



# **The Reproductive Behaviour in Municipalities with Low Living Standard**

**Boris Vaňo, Ján Mészáros**

**INFOSTAT  
Demographic Research centre**

**The Reproductive Behaviour  
in Municipalities with Low Living Standard**

**Bratislava, September 2004**

Publication evaluates the reproductive behaviour of the population in the municipalities with a low and a very low living standard and his impact on development of the number and the structure of the population. On the basis of the results received from the mentioned municipalities we made an estimation of the reproductive behaviour of the Roma population.

**Authors:**

Boris Vaňo  
Ján Mészáros

**Translation:**

Jana Juriová

**2004 © INFOSTAT – Institute of Informatics and Statistics Bratislava**

**This document has been made in INFOSTAT, Bratislava. The wording can be used only in reference to this document.**

**No language redaction has been made.**

## ***Contents***

1. Introduction .....	5
2. The Characteristic of Selected Municipalities .....	6
3. The Reproductive Behaviour of Inhabitants in Municipalities with Low and Very Low Living Standard .....	8
3.1 Fertility .....	8
3.1.1 Total Fertility Rate .....	8
3.1.2 Age at the First Birth .....	9
3.1.3 Births out of Wedlock .....	10
3.2 Mortality .....	11
3.2.1 Total Mortality .....	11
3.2.2 Mortality by age .....	11
3.2.3 Cause of Death .....	12
4. Number and Increase of Population .....	13
5. Age Structure of Population .....	14
6.....	16
7. Conclusion.....	18
Literature .....	19
Appendix .....	20

## 1. Introduction

Although Slovakia is a small country, it is known for its great regional differences. There are differences of various forms; the historical, cultural, economic and demographic differences are the most apparent. Eventually the summary of regional differences is being reflected in the way of living and the living standard of inhabitants in particular regions. Some regions reach almost the common living standard of the EU countries; some regions remain behind it significantly. The backward regions are distinguished by high unemployment, high economic burden for population, unfavourable education structure, high share of Roma/Gypsy population and by high degree of segregation. On the other hand, many of the backward regions are characterized by strong reproduction.

This paper is focused on the reproductive behaviour of inhabitants in backward regions. We will try to use our results for the complementing the demographic characteristic of Roma/Gypsy population, because the Roma/Gypsy population is an important part of the inhabitants in these regions. Many serious social problems of Slovakia are currently connected with the Roma/Gypsy population. On the other hand, to map the situation some direct statistical information is missing<sup>1</sup>.

We shall characterize the backward regions by selected groups of municipalities with low living standard. To identify the municipalities with low living standard we shall use three criteria – technical facilities in a municipality (public water supply system, public sewerage, gas distribution mains, dustless local communications), housing standard (permanently occupied dwellings of the 4. category) and the number of the Roma/Gypsy population. It means that we shall research only the municipalities (and their inhabitants) with no or few technical facilities, the high share of permanently occupied dwellings of the 4. category and a Roma/Gypsy settlement must be there. We want to use our results for the demographic characteristic of the Roma/Gypsy population, for that reason we shall take into account only the municipalities in Banská Bystrica, Prešov and Košice regions. There are no direct relations between the low living standard and the high numbers of the Roma/Gypsy population in the other regions.

The selected municipalities have been divided into two groups according to their living

standard. The first group contains municipalities with low living standard and the second group contains municipalities with very low living standard. The inhabitants living in municipalities with some technical infrastructure (at least one of the four monitored criteria is missing) and with low housing standard (the share of permanently occupied dwellings of the 4. category is from 25 to 50%) shall be considered as the inhabitants with low living standard. The inhabitants living in municipalities with very weak technical infrastructure (at least two of the four monitored criteria are missing) and with very low housing standard (the share of permanently occupied dwellings of the 4. category is over 50%) shall be included into the group with very low living standard.

On the basis of our results we shall make conclusions about the reproductive behaviour of inhabitants in dependence on living standard. We shall point out the demographic particularities of the groups of inhabitants with low and very low living standard. We shall be also interested in how the reproductive behaviour of this population group is developing in time. We shall concentrate on the period of the last 10 years, i.e. from 1993. This is the period when the reproductive behaviour of inhabitants in Slovakia has been changed significantly. It will be interesting to observe how the reproductive behaviour of inhabitants was developing in the backward regions in this period of transformation.

---

<sup>1</sup> Data by ethnicity have not being surveyed because of the protection of human rights and data from the national statistics are not sufficient for a detailed analysis in the case of the Roma/Gypsy ethnic group. It is actually estimated that only approximately 25% of Roma/Gypsy population declare Roma/Gypsy nationality; moreover it is not possible to specify this Roma/Gypsy group more precisely.

## 2. The Characteristic of Selected Municipalities

In accordance with statistical data and to the intent of the definition above there are 454 municipalities with low housing standard in Slovakia (the share of permanently occupied dwellings of the 4. category is over 25% of all permanently occupied dwellings). 125 municipalities from these 454 ones are situated in Banská Bystrica, Prešov or Košice regions; there are also Roma/Gypsy settlements and these municipalities have few technical facilities. Thus these 125 municipalities comply with all our research criteria and that is why they shall be our database for the next computations. On the whole, they can be regarded as the municipalities with low living standard and high share of the Roma/Gypsy population.

36 municipalities of the database comply with the requirement of inclusion in the group of municipalities with very low living standard (Table 2.1). Most of municipalities from this group are located in Prešov district (7 municipalities); followed by Kežmarok, Košice okolie and Spišská Nová Ves districts (4 municipalities in each of them); Sabinov district (3 municipalities); Gelnica, Rožňava, and Veľký Krtíš districts (2 municipalities in each of them) and Bardejov, Brezno, Humenné, Levoča, Michalovce, Stará Ľubovňa, Svidník, and Vranov nad Topľou districts (1 municipality in each of them).

No municipality with very low standard has got a public sewerage, 22 municipalities (61%) have no public water supply systems and 19 municipalities (39%) have no gas distribution mains; and  $\frac{3}{4}$  of municipalities have neither public water supply systems nor gas distribution mains. There are almost 87 km of dustless local communications in all the municipalities together (2.4 km in one municipality on average). Three municipalities (Jurské, Rakúsy, Olejníkov) have got no dustless local communications. The length of dustless local communications doesn't go over 1 km in ten municipalities. Only 3 municipalities (Boliarov, Jarovnice, Markušovce) have got more than 5 km of dustless local communications.

The dwellings of the 4. category are the absolute majority of occupied housing stock in all the municipalities with very low living standard. The share of occupied dwellings of the 4. category to the total occupied housing stock is more than 80% in five municipalities (Jurské, Kecerovce, Vtáčkovce, Stráne pod Tatrami, Lomnička); and this share is over 90% in municipality Jurské (Kežmarok district). On the contrary, the share of permanently occupied dwellings of the 4. category moves from 50% to 60% in 20 municipalities (55%).

To the end of the year 2002 almost 40 thousand inhabitants lived in the group of municipalities with very low living standard. There are all

the smaller municipalities with the numbers of inhabitants below 5000 persons. The largest municipality in the observed file is Jarovnice in Sabinov district with the population of 4200. There are more than 3000 inhabitants in municipality Markušovce in Spišská Nová Ves district and more than 2000 inhabitants in municipalities Bystrany in Spišská Nová Ves district and Kecerovce in Košice okolie district. There are 13 municipalities (36%) in total with more than 1000 inhabitants in this file. 10 municipalities (27.7%) have less than 500 inhabitants and no one of these municipalities has less than 100 inhabitants. The smallest municipalities in our file are Rozložná in Rožňava district (195 inhabitants) and Prosačov in Vranov nad Topľou district (184 inhabitants).

There are 89 municipalities in our research in the group with low living standard (Table 2.2) located in 20 districts in the south of central Slovakia and in the eastern Slovakia (4 districts or 9 municipalities in Banská Bystrica region, 9 districts or 46 municipalities in Prešov region, 7 districts or 34 municipalities in Košice region). Most of municipalities with low living standard are in Vranov nad Topľou district (9 municipalities), 8 municipalities in both Bardejov and Košice okolie districts and 7 municipalities in Kežmarok, Rožňava, and Spišská Nová Ves districts.

In the group with low living standard, there are 74 municipalities (88.3%) without public sewerages, 27 municipalities (30.3%) without public water supply systems and 19 municipalities (21.3%) without gas distribution mains. There are also 397 km of dustless local communications in this group of municipalities (almost 4.5 km in 1 municipality on average). 7 municipalities have more than 10 km of dustless local communications (most of all Veľká Ida 16.7 km and Jasov 14.5 km). On the contrary, 8 municipalities have below 1 km of these communications (least of all Lascov 0.1 km and Uzovské Pekľany 0.5 km).

Permanently occupied dwellings of the 4. category are at least one fourth and no more than one half of housing stock in municipalities with low living standard. More than one half of municipalities (54.6%) have „only“ almost one third of permanently occupied housing stock of the 4. category, 16 municipalities (18%) have over 40% of permanently occupied housing stock of the 4. category (most of all Žehňa 47.8%, Draňov 47.5%, Mníšek nad Hnilcom 47.2%).

There were more than 101 thousand inhabitants in municipalities with low living standard to the end of the year 2002. 39 municipalities have more than 1000 inhabitants. The greatest municipalities are Veľká Lomnica in Kežmarok district (population of 3665), Rudňany in Spišská Nová Ves district (population of 3324), Veľká Ida in

Košice okolie district (population of 2901), Zborov in Bardejov district (population of 2769), Jasov in Košice okolie district (population of 2753), Zámuto in Vranov nad Topľou district (population of 2726), and Nálepko in Gelnica district (population of 2672). Other municipalities have population

below 2500. 22 municipalities (24.7%) of this group have less than 500 inhabitants. The smallest municipalities are Opiná in Košice okolie district (population of 177), Frička in Bardejov district (population of 248), and Lesíček in Prešov district (population of 283).

### 3. The Reproductive Behaviour of Inhabitants in Municipalities with Low and Very Low Living Standard

We shall analyze two reproductive processes – fertility and mortality; these processes (together with migration) influence the development of number and age structure of population directly. We shall not engage in migration specially, because the mobility of inhabitants is not big in the observed municipalities. We shall observe the reproductive behaviour of inhabitants in both groups of municipalities separately and compare results to the Slovak average. We shall be interested in changes of reproductive behaviour in particular groups during the observed period 1993-2002. We shall also try to interpret differences within the both selected groups of municipalities. Small numbers of inhabitants and associated significant random influences don't allow observing the demographic development in particular municipalities every year. Data on fertility and mortality of municipalities are processed as averages for 5 years (1993-1997 and 1998-

2002). Data processed in this way eliminate random deviations in particular years and simultaneously allow us to interpret the development of reproductive behaviour in time.

It is apparent already at the first sight of reproductive characteristics that we meet various models of reproductive behaviour of inhabitants. The reproductive behaviour of population in SR is typical of advanced countries – low fertility, low mortality and postponed births to higher age. The reproductive behaviour of inhabitants living in municipalities with low living standard is typical of developing countries – high fertility, high mortality and reproductive processes begin at very low age. In general, the rate of population segregation is growing with falling living standard and then differences are also growing towards average numbers in SR.

#### 3.1 Fertility

The changes in development of fertility count among the most significant characteristics of recent demographic development in advanced countries. The fertility has decrease by 39% over the last 10 years in Slovakia. The mean age at first birth is still growing; it has increased by about 2 years (9.3%) from the year 1993. The share of children born out of wedlock has also changed significantly. Approximately every fifth child is currently born out of wedlock in Slovakia; it means the growth of the share of children born out of wedlock about twofold when compared with the year 1993. Whereas Slovakia is currently by its fertility rate in the absolute end of the European list, the average age at the first birth and the share of children born out of wedlock are Europe average.

It is obvious that there are some regions or groups of municipalities in Slovakia in which the reproductive behaviour of inhabitants is different from the figures above to a large degree. The fertil-

ity rate is more times higher in these regions and is going down only slowly. The first births are shifted to the absolute beginning of reproductive period and the share of children born out of wedlock is higher significantly. The causes of these considerable differences are living conditions and habits together with the high degree of population segregation in these municipalities. These differences refer mostly to the group of municipalities with very low living standard. The municipalities with low living standard are isolated from other population to smaller extent. It is presented partly by higher living standard, partly by smaller differences of reproductive behaviour in population. In general, we can say that fertility characteristics in the group of municipalities with low living standard are approximately in the middle between the Slovak average and the figures of municipalities with very low living standard.

##### 3.1.1 Total Fertility Rate

**Tab. 3.1 The characteristics of natality and fertility in SR and in selected groups of municipalities**

Territory	Live births		TFR		Mean age at 1. childbirth		Births out of wedlock in %	
	1993-1997	1998-2002	1993-1997	1998-2002	1993-1997	1998-2002	1993-1997	1998-2002
SR	320 287	270 933	1,604	1,275	22,7	23,9	12,6	18,2
Very low standard	5 042	5 876	4,042	4,529	19,6	19,6	42,2	43,7
Low standard	9 516	9 839	2,744	2,593	21,1	21,1	30,2	37,0

At the first stage of analyzed period the fertility in the group of municipalities with very low

living standard was more than twice the Slovak figure. At the second stage the total fertility rate has

grown from 4.0 to 4.5, i.e. by 12.5% in this group. In the same period the fertility has decreased by 21% in SR. It means that the fertility is currently 3.5 times higher than the country average in municipalities with very low living standard. The fertility in municipalities with low living standard is below the fertility in municipalities with very low living standard, but much more over the number of the whole Slovakia (twofold in the second part of the analyzed period). In the observed period the fertility has fallen by 5.5% in municipalities with low living standard.

The fertility growth of municipalities with very low living standard is caused by 22 municipalities, of which fertility has increased from 1% to 46% (Table 3.2). The total fertility rate was over 5 children per 1 woman in the first half of the observed period in 7 municipalities; there were already such 8 municipalities in the second half. The highest fertility was in municipality Lomnička during all the observed period (over 7 children per 1 woman). The group of municipalities with the highest fertility consists also of municipalities Chminianske Jakubovany (6.4), Mirkovce (6.0), Cígeľka (5.8), Stráne pod Tatrami (5.4), and Olejníkov (5.0). In the same period the total fertility rate was below 3 children per 1 woman only in 3 municipalities – Zbudské Dlhé (2.8), Rozložná (2.9) and Roztoky (2.9). Five municipalities achieved the increase in fertility over 20% - Varhaňovce (21.8%), Boliarov (30%), Cígeľka (30.8%), Mirkovce (43.6%), and Chminianske Jakubovany (42.2%). The fertility has fallen in 14 municipalities, the decreases were moving from 5% to 37%. The highest decreases were in municipalities Vtáčkovce (21.3%), Roztoky (27.1%), Armutovce (33.0%), and Červenica (37.5%).

There are currently 12 municipalities with the total fertility rate over 3 children per 1 woman in the group of municipalities with low living standard (Table 3.3). The highest fertility is in municipalities Podhorany (5.2) and Lesíček (4.7). These two municipalities would count among the municipalities with the fertility above average also in the group of municipalities with very low living standard. 33 municipalities of this group have currently

### 3.1.2 Age at the First Birth

Age at the first birth is a good characteristic of the reproductive behaviour of population. It gives a real picture of the beginning and potential length of reproductive period. Populations with different models of reproductive behaviour differ mostly in just the mean age at the first birth except for the total fertility rate.

The women living in municipalities with very low living standard are at the age of almost 20 years on average at the time of their first births. This fact has not changed over the last 10 years. Also the mean age at the first birth has the similar stable trend in municipalities with low living stan-

the fertility below the replacement level and the municipality with the lowest fertility (Káľava) is the only one with the fertility below the country average.

The fertility has grown in the group of municipalities with low living standard in 19 municipalities (21%) and only 4 municipalities have the total fertility rate over 3 children per 1 woman (Lenártov, Kamenná Poruba, Uzovské Pekľany, Lukov). During the observed period the highest fertility growth was achieved in municipalities Tichý Potok (54.9%), Bretka (49.5%), Mengusovce (28.1%). These municipalities had the low fertility (the total fertility rate below 1.5) in the first stage of the observed period. The group of municipalities with low living standard consists mostly of the municipalities of which fertility has dropped during the observed period. Their fertility has dropped up to 10% in 17 municipalities, from 10% to 20% in 22 municipalities, from 20% to 30% in 21 municipalities, and over 30% in 10 municipalities. The highest fertility decrease was achieved during the observed period in municipalities Kendice (38.0%), Kráľovce (39.8%), Litava (39.9%), and Káľava (42.2%).

As a result of the fertility decrease about 50 thousand children were born less in the second stage of the observed period than in the first stage in SR (decrease by 16%). On the contrary, the numbers of live-born children have grown in the municipalities with low and very low living standard (by 3.4% and 16.5%). The numbers of live births are growing also in many municipalities where the fertility is going down. The reason is a very young age structure of population when the very numerous age groups are still at the age of highest fertility.

The specific development of natality and fertility of the two observed groups is a demonstration of historical, cultural, and socio-economic differences combined with considerable degree of segregation. The after-effects are: different way of living, living and education standards and also value orientation. The social system motivating no responsibility had also contributed to the high fertility of socially weak population in the past.

dard, although the number is by 1.5 years higher than in municipalities with very low living standard. Both these numbers are considerably below the average in Slovakia. In the second half of the observed period the mean age at the first birth was 23.9 years (difference of 4.3 and 2.8 years) in SR. But a more important difference is the development in time. Unlike the stagnation in both groups of municipalities the mean age at the first birth is growing in SR (growth by 1.2 years or 5.3%) between the first and the second half of the observed period.

We don't observe an usual relation between the change in the total fertility rate and the change in the age at the first birth in both the observed groups of municipalities. Despite the changes in total fertility rate (it is growing in one group and falling in the second one) the mean at the first birth is still the same. The tradition of having the first child at very young age seems to be very strong for the inhabitants of these municipalities and the total fertility rate is more influenced by fertility development at higher age, or rather, higher order.

A stable development of mean age at the first birth is typical of women in most of the municipalities in both the observed groups. The changes are usually below 1 year during the observed period. In the group of municipalities with very low living standard women have the lowest ages at the first birth in municipalities Rozložná (17.7), Sútor (18.4), Káloša (18.5), Žehra (18.5). No municipality of this group achieve the SR aver-

### 3.1.3 Births out of Wedlock

The other distinction of reproductive behaviour that we can watch in the both groups of municipalities is high share of children born out of wedlock exceeding the Slovak average at a great rate. The share of births out of wedlock in SR was stagnating at a relatively low level in the long term (5-6%). From the beginning of the 1990s this figure started to grow and is currently above 22%. Non-marital fertility has been at a high level in the long term in municipalities with low and very low living standard, it means that it was high also at the time when the Slovak average was relatively low. Therefore recent increases in the share of births out of wedlock are relatively low in these municipalities. Nowadays the share of births out of wedlock is about 2.5 times higher than the SR average in the municipalities with very low living standard, this figure is approximately twofold in the municipalities with low living standard. In the municipalities with very low living standard the share of births out of wedlock was above 40% during all the observed period; in the municipalities with low living standard it is moving slowly from 30% towards 40%. The reasons for such great differences are partly in very young age at birth, future parents may not to marry<sup>2</sup> else, and partly in the tradition of the Roma/Gypsy weddings that are no official legal acts. More than one half of couples start to cohabit without legalization of their relations by norms of majority society; weddings usually come only after several years of cohabitations. It is obvious of these reasons that non-marital fertility of the selected groups of municipalities is of different origin in the

age figure and only 4 municipalities have the mean age at the first birth above 21 years – Doľany (21.5), Cígeľka (21.7), Roztoky (21.9), and Závadka (22.9). In this group of municipalities the highest increase in the mean age at the first birth was achieved in municipality Cígeľka (2.2 years or 11.3%). Also in municipalities Richnava, Závadka, and Doľany the increases were above 1 year. The highest decrease in the mean age at the first birth was achieved in municipality Sútor (2 years or 9.9%). The decreases were over 1.5 years also in municipalities Tuhrina, Žehra, Červenica, and Juriské.

In the group of municipalities with low living standard women have the mean age at the first birth below 20 years in 8 municipalities and this figure is below 19 years only in one of them (Kobeliarovo). On the other hand, 3 municipalities with the highest mean age at the first birth (Blažice, Mengusovce, Haligovce) achieve the figure above the SR average.

majority of cases than the non-marital fertility of other population that is often based on cohabitation without wedding like an alternative of marriage. Different attitude to family and cohabitation comes from the different cultural tradition and value orientation. In both the researched groups of municipalities it is shown not only in many children, low age at the first birth or high share of births out of wedlock, which are documented in this paper. Family has different status, composition and functions in these municipalities than it is usually used to have in Slovakia. We may characterize it in a large degree as enlarged and multigenerational. Cohabitations (marriages) have also their specific qualities; they follow local customs rather than official norms. For example also the very low divorce rate is reflective of specific cohabitations in both the groups of municipalities. Whereas there were 35 divorces per 100 marriages during all the observed period in SR, there were 13 divorces in the municipalities with low living standard and only 7 divorces in the municipalities with very low living standard, i.e. the figure lower 2.7 times or 5 times).

In the group of municipalities with very low living standard the share of births out of wedlock was below the Slovak average only in one municipality (Doľany) in the second half of the observed period. On the contrary, more children are born out of wedlock than in wedlock in 11 municipalities. In the second half of the observed period the highest figures were in municipalities Valkovňa (80%), Vrbnica (78.7%), Sútor (74.5%), and Zbudské Dlhé (72.7%). Despite the very high shares of births out of wedlock in the long term the figures have lowered during the observed period only in 11 municipalities and the decreases were moving from 2.6% to 45.5% (most of all in municipalities Výborná, Prosačov, and Olejníkov). The growth of

---

<sup>2</sup> The minimal age for marriage is 18 years in SR. Court may allow marriage from the age of 16.

the share of births out of wedlock was above 20 percentage points in five municipalities and the share of births out of wedlock has grown by more than 30% in 10 municipalities. The increases by more than 50% were achieved in municipalities Roztoky, Červenica, Bôrka, Zbudské Dlhé, and Sútor.

More children are born out of wedlock than in wedlock in 15 municipalities in the group of municipalities with low living standard and 15 municipalities are below the Slovak average. The

### 3.2 Mortality

The second basic factor of reproduction – mortality – cannot be analyzed as in detail as fertility in the selected groups of municipalities. The number of deaths is very low despite the unfavourable mortality situation. It is caused by very young age structure of population in the municipalities

highest shares of births out of wedlock were in the second half of the observed period in municipalities Kamenná Poruba (64.9%), Boťany (59.8%), Šíd (59.8%), and Hrčel' (58.4%). On the contrary, this share was below 10% in 3 municipalities – Hali-govce, Holumnica, and Kružlová. In 11 municipalities the share of births out of wedlock has increased by more than 20 percentage points and the increase was more than 100% in 10 municipalities. The highest decreases in the share of births out of wedlock were in municipalities Lenártov and Lesíček.

with low and very low living standard. We will concentrate only on the analysis of the whole groups of municipalities and during the whole observed period, because the low numbers of deaths allow no differential mortality analysis.

#### 3.2.1 Total Mortality

**Tab. 3.4 The characteristics of mortality in SR and in selected groups of municipalities in 1993-2002**

Territory	Life expectancy at birth		Infant mortality rate
	Males	Females	
SR	68,9	77,1	9,3
Very low standard	65,0	72,6	20,3
Low standard	66,2	74,8	17,4

Recently there is a trend of mild improvement in total mortality. These tendencies reflect also social and economic living conditions except for health rate of population, which is closely related to living standard. The influence of living standard is more immediate in the case of mortality than fertility. Total Slovak characteristics of mortality are averages between characteristics of particular regions, or rather, groups of municipalities with various living standards. The municipalities with very low living standard are the localities of mortality significantly higher in this context. The municipalities with low living standard also contribute to the mortality worsening in SR, but not at such a great rate as the municipalities with very low living standard.

The improving trend of total mortality recently in Slovakia can be explained the best by life expectancy at birth, which achieved 69.8 years for men and 77.6 years for women in the year 2002. These figures mean the increase by 1.4 or 0.9 years comparing to the year 1993. In 1993-2002 the life

expectancy at birth was 65.0 years for men and 72.6 years for women in the municipalities with very low living standard. These figures are lower when compared to the whole SR in the same period. In this group of municipalities men live by 3.8 years and women 4.5 years shorter on average than an average inhabitant of SR. The life expectancy at birth is 66.2 years for men and 74.8 years for women in the group of municipalities with low living standard. It means a higher figures by 1.2 or 2.2 years comparing to the municipalities with very low living standard, but a lower figures by 2.7 or 2.3 years when compared to the total Slovak figure.

There is a relatively great difference between the life expectancy at birth for both genders in Slovakia. This difference was 8.2 years in the observed period. The differences in the life expectancy at birth between men and women are similar in both the observed groups of municipalities (7.6 years in the municipalities with very low living standard and 8.6 years in the municipalities with low living standard).

#### 3.2.2 Mortality by age

The mortality of observed municipalities is higher than the Slovak average in the whole age interval with the exception of the oldest age groups of men (85 years and more). The greatest differences are in child mortality. The infant mortality was 20.3‰ during the observed period in the mu-

nicipalities with very low living standard and 17.4‰ in the municipalities with low living standard. And the Slovak average was 9.3‰ over the observed period. It means that in the municipalities with very low living standard there are more than 2 times dead infants per 1000 live-born children

compared to the country average. This figure is a little bit below the double in the municipalities

with low living standard.

### 3.2.3 Cause of Death

**Tab. 3.5 Deaths by causes in SR and in selected groups of municipalities in 1993-2002 (%)**

Cause of death	SR		Very low standard		Low standard	
	Males	Females	Males	Females	Males	Females
Circulatory diseases	49	62	43	56	50	64
Neoplasm	24	19	21	14	23	15
Respiratory diseases	6	6	10	11	7	8
Digestive disease	6	4	4	3	5	3
External	9	3	10	5	7	3
Other	6	6	12	11	8	7

Recently 94% of men and women die of 5 the most frequent causes of death in Slovakia; all other causes take only 6% of deaths<sup>3</sup>. 73% of men and 81% of women die of circulatory system diseases and neoplasm. The death structure by causes doesn't practically differ from the total Slovak average in the municipalities with low living standard. Some differences are in the group of municipalities with very low living standard. The shares of dead of two the most frequent causes of death are lower

than the total Slovak average (64% for men, 70% for women). But respiratory system diseases, external, and other causes cause the higher share of deaths. Factually, there are more frequent deaths after such diseases as influenza, bronchitis, pneumonia, tuberculosis, intestinal diseases, hepatitis and injuries. These diseases are closely related to the environment, way of living, hygienic conditions, or in other words, to the living standard.

<sup>3</sup> In Slovakia the most frequent causes of deaths are circulatory system diseases, neoplasm, digestive system diseases, respiratory system diseases and external causes.

## 4. Number and Increase of Population

Tab. 4.1 Number and Increase of population in SR and in selected groups of municipalities

Territory	Population		Increase	
	1.1.1993	31.12.2002	Abs.	%
SR	5 314 155	5 379 161	65 006	1,2
Very low standard	29 854	39 015	9 161	30,7
Low standard	89 865	101 729	11 864	13,2

The specific demographic development of observed municipalities (most of all high fertility) added to the different development of number, increase and age structure of inhabitants to a large degree when compared to other municipalities in SR.

There was the population about 140 thousand to the end of the year 2002 in the selected municipalities with low and very low living standard (2.6% of the total population in SR). 39 thousand inhabitants were living in the group of municipalities with very low living standard and above 101 thousand inhabitants in the municipalities with low living standard. The numbers of inhabitants have increased by 21 thousand persons in these municipalities when compared to the year 1993, which mean the increase of 17.6%. Over the same period the number of inhabitants has grown by 45 thousand persons in SR, i.e. only by 1.2%. It means that the increase in the population of 125 observed municipalities is about one third of the total increase in the population of SR. All the rest of more than 2700 municipalities take 67.7% of the total increase in the population of SR. The increase in the number of inhabitants was 30.7% in the municipalities with very low living standard, about 13% in the municipalities with low living standard.

The number of inhabitants has decreased in no municipality of the group of municipalities with very low living standard during all the observed period (Table 4.2). Increases in the numbers

of inhabitants were moving from 8.7% in municipality Valkovňa till 56.1% in municipality Lomnička. The annual average increases in the population were below 1% only in two municipalities (except for the mentioned municipality Valkovňa, also municipality Tuhrina). On the contrary, 6 municipalities have achieved the annual average increases above 4% (Richnava, Rakúsy, Vtáčkovce, Stráne pod Tatrami, Doľany, and Lomnička).

The municipalities with increases in population are considerably leading the municipalities with decreases in population also in the group of municipalities with low living standard (Table 4.3). The total numbers of inhabitants have decreased over the observed period in only five municipalities (Šumiac, Telgárt, Kurov, Bretka, and Uzovské Peklany) and the annual average decrease in population achieved 1% in municipality Šumiac only. The increase in population was above 20% in 15 municipalities over the observed period. The highest increase in population was achieved in municipality Podhorany (59.3%), followed by municipalities Vítkovce (34.9%), Žehňa (29.8%), Čičava (28.7%), and Betlanovce (26.0%). The annual average increases in population were above 1% in 48 municipalities in total. The increase in population of municipality Podhorany is even the highest one of all 125 observed municipalities. It means that it goes over the increases in population also in all the municipalities with very low living standard.

## 5. Age Structure of Population

**Tab. 5.1 The age structure of population in SR and in selected groups of municipalities**

Territory	0-14 (%)		15-44 (%)		45-64 (%)		65+ (%)	
	1993	2002	1993	2002	1993	2002	1993	2002
SR	24,1	18,1	46,1	46,5	19,3	23,9	10,5	11,5
Very low standard	37,1	39,0	43,2	43,3	12,5	11,7	7,2	6,0
Low standard	28,5	28,1	43,0	44,6	17,8	17,4	10,7	9,9

The impact of demographic development on age structure of population is similar to the case of increases in population – the situation in the observed groups of municipalities differs considerably from the country average. The age structure of population has changed over the last 10 years in SR; population ageing has intensified. From the year 1993 the age structure of population has not changed practically in the group of municipalities with low living standard; even there was achieved rejuvenation of population in the municipalities with very low living standard, which is currently typical only of inhabitants in developing countries.

The greatest differences of the observed groups of inhabitants are in the age group of 0 till 14 years old. As a result of the falling natality the share of children of the population in SR has decreased by 5 percentage points over the last 10 years and it is currently rather below the limit 20%. On the contrary, the number and share of children is not decreasing in the observed municipalities with low and very low living standard because of the high natality of this group of municipalities; it is even increasing in the municipalities with very low living standard. The share of children has increased from 37.1% in the year 1993 to 39% in the year 2002 in the municipalities with very low living standard, which is twice the present figure of SR. The share of children is at a standstill of 28% in the municipalities with low living standard (by 55% more than the figure of SR).

The population at the reproductive age (15 till 44 years) show the most stable development. The differences in proportional representation be-

tween the particular observed groups of municipalities are not significant and the development is practically constant over the last 10 years.

The population achieve the highest increases in the population of SR at the active post-reproductive age (45-64 years). At this age, there are actually the strong age groups born in 1950s. But the share of population in this age group has decreased slowly in the both observed groups of municipalities. Above all it is a result of the unfavourable development of mortality at the age over 50 years.

The high mortality and many children of the municipalities with low and very low living standard result in the low number and share of inhabitants at a higher age. While the share of inhabitants at the age over 65 is currently 11.5% in SR and this figure is still growing, it is only 9.9% or 6% in the municipalities with low and very low living standard and these figures have decreased by 7.5% or 15.5% over the last 10 years.

Different age structure of population is being reflected in different mean ages of population and ageing indexes of population. The mean age of population has increased by 2.7 years (8.0%) over the last 10 years in SR. It has not changed practically over the last 10 years in the municipalities with low living standard and it was about 5 years below the average of SR to the end of the year 2002. The mean age is about 11 years lower in the municipalities with very low living standard than in SR and it has decreased about 1 year (3.4%) over the last 10 years.

**Tab. 5.2 The characteristics of age structure of population in SR and in selected groups of municipalities**

Territory	Ageing index		Mean age	
	1993	2002	1993	2002
SR	43,8	63,2	33,8	36,5
Very low standard	19,5	15,3	26,6	25,7
Low standard	37,7	35,4	32,1	31,9

In the period of 1993-2002 the mean age of population has increased in only 8 municipalities of the group of municipalities with very low living standard. The highest increases (from 0.6 to 0.8 years) were achieved in municipalities Stráne pod Tatrami, Tuhrina, Výborná, and Červenica. The

mean age has decreased in other municipalities; 6 municipalities achieved considerable decreases from 4 to 7 years (Bôrka, Roztoky, Prosačov, Valkovňa, Olejníkov, Rankovce). The mean age was over 30 years in only 5 municipalities. In the year 2002 the highest mean age of population was in

municipalities Závadka (34.5 years), Valkovňa (33.3 years), and Roztoky (31.9 years). The lowest mean age of population was over all the observed period in municipality Lomnička that was the only municipality with extremely low figure below 20 years. There were other 10 municipalities, except for Lomnička, with the mean age of population below 25 years in the year 2002. The difference in mean ages of the municipalities with the highest and the lowest figures was 16 years in the group of municipalities with very low living standard (Lomnička 18.5, Závadka 34.5).

There are living relatively young inhabitants in the municipalities with low living standard, but the differences are not so high as in the case of municipalities with very low living standard when compared to the country average. Over the observed period the mean age of population has increased in 33 municipalities, it has not changed in 4 municipalities, and it has decreased in the 52 remaining ones. The differences in the mean age were not usually high. They were above 5% in only 22 municipalities. The growths were moving from 0.1 years in municipalities Ihľany, Šíd, and Šarišská Poruba till 2.8 years in municipality Kráľovce. Other municipalities with more significant increases in mean age of population were municipalities Chrast nad Hornádom (1.8 years), Veľká Lomnica (1.5 years), and Mengusovce (1.5 years). The mean age of population has decreased in the majority of municipalities, though the decreases were slight (to 2%) in 18 cases. The decreases in the mean age of population were above 10% in 4 municipalities (Nižný Slavkov, Draňov, Rejdová, and Frička), but these decreases were always below 5 years. 20 municipalities with low living standard had the mean age of population below 30 years in the year 2002. From a distance, the lowest mean age of population was achieved in municipalities Podhorany (21.4 years), followed by Žehňa (26.1 years), Rokycany (26.9 years), Krížová Ves (27.7 years), and Vítkovce (27.8 years). 7 municipalities of this group had the mean age of population above the country average in the year 2002. Those are municipalities Úbrež, Veľké Trakany, Šumiac, Točnica, Dvorníky-Včeláre, Tichý Potok, and Malé Trakany. The difference in the mean age of population between the municipality with the highest figure and the municipality with the lowest figure was 18.1 years in the group of municipalities with low living standard (Podhorany 21.4, Úbrež 39.5).

Ageing index has a similar development as the mean age. From the year 1993 the ageing index has increased by 44.3% in SR, it has decreased by 21.5% in the municipalities with very low living standard and by 6.1% in the municipalities with low living standard. While in the year 2002 there were

63 inhabitants at the age over 65 years per every 100 inhabitants at the age up to 15 years on average in Slovakia, there were only 15 inhabitants in the municipalities with very low living standard and 35 inhabitants in the municipalities with low living standard. It means that the ageing index is only almost one fourth of the SR figure in the municipalities with very low living standard and a little more over the half figure in the municipalities with low living standard.

Over the observed period the ageing index has increased in the group of municipalities with very low standard in only 3 municipalities (Červenica 34.6%, Markušovce 12.0%, Rakúsy 2.2%). In other municipalities the ageing index has decreased from 2.3% (Tuhrina) up to 61.1% (Bôrka). In the year 2002 the ageing index achieved more than 50 in only two municipalities (Závadka and Valkovňa). On the contrary, the ageing index is below 10 in 7 municipalities; it means that there are below 10 inhabitants at the age over 65 years per every 100 children at the age up to 15 years. The extremely low ageing indexes are especially in municipalities Lomnička (2.6) and Stráne pod Tatrami (4.8).

The ageing index has increased over the observed period in 38 municipalities with low living standard. The increases were moving from 3.6% in municipality Čoltovo up to 48.7% in municipality Veľké Trakany. The growth of more than 30% was achieved in 4 municipalities. Except for the municipality Veľké Trakany, in municipalities Chrast nad Hornádom (37.9%), Veľká Lomnica (36.3%), Kružlová (30.6%). The decreases in ageing index were close to 50% in some municipalities. The highest decreases in ageing index were achieved in municipalities Roštár (49.5%), Draňov (44.2%), Žehňa (41.0%), Blažice (40.5%), Nižný Slavkov (40.3%). The decrease in ageing index was above 25% in 15 municipalities in total. In the year 2002 the ageing index exceeded 100 in only 2 municipalities; it means that the number of inhabitants aged 65 and over was higher than the number of inhabitants aged 0-14 years. It was in municipalities Úbrež and Veľké Trakany. There are more children than elderly inhabitants in other municipalities. Also in this group there is a municipality with extremely low ageing index (Podhorany) where only 5 inhabitants at the age of 65 and over are per every 100 inhabitants at the age of 0-14. The ageing index is below 20% in five municipalities. Those are municipalities Vítkovce, Huncovce, Rokycany, and Žehňa, except for the municipality Podhorany. The group of municipalities with very low ageing index consists of 26 municipalities totally, in which the share of inhabitants at the age over 65 years is below 30% of child population.

## 6. The Reproductive Behaviour of Roma/Gypsy Population according to Integration Degree

There are several estimates of the number of Roma/Gypsies and their reproductive behaviour in Slovakia not always based on real assumptions. Moreover, there are data for the whole Roma/Gypsy population in the majority of cases (without reference to the integration degree), which reduces the use of obtained results. So we will try to specify the demographic estimates about the Roma/Gypsy ethnic group and especially by reference to social integration degree as the most significant differential factor.

According to real estimates, there are currently living about 400 thousand Roma/Gypsies in Slovakia, which is approximately 7% of the total number of population. The Slovak Republic is one of the countries with the highest share of Roma/Gypsy population in Europe. It is the third most numerous ethnic group of population following the Slovak and Hungarian populations in Slovakia. But this population is developing the most dynamically. Roma/Gypsies are spread out over the whole territory of Slovakia. The highest density of Roma/Gypsy population is in the south of central Slovakia and in the eastern Slovakia. It is common knowledge that the Roma/Gypsy population differs from the other in the way of living, living and education standards and reproductive behaviour, too. On the other hand, Roma/Gypsies are far from a homogeneously group. The integration or segregation degrees are becoming the more significant differential factors.

It is possible to divide the Roma/Gypsies living in Slovakia to three basic groups according to their social integration – integrated, partly integrated, and non-integrated. The integrated part of the Roma/Gypsy ethnic group has accepted the reproductive behaviour of majority population to a large degree and its reproductive characteristics don't differ too much from the other population living in the relevant region. The non-integrated Roma/Gypsies are living apart from the other popu-

lation – either in separated parts of municipalities or more often in segregated Roma/Gypsy settlements. The surroundings influence upon this Roma/Gypsy group is very limited. The reproductive behaviour often follows own rules based on traditions and local habits, which differ much from the norms of majority society. We suppose that the reproductive behaviour of non-integrated Roma/Gypsies can be quite well characterized by the reproductive behaviour of population in municipalities with very low living standard. Then the reproductive behaviour of partly integrated Roma/Gypsies can be characterized by the reproductive behaviour of inhabitants in the group of municipalities with low living standard, with a mild shift towards the municipalities with very low living standard. The Roma/Gypsy population is living not so isolated in this group of municipalities and the interaction between the Roma/Gypsy population and the other one is more intensive<sup>4</sup>.

As the integrated Roma/Gypsies don't differ much from the other population in their way of living and reproductive behaviour, just the information about partly integrated and non-integrated Roma/Gypsies is important because several specifics and many problems are associated with just these two groups.

To make the picture complete we will try to derive also data for the whole Roma/Gypsy population even though the Roma/Gypsy population is heterogenous and it is necessary to deal with particular groups differentially. According to estimates, about a half of Gypsies living in Slovakia may be marked as partly integrated, 30% as non-integrated and 20% as fully integrated to society. If we consider the estimated numbers of particular groups of the Roma/Gypsy population, average numbers of the Roma/Gypsy population as a whole are close to numbers of the partly integrated Roma/Gypsies.

**Tab. 6.1 The estimates of reproductive characteristics of Roma/Gypsy population in the year 2002**

Roma population	TFR	Mean age at 1. childbirth	Births out of wedlock (%)	Life expectancy at birth		Infant mortality rate
				Males	Females	
Total	3,1	21,1	37,4	66,5	74,5	16,6
Integrated	1,3	24,0	19,0	69,0	77,5	9,0
Partly integrated	3,0	20,8	44,0	66,0	74,5	17,5
Non integrated	4,6	19,6	38,5	65,5	73,0	20,0

**Tab. 6.2 The estimates of number and age structure of Roma/Gypsy population in the year 2002**

Roma population	Total	Age group (%)				Ageing index
		0-14	15-44	45-64	65+	
Total	390 000	30,5	44,5	16,4	8,6	28,2
Integrated	78 000	18,1	46,5	23,9	11,5	63,5
Partly integrated	195 000	30,3	44,4	16,2	9,1	30,0
Non integrated	117 000	39,0	43,3	11,7	6,0	15,4

It is a well-known fact that the reproductive behaviour of Roma/Gypsy population differs from the other one. But it is worth paying attention to the extent of this difference regarding the heterogeneity of Roma/Gypsy population. Missing more reliable and detailed information of this sort gives space for various constructions, which may complicate the delicate problem of Roma/Gypsies coexistence with others much more. Then we will concentrate on proving or disproving the generally respected theories, but supported with few evidences, about the reproductive behaviour of Roma/Gypsy population. We will not engage in explaining causes but focus on the more precise quantification of particular claims from the theories. We will the most often deal with the following theories:

1. The fertility in Roma/Gypsy population is higher more times than the fertility in other population.
2. The mortality in Roma/Gypsy population is significantly higher than in other population. Roma/Gypsies live by 10 years less on average.
3. The high increases in Roma/Gypsy population cause significant increase in the share of Roma/Gypsies from the total number of SR population.

#### Ad. 1

Both professional and laic discussions give a lot of space to the Roma/Gypsy fertility. It is shown the most just during the assessing fertility that it is not distinguished between particular groups of Roma/Gypsies and the Roma/Gypsy population is often identified with the population of Roma/Gypsy settlements. It is beyond doubt that the Roma/Gypsy fertility is above the fertility of the other population. If we take the Roma/Gypsy population as a whole, is currently about 2,5 times the country figure. There are currently about 1,2 children per one woman at the reproductive age in Slovakia, about 3 children in the Roma/Gypsy population. The fertility is even higher in the Roma/Gypsy settlements. There are, on average, 4,5 children per one woman, which is almost 4 times the country average.

Also the development of mean age at the first birth is different for the Roma/Gypsy population and the other. Roma/Gypsies have low figures in the long run; the mean age at the first birth is

gradually increasing in SR. The difference is currently 3.5 years when we take the whole Roma/Gypsy population into consideration. When we regard only non-integrated Roma/Gypsies, the difference is about 5 years.

Researching the Roma/Gypsy fertility the greatest differences are in the numbers of children born out of wedlock. While the share of births out of wedlock is increasing in SR and currently is above 20%, it is high in the long run in the Roma/Gypsy population and currently is close to 40%. Above 40% of children are born out of wedlock in the Roma/Gypsy settlements, which is about 2 times the country figure.

#### Ad. 2

According to our computations, the difference in life expectancy at birth is „only“ about 2.5 years against the Roma/Gypsies for both genders. The difference is about one half of year higher for the non-integrated part of the Roma/Gypsy population, i.e. 3 years. It means that the difference between the Roma/Gypsy mortality and the other one need not to be so significant as it is used to mention (10 years for life expectancy at birth).

The most unfavourable situation is in child mortality where the difference between the Roma/Gypsy mortality and the other is the most significant. The differences have decreased also here comparing to the past. According to our estimates, the Roma/Gypsy infant mortality is about 1.8 times the SR figure or 2.2 times when we regard only the non-integrated part of the Roma/Gypsy ethnic group.

#### Ad. 3

As a result of different demographic behaviour the increases in the number of Roma/Gypsy population are higher than the increases in the other population. The Roma/Gypsy reproduction is decelerating, that is why the increases in population will be decreasing and there should be no significant differences in the development of the Roma/Gypsy population and the other population in 30 years. It is supposed that Roma/Gypsies will be about 10% of the SR population after the year 2025. Even in the case of keeping recent differences in reproduction the increases in the Roma/Gypsy population would not be high enough to talk about the Roma/Gypsy population explosion in Slovakia.

## 7. Conclusion

Comparing reproductive characteristics of particular groups of the Roma/Gypsy population it is apparent that the integration degree is an important differential factor. The differences in reproductive behaviour between the particular Roma/Gypsy groups are significant as well as the consequent differences in age structure of population. Therefore it is always appropriate to mention which Roma/Gypsy population we are talking about. Whether we mean 120 thousand segregated Roma/Gypsies with 4.5-fold fertility and life expectancy by 3 years lower or 80 thousand integrated Roma/Gypsies with reproductive behaviour similar to the other population, or we talk about the whole Roma/Gypsy population of SR (about 400 thousand persons) with 2.5-fold fertility and mean life expectancy by 2.5 years lower than for an average inhabitant of SR.

Observing differences between particular groups of the Roma/Gypsy ethnic group is concerning not only the reproduction. The Roma/Gypsy population is so heterogenous in majority of respects that we shouldn't regard it as one whole at all solving common social problems. Such a selective view is reasonable for example also considering remedies and help in favour of the Roma/Gypsy ethnic group.

Future development of integration will determine the next demographic development of the Roma/Gypsy population. Also the European integration will be important. The balancing regional differences and progress of backward regions are among the primary priorities of the European union. This problem can be solved only regarding the situation of the Roma/Gypsy population in Slovakia.

The intensity of integration processes will be the significant criterion for the next demographic development of the Roma/Gypsy population. The convergence between the reproductive behaviour of Roma/Gypsies and the other population is expected together with the continuing integration. In practice, Roma/Gypsies will be more and more copying the reproductive and family behaviours of majority society.

The question is whether this way is desirable. Maybe the majority society should be more inspired by the Roma/Gypsy attitude to family and children and reproductive characteristics of the Roma/Gypsy population and the other could meet somewhere in the middle. The Roma/Gypsy population is lacking in more responsibility for reproductive plans and the other population is short of greater passion for family and children. Just the connection of natural Roma/Gypsy relation to families with many children and the other population responsibility for family living standard might be the appropriate reproductive model in the future.

## Literature

- Bačová, V.: Typológia rómskych rodín na Slovensku, Sociológia, 1990, č.4.
- Cigánske obyvateľstvo SSR. Bratislava, Slovenský štatistický úrad, 1984.
- Davidová, E.: Cesty Romů – Romano Drom 1945-1990. Olomouc, Univerzita Palackého, 1995.
- Dubayová, M.: Rómska rodina na Slovensku: Pokus o kultúrnoantropologickú reflexiu. Slovensky národopis, 1994, č.2, s.129-138.
- Džambazovič R.: Premeny rómskej rodiny. Prešov, Filozofická fakulta PU, 2001.
- Džambazovič, R., Jurásková, M.: Sociálne vylúčenie Rómov na Slovensku. In: Vašečka, M. (ed.): Súhrnná správa o Rómoch na Slovensku. Bratislava, IVO, 2002.
- Horváthová, E.: Cigáni na Slovensku. Bratislava, Slovenská akadémia vied, 1964.
- Informácia o realizácii bytovej politiky Rómov z najviac zaostalých rómskych komunít. Bratislava, Úrad vlády SR, 2002.
- Informačný systém MOŠ-MIS. Bratislava, Štatistický úrad SR.
- Jurová, A.: Vývoj rómskej problematiky na Slovensku po roku 1945. Bratislava, Goldpress, 1993.
- Jurová, A.: Problémy Rómov v regióne východného Slovenska v minulosti a súčasnosti. Romano fil, 1998, č.309, s.10 - 11.
- Kalibová, K.: Prognóza rómskej populácie v ČSFR do roku 2005. Demografie, 1990, č.3, s.219-223.
- Kalibová, K.: Demografické charakteristiky rómskej populácie v Česko-Slovensku. Praha, Přírodovědecká fakulta UK, 1991.
- Kalibová, K.: Charakteristika úmrtnostních poměrů rómskej populácie v ČSSR. Demografie, 1999, č.3, s. 239-249.
- Kompaníková, S., Šebesta, M.: Životné stratégie Rómov. In: Vašečka, M. (ed.): Súhrnná správa o Rómoch na Slovensku. Bratislava, IVO, 2002.
- Komplexný rozvojový program v rómskych osadách. Bratislava, Úrad vlády SR, 2001.
- Kumanová, Z., Džambazovič, R.: Rómska rodina: rozhranie medzi tradicionalizmom a modernitou. In: Vašečka, M. (ed.): Súhrnná správa o Rómoch na Slovensku. Bratislava, IVO, 2002.
- Liegeois, J-P.: Rómovia, Cigáni, kočovníci. Bratislava, Academia Istropolitana, 1995.
- Loran, T.: Sociálna politika a zamestnanosť Rómov. In: Vašečka, M. (ed.): Súhrnná správa o Rómoch na Slovensku. Bratislava, IVO, 2002.
- Mann, A.B.: Rómsky dejepis. Bratislava, Kaligram, 2000.
- Mann, A.B.: Rómovia na Slovensku. [www.inforoma.sk](http://www.inforoma.sk).
- Mušinka, A.: Bývanie Rómov. In: Vašečka, M. (ed.): Súhrnná správa o Rómoch na Slovensku. Bratislava, IVO, 2002.
- Pilát, J.: Decentralizácia a jej potenciálny vplyv na situáciu Rómov. In: Vašečka, M. (ed.): Súhrnná správa o Rómoch na Slovensku. Bratislava, IVO, 2002.
- Radičová, I.: Hic Sunt Romales, Bratislava, S.P.A.C.E., 2001.
- Radičová, I.: Rómovia na prahu transformácie. In: Vašečka, M. (ed.): Súhrnná správa o Rómoch na Slovensku. Bratislava, IVO, 2002.
- Romové v České republice. Praha, Socioklub, 1999.
- Sčítanie obyvateľov, domov a bytov 2001. Bratislava, Štatistický úrad SR.
- Srb, V.: Kolik je Cikánů-Romů v Československu? Demografie, 1979, č.4, s. 321-324.
- Srb, V.: Změny v reprodukci československých Romů. Demografie, 1988, č.4, s. 305-309.
- Stratégia vlády SR na riešenie problémov rómskej národnostnej menšiny a súbor opatrení na jej realizáciu. Bratislava, Úrad vlády SR, 1999.
- Stav a pohyb obyvateľstva v Slovenskej republike (1993-2002). Bratislava, Štatistický úrad SR.
- Vaňo, B.: Demografická charakteristika rómskej populácie na Slovensku. Bratislava, INFOSTAT, 2001.
- Vaňo, B. (ed.): Prognóza vývoja obyvateľstva SR do roku 2050. Bratislava, INFOSTAT, 2002.
- Vaňo, B.: Prognóza vývoja rómskeho obyvateľstva v SR do roku 2025. Bratislava, INFOSTAT, 2002.
- Vašečka, I.: Spôsoby integrácie Rómov v minulosti a v súčasnosti, Sociológia, 2001, č.5.
- Vládna politika a Rómovia 1948-2002. Bratislava, Úrad vlády SR, 2003.
- Základné informácie o problémoch rómskej menšiny. Bratislava, Úrad vlády SR, 2001.
- Základné tézy koncepcie politiky vlády SR v integrácii rómskych komunít. Bratislava, Úrad vlády SR, 2003.
- Zoznam obcí SR na území ktorých sa nachádzajú rómske osady. Bratislava, Úrad vlády SR, 2001.
- Zoznam obcí, v ktorých občania SR, rómskej národnosti tvoria najmenej 20% obyvateľstva v zmysle výsledkov SODB 2001, Bratislava, Úrad vlády SR, 2002.

## Appendix

**Tab. 2.1 List of municipalities with very low living standard**

Municipality	Region	Population	Dwellings of the 4. category (%)	Public water supply system	Public sewerage	Gas distribution mains	Dustless local communications (km)
Valkovňa	Brezno	325	53,9	yes	no	no	3,7
Káloša	Veľký Krtíš	652	58,2	no	no	yes	3,0
Sútor	Veľký Krtíš	403	68,5	no	no	no	0,7
Cigeľka	Bardejov	455	67,7	yes	no	no	3,8
Zbudské Dlhé	Humenné	571	59,5	no	no	yes	0,8
Boliarov	Košice-okolie	597	55,5	no	no	no	5,0
Kecеровce	Košice-okolie	2 415	87,3	no	no	no	2,6
Rankovce	Košice-okolie	572	69,9	no	no	no	1,2
Vtáčkovce	Košice-okolie	769	85,0	no	no	no	0,7
Vrbnica	Michalovce	776	55,7	yes	no	yes	4,6
Jurské	Kežmarok	798	94,3	no	no	yes	0,0
Rakúsy	Kežmarok	1 998	62,6	yes	no	yes	0,0
Stráne pod Tatrami	Kežmarok	1 208	81,3	yes	no	yes	4,1
Výborná	Kežmarok	875	59,4	no	no	yes	2,2
Červenica	Prešov	697	58,1	no	no	no	2,5
Chminianske Jakubovany	Prešov	1 498	73,3	no	no	no	1,3
Jarovnice	Sabinov	4 274	68,7	no	no	yes	6,6
Malý Slivník	Prešov	671	58,6	no	no	yes	1,0
Mirkovce	Prešov	966	61,2	yes	no	yes	2,7
Olejníkov	Sabinov	354	56,8	no	no	no	0,0
Ostrovany	Sabinov	1 524	51,4	no	no	yes	2,2
Svinia	Prešov	1 359	53,3	no	no	yes	3,0
Tuhrina	Prešov	415	50,1	yes	no	yes	3,5
Varhaňovce	Prešov	1 036	57,0	yes	no	yes	1,3
Bôrka	Rožňava	455	61,0	yes	no	no	1,1
Rozložná	Rožňava	195	51,8	yes	no	no	2,5
Arnutovce	Spišská Nová Ves	569	56,6	no	no	yes	1,9
Bystrany	Spišská Nová Ves	2 600	67,4	no	no	yes	1,5
Doľany	Levoča	402	59,7	yes	no	yes	4,0
Závadka	Gelnica	606	56,3	no	no	yes	3,0
Žehra	Spišská Nová Ves	1 597	70,8	yes	yes	yes	0,7
Lomnička	Stará Lubovňa	1 639	80,7	yes	no	no	1,0
Roztoky	Svidník	295	55,4	no	no	no	1,0
Prosačov	Vranov nad Topľou	184	55,7	no	no	yes	2,0
Markušovce	Spišská Nová Ves	3 318	52,4	yes	no	yes	7,0
Richnava	Gelnica	1 947	64,1	no	no	yes	4,6

**Tab. 2.2 List of municipalities with low living standard**

Municipality	Region	Population	Dwellings of the 4. category (%)	Public water supply system	Public sewerage	Gas distribution mains	Dustless local communications (km)
Šumiac	Brezno	1 450	37,1	yes	no	no	13,0
Telgárt	Brezno	1 529	33,4	yes	no	no	12,3
Čakanovce	Lučenec	949	36,8	no	no	yes	3,8
Rapovce	Lučenec	934	28,2	yes	no	yes	9,0
Šíd	Lučenec	1 156	28,0	yes	no	yes	2,9
Točnica	Lučenec	317	26,3	yes	no	yes	1,8
Bretka	Rožňava	355	40,7	yes	no	yes	3,2
Držkovce	Rimavská Sobota	518	29,0	yes	no	no	1,1
Litava	Krupina	810	26,2	yes	no	no	3,9
Frička	Bardejov	248	46,2	yes	no	no	1,2
Kurov	Bardejov	545	26,0	yes	no	no	2,5
Lascov	Bardejov	525	26,4	no	no	yes	0,2
Lenártov	Bardejov	951	41,0	yes	no	no	1,8
Lukov	Bardejov	576	40,7	yes	no	no	2,0
Nižný Tvarožec	Bardejov	461	31,1	yes	no	no	1,4
Snakov	Bardejov	645	30,7	yes	no	no	1,9
Zborov	Bardejov	2 769	26,1	yes	no	yes	8,4
Blažice	Košice okolie	484	27,2	no	no	yes	2,3
Jasov	Košice okolie	2 753	36,2	yes	no	yes	14,5
Kráľovce	Košice okolie	1 041	30,5	yes	no	yes	2,5
Nižný Láneč	Košice okolie	416	35,3	no	no	yes	0,8
Nováčany	Košice okolie	671	30,4	no	no	yes	3,0
Opiná	Košice okolie	177	30,8	no	no	no	2,0
Veľká Ida	Košice okolie	2 901	39,1	yes	no	yes	16,7
Laškovce	Michalovce	516	31,3	yes	no	yes	2,7
Úbrež	Sobrance	650	28,1	no	no	yes	3,4
Holumnica	Kežmarok	779	28,7	yes	yes	yes	0,7
Hranovnica	Poprad	2 481	27,5	yes	yes	yes	7,5
Huncovce	Kežmarok	2 349	28,5	yes	yes	yes	6,1
Ihlany	Kežmarok	1 274	40,5	yes	yes	yes	2,7
Jyesvce	Poprad	1 144	34,4	yes	yes	yes	2,9
Krížová Ves	Kežmarok	1 651	33,5	yes	yes	yes	2,4
Mengusovce	Poprad	580	30,7	yes	yes	yes	2,8
Podhorany	Kežmarok	1 489	43,4	no	no	yes	1,5
Spišský Štiavnik	Poprad	2 097	34,8	yes	no	yes	3,4
Toporec	Kežmarok	1 652	32,9	yes	no	yes	4,1
Veľká Lomnica	Kežmarok	3 665	33,0	yes	yes	yes	10,5
Vydrník	Poprad	944	46,0	no	yes	yes	1,8
Abranovce	Prešov	540	29,4	no	no	yes	1,5
Hermanovce	Prešov	1 502	32,2	yes	no	yes	8,6
Kendice	Prešov	1 629	26,2	yes	yes	yes	4,6
Lesíček	Prešov	283	34,6	yes	no	yes	2,5
Nižný Slavkov	Sabinov	804	26,5	yes	no	no	2,2
Rokycany	Prešov	751	46,0	no	no	no	3,1
Šarišská Poruba	Prešov	405	33,8	yes	no	yes	1,0

**Tab. 2.2 List of municipalities with very living standard (continuation)**

Municipality	Region	Population	Dwellings of the 4. category (%)	Public water supply system	Public sewerage	Gas distribution mains	Dustless local communications (km)
Terňa	Prešov	1 054	25,2	yes	yes	yes	3,8
Tichý Potok	Sabinov	395	35,1	yes	no	no	1,4
Uzovské Peklany	Sabinov	378	29,6	no	no	yes	0,5
Žehňa	Prešov	832	47,8	yes	no	yes	3,8
Čoltovo	Rožňava	474	35,4	no	no	yes	5,1
Hucín	Rimavská Sobota	783	38,5	yes	no	yes	0,8
Kobeliarovo	Rožňava	439	38,5	yes	no	no	2,5
Krásnohorské Podhradie	Rožňava	2 437	36,1	yes	no	yes	6,2
Rejdová	Rožňava	738	29,9	yes	no	yes	4,5
Roštár	Rožňava	534	39,0	yes	no	no	3,5
Betlanovce	Spišská Nová Ves	635	35,6	no	no	yes	1,0
Dlhé Stráže	Levoča	506	26,1	yes	no	no	4,5
Haligovce	Stará Ľubovňa	687	38,2	no	no	no	4,0
Jakubany	Stará Ľubovňa	2 420	31,7	yes	no	yes	7,4
Kyjov	Stará Ľubovňa	768	30,4	no	no	yes	2,3
Šarišské Jastrabie	Stará Ľubovňa	1 141	34,6	yes	no	yes	6,0
Kružlová	Svidník	549	25,8	yes	no	yes	3,7
Báčkov	Trebišov	621	35,9	yes	no	yes	2,9
Boľany	Trebišov	1 215	29,0	yes	no	yes	6,0
Drahňov	Michalovce	1 100	47,5	yes	no	yes	3,1
Hrčeľ	Trebišov	812	44,6	yes	no	yes	1,7
Kapušianske Kľačany	Michalovce	810	26,6	no	no	yes	5,0
Malé Trakany	Trebišov	1 059	27,1	yes	no	yes	4,9
Poľany	Trebišov	535	27,7	yes	no	yes	0,9
Kamenná Poruba	Vranov nad Topľou	1 102	45,4	yes	no	yes	3,0
Sačurov	Vranov nad Topľou	1 968	29,0	no	yes	yes	9,3
Skrabské	Vranov nad Topľou	724	31,1	no	no	yes	4,2
Soľ	Vranov nad Topľou	2 223	31,4	no	no	yes	11,0
Vechec	Vranov nad Topľou	2 237	35,7	no	no	yes	4,2
Zámutov	Vranov nad Topľou	2 726	32,4	no	no	yes	5,3
Chrast nad Hornádom	Spišská Nová Ves	735	30,5	yes	yes	yes	7,0
Kaľava	Spišská Nová Ves	418	32,4	no	no	yes	2,0
Letanovce	Spišská Nová Ves	1 997	37,6	no	no	yes	5,8
Mníšek nad Hnilcom	Gelnica	1 702	47,2	yes	no	yes	3,0
Nálepkovo	Gelnica	2 672	45,8	yes	yes	no	11,5
Poráč	Spišská Nová Ves	1 046	25,1	yes	no	yes	5,6
Rudňany	Spišská Nová Ves	3 324	44,2	yes	yes	yes	9,3
Vítkovce	Spišská Nová Ves	518	36,0	yes	no	yes	9,1
Veľké Trakany	Trebišov	1 376	26,5	yes	no	yes	9,6
Banské	Vranov nad Topľou	1 489	32,0	no	no	yes	4,6
Čičava	Vranov nad Topľou	928	27,0	no	no	yes	6,0
Hlinné	Vranov nad Topľou	1 566	36,8	yes	no	yes	6,6
Dvorníky - Včeláre	Košice okolie	443	33,9	yes	no	yes	2,9
Brzotín	Rožňava	1 247	41,9	no	no	yes	2,9

**Tab. 3.2 Characteristics of natality and fertility in the municipalities with a very low living standard**

Municipality	TFR		Mean age at 1. childbirths		Births out of wedlock %	
	1993-1997	1998-2002	1993-1997	1998-2002	1993-1997	1998-2002
Valkovňa	3,119	3,236	20,6	19,9	61,5	80,0
Káloša	2,691	3,000	19,6	18,5	46,3	65,7
Sútor	3,671	3,261	20,4	18,4	48,9	74,5
Cigeľka	4,439	5,805	19,5	21,7	31,3	25,4
Zbudské Dlhé	3,338	2,786	19,8	19,5	47,1	72,7
Boliarov	3,697	4,805	19,3	19,5	50,0	54,7
Kecеровce	3,804	4,016	19,4	19,8	28,5	30,3
Rankovce	4,017	4,209	19,6	20,3	25,8	18,8
Vtáčkovce	4,780	3,761	19,3	19,9	24,2	34,3
Vrbnica	4,564	4,121	19,4	20,2	54,7	78,7
Jurské	4,539	5,015	21,1	19,6	35,6	31,1
Rakúsy	5,452	4,405	19,2	19,6	49,5	33,3
Stráne pod Tatrami	5,342	5,419	19,2	19,4	47,8	31,7
Výborná	3,260	3,768	19,2	19,2	41,6	24,2
Červenica	5,180	3,235	22,0	20,4	20,5	34,3
Chminianske Jakubovany	4,364	6,378	17,9	18,9	59,5	53,5
Jarovnice	4,852	5,149	18,5	18,7	39,9	45,9
Malý Slivník	4,386	4,786	20,2	19,9	33,0	24,6
Mirkovce	4,158	5,971	19,8	19,6	54,1	64,6
Olejníkov	6,261	5,354	20,4	20,3	50,0	27,3
Ostrovany	3,814	4,011	19,9	19,5	42,0	47,9
Svinia	4,613	4,954	19,8	20,1	46,5	45,2
Tuhrina	4,009	3,675	20,4	18,7	41,1	49,1
Varhaňovce	3,218	3,920	20,0	21,0	35,0	46,1
Bôrka	4,431	4,684	20,5	20,7	38,5	62,7
Rozložná	2,831	2,859	18,9	17,7	36,8	38,9
Arnutovce	4,836	3,241	19,6	19,1	40,5	43,3
Bystrany	5,121	4,264	19,4	19,3	48,5	53,2
Doľany	3,993	3,793	19,9	21,5	28,6	13,7
Závadka	3,787	4,216	21,3	22,9	38,2	49,3
Žehra	5,689	4,845	20,1	18,5	58,9	54,8
Lomnička	7,183	7,371	19,0	19,0	30,5	32,2
Roztoky	4,085	2,977	21,5	21,9	0,0	21,7
Prosačov	4,516	4,260	22,0	20,8	50,0	28,0
Markušovce	3,356	3,927	20,7	20,8	34,6	40,9
Richnava	4,413	4,648	18,4	20,2	56,2	49,1

**Tab. 3.3 Characteristics of natality and fertility in the municipalities with a low living standard**

Municipality	TFR		Mean age at 1. childbirths		Births out of wedlock %	
	1993-1997	1998-2002	1993-1997	1998-2002	1993-1997	1998-2002
Šumiac	1,572	1,756	22,4	22,0	27,1	40,7
Telgárt	1,703	1,410	21,0	22,4	33,9	48,2
Čakanovce	2,364	1,845	20,4	20,3	38,1	56,4
Rapovce	2,123	1,388	20,9	22,6	14,1	40,0
Šíd	2,432	1,791	21,1	21,1	48,9	59,8
Točnica	1,807	1,697	22,3	23,5	12,5	55,6
Bretka	1,161	1,735	21,5	22,5	29,4	44,4
Držkovce	1,826	1,775	20,4	21,6	12,5	31,6
Litava	3,100	1,864	21,3	21,5	21,5	41,9
Frička	3,331	2,792	19,9	19,9	26,1	48,3
Kurov	2,016	2,188	22,8	21,2	11,6	27,1
Lascov	3,230	2,426	21,2	22,2	11,7	12,7
Lenártov	2,769	3,096	18,7	20,4	52,1	18,6
Lukov	3,607	3,804	20,2	19,1	34,5	34,3
Nižný Tvarožec	3,183	3,059	22,0	20,2	34,6	36,4
Snakov	3,295	2,565	22,7	21,9	15,6	16,7
Zborov	2,964	2,497	21,4	21,1	30,9	32,6
Blažice	2,517	1,990	21,6	24,2	15,2	37,5
Jasov	3,013	2,896	20,9	21,1	41,3	54,9
Kráľovce	2,146	1,292	20,6	20,1	34,5	33,9
Nižný Láneč	2,525	1,807	20,7	19,7	20,0	51,6
Nováčany	1,961	1,705	22,5	23,1	19,1	26,0
Opiná	2,836	2,150	20,5	22,5	20,0	57,1
Veľká Ida	3,204	3,021	20,9	21,1	47,3	57,3
Laškovce	3,207	2,317	20,2	21,1	39,7	49,0
Úbrež	1,720	1,715	23,1	22,3	21,9	15,0
Holumnica	2,684	1,839	21,5	21,4	9,2	8,6
Hranovnica	2,556	2,157	20,3	20,2	35,5	52,0
Huncovce	3,219	2,605	22,3	21,2	33,6	28,7
Ihlany	2,783	1,928	21,7	21,5	23,3	12,6
Jánovce	3,150	2,818	21,5	21,7	19,5	34,6
Krížová Ves	3,257	2,684	19,2	20,2	38,4	25,9
Mengusovce	1,402	1,796	22,6	24,1	6,7	31,8
Podhorany	6,642	5,193	19,6	19,4	43,6	26,5
Spišský Štiavnik	2,750	2,493	20,8	21,5	29,4	38,0
Toporec	2,591	2,140	21,7	22,4	13,9	14,9
Veľká Lomnica	2,982	2,337	21,5	20,8	31,4	35,0
Vydrník	3,528	2,625	21,6	20,7	36,2	45,2
Abranovce	2,210	1,531	23,3	21,7	16,0	17,9
Hermanovce	2,738	2,804	21,2	22,3	30,9	44,7
Kendice	3,353	2,080	22,4	22,9	23,4	28,9
Lesíček	4,852	4,662	19,0	22,1	34,1	10,9
Nižný Slavkov	3,068	2,812	21,0	21,6	18,4	23,5
Rokycany	3,014	2,663	20,6	20,6	20,9	36,6
Šarišská Poruba	3,706	2,733	22,9	20,0	34,0	56,1

**Tab. 3.3 Characteristics of natality and fertility in the municipalities with a low living standard (continuation)**

Municipality	TFR		Mean age at 1. childbirths		Births out of wedlock %	
	1993-1997	1998-2002	1993-1997	1998-2002	1993-1997	1998-2002
Terňa	1,753	1,881	22,5	23,1	12,9	13,6
Tichý Potok	1,445	2,238	22,5	23,0	0,0	19,4
Uzovské Peklany	2,826	3,076	21,6	23,3	30,6	23,1
Žehňa	3,873	3,244	20,2	19,4	31,3	38,9
Čoltovo	2,369	1,815	20,7	20,1	25,9	36,8
Hucín	2,542	2,018	20,6	23,4	40,7	30,2
Kobeliarovo	2,334	2,669	23,2	18,1	32,4	40,9
Krásnohorské Podhradie	2,509	2,159	21,6	20,5	31,1	50,4
Rejdová	2,533	2,731	21,8	21,6	38,0	47,3
Roštár	2,387	2,839	19,7	19,7	38,6	41,3
Betlanovce	4,045	2,782	21,7	21,0	27,3	50,8
Dlhé Stráže	3,362	2,656	22,3	22,0	19,4	33,9
Haligovce	2,083	1,838	22,0	23,9	0,0	8,9
Jakubany	3,536	2,447	21,6	21,3	10,0	14,0
Kyjov	3,276	2,907	21,6	20,3	27,9	35,7
Šarišské Jastrabie	3,303	3,162	20,8	20,8	31,8	27,1
Kružlová	2,493	2,141	21,6	21,3	9,8	0,0
Bačkov	1,938	2,093	21,6	21,7	25,6	35,3
Boňany	2,331	1,885	20,3	21,1	39,5	59,8
Drahňov	2,975	2,833	21,9	20,0	24,0	41,3
Hrčeľ	2,316	2,195	21,2	20,0	49,2	58,4
Kapušíanske Kľačany	2,276	2,306	21,0	21,3	38,9	37,7
Malé Trakany	2,533	2,148	20,9	21,7	16,7	34,8
Poľany	2,248	1,712	23,3	23,1	35,5	23,5
Kamenná Poruba	2,792	3,074	19,2	20,9	64,8	64,9
Sačurov	2,580	2,190	20,5	21,6	35,2	46,8
Skrabské	2,267	2,320	21,4	21,8	24,1	38,6
Soľ	2,124	2,136	21,2	21,1	25,5	26,3
Vehec	3,034	2,958	20,5	20,3	31,8	32,4
Zámutov	2,429	1,942	19,8	19,7	31,4	37,5
Chrast nad Hornádom	2,622	2,527	21,3	21,4	33,3	30,1
Kaľava	1,971	1,140	20,6	22,3	9,1	16,0
Letanovce	3,415	2,730	21,3	20,1	32,9	39,7
Mníšek nad Hnilcom	2,288	1,684	22,2	22,7	18,3	32,8
Nálepkovo	3,117	2,724	20,3	20,2	37,0	46,5
Poráč	2,596	2,110	22,4	22,2	27,8	34,9
Rudňany	3,298	3,090	20,8	19,8	41,1	53,3
Vítkovce	4,166	3,137	20,6	20,9	42,3	33,3
Veľké Trakany	2,216	1,664	21,4	22,3	0,0	16,7
Banské	2,692	2,617	20,3	21,1	14,7	26,2
Čičava	3,251	2,688	20,4	20,3	32,7	44,7
Hlinné	2,693	2,096	20,2	20,5	14,1	32,2
Dvorníky - Včeláre	1,455	1,315	21,8	21,2	25,0	16,7
Brzotín	1,432	1,584	19,7	20,3	47,8	48,9

**Tab. 4.2 Number and increase of population in the municipalities with a very low living standard**

Municipality	Population		Increase	
	1.1.1993	31.12.2002	Abs.	%
Valkovňa	299	325	26	8,7
Káloša	572	652	80	14,0
Sútor	324	403	79	24,4
Cigeľka	363	455	92	25,3
Zbudské Dlhé	456	571	115	25,2
Boliarov	475	597	122	25,7
Kecеровce	1 834	2 415	581	31,7
Rankovce	462	572	110	23,8
Vtáčkovce	530	769	239	45,1
Vrbnica	586	776	190	32,4
Jurské	574	798	224	39,0
Rakúsy	1 385	1 998	613	44,3
Stráne pod Tatrami	813	1 208	395	48,6
Výborná	647	875	228	35,2
Červenica	572	697	125	21,9
Chminianske Jakubovany	1 122	1 498	376	33,5
Jarovnice	3 222	4 274	1 052	32,7
Malý Slivník	513	671	158	30,8
Mirkovce	785	966	181	23,1
Olejníkov	290	354	64	22,1
Ostrovany	1 199	1 524	325	27,1
Svinia	1 104	1 359	255	23,1
Tuhrina	375	415	40	10,7
Varhaňovce	854	1 036	182	21,3
Bôrka	343	455	112	32,7
Rozložná	151	195	44	29,1
Arnutovce	421	569	148	35,2
Bystrany	2 011	2 600	589	29,3
Doľany	269	402	133	49,4
Závadka	541	606	65	12,0
Žehra	1 202	1 597	395	32,9
Lomnička	1 050	1 639	589	56,1
Roztoky	249	295	46	18,5
Prosačov	152	184	32	21,1
Markušovce	2 740	3 318	578	21,1
Richnava	1 369	1 947	578	42,2

**Tab. 4.3 Number and increase of population in the municipalities with a low living standard**

Municipality	Population		Increase	
	1.1.1993	31.12.2002	Abs.	%
Šumiac	1 636	1 450	-186	-11,4
Telgárt	1 671	1 529	-142	-8,5
Čakanovce	904	949	45	5,0
Rapovce	827	934	107	12,9
Šíd	1 104	1 156	52	4,7
Točnica	309	317	8	2,6
Bretka	364	355	-9	-2,5
Držkovce	469	518	49	10,4
Litava	796	810	14	1,8
Frička	217	248	31	14,3
Kurov	562	545	-17	-3,0
Lascov	482	525	43	8,9
Lenártov	789	951	162	20,5
Lukov	460	576	116	25,2
Nižný Tvarožec	434	461	27	6,2
Snakov	592	645	53	9,0
Zborov	2 380	2 769	389	16,3
Blažice	408	484	76	18,6
Jasov	2 356	2 753	397	16,9
Královce	889	1 041	152	17,1
Nižný Láneč	382	416	34	8,9
Nováčany	606	671	65	10,7
Opiná	169	177	8	4,7
Veľká Ida	2 442	2 901	459	18,8
Laškovce	415	516	101	24,3
Úbrež	582	650	68	11,7
Holumnica	694	779	85	12,2
Hranovnica	2 148	2 481	333	15,5
Huncovce	1 890	2 349	459	24,3
Ihlany	1 104	1 274	170	15,4
Jánovce	947	1 144	197	20,8
Krížová Ves	1 416	1 651	235	16,6
Mengusovce	555	580	25	4,5
Podhorany	935	1 489	554	59,3
Spišský Štiavnik	1 799	2 097	298	16,6
Toporec	1 444	1 652	208	14,4
Veľká Lomnica	3 101	3 665	564	18,2
Vydrník	792	944	152	19,2
Abranovce	518	540	22	4,2
Hermanovce	1 355	1 502	147	10,8
Kendice	1 352	1 629	277	20,5
Lesíček	243	283	40	16,5
Nižný Slavkov	784	804	20	2,6
Rokycany	617	751	134	21,7
Šarišská Poruba	369	405	36	9,8

**Tab. 4.3 Number and increase of population in the municipalities with a low living standard (continuation)**

Municipality	Population		Increase	
	1.1.1993	31.12.2002	Abs.	%
Terňa	968	1 054	86	8,9
Tichý Potok	394	395	1	0,3
Uzovské Peklany	386	378	-8	-2,1
Žehňa	641	832	191	29,8
Čoltovo	435	474	39	9,0
Hucín	770	783	13	1,7
Kobeliarovo	416	439	23	5,5
Krásnohorské Podhradie	2 002	2 437	435	21,7
Rejdová	682	738	56	8,2
Roštár	493	534	41	8,3
Betlanovce	504	635	131	26,0
Dlhé Stráže	430	506	76	17,7
Haligovce	652	687	35	5,4
Jakubany	2 194	2 420	226	10,3
Kyjov	716	768	52	7,3
Šarišské Jastrabie	968	1 141	173	17,9
Kružlová	526	549	23	4,4
Bačkov	586	621	35	6,0
Boňany	1 115	1 215	100	9,0
Drahňov	971	1 100	129	13,3
Hrčeľ	758	812	54	7,1
Kapušíanske Kľačany	756	810	54	7,1
Malé Trakany	964	1 059	95	9,9
Poľany	461	535	74	16,1
Kamenná Poruba	914	1 102	188	20,6
Sačurov	1 838	1 968	130	7,1
Skrabské	608	724	116	19,1
Sol'	1 962	2 223	261	13,3
Vehec	1 835	2 237	402	21,9
Zámutov	2 415	2 726	311	12,9
Chrast nad Hornádom	682	735	53	7,8
Kaľava	397	418	21	5,3
Letanovce	1 686	1 997	311	18,4
Mníšek nad Hnilcom	1 559	1 702	143	9,2
Nálepkovo	2 376	2 672	296	12,5
Poráč	973	1 046	73	7,5
Rudňany	2 832	3 324	492	17,4
Vítkovce	384	518	134	34,9
Veľké Trakany	1 295	1 376	81	6,3
Banské	1 287	1 489	202	15,7
Čičava	721	928	207	28,7
Hlinné	1 421	1 566	145	10,2
Dvorníky - Včeláre	433	443	10	2,3
Brzotín	1 151	1 247	96	8,3

**Tab. 5.3 Age structure of the population in the municipalities with a very low living standard**

Municipality	0-14 (%)		15-44 (%)		45-64 (%)		65+ (%)		Ageing index		Mean age	
	1993	2002	1993	2002	1993	2002	1993	2002	1993	2002	1993	2002
Valkovňa	21,4	27,4	40,8	40,9	19,4	17,5	18,4	14,2	85,9	51,7	38,2	33,3
Káloša	33,6	32,1	44,6	45,7	14,0	15,3	7,9	6,9	23,4	21,5	28,6	29,0
Sútor	34,0	35,0	41,7	45,2	16,0	13,6	8,3	6,2	24,5	17,7	28,6	27,0
Cigeľka	34,2	36,7	38,0	41,5	15,4	11,9	12,4	9,9	36,3	26,9	31,1	27,9
Zbudské Dlhé	34,2	30,1	41,7	47,5	13,8	14,0	10,3	8,4	30,1	27,9	29,1	29,3
Boliarov	34,9	35,3	43,2	43,0	13,3	14,1	8,6	7,5	24,7	21,3	28,9	28,0
Kecеровce	37,7	38,5	45,5	45,5	11,1	11,6	5,7	4,3	15,2	11,3	25,4	25,0
Rankovce	31,8	37,1	40,0	40,7	15,2	14,2	13,0	8,0	40,8	21,7	31,6	27,5
Vtáčkovce	37,7	40,3	46,6	45,9	10,6	10,4	5,1	3,4	13,5	8,4	24,8	23,5
Vrbnica	32,4	37,1	40,6	42,1	16,4	13,0	10,6	7,7	32,6	20,8	30,2	27,1
Jurské	41,5	40,1	43,0	45,0	8,9	9,4	6,6	5,5	16,0	13,8	24,9	24,4
Rakúsy	43,4	41,8	42,3	44,1	10,2	10,0	4,1	4,1	9,5	9,7	23,1	23,5
Stráne pod Tatrami	45,0	46,1	45,1	42,9	7,3	8,8	2,6	2,2	5,7	4,8	20,9	21,5
Výborná	40,8	37,9	44,4	46,9	9,6	10,6	5,3	4,6	12,9	12,0	24,0	24,7
Červenica	33,4	29,7	44,2	47,2	14,0	13,1	8,4	10,0	25,1	33,8	29,3	30,1
Chminianske Jakubovany	39,5	43,1	37,2	39,9	14,5	11,2	8,8	5,8	22,3	13,5	27,4	24,0
Jarovnice	43,7	44,2	40,3	42,5	10,4	9,0	5,6	4,3	12,9	9,7	23,5	22,4
Malý Slivník	36,6	41,0	45,8	42,0	10,7	13,4	6,8	3,6	18,6	8,7	25,9	24,5
Mirkovce	36,7	38,0	43,3	41,2	11,1	13,4	8,9	7,5	24,3	19,6	27,6	26,6
Olejníkov	25,2	35,6	44,8	39,8	15,9	14,7	14,1	9,9	56,2	27,8	33,7	29,2
Ostrovany	36,2	36,4	45,3	46,4	12,8	12,0	5,8	5,2	15,9	14,2	26,1	26,0
Svinia	35,6	36,9	41,2	42,2	14,9	12,8	8,2	8,0	23,2	21,7	28,3	27,1
Tuhrina	32,5	34,9	42,4	40,2	16,3	15,7	8,8	9,2	27,0	26,2	29,3	30,0
Varhaňovce	35,6	36,3	45,1	44,6	11,1	13,3	8,2	5,8	23,0	16,0	27,0	26,8
Bôrka	24,8	38,5	40,5	38,0	17,5	13,4	17,2	10,1	69,4	26,3	35,3	28,3
Rozložná	28,5	30,3	37,7	45,6	19,2	10,8	14,6	13,3	51,2	44,1	34,3	31,1
Arnutovce	35,4	37,6	45,6	44,8	12,8	11,6	6,2	6,0	17,4	15,9	27,1	26,1
Bystrany	39,5	40,3	44,8	42,6	10,9	12,5	4,8	4,6	12,1	11,4	24,5	24,4
Doľany	32,3	37,8	44,6	41,3	14,5	13,4	8,6	7,5	26,4	19,7	29,6	26,7
Závadka	20,1	29,0	39,6	38,4	26,2	16,3	14,0	16,2	69,7	55,7	37,3	34,5
Žehra	38,2	40,3	48,8	48,0	8,2	7,7	4,8	4,0	12,6	9,9	23,5	23,5
Lomnička	49,4	52,4	42,8	39,3	5,3	7,0	2,5	1,3	5,0	2,6	18,9	18,5
Roztoky	22,9	30,5	36,9	41,0	22,5	16,6	17,7	11,9	77,2	38,9	37,1	31,9
Prosačov	27,0	31,5	44,7	42,4	13,8	16,8	14,5	9,2	53,7	29,3	33,9	28,8
Markušovce	33,7	33,8	44,2	44,1	15,0	14,1	7,1	8,0	21,0	23,5	28,3	28,4
Richnava	32,6	38,0	45,6	43,2	13,7	12,2	8,1	6,6	24,9	17,3	28,0	26,4

**Tab. 5.4 Age structure of the population in the municipalities with a low living standard**

Municipality	0-14 (%)		15-44 (%)		45-64 (%)		65+ (%)		Ageing index		Mean age	
	1993	2002	1993	2002	1993	2002	1993	2002	1993	2002	1993	2002
Šumiac	19,4	19,8	38,9	40,7	25,6	22,3	16,1	17,2	82,7	87,1	38,9	38,7
Telgárt	27,3	25,0	40,5	42,8	18,6	18,1	13,6	14,1	50,0	56,4	33,7	34,7
Čakanovce	24,4	24,6	41,8	42,7	21,8	19,1	11,9	13,7	48,9	55,8	35,0	34,7
Rapovce	25,6	20,0	44,1	49,8	18,7	20,4	11,5	9,7	44,8	48,7	33,5	34,4
Šíd	26,3	22,8	41,0	44,6	21,1	21,7	11,6	11,0	44,1	48,3	34,4	34,5
Točnica	21,4	15,8	37,9	45,7	25,2	24,3	15,5	14,2	72,7	90,0	38,7	38,4
Bretka	23,1	20,3	40,1	46,8	19,0	20,3	17,9	12,7	77,4	62,5	36,9	35,3
Držkovce	22,2	22,4	39,9	44,6	24,1	18,1	13,9	14,9	62,5	66,4	37,3	35,0
Litava	24,2	27,3	42,2	42,7	19,8	16,7	13,7	13,3	56,5	48,9	35,0	33,4
Frička	30,9	28,6	34,6	45,2	17,1	13,7	17,5	12,5	56,7	43,7	35,6	30,7
Kurov	25,8	23,3	39,3	43,9	18,1	17,1	16,7	15,8	64,8	67,7	35,6	35,4
Lascov	25,5	26,7	48,1	45,0	16,2	20,2	10,2	8,2	39,8	30,7	32,0	32,0
Lenártov	29,0	32,0	40,7	43,1	16,0	13,6	14,3	11,4	49,3	35,5	32,7	30,5
Lukov	25,2	29,2	37,2	41,1	21,3	14,9	16,3	14,8	64,7	50,6	36,4	33,0
Nižný Tvarožec	24,9	28,4	40,6	40,6	19,6	19,1	15,0	11,9	60,2	42,0	34,9	33,6
Snakov	25,2	26,0	44,3	44,5	18,6	16,6	12,0	12,9	47,7	49,4	33,7	33,1
Zborov	27,4	27,4	45,3	45,1	16,8	19,3	10,5	8,3	38,2	30,2	32,1	31,2
Blažice	19,9	29,3	48,0	40,3	20,6	20,2	11,5	10,1	58,0	34,5	34,3	32,9
Jasov	29,2	30,5	42,4	43,8	18,4	17,5	10,0	8,1	34,3	26,7	32,1	30,2
Kráľovce	30,4	23,9	47,2	45,6	13,8	22,9	8,5	7,6	28,1	31,7	29,7	32,5
Nižný Láneč	28,8	24,5	40,1	45,7	18,6	16,3	12,6	13,5	43,6	54,9	33,3	34,2
Nováčany	26,2	21,6	44,6	50,4	18,6	17,9	10,6	10,1	40,3	46,9	33,0	33,5
Opiná	23,1	23,7	39,1	45,8	20,7	15,8	17,2	14,7	74,4	61,9	37,8	34,8
Veľká Ida	26,7	28,6	40,1	43,5	20,2	18,0	12,9	9,9	48,4	34,7	34,3	31,7
Laškovce	26,0	26,7	44,8	43,8	18,8	19,6	10,4	9,9	39,8	37,0	32,1	32,3
Úbrež	20,3	18,2	38,5	42,9	20,8	17,5	20,4	21,4	100,8	117,8	39,2	39,5
Holumnica	32,7	29,0	46,8	49,6	14,0	14,8	6,5	6,7	19,8	23,0	28,1	29,3
Hranovnica	30,3	26,8	43,3	47,1	18,2	17,7	8,1	8,4	26,9	31,2	30,7	31,5
Huncovce	33,5	32,1	45,6	46,6	14,0	15,0	6,9	6,3	20,5	19,6	28,3	28,5
Ihlany	30,5	30,0	46,5	46,7	14,8	15,5	8,2	7,8	27,0	26,2	29,5	29,6
Jánovce	28,7	33,9	46,4	42,2	17,0	16,5	7,9	7,3	27,6	21,6	29,4	29,1
Krížová Ves	37,2	33,9	42,5	46,2	13,5	13,0	6,8	7,0	18,2	20,6	27,1	27,7
Mengusovce	26,3	21,2	43,4	46,0	18,6	21,6	11,7	11,2	44,5	52,8	33,5	35,0
Podhorany	45,1	47,1	42,6	41,0	9,0	9,5	3,3	2,5	7,3	5,3	21,7	21,4
Spišský Štiavnik	31,9	30,1	45,0	45,3	14,5	16,5	8,7	8,1	27,2	26,9	29,3	29,9
Toporec	31,4	29,1	44,9	47,6	16,6	15,0	7,1	8,4	22,7	29,0	29,0	30,2
Veľká Lomnica	33,3	30,7	45,6	45,1	15,6	17,3	5,5	7,0	16,7	22,7	27,9	29,5
Vydrník	29,8	32,5	45,3	44,7	15,5	15,0	9,3	7,7	31,4	23,8	30,0	29,3
Abranovce	29,0	25,9	46,7	49,4	15,4	17,6	8,9	7,0	30,7	27,1	29,7	31,0
Hermanovce	28,2	30,0	43,3	42,8	16,7	16,6	11,8	10,6	41,9	35,3	31,9	31,5
Kendice	27,5	28,7	43,5	43,5	17,2	18,2	11,8	9,6	42,7	33,3	32,6	31,6
Lesíček	25,9	37,8	43,6	35,7	21,0	15,9	9,5	10,6	36,5	28,0	32,0	29,2
Nižný Slavkov	23,2	29,9	39,8	41,3	19,6	15,5	17,3	13,3	74,7	44,6	36,4	32,4
Rokycany	36,8	35,4	45,2	46,5	11,3	11,9	6,6	6,3	18,1	17,7	26,2	26,9
Šarišská Poruba	33,1	30,6	41,5	45,2	14,6	14,8	10,8	9,4	32,8	30,6	30,2	30,3

**Tab. 5.4 Age structure of the population in the municipalities with a low living standard (continuation)**

Municipality	0-14 (%)		15-44 (%)		45-64 (%)		65+ (%)		Ageing index		Mean age	
	1993	2002	1993	2002	1993	2002	1993	2002	1993	2002	1993	2002
Terňa	26,1	25,5	43,3	45,7	19,4	17,4	11,2	11,4	42,7	44,6	33,3	33,3
Tichý Potok	21,8	25,3	36,0	40,3	18,5	15,4	23,6	19,0	108,1	75,0	39,3	37,3
Uzovské Peklany	26,4	28,3	39,1	41,3	18,7	15,9	15,8	14,6	59,8	51,4	35,2	33,3
Žehňa	35,4	38,1	43,4	42,9	12,3	13,3	8,9	5,6	25,1	14,8	27,6	26,1
Čoltovo	22,8	19,8	43,9	47,3	19,3	20,3	14,0	12,7	61,6	63,8	36,1	35,0
Hucín	26,4	26,6	48,2	44,3	16,5	20,7	9,0	8,4	34,0	31,7	31,2	32,5
Kobeliarovo	25,7	28,7	39,9	39,4	21,4	18,0	13,0	13,9	50,5	48,4	34,8	33,9
Krásnohorské Podhradie	27,2	26,8	45,3	45,6	18,4	17,8	9,1	9,8	33,4	36,8	31,9	31,9
Rejdová	18,8	24,9	38,4	38,9	22,1	19,2	20,7	16,9	110,2	67,9	41,0	35,9
Roštár	29,4	33,0	43,6	43,6	14,4	16,3	12,6	7,1	42,8	21,6	31,6	29,4
Betlanovce	28,6	29,6	41,3	45,7	19,8	14,5	10,3	10,2	36,1	34,6	32,7	31,1
Dlhé Stráže	31,9	31,2	47,0	46,2	13,3	15,0	7,9	7,5	24,8	24,1	28,9	28,8
Haligovce	27,3	24,7	44,2	46,0	20,4	19,9	8,1	9,3	29,8	37,6	31,9	32,7
Jakubany	30,6	28,1	40,2	43,2	18,4	16,9	10,7	11,7	35,0	41,6	31,6	32,1
Kyjov	23,2	25,3	39,1	39,6	20,7	18,1	17,0	17,1	73,5	67,5	37,4	35,9
Šarišské Jastrabie	25,9	30,1	40,2	39,3	19,0	18,1	14,9	12,4	57,4	41,3	34,6	32,4
Kružlová	27,0	25,0	47,0	45,2	16,5	18,4	9,5	11,5	35,2	46,0	31,6	33,0
Bačkov	20,3	22,7	40,8	40,4	19,3	22,4	19,6	14,5	96,6	63,8	38,5	36,2
Boľany	23,8	21,2	43,2	46,7	20,3	20,8	12,7	11,3	53,6	53,1	35,2	34,2
Drahňov	26,3	31,5	39,0	41,7	19,9	16,9	14,8	9,9	56,5	31,5	34,9	30,7
Hrčef	26,9	28,0	41,8	43,8	18,7	17,9	12,5	10,3	46,6	37,0	33,4	32,2
Kapušíanske Kľačany	23,1	22,6	41,0	45,2	21,3	20,6	14,6	11,6	62,9	51,4	36,4	34,7
Malé Trakany	22,0	20,3	38,2	44,2	25,9	21,3	13,9	14,2	63,2	69,8	37,8	36,7
Poľany	22,3	20,7	40,3	42,8	19,5	20,9	17,8	15,5	79,6	74,8	37,7	36,4
Kamenná Poruba	32,3	32,2	43,7	45,3	14,9	15,1	9,2	7,4	28,5	23,1	28,9	28,4
Sačurov	29,8	25,6	42,7	45,9	16,9	18,0	10,6	10,5	35,6	40,9	31,7	32,2
Skrabské	28,5	25,7	40,5	45,6	19,6	16,6	11,5	12,2	40,5	47,3	33,0	32,9
Soľ	30,3	26,7	46,0	46,3	15,9	19,2	7,8	7,8	25,9	29,1	30,0	31,0
Večec	31,2	32,5	45,3	43,9	15,0	16,8	8,5	6,8	27,3	21,1	29,5	28,9
Zámutov	32,8	26,7	45,0	47,8	13,6	16,9	8,7	8,6	26,4	32,2	29,5	30,6
Chrast nad Hornádom	29,6	29,7	46,2	45,6	17,9	16,1	6,3	8,7	21,3	29,4	28,9	30,7
Kaľava	23,4	25,1	45,8	44,7	21,2	19,1	9,6	11,0	40,9	43,8	34,0	33,9
Letanovce	30,5	31,0	42,9	43,3	17,0	16,4	9,5	9,4	31,3	30,2	30,6	30,1
Mníšek nad Hnilcom	25,7	24,6	42,4	44,5	20,0	20,0	11,9	10,9	46,5	44,5	34,1	33,6
Nálepkovo	30,6	31,7	42,4	43,3	16,1	16,4	10,9	8,6	35,4	27,3	30,8	29,8
Poráč	26,0	24,1	42,0	45,3	20,8	18,8	11,2	11,8	43,1	48,8	33,7	33,9
Rudňany	31,7	32,4	43,6	44,7	17,9	14,4	6,8	8,5	21,5	26,3	29,6	29,0
Vítkovce	28,6	35,3	47,7	42,1	16,9	17,2	6,8	5,4	23,6	15,3	29,4	27,8
Veľké Trakany	20,3	16,1	38,8	44,8	26,3	21,8	14,7	17,4	72,2	108,1	38,5	38,8
Banské	30,5	29,4	44,0	45,1	15,6	16,2	9,9	9,3	32,7	31,5	30,7	30,5
Čičava	31,8	31,6	42,4	46,9	15,4	13,9	10,4	7,7	32,8	24,2	30,1	28,9
Hlinné	32,7	28,0	45,0	48,0	13,8	15,8	8,6	8,2	26,3	29,2	28,8	30,2
Dvorníky - Včeláre	20,3	16,3	42,3	44,9	21,9	22,8	15,5	16,0	76,1	98,6	37,5	38,1
Brzotín	25,3	20,7	43,6	45,1	20,1	22,5	11,0	11,7	43,6	56,6	34,3	35,2