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Abstract: The last decades were the years of the mass-urbanization (mass migration from the rural areas to the large towns) in Hungary. After 1990 new urbanization trends started. The population of the large towns started to decline, while the population of the nearby villages and small towns started to grow because of the suburbanization process. The population of the rural areas became on the same level in the last years. In the last three-four years these trends changed again. The population of the large towns, especially Budapest started to grow again because of the larger amount of the immigrants from the rural areas. The rural areas have large migration and population loss again, while the increasing population and migrational trends of the suburban areas still the same as in the last decade. We can see suburbanization and urbanization again in Hungary.
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1. INTRODUCTION

The urbanization and inner-migration trends of the last decades are well-known. The mass-urbanization process was the main migrational process in Hungary before 1990, the population of the towns became larger, the villages’ smaller (Enyedi, Gy. 1988, Beluszky, P. 1999). First we could see this population growing process at the large towns than later at the medium-sized and small towns as well. The size was also really important at the villages, the smaller was the village, the larger was the migrational loss. The geographic location was also important, but not as important as the size. Only some villages with special functions had migrational gain (villages with sizable tourism, industrial villages, mining villages, some important agricultural centres). Because of the out-migration the
After 1990 most of the towns also had natural decrease, and the previous migration trends changed dramatically. The urbanization, which was much slower in the 1980’s than before, now stopped. The population of the large and medium-sized towns became smaller and smaller. The most important reason of this decline was the suburbanization. First around Budapest, than around the other large towns we could see villages with increasing population and the reason was the migration from the towns. The literature of suburbanization is quite rich in Hungary, we know most of the reasons as well (Bajmócy, P. 2000, Bajmócy, P. 2002, Bajmócy, P. 2006, Dövényi, Z. – Kovács, Z. 1999, Hardi, T. 2002, Timár, J. 1999). Normally during suburbanization we can see population decline in the rural areas. In Hungary we could see it in the 1990’s, but the size of this decline was not larger than the decline of the total population. The population change tendencies of the rural areas had been caused by several reasons. In the first half of the 1990’s a lot of people moved back from the towns to rural areas because of the living problems, unemployment, economic crisis of the towns. They went first of all to the poorest regions of Hungary (Szabolcs-Szatmár-Bereg and Borsod-Abaúj-Zemplén counties). The dynamic zones near the towns sometimes overlapped the borders of suburban zones. Some classic rural areas also became popular, usually which are touristic areas too (Balaton-Highland, Órség), and some people moved there. So during the 1990’s and the first 3-4 years of the 2000’s we could see declining large and medium-sized towns, increasing suburban regions and stagnating small towns and rural areas in Hungary. After 2004 some of these trends seem to change. Let us see these changes!

2. DATABASE OF THE RESEARCH

In this research we can deal with the population change trends of settlements between 1949-2001 by decades, between 2001-2009 by years. We could also see the different elements of population changes (migration balance, in-migration, out-migration, natural increase/decrease, births, deaths) separately. We have got the data from HSO (Hungarian Statistic Office) and we’ve seen 3135 settlements in the whole era. Those new villages, which became independent after 2001, we could not see separately because of lack of data. There were some problems because of the methodological differences of data of the census and the other years. The population of some special institutions (schools, prisons) counted at the census, but not at the other years. For example the population of Márianosztra (Pest county) was 866 in 1990, 1610 in 2001 and 969 in 2008. In 2001 the population of a prison also added, but not before and later. Sometimes the data of the year 2001 can be really different from the others, but it gives a small problem as we’ve seen the trends. This is why we had to see two data for the year 2001, the census and the overcounted one.

We divided the settlement of Hungary by the population change trends into two large groups and into eight small, inside them. The two large groups are the towns and the villages. The towns mean not the administrative ones (more than 300 in Hungary), but the

---

1 The overcounted population means that to the population of a census added the number of births, deaths, migration year by year. Source of data: HSO.
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There are a lot of administrative towns in Hungary without any urban functions. We used the typology of Pál Beluszky at the towns, with some simplifications. We had four groups: Budapest, the large towns (regional and county centres, 19) medium-sized towns (40) and the small towns (small towns and partly urban settlements, 109). There are 169 towns in contrast of Beluszky’s 190, because we put some towns of urban agglomerations and some touristic towns into different types.

In the second large group there are the villages. We made also four sub-groups, three dynamic ones and one laggard. There are two suburban groups of villages (and small towns), one around Budapest and one around the other large towns. The suburban zone of Budapest is much larger than the official agglomeration, finally there are 166 settlements in this group, most of them in Pest County. There are 291 suburban settlements around the other large towns, most of them are around Győr (36), Pécs (27), Zalaegerszeg (27), Szombathely (26), Kaposvár (25) and Miskolc (23). The third special group of rural settlements are the touristic ones, because the population change trends are also different from the others. There are 116 such settlements, most of them around Lake Balaton (88), but there are some around the Lake Velence, Lake Tisza, Danube Bend and also some spas as well. The largest group of villages are the rural settlements (2393 mainly villages, with some administrative towns without any urban functions). In this paper we could examine the population change trends of these groups between 1949-2009 by categories and counties.

3. POPULATION CHANGE TRENDS

The basic table of this paper is the next (table 1). We could see what part of the whole population of Hungary lived in the selected categories in the different years between 1949-2009.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Budapest</th>
<th>Large town</th>
<th>Medium-sized town</th>
<th>Small town</th>
<th>Suburban zone of Budapest</th>
<th>Suburban zone of large towns</th>
<th>Tourism area</th>
<th>Rural area</th>
<th>All-together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1949</td>
<td>17.28</td>
<td>11.05</td>
<td>8.93</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>39.29</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>17.88</td>
<td>12.49</td>
<td>9.79</td>
<td>10.10</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.99</td>
<td>36.35</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>19.39</td>
<td>15.05</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td>9.76</td>
<td>7.26</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>31.27</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>19.23</td>
<td>17.38</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>7.81</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>27.52</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>19.44</td>
<td>18.40</td>
<td>11.40</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>7.92</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>25.64</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>17.43</td>
<td>18.41</td>
<td>11.23</td>
<td>10.43</td>
<td>9.41</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>25.60</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>17.27</td>
<td>18.30</td>
<td>11.27</td>
<td>10.53</td>
<td>9.31</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>25.82</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2002</td>
<td>17.09</td>
<td>18.23</td>
<td>11.24</td>
<td>10.52</td>
<td>9.49</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>25.83</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\footnote{1949-2001: Data of census, 2001-2009: Overcounted data (adding the natural increase and the migrational balance year-by-year. The first 2001 row is the data of census, the second is the overcounted. See the categories in the text.}

Tab. 1. Percentage of the settlement types from the total population of Hungary 1949-2009

Ponderea tipurilor de aşezări în populaŃia totală a Ungariei 1949-2009
The percentage of the urban types became larger and larger before 1990, in the case of Budapest between 1949-1970, at the large towns always, at the medium sized towns to 1980 and at the small towns between 1970-1990. In contrast of it the percentage of rural areas dropped from 39.3% to 25.6%. The suburban zone of Budapest had a small increase, especially between 1960-1980, but the suburban regions of the other towns dropped slowly between 1949-1980 and grew a bit after 1980. The touristic regions had also small population gain after 1960. So before 1990 we could see increasing towns, stagnation suburban and touristic area and declining rural regions in Hungary.

After 1990 these trends changed a lot. The population of Budapest and the large towns started to decline, while the population of suburban areas increased rapidly. We could see small increase of the touristic areas, but the population of the small towns and the rural areas seemed to stagnate. It was a classical case of suburbanization.

After 2004 new trends started, which are not well known yet. (Bajmócy P. – Dudás R. 2009).

The most important changes are the next: the population loss of Budapest and the large towns stopped and their population started to increase. Anyway we can see a continuous increase in the agglomeration of Budapest. In the suburban areas of the other towns first we could see just smaller and smaller increase and finally in 2009 the population increase of these regions stopped. We can see really huge decrease of population in the rural areas nowadays. This decline of the rural areas is as large, as their loss in the 1960’s and 1970’s during the era of mass-urbanization. The population change trends are similar to the percentage changes of the categories from the total population of Hungary (table 1, table 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Percentage Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>16.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2004</td>
<td>16.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>16.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>16.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2007</td>
<td>16.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>16.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2009</td>
<td>17.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: HSO
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tourism area</td>
<td>9,8</td>
<td>9,7</td>
<td>3,1</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>2,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural area</td>
<td>-1,7</td>
<td>-4,9</td>
<td>-10,7</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
<td>-2,6</td>
<td>-1,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
<td>-2,6</td>
<td>-1,9</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
<td>-2,6</td>
<td>-1,9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HSO

The population trends of Budapest and the large towns became much better between 2005-2009 comparing the years of 2001-2005. On the other hand the situation at the small towns and rural areas became much worse. In the suburban areas of Budapest we can see the same – growing – trends between 2005-2009 than 2001-2005, but the situation at the other suburban regions became worse, their population increase almost stopped.

Tab. 3 The trends of the elements of population change by categories, yearly between 2001-2007 (Source of data: HSO)

If we divide the population change into its two main components, we’ll closer to the solution. The main reason of the change of the previous population change trends is the change of the migration trends. If we have a look at the natural increase, we can see a small increase at Budapest and a small decline at the rural areas, but the changes in the migration trends are larger at these two types as well. The migration balance of Budapest and the large towns became more positive after 2004. On the other hand we can see a decline of migration trends at the small towns, suburban areas of large towns (except Budapest) and rural areas. At the rural areas and small towns we can see the increase of out-migration. The situation is the same at the suburban areas of the large towns as well. The situation at
Budapest and the large towns is opposite to the previous groups of settlements. Here we can see an increase of in-migration rate (table 3, table 4).

Tab. 4 The trends of the elements of migration rate by categories, yearly, in per thousand, between 2001-2007

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>-6.8</td>
<td>-2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large town</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>41.3</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>-4.1</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium-sized town</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>38.3</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>-3.2</td>
<td>-2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small town</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>39.0</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>-1.7</td>
<td>-4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban zone of Budapest</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban zone of large towns</td>
<td>55.7</td>
<td>55.2</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tourism area</td>
<td>63.6</td>
<td>65.5</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>61.2</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural area</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>49.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: HSO.

We can summarize the previous results now. The population decline of Budapest stopped, because of the larger amount of in-migration and partly because of the better position of natural increase. The population loss of the large towns also stopped, mainly because of the increase of in-migration. The population of the suburban zone of Budapest still increase rapidly. But the population increase of the other suburban areas almost stopped, mainly because of the increase of out-migration, partly because of decrease of in-migration. Finally, the rural areas (small towns and villages) have now a very serious population loss, mainly because of the larger amount of out-migration.

These processes are general in Hungary. It is not typical around only some towns or around some regions, but in almost every regions of Hungary. Most of the large towns have better population change trends nowadays than some years before (Table 5). There are only three counties (Somogy, Jász-Nagykun-Szolnok and Zala) where the county-seat had larger population decline between 2004-2007 than between 2001-2004. The situation is similar at the suburban areas of the large towns. In all these suburban regions (except one) the population change situation is worse now, than some years ago. This decline is also general in the rural areas (18 counties from 19) and at the small towns (16 from 19). Only at the medium-sized towns the situation is more diverse, but there are a little bit more mending than decaying towns.

But there are no large, homogenous regions with mending or decaying settlements if we see the population change trends between 2004-2007 and 2001-2004. There are some
peripheral regions with decaying trends (Southeast-Hungary, Zemplén Hills, Lake-Tisza region, Southwest-Hungary). Mending regions are in Northwest-Hungary near Győr and Sopron and a small north-eastern part of the agglomeration of Budapest near Vác and Veresegyház.

Tab. 5 Changes of population change trends between 2004-2007 and 2001-2004 by categories and counties in per thousand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Counties</th>
<th>Budapest</th>
<th>Large town</th>
<th>Medium-sized town</th>
<th>Small town</th>
<th>Suburban zone of Budapest</th>
<th>Suburban zone of large towns</th>
<th>Village with tourism</th>
<th>Tourism area</th>
<th>All-together</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>9,2</td>
<td>-0,5</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>-3,8</td>
<td>-4,6</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baranya</td>
<td>5,1</td>
<td>-0,5</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>-3,8</td>
<td>-4,6</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bács-Kiskun</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>2,2</td>
<td>-1,3</td>
<td>-3,7</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Békés</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>-1,3</td>
<td>-6,6</td>
<td>-6,4</td>
<td>-1,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Borsod-A.-Z.</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>-2,0</td>
<td>-4,3</td>
<td>-2,6</td>
<td>-4,5</td>
<td>-1,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Csongrád</td>
<td>11,1</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>-4,0</td>
<td>-7,5</td>
<td>-3,4</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fejér</td>
<td>9,4</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
<td>-0,9</td>
<td>-5,1</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>10,2</td>
<td>-3,3</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Győr-M.-S.</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>8,5</td>
<td>-1,6</td>
<td>-3,4</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hajdú-B.</td>
<td>4,3</td>
<td>-2,5</td>
<td>-3,7</td>
<td>-4,3</td>
<td>-3,4</td>
<td>-0,5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heves</td>
<td>9,6</td>
<td>-2,3</td>
<td>9,6</td>
<td>-4,4</td>
<td>-9,0</td>
<td>-3,1</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Komárom-E.</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>3,2</td>
<td>2,6</td>
<td>-0,3</td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>5,0</td>
<td>-0,4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nógrád</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>4,0</td>
<td>-2,3</td>
<td>3,9</td>
<td>-13,1</td>
<td>-4,7</td>
<td>-2,4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pest</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>6,1</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somogy</td>
<td>-0,8</td>
<td>-1,8</td>
<td>-6,1</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>-2,4</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szabolcs-Sz.-B.</td>
<td>2,1</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>-2,2</td>
<td>-3,3</td>
<td>-1,0</td>
<td>-0,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jász-N.-Sz.</td>
<td>-0,4</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>-2,8</td>
<td>-4,7</td>
<td>4,0</td>
<td>-3,2</td>
<td>-1,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolna</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>-1,9</td>
<td>-0,7</td>
<td>-2,2</td>
<td>-5,3</td>
<td>-2,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vas</td>
<td>3,7</td>
<td>-1,1</td>
<td>-5,6</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>-0,7</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veszprém</td>
<td>6,3</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>-6,1</td>
<td>-15,1</td>
<td>-1,2</td>
<td>-4,0</td>
<td>-1,3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zala</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>6,9</td>
<td>-2,7</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td>3,9</td>
<td>-2,2</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hungary</strong></td>
<td><strong>9,2</strong></td>
<td><strong>4,5</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,2</strong></td>
<td><strong>-1,8</strong></td>
<td><strong>0,1</strong></td>
<td><strong>-4,7</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,3</strong></td>
<td><strong>-3,1</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,5</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: HSO.
Note: Significantly mending types in bold, significantly decaying types in italics.

At 15 among the 20 large towns of Hungary we can see better population change trends between 2004 and 2008, than between 2001 and 2004 (Table 6). In 14 cases this mending is significant and among there 14 towns there are the ten largest towns of Hungary.
In all cases (except one, Szekszárd) one of the main reasons of these mending population change trends is the increasing in-migration and in the half of cases the decrease of out-migration and the mending birth-rates. The mending of the death rate is significant, but not the most important at only Szeged and Szombathely. So we can emphasize, that the most important reason of the mending population trends of the large Hungarian towns is the increasing in-migration.

**Tab. 6 Population change of the large towns between 2001-2004 and 2004-2008, and the main reasons of the changes**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>1763533</td>
<td>1705309</td>
<td>1702297</td>
<td>-11,0</td>
<td>-0,4</td>
<td>10,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szeged</td>
<td>165754</td>
<td>162586</td>
<td>167039</td>
<td>-6,4</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>13,2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Székesfehérvár</td>
<td>104921</td>
<td>101778</td>
<td>101755</td>
<td>-10,0</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>9,9</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eger</td>
<td>58270</td>
<td>56807</td>
<td>56457</td>
<td>-8,4</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Veszprém</td>
<td>62087</td>
<td>61470</td>
<td>62286</td>
<td>-3,3</td>
<td>3,3</td>
<td>6,6</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Békéscsaba</td>
<td>67663</td>
<td>65710</td>
<td>64852</td>
<td>-9,6</td>
<td>-3,3</td>
<td>6,4</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kecskemét</td>
<td>107686</td>
<td>107665</td>
<td>110316</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>6,2</td>
<td>6,2</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Debrecen</td>
<td>208016</td>
<td>204722</td>
<td>205084</td>
<td>-5,3</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pécs</td>
<td>161179</td>
<td>157659</td>
<td>156664</td>
<td>-7,3</td>
<td>-1,6</td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miskolc</td>
<td>185578</td>
<td>177809</td>
<td>171096</td>
<td>-14,0</td>
<td>-9,4</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Győr</td>
<td>130101</td>
<td>128571</td>
<td>128808</td>
<td>-3,9</td>
<td>0,5</td>
<td>4,4</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szombathely</td>
<td>82476</td>
<td>80530</td>
<td>79300</td>
<td>-7,9</td>
<td>-3,8</td>
<td>4,0</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nyíregyháza</td>
<td>117516</td>
<td>116540</td>
<td>116874</td>
<td>-2,8</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>3,5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szekszárd</td>
<td>36059</td>
<td>35008</td>
<td>34004</td>
<td>-9,7</td>
<td>-7,2</td>
<td>2,5</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tatabánya</td>
<td>72776</td>
<td>71626</td>
<td>70388</td>
<td>-5,3</td>
<td>-4,3</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sopron</td>
<td>55059</td>
<td>56257</td>
<td>57895</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td>7,3</td>
<td>0,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zalaegerszeg</td>
<td>62366</td>
<td>62148</td>
<td>61717</td>
<td>-1,2</td>
<td>-1,7</td>
<td>-0,6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Szolnok</td>
<td>77646</td>
<td>76604</td>
<td>75008</td>
<td>-4,5</td>
<td>-5,2</td>
<td>-0,7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salgótarján</td>
<td>45673</td>
<td>43681</td>
<td>40970</td>
<td>-14,5</td>
<td>-15,5</td>
<td>-1,0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kaposvár</td>
<td>68255</td>
<td>68077</td>
<td>67464</td>
<td>-0,9</td>
<td>-2,3</td>
<td>-1,4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source of data: HSO.

*: an important reason is the progression of this element

**: the most important reason is the progression of this element

For better understanding we made some interviews with the mayors of some settlements. We made these interviews in some suburban villages near the large towns,
where the population change trends became worse and in some rural villages with also decaying population change trends. In the first group we could see population growth in the last decade, but nowadays stagnating population, in the second stagnating in the last decade and now steep decline.

In the suburban villages we can see an increase of out-migration and sometimes decline in in-migration. The local people can not see any dramatic changes in the migration trends of the suburban villages and also not in the rural areas. So if there is some kind of turnaround, the local people can’t feel it. None of the majors of the suburban villages said, that there is a strong out-migration from these village to anywhere. They also do not feel those processes, which occur sometimes near Budapest, that some people because of the disadvantages of suburban regions (traffic jams, too many people, loss of natural beauty, lack of services) going back to the towns. In some suburban villages (around Veszprém and Miskolc) there is some kind of moving in – moving out migration: if the possibilities are better in the towns, some, mainly poor people move there and when the possibilities are better in a suburban village go back. There is a small out migration from these suburban villages to the most developed regions of Hungary (Budapest, Székesfehérvár, etc.). On the other hand the mayors said, that less people moved to these suburban villages, than before. The main reason is the lack of building plots for new houses. But the in-migration is continuous to these suburban villages both from the nearby town and both from the rural areas – said the mayors.

In the rural areas the mayors said, that they feel the larger out-migration from these villages. The main reasons are the lack of working places, the better quality of education elsewhere and also the lack of building plots. Most of the people had moved to the local urban centres (small towns, county seats), and also to Budapest and Western-Hungary. But some people come also to these rural villages from those ones, which are in worse situation. There is a special group of these rural villages with large Roma population. Before 2004 they had really large population growth because of the large natural increase of rural Roma population and also because of the in-migration of them. Nowadays this migration gain changed to migration loss, but the reasons are different. The non-Roma people move out from all these villages usually to those nearby small towns and villages, where the percentage of Roma population is smaller. But sometimes the Roma people also move out, mainly to those villages which are in even worse situation and because of it they are even cheaper.

4. CONCLUSIONS

If we compare the present trends with the trends of previous decades we can see the next: The population loss of the large Hungarian towns between 1990 and 2004 was the largest, what we could ever see. We had seen larger and larger population loss of the medium-sized and small towns since 1990. The large population growth of agglomeration of Budapest is not unparalleled. We could see such increase between 1880-1941 and 1949-1980, but the growth rate between 2001 and 2005 was the largest. In the suburban areas around the other large towns we can see large population growth between 1990-2004, but nowadays we can see just stagnation. The population of these areas became smaller and smaller between 1960 and 1990. In the touristic areas we can see a small, but continuous
population growth since 1870. In the rural areas after the large decline of population during Socialism we could see stagnating population between 1990-2005 and a steep decline again after 2005. The speed of the decline is as large nowadays as it was in the 1960’s, but nowadays the natural decrease is also important beside the out-migration.

In the last years we can see large out-migration from rural areas to the large towns. The population of the large towns became larger and larger, so we can see a new urbanization process in Hungary. In a first sight we can define this process as re-urbanization. If we see the re-urbanization process defined by Van den Berg we can see growth in the large towns and also in the rural areas and a steep decline in the suburban areas (Van den Berg et al. 1982). In Hungary the situation is different from it. We can see suburbanization around Budapest, and something, which is somewhere between urbanization and suburbanization around the large towns of Hungary. It is interesting, what will happen later. Do the processes go back to urbanization or go forward to suburbanization or somewhere else? It can be also interesting compare these processes with the other Central and Eastern European countries.
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