brooks 2012). Due to the racial domination of white people in both North American and Hungarian societies, there is a tendency in academic scholarship to compare the intersecting inequalities of Roma people to those of black Americans.

There are a few outlier studies that take a race-conscious approach to cultural capital research that focusing on the lived experiences of the racially marginalized, and confronting the colour-blind assumptions and cultural deficit views that stigmatize these groups. For instance, Carter (2003) introduces the notion of “non-dominant cultural capital” that ‘…embody a set of tastes, or schemes of appreciation and understandings, accorded to a lower status group, that include preferences for particular linguistic, musical, or interactional styles’ (Carter 2003: 138.). This kind of cultural capital refers to those resources which are used by lower status individuals to earn status and prestige within their community. Shah et al. (2010: 1112) presents the concept of ethnic capital as ‘…a triad of factors – familial adult-child relationships, transmission of aspirations, and attitudes and norms enforcement – that can facilitate educational achievement and social mobility among those with limited economic capital’. Lin and Zhou (2005: 261) also uses the concept of ethnic capital that is defined as “the interplay of financial capital, human capital, and social capital within an identifiable ethnic community”. Yosso (2005) also focuses on the cultural knowledge, skills, abilities and contacts of the socially marginalized groups and rejects the deficit view according to which low income Communities of Colour lack cultural capital. The author identifies six different forms of capital which are the resources of racially marginalized communities: aspirational, navigational, social, linguistic, familial and resistant
capital. Aspirational capital includes the capability to maintain hopes and dreams for the future. Linguistic capital refers to the intellectual and social skills acquired through communication experiences in more than one language and/or style. Familial capital calls attention to those cultural knowledges nurtured among kin that contain a sense of community history, memory and cultural intuition. This form of capital engages a commitment to community well-being and extends the concept of family with a more broad understanding of kinship. Yosso defines social capital as networks of people and community resources. Navigational capital includes skills of manoeuvring through social institutions. Resistant capital applies to those knowledges and skills that challenge inequality. Bonilla-Silva et al. (2007) expand Bourdieu’s concept on habitus when they highlight its racialized character. They introduce the notion of white habitus, which is the result of significant residential segregation, and defined as ‘a racialized, uninterrupted socialisation process that conditions and creates whites’ racial tastes, perceptions, feelings, and emotions, and their views on racial matters’ (cited by Bonilla-Silva et al. 2007, Bonilla-Silva 2003: 104). White habitus facilitates in-group solidarity and negative opinions on non-whites, creating an environment where the segregation of whites and the avoidance of out-groups seem proper, thereby reproducing the existing racial hierarchy (Bonilla-Silva et al. 2007).

There are many advocates for a majority-inclusive approach. They argue that by involving not only minority but also majority groups in intersectional analysis (Christensen-Jensen 2012), we can shed light on intra-group differences and inter-group commonalities. With this comparative approach we can protect ourselves from the danger of exoticizing and ‘othering’ the minority group studied. This research project follows this line of thinking.

In sum, ‘the habitus is not just composed of dispositions based on social class, these dispositions are also racialised and gendered’. (Richards 2020: 10.) Therefore, in our research it is necessary to take into account that – besides the class position – race or ethnicity on its own and in intersection with class impact habitus.
2.5.3 The unitary and coherence of habitus

The chapter examines how habitus is affected when one moves from a field to another one (e.g. upwardly mobile) and as a result, is present in several contradictory fields simultaneously. The question is whether habitus remains unified and coherent or it changes.

The unitary and coherence of habitus is a controversial issue in the literature. According to Silva (2016), Bourdieu’s early elaborations of the notions described it as unitary, while later he supposed that habitus can be fragmented. Similarly, Hadas (2019) points out that the late self-reflexive works of Bourdieu introduce (1) the possibility of restructuring the habitus, (2) the concept of primary and secondary habitus, and (3) the fragmentation of habitus (divided habitus).

First, Hadas (2019) highlights that Bourdieu does not exclude the possibility of restructuring of the habitus in the case of extraordinary subversive factors.

Second, Hadas (2019) reveals that Bourdieu distinguishes between original and specific habitus. The original habitus is based on experiences in the family and early schooling in childhood and influences individual’s behaviour in several contexts. The specific habitus is a set of specialised worldviews and dispositions formed by a particular field.

Furthermore, there is a distinction between primary and secondary habitus in Bourdieu’s work. The primary habitus is established in early childhood, the secondary habitus is its conversion when individuals enter professional fields in their adulthood (Hadas 2019).

Third, according to Hadas (2019), another evidence for habitus differentiation in Bourdieu’s theory is the possibility of the fragmentation of habitus: the divided habitus. Bourdieu points out that the individual’s habitus works with the fewest problems if its environment is the most similar to the conditions in which it was produced (Fáber, 2018): ‘…when habitus encounters a social world of which it is the product, it is like a “fish in water”: it does not feel the weight of the water, and it takes the world about itself for granted… the world encompasses me (me comprend) but I comprehend it (je le comprends) precisely because it comprises me. It is because this world has produced me, because it has produced the categories of thought that I

---

apply to it, that it appears to me as self-evident’ (Bourdieu – Wacquant, 1992: 127) However, in the case of large-scale social changes and (long-range) social mobility, a mismatch arises between the individual’s primary habitus and the habitus required in the new field (Friedman 2016). In other words, a hysteresis\(^6\) occurs according to Bourdieu when ‘…dispositions function out of phase and practices are objectively ill-adapted to the present conditions because they are objectively adjusted to the conditions that no longer obtain’ (Bourdieu, 1990: 62.) That is, a gap is created between changing field conditions and habitus. This hysteresis – the dislocation of the habitus – may lead to the double isolation of mobile individuals from both their origin and destination class which often has profound psychic consequences. Bourdieu argues that the misalignment of habitus and field could create a painfully fragmented self, a divided habitus\(^7\) (Friedman 2016): ‘Such experiences tend to produce a habitus divided against itself, in constant negotiation with itself and with its ambivalence, and therefore doomed to a kind of duplication, to a double perception of self, to successive allegiances and multiple identities’ (Bourdieu 2000 511.).

Similarly, Naudet (2018) raises that large-scale social mobility may result in a divided habitus. According to Naudet, upwardly mobile individuals experience tension because they face two, contradictory constraints: (1) avoiding the feeling of betrayal of their community of origin and at the same time (2) minimal acculturation to the new group is needed since mobility is not possible without a minimal mastery over the strategies of action and perception that are accepted in the new group.

However, Hadas (2019) points out that these possibilities of habitus differentiation in the Bourdieusian theory are pure speculation and lack empirical evidence. Their presentation is not sufficiently detailed, deep and nuanced. Furthermore, the use of the concepts on habitus differentiation is inconsistent and the conceptualisations are not clear.

According to Friedman (2016), Bourdieu did not elaborate the concept of divided habitus thoroughly since he believed that its occurrence is rare. However several empirical studies (e.g. Reay 2002, Friedman 2016, Naudet 2018) highlight that the divided habitus is more common than believed by Bourdieu.

\(^6\) The term is used in physics to describe a retardation of an effect when the forces acting upon a body are changed. https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/hysteresis

\(^7\) The literature uses several synonymies of Bourdieu’s (2004) divided habitus or habitus clivé, such as ‘emotional costs’ of mobility (Reay, 2005) or ‘splitting of the self’ (Lahire 2011). For a summary see Naudet (2018: 7-10).
According to Wacquant (2016), “…habitus is not necessarily coherent and unified. Rather, it displays varying degrees of integration and tension, depending on the character and compatibility of the social situations that fashioned it over time.’(Wacquant 2016: 68.) Congruent institutions and stable environments develop a cohesive and unified habitus. By contrast, dissimilar organisations characterized by different values and entropic universes, tend to form unstable dispositions divided against themselves that leads to irregular and inconsistent series of action. (Wacquant 2016)

Lahire (2003, 2011) argues for the plurality of dispositions because individuals are products of various socialisation processes. The coherence of the principles of socialisation determines the extent of the coherence (or incoherence) of habits, schemes or dispositions. The author argues that the more individuals have encountered with non-homogenous (or even conflicting) situations (especially in the early stages of their lives), the more individuals will have heterogeneous and not unified dispositions, habits and abilities varying across the social contexts where their socialisation took place. The individuals are less unified than that is assumed by sociologists and have non-homogeneous habits, schemes, or dispositions which may be even conflicting with one another. Lahire reminds us “that individuals are neither ‘fragmented’ realities – as postmodernist views of ‘exploded’, ‘dispersed’ individuals lacking ‘unity’ and ‘coherence’ have it – nor pure and sensible adaptations to varying demands posed by particular contexts – as the empiricist view of experience claims – does not increase the coherence of experiences which are constitutive of socialisation and the cohesion of the dispositional traces they leave on individuals’ (Lahire 2003: 345.).

In sum, Lahire supports a theory of action that is based on the plurality of dispositions because individuals’ socialisation is heterogeneous which results in heterogeneous (or occasionally even contradictory dispositions to believe and to act. The actualisation of dispositions depends on the context. (Lahire 2003)

According to Lahire (2003), the issue of the nature and the organisation of the personal heritage of disposition is not a theoretical question, but it should be studied by empirical research. The author draws attention to the great importance of case studies of ‘class defectors’ in order to examine (1) how one may embody conflicting dispositions and how is it possible to live with this contradiction (by suppressing or strengthening his earlier dispositions?; by sharply separating the two worlds?; by feeling constant tension and pain because of this contradiction?), and (2) to what extent the multiplicity of the dispositions leads to psychological costs and to the disintegration of their identity.
Silva (2016) highlights the fragmented aspect of habitus, in which ‘the habitus incorporates differences and is transformed as the person relates to various fields both over time and simultaneously’ (Silva 2016:170.). She points out that the notion of a fragmented habitus is more adequate to capture the complex relationalities of the individuals in contemporary societies. She suggests a multidimensional approach to study the workings of flexible notions of the habitus that intersects gender, class, age and local contexts. It enables individuals the capacity to apprehend the social world in multiple ways. Furthermore, it allows a wider account of social change. (Silva 2016)

Bourdieu did not mention that whether the tension which is associated with upward mobility can be reduced or avoided, however there are some studies (e.g. Abrahams – Ingram 2016; Naudet 2018) that raises this option. According to Naudet (2018) the tension, which is the result of the contradiction between the obligation to legitimize the mobility trajectory and to remain loyal to the social group of origin, can be reduced by creating and managing a coherent self-narrative to make sense of the mobility path. The author claims that the only way to reduce tension is to tell ourselves that there is no tension, or to make sense of the tension by creating our self-narrative.

Abrahams and Ingram (2016) highlight that the internalisation of the structures of multiple fields results in a temporary destabilisation (or as they call it interruption) of the habitus, that is, ‘it is caught in a tug between two conflicting social fields’ (Ingram – Abrahams 2016: 145.). However, Abrahams and Ingram (2013, 2016) suggest that this interruption can lead not only to divided habitus, but other ways of negotiating multiple fields exists. Their typology of habitus interruptions differentiates four types: abandoned habitus, re-confirmed habitus, reconciled habitus and destabilised habitus. In the case of an abandoned habitus the original field is rejected and a person incorporates the structuring forces of the new field. Re-confirmed habitus is created when the habitus has encountered and rejected the new field, so its structures are not internalised. Reconciled habitus occurs when a person incorporates the structuring forces of two, contradictory fields, therefore able to successfully navigate in both worlds (Abrahams – Ingram 2016). Abrahams and Ingram (2016) emphasise that the reconciled habitus can evoke reflexivity. Divided habitus occurs when a person tries to incorporate the structuring forces of two inconsonant fields, but it fails and thus he/she oscillates between two dispositions and internalises conflict and division (Abrahams – Ingram 2016). These types are not mutually exclusive and shift between them is possible (Abrahams – Ingram 2013). Nimer (2021: 7-8.) also argues that “individual responses that emerge as actors position themselves in a new
environment are in fact not a result of a rigid confrontation between different habitus, but that different responses appear to be related to each other and can occur simultaneously within one person’s trajectory.”

2.5.4 The cognitive aspects of habitus, social identity and habitus

This chapter deals with the reflexivity and consciousness of habitus, and examines the possible link between the concept of habitus and identity. A crucial issue in relation to the concept of habitus is its reflexivity. Reflexivity is a central aspect of agency, the extent to which habitus is considered reflexive is related to its mutability and the possibility of intentionally modifying it.

There is a new direction in the sociology of identity which hybridises the concepts of self-reflexivity and habitus for a sociological understanding of identity (Adams 2006). It is important to highlight that there is no consensus in the definition of reflexivity (Adams 2006, Bottero 2010). Bottero points out that “the term ‘reflexivity’ covers a range of meanings, from the routine monitoring of conduct; to the need for agents to provide accounts of their actions to themselves, and others; to more ‘self-conscious’ habitual activity generated by particular types or contexts of interaction.” (Bottero 2010: 10).

According to Bourdieu, habitus is not conscious and cannot be modified by reflexive intervention: “the principles embodied in this way are placed beyond the grasp of consciousness, and hence cannot be touched by voluntary, deliberate transformation, cannot even be made explicit’ (Bourdieu, 2013: 94).

Bourdieu argues that the habitus is only becoming reflexive when it does not fit the field. As he writes about it: ‘It is likely that those who are ‘in their right place’ in the social world can abandon and entrust themselves more, and more completely to their dispositions (that is the ‘ease’ of the well-born) than those who occupy awkward positions, such as the parvenus and the declassed; and the latter are more likely to bring to consciousness that which, for others is taken for granted, because they are forced to keep watch on themselves and consciously correct the ‘first movements’ of a habitus that generates inappropriate or misplaced behaviours.’ (Bourdieu 2000: 163.; cited by Abrahams – Ingram 2016: 145.) That is, in Bourdieu’s theory reflexivity only emerges from moments of ‘crisis’ when there is a mismatch between habitus and field (Bottero 2010).

Abrahams and Ingram claim “that when a habitus is forced outside of the structures in which it
developed, acute reflexivity can occur. Being forced into a new space makes you think not only of what is novel in that space but it creates a new lens to look at where you have come from” (Abrahams and Ingram 2016: 145). Similarly, Nowicka points out that “habitus remains unreflexive unless it is in situations in which people feel like ‘fish out of water’. This happens when one enters an unknown field and does not know the rules of that field.” (Nowicka 2015: 102) Habitus is unconscious when I am a “fish in the water”: if everyone has the same accent (or clothing style etc. – that is, habitus) like me then I will not notice my accent (it will remain unconscious). However, if I enter a new field then I will realise that my way of speaking is different from the others in the new field. This way my habitus becomes reflexive.

Opposing views to Bourdieu (e.g. Jenkins 1982, Giddens 1991, McNay 1999, Sweetman 2003, Archer 2007) claim that habitus is increasingly reflexive in modern societies. As Sweetman (2003) points out that for more and more individuals, reflexivity itself may have become habitual in contemporary societies. Sweetman argues that ‘not only does the concept of habitus not, in and of itself, preclude reflexive engagement with self, but also that certain forms of habitus may be inherently reflexive, and that the flexible or reflexive habitus may be both increasingly common and increasingly significant due to various social and cultural shifts. (Sweetman 2003: 529) According to Sweetman (2003) Bourdieu’s notion of habitus limits reflexivity in two ways. First, the habitus itself cannot be modified by reflexive intervention. Second, the development of the habitus is irreversible and the first experiences have priority, thus habitus designates the range of conceivable actions (and excludes the unthinkable actions).

Pöllmann (2016) criticises Bourdieu for believing that reflexivity only arises when habitus encounters new or significantly altered field conditions. He argues that individuals’ reflexivity also increases through relationships with other individuals or groups where individuals notice the power of new structural forces. For instance, in the case of international migrants who enter a world of new linguistic, ethno-racial, religious, or sociocultural majority backgrounds.

Noble and Watkins (2003) also criticise Bourdieu because his concept is not extended to reflexivity and consciousness. They argue that habitus needs to be reconceptualised “...by articulating it with modalities of consciousness, rather than opposing habitus to consciuones.” (Noble – Watkins 2003: 535.). The authors propose an analytical distinction between three intensities of consciousness (levels of awareness). The first is practical sense that includes routine, habituated actions. They highlight that even strongly automatised actions involves consciousness: “Bourdieu, in trying to emphasise the largely unconscious nature of embodied
practice, mistakes automaticity for absence of consciousness.” (Noble – Watkins 2003: 535.). The second is bodily attention that involves constant monitoring of the body. It “captures the consciousness attendant when we engage in everyday activities and which makes it possible to monitor them without disruption.” (Noble – Watkins 2003: 532.). The third level of awareness is agentic reflection that is conscious calculation and reflection. It is “that discursive practice in which we consider our behavior and its principles, which involves the monitoring of conduct which can be brought to discourse” (Noble – Watkins 2003: 531.). Sport is cited as an example by the authors. They highlight that learning a sport requires conscious attention and numerous rehearsals, it does not come by itself. According to Noble and Watkins (2003), Bourdieu fails to sufficiently explain and discuss these forms of acquiring skills.

Sayer points out that Bourdieu’s focus on the unconscious and pre-reflexive does not allow for any ethical aspects – e.g. ethical dispositions and ‘moral sentiments’ – of habitus. The author recommends broadening the conceptualisation of habitus in such a way to include ‘cares, concerns and commitments’ and conscious deliberations so we can grapple analytically with aspects of identity (e.g. personal or political commitments) that current conceptualisations of habitus neglect (Reay 2004).

Schneider and Lang (2014) point out that habitus and identity are very rarely conceptualised together, although they are close to each other. They suggest that connecting the habitus concept with insights from the identity literature can create more fruitful approaches in the study of social mobility. The authors identify the similarities between the two concepts: habitus groups together individuals according to their shared or similar positions in the social space. Identities mean ‘labels’ for belonging to groups. Schneider and Lang (2014: 92.) state that “in the ‘ideal’, non-conflictive case, belonging to a certain group coincides with habitual practices of distinction. Moreover, both identity and habitus are based on the existence and definition of boundaries.” Furthermore, both concepts include deterministic aspects and the possibility for change, and they are personal and collective attributes at the same time. According to the authors, the main difference between the two concepts is that identities are multiple, hybrid and dynamic, while habitus is stable and enduring. The authors omit a very important difference between the two concepts: habitus is unconscious according to the Bourdieusian definition, while identity is (at least partly) conscious. However, I agree with the authors that linking the two approaches together is a useful approach.

In sum, this chapter demonstrated that several authors emphasise that it is necessary to expand
the concept of habitus with reflexivity and consciousness in order to understand identity.

2.6 The conceptualisation of habitus

This study applies an extended conceptualisation of the Bourdieusian habitus concept in order to make it applicable for studying the subjective experience of upward mobility.

According to the applied definition, habitus is a product of social conditions (a ‘structured structure’), and a scheme of perception, conception and action (a ‘structuring structure’). It is composed of dispositions. I agree with the interpretations that claim that habitus can gradually change, however, this change is limited the childhood dispositions (Friedman 2016). Unlike the Bourdieusian concept, I suppose that habitus is not only based on class positions, but also racial and gender differences influence it. Regarding the unitary and coherence of habitus, I am of the opinion of those authors who claim the plurality of dispositions and suppose that habitus can consist of ambivalent and contradictory dispositions. In opposition to Bourdieu, this study supposes that habitus has cognitive aspects as well, that is, it hybridises the concept of habitus and reflexivity. The study also applies a newer conceptualisation of habitus which defines it as a “sense of one’s (and others’) place and role in the world in one’s lived environment”. (Hillier – Rooksby 2002: 21) (The empirical use of the habitus concept is presented in Chapter 4.4.)

2.7 Former empirical findings

This chapter introduces those empirical studies which examine the effect of upward mobility on habitus by using qualitative techniques and the Bourdieusian theoretical framework.

There is an increasing number of published studies (e.g. Abrahams – Ingram 2013, Friedman 2016, Naudet 2018, Reay et al. 2009, Shahrokni 2018) that describe the complex consequences of social mobility on individuals’ psychological and emotional lives. This literature draws attention to the ‘hidden costs of upward mobility’ (Cole – Omari 2003) or the ‘psychological price’ (Friedman 2013) of mobility. Upwardly mobile individuals experience tension because they face two, contradictory constraints: (1) avoiding the feeling of betrayal of their community of origin and at the same time (2) minimal acculturation to the new group. (Naudet 2018, Shahrokni 2018) The latter is needed since mobility is not possible without a minimal mastery
over the strategies of action and perception that are accepted in the new group. (Naudet 2018)
As Friedman claims “…class ‘transfuges’ were caught in a ‘painful’ position of social limbo, of ‘double isolation’, from both their origin and destination class. While they certainly attempted to adopt the cultural dispositions valued in their new elite milieu, they were never able to ‘erase their nostalgia for reintegration into their community of origin’ (cited by Friedman 2016: 132., Bourdieu 1998: 107).

There are only a few studies (e.g. Friedman 2016, Mallman 2018) that examine under what conditions does the habitus become destabilised as a result of social mobility. Friedman (2016) identified that the mutability of habitus depends on the range and speed of mobility, on the direction and destination (measured by occupational class) of movement through social space, and on the individual’s class, ethnicity, and gender. His empirical work focuses mostly on the range and speed of upward mobility. He found that high speed and large-scale movements are more likely to cause habitus dislocation than slow and small-scale ones. Mallman (2018) studied how family background influences the experience of divided habitus. The author highlights that working-class families are not homogeneous: some of the interviewees felt that their family was proactive and ambitious while others described their families as fatalist. Those who had ambitious families received symbolic resources in the form of their family members’ traits (like curiosity, intellect, or ingenuity) for their mobility. However, these interviewees often experienced habitus clivé because there were contradictory family expectations: pressure from family to perform well and be successful, and pressure not to stand out in the family. The other group of interviewees offered narratives in which their mobility trajectory was a deviation from their family’s immobility. These interviewees characterized themselves as different from their families, and it caused tension in themselves and in their family relationships.

A growing body of literature (e.g. Cole – Omari 2003, Naudet 2018, Reay 2001, Shahrokini 2018) investigating those costs of upward mobility that specifically affect racial minority groups. Naudet (2018) highlights that upwardly mobile African Americans do not release from the double sense of belonging, they have to constantly navigate between two reference groups. After their upward mobility they still have a strong attachment to the African American community which leads to the continuous negotiating of their identity. Several studies (Neckerman et al. 1999, Shahrokini 2015) emphasise that upwardly mobile minorities frequently experience the ‘psychological burden of loneliness and isolation’ due to their underrepresentation in many educational and professional settings (Shahrokni 2018). Rollock et al. (2014) found that Black Caribbean middle-class individuals in Britain often
applies a code-switching strategy – e.g. switching their language and accent – depending on their context in order to fit in their new middle-class position and to their background of origin. Abrahams and Ingram (2013) call it as chameleon habitus. Only a few studies (e.g. Naudet 2018, Abrahams – Ingram 2013) examined how this tension between the two worlds can be reconciled.

Abrahams and Ingram (2013) studied the habitus of university students with working-class backgrounds who attended a higher education institution in their locality. The study focuses on how these students negotiate their habitus in multiple fields (local and university spaces). The authors identified three strategies which are applied by the students to resolve the confrontation in their habitus: (strategy 1) ‘distancing from the university field’ (adhering to the local field; re-confirmed habitus), (strategy 2) ‘distancing from the local field’ (adhering to the university field), and (strategy 3) adapting to both fields. 8 These categories are not mutually exclusive, that is, many students apply multiple strategies. In the case of strategy 1 the university field is rejected by the habitus and thus has limited influence on structuring it, so the individual remains embedded in his/her original field. Those students, who follow strategy 2, has changed to suit their new position in the social space. They have distanced themselves from their working-class community and have more common with the people of their destination field. The authors highlight that habitus change that entails a distancing from one’s community of origin can lead to emotional cost, guilt and dislocation. (Abrahams – Ingram 2013) Those students, who use strategy 3, often spoke about having two different lives which they keep separate from each other. They are able to fit in both fields by modifying their behaviour, appearance, and speech draws upon a ‘chameleon habitus’. They have the ability to smoothly switch between the fields in order to adapt their habitus to the field where they are just. The authors highlight that “although having the capacity to operate in both fields, the person’s habitus is not necessarily wholly attuned to either but to a third space. The ‘productive capacities’ (Bhabha 1994: 38) of the third space are born out of the habitus rupture. (Abrahams – Ingram 2013: 11) The position in the third space enables individuals to remain connected to their original and destination field at the same time. Thus, Abrahams and Ingram point out that local working-class students are not torn between two competing fields, but occupy a unique and privileged position: the third space. As the authors write the third space is a: “separate space that is something other than a

8 Hurst (2010) studied the responses of working-class students to the burden of academic success and created a similar typology to the one of Abrahams and Ingram (2013), however she used the concept of identity. She identified three groups: loyalists are those who identify with their class origins and remain true to their roots and values, renegades are those who identify as middle-class and denies their class origins, and double agents are those who occupy an uncertain position that oscillates between working- and middle-class identity.
place between the worlds, but from which to navigate and reconcile the apparent incommensurability of the two fields.” (Abrahams – Ingram 2013: 11) They highlight that the third space is not purely positive, but it can be emotionally and psychologically difficult to be there. (Abrahams – Ingram 2013)

According to the results of Naudet (2018), upwardly mobile African Americans reconcile their two worlds by relying on the ideology of reaching back, that is, they often support their family of origin financially and in other ways, and they make small daily gestures (for example giving tips) to their poorer counterparts in order to express their solidarity to the African American community. Their solidarity roots in a collective identity that is based on the collective experience of discrimination against African American people. However, upwardly mobile African Americans do not deny the existing social order and do not question the lifestyle associated with their new position.

In sum, the literature on the costs of upward mobility for minority groups is increasing however there is a lack in comparative studies, while the process of reconcilement of the two worlds of upwardly mobile minorities is a less investigated research field.

2.8 Research on successful Roma in Hungary

The vast majority of the academic literature (e.g. Kende – Neményi, 2006; Kertesi – Kézdi, 2008; Neumann, 2013; Messing et al., 2010; Szalai, 2011; Szalai, 2013; Papp, 2011; Zolnay, 2016) that discusses the school careers and educational mobility of the Roma population in Hungary focuses particularly on disadvantaged communities. Much of the current literature on successful Roma pays almost exclusive attention to examining young people who are still participating in higher education. For example, research by Forray (2004; 2014) examined the socio-economic characteristics and motivations of the former, Mendi (1999) investigated the factors which contribute to their academic success, but the most well studied area (e.g. Kende, 2005; Kende, 2007; Bokrétás et al., 2007; Békés, 2011) is the development of the identity of university students. Lukács (2018) and Lukács and Dávid (2019) investigated the integration of Roma university students using a social capital approach. These studies provide valuable information about the beginning of the process of upward mobility; however, it is obviously unable to explain the long-term development and consequences of social climbing.

Few studies have investigated the process of social climbing after graduation and its
consequences. Székely et al. (2005) studied the educational mobility, networks, the construction of identity, typical mobility paths and life satisfaction of Roma who were not specifically graduates but at least skilled workers. Torkos (2005) – besides identifying the factors determining school success – analysed how graduation influences social integration. The results indicate that this group typically assimilates. Kóczé (2010) studied the life history of politically active, upwardly mobile Roma women with a special focus on the intersectionality between gender, ethnicity and class. Kóczé draws attention to the fact that the mobility of the first-generation Roma intellectuals is a complex process in which psychosocial factors play an important role, as well as the traditional mobility variables. The importance of family and micro-community is emphasised in facilitating upward mobility. Máthé (2014, 2015) and Forray (2016) examined the identity constructions of resilient Roma intellectuals. According to Forray (2016), resilience is a universal ability that allows an individual, a group, or a community to prevent, minimize, or overcome the harmful effects of affliction. Óhidy (2013; 2016) conducted qualitative interviews with ten Roma women graduates and found that the most important factor in their academic success is learning motivation. Szabóné (2012) investigated the sociodemographic characteristics and mental health of Roma intellectuals. Tóth (2004a, 2004b, 2008) examined (mostly graduate) Roma intellectuals from the United Kingdom and Hungary to identify whether it is possible to achieve upward mobility and retain Roma identity, or whether social uplift necessarily entails a dual identity or assimilation. Results show that the most common type of identity is dual identity (here, a feeling of being both Hungarian and Roma) in the case of upwardly mobile Hungarian Roma intellectuals. Tóth (2004b) stated that, in the case of the Hungarian sample, the experience of (temporal) identity crisis is common. Árendás et al. (2018) studied the position of highly-qualified young Roma in the Hungarian business sphere. They highlighted the tangible and hidden obstacles (like discrimination, prejudice, low self-esteem and self-confidence) that highly educated young Roma have to struggle with during their career. Durst and Bereményi (2021) examined the upward mobility trajectories and its costs of first in family Roma graduates from socially disadvantaged background. They found that they realise a distinctive minority mobility path that results in their selective acculturation into the majority society. The authors identified three main characteristics of this mobility trajectory: (1) the construction of a Roma middle class identity, (2) the establishment of grass-roots ethnic (Roma) organisations, and (3) the practice of giving back to their community of origin.

However, none of these studies systematically analysed the way how the two worlds of
upwardly mobile persons can be reconciled.
3. BACKGROUND

3.1 The socioeconomic and educational characteristics of first generation graduates in Hungary

In this chapter, we describe the main target groups of the research: Roma graduates, first generation graduates and compare them to the total Hungarian graduate population. Particular attention is paid to the potential socio-demographic, higher education, and labour market participation differences between the outlined groups.

Data in terms of Roma graduates and the total population of Hungarian graduates have been accessed through the 2011 census, while data about first generation graduates has been provided by the 2016 micro census. As the general census does not contain questions regarding parents’ highest level of education, data concerning first-generation graduates has been complemented via another source. At the same time, data available from the 2016 micro census is not sufficient to compare first-generation graduates and first-generation Roma graduates. Though the questionnaire did include data on first-generation graduates by nationality, due to the low number of first generation Roma participants (as the unweighted turnout suggests), the dataset is not representative of this population.

In this chapter, we define Roma graduates as having obtained college, university or doctoral degrees and self-identified as Roma at the 2011 census. As mentioned formerly, there is no available data regarding first-generation Roma graduates, therefore this research is limited to the features of the Roma graduate population. However, based on the results of a previous qualitative research among 53 participants (Durst et al 2014) and a study on 124 Roma higher education students participating in advanced colleges (Lukács 2018), we assume that the

---

9 First generation graduates are 20-years-old or older who have obtained a university degree and completed the supplementary “Social stratification” questionnaire in the 2016 micro census, having indicated both of their parents’ highest education lower than college/university degree.

10 The Central Statistical Office used several questions for nationality self-identification in the 2011 census besides nationality itself, such as questions regarding mother tongue or the language spoken among family members/friends. Previous academic findings suggest that the self-identification of multiple nationalities and identities is more easily grasped by two or more, equally important questions. Accordingly, the Central Statistical Office uses 4 questions to determine respondents’ nationalities. If a respondent indicated a nationality in at least one of the four questions, they were considered as self-identifying with that nationality (besides Hungarian). Source: Central Statistical Office (2011) http://www.ksh.hu/nepszamlalas/docs/modszertan.pdf
majority of Roma graduates are first-generation graduates. Thus, in the lack of more comprehensive data, statistical interpretations regarding Roma graduates in general are presumed to be representative of first-generation Roma graduates.

According to the latest general census, some 1,440,000 college/university students graduated in Hungary in 2011, among whom 2,424 respondents identified as Roma (and Hungarian). The 2016 micro census weighted data suggests that there have been 982,000 first-generation graduates in Hungary. Women are overrepresented among graduates (56%) and first-generation graduates (58%). In contrast, the gender distribution among Roma graduates is equal (50-50%). Distribution by age among the first-generation graduates and total population of graduates varies significantly from the Roma graduate population, among whom the ratio of younger graduates is higher. 59% of Roma graduates are under 39 years of age, while only 35% and 44% are younger than 40 years among first generation graduates and the total graduate population accordingly (see Appendix Figure 3).

Roma graduates’ family/marital status also varies from first-generation graduates and the total graduate population. A higher ratio of male (39%) and female (44%) Roma graduates are single than first-generation graduates (male: 24%, female: 24%) and the total graduate population (male: 27%, female: 29%). Those of married family status represent a significantly smaller group among Roma graduates (male: 45%, female: 39%) compared to the two other groups (first-generation graduates: male: 63%, female: 54%, total graduate population: male: 61%, female: 52%) (see Appendix Figure 4).

The percentage of childless women is highest among Roma graduates (41%), with significantly lower rates of childlessness in the total female graduate population (34%) and first-generation graduates (28%). Roughly a quarter of women have one child in all three groups. The rate of first-generation women (38%) and the total female graduate population (33%) who have two children is higher than among Roma female graduates (23%). At about every tenth woman have three or more children in the observed groups. (see Appendix Figure 5).
According to the type of settlement, close to a third of the total graduate population (32%), a quarter of first-generation graduates (26%) and more than a third of Roma graduates (36%) live in the capital, Budapest. More than a quarter of the total graduate population (26%) and first-generation graduates (27%), while only a fifth of Roma graduates (20%) live in towns with county rank. Close to a third of total graduates (27%) and first-generation graduates (31%), and almost a quarter of Roma graduates (24%) reside in other towns. Every fifth Roma graduate lives in a village, in contrast to only 15% of total graduates and 17% of first-generation graduates.

The majority of both first-generation graduates (15%) and Roma graduates (20%) were born in Budapest. There are variations between the two groups in Baranya county, where some 6% of Roma graduates were born, compared to only 3% of first-generation graduates. There are no significant differences between the distribution of first-generation and Roma graduates across the other counties.

In the following, some characteristics of the qualifications of the three groups are compared. College is the highest educational affiliation of approximately two-thirds in all three groups: Roma graduates’ 66%, first-generation graduates’ 64% and 60% of the total graduate population. A third of Roma graduates (33%), 36% of first-generation graduates and 39% of the total graduate population have graduated from university. Only 1-1% attained their PhD in all three groups. As for gender distribution, more men than women acquired university degree in all three groups.

The majority of all three groups completed their highest level of education in the field of social sciences, economics and law: 31% of Roma graduates, 28% of first-generation graduates and 29% of the total graduate population have attained their degree in one of these subjects. The second most popular field of study is education: about a quarter of all three groups finished college/university in a field related to education. The distribution of first-generation graduates and the total graduate population is strikingly similar across all the other subjects as well. However, the ratio of Roma graduates significantly deviates from those of the two other groups. While approximately every tenth Roma graduate (11%) have completed their degree related to humanities and arts, the same ratio is less than 5% among first-generation graduates and the total graduate population. Roma graduates are overrepresented in subjects related to health and social care (11%) compared to first-generation graduates (7%) and the total graduate population (8%). The most striking differences are related to the technical, industrial and construction
training: only 10% of Roma graduates completed degrees in this field, in contrast to a fifth of first-generation graduates (19%) and 17% of the total graduate population.

Figure 1. Distribution of the total graduate population, first-generation graduates and Roma graduates by field of study, percentage

The distribution of the most popular field of study – social sciences, economics, and law – by specialisation shows that the distribution of Roma graduates and first-generation graduates differs significantly in the case of several specialisations. More than a quarter of Roma graduates (26%) specialized in management and administration, compared to only a fifth of first-generation graduates (21%) in the same program. More than a third of first-generation graduates attained their highest level of education in economics (35%), while only a fifth (19%) of Roma graduates studied in this field. Roma graduates are overrepresented in sociology and cultural studies, as well as political and civil society studies (16% and 9% accordingly) compared to first-generation graduates (7% and 3% accordingly). Contrastingly, in finance, banking and insurance, the ratio of first-generation graduates (8%) is considerably higher than the ratio of Roma graduates (4%).
In terms of economic activity, data derived from the 2011 census indicates that the rate of employment has been around 70% in both the total graduate population (69%) and Roma graduates (72%). In 2011, every tenth Roma graduate has been unemployed, in contrast to only 4% of the total graduate population. Close to every fifth member of the total graduate population was retired, comparing to only 7% among Roma graduates. The ratio of those receiving childcare allowance (3-4%), inactive members receiving other types of allowance (0-1%), or dependents (2-5%) does not exceed 5% in any of the three groups.

As of employment, all three groups demonstrate similar attributes. At about two-thirds of all three groups (66-69%) are intellectuals, managers. The ratio of other white-collar workers is approximately 20% in the three groups. 5-5% of the total graduate population and first-generation graduates and roughly 7% of Roma graduates are employed in the tertiary sector. In all three groups, some 1-2% has been occupied in the construction industry, agriculture and forestry. Only a limited share of first-generation graduates (1%), the total graduate population (2%) and Roma graduates (4%) work in other industries.

In the 2016 micro census, respondents were asked to fill in questions regarding their social class. Most first-generation graduates (61%) self-identify as middle-class, while every tenth respondent (11%) classify themselves as upper-middle-class. Only 1% of respondents thought...
they climbed the socio-economic ladder from childhood by belonging to the upper class as adults. Every fifth (22%) assign themselves to the lower middle-class. A low number of respondents self-classify as working-class (3%) or the lower class (1%). Thus, most first-generation graduates (e.g. whose parents did not attain college/university degree) categorize themselves as middle-class, having reached this status through social mobility.

3.2 The trends of social mobility in Hungary between the 1930s and 2010s

Andorka (1990) studied the mobility trend of Hungary between 1930 and 1983. According to his results, the total mobility rates significantly increased from 1930 to 1949, and then up to 1962-64, and the increase continued throughout the whole period. The high degree of mobility during the transition from capitalism to socialism was due to rapid economic and social structural changes. In 1949 the main cause of mobility was the land reform which resulted in the fact that agricultural workers became self-employed peasants. In 1962-64 a significant part of mobility can be explained by the movement from agriculture to industry and from blue-collar to white-collar jobs.

Andorka (1990) highlights that during the socialist transformation and rapid industrialisation (i.e. 1949-1964) the rate of social mobility significantly increased and the Hungarian society became more open, that is, the chances of social mobility became more equal. However, between the 1960s and 1980s the openness of the society declined due to economic, social and educational policies, and to the change of internal political climate.

Róbert and Bukodi (2004) examined the mobility trends of Hungary between 1973 and 2000. They found that the level of total mobility – measured as the percentage of men and women whose destination class is different from their class origins – decreased in Hungary between 1973 and 2000. If we examine the two components of vertical mobility – the movement between lower-level and higher level classes -, that is, upward and downwards movements, then we can see, that man’s upward mobility decreased from 40% to 36%, and their downward mobility increased from 11% to 14% between 1983 and 2000. In this period women’s downward movement increased too (from 12% in 1983 to 17% in 2000), while their upward mobility almost stagnated (from 35% to 36%). (Róbert – Bukodi 2004) That is, Róbert and Bukodi...
(2004) point out that although the total mobility rates were high in Hungary, the social openness did not increase between 1973 and 2000, and men’s mobility chances were more unfavourable compared to women’s chances.

Studies on intergenerational class mobility found that the total mobility rate of Hungary significantly decreased for both men and women since the regime change and women’s and men’s mobility characteristics continued to differ. The absolute mobility rate is higher among women compared to men. Before 2000 the upward mobility rate of men was higher while after 2000 it is higher among women. (Huszár et al. 2020.)

Róbert and Bukodi (2004) found that the social fluidity, that is the openness of the society, increased between 1973 and 1983, it became more moderate between 1983 and 1992, and it reversed between 1992 and 2000. That is, the trend of social fluidity was not increasing between the early 1970s and 2000. This decrease of social fluidity in the 1990s is largely due to the intensification of class inheritance and to the closure of former typical mobility paths. The strengthening of inheritance effect means that the mobility chances became worse in the 2000s.

Huszár et al. (2020) examined the mobility trends of Hungary in 2018. They found that the total mobility rate continued to decline for both men and women at the end of the 2010s and it is still higher among women compared to men. (Huszár et al. 2020.) That is, the previous trends did not change and Huszár et al. (2020) emphasise that the Hungarian society is the most rigid in the last fifty years.

The upward mobility rate of women is continued to be higher than men’s rate while downward mobility level is lower among women compared to men in 2018. That is, the mobility chances of women are better than those of men. The upward and downward mobility of each gender is deteriorated in 2018 compared to 2010. The upward mobility rate of men decreased from 36% in 2000 to 29% in 2018, while their downward mobility increased from 14% to 20%. The indicators of women also deteriorated, but to a lesser extent: their upward mobility declined from 36% in 2000 to 32% in 2002, while their downward mobility rose from 17% to 18%.

---

11 Absolute mobility is the effect of change in the class structure, while relative mobility is free from this influence. Relative mobility is called social fluidity and it is the indicator of the openness of society (Róbert 2019).
Huszár et al. (2020) point out that the problem with the mobility trends in Hungary is not only is that the immobility rate is high and the mobility rate is low, but “social mobility increasingly means downward shifts in the ever more rigid Hungarian society”. (Huszár et al. 2020: 7.) According to the authors this trend is due to structural transformations after the regime change, namely due to polarisation of the occupational positions. The expansion of lower level occupation positions led to the trend of downward structural mobility. (Huszár et al. 2020.)

Related to the relative mobility chances, Huszár et al. (2020) found that the chances for someone who was born into unfavourable circumstances can move up on the social ladder are greater than for those who brought up in favourable circumstances to slide down.

### 3.3 Prejudice and discrimination against Roma in Hungary

Roma are exposed to a variety of forms of prejudice and discrimination in Hungary (Csepeli, Fábián és Sik, 1998, Vajda – Dupcsik 2008). After the regime change the willingness to discriminate and exclude is strengthened (Fábián – Erős, 1996) which was a taboo before the regime change (Tomka 1991). The open prejudice decreased in the 1990s, while it was stagnated at the beginning of 2000s, but after the economic crisis in 2009 xenophobia and anti-Roma attitudes increased again (Keresztes-Takács et al. 2016).

Earlier studies found that anti-Roma attitudes are associated with certain sociodemographic characteristics. For example, it was associated with age (Marián, 2013, Murányi – Sipos 2012) and political orientation (Karácsony – Róna 2010). However, according to the findings of Pulai (2009) and Keresztes-Takács et al. (2016) anti-Roma attitudes are a phenomenon that pervades society as a whole. The latter study found that the rejection of Roma is so prevalent, liberated, and open that it cannot be predicted based on the factors typically related to prejudice. The authors claim that prejudice against Roma has no moral barriers in Hungary.

The prevalence and extent of discrimination are very difficult to determine (Lovász – Telegdy 2010), there is no single indicator or method that could provide a reliable estimate on its extent (Sik – Simonovits 2010). According to the results of EU-MIDIS survey, 90% of Roma respondents experienced discrimination in some areas of their life. One-third of Roma people experienced discrimination during job search which is was the highest value among the EU-27.
countries. Sik and Simonivits (2010) point out that Roma origin significantly increases the degree of perception of discrimination in the labour market, education and for access to different services.

In sum, the empirical findings show, that prejudice against Roma is very high in the Hungarian society and increased after 2009, and Roma people are exposed to discrimination in many areas of life.

### 3.4 Spatial and educational segregation of Roma in Hungary

This chapter introduces the spatial and educational segregation of Roma in Hungary that is closely related to their chances of social mobility.

Ferge (1990) highlights that “There are significant distances between different parts and groups of the society in the case of segregation. Social distances are large, sometimes almost unbridgeable in the social sense, it is difficult or impossible to move from one group to another either through individual mobility or marriage”.

Nieuwenhuis et al. (2017: 2) has revealed that “…the combination of high levels of social inequalities and high levels of spatial segregation tend to lead to a vicious circle of segregation for low income groups, where it is difficult to undertake both upward social mobility and upward spatial mobility.” This research suggests that increasing inequality in cities leads to decreased social mobility because the “socio-economic distance” between the lowest and the highest income groups is large and as a consequence upward mobility is difficult. A lack of social mobility and a high level of inequality result in the spatial sorting of households into neighbourhoods, where the lowest income groups are concentrated in neighbourhoods where apartments are cheap, and this leads to the segregation of socio-economic classes (Nieuwenhuis et al. 2017). Similarly, Van Ham et al. (2018) claim that reducing levels of segregation by socially mixing neighbourhoods can influence inequality and social mobility,
Educational segregation

Kertesi and Kézdi define educational segregation as ‘the greater presence of children from low-status families in certain types of schools or in certain types of classes within a school than would result from residential separation”. (Kertesi – Kézdi 2005: 317-318). According to Havas (2008: 122) “segregation is the separation of children with multiple disadvantages, especially Roma children, in schools”. Dupcsik (2012: 244) provides the following definition: “the separated education of children from disadvantaged groups and/or groups at risk of discrimination”.

There are three main types of educational segregation: (1) special schools set up for children with mental disabilities, although mostly attended by Roma students; (2) segregated schools where the majority of pupils are Roma; and (3) segregated classes within regular schools. A newer form is when schools get rid of troublesome Roma students by exempting them from school-attendance and converting them into ‘home-schooling pupils’ (magántanuló). (Molnár – Dupcsik 2008).

According to the results of Csanádi, Ladányi and Gerő (1978) and Ladányi és Csanádi (1983), the segregation of students has been present since the 1970s in Hungary. In this period one form of separation was the specialised classes12, and another form was the special schools / classes (Dupcsik 2012). From the 1980s students and their parents are allowed to choose what primary school they want to attend, even outside of their residential district. This measure intensified the residential and school segregation (Havas – Zolnay 2010).

Havas and Liskó (2005) studied the segregation between and within schools in primary education. According to their results, every fourth to fifth Roma child attends a school where the proportion of Roma exceeds 40%, and every sixth child goes to a school where this ratio is greater than 50%. The authors conclude that a significant number of schools can be classified as ethnic and social ghettos, attended predominantly by children from Roma and non-Roma poor families. A research of Havas, Kemény and Liskó (2002) found that the practice of segregating Roma children within schools has been going on for decades in the Hungarian educational system. As a result of this, classes are created that provide higher quality education for children from families of higher social status. Occasionally a Gypsy child from a very integrated, higher status family is admitted to these classes as well. Non-Roma children from

---

12 Classes in which special emphasis is placed on the education of one or a few subjects (tagozatos osztályok).
low-educated and low-status families are also admitted to classes that were created primarily to segregate the Roma children. Havas and Liskó (2005) point out that 16% of the schools (314 primary schools) studied have a homogeneous Roma and a homogeneous non-Roma class. In 2002 the same ratio was 13% (Havas-Kemény-Liskó 2002).

Research results show that Roma students are overrepresented in special education classes. In 2004, 3.6% of primary school students studied in special education classes, while the same proportion is 15% among Roma primary school students according to the estimation of Havas (2008). Havas, Kemény and Liskó found that the proportion of Roma students was 84% in special education classes in 2002 based on the data of 198 schools. The same ratio was 71% in 2004 based on the data of 553 schools (Havas 2008).

According to the research results based on the analysis of the National Assessment of Basic Competencies, the proportion of ghetto schools – where the proportion of Roma students is over 50% – rose steadily between 2008 and 2016. In 2008, the proportion of ghetto schools was 10%, while this proportion increased to 14% in 2016 (Ercse 2016). According to Ercse, this increasing segregation is due to a new segregation mechanism that is encouraged by the state and assisted by the church.

Kertesi and Kézdi (2012) studied the degree of between-school segregation of Roma versus non-Roma students between 1980 and 2011. The authors found that ethnic segregation between Hungarian schools increased greatly between 1980 and 2011. Their results show that school segregation is positively associated with the size of the educational market and the proportion of Roma students. Another study of the authors (Kertesi – Kézdi 2013) examined the impact of various factors on school segregation in the Hungarian primary school system. The inter-district mobility of higher-status students, local educational policies, and the share of the Romani population in a town were found to have the greatest effect on school segregation. However, residential segregation does not have a direct influence on the level of school segregation. According to the assumption of the authors, this is due to inter-district mobility and free school choice. Hajdu, Kertesi and Készdi (2021) pointed out that ethnic segregation in Hungarian primary schools is moderate on average but rising over time, and the degree of segregation is very high in some cities.

Radó (2020) identifies eight factors that contribute to social selection in Hungary, namely: social inequalities, pedagogical practice, early performance gaps, school structure, school
networks, parental choices, policy expectations, and governance failures. In sum, studies show that the segregation of students on the basis of both socio-economic and ethnic backgrounds is strengthening in the last decades in Hungary.

Spatial segregation

Data on the spatial segregation of the Roma in the period of socialism is provided by the research of István Kemény. At the time of the 1971 research two-thirds of the Roma population lived in segregated areas (in traditional settlements, on the outskirts of villages, or the outskirts) (Kemény 1976). In 1965 the elimination of Gypsy neighbourhoods and settlements has begun and families received loans to build low-standard houses (Cs housing) or to buy finished houses (Váradi – Virág 2014, Tóth 2019). Due to this programme the living conditions of the Roma population improved somewhat, but it was not able to eliminate residential segregation or close the gap in living conditions of the majority and the Roma (Farkas et al. 2017). The new houses were often built next to each other thus the segregated gypsy settlements were reproduced (Váradi – Virág 2014). There were other factors that also contributed to the reproduction of residential segregation. The amount of the loan was only enough to buy a house in small, depopulating villages. As a result, a rapid population change occurred in the affected villages (Farkas et al. 2017, Tóth 2019). Those settlements which had a stronger lobbying capacity displaced their Roma population to these villages (Havas 1999). Due to this practice, a Roma majority was formed in many settlements (Farkas et al. 2017).

In 1993 Kemény and his colleagues repeated their research and found that the proportion of families living in Gypsy settlements significantly decreased but half of Roma families still lived in segregated areas. This rate increased to two-thirds in 2003 (Janky es Kemény 2004). Between the 1970s and 2010, the housing conditions of Gypsies significantly increased, the number of Gypsy settlements greatly decreased, but their separation within settlements has risen (Teller 2011). According to the research of the National Development Agency (Nemzeti Fejlesztési Ügynökség) there were 1633 neighbourhoods in 823 settlements and ten metropolitan districts of Budapest where low-status or Roma people lived in residential segregation. The estimated population of these areas is 300,000 heads (Domokos – Herczeg 2010).

According to Váradi and Virág (2014) the forms of spatial exclusion have changed in the last decades. In the 1960s most of the Roma families lived in Gypsy settlements that are located outside the settlement structure, in the 1980s Roma families concentrated in certain parts of
settlements, and Roma-only” villages (“elcigányosodó” falvak) came into being due to selective migration, and urban slums have also appeared. From the 2000s the organisation of ghettoizing small villages into areas began in peripheral rural areas (Virág 2010).

Farkas et al. (2017) state that recent surveys and other studies demonstrate that the integration process that started in state socialism has been interrupted in Hungary, and that after the regime change the issue of spatial segregation is again becoming more pressing.

3.5 Changes in educational policy in the education of Roma children

The chapter briefly presents the history of educational policies targeting Roma children in Hungary between the 1960s and 2010s.

After World War II, the state did not regard the Roma issue as a political and social problem thus they did not work on the improvement of their situation. The turning point was the 1961 party decree which aimed to make better the situation of Roma in the areas of housing, education, and employment (Forray – Hegedűs 2001, Hajnáczky 2015). However, the educational initiatives of this decree led to further disadvantages because it supported the segregated education of Roma students (Majtényi – Majtényi 2016). This decree considered the treatment of Gypsies as a nationality harmful. It aimed to integrate and assimilate the Roma and did not support the strengthening of Roma identity, keeping their culture alive, or cultivating their languages (Orsós 2020, Zolnay 2021). In this period the ethnic and social issues were mixed up in the judgement of the Roma (Orsós 2020). As a result of this decree, the enrolment of Roma children in primary schools has increased significantly, but many of them did not complete primary school, they barely enrolled in vocational training, and the number of children attending special schools has increased (Hajnáczky 2015, Orsós 2020, Zolnay 2021). However, schooling contributed significantly to the rapid language loss of Romani and Beas students (Zolnay 2021).

In 1962 and 1967 ministerial decrees were issued that allowed the organisation of segregated classes (“cigányosztályok”). As a result of these controversial measures the mass schooling of Roma children began in separate schools and Gypsy classes, and many Roma students were directed into special education schools ((Forray – Hegedűs 2001, Majtényi – Majtényi 2016). In 1968 a new party decree was issued which highlighted the effectiveness of segregated classes
for Gypsy students (Forray – Hegedűs 2001, Zolnay 2021). The 1974 party decree states that the Gypsy community cannot be considered as a nationality, it regards the Roma as a social group with "certain ethnographic characteristics". The decree did not allow the introduction of Gypsy-language newspapers, theatres, or Gypsy-language education. In the 1970s the segregated education of Roma students continued, however, the 1979 party decree formulated that segregated education is a failure, but it does not mean that there were no ‘Gypsy classes’ and ‘Gypsy’ schools left (Forray – Hegedűs 2001). This decree also highlighted that “Gypsies living in Hungary cannot be considered as a nationality, but they are an ethnic group that is gradually integrating into our society and assimilating.” (Forray – Hegedűs 2001: 15.). In 1984, a new report was issued by the party that identifies education and culture as the main form of support for the Roma, and it recognises that their cultural traditions are worth preserving and disseminating institutionally (Forray – Hegedűs 2001).

The Act on Local Governments was adopted after the regime change in 1990. It deals with the education of nationalities and mentions the education of the Gypsies along with other nationalities. However, while catching up education is prescribed for them, nurturing mother tongue and culture is considered important in the case of other nationalities (Forray 1998, Orsós 2020).

The segregation trends had strengthened around the regime change due to the free school choice which was codified in 1985 (Papp – Neumann 2021).

Papp and Neumann (2021) identified five paradigms regarding the public policies on the education of Roma pupils since 1993.

(1: cultural, essentialist paradigm) Between 1993 and 2002 the “cultural, essentialist paradigm” prevailed which supposed that transferring minority culture (e.g. organising targeted classes and lessons for them) is necessary for the education of Roma children (Neumann 2013, Papp – Neumann 2021). During this period, social disadvantages and ethnic differences were addressed through minority education policies. There was a major shift in the second half of the 1990s when compensation for disadvantages of the Roma was formulated as a separate area of public policy (Eröss 2012)

The Act on the Rights of National and Ethnic Minorities was adopted in 1993 (see Kállai 2013). It recognised the collective rights of the historical minorities (Eröss 2012). This act was the first to formulate the right to minority education in Hungary, that is, the right of minority individuals to participate in mother tongue education, and the right of minority communities to create their training at different levels of education. It distinguishes the Roma from other nationalities even
at the level of names: it regards the Roma as an ethnic minority, while it considers the other groups as national minorities. (Orsós 2020).

The Act LXXIX of 1993 on Public Education allowed for the children of national and ethnic minorities to receive pre-school and school education in their mother tongue and/or in Hungarian (Forray 1998, Orsós 2020). However, in the case of the Roma children, it was not nationality education that was realised, but ‘Gypsy catch-up programmes’ („cigány felzárkóztató programok”) were created (Forray 1998, Varga 2013, Orsós 2020).

The educational policy of the 1990s failed to tackle the disadvantaged Roma pupils’ schooling problem through minority education, but it created the legal conditions for segregated education (Orsós 2020).

**(2: desegregation)** Between 2002 and 2005 the new paradigm focused on desegregation and on the integrated education of Roma students (Papp – Neumann 2021). During this period anti-discrimination legislation was introduced, and the prohibition and sanctioning of school segregation were also codified (Erőss 2012).

In 2002 a new body – the Ministerial Commission of Integration of Roma and Socially Disadvantaged Children – was created within the Ministry of Education. The Commission participated in the preparation of new programmes, such as the development of new education forms aiming at integration, the support of students’ development, and the decrease in the number of children who receive special education (eg. ‘Utolsó padból’ project). That is, several initiatives were introduced in order to reduce inequalities and combat segregation. For instance, the National Education Integration Network (Országos Oktatási Integrációs Hálózat) has been set up in 2002 in order to facilitate the education of disadvantaged children in integrated classes (Molnár – Dupcsik 2008, Forray – Pálmainé 2010). The National Education Integration Network organised the introduction of the Integrated Pedagogical System (IPR) programme in 2003 (see e.g. Németh – Papp 2006, Forray – Pálmainé 2010, Varga 2018). It aims to reduce inequalities of opportunity for children with multiple disadvantages in the schools and promotes inclusive education. The programme provides additional financial support to kindergartens and schools through yearly tenders (Varga 2016).

The education governance has not dared to abolish the right of free choice of schools, however, they introduced an amendment of the Public Education Act according to which those schools that undertake integrated education get additional resources (called integration grant, later
integration support). Furthermore, they tightened and clarified the rules related to the exemption of pupils and special education (Molnár – Dupcsik 2008).

From 2007, new regulations were introduced in order to reduce the so-called ‘white flight’, e.g. local governments had to modify the boundaries of school districts in a way that diminishes the effects of residential segregation, schools had to admit any children within the schooling area; and schools had to prioritise the multiply disadvantaged children amongst the ‘extra-territorial’ students (Molnár – Dupcsik 2008).

In the next period (2004-2007) integrated education was the aim (Papp – Neumann 2021). In 2006 the Roma Education Fund started to operate in Hungary with the aim of promoting equal opportunities for the Roma in the field of education (Molnár – Dupcsik 2008).

Between 2007 and 2010, the focus was on equal opportunities ((Papp – Neumann 2021, see Forray – Pálmainé 2010). In 2007 the Education Roundtable was organised which aim was to create a proposal regarding the reform of public education. Based on this document the Government elaborated its action plan (Molnár – Dupcsik 2008). “The most important fields of governmental actions include the following: early age development, equal opportunities and integration, supporting talented pupils, dormitory development, teacher incentives, content development for public education, standardised measurements and assessments of education, school management, admission procedures of secondary educational institutions. (Molnár – Dupcsik 2008: 23.).

Since 2010, Hungary’s new government dismissed the desegregation paradigm and started to frame its policies in a narrative that argues that those who lagged behind should be taught separately. After 2010, the view of responsibilisation appeared according to which Roma need to ‘contribute’ to their catching up to the majority (Papp – Neumann 2021).

In 2011 the National Public Education Act was adopted which highly centralised the educational system. This law subordinated the maintenance and operation of schools to the Klebelsberg Institutional Maintenance Centre (KIMC). It also supported the Christian churches in taking over schools. The number of parochial schools especially increased in the poorer regions of the country and small settlements. This means that Roma students are increasingly educated in parochial schools. These schools are supported by the state budget, and they intensified the local segregation processes (Papp – Neumann 2021).
According to Zolnay (2021), the National Public Education Act of 2011 and subsequent lower-level legislation led to an exclusionary turn in public education in Hungary. These laws abolished freedom of education and eliminated the textbook market. School funding was taken over by the state and per capita-based normative funding was abolished. The upper age limit for compulsory schooling was again reduced to 16 years.

In 2011, the National Social Inclusion Strategy was introduced which aims to improve the living conditions of the Roma and those who live in extreme poverty. This strategy embraces several scholarships (‘Útravaló’ Scholarship Program, János Arany Gifted and Talented Program, János Arany College Program, János Arany College and Vocational School Program), extracurricular tutoring centres for socially disadvantaged children (“tanoda program”), and mentor programs for Roma pupils in higher education (Papp – Neumann 2021).

The Act CLXXIX/2011 on the Rights of Nationalities abolished the concept of the national and ethnic minority, and introduced the concept of nationality uniformly (Orsós 2020). Furthermore, it introduced uniform (i.e. for all nationalities, including the Roma) legal conditions in the field of nationality education (Orsós 2020).

In summary, the educational outcomes of Roma children have improved in recent decades, however, this is mainly due to the structural and specific characteristics of the educational system. Roma students increasingly complete primary education and obtain a high school diploma in increasing numbers, but they are still the most disadvantaged group in education compared to the whole population and inequalities have shifted to higher educational levels because of the educational expansion (Papp – Neumann 2021).

### 3.6 Educational disadvantages of Roma in Hungary

This chapter examines the disadvantaged situation of Roma in education and the discrimination against Roma in the labour market in Hungary.

Kertesi, Kézdi and Hajdu (e.g. Kertesi – Kézdi 2013, Kertesi et al. 2014, Kertesi – Kézdi 2016, Hajdu et al. 2021) extensively studied the educational attainment of Roma students and their school segregation in Hungary in recent decades.
Kertesi, Kézdi and Hajdu (2014) studied the educational situation of Roma students after the regime change. They compared the educational attainment of the cohort born in 1974 with the cohort born around 1991 at their 20-21 years old. They identified two trends: there has been a significant catch-up in the successful completion of primary school and further education in secondary school (it typically means vocational school for the Roma children); the gap between Roma and non-Roma students in the case of completing the secondary school and participation in higher education has significantly increased. However, this development had little value in the labour market because the wages stagnated or increased very slightly in the fields – completing primary school or vocational school – where Roma students’ educational attainment advanced during that two decades. Meanwhile, the wages significantly increased in the areas – taking maturity exam and graduating in higher education – where the gap between the Roma and non-Roma students’ educational attainment is the highest.

According to the results of Kertesi and Kézdi (2016) the gap between the educational attainment of Roma and non-Roma students arises at the level of secondary school. Their study analysed the educational attainment of a cohort of students who started secondary school in 2006. They found that 75% of non-Roma students take a final maturity exam while this rate is only 24% among Roma students. The college attendance among non-Roma students is 31% while the corresponding figure for Roma is only 4%.

They found that the disadvantage of Roma students is due to social differences in income, wealth and education of parents, and ethnic factors do not have an important role. The authors identified two mechanisms that are responsible for the ethnic difference in high school attainment: (1) Roma children’s home environment is less favourable for their cognitive development compared to those of non-Roma children, (2) the educational environment of Roma children is lower quality than those of non-Roma children (Kertesi – Kézdi 2016). Kertesi and Kézdi (2016) emphasise that the ethnic differences in the home environment of students can be explained by social differences, that is, ethnicity does not play a role in it. The educational environment of Roma children is less favourable because of ethnic segregation. Most of the Roma students studies in classrooms where there are many pedagogical problems that makes teaching very difficult. The reason for this selection is residential inequalities, selection by social disadvantage, and ethnic exclusion mechanisms.
3.7 Talent development and support programmes for Roma students in Hungary\textsuperscript{13}

Talent development and support programmes play an important role in the lives of most Roma / Gypsies who have a successful school career (Havas 2007, Óhidy 2016, Boros et al. 2021). The number of support programs for Roma and/or disadvantaged students\textsuperscript{14}, which facilitate the entry into higher education or the career of students who have already entered higher education, has increased since the second half of the 2000s, that is, typically our younger interviewees participated in such initiatives.

In the next section, I will introduce those support programs and institutions which were frequently mentioned in the narratives of our interviewees.

Several respondents mentioned the important role of Gandhi High School, Dormitory and Elementary Art School –National High School in their mobility path. This school was established in 1994 by a group of independent Roma and Gypsy intellectuals in Pécs (Boros – Gergye 2019). This is the first Romani/Gypsy nationality secondary school in Europe. The aim of its foundation was “to train a significant number of Roma intellectuals who are attached to their people, and are able to reorganize the disintegrated Roma communities”.\textsuperscript{15} All students study Gypsy languages (Beas and Romani) and Gypsy / Roma culture on a compulsory basis. The school operates a social support system in order to increase the school success of multiple disadvantaged students.\textsuperscript{16} It is a boarding school (Boros – Gergye 2019), that is, it offers food and lodging to its students.

In the 1990s an important initiative was the training of the Bárczi Gusztáv College of Special Education which targeted Roma youth. This training has enabled many Roma students to become social workers (Forray 2012).

Many of our respondents mentioned in their narratives that without the support of the Kurt Lewin Foundation’s (KLF) preparation course for university entry they would never have been admitted into higher education. KLF’s program for secondary school students from poor,

\begin{footnotesize}
\textsuperscript{13} This chapter is partly based on the study of Nyírő – Durst 2018.
\textsuperscript{14} For a list of educational support programmes at all educational levels for disadvantaged and Roma students see Boros 2019: 48.-52.
\textsuperscript{15} http://gandhigimi.hu/bemutatkozunk/
\textsuperscript{16} http://gandhigimi.hu/bemutatkozunk/
\end{footnotesize}
disadvantaged family backgrounds operated from 1995 to 2007. The aim of this initiative was to promote the social integration of disadvantaged university students, facilitate access to higher education for those who intended to become university students, and also support members psychologically and professionally throughout their education. The initiative had two parts: a preparatory course for university entry and the Szocháló Project (a webpage about social sciences). Most of the student participants came from the countryside and were either close to graduating from high school or had already obtained a high school diploma, or A-level qualification (érettségi), one or two years earlier. Both Roma and non-Roma students could apply to the program. The course was mainly designed for those students who wished to apply for the field of sociology, social policy or social work, but some students tried out for other areas of study at the beginning of the program. Later, the organisers had to narrow the choice of study and institutions due to a lack of teachers and several other factors. In the end, the program prepared students exclusively for the entrance exam for the sociology, social policy and social work course at Eötvös Loránd University. The program also sought to help students outside of education by organising social events (e.g. summer camps, and year-round excursions), and by providing mentoring and emotional support to participants. Tuition was free and books and a travel subsidy were also provided. The preparatory course lasted 10 months per year, but those students who were admitted to university could continue to access support within the framework of the Szocháló Project. The aim of the Szocháló Project was to compensate for the professional and cultural deficiencies of students from disadvantaged family backgrounds by making available work on the project website. The project also included a mentoring program: younger students were mentored by older project students in terms of their studies, support for integration, and keeping in touch with their families (Ligeti, 2001) as the mentors realised how important but difficult it was for academically high achievers who suffered from the above-mentioned dislocated habitus to maintain relations with family members.

Another important ‘protective agents’ (Stanton-Salazar, 2004) in the lives of our upwardly mobile respondents were the Roma colleges for advanced studies (see e.g. Forray – Boros 2009, Forray 2012, Varga 2013, Forray 2017), the first of these was the Romaversitas Hungary. Romaversitas was founded in 1996 by the Roma Civil Rights’ Foundation (Forray – Boros, 2009). Its aims, according to its founding document, are to create equal opportunities for outstanding young Roma studying in higher education by offering them training and coaching

17 See: the history of Romaversitas: Arnold et al., 2011
and providing them with talent management, together with financial, psychological, professional and ethical support for smoothing their transition into positions typical of middle-class intellectuals. The overarching aim of the program is to create an autonomous intellectual elite of Roma origin which will contribute to the creation of a Roma middle-class through fostering a feeling of responsibility for and commitment to the advancement of this ethnic group (Arnold et al., 2011). The program’s stated missions include helping deal with the conflicts associated with becoming a Roma intellectual, and strengthening students’ Roma identity (Arnold et al., 2011).

According to Foundation Evaluation Research 2010, there was disagreement about the political commitment of Romaversitas between those who supported the foundation’s active role in the Roma civil rights movement, and those who wished to promote professionalism. In 2010, the latter approach was favoured by the then-current management. However, by 2014 it had become clear that the foundation needed to represent an activist approach as well (Arnold et al., 2011; Héra, 2014). An employee of Romaversistas put it this way: ‘Professionalism and activism go together. One without the other is worth nothing.’ (Héra, 2014: 9)

Romaversitas offers a wide variety of services to its students. However, the range of services is subject to change because of the foundation’s funding problems: as an NGO it relies primarily on grants, donations, and supporters (Forray – Boros, 2009; Héra, 2014). Our interviewees, former beneficiaries of this ethnic support group, reported to having received much-needed financial as well as professional support. All participants received monthly scholarships", which many of them used to support their poor families at home. The program also provided personal professional assistance, including language courses, private tutors for students working on their theses or preparing for academic competitions, and mentors (older students who helped them adjust to the community of Romaversitas). Furthermore, students took part in monthly group events (called ‘Open University’) involving lectures and seminars. Our respondents emphasised the presence of emotional support as well: Romaversitas students can ask for psychological assistance and lifestyle coaching. The foundation also helps in their career building by offering assistance with job searching and writing grants or job applications. In addition, there are social events such as camps and film clubs. Students have to complete all the requirements of their university or college studies, maintain a grade-point average of at least 3.0, and take part in mandatory courses in exchange for the services provided by Romaversitas (Arnold et al., 2011).

---

19 Since the academic year 2017/18 the Foundation has no longer offered this monthly scholarship, but it was available at the time our interviewees participated in the program.
Another important program in our interviewees’ narratives is the Department of Romology and Education Sociology. It was established in 1998 in the Faculty of Humanities at the University of Pécs in the Institute of Education. The training provides a scientific background for teaching and representing the knowledge about the society, language and culture of the Roma population. They offer bachelor's and master's programmes as well. The aim of the programmes is to train specialists who are familiar and insightful about political, legal, linguistic, cultural, educational, demographic, labour market situation of the Roma communities. Since 2005, the department has been training primary and secondary school teachers who are well acquainted with the problems of disadvantaged and Roma students’ backgrounds, cultures and educational challenges; and who are able to speak and teach the Beas or the Romani language (Boros – Gergye 2019).

A couple of our socially mobile interviewees were beneficiaries of media internship programs. One of these pro-Roma support initiatives was the journalist internship program of the Center for Independent Journalism (Független Médiaközpont). The aim of the project was to prepare talented Roma youngsters for a career in journalism in majority society, and it only targeted Roma students. At the outset, educational attainment was not one of the selection criteria, although later only university students and new graduates could participate. The program operated between 1998 and 2012, during which time 110 students completed it. The Roma Press Centre (Roma Sajtóközpont) was the initiator of the project, but the organiser was the Centre for Independent Journalism. The internship took ten months (daily 8-9 hours) and comprised two parts: a theoretical education and work at an editorial office. Students received a scholarship to cover their living expenses, and participants from the countryside also received accommodation and travel subsidies (Szabó, 2013).

The other media internship program was a Roma Scholarship Media Program (Roma Ösztöndijás Médiaprogram) at the broadcaster Hungarian Television. The program operated in 2006 and 2007 and seven students completed it. The aim of this initiative was to offer an opportunity for Roma journalists and presenters to appear on TV and work on TV programs (Szabó, 2013). According to Szabó (2013), the other goal of Hungarian Television was to contribute to the creation of a credible and positive image of Roma by using the trainees themselves. One of our respondents, a former trainee in this initiative, told us why she had joined the program and why she believed in its positive effect on the Roma community: ‘During the last 20-30 years there has been public discourse in Hungary about how much change it

---

20 https://nevtud.btk.pte.hu/content/department-romology-and-sociology-education-0?language=en
21 http://hvg.hu/karrier/20071219_mtv_roma
would bring about in public thinking if there were Roma presenters on television. I was there, one of those few media people, sitting in on a non-Roma program, in which there was not a single word about Roma. Still, I felt strongly that I was working as much for Roma issues during this time as when I worked for a Roma NGO. Just by sitting in front of the camera, showing my face.’

Many of our respondents mentioned the ‘Útravaló’ Scholarship Programme which has been available since 2005 (Boros 2019). The aim of the scholarship is to facilitate the educational success of disadvantaged students, to promote equal opportunities, and to improve young people’s chances of further education (A-level certificate and university degree), and acquiring a good job in the labour market.²² It has two elements: it provides financial support and a mentor helps the students’ school career (Boros 2019).

Several interviewees highlighted the role of Wlislocki Henrik Student College in their educational careers. This college belongs to the Romology Department of the University of Pécs. Its aim is to bring together Roma students attending the University of Pécs and those who are interested in Roma studies and Roma culture.²³ This programme provides a wide range of services for the students, for instance, they get financial support, help in their educational and scientific career (e.g. tutoring and mentoring system, professional trips), and they also receive psychological support. It also draws students ’attention to the importance of social responsibility.²⁴

Another important support program is provided by Christian Roma Special College Network (Keresztény Roma Szakkollégiumi Hálózat) which was founded in 2011 by four institutions (Jesuit Roma Special College, Hungarian Evangelist Church Roma Special College, Miskolc Greek Catholic Gypsy Special College, Wáli István Reformed Gypsy Special College), and later the Christian Roma Special College of Szeged is joined to the network (Jancsák 2016). According to their founding document, a priority task is to train the intelligentsia in order to realise the catching up of Gypsies in Hungary, for which the special colleges provide support. The aim of the programme is to train Christian intellectuals who are highly qualified, who are open to further development, and who are committed to their Roma identity²⁵. These colleges

²² https://emet.gov.hu/utravalo-macika-osztondijprogram/
²³ https://wlislocki.pte.hu/content/wlislocki-henrik-roma-student-college-whsz?language=en
²⁴ https://wlislocki.pte.hu/
²⁵ http://krszh.hu/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/R-KERESZT%C3%89NY-ROMA-SZAKKOLL%C3%89GIUMI-H%C3%81L%C3%93ZAT.doc
provide a wide array of services to their students, for example, they receive financial and material support, help in their studies (e.g. tutoring, private lessons), and professional support (Győrbíró et al. 2015).

Studies on the effectiveness of these programmes are rare (for a few exceptions see e.g. Dezső 2013, Héra 2014, Jancsák 2016). However, most of them rely on qualitative interviewees with a small number of students. As Forray (2012) highlights targeted research is lacking in the field on many issues.
4. RESEARCH QUESTIONS, SAMPLE AND METHOD

4.1 Research questions

The purpose of this thesis is to analyse the subjective experience of mobility of Roma and non-Roma first in family graduates in Hungary.

Bourdieu highlights (1990, 2000) that large-scale social changes and (long-range) social mobility can cause a dislocation of habitus, that is, a mismatch emerges between habitus and field. This means that dispositions are not adapted to the field because they are adjusted to the conditions of the former field. This may lead to the double isolation of individuals both of their background of origin and their attained social group. According to Bourdieu, the misalignment of field and habitus could create a painfully fragmented self, a divided habitus.

However, Bourdieu does not detail exactly what conditions lead to divided habitus. According to Friedman (2016) the mutability of habitus depends on a person’s mobility trajectory. Mobility trajectory refers “…to the range of upward mobility but also by the speed and direction of movement through social space, as well as a person’s particular combination of class, gender and ethnicity.” (Friedman 2016: 144.) Therefore my first research question is:

Under what conditions do the habitus of first in family graduates become destabilised as a result of upward mobility?

As it was mentioned, the movement between social classes could lead to the dislocation of habitus when the individuals feel that they do not ‘fit in’ to either their original field or their new field. Abrahams and Ingram (2016) highlight that habitus interruption can lead not only to divided habitus, but other ways of negotiating multiple fields exists. They identify four types of habitus interruption: abandoned habitus, re-confirmed habitus, destabilised habitus, and reconciled habitus (see Chapter 2.5.3.). The latter – which group is the focus of my research – is when a person incorporates the structuring forces of the two, contradictory fields, and is therefore able to successfully navigate in both worlds. Similarly, Naudet (2018) claims that tension arises because the individual oscillates between the loyalty to the group of origin and the – necessary - acculturation to the new group. The author highlights that this tension could be resolved by making sense of the mobility trajectory. That is, upwardly mobile individuals may be able to navigate in both fields and accommodate both structures despite the contradiction between them by developing a coherent self-narrative. Therefore my second
research question is:

How did Roma interviewees make sense of their upward mobility according to their narratives? In other words, how the two social contexts could be reconciled by those who successfully navigate in both worlds?

4.2 Sample

The empirical base of this dissertation derives from two research. The first project was conducted between 2011 and 2015 when we made semi-structured life path interviewees with 65 high-achiever Roma and non-Roma women. We selected Roma interviewees who have a college or university degree. Those interviewees were regarded as Roma who were self-identified as Roma. The non-Roma interviewees were first in family graduates. The project used the snowball sampling method. The second project, Social mobility and ethnicity: Trajectories, outcomes and hidden costs of mobility26 also used life path interviews that were conducted with a total of 166 first in family graduates, in the period between 2018 and 2021. Among the respondents of this research were both majority (non-Roma) and minority (Roma) interviewees, the latter of which consisted of those who self-identified as Roma. The research used several channels to recruit participants: from the snowball sampling method, through advertisement on social media, to an online survey.

Chapter 5.1. of the dissertation is based on sample A, while other chapters are constituted as a subsample of the two research projects (sample B). For subsample B, we selected those interviewees who are Roma and first in family graduates.

Sample A (176 interviewees): In terms of age, interviewees ranged from 23 to 67 years old. 114 interviewees were female, and 62 were male. 63 of them were non-Roma, while 113 were Roma. The sample included participants both from urban and rural locations in Hungary. (This sample contains 12 interviews from the first project and 164 interviews from the second project.) (See Appendix 7.3.)

---

26 The research project is supported by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences’ (NKFH) research grant (no. K-125 497). The leader of the project is Judit Durst, the members: Ábel Bereményi, Péter Bogdán, Julianna Boros, Fanni Dés, Margit Feischmidt, Ernő Kállai, Zsanna Nyirő, Attila Z. Papp. The description of the project can be found here: https://tk.hu/en/social-mobility-and-ethnicity-trajectories-outcomes-and-the-hidden-costs-of-high-educational-achievement
Sample B (48 interviewees): in terms of age, interviewees ranged from 25 to 62 years old. 38 interviewees were female, and 10 were male, all of them are Roma. The sample included participants both from urban and rural locations in Hungary. All of them belong to the type of reconciled habitus. (This sample contains 11 interviews from the first project and 37 interviews from the second project.) (See Appendix 7.4.)

4.3 Qualitative interviews and qualitative content analysis

Our research analyses the subjective experiences of upward mobility therefore it seemed adequate to use qualitative interviewees. Since this method is useful when we are “…interested in people’s experiences, behaviour and understandings and how and why they experience and understand the social world in this way.” (Matthews – Ross 2010: 221.) It provides information about “the content of the interview conversation and the way the participant expresses themselves – the words they use.” (Matthews – Ross 2010: 222.) Bourdieu also supports the use of interviews: “narratives about the most “personal” difficulties, the apparently most strictly subjective tensions and contradictions, frequently articulate the deepest structures of the social world and their contradictions” (Bourdieu 1999: 511.)

The first part of the interview was the Biographical Narrative Interpretive Method (Rosenthal 2003, Wengraf 2006, Burke 2014) when we asked the interviewees to tell their life stories. The second part of the interview was a semi-structured interview (Schmidt 2004) when we asked the interviewees about those questions in the interview guide (see Appendix 7.2.) that were not covered during the narrative part. Furthermore, during the second part of the interview, the interviewer had the opportunity to ask questions about clarifying and detailing what was said in the narrative. This method enabled us to take the advantage of Biographical Narrative Interpretive Method while at the same time covering all the topics which are relevant to our research.

Costa et al. (2019) argue that tracing individuals’ subjective trajectories – for example by using biographical interviews – is an appropriate research technique to ‘capture’ habitus. The biographical interview allows us to study individuals’ capability to ‘play the game’. The longitudinal aspect of this method enables the researcher to look for repetition of attitudes and practices, that is, empirically capture habitus as Bourdieu (1987) recommended it. It also
provides the opportunity to compare different phases of the interviewees’ life histories. Mallman (2018: 28.) also agrees that life history and narrative methods “…allow at least a partial understanding of the operation of habitus, in people’s life outcomes, in their attitudes, values, and opinions, their possessions and daily practices, and in the narratives, they construct in the research moment.’

The interviews of the first research were conducted by Durst Judit, Fejős Anna and me. In this project, I conducted 29 interviewees. The interviews of the second research were conducted by our OTKA research team of 14 members (5 men and 9 women), whose ages ranged from 25 to 52. Four of the team members are Roma. The diversity of the interviewers contributed to the avoidance of one-way bias when collecting the interview data. In this project, 24 interviewees were conducted by me.

The duration of the interviews was between one and a half and two and a half hours. We described the topic and aim of the research and all other important information about the research (e.g. voluntary participation, anonymity) before the interviews. Throughout the dissertation, we use pseudonyms for our interviewees, and settlements are also referred to with fantasy names. In addition, we use broad categories to describe the major jobs, and workplaces of our interviewees in order to protect their anonymity.

The interview consisted of two parts: the first part was the narrative bit, while the second part was a semi-structured interview. The latter section covered the following main topics: family background, educational attainment, career path, intimate relationships and children, family relationships and friends, self-characterisation (identity), satisfaction, and success (see the interview guide in Appendix 7.2.). The first version of the interview guide was made by me, then the team discussed it and I modified it again, we conducted a few trial interviews and then I made the final version of the guide.

The language of the interviews was Hungarian, and all interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed. In order to analyse the interview data we created a codebook (see Appendix 7.6.) by using a mixed method (deductive and inductive) category application. The codebook was developed based on our theoretical questions and interview guide and some additional categories were also created based on the empirical material of interviews. The codes are assigned to the appropriate text excerpts. The codebook provides explicit definitions for each category. (Mayring 2004) The first version of the codebook was created by me, then the OTKA
project team discussed it, after I modified it again, then we repeated this process. The next step was trial coding when each team member coded two interview transcripts, then there was another team meeting on the codebook, and finally, I modified it again. We used a hierarchical code structure: 26 supercodes (main category) that consist of code families (level two category) that consist of codes (level three category). For the purpose of this dissertation, I added some new codes to the codebook. In the following step all interviews were coded by using qualitative data analysis and research software, ATLAS.ti 8. The interview transcripts of subsample A were coded by the OTKA project team, the interview transcripts of subsample B were coded by me. The coded segments were mostly a few sentences or short paragraphs of the interview transcripts. The interviewees’ sociodemographic data was also uploaded to the software. This software made it possible toanalyse this large number of interviews and to compare the subgroups of our interviewees according to our codes.

As with the majority of studies, the design of the current study is subject to limitations. Firstly, the main limitation of this research comes from the fact that its findings cannot be generalised to a larger population. However, this method – unlike quantitative research - enables us to study the complexity of the experience on social mobility and to examine it in detail and in-depth. Secondly, narrative interviews can suffer from a posteriori biographical re-construction, that is, interviewees have a desire for the presentation of self (Costa et al. 2019). This issue is highly relevant for our research because we were looking for “first generation graduates” which sometimes involved to tell the life history mostly in terms of success. This does not apply to the majority of interviews, but such cases have occurred. In this respect, it is important that the interview had a second part when a semi-structured interview guide was used that included questions on the difficulties of mobility. Furthermore, all interviewees were asked to focus on the psychological costs of mobility. Thirdly, interviews do not offer a linear account of an individual’s life history but interviewees reconstitute their memories. (Costa et al. 2019). However, they are meaningful reconstructions of experiences at the moment of the interview (Mallman 2018). Fourthly, the study relies on narratives when examining habitus, that is, this method does not allow to directly observe the social practices and embodied aspects of habitus (unlike other techniques e.g. participant observation). These can only be reconstructed through the narratives. Fifthly, in the case of the research of hard-to-reach groups, there is a problem of non-response which affects the validity of the research. It has two types: (1) we can reach the interviewee, but the participation is denied, (2) we cannot reach an interviewee (Kristóf 2019). The former problem was very rare in the case of both research. To avoid these problems several networks and different channels were used to recruit participants.
Another important issue is related to the definition of the target group of the research. According to Majtényi and Majtényi (2016: 17) “…in any case when we attempt to answer the question of who may be a member of a given minority or ethnic group, the primary aspect and the starting point should be the individual’s free choice, or whether the individual ascribes him/herself as belonging to the minority or wishes to assimilate.” This research follows this line of thinking, and the Roma sample includes only interviewees who ascribed themselves as belonging to the Roma minority. That is, the sample does not include interviewees who wish to assimilate and do not ascribe themselves as Roma because according to the applied definition, they do not belong to the target group of this research.

4.4 Conceptualisation of habitus for the empirical research

Horvat (2003: 7.) claims that „because the notion of habitus encompasses the universe of experiences and background characteristics of particular individuals, it is potentially quite useful to investigations focused on race and class influences (…) An individual’s habitus is a means by which we can look at race and class simultaneously and explore how these constructs shape individual’s views of the possible for their plans and actions in the social world.”

Defining habitus for empirical research is a challenge, as Swartz argues “this very appealing conceptual versatility sometimes renders ambiguous just what the concept actually designates empirically” (Swartz 1997: 109). Habitus will be grappled in the interviews in three ways.

First, practices serve as evidence of the structure of habitus since habitus generates practices. Thus if we study practices then we can reveal the underlying structuring principles of habitus (Maton 2008). “However, empirically, one does not » see« a habitus, but rather the effects of a habitus in the practices and beliefs to which it gives rise.” (Maton 2008: 62.). That is, we can infer habitus based on practices.

Second, habitus can be defined as a ’sense of one’s (and others’) place and role’ in the world in one’s lived environment. (…) Habitus is an embodied, as well as cognitive, sense of place. (Hillier – Rooksby 2002: 21) It can be associated with making a social position ‘homey’, that is, with the acquisition and internalisation of a social position (Németh 2020). We may also include in this definition when one does not find his place or role in a given social context. Thus
habitus can be identified when it is reflected because the individual feels:

- like not ‘fitting’ to a new field (Nowicka 2015),
- like ‘fitting’ to a field (Nowicka 2015),
- like not ‘fitting’ to their old field anymore,
- like ‘fitting’ to his old and new field at the same time is problematic
- that his/her old and new field’s rules contradict each other or get in conflict with each other.

When an individual’s habitus is ‘well-formed’, adapted to the field, owns a ‘feel for the game’ in that field, his/her habitus is not reflexive and the person is like ‘a fish in water’ (Bourdieu, 1977). However, habitus becomes reflexive when someone enters a new field whose rules are unknown to him/her. Bourdieu writes about physical and social ‘clumsiness’ in a new social context, and that individuals need to learn to ‘fit in’ by inhabiting a consciousness of awkwardness. Therefore we can capture habitus when interviewees feel that they do not fit in or do not understand the ‘rules of the game’ or their practices seem anachronistic. We can also identify habitus when interviewees narrate situations in which they feel at ease, well-fitted, ‘normal’, and attuned to the field. (Nowicka 2015) Furthermore, habitus can be captured when interviewees speak about not fitting to their old field anymore because of adapting to their new field, when they feel that belonging to two contradictory fields at the same time leads to tensions and when they find that the two worlds collide with each other. These cases also lead to greater reflexivity.

Third, as it was demonstrated in Chapter 2.5.4, habitus concept can be extended with cognitive aspects (cares, concerns and commitments and conscious deliberations), that is, aspects of identity. Thus this study uses a habitus conceptualisation that includes references to the identity.
5. RESULTS

5.1 Habitus dislocation due to upward mobility

This chapter seeks to answer to my first research question: Under what conditions does the habitus of first in family graduates become destabilised as a result of upward mobility? According to the results, education-driven upward mobility is not necessarily associated with habitus dislocation (Friedman 2016, Christodoulou – Spyridakis 2016). The mutability of the habitus – the formation of habitus dislocation or habitus clivé – depends on certain characteristics of the mobility trajectory (Friedman 2016). By the characteristics of mobility trajectory, we refer to (1) the range of social mobility, (2) the direction and destination (measured by occupational class) of movement through social space, (3) the range of geographical mobility, (4) the person’s ethnicity/racialised minority group (see Friedman 2016), (5) the aspirations of their family of origin. (See Yosso 2005 on the role of aspirational capital of parents or background community in high educational achievement among People of Colour). The unique combination and the intersecting effect of these factors significantly influence the subjective experience of mobility, but of course, some individual factors (e.g. personality, contingency such as biographical events) are also decisive. Each factor has a different weight in each narrative. However, one needs to emphasise the role of (racialised) minority status: we found that the dislocation of habitus is a frequent experience among Roma interviewees. We speak about the Roma’s racialised minority status in Hungary (Kóczé 2020) in the same way that scholars speak about the discrimination of the diverse category of ‘People of Colour’ (Yosso 2005). That is, when people (of colour) face severe injustice in power relations, and also encounter prejudice and discrimination as a group for reasons of race alone.

27 This chapter is based on a study which will be published in the Sociological Review, and it is written by me and Judit Durst. Its title is: “Racialisation rules: The effect of educational upward mobility on habitus”.
28 This study regards the range of the mobility as long as the respondents’ parents had only completed primary school, at most. On the contrary, if any of the parents have a higher qualification beyond primary school then the mobility path is considered short-range.
29 We consider a mobility trajectory characterised as high speed when the upwardly mobile person has mobility with a linear, uninterrupted educational path, and it is low speed when there are interruptions in the educational path (e.g. the upwardly mobile person does not attend a university immediately after completing high school but skip a few years).
30 We consider a mobility trajectory geographically long-ranged if the upwardly mobile person spent her childhood in a rural settlement and attained a job and therefore began to live in a big city (typically in the capital, Budapest). On the other hand, we call a mobility path geographically short-ranged when there is small or no difference between the status of the settlement of origin and of the destination of the upwardly mobile individual.
The upward mobility experience caused serious emotional strain for some of the interviewees. They speak about this tension (that is, habitus clivé) in phrases such as: “schizophrenic life”, “living between two worlds”, “having two lives”, “not belonging to anywhere”. Conversely, other interviewee narratives, describe a more or less psychologically smooth journey. Some of the interviewees only experienced habitus clivé at a particular stage in their lives while others reported that it accompanied their whole career path. One of the interviewees, Levente (majority, 25, child protection specialist) described this tension as follows:

*The bad thing is that I am far away from the academic world (...), but I am already far away from my old friends and family as well, so I’m there in something, I cannot behave and talk like a proletarian (‘proli’), but I can’t find my place in the academic environment either.*’ (Levente, 25)

In the following section, the identified factors that influence the subjective experience of upward mobility will be discussed separately.

5.1. Racialized minority status

The results show that the majority interviewees’ educational mobility typically does not cause habitus dislocation. This is not in line with the results of some other studies (Friedman 2016, Naudet 2018), which found that long-range social mobility typically causes dislocation between habitus and field. One of the explanations of this discrepancy can be the fact that they only examined those who have working-class backgrounds and moved to the elite sector (by working in high prestigious jobs) while our sample is not restricted to the elites. Contrary to the majority respondents, almost all Roma interviewees, with a few exceptions, have experienced a misalignment between their habitus and their social context of origin or/and destination. It was found that belonging to a racialised minority group has a significant effect on the emotional/psychological price of mobility. Many of the Roma respondents experienced habitus clivé, that is, the feeling of being located somewhere in-between (*lebegés állapota*, in: Mendi, 1999; see Nyırő – Durst 2018). For example, István (43, Roma, communication expert), who has a long-range mobility trajectory, moved from a large town of a county to Budapest and works in the field of communication in the business sector, spoke about his isolation from both the ‘Gypsy and Hungarian world’:

‘… when I started university and moved to Budapest I thought that my problem of not belonging anywhere would go away. See, my childhood friends who were Roma dropped out of school when they were fourteen. As for me, I was still going to secondary school back then, carrying my drawings, schoolbag and all. For them I was not Gypsy enough anymore, so to speak. And
at school I was still not Hungarian enough. There they knew I was a Gypsy. I have always been proud of that, and it is one of the things that has been very important to me. However, it caused me a lot of suffering.” (István, 43)

Anna (38, Roma, equality expert), who has had a short-range mobility path both in an educational and geographical sense, also experienced the feeling of not belonging anywhere: “...if they went anti-Gypsy, I had to raise my voice. After the third Gypsy joke I usually told people to stop (...). That topic will come up at times, and then I've got to bring arguments for and against, and defend Roma people (...). At the same time we [college-educated Roma] stand out of the Roma crowd because we don't speak Romani, we don't even look like them – after all, we don't have such a bad life, we live well, we're educated... Therefore in both groups we're still very different from the rest. This makes matters a bit more complex I think.” (Anna, 38)

As stated above, our results show that minority status has a central importance in mobility experience (see Naudet 2018). Several upwardly mobile Roma interviewees feel or felt at some point in their path that they are not accepted or that they are even rejected by the majority society while at the same time they are detached from their community of origin. This is because (racialised) minority middle-class (college graduated) people have a distinctive problem (Neckermann et al. 1999). On the one hand, the frequent experience of discrimination and stigmatisation prevents many of them from feeling that they fit into their new world. Apart from a few exceptions, all Roma interviewees reported painful experiences of prejudice and discrimination. During their mobility trajectory they often encountered the situation of ‘being the only Roma’ in their schools or at their workplace which can be emotionally difficult. The exposure to prejudice and discrimination prevents interviewees from being able or willing to adapt to the new social milieu and contribute to their feeling of being located somewhere in-between. As they explain:

“It is always weird when I get into a non-Gypsy community where I am the only Gypsy, and sometimes I get into communities where there are only Gypsies. Of course, I feel better in a community where there are only Gypsies, but you have to learn and get used to the situation where you are seen a bit like a stranger, an odd one out (‘csodabogár’) by non-Gypsies, or you are treated like a mannequin in a shop window.” (Elizabet, 32)

“I was very humiliated, it was partly due to being a young intern, but I started to realise after one and a half years that unfortunately it is not just about that. It was also about my origin. The Gypsies were exterminated in front of me, they were desecrated. And really, other students could do everything, and I could not do anything (...) and it hurt a lot and I was accused of stealing and being expelled from the locker room. (...) even the cleaning lady humiliated me.
Ágnes, 30

On the other hand, the question of loyalty to the group of origin is more complicated for Roma interviewees than for the majority respondents, because it arises in the intersection of class and race/ethnicity while for the majority this question is formulated only in terms of class. Upwardly mobile majority respondents leave their class while mobile Roma interviewees leave to a certain extent their class and have to deal with the challenge of identity and belonging to their race/ethnicity.

Many respondents feel that following their upward mobility, the Roma community in a broader or narrower sense or their family of origin challenges their identity as Roma, while others question their belonging to the ‘Roma community’. That is, several interviewees reported that their loyalty was questioned by others (or by themselves). Our respondents reflexively highlight that their behaviour, appearance, value system, speech or lifestyle distanced them from those of their family or background community during their mobility path which can be a source of pain or conflict because it raises the issue of loyalty. The Roma interviewees mentioned the painful moments when their Roma acquaintances and/or family members told them they are no longer Roma, that they have ‘become a Hungarian’ (elmagyarosodott) (Nyírő – Durst 2018) because of their changed way of speaking, dress style, worldview or value system, that is, because of their habitus (partially) adapted to their new world. Katalin (36), for example, explains the feeling of unease and exclusion:

“\textit{My family was happy when I got into college. Even my brothers told me what an achievement it was. But for that same reason they also excluded me somehow because they thought I had become an educated Hungarian gadje. And this is still the situation today.}” (Katalin, 36)

This divergence from the family, that is the adaptation to the destination group, often leads to internal self-doubt or conflict with the family or community of origin. This conflict is especially aggravated for Roma women, many of whom have to negotiate the traditionally expected gender roles with their community of origin (Pantea 2015). This double or multiplied burden (Kóczé 2011) of being a Roma woman sharply illustrates the intersectional effect of race and gender on the price of upward mobility. As they explain that their life path is divergent from that of their friends or relatives:

“\textit{They [the family] asked me why I am not married yet, when will they have grandchild, they told me you should rather get married than have children. And you know, [at that stage of my life], it was not in my mind to get married and have children. There were many such conflicts.}”

\footnote{This study uses the expression ‘Roma community’ because the interviewees also use this term. It sometimes refers to their narrower community of origin while others use it as a generic term.}
“...on my way, as I proceeded, I went home several times and saw my friend who already has three kids, I saw them playing and I was thinking, oh my God, I am here at the age of thirty, I really do not have a chance to have a child yet, I am always looking for someone who would be good to raise a child with, who would be realistic. And she is much happier than I am, it is true that they are very poor, but she is much happier.” (Réka, 37)

“During college, the process of distancing from my family already started. (...) It is already another way of being for you that you continue to study. For example, my cousin, the same age as me, has already earned a lot, and this causes a distancing. That is, you are distanced from your family. You have not gotten anywhere in your life yet.” (Valéria, 30)

It is important to note that most of the respondents reported that they have a strong Roma identity and they are proud to be Roma and they feel solidarity towards Roma people. However, at the same time, several interviewees recounted their pain that they do not feel accepted by the ‘Roma community’ in a narrower or broader sense.

The central importance of the issue of loyalty is shown by the fact that many interviewees reported a sense of responsibility towards the ‘Roma community’ (Kóczé 2010, Durst et al. 2016, Nyíró – Durst 2018). Unlike their white majority counterparts, who are taught to think of themselves as individuals, Roma interviewees often see themselves as part of a racially socialised group (see also DiAngelo 2015 for white Americans), To offer some of the several examples, let us present Elizabet’s (32) thoughts:

“Now I know it for sure that my responsibility is way bigger than the one I would have if I wasn’t Roma. As a Roma woman, no matter if I serve the Roma or the non-Roma community, I always have to stand up for the people. Because, even if I don’t want it, I am considered a Roma woman and a Roma expert... a great burden on the shoulder”. (Elizabet, 32)

However, as the quote above shows this responsibility is important but at the same time it is a burden as well. Several interviewees feel that this responsibility and solidarity is indirectly expected from them by the Roma intellectuals and by the pro-Roma support programmes (Nyíró – Durst 2018, Boros et al. 2021, this volume). Therefore, those, who do not want to live up to this expectation, and chose a general (not racially directed) career path, struggle with a feeling of divided loyalty. While those, who have a racially directed career work in positions that are emotionally difficult and therefore requires great individual effort and which are vulnerable and offer lower wages and opportunities (Nyíró – Durst 2018).

In sum, Roma interviewees much more often experienced habitus clivé than the majority respondents. The process of acculturation is more difficult and complicated for upwardly
mobile Roma because of prejudice and discrimination against Roma. In other words, the interaction and connection with the new environment are more problematic for Roma people because of their stigmatised situation. The issue of loyalty is also a more complex question for Roma interviewees because it appears in the intersection of class and race/ethnicity as well while for the upwardly mobile majority interviewees whose identity is a non-racialised identity, this question emerges only in terms of class. That is, our results also highlight that there is a difficult intersection between class mobility and changing ethno-racial identity (see Friedman 2016). The acculturation to the new group in a prejudiced and discriminatory environment and remaining loyal to the group of origin at the same time creates a particular and complex tension for upwardly mobile Roma.

5.2. The range of social mobility
The range of mobility also influences the subjective experience of mobility (Friedman 2016). This research defined the range of mobility in terms of the educational attainment of the interviewee compared to that of their parents’: if the parents have completed at most primary school then the interviewee regarded as long-range social mobile, if the parents have a higher education than primary school then the interviewee is regarded as short-range upwardly mobile. Those interviewees who underwent long-range social mobility are more likely to experience habitus dislocation or habitus clivé compared to those who realised short-range movement.

5.3. The range of geographical mobility
We found that mobility in a geographical sense also affects the individuals’ experience of social mobility. Those who lived in the same settlement since birth or moved back to where they lived as children are less likely to experience dislocation while those who undergo long-range mobility in a geographical sense (those who move from villages to Budapest or from Hungary to abroad) are more likely to feel it.

5.4. Aspirational capital of the family of origin
Those interviewees whose family of origin was ambitious, that is, they had mobility aspirations or had a positive attitude towards mobility and saw education as the most important vehicle for it, usually had fewer conflicts with their family, which makes their mobility trajectory emotionally smoother. Many interviewees reported that their parents (or one of them) wanted to study further, but they had no opportunity, so they fulfil their parents’ unfulfilled dreams. The upward mobility of our interviewees is often the result of a multigenerational family
project. That is, we found that aspirational capital: the parent’s dreams, hopes and high aspirations for their children’s future in the case of difficult circumstances is a resource (Yosso 2005) which in most cases promotes a smooth upward mobility trajectory.

5.5. Speed of mobility

We also found that those whose mobility trajectory is slow and gradual are less likely to experience habitus dislocation even if they travelled through long social distances (see Friedman 2016). As one of our study participants who came from a very poor family from a small village, yet made it to the top of the capital’s film industry, put it, he “didn’t have to fear of tripping over (megbotlok) as I didn’t have to jump high stairs. I was lucky, by coincidence, to get to a top urban primary school from my village school at Year 3, and since then my rising as someone who is talented at writing, was steady and gradual” (Béla, 43, majority, screenwriter).

Those interviewees, who progressed in small steps and in a gradual manner in their educational or professional careers, typically did not experience misalignment between their habitus and their new social context. For example, such a small step as getting a high school diploma from a secondary vocational school (szakközépiskola) or in an evening school, followed by getting a university or a college degree in a distant learning programme correspondence courses. On the contrary, sudden and large steps are more likely to cause a hysteresis effect between habitus and field such as attending an elite grammar school or a highly prestigious major course at a top university. In some cases our interviewees consciously slowed down the speed of their upward mobility in order to gain time to adapt to the new social milieu (see Bereményi – Durst 2021, this volume).

The results show that the practice of past mobility or immobility of the family of origin also influences whether the upwardly mobile person experiences habitus dislocation or not. It is easier to negotiate multiple identities for those whose families of origin have also achieved some level of social ascension. In these cases, the interviewee’s mobility trajectory is the continuation of the family’s upward mobility path. That is, the speed of mobility is important in an intergenerational sense as well. For example, several interviewees mentioned that their family was the first in their community who moved out from the Gypsy settlement (‘cigánytelep’) to the village, which was a huge step of the family’s mobility trajectory. Others reported that their parents or grandparents were the first in the village who possessed a high school diploma.

5.6 Destination and attained occupational groups of mobility
Finally, we found that moving toward the quadrant of social space and groups of occupations dominated and operated by (white middle-class) cultural capital, is more likely to cause habitus dislocation or habitus clivé than moving toward the economically dominant quadrant of the social space (see Friedman 2016). Those who arrive at occupations where dominant white middle-class cultural capital is required to get on, and who did not acquire the symbolic mastery of it (Friedman – Laurison 2019) in their family of origin or through primary socialisation, are more likely to experience a mismatch between their habitus and attained field. Echoing the work of scholars analysing personal experiences of upward social mobility (Lawler 1999, Skeggs 1997, Friedman 2016), many of our interviewees coming from (formally) low-educated families, reflected on the emotional distress they felt by their deficit of this dominant cultural capital (such as language style, taste, etiquette on formal work events, and dressing code). Their embodied experiences of these subtle cultural distinctions among social classes (Bourdieu 1984) contributed to their feeling of insecurity, not fitting in, and to hitting barriers to get on and succeed in their profession.

In sum, habituses travelling long distances socially and geographically at a fast speed, moving towards the quadrant of the social space dominated and operated by white middle-class cultural capital, and originating from Roma families with low levels of aspirational capital are more likely to experience habitus dislocation or habitus clivé.

5.7. The intersecting effect of individual factors and the minority, majority mobility trajectories

According to the results, the unique combination and intersecting effect of the six factors presented above greatly influence the subjective experience of mobility. In the following section, we present four cases to demonstrate that it is not the individual factors themselves, but a particular set of factors and the intersecting new position their combination creates, is what is decisive in terms of our respondents’ mobility experience. We introduce two common or typical cases: a narrative of a ‘minority mobility trajectory’ (Durst – Bereményi 2021) of a Roma interviewee who experienced habitus clivé and a narrative of a ‘majority mobility trajectory’ of a non-Roma majority respondent whose mobility trajectory was without psychological costs. We also explore two rare or atypical cases: a story of a Roma participant of our research project who had a smooth mobility path; and a discourse of a majority respondent who described a painful ‘emotional price’. As mentioned earlier, among the six identified factors or conditions, the most important one is the person’s belonging to the majority society or to a racialised minority group, however other factors may override this as we will see from the two rare or
atypical examples.

To offer one out of several cases for a ‘majority mobility trajectory’ without habitus dislocation, let us discuss Êva’s mobility path. Êva (56, majority, nurse) comes from a very small village, her parents did not complete elementary school and were agricultural workers in a cooperative farm (termelőszövetkezet). During the summer school holidays Êva had to work in the cooperative. Her father did not want her to go to a secondary school. Instead, he preferred her getting a job because the family needed financial support but finally he allowed her to continue studying. After graduating from high school, she worked in a hospital for a few years and then enrolled in nursing training at a university. Now she is a senior nurse in a hospital in Budapest and performs a great variety of professional activities (e.g. book publishing, charitable foundation management), so she feels quite successful and honoured. Despite travelling a long distance both geographically and socially at high speed, Êva as many majority respondents, did not report ‘moments of hysteresis’ but her trajectory was psychologically smooth according to her narrative. We argue that it is partly because she chose an occupation in the quadrant of social space which is not dominated and operated by the middle-class cultural capital. As a nurse, she does not suffer from the lack of the dominant white middle-class cultural capital of her family of origin.

To provide one of the many cases where a Roma interviewees’ upward mobility trajectory is psychologically and emotionally painful, let us introduce Bettina’s (43) narrative. She grew up in a Gypsy settlement in a small village, her parents did not complete primary school. Her family was not ambitious, but she had an inner drive to read and study since her childhood. She attended an elite high school in her local area which she did not like because she could not fit in. She recalls the unease in this environment; that she did not want to invite her parents to the leavers’ ball because of their low education and their visible minority status. Her upward mobility trajectory was gradual: after completing high school she did not start university immediately, but she began to work as an unqualified teacher (‘képesítés nélküli tanár’) in Budapest. After a few years of working, she applied to a university to study teacher training and later she also completed two other majors. She used to work for several pro-Roma NGOs. She is currently working on her PhD and a researcher in a white-dominated academic institute. During her upward mobility trajectory, she felt that she distanced herself from her family. According to her narrative, the question of her belonging was a central problem of her life for a long time. She reported that she is still struggling with an inferiority complex, and she is insecure in herself. In sum, coming from a Roma family with low aspirational capital, travelling a long-range mobility path socially and geographically and moving to the culturally dominant
quadrant of the social space have all contributed to Bettina’s experience of habitus dislocation. After these two common, typical cases, let us turn to the rare, atypical mobility trajectories. As mentioned earlier, most of our majority interviewees did not experience a mismatch between their habitus and social world. However, a few of our majority respondents described their upward mobility path as emotionally and psychologically difficult. For example, let us introduce Klára’s (45) case. She was born in a small village. None of her parents completed primary school, her father worked as a driver, her mother was a hard-working seamstress. She performed well at the local primary school, therefore she moved to a bigger city to study at a good quality high school. She was admitted to a university in that city to study economics right after high school, and then she continued to study in a doctoral programme. During the years of the PhD program, her first two children were born, so she had to interrupt her studies. Klára became a university lecturer after completing her PhD, but she did not feel at home in the academic world. She suffered from impostor syndrome as she was unable to believe that she is ‘good enough’ to work there:

“I was scared of them [our colleagues]. Yeah. Then it came to me again that I'd always been scared of not being good enough, not being able to behave and react well, that my skills are not adequate, that I'm not prepared, not working hard enough, so I've always been scared and lived in constant stress, I've never been self-confident and I've never felt safe (...) Take etiquette for instance, at parties I've never really grasped who should introduce whom, what's the protocol for shaking hands, and I've never known where to stand and what to do, not even how to dress up. I read a book on such customs once, but it was a waste of time - I couldn't remember anything, I felt I wouldn't be able to use it in a real-life social situation anyway.” (Klára, 45)

In her case ‘the emotional imprint of this dislocation was felt through (...) an internal self-doubt’ (Friedman 2016: 140.):

“... I constantly had an inferiority feeling, oh, oh, do not turn out, others do not notice that I do not belong here, I am not good enough. (...) One of the reasons, for example, was English, that I am not good enough, I am definitely not good enough in English, but not necessarily in other things either, I cannot reach this level anymore, somehow I went too far, it did not work for me anymore, the university degree was okay, but it [teaching at a university] was a too large step for me.” (Klára, 45)

Finally, she quit her job and has been at home with her children for years now. When she was asked about why she applied for the interview, she said that she was interested in the reasons for her giving up her academic career and believed that she climbed too high on the social ladder and she felt as a ‘fish out of water’, so she had to leave her job in order to decrease the
effects of the hysteresis. (see Friedman 2016, Mallman 2018, Bereményi – Durst 2021, this volume):

“…I've been thinking about the reasons why I quit my job - it's unusual, and my mind keeps reeling on the causes of why that happened, and one of them was that it felt really hard to live with it, that is, taking such a giant step, that it eventually brought me to a halt. (...) I didn't feel comfortable working as an assistant professor, I didn't feel at home any more, I felt I didn't belong there, and I was no longer certain about doing my stuff right, and in general I started doubting that my knowledge was adequate (...) I don't remember having any such problems as a university student, I didn't have any doubts about belonging, taking steps, or knowing what I knew. Back then it wasn't an issue” (Klára, 45)

When she was asked to briefly describe herself, she said:

“The main problem in my present situation is that I can't find my place in society – in my family, I can, yes, I'm a mother, I'm a wife, but in society, I can't” (Klára, 45)

That is, the effects of hysteresis still influence her life even years after quitting her career.

In sum, most of our majority interviewees had a smooth mobility path but a few of them experienced habitus clivé. In Klára’s case the unique combination and intersecting effect of the examined factors contributed to her painful mobility experience: she travelled through a long-range mobility path at a fast speed, described her family as not really aspiring and supportive, and as one lacking the type of middle-class cultural capital that was needed in her attained class to get on. The lack of this middle-class cultural capital brought from home together with her fast and long-range social ascension and her travelling to that part of the social space (academic sphere) where cultural capital is the dominant resource to succeed resulted in her difficulties.

To introduce one of the few, atypical examples for the mobility trajectory of a Roma respondent without habitus dislocation, let us discuss Róbert’s (43) case. His mother was a factory worker, his father was a brigade leader in the construction industry, later he became an entrepreneur. The whole family worked in the second economy in order to generate extra income. He was born in the Gypsy settlement of a small village and went to the local primary school there, and then he attended a high school in a nearby town. Immediately after graduation, he was admitted to a university in Budapest where he studied to be an engineer.

Róbert offers a narrative about hard-working and very ambitious parents and grandparents who managed to move out from a Gypsy settlement to the village and to provide financial security

---

32 István Gábor defined the second economy “as the group of economic activities and transactions which take place outside of the socialist sector” (Sik 1992: 155.).
for the family. He believes that his family made upward mobility possible for him in two senses: on the one hand, by creating the material conditions, on the other hand, by encouraging him to study. Furthermore, he describes that further education at university was his father’s unfulfilled wish.

As Róbert explains the great ascension on the social ladder was achieved by his parents and grandparents and not by him:

“Well, there I was, three years old, and people would ask me what I wanted to be, and I’d tell them I wanted to be an engineer (...) now a three-year-old doesn’t have any clear-cut ideas of his own and usually echoes what he’s told or programmed to. My parents programmed me to want to become an engineer, practically that’s how I grew up. And it tells a lot about what a leap I took, and how much my parents helped me. All I reached is down to my parents, and my parents’ parents. I come from a family, I come from an environment where the importance of education was understood early (...) I only had to study, that’s all. I didn’t take such big steps. It was my parents, they took giant steps, coming from great poverty, and my mother’s parents and my father's parents managed to create a decent existence, they rose from that deep poverty. My father could build on those foundations, he had a jumping board. And then, me, I could grow up like an average gadjo [non-Gypsy] kid, I had my own room, I had food, I had everything, see? (Róbert, 43)

He describes that his progress was due to his family’s attitude towards studying:

“...I started out from a home where I was given the opportunity to study, that’s what I got from my parents, even from my illiterate grandmother, and they gave it to me exactly because they saw the disadvantages of having no education. They knew I had to study” (Róbert, 43)

Róbert reported that he did not have any problems with living in two worlds:

“...Gypsies haven’t outcast me. Ever. No matter what, high school or university, whenever I was home in Maros I went down to the disco with my Gypsy relatives and friends all the same and met chicks. We sat in a run-down Trabant, and when it broke down a Hungarian kid pushed the car, see? (...) I was on very, very good terms with the Hungarian kids in Maros, too, and they looked up to me. I was kind of like a role model even to gadjo kids. So I've never had this issue, like, that I had to choose between two worlds. Never. Not for a second. At secondary school I made a lot of friends, but I also kept my Gypsy and Hungarian childhood friends.” (Róbert, 43)

Despite travelling a long distance educationally and geographically at a fast pace, Róbert’s mobility trajectory is the continuation of his family’s progress. We could say that his mobility trajectory is part of a multi-generational family upward mobility project and that his career track
meets with his family’s expectations and aspirations which may have contributed to his emotionally smooth path. In sum, Róbert’s case is rare since most of our Roma respondents reported that they experienced (at least in a short period of their life) a mismatch between their habitus and social world, but he described he never experienced habitus dislocation in his life. As he highlights this was due to the fact that his grandparents and parents climbed high on the social ladder and he only had to take a small step further. That is, Róbert describes that his mostly smooth upward mobility process is due to an intergenerational aspiration capital in his family: to his grandparents’ and parents’ efforts and aspirations to ascend from poverty.

Furthermore, as an engineer he did not have to struggle with the lack of middle-class cultural capital because it is not the dominant resource needed to succeed in that sphere.

This study demonstrated that upward mobility does not necessarily lead to habitus dislocation. Instead, certain characteristics of the mobility trajectory make the emergence of habitus clivé more likely.

The subjective experience of education-driven social ascension is influenced by the upwardly mobile individual’s range of social mobility, the speed, the destination of mobility and the direction of movement through social space, and also, by one’s ethno-racial belonging, the range of geographical mobility, and the aspirational capital of one’s family of origin. The combination and the intersectional effect of these factors are decisive on the personal experience of mobility, and some individual factors (e.g. personality, contingency such as biographical events) also play an important role.

One of the main findings is that those interviewees who belong to the Roma minority are more likely to experience habitus clivé than the majority participants of the study. That is, belonging to a racialised, stigmatised and discriminated minority group has a significant influence on the subjective experience of upward mobility. This is because both the issue of loyalty and acculturation is more complicated in their case compared to the majority respondents. The acculturation to the new group is more difficult and complicated for upwardly mobile Roma because of prejudice and discrimination against Roma. The question of loyalty is also a more complex question for Roma respondents because it appears in the intersection of class and race/ethnicity as well while for the majority interviewees this issue emerges only in terms of class. Many Roma interviewees reported that their Roma identity was challenged by others (or by themselves) after their upward mobility. Furthermore, several Roma respondents described their feeling of responsibility towards their community which was a psychological burden as well. That is, the acculturation to the new group in a hostile (prejudiced and discriminatory) environment and remaining loyal to the group of origin at the same time result a specific and
highly complex tension in the narratives of upwardly mobile Roma. However, as it was demonstrated, other factors may override the effect of belonging to the majority society or to the Roma minority. That is, there are some Roma respondents who had a psychologically and emotionally smooth mobility trajectory and a few majority interviewees who, on the contrary, experienced habitus dislocation. For example, we presented the case of Róbert, who is Roma, however his mobility trajectory was smooth because his path was not a deviation from his family’s journey and in his field of work (engineer) the lack of middle-class cultural capital was not a problem, and it did not hinder his adaptation to his new social milieu. Although Bourdieu highlights that habitus may change, he acknowledges that these cases are rare and temporary. Our results also suggest that habitus may be subject to change (see e.g. Waterson 2005, Friedman 2005) when someone enters a new social context, in our case when upward mobility is achieved. The psychological price of social mobility, especially among racialised minority people reflect, however, that even when primary habitus changes, the inequality of starting positions cannot be eliminated by upward mobility through education. This research shed light on the fact that the social inequalities of the starting positions should be decreased in order to diminish the emotional cost of mobility (Dés 2021).

5.2 Negotiating two worlds

This chapter presents the ways in which the Roma interviewees negotiated their two worlds. It focuses on the narratives of Roma respondents because the study of those interviews enables to examine the intersecting effects of class and race/ethnicity in forming individuals’ movement across the social space. Furthermore, the analysis of those narratives makes it possible to formulate important suggestions for the modification and expansion of the Bourdieusian habitus concept to the case of racialised minorities.

This chapter reveals how our Roma interviews were able to negotiate their group of origin and attained group, how they were able to dissolve the tension between the two worlds. This tension has two aspects, a ‘sociological’ and a ‘moral’. The sociological aspect refers to the fact that upwardly mobile individuals’ past and present is not a continuum, but there is a difference, even a contradiction, between the two worlds because of the double socialisation. As a result upwardly mobile individuals oscillate between the two reference groups which is a source of
tension. The moral aspect of the tension is the dilemma between maintaining the links with the community of origin and being in solidarity with them or identifying with the standards and values of the new group. (Naudet 2018) According to Naudet (2018), it is necessary to develop a coherent self-narrative to resolve these tensions that manages to make sense of the upward mobility trajectory. In other words, one is able to justify his/her social position by developing a narrative that eliminates these contradictions.

In the narratives of our interviewees negotiating the two worlds means negotiating the Roma and majority (non-Roma) world. Their reference to their background of origin is usually not formulated in terms of class, but in terms of race. However, it complicates the picture that Roma in Hungary is “…a group defined by racial criteria, but mainly by class criteria” (Naudet 2018: 188.) Similar to our results, Naudet (2018) found that African American upwardly mobile interviewees prefer the racial referent to define their background of origin, while his majority American interviewees refer to their working-class family when they talk about their background of origin. As one of our interviewees, Géza (34, police man) told that being a Roma means to him not to forget about his roots:

“Q: What does your Roma origin mean to you, and do you think it changed over the years?
R: It always reminds me not to forget where I came from, so whatever I reach in life I'll always have that background.” (Géza, 34)

The reference of our interviewees to their destination group is also defined in terms of race when they speak about the ‘majority society’, the ‘non-Roma people’ or the ‘Hungarians’, however, it also interacts with the class criteria. The dilemma on belonging in the narratives means the choice between the Roma world and the non-Roma world:

„Yeah, well, school. Wasn't bad, that, at primary school, I already felt I didn't belong to the majority, but I never really dared to embrace it. No way, I was the same... I felt I wasn't really a Gypsy, but I was just like the others around.” (Csaba, 27)

“...I have my Gypsy family at home where I belong. I leave it behind every day and return to it at weekends. (...) But there's no one there, that is, no Gypsies that I used to go to secondary school with. At school they didn't know what environment I came from. Well then, do I belong here? Yes, I do. But there, I don't belong there, not just yet.” (Lili, 39)

In sum, in the narratives, the contradiction between the two worlds primarily means the opposition between the Roma and the majority world, and class change associated with upward
mobility is less pronounced. However, the latter one also appears because Roma origin does not only mean an ethnic category but also includes that they are from a disadvantaged, poor community.

I applied the typology of habitus interruptions of Abrahams and Ingram (2016) (see Chapter 2.5.3.) to analyse the ways in which the interviewees negotiated their two worlds. Abandoned habitus – when a person rejects their original field and renegotiates their habitus in response to the structuring forces of the new field (Abrahams and Ingram 2016) – is not so typical in our sample, however, some interviewees’ narrative can be included in this category. These interviewees ascribed themselves as Roma, but they describe their origin as “not very relevant in my life” or “I do not deal with it” or they feel that “I belong to the Hungarians”, “I belong to the majority society, or “I do not belong to the Gypsies”. That is, these interviewees reported that they primarily ‘fit in’ the majority society while they do not ‘fit in’ their old field. For instance, as Anna (38) put it: “I rather feel that I am Hungarian. I always feel among the Gypsies that they do not accept me. Or I can't classify myself there completely. So it's strange.”

Some of these respondents’ family has already achieved a degree of upward mobility and somewhat assimilated, and their child (our interviewee) just continued the family’s path. While other interviewees of this group have embarked on this path themselves. Both short-range and long-range mobility in an educational sense is typical in this group.

Re-confirmed habitus – when a person rejects their new field, does not internalise its structures, and renegotiates their habitus in response to the structuring forces of the old field (Abrahams – Ingram 2016) – applies to some interviewees, but it is not very common in the sample. These interviewees primarily ascribe themselves as Roma, however, most of them also mentioned that “I am Hungarian as well”. Their narratives usually describe that they did not find their ‘place’ in their new environment. Many of them did not leave their place of origin during their university years, while those who did leave moved back after graduating from university, and they have taken a job that is not highly prestigious (like a teacher or social worker). These interviewees tended to have a short-range mobility trajectory both in an educational and geographical sense.

Destabilised (divided) habitus – when a person tries to incorporate the structuring forces of both fields into their habitus but cannot successfully reconcile them; instead, they oscillate between two fields and internalise conflict and division (Abrahams – Ingram 2016) – was very common among the Roma respondents. These interviewees describe divided habitus as “I am located somewhere in-between”, “It is like living a schizophrenic life”, “I'm not Hungarian enough for Hungarians, I’m not Gypsy enough for Gypsies.”, ”I lived between the two worlds.”, "The Roma
were no longer accepted me, the non-Roma were not yet accepted me.". "The Gypsies think of me as I am a Gadjo, the Gadjos think of me as I am a Gypsy." That is, these interviewees reported that they felt in a period of their lives that they do not ‘fit in’ either their original or their new field. In our sample this habitus interruption type is usually not a constant situation, rather it is characteristic of a particular stage of their lives. Many interviewees’ narrative describes a life stage when their habitus was destabilised, but most of them mentioned that later they were able to reconcile their old and new field. Abrahams and Ingram (2016) emphasise that shifts between the different habitus interruption types are possible. A typical move in our sample is when the destabilised habitus becomes a reconciled habitus. However, there are a few interviewees who described that they live with a permanent habitus and field misfit. Destabilisation of habitus is greater in the case of long-range mobility path both in educational and geographical sense, and if the mobility trajectory is not gradually, but structured around a few sudden, great steps (e.g. attending a high prestige, elite secondary school or university).

Reconciled habitus is – when a person can successfully navigate both fields, and can accommodate both structures despite their opposition (Abrahams – Ingram 2016) – is a frequent type in our sample. These interviewees described that they ‘fit in’ both to their old and new fields. They usually have a strong and positive Roma identity and at the same time, they ascribe themselves as Hungarian as well. Their narratives demonstrate that they successfully navigate both in their old and new world, many of them play a ‘bridging role’ between the two worlds (see Durst – Bereményi 2021). Reconciling the two fields is easier in the case of short-range mobility path both in educational and geographical sense, and if the mobility path is slow and gradual.

Tóth (2004a) introduces the concept of discovered identity that refers to the case when minority identity is not dominant (or even neglected) in the lives of minorities, but, it is possible that in a later period of their life they discover their minority identity. This study does not deal with this possibility because these situations typically does not entail habitus interruption.

The rest of the study will focus on the narratives of those Roma interviewees, who have successfully reconciled their two worlds and ‘found their new place’, that is, who have a reconciled habitus. The dissertation focuses on the analysis of this habitus interruption type because the possibility of reconciled habitus has important consequences regarding the modification and extension of the habitus concept of Bourdieu. As it will be shown in the following chapters, those who have a reconciled habitus play an important role in society, because they create ‘bridges’ between their original and new social world. Furthermore, this is the most frequent habitus interruption type in the sample.
5.3 The process of reconciliation

This chapter seeks to answer to my second research question: How did Roma interviewees make sense of their upward mobility according to their narratives? In other words, how the two social contexts could be reconciled by those who successfully navigate in both worlds?

The chapter focuses on the narratives of those interviewees who were able to reconcile their two worlds, that is, who are able to navigate in both social contexts without fail (who has a reconciled habitus). The empirical base of the chapter is 48 interviews.

This chapter has four subchapters. Chapter 5.3.1. will highlight how the Roma respondents renegotiated and redefined their Roma identity that relates to the question of the second chapter (Chapter 5.3.2.) because I found that those interviewees are able to reconcile their two worlds who are able to develop a stable and positive Roma identity. That is, a stable and positive Roma identity is a prerequisite for someone to successfully navigate in both worlds. Chapter 5.3.2. reveals how the interviewees made sense of their mobility trajectory, how these interviewees were able to reconcile their primary and secondary habitus. Chapter 5.3.3. provides two case descriptions. Chapter 5.3.4. deals with the external factors that ‘directed’ the upwardly mobile Roma graduates to the field of “Roma issues”.

5.3.1 Reconstruction of the Roma identity

As I argued, it is necessary to extend the concept of habitus to include its cognitive aspects in order to make it useful for analysis. More specifically, my conceptualisation contains ethical dimensions of habitus, that is, aspects of identity such as personal and political commitments.

This chapter reveals how our interviewees renegotiated and recasted their Roma identity because of their upward mobility and how they were able to find a stable Roma identity which is associated with the reconciling of their group of origin and attained group. That is, I found that those interviewees who were not able to develop a stable Roma identity were not able to reconcile their primary and secondary habitus.

Many interviewees reported that either currently or at an earlier stage in their lives, they had an
identity conflict but they managed to reconstruct their Roma identity (see Feischmidth 2012, Durst – Bereményi 2021). The anti-Gypsyism of the majority society is a common experience of our interviewees who have much more contact with the majority society during their educational and professional career than their poorer counterparts that threatens their positive identity. Several interviewees reported the experience of internal tensions, an inferiority complex or even shame for being Roma, because of the everyday racism in Hungary. These difficulties directed many interviewees to redefine their identity in order to find a positive and stable Roma identity.

Several interviewees reported painful experiences of prejudice, stereotypes and discrimination that were directed against them or the Roma people in general. Obviously, these cases pose a threat to the positive value of their Roma minority identity. For instance, Szulamit (28) works in health care and often encountered prejudice from her colleagues that threatened her Roma identity:

„...I work in healthcare, (...) where you can see pretty much everything, (...), so the police bring them in, yes, mostly the Roma. Many times they're perfectly normal for that matter, not all of them are drunk or aggressive as people would generally think. Of course, there are others, smashing in windows, and the like. The doctors are generally Hungarian, like many nurses, they're surely not Roma, and they don't know that I'm one of them, or whatever, they simply don't care. And my heart aches when I hear that some Roma so-and-so raised hell and was brought in. (...) Obviously, there are both warm and cold feelings, but, I mean, I feel a bit discontent with what I reached. That I happen to be Roma just makes it worse. (...) What I find is that many don't know that, or maybe they do, I've really no idea.” (Szulamit, 28)

Several interviewees reported that their environment does not believe that they are Roma even when they said they are of Roma origin that is also a manifestation of prejudice:

„...at my new school I started telling everyone that I was of Roma origin, I thought it was part of me, so I told them, and (...) the reaction was, no, you can't be Roma, they don't behave like you. So they didn't want to acknowledge my origins, because they've never met anyone like me, they had a different general image that clashed with the image I displayed to them. I was regarded as an exception, some even supposed that I was a foreigner rather than Roma. That I

33 Of course, there are some interviewees who reported that she/he did not have to renegotiate their identity during their mobility trajectory.
assume is also strong discrimination, rejecting to acknowledge that there might be anyone of Roma origin around them, no matter how high up, who's just as normal as they are.” (Sarolta, 34)

Another interviewee, Tamás (39, child protection specialist) also described that he felt ashamed because of his Roma origin during his college years as a soldier:

“R: (...) I went to military college, where they absolutely hated the Roma... just imagine, we had military practice, going from point A to point B, and crossing towns was forbidden, we were only allowed to take dirt paths (...) and there were those Roma settlements. And then they'd all go like “just look at them Gypsies there, let's get there and kill them” Like, always.
Q: And what did you do then?
Q: And wasn't it a bad feeling?
R: Sure it was.
Q: That you wouldn't stand up for them?
R: No, not that. But the shame. I felt ashamed (...) because of my origin.” (Tamás, 39)

Several interviewees spoke about internal tensions related to their Roma origin: many of them had an inferiority complex, some of them struggled to accept their Roma origin or did not want to identify with the image they had of Roma people, while others were clearly ashamed of their Roma origin.

Many of our respondents reported that they suffered from an inferiority complex because of their Roma origin and/or poor family background at some point in their lives (or even now). Erna (36, primary school teacher) illustrates this well in describing what it meant to be Roma to her as a child (but she is proud of her origin as an adult):

„What does being Roma mean to me? Hm... Well, as a child, when I saw the world differently from how I see it today, I always felt inferior. (...) I heard bad things about Roma people. That we were raised in a different way didn't matter, I still heard people bash the Roma. Yes, they were bashed, and yes, as a result I developed this feeling of inferiority. (...) But now, honestly, the fact that I'm Roma makes me proud, because what I reached as a Roma makes me think, well, I don't even know how I did it and if I'd be able to do it once again.” (Erna, 36)

As mentioned earlier, the interviewees’ families of origin are heterogeneous in terms of their aspirational capital. There are families who are rich in aspirational capital, some of the parents (even the grandparents) were already on a mobility path, and among them there are families
who followed an assimilation strategy. These families often did not emphasise (or even hide) that the family was of Roma origin and this made our interviewees’ identity formation difficult. For instance, Csaba (27, primary school teacher) reported that he was ashamed of his Roma origin and felt that he belongs to the majority society:

“R: I felt it for a long time in my childhood that being a Gypsy was embarrassing.  
Q: Were there many Gypsy people in Almás?  
R: Yes, yes. There were many Gypsy people but we didn’t live in their neighbourhood, our house was opposite the kindergarten, a tip-top place, we lived in a beautiful three-storey family home. Our conditions were pretty normal (...) Later when I went to secondary school it wasn’t important to me, I felt to belong to the majority in the cultural life and all the haze in Rétvár.” (Csaba, 27)

Márton (40, historian) spoke about how his parents’ assimilation strategy negatively affected his identity:

“... my parents were assimilated people (...) my parents (...) said we would assimilate, but to a point that we didn't speak in Romani, not even at home (...) So they would follow the external patterns the “farmers” [parasztok, the majority society] followed. (...) But it does have a serious disadvantage, because of what you feel every day if you assimilate, and not only you but also your children, so you pass on some sort of strange identity disorder. You pass it on to your children. And it's a bloody dangerous thing, I think you do not need to display yourselves as a big Gypsy to be able to function normally in your community. (...) But I think it’s important to bear in mind where you started from, and where you came from. Then you will know which way you should be going” (Márton, 40)

Several interviewees’ narrative describes that they felt ashamed of their Roma origin or/and poor family background at some point on their mobility journey. For example, Hedvig (35, kindergarten teacher) remembers that she was aloof and loner during her high school years because she was ashamed to live in poverty:

„I am all that reserved and reluctant of a person to start with, and to make matters worse I’m also Roma. (...) I didn’t like, how to say, larger companies, because I could never open my mouth, I could not join in conversations, and now that I think back it must have been because I didn’t have a topic to share – the raw materials, so to speak, that I brought from home were not meant for sharing, I always thought they were shameful (...) I really didn’t want to disclose anything, I didn’t want people to know that where I come from there was not even a bathroom.” (Hedvig, 25)
Some interviewees – mostly those who came from an assimilated family – mentioned that they had to struggle with their own stereotypes of Roma:

„I didn't really have (...) any Gypsy friends. I wasn't brought up in a Roma settlement, I had some sense of superiority that I was better and I was different, and I was superior. I wasn’t raised in a Gypsy settlement, I didn't have lice... you know. Those negative stereotypes were there in me, myself a Gypsy, that's also what my mother taught me.” (Tünde, 53)

The words of Hanga (40, equity expert) express the feelings described in the narrative of many upwardly mobile Roma interviewees when she explains that being Roma means being able to dare to embrace Roma identity.

"Q: Who do you think is Roma?
R: Well, who dares to embrace it, is a Gypsy.
Q: What do you mean by embracing?
R: There are a lot of aspects of being Gypsy. There was a lot in the past as there will be in the future I think. (...) You have to show you’re a Gypsy when you’re in love with someone (...) because I knew immediately that he didn't believe I was a Gypsy. He was shocked. Desperate. Jesus. And I should make the effort to explain to him calmly, for better or worse. (...) You also need to dare to show your face, that is your true colours, at the doctor's, at scientific conferences, and at your workplace. You will need the courage it takes to take your child to the school you chose even if there aren’t other Gypsy kids. You need the nerve to embrace who you are, that you are Roma. If you hide it, you accept what others think of Gypsies, that your child should go to the school at Bodrogi street [a special school], then don a hi-vis vest and start sweeping [as a public worker]. ” (Hanga, 40)

Some of our interviewees reported that they developed a stable and positive Roma identity on their own. However, most of them revealed that an ethnic support group34 (e.g. Romaversitas, any of the Christian Roma Colleges for Advanced Studies) or an ethnic educational institution or training (e.g. Gandhi High School and College, Romology major) had an important role in this. To offer an example, Kristóf (26, PhD student) describes that he did not connect to his Roma origin, so, for instance, he did not know the Roma culture and did not have Roma friends. But during his high school years he started to feel that he need to find and develop his Roma identity in order to become successful:

„...whatever I did I could only achieve about seventy-five percent of my goals. Somehow I felt I was missing something to become entirely successful. I had a missing part of my ego, my

34 We call ethnic support groups those organisations which facilitate or support the upward mobility of Roma and other stigmatised minority groups (Nyirő – Durst 2018).
identity, that I'm Gypsy. After the first half of secondary school, I started to spend my evenings examining myself. I thought over the reasons why my life was the way it was. (...) I found it was because of the way of life I had (...) besides I was also a Gypsy. Which made me think, okay, I'm a Gypsy boy, but I don't know my own language, I don't know my own culture, music, I don't even know how to dance. I'm a Gypsy but it's as if I wasn't a Gypsy. But my skin is brown, so I found I'm a white Gypsy or something like that. And so I realised that those were serious issues and I had to do something to discover my own culture a little and actually make it my own. (...) And those intellectual activities [reading books on philosophy and religion] I pursued also reinforced my willingness (...) to find myself, because I felt that as long as I didn't know myself none of my actions would ever be perfectly successful. I simply needed to know who I was. I had to take step zero, the first thing you need to know is who takes the step. Knowing where you step is not as important as knowing who takes that step." (Kristóf, 26)

Another example is the narrative of Tünde (53, cultural manager), who did not have a Roma identity at first, which she missed while suffering from an inferiority complex. She was skeptical that she could be as good as the Gadjos and formulated the doubts of her own capabilities in the question: “Do I make the grade that the Gadjos do?” She describes that the path by which she found her Roma identity led through Christianity:

„At the end of the day, I think my Gypsy identity helped me. I identified as a Hungarian to start with, I spoke and thought in Hungarian. I was missing something to strengthen my Gypsy identity though, I think it started to develop when I went to evening secondary school. Or even earlier, when I studied the Bible, that helped me a lot to become someone, and not feel inferior anymore. Knowing that the most powerful being in the universe who is also its creator accepts me and loves me, and even sacrificed his son made me realise that I should not lift anyone above me, since we are all created of the same blood. That I live in not so favourable conditions is not my fault, it's because of history, human relations, global social issues and oppression. So what helped me the most with becoming human was studying the Bible. (...) It made me understand [the Bible], that I'm not inferior to anyone.” (Tünde, 53)

Many of our interviewees found support to develop a stable or proud Roma identity in an ethnic support group or in an ethnic educational institution or training. According to the narrative of these respondents, these organisations and institutions promoted the strengthening of their identity in several ways. Our interviewees reported that these places provided a community for them which was very important since many mentioned that they were lonely during their educational careers. For example, the painful experience of ’being the only Roma’ in the school,
class or 'coming from a poor family' appeared in many narratives. That is, the relationships in these ethnic organisations and institutions were precious because the interviewees could meet people whose life experiences are similar to theirs. Furthermore, several interviewees reported that getting acquainted with Roma culture and history was important for them and contributed to the strengthening of their identity. It is important to note that some of these programmes also include Roma identity strengthening as a declared goal. A few examples were offered when our interviewees spoke about the effects of these organisations and institutions on their identity development:

„It gave me a feeling that you were not alone, so whenever I look back on Romaversitas, the best thing was that I felt I could finally breathe, knowing I was not alone. That there’re people just like me. That was very, very liberating.” (Alma, 38)

„They strengthened me a great deal in identity matters. And that we could meet people, similar Gypsy people that were of similar age and of similar background. (...) Those were very important. They gave us a lot.” (Árpád, 38)

„Q: What did Romver [Romaversitas] tell you?
R: That I should not be ashamed because of my skin colour.” (Tamás, 39)

R: Yes, and I am only half Gypsy, I could tell people that I am not Gypsy at all, but I would rather say I am a Gypsy, and not identify as Hungarian, people are shocked when they hear it.
Q: So why do you think you identify as a Gypsy?
R: Because I went to Gandhi [a high school for the Roma minority in Hungary], it must be because of Gandhi, those six and a half years I spent there, certainly.” (Etelka, 32)

“Q: What did the college for advanced studies mean to you? (...) Did it provide you something extra, spiritually or cognitively?
R: Hm, hm, well actually, in spite of the fact that I could hardly deny that I am a Gypsy, it was not easy at all to talk about it. Even at university when people were discussing Gypsies I never said a word, although my origin is conspicuous enough. And [the college for advanced studies] helped me to stand up for myself. Though I had prejudices against myself. (...) Many times I had adverse feelings against Gypsies. (...) But knowing that there were fellow sufferers helped a lot. That I was not alone in this world.” (Erika, 26)
In sum, this chapter demonstrates that the upward mobility process may significantly influence the individuals’ Roma identity in a variety of ways. Many interviewees reported that their Roma origin was not important for them at the beginning of their life (often due to the fact that they came from an assimilated family) or was a source of tension, shame or an inferiority complex at one stage of their life. Some of them noted that they were able to find their Roma identity or develop a stable one by themselves, but most of them received support in this process from an ethnic organisation or institution. I found that the development of a stable and positive Roma identity is a precondition of reconciling the two worlds.

5.3.2 Making sense of the mobility trajectory

That is, the chapter will focus only on those narratives that are about the successful reconcilement of the two worlds. It will reveal how socially mobile Roma graduates making sense of their mobility trajectory, how they can reconcile the contradiction between their past and present that is the result of their upward mobility. In other words, after the dislocation of habitus and after the movement between social worlds how can one find her/his social place again?

This chapter analyses habitus in multiple ways. First, habitus is conceptualised as a 'sense of one's place' and 'sense of one’s role' (Hillier- Rooksby 2002). Therefore I will focus on how and where the interviewees find their new place and role after their upward mobility trajectory. Second, habitus can be inferred based on practices (Maton 2008). That is, the narrated actions of the interviewees will be used to deduce their habitus.

The most striking element of these discourses is the interviewees’ strong attachment to their group of origin. As it was mentioned earlier, the reference of our interviewees to their background of origin is usually formulated in terms of race, however, it often includes the class criteria as well.

This strong connection to the group of origin appears in a variety of ways in the narratives.

Several interviewees reported that they support their family of origin financially or otherwise, however it is much more common to help the wider community in a direct or indirect way.

Many interviewees described that they are role models for their narrow or wider community or this is their task to be a role model that is a form of giving back to their community from their point of view. That is, many interviewees find their new role (their habitus) in being a role
model. For example, Ibolya (37) mentioned that it is the task of her and other graduated Roma people to set an example for the ‘Roma community’:

“Q: Do you think that it is a duty of Roma people who studied further and became successful to help the wider Roma community?
R: (…) From my point of view I say it is, or it should be. I do help. That's what I do. There are more of us [who do this] (…) The main reason is to set an example. Definitely, to set an example for Roma children. Doctors, lawyers, police officers. It is not important where or what you graduated from, but it's definitely important. I say it definitely is. Very important.” (Ibolya, 37)

Zselyke (30), who is just a student again and earning her third degree, reported that being a role model for her wider family and village community is a form of giving back from her point of view:

“I do give it back, in a way, so whenever I go home to my village I always visit the Gypsy settlement. Officially there is no such a thing in that village, but in fact, there is. I always go there to chat, of course, my family is very important to me, and to ask how they are doing. I'm happy to see that in my family the girls study further in colleges, more and more of them, thank God. I may sound conceited, or perhaps it simply makes me happy to say so, but it's probably because of me, because they see a living example. But it must have been important for them to see that I managed to do it and then they probably thought that they would be able to do it, too. (...) If I can achieve that, it's jolly good, and now I do it not only in the circle of my family, but in the entire community, I'm trying to expand in the village.” (Zselyke, 30)

The sense of responsibility towards the “Roma community” appears in the narrative of many Roma graduates (Kóczé 2010, Durst et al. 2016, Nyíró – Durst 2018). This sense of responsibility is also a manifestation of the strong commitment to the group of origin. To offer some of the several examples:

„Do you know what it [her work] is? It includes a sense of responsibility, the feeling that you are responsible for what you do, and for whatever happens in the community. So it’s more of a sense of responsibility. The great inequality between the two groups that bothers me”’. (Enikő, 29)

„Now I know it for sure that my responsibility is way bigger than the one I would have if I wasn't Roma. As a Roma woman, no matter if I serve the Roma or the non-Roma community, I always have to stand up for the people. Because, even if I don't want it, I am considered a Roma woman and a Roma expert... a great burden on the shoulder”. (Elizabet, 32)

Flóra (42), who is a teacher also spoke about her sense of responsibility to help the “Roma community” and how she helped them when she moved to a Gypsy settlement for a summer:
R: For instance me, I lived (...) for a time in a Gypsy settlement. And the morale of that story is that children would drop by in the summer to study with me. My father bought a house there, that's why I got to live there for one summer, and when I say it was a genuine Gypsy settlement, I mean it. And it was so good that the children came in, all by themselves, and the parents also took to coming to me for advice. (...) This helping behaviour is what they need. Whatever it takes. Our roots are at stake, we return to our roots. So I think it's important.

Q: And did you, by the way, feel that it was the thing people expected from you when you completed the university, or when you started it?

R: Yes, yes. Certainly. But I also thought it was a must, something that was unavoidable. For that matter, I didn't want it, but I had a sense of responsibility. (Flóra, 42)

Several interviewees reported that they feel that their new position means that they had to represent the “Roma community”, which also creates a strong connection between the individual (as the representative) and the community (as the represented):

“So, you have to function as a Gypsy at a normal workplace and represent them [the Roma]... the thing is, if you are a Gypsy, you will represent all the other Gypsies. At multinational companies or NGOs, all the same.” (Sarolta, 42)

The experience of many interviewees of “being the only Roma” entails this representative function, as Adrienn explains it:

“...when I went to university it was not at all trendy for Roma people to go to university. Then you didn’t represent Tóth Adrienn, but Tóth Adrienn and the Gypsies.” (Adrienn, 52)

The upwardly mobile members of minority groups often feel a responsibility that stems from the fact that they feel their own operation is crucial to the future of community members (Hochschild, 1993) because they represent the group. That is, it is a typical opinion if they do their job well, then the opportunities open up for their counterparts as well, but if they do badly, they – in a symbolic sense – close the gates to the others:

“...Well as a Gypsy it followed me in all my life that I have to show that I’m just like the others and even better than you’d think. It takes too much sometimes, but you have to get on and prove them (...) and perform well, because you represent all the Gypsies, it’s useless to say that you’re only one person.” (Alma, 28)

Besides the fact that many interviewees reported that they are attached to their community of origin through being a role model, being a representative or feeling responsible for the Roma people, several interviewees’ strong attachment is expressed in a more concrete form: through their work for the “Roma community”. Most of our interviewees’ job is related to the
improvement of Roma people’s social situation in Hungary or to their advocacy. This kind of work orientation refers to the interviewees’ habitus as well. It highlights the great importance of their background of origin in their career choice and life. As we will see, many interviewees found their new place and role in giving back to their community of origin.

As our previous studies (Durst et al. 2016, Nyíró – Durst 2018) highlighted many Roma graduates regard her/his job as a ‘soul work’, a ‘passion’, a ‘vocation’ or a ‘personal mission’, and they attribute a surplus value to their work. For example, Béla (44) who is primarily an artist, but as a teacher, he has been involved in the education of Roma children for a long time both in his paid jobs and as a volunteer, spoke about his soul work that is helping the Roma youth because of their shared destiny:

“Personally what I can do for the Roma community is putting in (...) soul work, out of empathy, because we have a common fate. By talking to the Roma youth I can give them something.”

(Béla, 44)

Adrienn (52), who was a leader of a pro-Roma NGO, spoke about her work for helping Roma youth to study in universities as a mission:

“...we had a mission [the activity of the NGO], which was also very good, and fruitful I think. We were really on a mission. (...) It was a lovely mission and I think we were very successful.”

(Adrienn, 52)

Rita (33) works as a university teacher and researcher in the field of Romology, and she regards her jobs as a mission in order to decrease social inequalities:

Q: What does work mean to you?
R: It is a mission. (...) In everyday practice, it may not be much, or it might seem Sisyphean, but I think it points, or it may point, to the direction of a diminishing social inequality. (...) The idea crystallised during my time at university (...) that there is a horrible great deal of inequality in the system against which you must fight, since you shouldn’t have fewer opportunities in life just because you’re a Gypsy (...) I made a vow once (...) that I would fight against it because I want everybody to have opportunities and to use their opportunities freely. I do it every day. That's why I teach, I'm trying to make my students believe in it, trying to help them. (Rita, 33)

The opposition between work and ‘mission’ or ‘working for an issue’ also indicates that working for the ‘Roma issue’ has a surplus value (Durst et al. 2016), as our interviewees explained it:

“... He [her husband] understands that it's my mission, he knows that. He also knows, because
I keep telling him, that I have a mission and he has a job.” (Rebeka 38)

„...My fate is none other than that of my friends, it's only different because while they work for multinational companies I work for a cause, it's quite a big difference actually.” (Valéria, 30)

The literature (Higginbotham–Weber 1992, Pantea 2014) on the social mobility of minorities reveals that it is a common phenomenon among upwardly mobile minorities that they feel indebted towards their family, friends or a generic ‘Roma community’ because of their success. Many of our interviewees justify their work for helping the ‘Roma community’ on the grounds that they want to give back something from what they received:

“...I have a colourful palette, and I like doing various things, but the Roma issue is definitely my soul work. I now edit a Roma cultural magazine, and I took the job because there I can give back something I got.” (Evelin, 39)

“...true, for me it wasn't too hard, it was not a question at home that I should study and we always had the money for heating and school books and everything. That's why I felt the urge to give back, that's why I always went back to Vaskút, although it was mentally exhausting. But I still think that every Roma person has the duty to give back to some extent what they took, no matter how.” (Hanna, 37)

“...I received loads of scholarships. Scholarships for Roma people. Of course I have to give back. You see, I don't just take and never give, but I'm grateful for it and give back.” (Linda, 45)

It is uncommon among our interviewees, but there are some of them who actually moved back to their village or town to help their community. For instance, Angéla (25) after graduating as a teacher went back to her village to work in the local primary school because she believes that she should be there locally to help:

“R: So why didn't I move from this place? There is a reason for that, too. No, it was not only because of my family who live here. I spent five years in Kékvár [a big city]. I could certainly break away. The problem is that I see there's a tendency for Gypsies coming from, say, a Gypsy settlement, working hard to stand out, then they get a job, and so on... and what is the first thing they do? They move away! Without leaving behind a trace or becoming a role model. Gypsies always say that the word flies, and you can say anything nowadays, and if people just tell stories of that a girl from the neighbourhood who went to university, well, that way I'm not going to motivate anyone. I have to be there to help.

Q: And was it the reason why you stayed here?
R: I stayed here to be a model for the children. To make them see that it's possible to live in a palace built in a muddy Gypsy settlement. If everyone went away who would set an example?” (Angéla, 25)

Patrícia (62), who a leader of a pro-Roma NGO, even defined success in terms of the amount of help provided by her:

„Success may be measured by the degree to which I manage to reach and help people is the degree of success (…) I think the most important thing in life is to reach out for people who need it most.” (Patrícia, 62)

Many interviewees reported that they found their new place or role by working in the field of ‘Roma issues’, by helping the ‘Roma community’. It is a common view among our respondents that someone who achieved upward mobility and thus became a member of the ’intellectuals’ or the ’middle-class’ is got into a position or role where she/he need or have to help the ‘Roma community’. They regard it as a “duty” or a “moral obligation”. For instance, Zsigmond (52), who works as a teacher and teaches disadvantaged children (primarily Roma students) and also participates in a program as a mentor that helps the Roma youth, spokes that helping Roma children is his place, where he has a role:

„I think that it is the most sacred duty of everyone (…) to do the most they can. I have my own personal environment. I have my schoolchildren, I have to take care of them. I have tasks to do there, I have a role to play there.” (Zsigmond, 52)

Béla (44) described that the ‘intellectuals’ have the insight to help the community:

„In reality, Roma intellectuals have to do something for the community also because by virtue of their schooling they have better vision and insight. The thing is that it's hardly a matter of decision, you will always give back something, I work with adolescents so it just goes, giving back stuff.” (Béla, 52)

Márk (46) and Alma (38) expressed similar thoughts:

„I think that it's the duty of Roma graduates to go back to their community and help them. And set an example to the next generation.” (Márk, 46)

„I think it's a part of an intellectual's life that you're aware of your identity so that you can set an example, not only professional but also moral. (...) we have the responsibility to help our community to our best abilities and motivations.” (Alma, 38)

Several interviewees spoke about their work for helping the ‘Roma community’ as their self-definition, that is, they identify themselves with their life goal to help. This is a very strong form of attachment to their group of origin.
“If I can inspire one child out of every one hundred to fight for their dreams because it is not impossible to make them come true. It isn't impossible to go, literally, from the mud to university, and become a role model (...) because I'm there to help, and if they go and complete it all the way then it was worth sitting in the school bench for seventeen years... So that's me. I've always been there to help people.” (Angéla, 25)

“It's interesting too, you know, I'm a teacher at an elementary school, teaching the youngest pupils. I specialise in Roma ethnology, with integrated Lovari language. I live in Budapest, but I don't teach there. I teach in the countryside, I travel two hours to my workplace and two hours back. (...) I wanted to teach Roma ethnology. There are many elementary school teachers. If I were restrained to do only what elementary school teachers are supposed to do, I couldn't be myself.” (Anita, 44)

“Q: What happened when you completed secondary school?  
R: That was a very good period because I understood that I want to live my life and work for Gypsies and with Gypsies...” (Tünde, 53)

Many interviewees reported that starting to work in the field of ‘Roma issues’ meant that they found their ‘place’:

“When I started to work I had a good relationship with my colleagues, but we didn't have much to do with Gypsies. No wonder, I didn't work with Gypsies. And I didn't have any Gypsy students in that elite secondary school. Even at elementary school, there was only one Gypsy girl. And in 1992 when I met Gypsies at Gandhi [a high school for the Roma minority in Hungary], then I finally felt that I had arrived.” (Benigna, 56)

Besides those interviewees who currently work in the field of “Roma issues”, there are numerous interviewees who deal with helping Roma people in a less formal or direct way. To offer one of the many examples, Luca (35, jurist) whose main job is not directly connected to the ‘Roma issue’ however she taught several times in Roma colleges for advanced studies, her PhD partly deals with questions related to the situation of Roma people, and she describes how her main job is connected to helping Roma people:

“...The sentence comes to mind that one of my teachers said (...) that we need to choose a weapon, and for instance, by the way of our work, or by the way of scientific activities, we will advance the Roma issue forward to some extent. For example in this PhD paper there are questions and practices related to Roma people, it is also actually a thing related to Roma
people that someone writes such a scientific paper. In my work, well, it's Roma people's access to law services and justice, so I help by way of my decisions, or via communication in the courtroom, or by providing them information.” (Luca, 35)

That is, however, Luca’s main job is not connected to the ‘Roma issues’ and she also highlighted that she did not disclose her Roma identity publicly (because her job as a jurist claims independence) her work-life is interwoven by her Roma origin.

As it was mentioned earlier, habitus can be deduced from practice (Maton 2008) and it can be conceptualised as a ‘sense of one’s place’ and ‘sense of one’s role’ (Hillier- Rooksbys 2002) and it can be associated with making a social position ‘homey’, that is, with the acquisition and internalisation of a social position (Németh 2020). As this chapter revealed, in these discourses the new social position as an ‘intellectual’, ‘graduate’ or ‘middle-class’ became ‘homey’ or internalised by finding a place from there helping their background of origin in a broader or narrower sense becomes possible. Many of our interviewees reported that they felt themselves ‘out of place’ at a given part of their upward mobility trajectory, and several of them found her/his ‘place’ in a helping position.

Finding a continuity between the (contradictory) past and present can be achieved by creating a narrative that makes sense of the mobility trajectory (Naudet 2018). In these discourses the sense of upward mobility and the suffering caused by this path is acquiring a position in which helping Roma people can be realised. The continuity of the relationship with one’s Roma origin can be maintained by this helping position.

As it was mentioned earlier, Abrahams and Ingram (2013) introduced the conception of reconciled habitus that means the ability to fit in two fields by reconciling them and internalising the structures of both fields. They highlight that individuals who have a reconciled habitus are able to navigate in two worlds, but their habitus is not completely attuned to either but to a new space. They call it as ‘third space’ based on Bhabha’s work who defines it as follows “…hybridity to me is the third space that enables other positions to emerge. This third space displaces the histories that constitute it and sets up new structures of authority, new political initiatives… I try to talk about hybridity through a psychoanalytic analogy… it bears the traces of those feelings and practices which inform it, just like a translation, so that hybridity puts together the traces of certain other meanings or discourses…. The process of cultural hybridity gives rise to something different, something new and unrecognizable, a new area of negotiation of meaning and representation.” (Rutherford 1990: 211) Habitus dislocation creates the ‘third space’, as Bhabha argues “…the transformational value of change lies in the rearticulation, or translation, of the elements that are neither the One…nor the Other… but
something else besides which contests the terms and territories of both” (Bhabha 1994:28)
According to Abrahams and Ingram (2013), the position in the third space enables upwardly mobile individuals to remain connected to both worlds simultaneously. The authors believe that those individuals who have a reconciled habitus constantly modify their habitus and relying on different aspects of their habitus depending on which field they are in, in order to ‘fit in’. That is why, they also call it chameleon habitus. However, our interviewees connected to both worlds in a different manner because they do not switch according to their social context but they can navigate in both worlds because they developed a habitus which is a bridge between the two social contexts. Durst and Bereményi (2021) call it a “bridging personality” or “bridging role”. Their habitus was able to reconcile the (contradictory) worlds by finding a position (‘the third space’) where they can be a ‘fish in the water’ and this is the position of the helper.
As Tünde (53) who worked for several years as a helper in different jobs explains that neither the “Roma community”, nor the majority society accepts her, so she plays a bridging role:
“...For some reason, I always think that I have the role of a bridge, as neither Gadjos nor Gypsies accept me as one of their own. Vlach Gypsies say I'm not a Gypsy because I don't speak the language. That's what I mean by not accepting me. Gadjos on the other hand look at me and take me for a Gypsy. And I take myself for a Gypsy, too. On top of that, I also take myself for a Hungarian. So I have a dual identity and when I need to defend one of my identities it sometimes can be strange, anyway, I function as a bridge. It's interesting.”
Later she returned to this topic:
“...when you're looking for your place and you have no identity, like I don't speak Romani and I'm not a traditional Gypsy woman, never having lived the traditional way. For instance, I didn't learn to dance when I was a little girl but I taught myself to dance the way I danced with you. So. And Gadjos don't accept me because they look at me and I'm a Gypsy to them, there was a time when it bothered me but now I just don't care. Now I know it's not important. So now I have a dual identity and I don't need to let go of either of the two, and I don't need to be ashamed. Yes, I am that bridge. And there are many more who feel the same way.” (Tünde, 53)
As Bourdieu (1990: 86.) writes habitus “refers to something historical, it is linked to individual history”. Our interviewees’ narratives clearly show how their past affects their present conditions, how their background of origin influences their career path and choices in their life. Habitus “is a socialised body. A structured body, a body which has incorporated the immanent structures of a world or of a particular sector of that world – a field – and which structures the perception of that world as well as actions in that world.” (Bourdieu 1998: 81.) As our study showed, our interviewees incorporated the structures of two worlds, the world of their
background of origin and the world of their new position, and they find a way to reconcile them, namely to help their community.

Habitus consists of a person’s own history and the whole collective history of the individual’s family and class (Reay 2004). Our interviewees’ narratives on working for the betterment of the ‘Roma community’ highlight the role of their collective history in their habitus.

Our results do not support Bourdieu’s claim (2016) that habitus can only change to a limited extent. The development of reconciled habitus also means that a profoundly new habitus emerges compared to the primary habitus. That is, habitus can significantly change due to new experiences and education.

This chapter analysed habitus as a sense of place and role, and through the actions of the interviewees. It revealed how upwardly mobile Roma interviewees making sense of their mobility trajectory, how they can reconcile the opposition between their past (group of origin) and present (attained position), how they find their new place and role where they feel at ‘home’. It was found that the most striking feature of these discourses is the interviewees’ strong attachment to their group of origin (while acculturation to the new group is a less emphasised topic). The most typical manifestation of this attachment is related to the work-life of our interviewees: many of them work to help Roma people. According to the narratives, the sense of the upward mobility process is to help the situation of the Roma people. In other words, the meaning of the new position is to help. By helping Roma it is possible to reconcile the opposition between their past and present.

5.3.3 Case descriptions

5.3.3.1 Case 1: Júlia’s narrative

Júlia (39) was born in a big city in the countryside, she originates from a Vlach Gypsy family, her father completed primary school and was an unskilled worker, and her mother was illiterate and worked as a cleaning lady. The parents lived in a gypsy settlement, but around Júlia’s birth, a panel apartment was allocated to them, so she grew up in an integrated environment. Her father considered her studying important and the primary school teachers also supported her. First, she completed a vocational school, then she graduated from a vocational high school (this latter was correspondence training). She applied to both schools because one of her non-Roma friends chose that school. Júlia had to postpone her graduation for a year because of the birth
of her first daughter. She was already working in the catering industry during her vocational high school years. She participated in a community development course in her town where she met with a university teacher who suggested to her to apply to university. She was successfully admitted to the Faculty of Social Sciences and Romaversitas. She almost did not go to her university admission interview because of her inferior complexity and this feeling still accompanies her life. Her second daughter was born during her university years. She graduated in social work and social policy, later she earned additional degrees and obtained her doctorate. Now she is a university teacher in the field of Romology and preparing for her habilitation. Júlia is active in political life as well: among others, she is a representative of a minority municipality. Furthermore, she is a leader of an NGO which supports disadvantaged Roma adults and children.

Júlia’s narrative main topics are her academic and political career, and her work in the civil sector. She reported that she is satisfied with her life and feels successful in her professional life because her work is recognized both in the Roma and non-Roma world:

“How successful do you think you are? To what extent have you been satisfied with your life so far?
I'm absolutely satisfied. I really am. (...) And do you think you're successful?
Interestingly, two years ago I started getting feedback that I am successful, widely known and acknowledged. So now they acknowledge me overtly. And they even ask me for some counselling (...), or ask my advice. For me, this means that other people acknowledge me, Roma and non-Roma alike.”

She emphasised that she is even recognised by Roma men in the political sphere:
“...Professionally I think I reached my goals and people acknowledge me. Even men, even Gypsy men in public life.” She is highlighted that she is proud of her Roma origin but her Hungarian origin is also important for her: “It [her Roma origin] is very important to me. I am proud of my identity. I am a Roma living in Hungary, and being a Roma and being a Hungarian are both very important to me...”

Júlia’s narrative reveals that she distances herself from her group of origin in some aspects because she rejects traditional values and traditional female roles of her community. She spoke about her younger sister who and her ex-husband “represents the traditional values”, for example, Júlia mentioned that her sister’s husband “...doesn't take the food out of the fridge. So he didn’t eat until my sister put it in front of him.” She reported about the divorce of her
sister and the meaning of divorce in her community of origin: “...it was a huge disaster for her, because a Vlach Gypsy woman marries for life, she is loyal and devoted, and will not look at other men. So it was a great shock to her.” Her sister’s life is cited as a negative example for her daughters because she did not study and had an unequal relationship with her husband so she had a hard life:

“...I used to tell them [her daughters] to keep studying. (...) My catchphrase was that being pretty is not enough, you also have to be smart, to be equal to your partner, because you mustn't be dependent on anyone. I'd tell them to look at my sister, she left school, her husband left her, and she had a hard life.”

Her younger daughter had a boyfriend from the Vlach Gypsy community which aroused concern in her: “I was afraid that she [her daughter] would leave school according to Vlach Gypsy traditions and they will elope.”

Júlia mentioned that she was not able to find a Roma man after rejecting a marriage offer from a Roma man because she still wanted to study: “By that time finding a partner was impossible in the Roma community, the boys have had all married. (...) All of them. And of course, I became famous after the first date. A conceited girl, goes to school, she, they thought. So I didn't have any more dates. Not after that. The news spread that I went to school.”

The decision not to get married at a young age, her thoughts on her sister’s life and the norms and values which she mediated to her daughters also shows that she was distanced from the traditional values and female roles of her group of origin which were even accepted in her family. In other words, these factors refer to the fact that her habitus has changed profoundly compared to her primary socialisation and she is acculturated to her destination group to some extent. Moreover, when she is asked about her class position, she answered that she belongs to the middle-class.

Meanwhile, she is strongly attached to her community of origin: as it was mentioned earlier, she is proud of her Roma identity, and thinks she is “just as Gypsy as all the others”:

R: I wanted to buy twenty kilos of bread, and a security guard started following me. (...) I asked him whether he thought if I wanted to steal that twenty kilos of bread that wouldn't even fit into that bag I was carrying. I told him to help me instead, because I was going to a vigil.

Q: And what did he say?

R: He looked ashamed. I rarely speak up, you see, if I go into a shop, people do not see a
university professor, they see a Gypsy, and they will assume, well, you know what.

Q: But you are well-dressed and educated.

R: All the same. They don't see I'm educated. To them, I'm just like any other Gypsy. Well, look at me. Aren't I?

That is, Júlia highlights that she is a member of a stigmatized minority group and she is exposed to the same discrimination and prejudice as her disadvantaged counterparts which makes her belong to the “Roma community”.

Our main question is how this double attachment can be reconciled according to her narrative? In other words, how does she make sense of her upward mobility trajectory in such a way as to eliminate the tension between her group of origin and attained group? As she highlights the sense of her attained social position is to help her community which she regards as her moral obligation:

“So that's why I undertake so many tasks because I see it as a moral obligation to help my community after acquiring a level of education and experience. This is me.”

Her career shows her strong attachment and solidarity to her group of origin: her research field is Romology, she is a leader of an NGO which helps disadvantaged Roma people, and she participates in minority politics as a representative. She highlights that she has a “common issue” with all Roma people:

“Someone said that I might be the only person in the country who will talk to any Gypsy, leftists and rightists, whatever. That is because it is important to me. Political beliefs are not important to me, their origin, on the other hand, is. They are also Roma and we have a common issue.”

The aim of her work, namely helping the “Roma community”, was appeared at the beginning of her career when she chose her field: “I'd rather do social work because I've always enjoyed working with people. I thought I could help Gypsies so it'd be jolly good to become a social worker.” But it also determines her whole professional career, when she was asked about her reasons to help her community, she answered the following: “That's because I really want to help my community. (...) I don't know, I've always been socially sensitive. (...) It is determined by my attitude and my way of thinking.” It is also highlighted that it was an expectation towards the graduated Roma persons from both the Roma and non-Roma people: “We were under a sort of moral pressure in 2000. (...) you are graduates because you need to go back and help your own community.” She even refused an opportunity for academic advancement because of this moral obligation to her community of origin:
“…I have a different calling. My job is to be a representative, work for an NGO, and help people who are put out to the grass with three children. They write to me at night and I have to help them first thing in the morning. It's my duty, which is important to me. If I had focused on my professional career, publications and conferences and all I'd be a goddess by now, you know, but I simply can't afford it morally.”

Even when she is asked about who are you, she answered – among others – that “I really like helping people.” However, she did not believe that this is a moral obligation towards all graduated Roma as she highlights that she did not expect to follow her path from her daughters: “No. They'll have to make their own decisions. One of my daughters will probably stay with the community, and the other might have a totally different life. I'll let them make their own personal choices.” The quote also demonstrates that helping the “Roma community” means “remaining in the community” that is, keeping the strong attachment to the group of origin.

Júlia’s narrative describes that she was distanced from her family of origin that is, her habitus significantly changed compared to her primary socialisation. For example, she no longer accepts the traditional values and female roles of her group of origin, the Vlach Gypsies. However, her narrative makes it clear that she found her place as she feels successful and recognized both by Roma and non-Roma people. She works in three jobs at the same time and all of them are related to helping the Roma people: she teaches Romology, she is a leader of a pro-Roma NGO, and she is a minority representative. Her academic career is important for her, but her soul work is NGO work and minority representation. As she describes helping the ‘Roma community’ is the moral obligation of Roma graduates. She believes that she has a common issue – i.e. improving the situation of Roma people – with all Roma people, that is helping the ‘Roma community’ means maintaining her attachment to them. The base of her solidarity with the ‘Roma community’ is the result of belonging to a stigmatized group.
Case 2: Borbála’s narrative

Borbála (37) was born in a medium-sized city but a few years after her birth, the family moved to Budapest. Her mother completed primary school and worked as a sewer and kitchen helper, her father had a high school diploma and was a musician. In her adulthood, her mother graduated from a vocational school, while her father obtained a degree in higher-level vocational training. She has two older brothers, one of them has a university degree, and the other one did not study in higher education.

Borbála attended a Christian high school which has only female students, later she switched to a coeducated school because the first school was too conservative for her and she was the only Roma student in the school which was emotionally hard for her. She highlighted that her father was a very intelligent man and he knew that studying is very important so it was evident since her childhood that she will go to university. She obtained a degree in psychology at a university in the capital, she was a member of a Roma college for advanced studies during her university years. After graduation she worked at pro-Roma NGO in the field of education, then she worked at a children’s home. She could not earn enough to pay for her further training to be a therapist in Hungary therefore she moved abroad and now she is studying psychology there.

Her parents’ recommendation to her was to be unnoticeable and to perform well in order to ‘compensate’ her Roma origin. That is, in her parents’ view the path to success is assimilation:

“R: ...In my family, we pass on that “you have the word Gypsy written all over your face” type of attitude.
Q: What do you mean you pass it on? (...)
R: It's the family narrative. You should keep your head down, work hard, be smart and resourceful, but don't show off because people will just think you do it because you're a Gypsy. You already look like one, don't make it worse.
Q: So they told you to be invisible?
R: They did. And to assimilate. You see my parents, it's easy like that.”

She reported that she did not ‘fit in’ both in the primary school and secondary school because of her eye problem and her Roma origin, however, she found herself and her accepting community at the university:

“I had a lazy eye for which reason I had to wear a patch on my glasses, so I was different, and
because of my family, I had already felt different. There were some (...) episodes in my childhood where my Gypsy origin suddenly became important. For instance, whenever there was a fight I was asked first if I'd started it. (...) We have discussed my high school years. There I was an alien, an extraterrestrial, I didn't bloody make any sense to people there. At university, I started to reassemble myself. I mean, all this. At last, I was a psychology student, and people who were happy for me, for what I was. That I was sensitive and different.”

According to Borbála, becoming an intellectual meant distancing from her family of origin because the upwardly mobile persons and the other family members no longer understand each other, and the upwardly mobile person can no longer meet the expectations of the family. In other words, her habitus and that of her family diverged from each other as a result of her mobility process. This evoked her need for a community – to find a place where she is a “fish in the water”– since she wanted to belong somewhere. She believes that Roma intellectuals (including her) find this new community in the work for “Roma issues”. Moreover, she believes that those upwardly mobile Roma persons who work in the field of humanities only receive jobs where they are “the Roma” (a token) that is, they are not accepted into the Hungarian society, they cannot ‘fit in’ the majority society:

“Q: Why do you think it's not surprising that they [the graduated Roma persons] work for the Roma issue?
R: Because when they graduate they suddenly become islands within their own families. From then on they will be desperate to belong to a community. Their family bonds will never be the same again, they will not understand each other like they used to, and their family will have totally different expectations towards them. And since they don't measure up to those expectations they will feel the urge to go away. And as for the intellectuals of the majority, they will not accept me, especially if the professional circle is small, they only say I'm the Gypsy sociologist, psychologist, artist, whatever.”

Borbála characterized herself as someone who “had very little self-confidence” and she linked the low self-esteem with the fact that someone is first in family graduate. She reported that it is difficult to join a social stratum with whom the family has no common history – in other words,

---

35 For instance, marriage and childbearing are often expressed as expectations from the family that cannot be completed by the upwardly mobile person during the period when the family would expect it because of participation in higher education.

36 According to our definition, those jobs are related to the ‘Roma issue’ which aim at improving the situation of Roma people living in poverty, and supporting the protection of their interests (Váradi, 2015).
habitus – and this makes upwardly mobile persons insecure.

As in many other narratives, Borbála also explained that a pro-Roma support group helped her to find her place, since it has a great impact on her feeling related to belonging to the broader “Roma community”:

“And what did it [the Roma college of advanced studies] mean to you? (…)
A lot. Like you and others said before, it was the place where I first felt that you and ‘are of the same blood.’

“And then it [a Roma college of advanced studies] (...) opened gates to social relations. It also opened a hidden compartment in my heart. I can't put it in another way. I didn't know about it. I learned to feel a certain bond with Gypsies I didn't know. And it was a magnificent feeling to learn that they are actually receptive to that bond. I could experience that subtle aspect of my ethnic identity.”

The main topic of her narrative is that she – as a Roma intellectual – has to help her community through her work. In other words, the sense of her social ascension, of her new position – as a Roma intellectual – is giving back to the Roma people according to her narrative. Despite the fact, that she is distanced from her family both emotionally and geographically, she reported that she feels obligated to give back to them:

“R: In Hungary, the situation is exactly what you say. We have become Gypsy intellectuals, with a gruesome idea stemming from our soul that we have got to do something. Also because that is our family.

Q: That's a beautiful way to put it (…)
R: But really, because that's our family, you understand, it really is.

Q: Well that's it, your family, it's still the first generation.
R: Exactly. That's my cousin and what will happen to her child, and they should have an opportunity to... and that's not far away.”

“…Gypsies live in shitty conditions. And I'm interested in their circumstances because my father's sister's children call me at Christmas (...) to tell me that once again they have nothing to eat....”

However, she also spoke about the fact that Roma intellectuals have solidarity towards the “Roma community” in a broader sense because of the disadvantaged situation (primarily poverty and segregation) of Roma in Hungary. Helping her family and the broader “Roma
community” is interrelated: her families’ problems will be only solved if all Roma people’s problems will be solved and for this reason, she considers all Roma to be her relatives. When she was asked why she undertook the interview she underlined again her willingness to help Roma people.

A recurrent element of her narrative is that her long-term plan is to go back to Hungary and help Roma children emotionally in the countryside. She reported that she went abroad with the aim of studying further in the field of mental hygiene intervention and after that, she would move back to Hungary and work with Roma children.

It is also highlighted that her motivation to help Roma children is her emotional involvement:

“Q: ...Is it your main interest to help Roma children, or to help any poor children who need it?  
R: Basically I want to help poor children, but as sixty to eighty percent of poor children in Hungary are Gypsies, I want to help Gypsy children. But my main field of interest is mental hygiene intervention (...) Because as a Gypsy it concerns me. I am emotionally concerned, that's why I chose it as the main focus of my professional specialisation. ”

Her solidarity is directed to the Roma children because of her emotional involvement, however, the main reason for her solidarity is their poverty. That is, her solidarity is ethnic and class-based at the same time.

In sum, Borbála’s narrative describes that her social mobility is associated with the distancing from her family of origin while ‘fitting in’ the majority society is problematic for Roma individuals whose profession belongs to the humanities because of tokenism. In this situation, she – and according to her opinion, other Roma intellectuals – can find their community or the place where they belong if they work on the “Roma issue”. That is, her new social position makes sense if she helps the “Roma community”.

Throughout the interview, she demonstrates her commitment to her community of origin e.g. the choice of her specialisation in psychology is to help Roma children, the aim of living abroad is to achieve the knowledge to help. She wishes to help her family, but besides her close family, she also regards the whole “Roma community” as her family. Her sense of solidarity is based on the shared experiences of racism and the disadvantaged socioeconomic position of Roma people, that is, the ethnic and class criteria are mingled. In her narrative, helping the “Roma community” appears not as a moral obligation but rather as an emotional need.
5.3.4 External factors which ‘directed’ the upwardly mobile Roma graduates to the field of “Roma issues”

The fact that most of our interviewees consider their job as a soul work (szívügy) (Nyíró – Durst 2018) and are very committed to their work does not mean that working for the “Roma issue” was a conscious choice of all respondents at the beginning of their career. Of course, many upwardly mobile Roma interviewees selected this career path wittingly, however several of them reported that “I ended up there” or “it was a coincidence” and over time it became their mission. Lots of interviewees’ field of specialisation is not closely related to the “Roma issue” and yet their careers evolve to eventually work in this area. This chapter will reveal what external factors limit the career choice of our interviewees which contributed to the fact that many of our interviewees work in the field of “Roma issues” as their main job or as a volunteer.

Of course, many Roma graduates consciously decided early in their career that they wish to work for the “Roma issues”, however several of them reported that she/he did not prepare purposely for this career path. For example, Róbert (43), who graduated as an engineer but now works in the field of communication and his job is closely related to the “Roma issues” (and earlier he worked in the area of equal opportunities), reported the following about his career choice:

“It wasn't conscious. It might have been subconscious, but I'm sure it was not conscious. So no, I didn't prepare for it, you see, I did completely different studies [he graduated as an engineer]. My plans were different. I simply got hooked on this.” (Róbert, 43)

While Elizabet’s (32) main motivation was to find a profession where she can help:

“I was always thinking about what profession I should choose which can provide real help.”

In the following section, those other factors will be highlighted that are outside of the individual's decision and may contribute to the fact that our interviewees came into contact with the “Roma issues” in their careers.

An important factor that limits the free career choice of our respondents is discrimination against Roma people in the Hungarian labour market (Bodrogi – Iványi 2004, Babusík 2008,

37 We regard as „Roma issues” those positions in the public and civil sector that are related in some way to the improvement of the situation and protection of the interests of this minority group (Váradi 2015).
Sik – Simonovits 2009, EU-MIDIS 2009) but this reason is rarely reported in the narratives of our interviewees. However, some of them mentioned that they applied for many jobs and they met with rejection. For example, Dóra who graduated in the field of humanities and was not able to obtain employment as a high school teacher so she was able to work in the civil sector:

„Finding a job as a secondary school teacher... not as if I couldn't do it, I applied to a lot of places, but they didn't call me back,(…) and then this sector found me [the NGOs]. (…) I also taught at a language school, but I never managed to get a job at a secondary school (…), although I tried many places, (…) about forty, I had no luck... Some of the schools answered but most did not, and it was a shitty feeling.” (Dóra, 32)

As it was demonstrated in Chapter 3.1., Roma graduates are overrepresented in college and university level programmes that are related to helping professions such as social studies and education. This also contributed to the fact that many Roma graduates work in the field of “Roma issues”. While many students selected these programmes themselves, several interviewees participated in preparation courses for university entry which targeted Roma students, and these courses usually prepared them exclusively for the entrance exam of sociology and social work. That is, this former group has no possibility to choose a programme. However, there were other ways, for example, one of our interviewees mentioned that she applied for the programme of English Language and Literature and Romology and the examination board told her if she applied to Romology as well then she should study Romology. In a similar vein, another interviewee, who studied geography, reported that her thesis topic was related to the “Roma issue” because one of her teachers recommended to choose it if she is Roma:

R: When I was writing my thesis because I studied that topic, social and economic integration...
Q: And why did you opt specifically for that topic?
R: Because the professor whom I really liked and was very close to me advised it, since I am of Gypsy origin and come from Káposztás [there is a Gypsy settlement there], that's why.
Angéla, 25)

These cases refer to the fact that there is a tacit opinion in some members of the majority society that Roma people should deal with “Roma issues” and this contributed to the career path of some of our interviewees.

Another reason is that numerous interviewees acquire a special network whose members are closely connected to the “Roma issue”. Several interviewees mentioned that they were able to
find a job through their informal relationships with people from pro-Roma NGOs (e.g. foundations, colleges of advanced studies) or with people who work at minority municipalities. These special networks obviously have access to job opportunities mostly in the field of “Roma issues”. Another group of interviewees directly joined these kinds of organisations and institutions, often as a volunteer, an intern or a member for the first time and later a job was offered to them.

The difficulty of finding a job for the Roma graduates in the Hungarian labour market is also indicated by the fact that several interviewees reported that they were able to obtain a job through an internship program (which later resulted in employment) or an employment program which targeted specifically Roma people. Of course, these programs also offered jobs that are related to the “Roma issue”.

As our previous study (Nyírő – Durst 2018) revealed pro-Roma supportive groups (e.g. advanced colleges of advanced studies) may also contribute to their members’ intention to find jobs that are related to the betterment of the whole ‘Roma community’.

Some interviewees ended up in a job that is related to the “Roma issue” because of tokenism. To offer an example, Hanga (40) graduated as a language teacher and was employed at a vocational high school when she was invited to work as an equity expert at a public organisation. Some interviewees reported that they would be happy to receive invitations that are not related to “Roma issues”. For example, Elizabet (32), who works as a journalist and a Gypsy language teacher, mentioned this difficulty of her career:

„So I work, say, at an online platform that was created specifically for the Roma youth, very good, okay, it's read mostly by young Roma people, fine, but how fine it would be if I taught English, not only Romani. And let's say they would look for me as an English teacher.”

(Elizabet, 32)

In sum, in addition to conscious choice, other factors also played a role in the fact that many of our interviewees started to work in the field of “Roma issues”. Based on the narratives of our interviewees, these reasons are discrimination against Roma in the Hungarian labour market, the external impact which directs Roma students to the university and college level programmes in the field of social science, social work and other helping professions, their special network, the internship and employment programs, and tokenism.
6. CONCLUSIONS

6.1 Summarising research findings

The purpose of the thesis is to contribute to the Hungarian literature on upward mobility, namely, the subjective experience on the mobility of first in family graduates. This is a little-studied area in the Hungarian mainstream mobility research that mainly focuses on vertical mobility and analyses the movements between broad occupational groups by using quantitative methods. The small amount of qualitative research done in Hungary has mainly concentrated on the experiences of university students therefore they were not able to study the long-term consequences of upward mobility. The comparison of the experiences of the members of a minority group and the majority society is rare even in the international literature (see as an exception Naudet 2018).

The thesis applies the habitus concept of Bourdieu which allows connecting the objective and subjective dimensions of social mobility because individuals are not external to the mobility but it inheres within people: it is experienced on a daily basis. (Friedman – Savage 2018). The use of the concept of habitus enables us to capture the ways in which the social world is incorporated into the dispositions of social actors. Adaptations to (changing) social circumstances are inherent in habitus. (Lawler – Payne 2018). As Bourdieu states social reality “exists… twice, in things and in minds, in habitus and field, outside and inside of agents.” (Bourdieu – Wacquant 1992: 127.)

The purpose of this thesis is to analyse the subjective experience of mobility of Roma and non-Roma first in family graduates in Hungary. The theoretical aim of the thesis is to make proposals for the modification and expansion of the Bourdieusian habitus concept based on our results in order to make the concept more useful for empirical research.

Two research questions were formulated. First, it examines the conditions under which the habitus is likely to be modified by processes of upward mobility. Second, it examines how upwardly mobile Roma graduates make sense of their mobility trajectory. That is, how they can reconcile the tensions between their group of origin and attained social group.

To answer these questions qualitative interviews were conducted with first in family graduates. The empirical base of the first part of the study consists of 166 interviews with Roma and non-Roma interviewees, while the second part is based on 48 interviews with Roma interviewees.
The interview data were analysed by qualitative content analysis, using Atlas TI software.

Related to the first research question, the study found that upward mobility does not necessarily lead to habitus dislocation. Certain characteristics of the mobility trajectory make the evolvement of habitus clivé more likely. The subjective experience of social mobility is influenced by the range of social mobility, the speed and direction of movement through social space, the person’s ethnicity, the range of geographical mobility, and the aspirational capital of the family of origin and the upwardly mobile individual. The intersection of these factors is what is decisive regarding the experience of mobility, and some individual factors (e.g. personality, contingency such as biographical events) also play an important role. It was found that those interviewees who belong to the Roma minority are more likely to experience habitus clivé than the majority participants of our study. That is, belonging to a stigmatised minority group has a significant influence on the subjective experience of upward mobility.

The second research question revealed how upwardly mobile Roma interviewees make sense of their mobility trajectory, how they can reconcile the opposition between their past (group of origin) and present (attained social position). That is, this part of the study only focuses on the narratives of those Roma interviewees who have reconciled habitus. I concentrate on this habitus interruption type in case of the Roma respondents because their reconciled habitus has important consequences related to the modification and extension of the Bourdieusian habitus concept. Furthermore, those who have a reconciled habitus play an important role in society, because they create ‘bridges’ between their original and new social contexts. I found that typically those interviewees were able to reconcile their two worlds who were able to develop a stable and positive Roma identity. The movement in the social space often entails the reconstruction and redefinition of the Roma identity (Durst – Bereményi 2021). According to the narratives, the redefinition of their Roma identity became necessary because many interviewees experienced external threaten to their identity in the form of prejudice and discrimination against Roma people, and thus many interviewees had to struggle with their own feelings (e.g. shame, inferiority complex) related to being Roma or with their own stereotypes on Roma people. Some of the interviewees were able to develop a stable Roma identity on their own, while most of the respondents describe that an ethnic support group (e.g. Romaversitas, any of the Christian Roma Colleges for Advanced Studies) or an ethnic educational institution or training (e.g. Gandhi High School and College, Romology major) had an important role in it.

The most noticeable characteristic of the discourses of those interviewees who were able to
reconcile their two worlds is the interviewees’ strong commitment to their group of origin (while the acculturation to the new group is a less emphasised topic). The most common manifestation of this attachment is related to the work-life of our interviewees: many of them work to help Roma people. According to the narratives, the sense of the upward mobility process is to help the situation of the Roma people. In other words, the meaning of the new position and the struggling path that leads to it is to help. By helping Roma it is possible to reconcile the opposition between their past and present. That is, their two worlds are reconciled in their habitus by finding a position that connects the two worlds.

By using, the Bourdieusian habitus concept, it was possible to connect the objective and subjective aspects of social mobility, that is, to demonstrate how the movement between social worlds influences the actions, namely, the career choice of our respondents. In other words, this concept enabled us to show how their social worlds are incorporated into their dispositions and actions, how social mobility leads to the choice of helping the ‘Roma community’.

6.2 Implications

6.2.1 Theoretical implications

This chapter will discuss what implications these empirical results have for the Bourdieusian concept of habitus.

First, Bourdieu (2016) suggests that habitus can change due to new experiences and education, however only to a limited extent because early experiences have particular significance. Furthermore, it typically does not involve a fundamental change in primary dispositions (Swartz, 1997). In contrast, the results show that the secondary habitus can profoundly change compared to the primary habitus. This is indicated by the fact that many of the interviewees’ narratives are about the process which starts with the experience of habitus dislocation – when their primary habitus did not ‘fit in’ to their new social milieu – and finishes with finding their new place and role (that is, their new habitus), so their habitus has been modified during their mobility trajectory. Therefore the results (similarly to Friedman 2016) suggest that it is necessary to expand the Bourdieusian habitus concept in a way that it could accept a more profound change of habitus.

Second, the results indicate that race has a great impact on one’s habitus. I found that belonging
to a stigmatised minority group has a significant influence on the subjective experience of upward mobility. Habitus dislocation was much more commonly mentioned in the narratives of the Roma interviewees compared to those of majority society interviewees. Furthermore, the role of race is greatly emphasised in the discourses of the interviewees and the renegotiation of habitus during their mobility path, while the movement between classes and its impact on habitus is less frequently described in the narratives. Thus I agree with the assertion of Reay (2004) who claims that habitus should be expanded to include race differences. Furthermore, the intersectional effect of class and race should be included.

Third, the results support the claim of Lahire (2003) and Hadas (2019) that one can have heterogeneous or even contradictory habits, schemes and dispositions due to various socialisation processes. According to my findings, the plurality of dispositions – namely, embodying conflicting dispositions – typically only cause temporary disintegration of individuals’ identity because they usually find a way to reconcile the contradictory dispositions and thus achieve integration again. I found that many of the interviewees were able to reconcile their background of origin and the attained social group by creating a bridge between them; that is, by helping people from the community of their background of origin from their new position. Consequently, the habitus concept should be altered to accept that an individual may have different (even contradictory) dispositions. The possibility of reconciled habitus is an example of habitus with plural (and conflicting) dispositions.

Fourth, I found that our interviewees became highly reflexive to their habitus when they enter into their new social context and a mismatch would arise between their primary habitus and the new world (Bourdieu 1990). As a result of the movement in the social space, they not only recognise what is novel in the new field but it gives them a new lens to look at the field where they come from (Abrahams – Ingram 2013). While Abrahams and Ingram (2013) draw attention to the movement from the working-class to the middle-class, I would like to highlight this increased reflexivity also appears in terms of race as many of our interviewees renegotiated their Roma identity during their mobility trajectory. This increased reflexivity entails that the concept of habitus becomes more useful when it also includes cognitive elements such as identity (Reay 2004).

In sum, this study provides empirical evidence that supports the extension of the Bourdieusian habitus concept in multiple ways. First, this research claims that a more profound transformation of habitus is possible than it is supposed by Bourdieu. Second, habitus is not
only based on class positions, but also racial differences have an effect on it. Third, habitus can consist of several different dispositions (even ambivalent and contradictory dispositions). Fourth, habitus has cognitive aspects as well, that is, the hybridisation of the concepts of habitus and reflexivity is recommended.

6.2.2 Practical implications

In addition to the interviewees’ individual choice, which is related to their particular social position, other factors also played a role in the fact that many of the interviewees started to work in the field of ‘Roma issues’. Based on the narratives of the interviewees, these reasons are discrimination against Roma in the Hungarian labour market, the external impact which directs Roma students to university and college level programmes in the field of social science, social work and other helping professions, their special network, the internship and employment programmes, and tokenism. These factors resulted in the segmentation of the interviewees in the labour market (see: Durst et al. 2016, Nyírő – Durst 2018). On the one hand, those jobs which are connected to ‘Roma issue’ are often mentally and emotionally burdensome and require significant individual effort (Collins 1983). On the other hand, these positions are usually tied to the public or non-profit sector, often involve only a fixed-term contract and thus do not offer career opportunities. Furthermore, these sectors usually offer lower wages than the private sector (see: Nyírő – Durst 2018).

Despite the fact that this career path is a free choice according to the narratives of several of the interviewees, many of them emphasise that more opportunities should be created for those who want to find a job outside the world of "Roma issues" (see: Nyírő – Durst 2018). This goal would be achieved if the impact of the external factors mentioned above (eg discrimination) could be diminished.
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7.2 Interview guideline

Social mobility and ethnicity: Trajectories, outcomes and hidden costs of mobility

Interview guideline

1st stage: Life course

The interviewee is asked to give an account of his/her life course. Questions in the 2nd stage are only to be asked if the interviewee does not provide answers for them spontaneously.

2nd stage: Topical questions

2.1 Family background

- What kind of family do you come from? Could you tell me about your parents? (introduce parents and grandparents, their highest education achieved, their jobs when respondent was at school, their origins, their present jobs) Where do they live? In what kind of environment were you brought up (village, city, among Roma or non-Roma)?

- Could you tell me about your siblings? (how many are there, how many are younger/older, ask about their schooling, job, where they currently live) If the respondent's siblings did not study further: Why do you think they did not?

- It is important to elicit whether the family has ambitions:
  o Was there someone in your family or in your broader environment who was more highly skilled/educated? (not necessary a graduate but someone who stood out by e.g. having been the only one in the village with a certificate of secondary education)
  o If the family moved to Budapest (or any other city) or moved away from a Gypsy settlement: Why do you think your family made that decision?

- From Roma respondents ONLY: Have your parents/extended family had any non-Roma friends, acquaintances or colleagues? If so, how important are those relations in their lives?

2.2 Education

From the beginnings to the certificate of secondary education
- What schools did you go to? About each school (primary, secondary or grammar school) the following questions must be asked:
  o How did you choose your school? Did someone give you advice?
  o What grades did you generally get?
  o From Roma respondents ONLY: Did you have Roma classmates? Who did you make friends with (Roma, non-Roma)?
  o How did you feel at school? Did you experience any negative discrimination coming from the teachers or students? (supportive or hostile atmosphere)
  o Did you have outstanding teachers who you remember fondly, or one you regularly contacted even after completing school? Would you please tell about him/her?
  o Where did you get the idea of studying at a high school or grammar school?
  o How did your family and broader environment react when they found out that you wanted to continue your studies at a high school or grammar school? To what extent did your family support or reject your idea? What did your family think or expect you to be in the future?
- Was there someone during your primary/secondary school years whom you considered as a role model? Could you tell me about him/her?

College/university

- Where did you get the idea to go to college/university?
  o What was your parents’ attitude to education, and specifically, your education? Who told you to continue your studies? Why do you think they did that?
    ▪ Were there any expectations from you as a young woman/man? If there were, what were they?
    ▪ What did your family and the broader community say when you decided to continue your studies? To what extent did they support or reject that idea?
- Did you go from secondary school directly to university? If you did not, what did you do in between?
  o If the respondent did not go to university directly, first ask them what they did after finishing primary/secondary school.
- Why did you choose that major? Did you send in your application to other majors as well?
- Was there someone during your university years whom you considered as a role model? Could you tell me about him/her? Did you have outstanding teachers who you remember fondly, or one you regularly contacted even after completing school? Would you please tell about him/her?

- What difficulties did you have with completing university? What motivations did you have to complete it?

- How did you feel at university? Did you experience any negative discrimination coming from the teachers or students? (supportive or hostile atmosphere)

- From Roma respondents ONLY: Who did you make friends with? (Roma, non-Roma) Did you have fellow students of Roma origin?

- How did you finance your daily life during university years? (Elicit in detail whether the respondent received any scholarships, if so, which type, who supported him/her financially, and whether he/she had to work besides studying)

- From Roma respondents ONLY:
  - Did you take part in any education/supportive programme specifically for Roma people? Did you receive any scholarships (eligible only to Roma people or other)?
  - Were you a member at a Roma college of advanced studies? From which aspects did the programme help (profession, career, living, identity)? Was the participation in programmes disadvantageous in any way?

- From non-Roma respondents ONLY: Did you receive a scholarship during your university years? Did you take part in programmes/trainings targeting to help the disadvantaged persons? If you did, could you tell me about those grants/programmes/trainings?

2.3. Career

- What kind of workplaces have you had so far? (Elicit how the respondent got each job – e.g. by way of relations, employment programmes, etc). If the respondent took part in an employment programme for Roma people, ask about the programme.

- From Roma respondents ONLY, if they work/worked in the field of ‘Roma issues’:
  - Do you work in the field of ‘Roma issues’ as a full-time or a part-time employee, or as a volunteer?
  - How did you come across ‘Roma issues’? Where did you get the idea of doing a job related to ‘Roma issues’? Did it happen by sheer coincidence or did you choose it on purpose?
  - Would you take on a job that supports not specifically Roma people?
If the respondent helps disadvantaged Roma people: What is their attitude towards you? How much do they accept you?

- If the respondent does social work: where did you get the idea to do social work?

- From Roma respondents ONLY: Do you think it is a task of successful Roma people to help the ‘Roma community’? To what extent do you feel it a personal obligation to do something for the ‘Roma community’? How much do you feel that others expect you to help?

- What is your relationship like with your colleagues? To what extent do you feel to ‘fit in’ at your workplace? Have you experienced negative discrimination or have your colleagues accepted you? Have you met any positive discrimination perhaps?

- From Roma respondents ONLY: Do you have Roma colleagues? Do you prefer working with Roma people?

- Have you ever felt at university or at your workplace that you had to work more than others? If you have, could you please tell me about it?

- What does your job mean to you? (elicit dedication)

- To what extent do you think your family, colleagues and broader environment appreciate your work and your professional success?

- How satisfied are you with your present job?

- Are you interested in public affairs? Are you a member of some NGO? If so, why, if not, why not?

2.4. Romantic relationships

- Are you in a relationship? Was/Is it difficult to find a partner?

- How would you describe an ideal partner?

- From Roma respondents ONLY: Have you had a partner of Roma origin? How important is origin to you?
  
  o If the respondent's partner is not a Roma: How did your partner's family react to your partner's choice? How did your family and relations react to your choice of taking someone non-Roma as a partner? If the respondent has never had a Roma partner: What do you think the reason is?
  
  o For Roma respondents: did you deliberately choose a Roma partner (if so, why), or did it only happen by chance?

- How important was it to you to choose a partner of high education?

- How much do you keep to traditional male/female roles? (e.g. housework, raising children)
- Do you have any children? If you do, could you tell me about them? (their age, what they currently do)

- How many children do/did you plan? If the number of children is higher/lower than planned: What is the reason that you have more/fewer children?

- From Roma respondents ONLY: In any regard, do you make sure that your children have a bond with their Roma roots? If so, in which regard?

2.5. Family relations, friendships

- What is your relationship like with your parents, siblings, and extended family (e.g. how often you meet)? How has your relationship with your family and broader (Roma) community change since you started college/university? (make sure to elicit whether going to college/university had any impact on the respondent's relationships)

- Do you support your family in one way or another (it is important to get to know if the respondent supports them financially)? Does your family support you?

- How does your family regard you and treat you (e.g. are they proud, are they distanced)? Have they expected you to become someone you did not want to or did not manage to be? If so, could you please tell me about it?

- From Roma respondents ONLY: Have you ever had the feeling that your family or the ‘Roma community’ do not accept you that much and keep a distance from you since you graduated?

- Have you had periods when you felt lonely or when you had a feeling you did not belong anywhere?

- Do you have a large circle of friends or do you have a tight relationship with only a few people? Where did you meet your friends? Are they Roma or non-Roma?

3rd stage:

3.1. Self-description

- What would you say if you had only one sentence to describe yourself?

- From Roma respondents ONLY:
  - What does your Roma origins mean to you? To what extent do you feel you belong to the Roma community?
  - Who do you consider as Roma?

3.2. Satisfaction, success

- What do you think the things you reached in life can be attributed to?
- What does success mean to you? How successful do you feel? To what extent are you satisfied with the course of your life so far?

- Do you think it was worth spending so much time with studying? How much did you profit from staying in school? Do you think it was worth the effort financially?

### 7.3 Subsample A

The distribution of interviewees in Subsample A according to ethnicity, gender and age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>Roma Man</th>
<th>Roma Woman</th>
<th>Non-Roma Man</th>
<th>Non-Roma Woman</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30 and below</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-39</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 and above</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 7.4 Subsample B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>name</th>
<th>age</th>
<th>job</th>
<th>gender (1: female, 0: male)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ibolya</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>public servant</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ilona</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>psychologist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Róbert</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>communication expert</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>István</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>communication expert</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anna</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Réka</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>minority expert</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarolta</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>NGO manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szulamit</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>health care worker</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csaba</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>primary school teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hedvig</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>kindergarten teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tünde</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>cultural manager</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanga</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>equity expert</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tamás</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>child protection specialist</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mártón</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>historian</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erna</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>primary school teacher</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristóf</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>PhD student</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zsuzsa</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>program director</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>communication expert</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Árpád</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>art teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Etelka</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>social scientist</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Occupation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erika</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>analyst</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lili</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>social worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Júlia</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>university teacher and social worker</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borbála</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>psychologist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dóra</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>archivist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angéla</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>primary school teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luca</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>jurist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flóra</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Béla</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>artist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hanna</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>entrepreneur</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrícia</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>leader of a pro-Roma NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rita</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>university teacher and researcher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zsigmond</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linda</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>communication expert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Márk</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>child protection specialist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anița</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>primary school teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benigna</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>university teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabet</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>public servant, journalist, teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ágnes</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>artist, teacher</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valéria</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>employee of a pro-Roma NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katalin</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>public servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kinga</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>public servant</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zselyke</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>university student (third degree)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enikő</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>employee of a pro-Roma NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alma</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>jurist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adrienn</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>psychologist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evelin</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>journalist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebeka</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>employee of a pro-Roma NGO</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7.5 Figures

Figure 3. Distribution of the total graduate population, first-generation graduates and Roma graduates by age, percentage
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*Source: Central Statistical Office, 2011 census, 2016 micro census, own calculation*

Figure 4. Distribution of the total graduate population, first-generation graduates and Roma graduates by marital status, percentage

![Marital Status Distribution Chart]

*Source: Central Statistical Office, 2011 census, 2016 micro census, own calculation*
Figure 5. Distribution of the total graduate population, first-generation graduates and Roma graduates by number of children, percentage

Source: Central Statistical Office, 2011 census, 2016 micro census, own calculation
### 7.6 Codebook

Note: My study primarily analysed the following code families (code groups): 08. WORK, 09. VOLUNTARY WORK, 10. ROMA ISSUES, 14. SELF-DESCRIPTION, 15. ROMA, 18. ‘FIT IN’, 19. COSTS OF MOBILITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Code definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>00.01. MEMO int fókusza</td>
<td>interjú fókusza kód, ezt az interjú első mondatához kell csatolni azért, hogy a memot hozzá tudjuk kapcsolni az interjúhoz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>00.02. MEMO elméleti</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.01.01. CSD apa iskolázottság</td>
<td>elbeszélések az apa iskolázottságával kapcsolatban pl. iskolai végzettsége; milyen végzettséget szeretett volna; elkezdett, de nem fejezett be vmit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.01.02. CSD apa foglalkozása</td>
<td>elbeszélések az apa munkaerőpiaci pályafutásával kapcsolatban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.01.03. CSD apa származása</td>
<td>elbeszélések az apa etnikai, származási osztályával származásával kapcsolatban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.01.04. CSD apa identitás</td>
<td>elbeszélések az apa identitásával kapcsolatban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.01.05. CSD apa mob</td>
<td>elbeszélések, amelyek az apa földrajzi, társadalmi mob történetével függnek össze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.01.06. CSD apa kapcsolat</td>
<td>az alany apájával való kapcsolatáról szóló elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.01.07. CSD apa egyéb</td>
<td>egyéb az apáról szóló fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.02.01. CSD anya iskolázottság</td>
<td>elbeszélések az anya iskolázottságával kapcsolatban pl. iskolai végzettsége; milyen végzettséget szeretett volna; elkezdett, de nem fejezett be vmit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.02.02. CSD anya foglalkozása</td>
<td>elbeszélések az anya munkaerőpiaci pályafutásával kapcsolatban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.02.03. CSD anya származása</td>
<td>elbeszélések az anya etnikai származásával, származási osztályával kapcsolatban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.02.04. CSD anya identitás</td>
<td>elbeszélések az anya identitásával kapcsolatban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.02.05. CSD anya mob</td>
<td>elbeszélések, amelyek az anya földrajzi, társadalmi mob történetével függnek össze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.02.06. CSD anya kapcsolat</td>
<td>az alany anyjával való kapcsolatáról szóló elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.02.07. CSD anya egyéb</td>
<td>egyéb az anyáról szóló fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.03. CSD műveltség</td>
<td>pl. könyvek, olvasás, programok pl. kiállítás, színház stb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.04.01. CSD szül. gyerekkora</td>
<td>a szül. gyerekkoráról szóló fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.04.02. CSD szül. társadalmi kapcsolatai</td>
<td>interetnikus kapcsolatok, osztályokon, társadalmi rétegeken belüli és osztályokon átnyúló kapcsolatok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.04.03. CSD szül. nevelési elvei</td>
<td>a szülő nevelési elveiről szóló elbeszélések pl. szigorúság</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.05.01. CSD</td>
<td>elbeszélések a ngyszlk iskolázottságával kapcsolatban pl. iskolai végzettsége; milyen végzettséget szeretett volna; elkezdett, de nem fejezett be vmit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.05.02. CSD</td>
<td>elbeszélések a ngyszlk munkaerőpiaci pályafutásával kapcsolatban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.05.03. CSD</td>
<td>elbeszélések a ngyszlk etnikai származásával, származási osztályával kapcsolatban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.05.04. CSD</td>
<td>elbeszélések a ngyszlk identitásával kapcsolatban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.05.05. CSD</td>
<td>elbeszélések, amelyek a ngyszlk földrajzi, társadalmi mob történetével függnek össze</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.05.06. CSD</td>
<td>az alany nagyszüléivel való kapcsolatáról szóló elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.05.07. CSD</td>
<td>egyéb a ngyszlkkról szóló fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.06.01. CSD</td>
<td>elbeszélések a testvérek iskolázottságával kapcsolatban pl. iskolai végzettsége; milyen végzettséget szeretett volna; elkezdett, de nem fejezett be vmit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.06.02. CSD</td>
<td>elbeszélések a testvérek munkaerőpiaci pályafutásával kapcsolatban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.06.03. CSD</td>
<td>testvér hatása az alanyra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.06.04. CSD</td>
<td>egyéb a testvérekről szóló fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.06.05. CSD</td>
<td>egyéb a testvérekről szóló fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.07. CSD</td>
<td>a roma hagyományok tartásáról, nem tartásáról szóló elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.08. CSD</td>
<td>elbeszélések a származási család elfogadásáról, szégyellőséről, rájuk való büszkeségről pl. szegénység, cigányság miatt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.09. CSD</td>
<td>elbeszélések a tágabb rokonságról</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.10. CSD</td>
<td>elbeszélések arról, hogy milyen tudásokat hoz az alany a családjából, amelyeket hasznosnak, extra tőkének tart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.11. CSD</td>
<td>a nemi szerepek felosztása a családban (nem az alany párkapcsolatában, hanem a felmenői esetében) pl. hagyományos nemi szerepek vagy egyenlőség, nemi szerepekkel kapcsolatos elvárások, konfliktusok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01.12. CSD</td>
<td>a családról szóló fontos egyéb elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.01.01. LAK.KÖRNY</td>
<td>településen belüli pl. szegregátumból vagy település széléről máshova, települések közötti költözés gyermekkorban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.01.02. LAK.KÖRNY</td>
<td>falusi, városi lakóhelyről szóló elbeszélések a gyermekkorban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.01.03. LAK.KÖRNY</td>
<td>lakóhelyi szegregációval kapcsolatos gyermekek történetek pl. milyen szegregátumban lakni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.01.04. LAK.KÖRNY</td>
<td>lakóhelyi integrációval kapcsolatos, roma – nem roma szomszédsági viszonyokról szóló gyermekek történetek pl. milyen volt romáként nem romák közöt lakni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.01.05. LAK.KÖRNY</td>
<td>a gyerekkori lakókörnyezettel kapcsolatos egyéb fontos történetek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.01.05.1. LAK.KÖRNY</td>
<td>településen belüli pl. szegregátumból vagy település széléről máshova, települések közötti költözés felnőttkorban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.01.05.2. LAK.KÖRNY</td>
<td>falusi, városi lakóhelyről szóló elbeszélések a felnőttkorban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.01.05.3. LAK.KÖRNY</td>
<td>lakóhelyi szegregációval kapcsolatos felnőttkori történetek pl. milyen szegregátumban lakni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.01.05.4. LAK.KÖRNY</td>
<td>lakóhelyi integrációval kapcsolatos, roma – nem roma szomszédsági viszonyokról szóló felnőttkori történetek pl. milyen romaként nem romák között lakni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.01.05.5. LAK.KÖRNY</td>
<td>a felnőttkori lakókörnyezettel kapcsolatos egyéb fontos történetek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02.03. LAK.KÖRNY</td>
<td>a lakókörnyezetről szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.00. BÖLCSŐDE-ÖVODA</td>
<td>a bölcsődéről, óvodáról szóló elbeszélések (pl. hány éves korában kezdte? Volt-e bölcsi/ovi a lakókörny? Szegregált/integrált? Segített az iskolaválasztásban?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.01. ÁLTISK orientáció, választás, felkészítés, bátorigás</td>
<td>az általános iskola választásának története (pl. személy / program aki befolyásolja, segíti az ált.isk. választását)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.02. ÁLTISK alany hozzáállása, motivációja</td>
<td>alany hozzáállása a tanuláshoz általában az ált.iskolában</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.03. ÁLTISK szül. hozzáállása</td>
<td>szül. hozzáállása a tanuláshoz általában az ált.iskolában</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.04. ÁLTISK intézm.gyak: szegregáció</td>
<td>elbeszélések, amelyek az ált. iskolai szegregációval kapcsolatosak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.04.1. ÁLTISK intézm.gyak: szegregáció</td>
<td>elbeszélések, amelyek az ált. iskolai integrációval kapcsolatosak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.05. ÁLTISK tanárok, nevelők gyakorlata</td>
<td>támogató, befogadó, előítélet, csoportdinamika</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.06. ÁLTISK társak gyakorlata</td>
<td>befogadó, támogató, segítő, érzelmi v. technikai segítség/nehezités</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.07. ÁLTISK sikeresség: tanulás</td>
<td>ált.iskolai sikerek a tanulmányok terén pl. jó tanuló, versenyeket nyer stb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.07.1. ÁLTISK sikeresség: tanulás</td>
<td>a tanárokkal, diáktársakkal lévő kapcsolatok terén elért sikerek az ált.iskolában pl. jól beilleszkedik, társaságot talál, jó viszonyban van egy/ több tanárral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.07.2. ÁLTISK sikeresség: kapcsok</td>
<td>minden egyéb ált.iskolához kapcsolódó siker az ált. és középisk.-ban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.07.3. ÁLTISK sikeresség: egyéb</td>
<td>minden egyéb ált.iskolához kapcsolódó siker az ált. és középisk.-ban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.08. ÁLTISK nehézségek: tanulás</td>
<td>tanulási nehézségek az ált. és középisk.-ban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.08.1. ÁLTISK nehézségek: tanulás</td>
<td>nehézségek a tanárokkal, diáktársakkal lévő kapcsolatokban az ált. és középisk.-ban pl. csúfolás, kirekesztés stb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.08.2. ÁLTISK nehézség: kapcsok</td>
<td>minden egyéb ált.iskolai nehézség az ált. és középisk.-ban pl. anyagiak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.09. ÁLTISK mentor, segítő tanár</td>
<td>nem a példaképről, hanem az aktív segítőkről szóló elbeszélések az ált.iskola időszakában, nem csak iskolai, hanem iskolán kívüli segítők is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.10. ÁLTISK finanszírozása</td>
<td>ki és hogyan finanszírozta az alany életét pl. étkezés, tankönyv, szabadidő, tanulmányai, az ált.iskolában, nehézségek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.11. ÁLTISK motiváció</td>
<td>elbeszélések az alanynak az iskola elvégzésére irányuló motivációjáról</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.12. ÁLTISK ösztöndíjak</td>
<td>elbeszélések az ösztöndíjakról pl. milyen ösztöndíjakat kapott, mire használta fel azokat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03.13. ÁLTISK egyéb</td>
<td>az ált. iskoláról szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.02. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. család viszonyulása</td>
<td>mit szólt a család ahhoz, hogy az adott iskola típusban tanul tovább az alany, tehát, hogy ezen az oktatási szinten tanul tovább</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.03. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. közösség viszonyulása</td>
<td>mit szólt a tágabb környezet ahhoz, hogy az adott iskola típusban tanul tovább az alany, tehát, hogy ezen az oktatási szinten tanul tovább</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.04. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. kortársak viszonyulása</td>
<td>mit szóltak a kortársai, barátaai ahhoz, hogy az adott iskola típusban tanul tovább az alany, tehát, hogy ezen az oktatási szinten tanul tovább - minden az ált. isk. utáni érettségít, diplomát nem adó iskolatípus ide tartozik pl. szakiskola, OKJ-s képzés, felnőttképzés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.05. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. alany hozzáállása, motivációja</td>
<td>alany hozzáállása a tanuláshoz és a tanuláshoz/tanult szakmához az iskolában</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.06. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. szül. hozzáállása</td>
<td>szüll. hozzáállása a tanuláshoz általában az iskolában - minden az ált. isk. utáni érettségít, diplomát nem adó iskolatípus ide tartozik pl. szakiskola, OKJ-s képzés, felnőttképzés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.07.01. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. intézm.gyak: szegregáció</td>
<td>elbeszélések, amelyek az iskolai szegregációval kapcsolatosak - minden az ált. isk. utáni érettségít, diplomát nem adó iskolatípus ide tartozik pl. szakiskola, OKJ-s képzés, felnőttképzés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.07.02. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. intézm.gyak: integráció</td>
<td>elbeszélések, amelyek az iskolai integrációval kapcsolatosak - minden az ált. isk. utáni érettségít, diplomát nem adó iskolatípus ide tartozik pl. szakiskola, OKJ-s képzés, felnőttképzés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.08. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. tanárok, nevelők gyakorlata</td>
<td>támogató, befogadó, előítélet, csoportdinamika - minden az ált. isk. utáni érettségit, diplomát nem adó iskolatípus ide tartozik pl. szakiskola, OKJ-s képzés, felnőttképzés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.09. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. társak gyakorlata</td>
<td>befogadó, támogató, segítő, érzelmi v. technikai segítség/nehezítés - minden az ált. isk. utáni érettséget, diplomát nem adó iskolatípus ide tartozik pl. szakiskola, OKJ-s képzés, felnőttképzés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.10.01. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. sikeresség: tanulás</td>
<td>sikerek a tanulmányok terén pl. jó tanuló, versenyeket nyer stb. - minden az ált. isk. utáni érettséget, diplomát nem adó iskolatípus ide tartozik pl. szakiskola, OKJ-s képzés, felnőttképzés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.10.02. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. sikeresség: kapcsok</td>
<td>a tanárakkal, diákátszakkal lévő kapcsolatok terén elért sikerek az iskolában pl. jól beilleszkedik, társaságot talál, jó viszonyban van egy/több tanárral - minden az ált. isk. utáni érettségét, diplomát nem adó iskolatípus ide tartozik pl. szakiskola, OKJ-s képzés, felnőttképzés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.10.03. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. sikeresség: egyéb</td>
<td>minden egyéb iskolához kapcsolódó siker az adott isk.-ban - minden az ált. isk. utáni érettséget, diplomát nem adó iskolatípus ide tartozik pl. szakiskola, OKJ-s képzés, felnőttképzés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.11.01. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. nehézségek: tanulás</td>
<td>tanulási nehézségek az isk.-ban - minden az ált. isk. utáni érettséget, diplomát nem adó iskolatípus ide tartozik pl. szakiskola, OKJ-s képzés, felnőttképzés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.11.02. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. nehézségek: kapcsok</td>
<td>nehézségek a tanárokkal, diákátszakkal lévő kapcsolatokban az isk.-ban pl. csülőfája, kirekesztés stb. - minden az ált. isk. utáni érettségét, diplomát nem adó iskolatípus ide tartozik pl. szakiskola, OKJ-s képzés, felnőttképzés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.11.03. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. nehézségek: egyéb</td>
<td>minden egyéb iskolai nehézség az isk.-ban pl. anyagiak - minden az ált. isk. utáni érettséget, diplomát nem adó iskolatípus ide tartozik pl. szakiskola, OKJ-s képzés, felnőttképzés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.12. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. mentor, segítő tanár</td>
<td>nem a példaképről, hanem az aktív segítőkről szóló elbeszélések az iskola időszaakában, nem csak iskolai, hanem iskolán kívüli segítők is - minden az ált. isk. utáni érettségét, diplomát nem adó iskolatípus ide tartozik pl. szakiskola, OKJ-s képzés, felnőttképzés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.13. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. finanszírozása</td>
<td>ki és hogyan finanszírozza az alany életét, tanulmányait az iskolában, nehézségek, pl. ösztöndíjak, lehetőségek, munkák - minden az ált. isk. utáni érettségét, diplomát nem adó iskolatípus ide tartozik pl. szakiskola, OKJ-s képzés, felnőttképzés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.14. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. motiváció</td>
<td>elbeszélések az alanynak az iskola elvégzésére irányuló motiváciájáról - minden az ált. isk. utáni érettségét, diplomát nem adó iskolatípus ide tartozik pl. szakiskola, OKJ-s képzés, felnőttképzés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.15. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. ösztöndíjak</td>
<td>elbeszélések az ösztöndíjjakról pl. milyen ösztöndíjjakat kapott, mire használta fel azokat - minden az ált. isk. utáni érettségét, diplomát nem adó iskolatípus ide tartozik pl. szakiskola, OKJ-s képzés, felnőttképzés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04.16. ÉRETTS NEM ADÓ ISK, OKJ STB. egyéb</td>
<td>minden az ált. isk. utáni érettségit, diplomát nem adó iskolátípusról (pl. szakiskola, OKJ-s képzés, felnöttképzés) szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.01. KÖZÉPISK orientáció, választás, felkészítés, bátorítás</td>
<td>a középiskola választás története pl. ki és hogyan találta ki, hogy milyen középiskolába, menjen az alany vagy evidens volt? ki választott középiskolát? Mi alapján? - csak az érettségit adó középfokú iskolátípusok tartoznak ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.02. KÖZÉPISK család viszonyulása</td>
<td>mit szólt a család ahhoz, hogy középisk-san tanul tovább az alany, tehát, hogy ezen az oktatási szinten tanul tovább - csak az érettségit adó középfokú iskolátípusok tartoznak ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.03. KÖZÉPISK közösség viszonyulása</td>
<td>mit szólt a tágabb környezet ahhoz, hogy középisk-san tanul tovább az alany, tehát, hogy ezen az oktatási szinten tanul tovább</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.04. KÖZÉPISK kortársak viszonyulása</td>
<td>mit szóltak a kortársai, barátai ahhoz, hogy középisk-san tanul tovább az alany, tehát, hogy ezen az oktatási szinten tanul tovább - csak az érettségit adó középfokú iskolátípusok tartoznak ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.05. KÖZÉPISK alany hozzáállása, motivációja</td>
<td>alany hozzáállása a tanuláshoz és a tanuláshoz/tanult szakmához a középiskolában - csak az érettségit adó középfokú iskolátípusok tartoznak ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.06. KÖZÉPISK szül. hozzáállása</td>
<td>szül. hozzáállása a tanuláshoz/általánban a középiskolában - csak az érettségit adó középfokú iskolátípusok tartoznak ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.07.01. KÖZÉPISK intézm.gyak: szegregáció</td>
<td>elbeszélések, amelyek a középiskolai szegregációval kapcsolatosak - csak az érettségit adó középfokú iskolátípusok tartoznak ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.07.02. KÖZÉPISK intézm.gyak: integráció</td>
<td>elbeszélések, amelyek a középiskolai integrációval kapcsolatosak - csak az érettségit adó középfokú iskolátípusok tartoznak ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.08. KÖZÉPISK tanárok, nevelők gyakorlata</td>
<td>támogató, befogadó, előítélet, csoportdynamika - csak az érettségit adó középfokú iskolátípusok tartoznak ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.09. KÖZÉPISK társak gyakorlata</td>
<td>befogadó, támogató, segítő, érzelmi v. technikai segítség/nehezítés - csak az érettségit adó középfokú iskolátípusok tartoznak ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.10.01. KÖZÉPISK sikeresség: tanulás</td>
<td>ált. és középiskolai síkerek a tanulmányok terén pl. jó tanuló, versenyeket nter stb. - csak az érettségit adó középfokú iskolátípusok tartoznak ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.10.02. KÖZÉPISK sikeresség: kapcsok</td>
<td>a tanárokkal, diáktársakkal lévő kapcsolatok terén elért síkerek az ált. és középiskolában pl. jól beilleszkedik, társaságot talál, jó viszonyban van egy/ több tanárral - csak az érettségit adó középfokú iskolátípusok tartoznak ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.10.03. KÖZÉPISK sikeresség: egyéb</td>
<td>minden egyéb iskolához kapcsolódó síker az középisk.-ban - csak az érettségit adó középfokú iskolátípusok tartoznak ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.11.01. KÖZÉPISK nehézségek: tanulás</td>
<td>tanulási nehézségek az középisk.-ban - csak az érettségit adó középfokú iskolátípusok tartoznak ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.11.02. KÖZÉPISKnehézség: kapcsok</td>
<td>nehézségek a tanárokkal, diáktársakkal lévő kapcsolatokban a középisk.-ban pl. csúfolás, kirekesztés stb. - csak az érettségit adó középfokú iskolatípusok tartoznak ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.11.03. KÖZÉPISKnehézség: egyéb</td>
<td>minden egyéb iskolai nehézség az középisk.-ban pl. anyagiak - csak az érettségit adó középfokú iskolatípusok tartoznak ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.12. KÖZÉPISK mentor, segítő tanár</td>
<td>nem a példaképről, hanem az aktív segítőkről szóló elbeszélések a középiskola időszakában, nem csak iskolai, hanem iskolán kívüli segítők is - csak az érettségit adó középfokú iskolatípusok tartoznak ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.13. KÖZÉPISK finanszírozása</td>
<td>ki és hogyan finanszírozta az alany életét, tanulmányait az középiskolában, nehézségek, pl. ösztöndíjak, lehetőségek, munkák - csak az érettségit adó középfokú iskolatípusok tartoznak ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.14. KÖZÉPISK motiváció</td>
<td>elbeszélések az alanynak az iskola elvégzésére irányuló motíváciájáról - csak az érettségit adó középfokú iskolatípusok tartoznak ide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.15. KÖZÉPISK ösztöndíjak</td>
<td>elbeszélések az ösztöndíjakról pl. milyen ösztöndíjakat kapott, mire használta fél azokat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05.16. KÖZÉPISK egyéb</td>
<td>a középiskoláról szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.01. FELSŐOKT választása</td>
<td>a felsőoktatás választásának története pl. ki találta ki, hogy a felsőoktatásba menjen az alany vagy evidens volt? Miért jelentkezett? ki választott intézményt, milyen intézményt, miért azt? ki választott szakot? milyen szakot, miért azt?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.02. FELSŐOKT család viszonyulása</td>
<td>mit szólt a család ahhoz, hogy továbbtanul az egyetemen, főiskolán, tehát, hogy ezen az oktatási szinten tanul tovább</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.03. FELSŐOKT közösség viszonyulása</td>
<td>mit szólt a tágabb környezet ahhoz, hogy továbbtanul az egyetemen, főiskolán, tehát, hogy ezen az oktatási szinten tanul tovább</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.04. FELSŐOKT kortársak viszonyulása</td>
<td>mit szóltak a kortársai, barátaí ahhoz, hogy továbbtanul az egyetemen, főiskolán, tehát, hogy ezen az oktatási szinten tanul tovább</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.05. FELSŐOKT alany hozzáállása, motivációja</td>
<td>alany hozzáállása a tanuláshoz általában az egyetemen, főiskolán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.06. FELSŐOKT mentor, segítő tanár</td>
<td>nem a példaképről, hanem az aktív segítőkről szóló elbeszélések az egyetemen, főiskolán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.06.1 FELSŐOKT orientáció</td>
<td>pálya/szakma választási tanácsadás, orientáció</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.07.01. FELSŐOKT sikereség: tanulás</td>
<td>sikerek a tanulmányok terén a felsőoktatásban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.07.02. FELSŐOKT sikereség: kapcsok</td>
<td>a tanárokkal, diáktársakkal lévő kapcsolatok terén elért sikerek a felsőoktatásban pl. jól beilleszkedik, társaságot találl, jó viszonyban van egy/ több tanárral</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.07.03. FELSŐOKT</td>
<td>minden egyéb felsőoktatáshoz kapcsolódó siker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.08.01. FELSŐOKT</td>
<td>tanulási nehézségek a felsőoktatásban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.08.02. FELSŐOKT</td>
<td>nehézségek a tanárokkal, diákta汞kakal lévő kapcsolatokban a felsőoktatásban pl. nem talál társaságot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.08.03. FELSŐOKT</td>
<td>minden egyéb iskolai nehézség a felsőoktatásban pl. anyagiak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.09. FELSŐOKT</td>
<td>elbeszélések az ösztöndíjakról pl. milyen ösztöndíjakat kapott, mire használta fel azokat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.10. FELSŐOKT</td>
<td>ki és hogyan finanszírozta az alany életét, tanulmányait az egyetemen, főiskolán, nehézségek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.11. FELSŐOKT</td>
<td>munka, szakmai gyakorlat és egyetemi/főisk.-i tanulmányok összeegyeztetéséről, annak nehézségeiről szóló elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.12. FELSŐOKT</td>
<td>továbbtanulás az első diploma/absz. megszerzése után pl. hogy jött az ötlet, miért tanult tovább, mit tanult stb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.13. FELSŐOKT</td>
<td>elbeszélések az alanynak az egyetem/főiskola elvégzésére irányuló motivációjáról</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06.14. FELSŐOKT</td>
<td>a felsőoktatásról szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.01. MOBIL.PROG.</td>
<td>elbeszélése arról, hogy hogyan került az alany kapcsolatba a programmal, honnan hallott róla, hogyan sikerült bejutnia a programba stb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.02. MOBIL.PROG.</td>
<td>mobilitást segítő program, ösztöndíj az általános iskolában</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.03. MOBIL.PROG.</td>
<td>mobilitást segítő program, ösztöndíj a középiskolában</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.04. MOBIL.PROG.</td>
<td>mobilitást segítő program, ösztöndíj a felsőoktatásban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.05. MOBIL.PROG.</td>
<td>pl. foglalkoztatási programokban vagy olyan programokban való részvétel, amelynek nem feltétele, hogy közben iskolába, felsőoktatásba is járjon az illető pl. felvételi előkészítő</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.06. MOBIL.PROG.</td>
<td>elbeszélések a program szakmai téren nyújtott segítségével kapcsolatban pl. iskolai előremenetel, továbbtanulás, karrier terén kapott segítség</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.07. MOBIL.PROG.</td>
<td>elbeszélések a program révén kialakult baráti kapcsolatokkal, közösséggel kapcsolatban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.08.01. MOBIL.PROG.</td>
<td>elbeszélések arról, hogy a programban való részvétel hogyan formálta az alany identitását, illetve arról, hogy milyen identitásstratégiait közvetített az alany számára a program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.08.02. MOBIL.PROG.</td>
<td>elbeszélések arról, hogy a programban való részvétel milyen hatással volt az alany életében a mobilitás költségeire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.08.03. MOBIL.PROG.</td>
<td>elbeszélések arról, hogy a program igyekezett a romaügy felé irányítani az alanyt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dátum</td>
<td>Cím</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.09.</td>
<td>MOBIL.PROG. értékelés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07.10.</td>
<td>MOBIL.PROG. egyéb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.01.</td>
<td>MNKA karrier</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.02.</td>
<td>MNKA munkakeresés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.03.</td>
<td>MNKA munkához jutás ok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.04.</td>
<td>MNKA munkanélkülség</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.05.01.</td>
<td>MNKA célja: kitörés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.05.02.</td>
<td>MNKA célja: önmegvalósítás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.05.03.</td>
<td>MNKA célja: öngyógyítás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.05.04.</td>
<td>MNKA célja: hivatástudat, segítségszínvonalat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.05.05.</td>
<td>MNKA célja: egyéb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.05.06.</td>
<td>MNKA célja: változás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.06.</td>
<td>MNKA továbbképzés</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.07.01.</td>
<td>MNKA sikereség: szakmai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.07.02.</td>
<td>MNKA sikereség: kapcsolat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.07.03.</td>
<td>MNKA sikereség: egyéb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.08.01.</td>
<td>MNKA nehézségek: szakmai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.08.02.</td>
<td>MNKA nehézségek: kapcsolat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.08.03.</td>
<td>MNKA nehézségek: egyéb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.09.</td>
<td>MNKA kapcsolat: etnikai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>08.10.</td>
<td>MNKA állásszínvonalas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>08.11. MNKA megfelelősége</strong></td>
<td>elbeszélések arról, hogy mennyire érzi az alany végzettségeinek, képességeinek megfelelőnek az állását, mennyire elégedett a munkájával</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>08.12. MNKA karrier kilátások</strong></td>
<td>elbeszélések arról, hogy tud-e fejlődni szakmailag /előre jutni a karrierlétrán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>08.13. MNKA karrierváltás</strong></td>
<td>elbeszélések bármilyen jellegű karrierváltásról pl. értelmiségi pályáról fizikai pályára lépés, civil szférából versenyszférába való átlépés stb.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>08.14. MNKA munkahelyváltás</strong></td>
<td>elbeszélések a munkahely váltásról (a korábbi karrierpályán maradás de munkahelyváltás)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>08.15. MNKA egyéb</strong></td>
<td>a munkáról szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>09.01. ÖNKÉNT. találkozás</strong></td>
<td>hogyan lett önkéntes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>09.02. ÖNKÉNT. munka</strong></td>
<td>hol, milyen munkát végez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>09.03. ÖNKÉNT. motiváció</strong></td>
<td>miért foglalkozik az adott üggyel? mi motiválja?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>09.04.01. ÖNKÉNT. célja: önmegvalósítás</strong></td>
<td>önmegvalósítás motiválja az önkéntes munkájában</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>09.04.02. ÖNKÉNT. célja: öngyógyítás</strong></td>
<td>az önkéntes munka terápiás funkcióval bír, identitás megtalálását, stabilizálódását eredményezi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>09.04.03. ÖNKÉNT. célja: hivatástudat, segítségnyújtás</strong></td>
<td>az önkéntes munkának morális célt tulajdonít, egy közösségért dolgozik, mások megsegítése motiválja a munkájában</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>09.04.04. ÖNKÉNT. célja: egyéb</strong></td>
<td>egyéb dolog motiválja az önkéntes munkában</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>09.05. ÖNKÉNT. egyéb</strong></td>
<td>az önkéntes munkáról szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.01. ROMAÜGY találkozás</strong></td>
<td>hogyan került a romaügy területére a munkája, tanulmányai során</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.02. ROMAÜGY munka</strong></td>
<td>hol, milyen munkát végez, mi motiválja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.03. ROMAÜGY motiváció</strong></td>
<td>miért foglalkozik romaügygel? mi motiválja?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.04. ROMAÜGY elkerülése</strong></td>
<td>elbeszélések arról, hogy elkerüli/szeretné elkerülni az alanya romáigényben dolgozást</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.05. ROMAÜGY feladata a romáknak</strong></td>
<td>az alany véleménye arról, hogy feladata-e neki/ a sikeres romáknak tenni a roma közösségért, hogyan éli meg, amikor mások ezt az elvárást támasztják vele/ a sikeres romákkal szemben</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.06. ROMAÜGY viszony</strong></td>
<td>hogyan viszonyul ahhoz, hogy a romaügy területén dolgozik</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.07.01. ROMAÜGY munka célja: önmegvalósítás</strong></td>
<td>önmegvalósítás motiválja a romaügy terén dolgozásban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.07.02. ROMAÜGY munka célja: öngyógyítás</strong></td>
<td>a romaügy területén való munka terápiás funkcióval bír, identitás megtalálását, stabilizálódását eredményezi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.07.03. ROMAÜGY munka célja: hivatástudat, segítségnyújtás</strong></td>
<td>a romaügy területén való munkának morális célt tulajdonít, egy közösségért dolgozik, mások megsegítése motiválja a munkájában</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.07.04. ROMAÜGY munka célja: egyéb</strong></td>
<td>egyéb dolog motiválja a romaügy területén való munkában</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.08. ROMAÜGY munka nehézségei</td>
<td>a romaügy területén való munka nehézségeiről szóló elbeszélések pl. kiegés, alacsony jövedelem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.09. ROMAÜGY tanulmányok</td>
<td>elbeszélések arról, hogy az alany tanulmányai (pl. egyetemi szakja, szakdolgozata, egyéb dolgozata) a romaügygal kapcsolatos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.10. ROMAÜGY egyéb</td>
<td>a romaügyről szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.01. PÁRKAP ideális partner</td>
<td>milyen az ideális partner az alany számára?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.02. PÁRKAP származás szerepe</td>
<td>mennyire fontos? partner saját etnikai csoportból, más kisebbségből?, ha van, megjelenik-e a páрокapcsolati dinamikában a különböző társadalmi háttér</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.03. PÁRKAP iskolázottság szerepe</td>
<td>mennyire fontos a partner iskolai végzettsége?, ha van: mennyire jelenik meg a páрокapcsolati dinamikában a különböző iskolai végzettség</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.04. PÁRKAP család hozzáállása</td>
<td>család hozzáállása a választott partnerhez, a partner családjának hozzáállása az alanyhoz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.05. PÁRKAP szül. páрокapcsolata</td>
<td>hogyan tekint a szülei páрокapcsolatára, a saját párválasztási “szokások”, páрокapcsolat és a szülői “szokások”, páрокapcsolat összehasonlításáról szóló elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.06. PÁRKAP nemi szerepek</td>
<td>a nemi szerepek felosztása a kapcsolatban pl. hagyományos nemi szerepek vagy egyenlőség, nemi szerepekkel kapcsolatos elvárások, konfliktusok</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.07. PÁRKAP hetero- és homoszexualitás</td>
<td>a hetero és homoszexualitásról szóló elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.08. PÁRKAP és munka összeegyeztetése</td>
<td>család és munka összeegyeztetésének stratégiája, nehézségei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.09. PÁRKAP nehézségek</td>
<td>a páрокapcsolati problémákról pl. konfliktusokról, válásról szóló elbeszélések; a problémák leküzdéséről szóló elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.10. PÁRKAP sikerek</td>
<td>a páрокapcsolat pozitívumairól szóló elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.11. PÁRKAP nők elleni erőszak</td>
<td>a nők elleni erőszakról szóló elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.12. PÁRKAP norma</td>
<td>normák a páрокapcsolattal kapcsolatban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.13. PÁRKAP párkeresés</td>
<td>párkeresésről szóló elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.14. PÁRKAP egyéb</td>
<td>a páрокapcsolatról szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.01. GYEREK gyermektelenség</td>
<td>az alany gyermekvállalási nehézségeiről, gyermektelenségéről szóló elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.02. GYEREK gyereknevelési elvek, gyakorlatok</td>
<td>elbeszélések arról, hogy milyen elvek, értékek mentén és hogyan neveli az alany a gyerekeit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.03.01 GYEREK képzés: jelen</td>
<td>a gyerek jelenlegi képzéséről pl. iskola, különórák szóló elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.03.02 GYEREK képzés: jövő</td>
<td>a gyerek jövőbeli képzéséről, karrierpályájáról pl. iskola, különórák szóló tervek, vágyak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.04. GYEREK anyaság</td>
<td>az alany/a partner anyaságáról szóló elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.05. GYEREK apaság</td>
<td>az alany/a partner apaságáról szóló elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.06. GYEREK gyökerek</td>
<td>a származás, gyökerek hangsúlyozása a gyerekek számára, e kapcsolatok ápolása a gyerekkel közösen pl. szegénység, cigándyság kapcsán</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.07. GYEREK egyéb</td>
<td>a gyerekről szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.01. KAPCSOK közeli családtagokkal</td>
<td>közeli családtagokkal való felnőttkori kapcsolatokról szóló elbeszélések pl. minőség, gyakoriság</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.02. KAPCSOK tágabb családdal</td>
<td>tágabb családdal való felnőttkori kapcsolatokról szóló elbeszélések pl. minőség, gyakoriság</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.03. KAPCSOK magas isk.végz. hatása</td>
<td>főiskolára/egyetemre járás hatása - a családtagokkal, barátokkal, ismerősökkel való – kapcsolataira, a származási közösséggel, roma közösséggel való kapcsolatára</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.04. KAPCSOK támogatás nyújtás</td>
<td>anyagi, érzelmi és egyéb támogatás nyújtása a származási család, tágabb rokonság részére, személyes ilyen jellegű elválaszokkal, ezzel kapcsolatos büntetés – felnőtt korban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.05. KAPCSOK támogatás kapás</td>
<td>anyagi, érzelmi és egyéb támogatás kapása, nem kapása, hiánya a családtól felnőtt korban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.06. KAPCSOK barátok</td>
<td>az alany baráti kapcsolatairól szóló elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.07. KAPCSOK intraetnikus szolidaritás</td>
<td>elbeszélések az etnikai csoporton belüli segítő kapcsolatokról, szolidaritásról, kik (a saját etnikai csoportból) és hová támogatták a pályáját, életét</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.08. KAPCSOK interetnikus szolidaritás</td>
<td>elbeszélések az etnikai csoportok közötti segítő kapcsolatokról, szolidaritásról, kik (nem a saját etnikai csoportból) és hová támogatták a pályáját, életét</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.09. KAPCSOK egyéb</td>
<td>a kapcsolatokról szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.00. ÖNJELLEMZÉS</td>
<td>az interjúalany jellemzése saját magáról</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.01. ÖNJELLEMZÉS példakép</td>
<td>az interjúalany mint példakép, nem példakép</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.01. ROMA identitás</td>
<td>mit jelent az alany számára, hogy roma származású, mennyire érzi magát a roma közösség részének, milyen identitásstratégiát folytat?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.02. ROMA származás fel nem fedése</td>
<td>roma származása szégyellése, szituációfüggően roma-nem roma identitás felfedése/elrejtése pl. munkahelyen nem fedi fel a származását, de baráti közösemben igen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.03. ROMA büszkeség</td>
<td>elbeszélések a roma identitásra való büszkeséggel kapcsolatban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.04. ROMA identitás alakulása</td>
<td>elbeszélések a roma identitás időbeli változásáról, identitáskonfliktus és annak megoldása, identitásra találás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.05. ROMA láthatóság</td>
<td>elbeszélések arról, hogy látszik/nem látszik az alanny a származása, mivel jár ez számára?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.06. ROMA meghatározása</td>
<td>elbeszélések arról, hogy az alany kit tekint romának</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.07. ROMA egyéb</td>
<td>a roma identitásról szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.01. SIKERESSÉG oka</td>
<td>minek köszönheti, amit élért az életében?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.02. SIKERESSÉG érzése</td>
<td>mit jelent számára a sikeresség? mennyire érzi magát sikeresnek, élégedettné? miért?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.03. SIKERESSÉG elismertség</td>
<td>a család, tágabb környezet általi elismerésről szóló elbeszélések pl. mennyire ismerik el? úgy érzi, hogy kellően elismerik?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.04. SIKERESSÉG egyéb</td>
<td>a sikerességről szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.01.01. MOB pálya: szülő beteljesített ványa</td>
<td>az alany mobilitási pályájáról – továbbtanulásáról/bizonyos szakma választásáról – a szülő beteljesített vágyaként mesél</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.01.02. MOB pálya: szül. elvárásai</td>
<td>milyenek a szülők elvárásai a tanulással, tanulmányokkal, karrierrel, tehát a mobilitási pályával kapcsolatban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.02.01. MOB referenciapont: példakép</td>
<td>elbeszélések az alany példaképével kapcsolatban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.02.02. MOB referenciapont: kiemelkedett családfő</td>
<td>a családban magasabb képzettségű, magasabb műveltségű ember hatása az alany gyerekkorában</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.02.03. MOB referenciapont: kiemelkedett ismerős</td>
<td>ismerősök között magasabb képzettségű, magasabb műveltségű ember hatása az alany gyerekkorában</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.02.04. MOB referenciapont: hidszerű ismeretségek</td>
<td>annak hatása, hogy a család vagy az alany kapcsolatba került vele nem azonos társadalmi rétegbe tartozó emberekkel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.03. MOB segítő személy</td>
<td>elbeszélések az alany mobilitását segítő személyekkel kapcsolatban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.04. MOB ngyszámk stratégiaja</td>
<td>elbeszélések a nagyszülők törekvéséről, stratégiájáról az előrejutasára, beilleszkedésre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.05. MOB apa stratégiaja</td>
<td>elbeszélések az apa törekvéséről, stratégiájáról az előrejutasára, beilleszkedésre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.06. MOB anya stratégiaja</td>
<td>elbeszélések az anya törekvéséről, stratégiájáról az előrejutasára, beilleszkedésre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.07. MOB tesó stratégiaja</td>
<td>elbeszélések a testvér törekvéséről, stratégiájáról az előrejutasára, beilleszkedésre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.08. MOB saját stratégia</td>
<td>elbeszélések az alany törekvéséről, stratégiájáról az előrejutasára, pl. roma/nem roma közösségben vagy szituációfüggően változatja az öltözködését, beszédmódját, vagyis az önérezperezentációját</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.09. MOB pozitív diszkrimináció</td>
<td>pozitív diszkriminációról alkotott vélemény, annak megtapasztalása</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.10. MOB egyéb</td>
<td>a sikerességről szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.01. BEILL közösségre találás</td>
<td>elbeszélések a tágabb társadalmi környezetbe – pl. középosztálybeli, értelmségi közegebe – való beilleszkedésről, a saját, mások asszimilációjához való viszonyról</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.02. BEILL hova</td>
<td>elbeszélések arról, hogy melyik társadalmi csoportnak, rétegnél tartja magát a tagjának vagy szeretne a tagja lenni</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.03. BEILL segítsői</td>
<td>elbeszélések a tágabb társadalmi környezetbe való beilleszkedést segítő személyekről</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.04. BEILL sikerei</td>
<td>a beilleszkedés sikerei</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.05. BEILL egyéb</td>
<td>a beilleszkedésről szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.01. KÖLTSÉG kisebbségi érzés</td>
<td>kishitűségről, önbizalomhiányról, kisebbségi érzésről szóló elbeszélések, ezzel való megbirkózás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.02. KÖLTSÉG kiégés</td>
<td>munkahelyi kiégésről szóló elbeszélések, ezzel való megbirkózás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.03. KÖLTSÉG túteljesítés</td>
<td>elbeszélések arról az érzésről, hogy többet kell teljesíteni, mint másoknak, ezzel való megbirkózás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.04. KÖLTSÉG eltávolodás a családtól, közösségtől, konfliktusok</td>
<td>kapcsolat, normák, értékek eltávolodása, emiatt kialakuló konfliktusok, pl. a környezet elmagyarázatnak, nagyképűnek tekinti az alanyt, ezzel való megbirkózás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.05. KÖLTSÉG magány, kiekesztettség, sehova tatozás</td>
<td>magány, kirekesztettség, talajtalanság, sehova sem tartozás érzése, ezzel való megbirkózás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.06. KÖLTSÉG túlzott felelősség</td>
<td>túlzott felelősség érzése a saját közösség felé vagy saját magával azonos helyzetűek felé, ezzel való megbirkózás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.07. KÖLTSÉG többségi tásadalom elutasítása</td>
<td>a többségi társadalom elutasításának megtagadása, ezzel való megbirkózás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.08. KÖLTSÉG üvegplafon</td>
<td>az alany úgy vél, hogy az előmenetele egy szervezet hierarchiáján belül csak egy bizonyos szintig lehetséges, ezzel való megbirkózás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.09. KÖLTSÉG mentális betegségek</td>
<td>mentális betegségek, ezekkel való megbirkózás</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.10. KÖLTSÉG egyéb</td>
<td>a mobilitás (pszichológiai) költségeiről szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.01. ELŐÍTÉL strukturális diszkrimináció</td>
<td>elbeszélések az intézményes rasszizmustól, diszkriminációról</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.02. ELŐÍTÉL személyes diszkrimináció</td>
<td>elbeszélések a személyes diszkriminációról</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.03. ELŐÍTÉL ált. és középiskola</td>
<td>diszkrimináció és előítéletek megtapasztalása általános- és középiskolában</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.04. ELŐÍTÉL felsőokt</td>
<td>diszkrimináció és előítéletek megtapasztalása/ meg nem tapasztalása a felsőoktatásban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.05. ELŐÍTÉL munkahely</td>
<td>diszkrimináció és előítéletek megtapasztalása/ meg nem tapasztalása a munkahelyen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.06. ELŐÍTÉL magánélet</td>
<td>diszkrimináció és előítéletek megtapasztalása/ meg nem tapasztalása nem iskolában, nem munkahelyen pl. üzletekben, baráti társaságban, hivatalokban, szórakozás stb. során</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.07. ELŐÍTÉL önvédelem, küzdelem</td>
<td>azok az elbeszélések, amikor az alany kiáll, nem áll ki a diszkriminációval, előítéletekkel szemben, kiáll/nem áll ki saját magáért/a közösségéért, előítéletek hatására fogadja el a származását, hogyan változnak e stratégiák</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.08. ELŐÍTÉL vélemény</td>
<td>az előítéletesességről alkotott általános vélemény, mekkora milyen előítéletek vannak itthon, a világban, miért?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.08. ELŐÍTÉL egyéb</td>
<td>az előítéletekről, diszkriminációról szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.01.01. ANYAGI HELYZET jellemzése gyerekkorban</td>
<td>szubjektív vagy objektív jellemzés is, jövedelem, vagyon pl. lakás a gyerekkorban, milyenek élte meg az anyagi helyzetét gyerekkorában?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.01.02. ANYAGI HELYZET jellemzése felnőttkorban</td>
<td>szubjektív vagy objektív jellemzés is, jövedelem, vagyon pl. lakás, milyenek éli meg az anyagi helyzetét felnőttként?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.02. ANYAGI HELYZET egyéb</td>
<td>az anyagi helyzettről szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.01. KÜLFÖLD élet</td>
<td>elbeszélések a külföldön élésről pl. miért költözött ki? milyen ott élni?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.02. KÜLFÖLD terv</td>
<td>elbeszélések a külföldre költözés tervezéséről pl. miért tervezi? kivel? mikor?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.03. KÜLFÖLD egyéb</td>
<td>a külföldre költözésről, külföldi élésről szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.01. KÖZÖSS. VISSZAAD igénye/elvárása</td>
<td>a közösségeknek való visszaadásról szóló elbeszélések pl. fontos-e számára, hogy a saját közösségének visszaadjon valamit? mit tesz ezért? feladatának tekinti-e ezt? elvárják-e tőle?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.02. KÖZÖSS. VISSZAAD nehézségei</td>
<td>milyen nehézségekkel szembesül a közösségnek való visszaadás kapcsán?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.03. KÖZÖSS. VISSZAAD sikereség</td>
<td>milyen sikerekkel szembesül a közösségnek való visszaadás kapcsán?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.01. KÖZÉLET szerepvállalás</td>
<td>elbeszélések a politikai, közéleti szerepvállalásról</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.02. KÖZÉLET motiváció</td>
<td>elbeszélések a politikai, közéleti szerepvállalás motivációjáról</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.01. GYEREKKOR feladatok</td>
<td>elbeszélése arról, hogy milyen feladatok (pl. házimunka) hárultak az alanyra gyerekkorában</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.01. GYEREKKOR egyéb</td>
<td>a gyerekkorról szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.01. PHD választása</td>
<td>a doktori képzés választásának története pl. ki találta ki, hogy doktori képzésben vegyen részt az alany? Miért jelentkezett? Hogyan sikerült bekerülni?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.02. PHD motiváció</td>
<td>elbeszélések az alanynak a doktori képzés elvégzésére irányuló motivációjáról</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.03. PHD egyéb</td>
<td>a doktori képzésről szóló egyéb fontos elbeszélések</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.01. MÁSSÁG</td>
<td>elbeszélések annak a megtapasztalásáról, hogy az interjúalany kilóg a sorból, &quot;más, mint a többiek&quot; bármilyen szempontból. Elbeszélések arról, hogy milyen referenciacsoporthoz képest lóg ki és miben tér el a többiektől.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>megtapasztalása</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.02. MÁSSÁG</td>
<td>Elbeszélések arról, hogy az alany milyen stratégiát alkalmazott a másság feloldására, a rossz érzés leküzdésére, feldolgozására.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>feloldása</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.03. MÁSSÁG</td>
<td>Egyéb, a mássággal kapcsolatos elbeszélések.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>egyéb</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>