

# The social construction of Roma housing issue: determinants of Roma and Romanians perceptions

Catalina-Ionela Rezeanu<sup>1 +</sup>

<sup>1</sup> University of Bucharest, Romania

**Abstract. International Competition: The Best Scientific Article of the Young Researchers.** *At the international level, there is a rapidly growing literature on the poor quality of Roma housing in order to formulate and implement better policies addressing this issue. On the one hand, empirical studies tend to focus predominantly on European or national level, ignoring the particularities of different local Roma communities; and on the other hand, most of these studies are concerned only with Roma perspective of the situation, not taking into account that the problem is a socially constructed one, implying conflict and negotiations between Roma and other ethnic groups perspectives. The premise of the paper is that, in Romania, general European housing policies for Roma population could be implemented better in taking into account local specificities, and accepting that the issue is a social construct between Roma auto-perception and Romanians perceptions about Roma. In this paper, we conducted a secondary analysis of data based on "The Barometer Survey on Roma in Fagaras" held in February 2013. Quantitative data were collected through the oral survey technique based on standardized questionnaire, applied to four Roma communities living in the peripheral areas of Fagaras City (systematic sample, N = 400 Roma respondents aged 18 years and over) and to the central and middle city neighborhoods, majority inhabited by Romanians (systematic sample, N = 400 Romanian respondents aged 18 years and over). We asked the question what variables are the determinants of Roma and Romanians perceptions about Roma housing issue. Applying OLS regression analysis, the data provided evidence that Roma respondents perceive that the issue of Roma housing is important and therefore should be included in public authorities' agenda when they: 1) acknowledge the lack of housing utilities and amenities and reject the need for some of them, 2) think a particular solution would bring them concrete advantages, 3) internalize social stigma and express the need to reduce their residential segregation; Romanian respondents perceive that the issue of Roma housing issue is important, and therefore should be included in public authorities' agenda when they acknowledge: 1) the specific problems of two local Roma communities, 2) the wage dependency of the entire local Roma community and 3) the labor discrimination against Roma and the need to reduce Roma residential segregation.*

**Keywords:** housing, ethnic minority, wage dependency, labour discrimination, access to basic utilities,

**JEL Codes:** 018, J15, E24, J71, I38

## 1. Introduction

In *The Decade of Roma Inclusion 2005-2015*, the housing issue was identified as one of the most pressing concerns regarding Roma population [1]. Additionally, recent sociological literature on Roma housing has been pointing to problems such as: lack of house accessibility and affordability, insecurity of

---

<sup>+</sup> PhD student, **winner** of the competition *The Best Scientific Article of Young Researchers*. Tel.: + 40727676895, e-mail address: rezeanucatalina@gmail.com.

house tenure, substandard housing conditions, overcrowding, and segregation [2]. Even if the characteristics and the magnitude of these problems are known, policies to address them do not seem to make substantial progress. Also, in the last decade research about Roma housing issue has been conducted in different countries like: Italy [3], [4], Serbia [5], Finland and England [6], Spain [7], Hungary [8], Bulgaria [9], and Romania [10]. Most of these studies are general ones, and present the Roma housing issue at the European Union, national or regional level.

With regard to Romanian national context, the research published in 2012 by *European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights* [11] showed that almost 8 of 10 Roma houses did not have: piped water inside (78%), toilet inside (82%), shower or bathroom inside (85%), and connection to the sewage system or waste water tank (80%). One quarter of Roma respondents described their residence as being a ruined house or slum. On average, more than 2.5 persons lived in one room. 23% of Roma declared that they live in an area which is segregated from the rest of the settlement, for 20% the reason for moving to their neighbourhood being eviction or relocation, and for 21% finding better housing. More than a quarter of Roma experienced discrimination because of their Roma background in the past year, and 34% experienced discrimination when looking for a house or apartment to rent or buy. 72% of Roma declared that their housing situation had not improved in the last 5 years. According to another research about Roma from Romania published in 2009 [12], 42% of Roma did not have security of house tenure (because they or someone close to not own the house in which they live). Therefore, the available evidence seems to suggest that at Romanian national level the Roma housing issue is a serious one, and needs efficient social policies to be addressed.

However, a recent study [13] applied to four Eastern European countries (Bulgaria, Hungary, Lithuania, and Slovakia) showed that national initiatives to solve Roma housing issues, according to the European Union directives, failed, and resulted in increasing Roma residential segregation. This situation happened because of the government applying top-down measures, ignoring the local needs and other contextual factors, and not evaluating periodically the program implementation effects. Along similar lines, [14] argues that the tradition of studying Roma minorities as a homogenous population with a similar identity did not provide a proper answer to the questions about who Roma is and ignored the diversity and complexity of local Roma communities. In this regard, in Romanian context, studies about Roma housing issues have been conducted on specific regional or local Roma communities [15], [16], [17], [18], [19].

Given the centrality of the issue of Roma diversity, in this paper we will focus on studying the particularities of four Roma communities situated on the periphery of Făgăraș City (Plopului Street, Negoiu Street, Combinat Colony, and Prunului Street), in order to contribute to the understanding of local specificities of Roma housing issue. Choosing these communities was based on the fact that the first three communities live in substandard social houses, while in the last community the majority of Roma live in illegally constructed houses or other forms of improvised shelters. We previously found that Roma and Romanians have a similar perception about the severity of Roma housing issue, but a different perception about the solutions proposed to solve the problem. This could mean that apparent similarities might hide different mechanism and arguments of crystallizing this perceptions, and also different levels of accepting the solutions proposed by local authorities. That's why in this paper we ask the question what variables are the determinants of Roma and Romanians perceptions about the importance of Roma housing issue, the main hypothesis being that the determinants might not be the same for Roma and Romanians perceptions. Not only that this research could make a step further towards a more profound understanding of the mechanism of decisions about the entrance of an issue of an ethnic minority group in the local communities' agenda, but also could make a contribution in helping local authorities formulate the public agenda without ignoring the specific determinants of different ethnic groups' perceptions.

### **1.1. Theoretical framework**

In the present paper, we put forward the claim that residential space is both socially produced and socially constructed. According to the relational model of space, developed recently by Marthina Low, the

social construction of space is defined as the “transformation of space – through people’ social exchanges, memories, images and daily use of the material settings – into scenes and actions that convey meaning”; and the social production of space “includes all those factors – social, economic, ideological, and technological – that result, or seek to result, in the physical creation of the material setting” [20]. On the one hand, the literature offers examples of studies that focus on understanding the providing of houses for Roma as a process of social production of residential space in which space can contribute to stigma and exclusion [21]. On the other hand, there is an increasing literature pointing to the need of studying more how public discourse is taken up by Roma, reinterpreted and lived in their everyday life [14]. In this regard [22] propounded the assumption that there are differences between how Roma represent themselves and how are represented by others, and introduced the distinction between ”representation of Roma” (the social construction of Roma identity, the way they are seen and understood by others) and ”representation for Roma” (their ability to make themselves understood and seen, to control the dominant images of themselves). Starting from these theoretical grounds, the present paper based on secondary analysis of data, becomes an answer to the need to study Roma issues as socially constructed ones, taking into account both Roma and Romanians perspectives. The originality of this paper resides in applying recent conceptual frameworks from the field of space studies and Roma studies to study local particularities of four Roma communities from Făgăraş City, assuming that Roma housing issue is a social construct based on local specificities and on different mental constructions of minority (Roma) and majority (Romanians) ethnic groups.

## 2. Method

This study is a secondary analysis based on data collected in February 2013 for the local study “The Barometer Survey on Roma in Făgăraş City”, in which I participated as a member of the research team by developing methodological research design and the research report.

### 2.1. Data collection

Quantitative data were collected through the oral survey technique based on standardized questionnaire, applied to four peripheral areas of Făgăraş City, where Roma communities face severe housing problems (systematic sample, N = 400 Roma respondents aged 18 years and over) and to the central and middle city neighbourhoods, majority inhabited by Romanians (systematic sample, N = 400 Romanian respondents aged 18 years and over). The collected data were centralized using IBM SPSS Statistics, Version 20.

The four Roma communities in which study was conducted are: Prunului Street form Galaţi district (located in the north periphery of the city, a big number of Roma living in substandard houses illegally built), Combinat Colony (located in the south industrial periphery of the city, the majority of Roma living in social houses), Negoiu number 1 block of flats (located in the east periphery of the city, Roma still living in a dilapidated social houses after refusing to move to Plopului Street), and Plopului Street number 3, 6, and 12 block of flats (located in the west periphery of the city, Roma living in social houses after they were moved from Negoiu number 2, 5, and 8 block of flats). The identification of potential Roma respondents was done using the technique of implicit validation, which is recognized in the literature as being a little more efficient than the direct self-identification [23]. More exactly, the potential Roma respondent was approached by the interviewer with the phrase “we are conducting a survey among the Roma population”, acceptance to participate in the study being interpreted as the respondent being Roma.

### 2.2. Measurements and statistical analyses

In the original study four concepts were measured: respondent socio-demographic profile; perceptions about Roma housing issues; perceptions about solutions to solve Roma housing issues; perceptions about the relationship between Roma and Romanians. The secondary analysis of data started from two dummy dependent variables regarding Romanians (DV1) and Roma perception (DV2) about whether the issue of Roma housing conditions is important or not (and therefore should be included in public authorities’

agenda). All the other potential independent variables from the database were either dummy variables, or continuous quantitative ones (detailed information about the measurements of the variables used in the study are presented in Table 1 from the Appendix. In order to identify the independent variables to be included in the regression model, first, we conducted Pearson correlation analysis, and selected only those variables which correlated significantly (Sig. < .05) with DV1, respectively DV2. Second, for every variable selected we tested a simple OLS (Ordinary Least Squares) regression model, and selected only those variables included in a statistical significant regression model. Third, we included the selected variables in two OLS multiple regression models (one for DV1 and one for DV2), eliminating variables until the models and the B coefficients were all statistically significant. Before performing any of these steps, we verified for every variable used the meeting of the Pearson correlation and the linear regression assumptions. Therefore, although the database included a much larger number of variables, in the operational scheme, presented in Table 1 from the Appendix, were included only variables identified as predictors (IV) in statistically significant linear regression models. The two multiple regression models are the optimized ones, as they were built by introducing only those variables whose coefficients were found to be statistically significant and to meet the conditions of regression application.

### 3. Results

This study is a secondary analysis based on data collected in February 2013 for the local study “The Barometer Survey on Roma in Făgăraș City”, in which I participated as a member of the research team by developing methodological research design and the research report For DV1, 29 linear simple regression models were statistically significant, showing that Romanians perception about whether the Roma housing conditions are important or not (and therefore should be included in public authorities’ agenda) can be modelled as functions of the sex of the respondent and of different dimensions of Romanians perception about the local Roma communities (see Table 2 from the Appendix):

- the Roma main source of income (not salary or independent activities, but child / maternal allowance or social welfare)
- a specific type of problem associated for every of the four analysed local Roma communities (not economic struggle, but housing issues or enforcement of law and order); in the category of economic struggle were included answers like: lack of jobs for Roma, low living standards for Roma, Roma poverty; in the category of housing issues were included answers like: lack of social houses, non tabulated houses, lack of sanitation services, lack of space inside de house, the need for Roma to be moved somewhere else, the need for renovating social houses in which Roma live, the danger of the housing buildings tearing down; in the category of enforcement of law and order were included answers like: lack of identity papers, lack of order, lack of tougher laws regarding Roma, lack of public order and safety in Roma communities
- evaluating housing conditions as poor and very poor in a specific local Roma community (Combinat Colony)
- knowing the fact that Roma lack access to basic infrastructure and house utilities in a specific local Roma community (Negoiu Street)
- estimating that in a year housing conditions from every of the four analysed Roma communities will worsen
- identifying a specific type of housing tenure associated for every of the four analysed local Roma communities (not owning the house; paying rent based on social housing contract; not paying rent, staying illegally in a social house; not having ID, impossible to make legal papers for land house tabulation; not having residence papers for some members of the household)
- appreciating that for two of the local Roma communities analyzed (Prunului Street and Plopului Street) City Hall should not primarily solve the housing issue
- supporting the solution of moving Roma population from a specific community (Negoiu Street) in a different place of the city
- perceiving the existence of discrimination of local Roma communities

- admitting the idea that is more difficult for Roma than for Romanians to find a job
- being in favour on the idea of Roma and Romanians living in the same neighbourhood
- having positive perceptions about Roma (knowing examples of Roma and Romanians from local community helping each other in work; thinking Romanians should help Roma to integrate in society; rejecting the idea that most of Roma children are beggars and pocket stealers)
- thinking that the State should help Roma more.

The linear multiple regression model for DV1 ( $F(314) = 10.282$ ,  $\text{Sig.} = .00 < .05$ ) shows that 23.3% of the variation of the DV1 could be predicted by the following 9 independent variables (ordered by their prediction power from the strongest to the weakest):

- 1) perceiving that the main type of problems of Roma from Combinat Colony is related to the lack of enforcement of law and order (IV8: in this category were included problems like lack of identity papers, order, tougher laws regarding Roma, public order and safety)
- 2) perceiving that the main source of income in Roma local communities is not the salary (IV2)
- 3) perceiving that the main source of income in Roma local communities is the social welfare (IV5)
- 4) perceiving that in Roma community from Combinat Colony there is a housing tenure issue related to the fact that some members of the household do not have residence paper and live illegally in social housing facilities (IV17)
- 5) perceiving that the main source of income in Roma local communities is child / maternal allowance (IV4)
- 6) perceiving that it is more difficult for Roma than for Romanians to find a job (IV26)
- 7) perceiving that the main type of problem in Roma community from Prunului Street is related to housing (IV6: in this category were included problems like lack of social houses, lack of tabulated houses, lack of cleanliness, lack of space, the need for Roma to be moved somewhere else, the need for social houses renovation, and the danger of the housing buildings tearing down)
- 8) being in favour of the idea of Roma and Romanians living in the same neighbourhood (IV24)
- 9) perceiving that in Roma community from Combinat Colony there is a housing tenure issue related to the fact that Roma live in social housing facilities, and therefore they do not own their house (IV12).

Consequently, the prediction of Romanian respondents' perception about the importance of Roma housing issue can be expressed as the following equation:

$$DV_1 = .437 - .601IV_8 + .308IV_2 + .184IV_5 - .181IV_{17} + .163IV_4 + .15IV_{26} + .143IV_6 + .139IV_{24} + .126IV_{12}$$

A closer look at the first multiple regression model indicates that Romanian respondents tend to perceive Roma housing issue as important when they think that in two specific local communities of Roma (Prunului Street and Combinat Colony) the main problems are related to housing conditions, housing tenure (lack of private ownership of the house, lack of residence papers for living legally in social houses), and poor enforcement of law and order. Moreover, the perception of Romanian respondents about the importance of Roma housing issues is determined by their perception about wage dependency of Roma (their main source of income not being the regular salary, but the social welfare or the child/maternal allowance given by the State). Moreover, Romanian respondents acknowledge the importance of Roma housing issue when they detach from prejudice and discrimination and realize that it is more difficult for Roma than for Romanians to find a job, and accept that it's normal for Roma and Romanians to live in the same neighbourhood.

For DV2, 12 simple linear regression models were statistically significant, showing that Roma auto-perception about whether their housing conditions are important or not (and therefore should be included in public authorities' agenda) can be modelled as functions of civil status (married or consensual union) of the respondent and of different dimensions of Roma auto-perception (see Table 2 from the Appendix):

- declaring improper housing conditions (not improper heating of the house or defective house equipments, but, lack of access to central heating or lack of kitchen inside the house)
- declaring that the house lack some basic utilities (access to central heating or kitchen inside), but that they do not need them

- estimating that giving Roma the opportunity to buy the land on which their house is build illegally will increase of the quality of Roma housing (in this category were included declared benefices like: new possibilities for Roma housing, Roma will be motivated to invest in their houses, more space in the house, better conditions of living, attracting investments in public utilities for Roma houses, solving the problem of electricity)
- being in favour on the idea of Roma and Romanians living in the same neighbourhood
- declaring that in the last year they or a member of their family experiences prejudice and discrimination (felt offended by others because of being Roma, felt embarrassed / uncomfortable in front of strangers to recognize being Roma)
- perceiving that is more difficult for Roma than for Romanians to find a job.

The linear multiple regression model for DV2 ( $F(237) = 7.929$ ,  $\text{Sig.} = .00 < .05$ ) shows that 17.1% of the variation of the DV1 could be predicted by the following 6 independent variables (ordered by their prediction power from the strongest to the weakest):

- 1) declaring that the house is not connected to central heating, but that they do not need this public utility (IV34)
- 2) being in favour on the idea of Roma and Romanians living in the same neighbourhood (IV24)
- 3) declaring improper housing conditions dew to defective house equipments (IV32)
- 4) declaring that in the last year the respondent or a member of their family felt embarrassed / uncomfortable in front of strangers to recognize being Roma (IV40)
- 5) declaring that the house does not have a kitchen inside, but that they do not need this utility (IV36)
- 6) estimating that giving Roma the opportunity to buy the land on which their house is build illegally will increase of the quality of Roma housing (IV37).

Thus, the prediction of Roma respondents' perception about the importance of Roma housing issue can be expressed as the following equation:

$$DV_2 = -.243 + .658IV_{34} - .309IV_{24} + .248IV_{32} + .194IV_{40} + .177IV_{36} - .145IV_{37}$$

The second multiple regression model suggests that Roma respondents perceive that the Roma housing issue is important when they personally experience lack of proper housing conditions (defective house equipments, lack of house connection to central heating, lack of kitchen inside the house), and, paradoxically, when they reject the need for some of them (connection to central heating, lack of kitchen). Furthermore, the perception of Roma respondents about the importance of Roma housing issues is also determined by their perception that the solutions of buying the land on which their house was illegally built could lead to an improvement of Roma quality of housing. In short, they think the problem is important and need an urgent City Hall intervention, when they favour a particular solution to that problem, and assume that the solution would improve their quality of life. In addition, the Roma respondents' awareness of the importance of the housing issue is determined by the internalization of stigma (declaring that in the last year the respondent or a member of their family felt embarrassed / uncomfortable in front of strangers to recognize being Roma) and by beliefs that social distance between Roma and Romanians should be reduced (being in favour on the idea that Roma and Romanians should live in the same neighbourhood).

#### 4. Conclusions

Romanian respondents perceive that the issue of Roma the housing issue is important, and therefore should be included in public authorities' agenda when they acknowledge: 1) the specific problems of two local Roma communities, 2) the wage dependency of the entire local Roma community and 3) the labour discrimination and the need to reduce residential segregation. Romanian respondents decide about the importance of the housing issue of the entire local Roma community based on perceiving specific problems of only Combinat Colony (enforcement of low and order and housing tenure), and Prunului Street (housing

conditions) Roma communities. They do not take into account aspects related to small Roma communities from Plopului Street and Negoiu Street where there are housing issues associated with the imposed change of residence. This situation may be due to the fact that local press had presented more frequently and more negatively the situation of Roma from Prunului Street and Combinat Colony. This idea is similar to the one developed by [24], who observed that “the visibility and homogeneity of the deviant characteristics of the social category are often amplified by the media, which increases the public perception of the otherness of the inhabitants”.

Roma respondents perceive that the issue of Roma housing is important and therefore should be included in public authorities’ agenda when they: 1) acknowledge the lack of housing utilities and amenities and reject the need for some of them, 2) think a particular solution would bring them concrete advantages, 3) internalise social stigma and express the need to reduce residential segregation. The apparent contradictory situation of Roma complaining about lack of housing utilities and also rejecting the need for some of them might hide an economic struggle problem. Specifically, a big number of Roma from local communities detached their houses from utilities because they couldn’t afford to pay for them, and when they were asked to pay the rent for staying in social houses or the property tax for owners of the houses, they refused to pay saying the authorities are trying to rob them putting big taxes on houses without access to basic utilities.

These results almost confirm the hypothesis that the determinants of Roma and Romanian respondents’ perceptions about the importance of Roma housing issue are different, except the discrimination determinant (both Roma and Romanians being in favour of the need to reduce residential segregation). The other discrimination determinant is different from Roma and Romanian respondents because Roma respondents take into account the internalisation of stigma in social life (feeling embarrassed or uncomfortable in front of strangers to recognize being Roma) while Romanians the stigmatisation of Roma on labour market (being more difficult for Roma than for Romanians to find a job). Another apparent similarity is considering the poor quality of Roma housing, but these determinants are very different. Romanian respondents concentrate on general housing problems of Roma from Prunului Street (lack of social houses, lack of tabulated houses, lack of cleanliness, lack of space, the need for Roma to be moved somewhere else, the need for social houses renovation, and the danger of the housing buildings tearing down) while Roma respondents on specific housing problems that all of them encounter in everyday life (defective house equipments, lack of house connection to central heating, lack of kitchen inside the house). Besides these, the other determinants are very different and suggest particular mindsets for Roma and Romanian respondents. Namely, Romanian respondents focus on aspects related to “low and order”, “house ownership”, “wage dependency”, “poor housing conditions”, “housing policy”, and “jobs” while Roma respondents on “access to utilities”, “quality of house amenities”, “potential increase of the quality of housing”, “land ownership” and “social embarrassment”.

Previous findings from Romanian context had shown the magnitude of problems like: discrimination against Roma [25], social distance towards Roma [26], legality of Roma house ownership [27], Roma houses access to basic utilities and facilities [28], Roma economic income sources [29]. This paper makes a step further by showing their causal power on the perception of the importance of housing issue in Roma and Romanians agendas. Additionally, by evidencing the public invisibility of collective evictions and relocations of Roma tenants from Negoiu Street to Plopului Street from Făgăraş City, this paper is consistent with the assumptions of [30] based on analyzing Roma public housing situation from five other Romanian cities (Bucharest, Cluj-Napoca, Piatra-Neamt, Tirgu Mures, and Roman). At the same time, the cited study points out to the visibility of criminality from Roma social houses neighbourhoods, that is also evident in the present study, which in addition shows its effects on the ethnic majority agenda.

Further studies need be done, in order to identify whether the different determinants of Roma and Romanians perceptions might reflect different grounds for the decision making processes, and even different systems of values and beliefs.

## 5. References

- [1] Badescu, G. V., Grigoras, Rughinis, C., Voicu, M. and Voicu, O. *Roma Inclusion Barometer*. Bucharest: Soros Foundatio Romania, 2007.
- [2] Berescu, C. On Some Ethnic Housing Areas of Călărași. *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai Sociologia*. 2013, **58** (LVIII): 77-110.
- [3] Berlin, J.. Housing-Related Problems of Roma in Finland and Gypsies and Travellers in England. In *Proceeding of Salford Postgraduate Annual Research Conference*. Manchester: The University of Salford. 2011, pp. 278-288.
- [4] Dohotaru, A.-O. Performative Anthropology. The Case of the Pata-Rât Ghetto. *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai Sociologia*. 2013, **58** (LVIII): 193-216.
- [5] European Centre for Minority Issues (ECMI). The Decade of Roma Inclusion. *ECMI Fact Sheet*. 2014, **11**, March. Retrieved from: [www.ecmi.de/fileadmin/downloads/publications/Decade\\_of\\_Inclusion.pdf](http://www.ecmi.de/fileadmin/downloads/publications/Decade_of_Inclusion.pdf), accessed March 2015
- [6] European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA). *Case study: Improving Roma housing and eliminating slums, Spain*. 2009, October. Retrieved from: [http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra\\_uploads/605-090210-ROMA\\_Housing\\_Case-final-ENES.pdf](http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/605-090210-ROMA_Housing_Case-final-ENES.pdf), accessed March 2015.
- [7] European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA). *The situation of Roma in 11 EU Member States. Survey results at a glance*. 2012. Retrieved from: [http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra\\_uploads/2099-FRA-2012-Roma-at-a-glance\\_EN.pdf](http://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/2099-FRA-2012-Roma-at-a-glance_EN.pdf), accessed March 2015.
- [8] Fleck, G. Income and Expenditure. In: G. Fleck, and C. Rughins (eds.). *ibidem*, p. 145.
- [9] Fleck, G. Social Distance Attitudes. In: G. Fleck, and C. Rughins (eds.). *ibidem*, p. 72.
- [10] Gheorghe, O., Serban, O. Gavril, F. and Levente, S. Poverty and Living. Roma Poor Neighborhoods in Romania and Hungary. *The Annals of the University of Oradea, Economic Sciences Series*. 2011, **1** (July): 137-184.
- [11] Harabula, H. Family as a Means of Survival, Formation and Inside Processes of a Roma Ghetto in Şumuleu. *Studia Universitatis Babeş-Bolyai Sociologia*. 2013, **58** (LVIII): 175-192.
- [12] Kosa, K., Molnar, A., McKee, M. and Adany R. Rapid health impact appraisal of eviction versus a housing project in a colony-dwelling Roma (Gypsy) community. *European journal of public health*. 2007, **17**: 217-217.
- [13] Löw, M. S. The Social Production and Social Construction of Public Space. In: M. Löw (co.), *On the Plaza: The Politics of Public Space and Culture*. Austin: University of Texas Press. 2000, pp. 127-128.
- [14] McGarry. A. Roma as a political identity: Exploring representations of Roma in Europe. *Ethnicities*. 2014, **14** (6): 759.
- [15] Messing, V. Methodological puzzles of surveying Roma/Gypsy populations. *Ethnicities*. 2014, **14** (6): 811-829
- [16] Molinuevo, D., Foti, K. and M. Koomen. *Living Conditions of the Roma: Substandard Housing and Health*. Dublin: European Foundation for the Improvement of Living and Working Conditions. 2012. Retrieved from: [http://eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef\\_files/pubdocs/2012/02/en/1/EF1202EN.pdf](http://eurofound.europa.eu/sites/default/files/ef_files/pubdocs/2012/02/en/1/EF1202EN.pdf), accessed March 2015.
- [17] Molnár, Á., Ádám, B. Antova, T., Bosak, L., Dimitrov, P., Mileva, H. and Kósa, K.. Health impact assessment of Roma housing policies in Central and Eastern Europe: A comparative analysis. *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*. 2012, **33** (1): 7-14.
- [18] Nita, D. L. Raxen - Thematic Study. Housing Conditions of Roma and Travellers – R. *Center for Legal Resources*. 2009, March. Retrieved from: [https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra\\_uploads/591-RAXEN-Roma%20Housing-Romania\\_en.pdf](https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/591-RAXEN-Roma%20Housing-Romania_en.pdf), accessed March 2015.
- [19] Nolan, A. 'Aggravated Violations', Roma Housing Rights and Forced Expulsions in Italy: Recent Developments

---

under the European Social Charter Collective Complaints System. *Human Rights Law Review*. 2011, **11** (2): 343-361.

- [20] Rughinis, C. Housing Issues in Survey Research. In: G. Fleck, and C. Rughinis (eds.). *ibidem*, p. 119.
- [21] Rughinis, C. Housing Issues in Survey Research. In: G. Fleck, and C. Rughinis (eds.). *ibidem*, p. 121.
- [22] Rughinis, C. Social housing and Roma residents in Romania. *ibidem*, p. 29
- [23] Rughinis, C. Social housing and Roma residents in Romania. *ibidem*, p. 30.
- [24] Rughinis, C. Social housing and Roma residents in Romania. *Policy paper, International Policy Fellowships*. Budapest: Central European University, Centre for Policy Studies. 2004. Retrieved from: <http://sar.org.ro/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Social-Housing-and-Roma-Residents-in-Romania.pdf>, accessed March 2015.
- [25] Rughinis, C. Survey Analysis of Ethnic Affiliation. In: G. Fleck, and C. Rughinis (eds.). *Come Closer. Inclusion and Exclusion of Roma in Present Day Romanian Society*. Bucharest: Human Dynamics. 2008, p. 59.
- [26] Slaev, A. D. Bulgarian policies towards the Roma housing problem and Roma squatter settlements. *European Journal of Housing Policy*. 2007, **7** (1): 63-84.
- [27] Tremlett, A. Making a difference without creating a difference: Super-diversity as a new direction for research on Roma minorities. *Ethnicities*. 2014, **14** (6): 830-848.
- [28] Vitale, T. and Membretti, A.. Just another roll of the dice: A socially creative initiative to assure Roma housing in North Western Italy. In: F. Moularet (ed.). *The International Handbook on Social Innovation: Collective Action, Social Learning and Transdisciplinary Research*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar. 2013, pp. 186-196.
- [29] Vitale, T. and Membretti, A. *ibidem*, p. 186.
- [30] Vuksanović-Macura, Z. The mapping and enumeration of informal Roma settlements in Serbia. *Environment and Urbanization*. 2012, **24** (2): 685-705.

## 6. Appendix

Table 1: The measurements of the variables used in the study

<i>Questions from the original study (response options)</i>	<i>Dummy variables after recoding: response option coded 1</i>	<i>Abbreviations</i>
<b>Data collected from Romanian respondents</b>		
In your opinion, the issue of Roma housing in Făgăraș is or it is not an important or urgent issue to be solved by City Hall? (it is very important; it is somehow important; it is not so important; it is not important at all)	The importance of the issue of Roma housing in Făgăraș: it is very / somehow important	DV1
Sex of the respondent (masculine; feminine)	Sex: masculine	IV1
What do you think is the main source of income for the Roma community from Făgăraș? (salary; income from self-employment, occasional activities or selling of goods; retirement pension; unemployment allowance; child / maternal allowance; social welfare; other source...)	Income source: salary	IV2
	Income source: independent activities	IV3
	Income source: child / maternal allowance	IV4
	Income source: social welfare	IV5
What do you think is the main problem that should be solved urgently by City Hall in Roma community from Prunului Street? (open question)	Main type of problem in Roma community from Prunului Street: housing	IV6
What do you think is the main problem that should be solved urgently by City Hall in Roma community from Combinat Colony? (open question)	Main type of problem in Roma community from Combinat Colony: economic struggle	IV7
	Main type of problem in Roma community from Combinat Colony: the enforcement of law and order	IV8
From your knowledge, how do you evaluate the housing conditions of Roma from Combinat Colony? (very good, good, bad, very bad)	Evaluating Roma housing conditions from Combinat Colony: bad or very bad	IV9
Most of Roma houses from Negoiu number 1 block of flats lack connection to utilities: water supply, sewerage, electricity, gas, central heating (true; false)	Perceptions about housing conditions of Roma community from Negoiu number 1 block of flats: lack of utilities	IV10
Most of Roma residents from Negoiu number 1 block of flats do not own the house they live in (true; false)	Perceptions about housing tenure of Roma community from Negoiu number 1 block of flats: not owning the house	IV11
Most of Roma residents from Combinat Colony are not owning the house they live in (true; false)	Perceptions about Roma housing tenure in Combinat Colony: not owning the house	IV12
Most of Roma residents from Combinat Colony are paying rents based on renting contracts for social houses (true; false)	Perceptions about Roma housing tenure in Combinat Colony: paying rent based on contract	IV13
Some Roma residents from Combinat Colony are not paying rents, but staying illegally within other families who are paying rents (true; false)	Perceptions about Roma housing tenure in Combinat Colony: not paying rent, staying illegally	IV14
Some Roma residents from Negoiu number 1 block of flats cannot make legal papers for the house they live in because they do not have ID papers (true; false)	Perception about housing tenure of Roma community from Negoiu number 1 block of flats: not having ID, impossible to make legal papers for house	IV15
Some Roma residents from Prunului Street and Plopului Street number 3, 6, and 12 block of flats cannot make legal papers for the house they live in because they do not have ID papers (true; false)	Perception about housing tenure of Roma community from Prunului Street and Plopului Street number 3, 6, and 12 blocks of flats: true that not having ID papers, it is impossible to make legal papers for house	IV16

In Roma community from Combinat Colony some members of the household don't have residence papers (true; false)	Perceptions about Roma housing tenure in Combinat Colony: true that some members of the household don't have residence papers	IV17
How do you think the living conditions of the Roma from Negoiu number 1 block of flats will be in a year? (much better; better, worse, much worse)	Estimating that in a year Roma housing conditions from Negoiu number 1 block of flats: will be worse or much worse	IV18
How do you think the living conditions of the Roma from Prunului Street and Plopului Street number 3, 6, and 12 blocks of flats will be in a year? (much better; better, worse, much worse)	Estimating that in a year Roma housing conditions from Prunului Street and Plopului Street number 3, 6, and 12 block of flats: will be worse	IV19
How do you think the living conditions of the Roma from Combinat Colony will be in a year? (much better; better, worse, much worse)	Estimating that in a year Roma housing conditions from Combinat Colony: will be worse or much worse	IV20
To improve Roma issues related to housing, which do you think is the best solution that City Hall should apply for Prunului Street and Plopului Street number 3, 6, and 12 block of flats? (open question)	Main solution that City Hall should apply to Roma communities from Prunului Street and Plopului Street number 3, 6, and 12 block of flats: improving housing situation	IV21
Starting from the case of the Roma community from Negoiu number 1 block of flats, a possible solution would be to move them elsewhere. How do you find this solution? (very good; good; bad; very bad)	Evaluating the solution of moving Roma from Negoiu number 1 block of flats: good and very good	IV22
In your opinion, the Roma community from Făgăraș is discriminated from the rest of population or not? (yes, it is very much discriminated; yes, it is discriminated somehow; no, it is not discriminated somehow; it is not discriminated at all)	Perceived discrimination of local Roma communities: it is very much / somehow discriminated	IV23
How do you find the idea of: Romanians and Roma living in the same area of the village, being neighbours? (it is very bad; it is bad; it is good; it is very good)	Opinion about Roma and Romanians living in the same neighbourhood: it is bad or very bad	IV24
Do you personally know such situations as: Roma and Romanians from local community helping each other in work? (yes; no)	Does not know situations of Roma and Romanians from local community helping each other in work: yes	IV25
In your opinion in Făgăraș City, Roma, compared to Romanians, find it easier, harder or the same to find a job (easier than for Romanians; the same as Romanians; harder than Romanians)	In Făgăraș City is easier, harder or the same for Roma than for Romanians to find a job: harder	IV26
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: Romanians should help Roma to integrate in society (totally agree; somehow agree; somehow disagree; totally disagree)	Romanians should help Roma to integrate in society: totally or somehow agree	IV27
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: the State should help Roma more (totally agree; somehow agree; somehow disagree; totally disagree)	The State should help Roma more: : totally or somehow agree	IV28
To what extent do you agree or disagree with the following statements: the State should help Roma more (totally agree; somehow agree; somehow disagree; totally disagree)	Most of Roma children are beggars and pocket stealers: totally or somehow agree	IV29
<b>Data collected from Roma respondents</b>		
What is your opinion, the main problem in your area that should be urgently solve by City Hall? (open question)	The main problem in the local area that should be urgently solved by City Hall: housing issue	DV2
What is your civil status? (unmarried; married;	Civil status: married or living in consensual	IV30

divorced; widowed; living in consensual union)	union	
In your house, you've experienced lately with any of the following problems: lack of proper heating? (yes; no)	Having house problems related to lack of proper heating: yes	IV31
In your house, you've experienced lately with any of the following problems: defective house equipments? (yes; no)	Having house problems related to defective house equipments: yes	IV32
Which of the following utilities do not exist in your house and you really need: connection to central heating? (we already have; we do not have and do need; we do not have, and do not need)	The house is not connected to the central heating: we do not have	IV33
	The house is not connected to the central heating: we do not have and do not need	IV34
Which of the following utilities do not exist in your house and you really need: kitchen inside the house? (we already have; we do not have and do need; we do not have, and do not need)	The house does not have a kitchen inside the house: we do not have	IV35
	The house does not have a kitchen inside the house: we do not have, and do not need	IV36
(for those who were in favour of the solution of buying the land on which they build their house) What advantages do you think you would have if you could buy the land? (open question)	Perceived benefices of buying the house land: the increase of the quality of housing	IV37
How do you find the idea of: Romanians and Roma living in the same area of the village, being neighbours? (it is very bad; it is bad; it is good; it is very good)	Opinion about Roma and Romanians living in the same neighbourhood: bad, very bad	IV38
In the past year, you or your family happened to feel offended by others because of being Roma? (yes; no)	Felt offended by others because of being Roma: yes	IV39
In general, you or your family feel embarrassed / uncomfortable in front of strangers to admit that you are Roma? (yes; no)	Felt embarrassed / uncomfortable in front of strangers to admit being Roma: yes	IV40

Table 2: Simple linear regression models for DV1 and DV2

	<i>R</i>	<i>R Square</i>	<i>Adj. R Square</i>	<i>Unstandardized B</i>	<i>Standardized Beta</i>	<i>Sig.</i>
<b>DV1 Predictors</b>						
IV1	.141	.020	.017	-.122	-.141	.005
IV2	.195	.038	.036	-.759	-.195	.000
IV3	.254	.064	.062	-.251	-.254	.000
IV4	.142	.020	.018	.163	.142	.004
IV5	.103	.011	.008	.098	.103	.040
IV6	.182	.033	.030	.173	.182	.001
IV7	.112	.013	.010	-.097	-.112	.040
IV8	.109	.012	.009	.153	.109	.047
IV9	.143	.020	.018	.265	.143	.005
IV10	.139	.019	.017	.128	.139	.005
IV11	.103	.011	.008	.089	.103	.040
IV12	.190	.036	.034	.166	.190	.000
IV13	.110	.012	.010	.100	.110	.028
IV14	.161	.026	.024	.146	.161	.001
IV15	.172	.029	.027	.160	.172	.001
IV16	.156	.024	.022	.139	.165	.002
IV17	.164	.027	.025	.146	.164	.001
IV18	.198	.039	.037	.204	.198	.000
IV19	.167	.028	.025	.169	.167	.001
IV20	.178	.032	.029	.183	.178	.001
IV21	.184	.034	.030	-.151	-.184	.002
IV22	.138	.019	.017	.135	.137	.006
IV23	.184	.034	.031	.167	.184	.000
IV24	.119	.014	.012	-.134	-.119	.018
IV25	.101	.010	.008	-.106	-.101	.044
IV26	.125	.016	.013	.109	.125	.013
IV27	.180	.033	.030	.197	.180	.000
IV28	.126	.016	.014	.113	.126	.012
IV29	.103	.011	.008	-.089	-.103	.040
<b>DV2 Predictors</b>						
IV30	.111	.012	.010	.119	.111	.031
IV31	.198	.039	.037	-.202	-.198	.000
IV32	.123	.015	.012	-.122	-.123	.017
IV33	.118	.014	.011	.467	.118	.023
IV34	.118	.014	.011	.467	.118	.023
IV35	.116	.013	.011	.128	.116	.025
IV36	.116	.013	.011	.128	.116	.025
IV37	.137	.019	.015	.136	.137	.032
IV24	.164	.027	.024	-.323	-.164	.001
IV38	.109	.012	.009	.110	.109	.035
IV39	.132	.017	.015	.138	.132	.011
IV40	.112	.013	.010	.147	.112	.035