

Introduction

This study aims at presenting a series of features of the roma population in Romania. The main purpose is that of formulating an accessible material that would allow a large number of readers to get a general picture of the situation of this ethnic minority in our country.

The paper has three main parts. The first one includes information related to demography, family planning, education, jobs and occupations, revenues, housing and dwelling conditions, migration, prejudices, tolerance and social exclusion. The focus is on the changes occurred in these areas between 1992-1998, so that the situation of the roma could be more accurately drawn.

The second part focuses on indicators resulted from representative research studies undertaken in the past. These are grouped, in an important degree, on the same structure of the previous chapter. The last chapter includes tools on the basis of which community diagnoses could be formulated, so that problems from various communities are better acknowledged. Being aware of the problems and the availability of local and external resources, we shall be able to draw some of the legitimate solutions that, in many cases, differ from one community to another. We are calling them legitimate, as the point of view of the roma themselves constitute the basis on which local intervention programs can be built.

The data sources used are multiple, but mainly rely on the two national-level researches undertaken by the Institute for Research of the Quality of Life (ICCV) from the Romanian Academy.

The first one, undertaken in 1992 by a research team formed of researchers from ICCV and the University in Bucharest, Faculty of Sociology, Psychology, Pedagogy and Social Assistance, resulted in the paper: *Tiganiii între ignorare și îngrijorare* – (Gypsies, between Ignorance and Concern) – coordinated by Elena and Catalin Zamfir. The second one is the result of the project “Resource Centre for Social Action” funded by the Open Society Foundation and formulated in collaboration with specialists from the University of Bucharest, Babes-Bolyai University from Cluj-

Napoca, University of Timisoara, “Al. I. Cuza” University from Iasi and the Centre for Demography. Equally, it has benefited from the support of the Ministry for National Minorities and various roma organisations.

Besides the above-mentioned researches, which allowed the creation of a comprehensive database, other papers and publications¹ focused on one area or another are to be also added. We can mention the following:

- ◆ UNICEF, DPC, *Situatia copilului în familiile de romi* (The Situation of Children in Roma Families), in Zamfir, Elena; Tolstobrach, Niculina (scientific advisors), *Situatia copilului si a familiei în România* (The Situation of Child and Family in Romania), Bucharest, 1997
- ◆ Culic, Irina; Horvath, Istvan; Lazar, Marius, *Etnobarometru – relatii interetnice în România* (Ethno-barometer – Inter-ethnic Relations in Romania), Resource Centre for Ethno-cultural Diversity, Risoprint, Cluj-Napoca, 2000
- ◆ Resource Centre for Ethno-cultural Diversity, *Barometrul relatiilor interetnice-* (Barometer of Inter-ethnic Relations), undertaken by Metro Media Transilvania, November 2001
- ◆ Institute for Mother and Child Care in Romania (IOMC) and Centre for Prevention and Control of Diseases (CDC) Atlanta – USA - *Sanatatea reproducterii* (Reproductive Health), Romania, 1993
- ◆ Centre for Prevention and Control of Diseases (CDC) and Romanian Association for Public Health and Sanitary Management *Sanatatea reproducterii, România* (Reproductive Health, Romania), 1999
- ◆ Catavencu Academy – *Raport de monitorizare – imaginea etniei Roma în presa Româneasca, 23 septembrie – 23 octombrie 2001* (Monitoring Report – Image of the Roma Ethnic Minority in the Romanian Press, September 23 – October 23, 2001).

All these papers contributed to the aggregation of information so that the final product be an accessible synthetic material.

¹ For a more comprehensive bibliography, see also *Cercetari cu privire la minoritatea roma* (Researches regarding the Roma Minority), Expert Publishing House, 2001, coordinator Ioan Marginean

1. Features of the Rroma population in Romania

Demographic features of the rroma population

The rroma population has a very young demographic structure, determined by the higher values of mortality and fertility of the rroma, in comparison with the rest of the population. In 1998, around one third of the rroma population was represented by children (0-14 years old), the percentage of the elderly being of 5%, and the average age of the rroma population being of approximately 24 years. Due to tendencies of decrease in fertility, also recorded with the rroma population, the percentage held by children in the rroma population is also decreasing, but the pressure that this segment exercises, as dependent persons from an economic point of view, on the active population, is still very high, determining a low level of the investment in children.

Most of the rroma families are being characterised by the following features: early marriage, un-legalized marriage, inhabitanacy of the young families with one of the parent families, increased number of children, low rate of divorce. "Marriage" is still, in many cases in the rroma population, concluded only according to (local) norms of the community, without legal recognition. Besides these types of marriages – defined as "with papers" or "without papers" – there are young people living together and forming a couple (consensual), without being married by the civil state officer, in front of the "community" or through the agreement of parents. In 1998, 39.4% of the couples included in the sample were recorded under the category of "marriages without papers". It has to be noted that we do not know how many of these marriages "without papers", so without legal recognition, had been concluded in front of the community (legitimated through the specific ritual of the wedding or through agreements between parents) – considered by specialists in rroma issues and rroma leaders as being in majority and representing the expression of a community norm – and how many are only consensual couples established without a wedding ritual. The percentage of marriages without papers is bigger for the category of young people, growing from 20% in the case of the age group between 45-49 years to 83% in the case of the age group between 15-19 years. Marriage without papers is more frequent for the inhabitants in rural areas, those who live in exclusive rroma communities or

those who have lower levels of education. People who are self-identified as roma or gypsy and those who speak romani language are more likely to be involved in such marriages. Not all the roma groups have the same rules related to marriage. Out of the roma groups, the silver-traders, the “Gabors” (Hungarian gypsy) black smiths, goldsmiths and coppersmiths record a bigger percentage of marriages without papers, while at the other edge are to be found the silk traders, the wanderers, the settled and the wooden spoon makers. However, even within these groups, there are differences from one community to another. At least in the 90s, we cannot speak of one and the same norm related to marriage without papers in two communities belonging to the same group. Different communities relate to norms of marriage without papers in different ways: there are communities characterised by the tradition of marriages without papers, tradition which is maintained in the present times, and there are communities that gradually renounce the marriage without papers; there are roma groups in which the norm is represented by legal marriages and roma groups for which consensual couples are more and more frequent, without being related to the preservation of a local habit.

The establishment of consensual couples is growing for all the categories of population in Romania, as well as other European countries. What is interesting in the case of the roma population is, on the one hand, an increased presence of the phenomenon without a visible change in the status of women and, on the other hand, the high level of the frequency of this form of living together. The growing incidence of “marriages without papers” is not a “cultural” phenomenon in itself, in the sense of a custom or a norm of the roma communities, but the high values recorded have been facilitated by a cultural specificity of this ethnic minority.

The age of women at their first marriage is very low: 35% of married women started their couple life when they were merely 16, 17% at the age of 17-18 years, 26% between 19-22 years and only 8% of marriages were concluded after this age interval. The percentage of women who were below 20 at their first marriage is growing: 70% of women from the generation of 25-29 years old had got married before being 20, while 84% of women from the generation of 20-24 years old got married before reaching 20. The percentage of women married before 18 grows from 44.6% (for the generation of 25-29 years old) to 52.1% (for the generation of 20-24 years old). A

female person would get married sooner than others if she had graduated a smaller number of grades, lives in the rural area and speaks romani. Features revealed by the analysis as making differences are indicators of openness / isolation with regard to life outside the family and community, in comparison with alternative models of marriage.

The structure of the female roma population by civil status reveals a low incidence of divorces. In 1998, there were only 2-4 persons divorced in 100 persons married with papers and between 8-9 persons separated or divorced in 100 persons married with or without papers. Women who are not self-identified as roma have an increased rate of divorces, thus defining themselves differently from the model of the roma communities, and more closely to the model of the majority population.

There are two dominant models of roma family and household. 56% of the households are formed of mononuclear families, while 44% of the roma households also include other persons besides the mononuclear family. Economic factors play a very important role in the surviving of the model with several nucleons. The extended family functions as a solution for survival of its members, given the scarcity of resources. The inhabitancy of several families in a single household brings a certain division of labour and a certain manner of sharing the responsibility of caring for the elderly and children. The extended family functions as a social security mechanism, given that this role is not taken over by formal institutions. Out of the total number of roma old persons over 60, 91.3% live with other persons in the household, while only 8.7% live alone (by comparison, at national level of the entire population, 26.3% of persons over 60 live alone). For the elderly, the surviving resources from the household manage to cover the basic needs, in the absence of reasonably cheap means of external care of the elderly.

The number of children born by roma women along life is decreasing. For the roma female population at fertile ages (15-44 years old), the average number of children born along life, recorded at the census in 1992, was of 2.35 children per woman. The investigation on roma, carried out in 1998, for the same age group, reveals an average number of 1.93 children / woman born along life (respectively 2.08 children / woman if we only consider women from families self-identified as roma). We can formulate the hypothesis of a change in the fertility model of the roma, after 1990,

determined on the one hand by the increased fertility at younger ages and on the other hand by the decrease of fertility at older ages. Basically, the general decrease of the fertility in roma is not due to the increased age at the first marriage or first birth, but rather to the avoidance of births of higher ranks (the fourth, fifth child and so on). The first birth, at roma women, is not the result of a family project regarding how many children they would like to have along life or when they would want to have them. In these conditions, the high levels of roma fertility are determined by the early withdrawal of roma women from the education system and their non-entering the labour market. Younger generations are more exposed to the “risk” of pregnancies at early ages. The comparison between the generations of 25-29 years and 20-24 years draws the attention on the increase of the percentage of women who had their first child born before they were 18, from 30.6% to 37.1% (the same as the increased percentage of women married before 18, growing from 44.6% to 52.1%). At the same time, the higher limit of the number of children is diminishing, through the perception of material difficulties and a decrease of opportunities to achieve the necessary means required for raising more children.

Who are the roma women with fewer children and who are those with more children?

The average number of children born by roma women is slightly higher in rural areas than in urban areas. The differences in the number of children are associated, for both residential environments, with demographic indicators (age, age at the first birth and age at the first marriage of the mother), with the number of grades graduated, the status of employee before or after 1990, the self-identification as roma or gypsy and the knowledge of romani language, as well as with cultural consumption (newspapers, TV, Radio). Except for the demographic indicators, the other determining factors are not as important for the differences in the number of children in the two areas.

Checking the age, in the urban area, relevant are the number of graduated grades and the cultural consumption – the more children had a woman born, the smaller is the number of grades graduated or the cultural consumption more decreased. In the rural area, a woman who had given birth to many children has had an early first birth, declares herself as belonging to the roma ethnic group and knows romani language. Thus, if in the urban area the criteria are of educational and informational type, in the rural area the ethnic and cultural belonging are more important. These differences are to be explained in the first place through the difference in the socio-demographic

structures of the roma groups from the two residential areas. The degree of social differences is higher in the urban area, the rural area being rather characterised by a similarity of the level of education and cultural consumption. In the urban environment, the number of children born is differentiated through an educational and cultural conditioning of appealing to family planning. In the rural areas, where the family planning services are difficult to obtain for the entire population, and the cultural consumption is low, ethnic and cultural isolation become decisive factors in establishing a demographic regime. Thus, it is expected that the decrease in the number of new-born roma children, a tendency recorded at national level, be recorded in different ways, depending on the regional positioning – relevant for the demographic model of the majority population – and geographic and ethnic isolation of communities – significant for the preservation of traditional patterns or solutions. The education and the level of information and culture act as intermediate factors between the social context and the intention of decreasing the number of children, through conditioning the access to family planning methods.

Family planning with the roma population is a rather controversial problem because – many times – it is mostly regarded as an anti-birth and coercive policy than a right of each individual and couple. Another problem raised is that roma families would be – in their big majority – of traditional type, characterised by increased levels of birth, and the authority and decision are the attributes of the father. The reality of many roma families contradicts however these prejudices. For example, the Research on Reproductive Health in Romania (CSRR)², a study undertaken in 1993, offers us data on the opinion regarding the ideal number of children for a family. It is interesting to note that this opinion is not very significantly different from one ethnic group to another, the average for the total population being of 2.1 children per family. Otherwise said, 73.5% of the interviewed roma women appreciated that women should always have the right to take decisions related to their pregnancies, including the decision to have an abortion (it is to be noted that this percentage was the highest recorded, in comparison to 73.0% other ethnic groups, 71.7% Romanians and 68.9% Hungarians).

² Study formulated by the Institute for Mother and Child Care (IOMC) and the Centre for Prevention and Control of Diseases (CDC) Atlanta – USA.

In the roma families, there are significant differences between the average number of children in one family (3.19) and the number of children considered ideal for a family (2.24). Thus, each family is – on average – more numerous with almost one child (0.95) comparing to the dimensions considered ideal. These differences are, usually, explainable through the lack of using contraceptive methods.

The differences in using contraceptive methods between total female population and the roma female population are dramatic: only 13.7% (in 1998) of the roma women at fertile ages (15-44 years old) use contraception, while at the level of the entire population the percentage of users of contraceptive methods is more than 4 times bigger (57.3%) in 1993.

Regarding the motivation for not using contraception, a significant percentage (23.2%) of roma women between 15 and 44 years claim the lack of knowledge regarding contraceptive methods. This segment of the population is aware of both the need for family planning and the lack of education and information in this area and, consequently, it presents a higher receptivity on this subject and represents a potential beneficiary of family planning services. The percentage of persons who claim the “lack of money” as a reason for not using contraception is much bigger in the case of the roma than the national sample: 15.8% comparing to 0.5% (in the national sample, this percentage includes, besides the difficulties related to the cost of contraceptives, the ones related to the low availability of these methods on the market and the reduced accessibility of family planning services). For this segment of the population, the solution would be the mobile family planning units that, besides the education and information services, offer – in certain conditions – free or compensated methods. The “unsatisfied need” for family planning is an indicator that measures the additional need for family planning, in order to eliminate the risk of (all) unwanted or inappropriate pregnancies. For the total population, the value of this indicator was of 39.1% in 1993, while for the roma population, of 52.6% (in 1998).

The data presented above clearly demonstrates the permeability of the roma population (especially women) at family planning, an attitude that requires a responsible and focused response from the system of services.

Health state of the roma population

Due to the difficulties encountered in undertaking an evaluation from the medical perspective of the state of health of the roma population, we have chosen a set of subjective indicators that offer us an image of the perceived quality of the state of health. According to these indicators, 72.5% of the total population investigated appreciated that it had no serious health problems, 11.2% had “small health problems”, 14.0% had “serious problems” and 2.3% declared themselves as handicapped persons.

However, data reveal the existence of a “risk group” representing 9.6% of the total number of persons included in the sample. The risk group is formed of extremely vulnerable persons, with serious health problems and an extremely precarious socio-economic situation (revenues – in the best cases – cover the basic needs, they are often and very often deprived from food and they live in households considered by operators poor or very poor).

One of the factors that negatively influence the state of health of the roma population, especially that of children from families with very low revenues, is insufficient feeding both from the point of view of quantity and quality, determining lack of vitamins, malnutrition, anaemia, dystrophy, rachitis and, in the majority of cases, a deficit in the weight and height of children, conditions that – according to medical doctors interviewed – affect an important segment of the roma children. Another important category of diseases is that of enterocolitis and food poisoning. From the point of view of feeding, institutionalised children are in a privileged position, since their daily food needs are mostly covered. Unfortunately, this situation represents a stimulating factor for child institutionalisation and, also, can prevent efforts of un-institutionalisation.

Another category of children who are advantaged from the feeding point of view is breast-fed newborn, given the practice of roma mothers to naturally feed their children. According to statistical data in 1992 “two thirds of the roma mothers were breast-feeding their children more than 9 months”³.

Health problems of the roma population are complex, but do not have ethnic determinants, but rather cultural (life style) and socio-economic (low living standards). And for solving this complex of problems, an inter-disciplinary approach

³ *Tiganiii între ignorare și îngrijorare* (Gypsies, between ignorance and concern) – coord. Elena and Catalin Zamfir, Alternative, 1993, p. 153.

is needed, to offer more than a symptomatic treatment. Pragmatically speaking, in order to respond to the health needs of the roma population, it is necessary that the Ministry of Health, in collaboration with the local Councils from the areas with an important percentage of the roma population, develop special medical assistance, prevention and sanitary education programs. Another possible solution, already experienced with positive results in many roma communities is the employment of roma persons as community mediators on health issues. This initiative of the roma civil society has been already formalised through a partnership with the Ministry of Health and Family.

Formal education in the roma population

In comparison with pre-school participation in the total population of Romania, the participation of roma children in pre-school education is almost four times smaller. Regarding school, roma participation is smaller with 15-25% than the participation on the total population, in what regards primary school, and with almost 30% in what regards secondary school. With regard to attending high school, the increased number of non-answers prevents us from determining exactly the level of participation of the roma in this form of education. However, we can assume that this important number of non-answers really reflects cases of non-participation. In this case, roma participation to high school education would be almost 40% smaller than the total population. In higher education, the presence of the roma is rather an exception, the percentage of roma people who attend University being insignificant.

Although reduced, school participation of roma children has improved in comparison to the beginning of the 90s. The percentage of un-educated children has diminished and the cases of school abandon have almost been reduced to half. This improvement of the school participation of the roma is an effect of conditioning the provision of child allowance to school frequency. Although a criticisable measure from a moral and socio-economic point of view, it has produced desirable effects in regard to the school participation of the roma.

The fact that almost 90% of the uneducated children come from poor families demonstrates how strongly conditioned is the access to education by the economic resources of the family. Besides this aspect, a series of other factors could be correlated to the lack of education: vicinity (cultural influence), language spoken in the family, declared nationality. Thus, in compact roma communities, where the roma language is preponderantly used in the family and community and where roma people declare their nationality as such, school participation is more reduced. We can assume that in such communities there is an increased lack of trust in school or that another cultural pattern is present, but we cannot exclude the hypothesis of geographical isolation of these communities. Finally, systemic factors from inside the school system are not to be ignored either.

The existence of schools with a majority of roma pupils is a reality, although until the present there is no quantitative image of the phenomenon. It is supposed, however, that given the role of the family in funding expenses related to school (fund of the classroom, special notebooks, school books, stationery, tutorials etc.) and in directly or indirectly supporting school for children, such schools are endowed with much lower financial resources than “normal” schools and, implicitly, inferior human resources.

The analysis of the level of education on generations of the roma population show that, for all generations, the education cycles towards which most individuals orient (primary and secondary) are under the required level for occupying a minimal position in the labour market. The lowest education levels are to be found in the “older” generation, including persons who got educated or could have attended school before 1960. The highest level of education is to be found in the “mature” generation, whose education could take place or took place between 1960 and 1980. Finally, with the young generation, who should have been enrolled in the education system between 1980-1989 and the “transition” generation (1990-1998), it is to be noted an increased level of lack of education and in general lower levels of education than in the “mature” generation, as the improvement of the situation in the last years (following the conditioning of child allowance by school frequency) was insufficient to correct the deficit in school attendance of the “transition” generation in comparison with the “mature” generation having been at school ages between the 60s and the 70s.

One explanation of the differences in school education on generations consists in the educational and social policies from the communist time (the relatively prosperous period of the 60s and 70s) that encouraged school participation of the roma.

The situation of illiteracy. The lowest incidence of illiteracy is to be found in the mature generation, where around 30% of the subjects can be considered illiterate (read with difficulty or not at all), while the highest incidence is in the older generation. Thus, in the case of the “older” generation, over 45% of the subjects declare that they read with difficulty or not at all, and the high number of non-answers probably also represents undeclared cases of illiteracy, the refuse to answer being determined by the negative image associated to it. If we are to also consider non-answers, it would mean that in the “older” generation, over 60% of the subjects are illiterate. In what regards the “young” and “transition” generations, it is noted that the incidence of illiteracy is slightly higher than in the “mature” generation.

If, in what regards the “older” generation, the percentage of illiterate women is much higher than that of men, the difference between sexes with regard to illiteracy reduces in the “mature” generation and is no longer present in the case of “young” and “transition” generations.

Occupations and professions of the roma

Professional training represents an important indicator of the roma participation to social and economic life of Romania. Depending on this, the roma can more easily integrate into the labour market and can financially support the families that they come from. A little over half of the roma people have no profession or practice activities that do not require qualification in the formal system of professional training. Thus, 33.5% of the roma have no qualification, 14.3% work in agriculture and 4.6% are day labourers. Modern qualifications are to be found in 37.3% of the cases and traditional ones in 10.3% of cases.

We cannot speak of major differences between the residence environments, respectively rural and urban. However, men are qualified in a bigger percentage than women, and the percentage of women with no profession (37.1%) is significantly bigger than that of men (15.3%).

The type of community in which roma live have profound implications on their qualification. Thus, for the roma individuals coming from compact and somehow

isolated communities, the lack of qualification or the existence of skills for traditional activities represent specificity. As they move away from such communities, the roma become more qualified, and usually in modern professions.

The analysis on generations suggests a change in the pattern of qualifications with the roma population. If for the grandparents the traditional crafts were representing the main occupation, their presence decreases gradually with the generation of parents and becomes very weak with the young population.

In the case of modern professions, the trend is just the opposite, as these are more present with the young population, which is quite normal if we consider economic and structural changes in the job market in the last 50-60 years.

It is very important and very serious at the same time that the number of young persons with no profession overcomes that of the adults, which means that after 1990, an important part of the young roma did not qualify in any profession.

The roma population has a different age structure than population at national level. It is very young, around 1/3 of the total being under 15, in comparison with the total population in which 1/5 of the total are under 15. This situation shows that in the following years an important number of roma people will enter the labour market, the lack of qualification determining most of them to choose “inferior” jobs from the point of view of remuneration or social status.

Participation of the roma on the labour market. The degree of occupation of the roma population in Romania is smaller than that of the population at national level (47% compared to 61.7%). The percentage of housewives is over 4 times bigger with the roma than at the national level and shows the weak participation of roma women on the labour market.

An important part of the roma has no occupation (13.2%) and the rate of unemployed persons benefiting from unemployment support registered in 1998 at the national level was bigger than in the case of roma (6.3% comparing to 0.5%). The percentage of registered unemployed is low amongst the roma, on the one hand due to the fact that few of them had graduated vocational schools or high schools or had been legally employed with a labour contract, and on the other hand due to the fact that few of the roma had been employed as full time employees and lost their jobs, becoming unemployed. Moreover, many of them have long over-passed the period of the

unemployment benefits, being what is called long-term unemployed, a situation that is not mentioned in the official statistics regarding unemployment.

Out of the total occupied roma population, approximately 2/3 of them are men (65%) and less than one third of them are full-time employees. These usually come from communities where the roma live together with Romanians. This fact can indicate the higher degree of integration of the roma when they adopt the behaviour of the majority population.

The high percentage of day-labourers, 41.7% of the total population, indicates that the roma are facing a difficult situation regarding employment and, implicitly, provision of minimum revenues necessary to cover the basic needs.

There are tight connections between the professions of the roma and their occupations, as their profession usually determines their current occupation or lack of occupation. The low professional training leads to the fact that roma have very few qualifications meant to support their entrance on the labour market and that is why most of them exploit marginal resources for providing necessary revenues for daily living.

Economic standard of the roma

The characterisation of the economic standard of the roma household starts from the analysis of declared revenues. For compensating the fragility of these data, additional information were also taken into consideration, like types of activities undertaken, types of revenues that enter the budget of the households along one year, the source considered as most important by household members, the revenue considered minimum necessary to cover family needs, features of dwelling and endowment, subjective evaluations regarding living conditions and main destinations of potential additional revenues.

Regarding the sources of revenues, the main distinction considered the variability of revenues in time, by delimiting permanent revenues that constantly concur to the formation of the household budget from non-permanent revenues. The high frequency of the latter is a specificity of the situation of roma: 53.4% of the households declared non-permanent revenues in their budgets of the previous month at the time when the research was undertaken. Moreover, between 1992 and 1998, the permanent

revenues have recorded a decreasing tendency with regard to their contribution to the budget of households, equalling to an increased instability of the revenues of roma. Salaries and revenues from social transfers also enter into the category of permanent revenues. The non-permanent revenues vary from one moment in time to another, both regarding size and source. We can distinguish among them: revenues from activities undertaken on one's own (freelance), as a result of practicing a certain profession or undertaking a private business, and occasional revenues, mainly determined by circumstances which are external to individuals. In this latter sub-category are to be included: revenues from day-labour activities, in kind revenues received for various work undertaken, as well as "occasional" revenues from activities like cutting wood, sale of various products, small trade (bottles, wild fruits), work abroad, various unqualified works or activities that require a minimum degree of qualification or illegal activities.

The most frequent source of revenue is child allowance, present in the budget of households in 66.2% of the cases. Salary revenues contribute to the formation of the budget in almost one third of the cases, and retirement pensions in 11.7%.

Unemployment benefits complete the budget of households in almost 1 out of 10 cases. Illness or disable pensions are present in 5.8%, respectively 4.7% of the households.

Along one year, the most frequent non-permanent source of revenues is the day labour activities, declared in half of the households. This is followed by activities on one's own, including business and trade, then work of land and support from others, then revenues from working abroad (4% of the household), exaggerated interest loans (1.8%), sale of property (1.7%), gambling (0.6%) and fortune telling (0.2%).

A hierarchy of the sources of revenues that the budget of households was based on highlights that for 22.6% of the households the most important source of revenue along the previous year was represented by salaries, followed by day labour activities (18.9%), pensions (15.6%), child allowances (13.3%). The scale is continued with revenues from activities on one's own (8.7%), revenues from social support or unemployment benefits (5.9%), revenues from work of land or in kind revenues in products for the household (5.2%), revenues from occasional activities or small trade (4.5%), business or work abroad (2.6%), support from friends, relatives, or begging (1.6%) and, on the last place, revenues from loans with exaggerated interests, other interest rates and gambling (1.2%).

The average declared revenue per person in the roma households was of approximately 15% of the net average salary on economy of that time. The residence environment significantly influences the level of the gained revenues, the revenue from rural areas representing half of the revenues of those from urban areas. The situation seems to have worsened from 1992, when this report was of 2/3.

The level of revenues varies over a large scale of values, as there are families whose revenue in the previous month was null and families whose revenue per person has been 7 times bigger than the net average salary on economy. The revenue per person of the richest 10% of the households was 50 times bigger than that of persons from the poorest 10% of households. In real terms, the revenues had decreased between 1992 and 1998, which indicates a process of impoverishment of the roma population along this time interval. The biggest “losses” in revenues are recorded on the segment of the rich, but these can also be determined by under-declaring real revenues.

The appreciation of the degree of covering daily needs of the households, based on current revenues, confirms the difficult situation in which the majority of the roma dwells: 86.1% of the households declare that their revenues are in the best cases covering their basic needs. The subjective evaluation of revenues confirms a decrease in the value of revenues noted with the roma population, based on recordings of revenues.

Regarding the report between expectations and revenues, the richest 10% of the households are the only ones for which gained revenues cover in an important degree their expectations. For the others, the revenues gained represent on average less than half of what they consider to be a minimum revenue value, which would cover the basic needs of the household.

The structure of revenues is modified according to the level of gained revenues. The group of the most rich 10% of the households is the only one in which permanent revenues represent (on average) half of the total revenues. On the other side of distribution (2nd decile) constant revenues represent three quarters of the total revenues, which is far from positive, given that the household revenues are almost entirely formed of child allowances.

The general tendencies in the structure of total revenues, in comparison to the growth of revenues (from the 1st to the 10th decile) are:

- Decrease of the percentage covered by child allowances from 2/3 (d2) to “disappearance”.
- Increase of salaries and retirement pensions, with the difference that the former increase to a value of 30%, while the contribution of the latter stops at the value of 15%.
- Unemployment benefits – reach the maximum level in the middle groups and decrease towards the extremes, up to elimination, being a rather insignificant source of revenues.
- The group of other constant revenues, including other types of pensions and different forms of social support, does not go beyond 2% of the total revenues of households.
- Revenues from occasional activities have a sinusoidal trend, with maximal levels at the extremes and the middle of the distribution, being mainly formed of revenues from “occasional work”, and oscillate around the value of 9%.
- Revenues from activities on one’s own increase slowly, equalling in d10 the percentage of revenues from salaries, representing together 60% of the revenues of these households.
- Social support is present in the budget of households belonging to the poor segment, being occasionally mentioned as the most important source of revenues of the previous year. Out of the total number of persons who were recognised the right to social support, only 24% had benefited from it from the beginning of the year to the moment of the research.
- Revenues from begging (4.8%) are present almost in the entire segment of the poorest 20%.
- Revenues from business are concentrated in the segment of the rich households.
- Non-permanent revenues increase their absolute value in parallel with the increase of revenues per person, without recording significant flows, except for the group of the richest 10%.

Households from the poor segment are preponderantly living in the rural areas, in homogenous roma communities, in own houses, towards which they declared themselves unsatisfied. On the contrary, rich households mainly come from the urban areas, being the owners of apartments in blocks of flats, living in heterogeneous conditions, in communities mainly inhabited by other ethnic groups than the roma. The preponderant concentration of the rural households in the poor segment and of

the urban ones in the rich group is a situation maintained in time, similar to that recorded at national level. The features of houses divide households in a similar manner to those of dwelling. Inhabitation in the urban areas brings along the facilities provided by living in blocks of flats: the presence of kitchen, bathrooms, sewerage and running water. The segment of the poor household is the “reverse image” of the rich segment.

Regarding property, the 2.6% of the households who have own working units in which they practice various works on their own or in family associations are to be mentioned. Regarding the endowment of households with tools for the work of land, the situation has significantly improved between 1992 and 1998, the percentage of those who declared that they owned such tools growing from 11.4% to 36.8%. Besides these, only other 2-3% of households mention various machinery and equipment used in agriculture or as transportation means (tractor, harrow, truck, land car, saw-mill etc.).

The poor endowment of households and the scarce property on land (62.8% do not own land) indicate that the work of land does not constitute a fundamental source of revenue for households. For 5% of the households, however, revenues from the work of land have constituted the most important source of revenues in the previous year. The majority of those who had such revenues are to be found amongst the poorest 20%, a segment that also gathers the households whose budget is formed of revenues from day labour activities, partly consisting in agricultural works.

The socio-economic features of households vary in a different manner along with the increase of revenues: the dimension of the family and the number of minor children under care (persons under 14 inclusively) decrease, while the average age of the household and the educational capital increase. It can be said that the most numerous and at the same time “young” families, with the biggest number of minor children under care and the lowest level of school education are to be found amongst the poorest households.

The indicator of education record a constant growth along with the increase of the revenue, reaching its maximal values in the same groups where salary revenues are significant in the budget of households. Consequently, the increase of the educational level brings along an increase of the permanent revenues, through facilitating the entrance of individuals on the formal labour market.

The material difficulties that most of the roma households face are confirmed by the stated destination that additional revenues would be given: acquisition / repairs of a house (30% of households), acquisition of food necessary for the family (20.7%) and provision of the daily needs / clothes / endowment of households (15.4%). In an equal number are those who declare that they would live better and those who would direct towards establishment of an own business or savings (8.1% of the households). Following them are the ones who would give to the others – to the poor or children / nephews, nieces – 4.8%, who would buy land / animals or would buy food for animals – 4.7%, who would take care of their health, would go to resorts or do something else – 2.8% each, and 2.5% of them would use the extra-money to pay back their debts or their maintenance expenses.

It is interesting to note the evolution in opposite directions of the current revenues indicators, supported by subjective evaluations, and respectively those related to accumulated wealth. Although the revenue indicators reflect a worsening of the situation of roma households between 1992 and 1998, from the perspective of the indicators of accumulated wealth, it can be said that the material situation of the roma has improved. The situation is explainable if we refer to the context of the Romanian economy of that period. On the one hand, the increase of the unemployment rate indicates the loss of salary revenues and, at the same time, the loss of one source of revenues for the budget of households. Unemployment has mostly affected persons with low professional qualifications and low levels of education, which allows us to assume that the roma population, corresponding to this description, was strongly affected by restructuring processes in the economy. On the other hand, massive migrations – especially of the German origin population – left several of the rural houses unoccupied, which were taken by the first-comers, their endowment being over the average recorded at the roma population. Last but not least, second-hand products from abroad were good occasions for the improvement of house endowments.

Situation of dwelling at the roma population

Comparing to the majority population, the roma population in Romania dwells in worse conditions. Regarding the average number of rooms / house, the average dimensions of rooms and the usable surface / house, the differences between the roma population and the Romanian population as a whole are not significant. On the

contrary, differences are extremely significant in what regards the average number of persons / house (almost double for the roma population), while the inhabited surface per person is smaller with 33% and the average number of persons / room is two times bigger at the roma population. Approximately 80% of the roma population benefits from an average surface / person under the national average of 11.9 sq.m./person, while at the level of the entire population (including roma) only 40% are under this average. In 25.6% of the roma households, there are in average 3.01 persons / room, while the corresponding percentage at the level of the entire population is of 1.7%. The roma households in which the man from the subject couple (considered as head of the household) has under 8 grades graduated registers an increased density of persons / inhabited room that the households in which the man from the subject couple has more than 8 grades (2.89 and respectively 2.38 persons / room). The determinant factors independently contributing to the explanation of the variations in inhabitancy density (persons / room) at the roma population are the residence environment, the level of education of the man from the subject couple (under / over 8 grades), the type of community (homogenous / dispersed), the total number of children in the household, the monthly revenue gained / person and the average age of the subject couple.

Between 1992 and 1998, significant changes have occurred with regard to the density of inhabitancy according to certain socio-demographic features. The households in which the head of the family (man) had in 1998 a modern profession have recorded an improvement in the density of inhabitancy comparing to 1992, the households lead by a man with no profession maintained at a constant level, while the households lead by men having a traditional profession or working in agriculture recorded significant declines.

According to the form of property, the most “crowded” (over 3.01 persons / room) are the persons living in a rented space or in the house of a relative. Less “crowded” are the ones who own their houses, especially those living in blocks of flats.

It has been noted that, the better the welfare level of the household is, the better are the living conditions, especially concerning density of inhabitancy. Households with

low monthly revenues per family member have a higher density of persons / room than persons with a higher average monthly revenue.

Comparing to the situation recorded in 1992, it seems that the situation of dwelling at the roma population has improved from the point of view of density of inhabitancy.

Thus, if in 1992, only little over 1/10 of the roma were recording densities of up to one inhabitant per room, in 1998 almost 2/10 of them have such a density.

The economic factor is an important determinant of the size of the house (under the aspect of number of rooms): the bigger the revenues per person, the more the number of rooms per house. In other words, many of the roma households have less spacious houses, not necessarily due to their lack of interest towards an improved living space, but mostly due to objective constraints of economic / financial nature. It is also true that the life style of this population could be associated with this situation.

An extremely interesting aspect is represented by the fact that 25.4% of the interviewed persons who live in “yard house – property” declare that they do not hold any legal documents for the land on which the house is built. Out of 22 households who state that their house is built on public land, 21 declare that they do not hold any documents on the land corresponding to the construction.

With regard to the quality and comfort of the roma houses, only less than one third have an appropriate kitchen, only one house out of five has a bathroom, only 2 out of 10 houses have toilets with running water inside the house and one out of 10 houses does not have a toilet at all. Only 31.6% of the houses are endowed with running water installations (1.8 times less than the average at national level). Roma households benefiting from connection to electricity systems are with almost 10% less than the average at the national level, and those connected to the natural gas and sewerage systems are twice less than the national average.

The self-evaluation of the quality of houses by the roma population shows that over two fifths of them consider their houses “poor”, while other 35.5% appreciate that their houses are modest.

The calculation of an index reflecting endowment with utilities has again showed huge discrepancies between the roma population and the entire population. The average index with the roma population was of 0.326, while at the level of the entire

population its value was of 0.619. If only 0.4% of the Romanian population did not have any of the utilities forming the index, at the level of the roma population this percentage is of 11.1% .

The correlation between the house endowments index and the average monthly revenue per person indicates that increased values of the index are to be found in the superior deciles of revenue (especially deciles 9 and 10), while in the inferior deciles we mainly find houses that have a maximum of 3 utilities.

The endowment of households with long-term use goods is also deficient at the roma population, in comparison with the entire population. The more frequent goods found in roma households included in the sample are cooking machines and refrigerators, as well as audio equipment while other modern goods (vacuum cleaner, washing machine, freezer, car) are to be found in a significantly more reduced number. The index of the house endowment with long-term goods at the level of the roma population represents only 21.8% of the maximum value of the index (endowment with all the 7 goods considered) and is 2.85 times smaller than at the level of the entire population.

If we only consider 4 strictly necessary goods (cooking machine, refrigerator, washing machine and TV/radio), goods considered to be necessary in any household, we note that 3 households out of 10 do not even hold one of the four elementary goods, comparing to one household out of 50 at the level of the entire country.

In what regards satisfaction towards endowment with household goods, the big majority of the roma declare themselves “unsatisfied” or “most unsatisfied” (55.1%) and only one quarter declare themselves “very satisfied” and “satisfied” (24.7%) with the endowment of their own household.

The main conclusion regarding dwelling and house endowments is that the roma population lives in worse conditions than the population as a whole. This is firstly due to the economic difficulties that this population faces and the lack of coherent governmental programs for fighting poverty, as well as, secondly, to certain specificity of their life style.

Migration and intention of migration at the rroma population

Internal migration and intention of migration of the rroma, as analysed data reveal, have certain distinct features from the ones in the rest of the population. Although, regarding volume, there are no significant statistical differences, these appear at the level of destination of migration and distance. Regarding the scope of the phenomenon, it does not significantly differentiate the rroma from the rest of the population. It cannot be stated that the rroma are more “likely” to migrate than the other citizens of Romania and that they are willing to re-adopt the nomad life style in the context of transformation that the Romanian society is going through. The differences that appear, namely the choice of rural areas as destinations of the migration and the intention of migration in short distances are determined by the different types of resources that this population has at disposal. Migrating to urban areas supposes the possession of better human resources (education and professional training) than those required by the rural areas. Thus, when rroma people decide to migrate, due to material constraints like poor quality of the dwelling space, increased density of inhabitancy, increased dissatisfaction (probably determined by the respective constraints), they chose to go towards an environment in which the adaptation efforts are not too high and the opportunities of gains are more certain. We can thus conclude that the differences recorded between rroma migration and the migration of the rest of the population are not due to the practicing, in the past, of the rroma nomad life style, but to the type of resources owned by the rroma, in comparison to the rest of the population.

The external migration of the rroma represents a phenomenon whose dimension is difficult to estimate. The departure of rroma people outside the borders of the country, after 1989, does not constitute a form of territorial mobility similar to emigration. This is situated somewhere between seasonal nomadism, specific to the rroma in the past, and permanent emigration. Departures outside the country represent a strategy adopted by the rich segment of the population, which took advantage of the opportunities offered by the freedom of movement brought by changes after 1989.

On differences: between tolerance and prejudices

In the transition years, the prejudices of the majority population towards the rroma have significantly decreased. The society has moved from a consensus of negative attitude towards this minority to social controversy. A significant statistical decrease

of these prejudices between 1993 and 1999 can be noted. Following an increased level of prejudices towards this population in 1993, a decreasing trend of negative attitudes towards the roma is to be noted. If in 1993 72% of the Romanians did not want to have gypsies among their neighbours, in 1999 only 48% wanted a neighbourhood without roma. Those who approve different treatments towards the roma, regarding their access on the labour market, are usually those with an increased degree of intolerance towards “alterity”, with a low level of education and of older ages. The roma population does not consider itself discriminated with regard to treatment received from public institutions. However, there is a model of controversy related to this situation. The controversy is generated by the important differences existing in this population. The features of the communities in which roma people live have a very big importance in treating a situation as discriminatory or non-discriminatory. Factors like the type of residential area (compact or mixed), the presence of conflicts between roma and the majority population, urban or rural residence, integration in the social life of the community, are important in this context. Out of the individual factors analysed, only the age of the person induces differences in what regards perceived discrimination. It can be concluded that, despite existing prejudices at the level of the majority population, the Romanian society is on a growing path of ethnic tolerance and decrease of discrimination, at least towards the roma population.

Social exclusion of the roma population in Romania

Starting from the theory of social exclusion, a multi-dimensional concept that is not only “fashionable” in Europe, but also extremely useful for analyses and social policies, we have studied the types of exclusion of the roma population, on the 4 components of the concept: democratic and legal system, labour market, welfare state system and inter-personal relations.

The specificity of social exclusion for the roma population in Romania consists in the existence of exclusion sources that do not exist at the level of the rest of the population or abroad (or there are very rare cases), like for example the lack of identity documents, determining a chain of other forms of exclusion. Western people call the absence of subjects from the labour market a “causing or facilitating factor” for social exclusion, as it determines chain reactions of exclusion. In the case of the roma population in Romania, there are several factors determining social exclusion. If we analyse their nature, we note that, excepting the presence on the labour market

that can be determined by the conditions from the local community and in the country, the causing factors have a preponderantly individual nature and in a certain measure a cultural one (or even community-related, in the sense of cultural communities), being thus cases of self-exclusion, in an important degree.

The fact that 3.1% of the roma have no identity documents excludes approximately 47,000 persons (out of which half are children) from a the rights of citizenship of the Romanian state: education and free sanitary services to child allowance, emergency support, other rights related to social assistance and social insurance. They cannot be educated, work legally or be insured. They cannot vote, become members of organisations or be elected in leadership positions. They cannot even be legally married or have identity documents issued for their children. The lack of interest for formal action, the ignorance or lack of education can be important causes for this situation; however, structural causes should not be ignored, like for example the legal and material difficulties that persons with no identity documents would face if they would want to solve this problem.

In the succession of forms of exclusion of the roma, one of the causes generating chain exclusion is also the non-attendance of school (at all) by almost 24% of persons over 10 years old who have abandoned school.

Equally serious is the fact that 84% of the roma persons over 14 who answered the question (28% did not answer) were not working on the basis of the legal contract, meaning not only the absence of constant revenues, but the lack of insurance for unemployment and pensions of the majority of the roma.

It is easy to note the huge dimensions that these basic, fundamental types of exclusion have in the roma population. Basically, to speak about poverty or living standards with regard to individuals who do not have identity documents (birth certificate and / or identity card) is useless.

Besides the main factor, which is of structural nature, although the chances of some individuals are also diminished by causes related to personal decisions and self-exclusion (like the ones mentioned above: lack of identity documents or non-attendance of school), we do not have to neglect the belonging to certain local communities and even the belonging to the ethnic minority, which become, with a high probability, sources of social exclusion. On the background of the lack of jobs (and especially those with no legal contract), to be part of a poor community, with no

jobs, becomes an additional source of social exclusion, the chances to find employment diminishing in a significant way.

An equally serious situation is to be found at the approximate 21% of the roma living in houses for which they have no property documents, a built house or (in more rare cases) a house illegally occupied. Besides the legal problems that this issue raises (we are speaking about tens of thousands of roma households), the risk of social exclusion is extremely high, basically hundreds of thousand persons being in danger of losing their houses, would the law be applied by the book.

It is obvious that illiteracy is a primary source of exclusion quite significant for the roma population in Romania. The 39% illiterates and semi-illiterates have, in the first place, minimal chances of entering the labour market.

The importance that school has for roma children is fundamental. Education is, in many cases, the only way through which they could escape from the vicious circle of social exclusion: poverty – non-attendance of schools – illiteracy – lack of professions and salaries – poverty.

The measures that are most likely to be efficient in this sense are direct incentives, like for example the state allowance and / or the introduction of free meals in schools (for all poor children, and not only roma, as also stipulated in the Government Strategy concerning the roma population). These could attract to schools many of the roma children.

A compulsory preparatory year could be introduced in areas with an increased percentage of roma children, for all children who do not know the language very well or have adaptation difficulties.

Excluded or self-excluded from the labour market, uncovered by the system of social insurance, 75% of the heads of roma families consider that their families would be entitled to / should receive social support.

But the effects of the types of exclusion presented above are already visible in the difference between the percentage of those who consider themselves entitled and decided to submit an application for social support and those who had actually submitted applications for social support. Basically, only 14% of the roma families did not manage to submit their application file because “they did not have the

necessary documents” (9%) or their application was not according (“corresponding” – 5%).

Considering that almost 50% of the population has submitted applications for receiving social support, and social support applications have been approved for one quarter of families, we can say that the roma population is, in an important degree, dependent on the social assistance system, the State and the local community.

Meals at the social canteens represent yet another extreme solution for the poor. 3.6% of the heads of households declare that persons from their household eat at the social canteens. Although it seems rather insignificant considering the huge number of roma people living in poverty, the percentage is quite important. It could however grow if social canteens were established in all the communities and all those entitled were (could be) accepted in order to benefit from this protection measure.

Being too vulnerable to resist on the labour market, too many to be covered by protection of a state that is already lacking in resources, many of the roma in Romania are left with the only possible alternative to fulfil their basic needs: the family and the community.

Passing from the life partner to the whole network of community support for an individual, we have tried to see how it works in an extreme situation, but not very rare in roma communities: lack of food, impossibility of satisfying it with own resources, need for food. If the network of relatives and friends functions for half of the roma people, when they are in need, it usually functions as a source of loans, and very rarely as a non-returnable loan (3.4% of the roma). Concerning extreme solutions like stealing, begging (4.3%) or searching in trash (1.5%), but also the solution of starving (in total 11%), these are the proof of a desperate situation that an important part of the roma population faces.

In Romania, there are a series of excluded social groups and obvious exclusion processes. The part of the roma ethnic minority that, as we demonstrated, suffers from serious exclusion processes, is only one of these social segments, but probably the worst affected.

2. General presentation of some indicators on the roma population

The following dimensions are followed:

- Ethnic self-identification
- Dimension of household
- Fertility
- Marriage
- Situation of identity documents
- Education
- Professions and occupations
- Revenues
- Property on land and other goods
- Housing

Data are being presented comparatively for 1992 and 1998, in the measure in which these indicators are to be found in both investigations. Additional comparisons have been made on the following categories: urban versus rural, compact or isolated communities versus communities in which roma people live dispersed, roma ethnic self-identification versus ethnic self-identification with other ethnic nationalities.

To these data are to be added aspects related to reproductive health, ethnic tolerance and mass-media image, taken over from other researches.

Ethnic self-identification of the interviewed

Table 1. Ethnic belonging of the respondents, 1992 (% of total respondents)

	Total sample	Compact roma group	Dispersed roma	Urban	Rural
Roma	78.67	80.92	74.29	77.63	79.35
Specified their group of belonging	43.58	46.66	37.82	46.88	41.44
Did not specify their group of belonging	35.09	34.26	36.47	30.75	37.91
Other ethnic minority than roma	17.36	15.55	22.65	18.17	16.83
No answer	3.97	3.53	3.06	4.19	3.82
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Table 2. Ethnic belonging of the respondents, 1998 (% of total respondents)

	Total sample	Compact rroma group	Dispersed rroma	Urban	Rural
Romi	60.68	67.13	58.14	55.91	63.96
Specified their group of belonging	19.04	21.84	17.93	18.08	19.69
Did not specify their group of belonging	41.64	45.29	40.21	37.83	44.26
Other ethnic minority than rroma	38.87	32.87	41.23	43.25	35.85
No answer	0.45	0.00	0.63	0.83	0.19
Total	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00

Dimension of households

Table 3. Average size of households (number of individuals/households), 1992 and 1998

	Total sample	Self-identified as rroma	Self-identified as other ethnic minority	Compact rroma group	Dispersed rroma	Urban	Rural
1992 investigation	6.67	6.84	5.92	6.79	6.19	6.66	6.68
1998 investigation	5.55	5.78	5.20	5.67	5.52	5.52	5.57

Fertility

Table 4. Average number of children born along life, on ages of women, 1992

	Total sample	Urban	Rural	Compact communities	Dispersed communities	Self-identified as rroma	Other ethnic identification
15-19 years	1.62	1.08	1.91	1.62	1.64	1.64	1.51
20-24 years	2.60	2.38	2.75	2.66	2.46	2.64	2.36
25-29 years	3.55	3.49	3.60	3.71	3.35	3.53	3.63
30-34 years	4.77	4.80	4.74	4.85	4.09	4.81	4.08
35-39 years	5.03	4.69	5.25	5.32	4.39	5.18	4.59
40-44 years	4.77	4.73	4.81	4.93	4.85	4.97	3.89

Note: Women included in the 1992 investigation and, consequently, in this analysis, are married women – with or without legal documents

Table 5. Average number of children born along life, on ages of women, 1998

	Total sample	Urban	Rural	Compact communities	Dispersed communities	Self-identified as rroma	Other ethnic identification
15-19 years	0,25	0,19	0,29	0,44	0,17	0,28	0,17
20-24 years	0,99	0,80	1,14	1,23	0,89	1,10	0,80
25-29 years	1,97	1,81	2,10	2,36	1,84	2,07	1,81
30-34 years	3,09	3,03	3,14	3,64	2,79	3,57	2,27
35-39 years	4,03	3,96	4,08	4,45	3,91	4,37	3,44
40-44 years	4,39	4,00	4,75	4,93	4,17	4,66	3,98

Note: The investigation in 1998 and this analysis included both married women – with or without legal documents – and unmarried women

Table 6. Average number of children born along life by married women, on ages of women, 1998

	Total sample	Urban	Rural	Compact communities	Dispersed communities	Self-identified as rroma	Other ethnic identification
15-19 years	0.72	0.57	0.82	1.07	0.55	0.73	0.68
20-24 years	1.38	1.29	1.44	1.48	1.34	1.43	1.28
25-29 years	2.18	2.00	2.32	2.52	2.07	2.24	2.08
30-34 years	3.31	3.31	3.32	3.72	3.09	3.69	2.62
35-39 years	4.27	4.18	4.33	4.98	4.08	4.56	3.73
40-44 years	4.41	4.03	4.75	4.96	4.17	4.69	4.00

Table 7. Age at first birth, 1992 and 1998

	Total sample	Urban	Rural	Compact communities	Dispersed communities	Self-identified as rroma	Other ethnic identification
1992 investigation	18.62	18.73	18.54	18.62	18.67	18.44	19.41
1998 investigation	19.26	19.43	19.15	18.70	19.47	18.83	19.96

Table 8. Percentage of women who do not want any more children, on ages, 1992

	Total sample	Urban	Rural	Compact communities	Dispersed communities	Self-identified as rroma	Other ethnic identification
18-19 years	55.5	22.4	75.9	62.1	38.7	59.4	43.8
20-24 years	57.2	48.5	63.6	56.7	60.8	55.5	55.8
25-29 years	61.8	62.6	61.2	58.8	63.8	59.3	72.0
30-34 years	68.2	66.0	70.1	70.3	58.8	69.1	59.5
35-39 years	75.4	72.9	77.1	75.4	78.2	76.3	85.6
40-44 years	77.7	74.5	80.1	74.4	92.3	77.8	97.0
18-44 years	68.4	64.4	71.3	67.5	71.9	68.3	71.9

Table 9. Percentage of women who do not want any more children, on ages, 1998

	Total sample	Urban	Rural	Compact communities	Dispersed communities	Self-identified as roma	Other ethnic identification
18-19 years	60.0	50.0	62.5	49.3	71.4	50.0	75.0
20-24 years	70.2	72.2	69.0	72.7	68.8	80.0	52.9
25-29 years	79.3	74.4	83.3	87.0	77.6	80.8	77.1
30-34 years	83.8	84.8	82.9	86.7	83.3	90.2	74.1
35-39 years	94.4	95.8	92.9	85.0	98.4	92.2	97.4
40-44 years	93.2	97.2	89.2	84.2	100.0	93.5	92.6
18-44 years	84.8	86.4	83.4	82.2	86.8	86.7	81.9

Marriage

Table 10. Average age at the first marriage

	Total sample	Urban	Rural	Compact communities	Dispersed communities	Self-identified as roma	Other ethnic identification
1992 investigation	17.07	17.12	17.05	17.07	17.11	16.90	17.79
1998 investigation	17.96	18.36	17.69	17.54	18.10	17.55	18.64

Table 11. Percentage of marriages without legal documents in the total number of marriages, on age of wife, 1992

	Total sample	Urban	Rural	Compact communities	Dispersed communities	Self-identified as roma	Other ethnic identification
18-19 years	78.2	71.1	82.2	77.8	78.5	75.0	87.5
20-24 years	54.0	49.7	57.3	54.7	49.4	59.8	34.1
25-29 years	43.9	39.9	46.9	49.7	31.8	50.3	10.9
30-34 years	44.6	44.6	44.7	46.1	41.8	47.1	35.5
35-39 years	43.1	42.0	43.8	45.6	37.3	46.0	28.2
40-44 years	45.8	39.1	50.9	43.6	49.0	46.9	26.5

Table 12. Percentage of marriages without legal documents in the total number of marriages, on age of wife, 1998

	Total sample	Urban	Rural	Compact communities	Dispersed communities	Self-identified as roma	Other ethnic identification
18-19 years	75.7	72.3	78.3	75.0	76.0	81.0	60.7
20-24 years	53.2	51.0	54.8	58.1	50.5	62.9	36.2
25-29 years	42.8	41.9	43.4	40.2	44.5	47.1	35.2
30-34 years	36.2	29.5	40.5	42.0	33.7	38.0	32.9
35-39 years	31.6	24.7	36.7	41.5	27.8	36.1	23.3
40-44 years	23.8	15.9	31.0	29.4	20.1	27.5	18.5

Situation of identity documents

Table 13. Percentage of persons with and without identity documents, 1998

Type of document	Do have...	Do not have...	No answer
Birth certificate (for all members of the household)	91.8%	4.7%	3.5%
Identity card (for those aged over 14 at the moment of the study)	91.9%	3%	5.2%
Passport (for those aged over 14 at the moment of the study)	13.6%	81.2%	5.2%

Education

Table 14. Percentage of men who cannot read, 1992

	Total sample	Urban	Rural	Compact communities	Dispersed communities	Self-identified as rroma	Other ethnic identification
15-19 years	63.0	25.0	83.3	48.4	93.3	64.3	66.7
20-24 years	36.8	19.2	48.6	37.9	31.3	44.1	10.4
25-29 years	18.9	10.2	25.8	25.2	4.0	12.4	35.5
30-34 years	17.4	11.3	21.8	20.1	9.2	20.2	7.1
35-39 years	20.5	13.0	27.3	27.4	4.2	20.7	18.5
40-44 years	20.2	10.9	25.2	26.0	10.5	21.8	8.6
45-49 years	14.1	15.5	13.4	19.0	0.8	14.5	0.0
50-54 years	24.4	34.7	18.6	29.0	12.0	26.9	5.6
55-59 years	42.4	27.3	50.5	47.6	32.7	47.2	23.8
Over 60 years	34.5	32.7	35.3	37.4	15.7	36.4	28.9
Total	23.8	16.5	28.5	28.3	12.1	25.1	17.0

Table 15. Percentage of women who cannot read, 1992

	Total sample	Urban	Rural	Compact communities	Dispersed communities	Self-identified as rroma	Other ethnic identification
15-19 years	53.9	20.9	71.5	57.2	46.6	62.2	20.0
20-24 years	37.6	24.4	47.2	41.4	26.4	37.7	33.3
25-29 years	32.5	26.2	37.2	38.1	21.4	35.2	25.8
30-34 years	37.3	25.6	47.0	43.5	19.1	40.6	28.9
35-39 years	43.1	32.2	50.3	50.0	28.0	45.6	29.5
40-44 years	34.1	25.4	40.4	37.4	30.4	35.5	37.3
45-49 years	35.8	32.0	37.2	42.5	27.0	39.7	18.1
50-54 years	45.5	28.1	53.1	48.5	34.4	48.9	28.5
55-59 years	67.3	75.7	62.6	75.2	46.9	66.8	65.3
Over 60 years	68.4	74.6	64.7	71.0	58.9	72.8	56.6
Total	42.4	33.2	48.3	47.8	30.3	44.7	35.0

Table 16. Percentage of men who cannot read , 1998

	Total sample	Urban	Rural	Compact communities	Dispersed communities	Self-identified as roma	Other ethnic identification
15-19 years	27.6	21.1	31.9	43.3	19.9	33.0	16.9
20-24 years	18.9	12.7	24.1	31.0	14.2	22.4	13.5
25-29 years	12.3	8.8	14.8	23.1	9.1	16.0	6.0
30-34 years	12.6	11.2	13.5	14.5	11.0	16.8	6.1
35-39 years	13.6	5.7	18.1	21.8	10.3	17.1	5.7
40-44 years	13.3	5.1	19.7	17.9	11.6	15.3	10.9
45-49 years	9.6	10.1	9.2	17.8	6.6	11.7	6.5
50-54 years	20.3	17.5	22.9	32.1	16.8	27.8	11.5
55-59 years	13.0	9.4	14.7	16.0	12.5	17.2	7.1
Over 60 years	29.8	18.7	35.7	31.5	28.3	40.2	17.8
Total	18.0	12.6	21.8	27.7	14.2	22.5	11.0

Table 17. Percentage of women who cannot read, 1998

	Total sample	Urban	Rural	Compact communities	Dispersed communities	Self-identified as roma	Other ethnic identification
15-19 years	26.5	25.2	27.4	31.6	24.7	32.7	14.5
20-24 years	20.1	16.5	23.1	33.1	15.8	23.7	14.4
25-29 years	21.1	13.5	27.0	29.0	18.4	26.6	12.1
30-34 years	22.5	15.9	27.2	23.8	21.7	30.1	9.1
35-39 years	22.9	20.7	24.7	34.3	18.8	31.0	9.0
40-44 years	19.2	13.2	24.8	31.6	14.7	23.3	13.3
45-49 years	24.2	21.3	26.5	30.9	21.7	31.5	16.0
50-54 years	32.8	30.6	34.1	40.6	29.8	41.5	18.4
55-59 years	43.0	27.8	50.7	52.0	41.6	56.5	24.4
Over 60 years	58.6	43.8	66.5	72.1	53.3	73.9	40.0
Total	27.6	21.4	32.1	36.2	24.5	34.3	17.0

Table 18. Pre-school situation of children aged between 3-7 years, 1998

Registered	17.2%
Not registered	65.1%
No answer, do not know	17.7%

Table 19. School situation of children aged between 7-18 years, 1998

Registered	53.4%
Interrupted school	15.3%
Were never registered	16.9%
No answer, do not know	14.4%

Table 20. Last form of education graduated by persons over 10 years old who are not going to school anymore, 1998

No grade	22.1%	Vocational school graduated	6.7%
4 grades not graduated	8.4%	High school not graduated	5.9%
4 grades graduated	14.2%	High school graduated	4.1%
8 grades not graduated	12.2%	Post-high school education	0.6%
8 grades graduated	17.1%	Faculty	0.3%

Vocational school not graduated 1.9% | No answer 6.5% |

Mass-media consumption

Table 21. Frequency with which people use the main media channels, 1998

	Often	Sometimes	Never	No answer
Listen to radio	16.7%	31.6%	44.5%	7.2%
Read newspapers, magazines	7.4%	29.2%	55.6%	7.8%
Watch TV	34.7%	27.6%	31.8%	5.9%

Professions and occupations

Table 22. Percentage of types of professions in total population over 16

	1992 investigation	1998 investigation
Modern professions	15,75 %	37,7 %
Traditional professions	7,14 %	10,3 %
No profession	77,1 %	52 %

Note: In 1998, the increased accuracy of the question referring to qualifications was much bigger, fact that determines a significant change in what regards modern type qualifications and lack of qualification. Another explanation is to be found in the need of the roma to undertake more secure revenue-generating activities in the time interval between 1992 and 1998.

Table 23. Percentage of type of professions, on generations, 1992

	Grandparents	Parents	Reference couple
Modern professions	3.3 %	11.7 %	18.07 %
Traditional professions	14.0 %	5.8 %	5.86 %
No profession	82.7 %	82.5 %	76.07 %

Table 24. Percentage of type of professions, on generations, 1998

	Grandparents	Parents	Reference couple
Modern professions	33.3 %	35.9 %	40.14 %
Traditional professions	8.3 %	7.9 %	11.49 %
No profession	58.4%	56.2 %	48.37 %

Table 25. Occupational status of population over 16 years old, 1992 and 1998

	1992 investigation	1998 investigation
Full-time employees	23.4 %	12.9 %
Business owners	0.8 %	0.5 %
Freelance activities	22.1 %	33.6 %
Retired	5.3 %	7.1 %
No job	46.8 %	40.7 %
In school	0.5 %	2.5 %
	In prison 1.1 %	<u>Other situations 2.7 %</u>

Table 26. Degree of qualification of employees

1992 investigation		1998 investigation	
Unqualified workers	60.4 %	Unqualified workers	45 %
Qualified workers	37.8 %	Qualified workers	51.4 %

Table 27. Structure of population, on professional status, 1998

Employed	27.5 %
Business owner	0.8 %
Freelance worker, out of which:	71.7 %
Trade	10.1 %
Traditional crafts	6.4 %
<u>Agriculture</u>	<u>1.2 %</u>
Occasional labour abroad	1.5 %
Day labour	41.7 %

Revenues

Table 28. Sources of revenue, in money or in kind, obtained for the household during the previous year (1997), investigation in 1998

Type of revenue in money or in kind	The household obtained this type of revenue	The household did not obtain this type of revenue	No answer
Revenues from day labour activities	50.9%	36.4%	12.8%
Revenues from work on land, own or concession	16.4%	70.8%	12.8%
Revenues from trade	7.9%	79.3%	12.8%
Revenues from freelance activities or other activities undertaken on one's own (including traditional crafts)	22.4%	64.8%	12.8%
Revenues from business	2.1%	85.1%	12.8%
Revenues from work abroad	4%	83.3%	12.8%
Revenues from sale of property (animals, land, shares)	1.7%	85.5%	12.8%
Revenues from support granted by relatives, friends, other persons	10.5%	76.7%	12.8%
Revenues from begging	4.8%	82.4%	12.8%
Revenues from gambling or other games	0.6%	86.7%	12.8%
Revenues from lending money with exaggerated interest rates	1.7%	85.5%	12.8%
Revenues from renting goods (cars, land, other mobile goods)	0.1%	87.2%	12.8%
Revenues in money from social support	1.6%	85.6%	12.8%
Revenues from the household / animal products	2.1%	85.1%	12.8%
Revenues in money or in kind from occasional activities undertaken for owners	0.6%	86.7%	12.8%
Revenues from other activities than those mentioned	21.5%	65.8%	12.8%

Table 29. The most important source of revenue of the household in the year 1997, investigation from 1998

Salary	21.3%
Day labour activities	18.1%
Pension	14.8%
Allowances	12.8%
Social support	4.1%
Work on land, own or concession	4%
Small trade (sale of pigs, bottles)	3.8%
Freelance activities or other revenues from work on one's own (including traditional crafts)	3%
Work abroad	1.4%
Unemployment benefits	1.4%
Revenues from business	1%
Support from relatives, friends, other persons	1%
Loans with high interest rates, other interest rates	1%
Products from households, animal products	0.5%
Begging	0.5%
Occasional revenues	0.4%
Salaries from restructuring processes	0.1%
Gambling	0.1%
No answer	5.2%

Table 30. Revenues from activities on one's own or in kind revenues in goods or services for work undertaken, in the month previous to investigation, 1998

Households that obtained revenues from activities on one's own	35.7%
Households that obtained revenues in the form of goods or services for the work undertaken (food, transportation, clothes, shoes, rent)	11.9%

Table 31. Subjective evaluation of household revenues, 1992 and 1998

1992 investigation – “Considering all the revenues of your family, can you say they are sufficient or not?”		1998 investigation – “Considering all the revenues of your family, what can you say about them?”	
They are not even enough for us to live	40.9%	We live with great difficulties	68.0%
Only enough for surviving, without being able to buy something better or to save money	44.8%	We hardly cover our basic needs	18.2%
We manage to save some money or to buy something better, but with sacrifices	9.1%	We manage, but we still lack many things	10.9%
They are quite enough for what we need	3.0%	We manage pretty well	2.1%
		In general, we have all we need	0.6%
No answer	2.2%	No answer	0.3%

The situation of land property

Table 32. Percentage of households that owe land, 1992 (%)

	Total	Urban	Rural	Compact rural communities	Dispersed rural communities	Self-identified as roma, from rural areas	Other ethnic identification, from rural areas
YES	15.4	3.3	23.2	21.5	28.9	15.5	59.2
NO	84.0	96.5	75.8	78.3	71.1	84.4	40.8
No answer	0.6	0.1	0.9	0.2	0.0	0.2	0.0

Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------	-------

Table 33. Percentage of households with yards, 1998 (%)

	Total	Urban	Rural	Compact rural communities	Dispersed rural communities	Self-identified as rroma, from rural areas	Other ethnic identification, from rural areas
YES	31.4	16.8	41.4	28.2	51.5	40.4	43.2
NO	63.6	78.7	53.3	66.2	43.3	55.6	49.1
No answer	5.0	4.5	5.4	5.6	5.2	4.0	7.7
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Table 34. Percentage of households with agricultural land, 1998 (%)

	Total	Urban	Rural	Compact rural communities	Dispersed rural communities	Self-identified as rroma, from rural areas	Other ethnic identification, from rural areas
YES	15.5	3.3	23.8	17.0	28.9	21.1	28.6
NO	72.7	85.1	64.2	71.5	58.9	67.0	59.4
No answer	11.8	11.5	12.0	11.4	12.2	12.0	11.9
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0

Other goods in property

Table 35. Percentage of households that have in their property...

	1992 investigation	1998 investigation
Working units	4.4%	2.6%
Agricultural tools and machinery		
Manual tools		37.3%
Agricultural accessories (plough, harrow)	Not included in the questionnaire	0.3%
Tractor		0.2%
Circular		0.1%
Means of transportation		
Wagon	16.1%	9.6%
Car	7.9%	5.5%
Land car	Not included in the questionnaire	0.2%
Motorcycle	0.8%	Not included in the questionnaire
Truck	2.1%	0.1%

Table 36. Endowment of households with long-term use goods, 1992 and 1998 (%)

Goods	1992 investigation	1998 investigation
Cooking machine	31.2%	42.1%
Refrigerator	18.1%	26.1%
Freezer	3.7%	2.8%
Washing machine	14.3%	12.0%
Vacuum cleaner	13.3%	5.2%
Black and white TV set	28.5%	37.5%
Colour TV set	13.9%	19.0%
Radio	25.3%	31.9%

Tape player/Tape recorder/Record player	35.5%	-
Tape player/Tape recorder/Record player /CD	-	21.8%
Telephone	Not included in the questionnaire	10.4%

Dwelling

Table 37. Type of house, 1992 and 1998

1992 investigation	1998 investigation
78.7% House in property	74% Own house, out of which: 63,1% House with yard 10,9% Apartment in a block of flats
17.2% House rented from the state	8.7% Apartment in a block of flats rented from the state
1.7% House rented from private persons	6.6% Rented house with yard 1% Apartment in a block of flats rented from a private person 3.2% House in the property of a relative (mother, grandmother etc ...)
	1.3% No documents on the house built on public land
	0.8% Hut, cottage, one room
	0.2% Nationalised house
	0.2% Inherited house
	0.2% Drying room of the block / other places in a block clandestine
	0.1% Deserted house
	0.1% Improvisation, house abusively occupied
	0.1% House from work place
0.6% Tent	
1.7% No answer	3.5% No answer

Table 38. Average size of houses and density of inhabitancy, 1992 and 1998

	1992 investigation	1998 investigation
Number of rooms per household	2.68	2.51
Number of persons per room	2.53	2.23
Inhabited surface per person (m2)	Not included in the questionnaire	6.15

Note: in the total number of rooms, bedroom-kitchens are also included

Table 39. Endowment of the house with electricity, running water and bathroom, 1992 and 1998

	1992 investigation	1998 investigation
% households connected to electricity networks	87.8%	86.9%
% households with bathrooms	17.2%	20.8%
Water supply of houses (% of households)		
Households with running water	29.0%	23.0% (in the house) + 7.4% (in the yard)
Use fountains / public pumps	Not included in the questionnaire	42.5%
Have their own fountain		22.8%

Use water from springs	1.3%
Use sources of water from neighbours	0.7%

Table 40. Evaluation of houses, 1992 and 1998

	1992 investigation	1998 investigation
Good	26.1%	20.5%
Modest	38.6%	35.2%
Bad	34.9%	43.3%
No answer	0.3%	1.0%

Migration

Table 41 – Intention of migration of the roma in comparison with the rest of the population in 1998

Do you intend to move to another locality ...?	Research on the roma population	Barometer of human resources ¹
YES	7.8%	7.3%
NO	90.6%	86.3%
NO ANSWER	1.5%	6.4%

Table 42 – Intention of migration depending on the residential environment of departure and arrival² in 1998

Environment of Departure – Environment of Arrival	Research on the roma population	Barometer of human resources
urban -- urban	7.7%	42.3%
urban - rural	8.8%	16.9%
Rural-urban	29.7%	35.2%
Rural - rural	53.8%	5.6%

Table 43 – Intention of migration depending on the distance of travel (within or outside the county of residence)³

¹ Data is taken from the research “barometer of Human Resources”, undertaken by CURS at the request of the Open Society Foundation, June 1998, on a sample of 1212, representative for the Romanian population over 18. The time frame that the question was envisaging, as well as the referent, were different in the two researches. In the research on roma population, the question was referring to the intention of migration for the following 1-2 years, having in view the entire family. In the “Barometer”, the question was referring to the following 5 years and the intention of migration was measured only in what regards the respondent. Although there are differences in the manner the question has been formulated, the answers can however be compared, subject to certain reservation, because the migration of a married adult would probably determine, in most of the cases, the consequent migration of the family. It is hard to assume that an adult, member of a nuclear family, will migrate alone, without the other members of his nuclear family (wife, minor children). In what regards the time horizon envisaged by the question, the existence of this difference is probably justifying the larger number of non-responses appearing in the case of the “Barometer”, where the question refers to a longer period of time

² Figures from the table represent percentages from the total of persons who want to migrate and indicate a destination

Where would you like to move?	Research on the roma population	Barometer of human resources
Village, same county	7.7%	42.3%
Town, same county	8.8%	16.9%
Village, another county	29.7%	35.2%
Town, another county	53.8%	5.6%
Do not know	31.6%	
To another country		18.4%

Table 44 – Arrival in the locality in the last 5 years (1998)

Has your family lived in the locality for less than 5 years?	Research on the roma population
YES	5.8%
NO	90.1%
NO ANSWER	4.1%

Table 45 – Previous migration depending on the residential environment of departure and arrival⁴ in 1998

Environment of Departure – Environment of Arrival	Research on the roma population
urban -- urban	6.3%
urban - rural	13.5%
rural-urban	31.2%
rural - rural	49%

Reproductive health

Table 46 – Rates of infantile and juvenile mortality (deaths of children between 1-4 years from 1,000 new born alive) on ethnic belonging. Children born between July 1994 and June 1999

	Infantile mortality			Juvenile mortality	Total
	Total	Neo-natal	Post-neonatal	1-4 years	(0-4 years)
Romanian	27.1	18.5	8.6	1.1	28.2
Rroma	72.8	34.7	38.1	7.7	80.0

Source of data: Florina Serbanescu and others (2001) – “Study on reproductive health – Romania 1999 – Final Report”, CDC, ARSPMS, p. 118.

Table 47 – Current use of modern and traditional methods of contraception on ethnic belonging, for women between 15-44, part of couples

	Any method	Modern methods	Traditional methods
Romanian	64.8	30.3	34.5
Rroma	45.3	16.3	29.0

Source of data: Florina Serbanescu and others (2001) – “Study on reproductive health – Romania 1999 – Final Report”, CDC, ARSPMS, p. 146

³ Figures from the table represent percentages from the total of persons who want to migrate and indicate a destination

⁴ Figures from the table indicate percentages from the total number of those declaring that they had arrived in the locality in the last 5 years.

Table 48 – Percentage of women who had at least one abortion and percentage distribution of the number of abortions along life, for women who had at least one abortion, on ethnic belonging

	Percentage of women who had at least one abortion	Number of abortions for women who had at least one abortion					
		1	2	3	4-5	6	Total
Romanian	35.7	36.7	23.7	17.3	11.5	10.8	100
Rroma	41.9	29.6	15.5	17.9	21.1	15.9	100

Source of data: Florina Serbanescu and others (2001) – “Study on reproductive health – Romania 1999 – Final Report”, CDC, ARSPMS, Annex A/11.

Prejudices and interethnic relations

Table 49 – Dynamics of prejudices⁵ towards the roma 1993 - 1999⁶

	%	1993	1997	1999
Would not want to have gypsies as neighbours		71.8	59.7	48.5

Table 50 – Features that characterise the roma, as most frequently mentioned by the majority population

This list enumerates a few features. Please select three out of them that could best characterise the roma people in Romania ⁷	Percentage
Dirty	50%
Retarded	19%
Divided	20%
United	10%
Thieves	50%
Hypocrites	10%
Careless	11%
Lazy	39%

Source of data: *Barometer of inter-ethnic relations –carried out by Metro Media Transilvania for the Resource Centre for Ethno-cultural Diversity, November 2001, p.11.*

Table 51 – Stereotypes promoted by the written media (monitoring undertaken between 23.09-23.10 2001)

Stereotypes:	%
Gypsies are poor	35.08
Traditions, customs	26.31
Gypsies are criminal	20.17
Gypsy mafia	6.14

Source of data: *Catavencu Academy – Monitoring report – image of the Rroma ethnic minority in the Romanian written press September 23-October 23, 2001*

⁵ Data is taken from the researches Values of the World 1993, Values of the World 1997 and Values of the Europeans 1999. **Values - 1993** – undertaken in 1993 by the Institute for Research of the Quality of Life on a sample of 1103 persons over 18 years old, sample on quotas, coordinated by Prof. Dr. Catalin Zamfir. **Values 1997** - undertaken by the Institute for Research of the Quality of Life in collaboration with the Department of Sociology from the University of Bucharest, research financed by CNCSSU and coordinated by Prof. Dr. Dumitru Sandu. The probabilistic, multi-staged sample includes 1000 persons aged over 18 years old, being representative for the population with a right to vote in Romania. The research was undertaken in November 1997. **Values 1999** – undertaken by the Institute for Research of the Quality of Life in collaboration with the European Values Study Group and the Department of Sociology from the University of Bucharest, coordinated by Malina Voicu and Lucian Pop. The research was undertaken in July 1999, with financial support from CNCSSU and the European Values Study Group. The probabilistic, multi-staged sample includes 1146 persons over 18 years old, being representative for the population with a right to vote in Romania.

⁶ The same item has been used in the three researches: subjects were required to chose from a list of groups whose members they would not wish as their neighbours. The groups included in the list are: persons with a criminal record, persons of different races, leftist extremists, alcoholics, right-wing extremists, persons with numerous families, persons with psychic problems, Muslims, immigrants, persons with AIDS, drug addicts, homosexuals, Jews, gypsies.

⁷ Question with multiple answers. The table only includes the alternatives of answers that cumulated more than 10% of the options.

Table 52 – Attitude of journalists towards the roma ethnic minority, manifested in press articles (monitoring undertaken between 23.09-23.10 2001)

Attitude of the journalist	Percentage
Tendentiously negative	40%
Tendentiously positive	6%

Source of data: *Catavencu Academy – Monitoring report – image of the Rroma ethnic minority in the Romanian written press September 23-October 23, 2001*

3. Instruments for the elaboration of community diagnoses

A. Questionnaire for households

I. SOCIO-DEMOGRAPHICAL

1. **How old are you** (full years) _____

2. **Sex** 1. Male
 2. Female

3. **Civil status**
 1. Married with papers 4. Divorced
 2. Married without papers 5. Widow
 3. Not married 6. Separated / Abandoned

4. **Age at the first marriage** _____

5. **Do you have children?**
 1. Yes 2.No

6. **What is the age of your children?**

1		8	
2		9	
3		10	
4		11	
5		12	
6		13	
7		14	

7. (FOR WOMEN ONLY) **Age at the first birth** (years): _____

8. (FOR WOMEN ONLY) **How many children did she give birth to?** (without children born dead) _____

9. Last form of education:

- | | |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| 1. None | 7. Vocational school graduated |
| 2. 4 grades not graduated | 8. High school not graduated |
| 3. 4 grades graduated | 9. High school graduated |
| 4. 8 grades not graduated | 10. Post high school education |
| 5. 8 grades graduated | 11. Faculty |
| 6. Vocational school not graduated | 12. Post-University studies |

10. In total, how many years of school (grades) have you graduated? _____

11. What is your current socio-economic status?

- | | |
|--------------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. I work | 4. Housewife / man |
| 2. Student | 5. Retired |
| 3. Maternity leave | 6. No job |
| 7. Inactive from other reasons | |

12. (Only for persons active from the economic point of view) What is your occupation?

.....

13. What does your wife / husband do? (If she / he works or has worked)

.....

II. FEATURES OF THE HOUSEHOLD

14. How many members live in the household? (stay in this house)

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Subject partner (____) | 8. Grandchildren (how many? ____) |
| 2. Husband's parents (how many? ____) | 9. Brothers / Sisters (how many? ____) |
| 3. Wife's parents (how many? ____) | 10. Sisters / Brothers in law (how many? ____) |
| 4. Husband's grandparents (how many? ____) | 11. Nephews / nieces (how many? ____) |
| 5. Wife's grandparents (how many? ____) | 12. Others* (how many? ____) |
| 6. Children (how many? ____) | Including those in the Army, Prison, Orphanage |
| 7. Daughter in law / Son in law (how many? ____) | |

15. Out of the household members

- How many persons are between 0-3 years old _____
How many persons are between 3-7 years old _____
How many persons are between 7-16 years old _____
How many persons are over 16 years old _____

16. How many of the household members do not have the following identity documents:

- | | |
|----------------------------|------------------------|
| 1. Birth certificate _____ | 2. Identity card _____ |
| | 3. Passport _____ |

17. Is romani (gypsy) language spoken in your household?

1. Yes 2. No

III. OCCUPATION / REVENUES

18. How many of your household members are full-time employed? _____

19. What was the approximate amount that you have spent last month on the following? (estimated amounts in Lei)

1. Food
2. Clothes and shoes
3. House (rent, maintenance and electricity)
4. Alcohol
5. Cigarettes
6. Fuel (including gas)
7. Big articles (washing machine / stereo system / TV / car, etc.)

20. Last year, in your household, revenues in money or in kind have been obtained from: (the amount is not important!) (multiple codes)

1. Day labour activities
2. Work of land, own or concession
3. Trade
4. Freelance activities or other revenues from work on one's own
(including traditional crafts)
5. Revenues from business (for business owners, family associations)
6. Work abroad
7. Revenues from sale of property (animals, land, shares)
8. Support from relatives, friends, other persons
9. Begging
10. Gambling (or other games)
11. Lending money with exaggerated interest rates
12. Renting (cars, land, houses, other mobile goods)
13. Others, which _____

21. Along last year, what was the most important source of revenue of your household? _____ (one source only)

22. Considering all the revenues of your family, what can you say about them?

1. We live with great difficulties
2. We hardly cover our basic needs
3. We manage, but we still lack many things
4. We manage pretty well
5. In general, we have all we need

23. What revenues in money were obtained in your household last month? _____ Lei

(all the household members together, regardless of the source, without revenues, in kind)

24. What revenues in kind (in products) have been obtained in your household last month?

1. Food / agricultural products
2. House appliances
3. Clothes, shoes
4. Others _____

25. What is the minimum revenue that your household would need to cover basic needs? _____ lei

IV. EDUCATION AND FAMILY

26. Do you have any children:

1. In a child house, orphanage, how many _____
2. In a shelter-hospital for handicapped, how many _____
3. In a correction schools, how many _____
4. Adopted by other persons, how many _____
5. Run away from home, how many _____

27. Would you like to have more children than you have now?

1. Yes. How many? _____
2. No, we do not want any more children

28. How many children do you believe a family should have? _____

29. Out of children of school age (7 -18 years old *check with question 6*) how many go to school?

30. Out of children of school age (7 -18 years old *check with question 6*) how many have interrupted? In what grade?

Grade			
1		8	
2		9	
3		10	
4		11	
5		12	
6		13	
7		14	

31. Out of children over 7 years old, how many have never went to school (*check with question 6*)? _____

32. What level of education do you think is enough for a child, so that he/she succeeds in life? (chose one).

- | | |
|-------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. None | 4. Vocational school |
| 2. 4 grades | 5. Graduated High School |
| 3. 8 grades | 6. Post-High School education |
| | 7. Faculty |
| | 8. Post-university studies |

33. What is the ethnic belonging of children from the school and classroom attended by your children (chose one)

1. Their majority are Romanian
2. Their majority are Roma
3. Their majority are of other ethnic groups
4. Do not know / do not answer

34. How do you consider it would be better for your children to study?

1. Together with Romanian children and children from other ethnic groups
2. Separately, in special roma schools
3. Do not know / do not answer

V. HEALTH

35. How do you evaluate your state of health?

1. Very good
2. Good
3. Not good, nor bad
4. Bad
5. Very bad

36. How do you evaluate the state of health of your children?

1. Very good
2. Good
3. Not good, nor bad
4. Bad
5. Very bad

37. Do you have a family physician?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Do not know / do not answer

38. Do you have a medical insurance?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Do not know / do not answer

V. HOUSING

39. Your house is

1. In a block of flats, rented from the state
2. In a block of flats, rented from a private owner
3. In a block of flats, private property
4. House with yard, rented
5. House with yard, property (jump to 50)
6. Other situation, which? _____

40. Do you have documents attesting property over the land on which your house is built?

1. Yes
2. No

41. The house was built in year _____

42. The main construction material is

1. Reinforced concrete with built-up concrete
2. Brick, stone or substitutes
3. Wood (beams, logs etc)
4. Half-timber, adobe or other similar materials

43. How many rooms does your house have? (Including bedroom-kitchens)_____

44. What is the surface of your house (without annexes and facilities. Only the inhabited rooms, including bedroom-kitchens)? _____ sq.m.

45. Do you have a kitchen (not improvised summer kitchens)

1. Kitchen as such
2. Bedroom-kitchen
3. No kitchen

46. Do you have a toilet ?

1. Yes, in the house, with running water
2. Yes, in the yard
3. No

47. Do you have a bathroom? 1. Yes 2. No

48. The water supply is

1. Running water installation in the house
2. Running water installation in the yard
3. Own fountain in the yard
4. Public fountain / pump

49. Sewerage 1. Yes 2. No

50. Electricity 1. Yes 2. No

51. Connection to natural gas system 1. Yes 2. No

52. House heating is

1. Central heating
2. With natural gas
3. Electric heating
4. With liquid fuel
5. With wood, coal
6. With vegetable waste, paper
7. No heating
8. Something else_____

53. How would you evaluate your house?

1. Good
2. Modest
3. Bad

54. How many families live in this house ? _____

55. Which of the following goods do you have (functional)?

1. Cooking machine
2. Refrigerator
3. Freezer
4. Washing machine
5. Vacuum cleaner
6. Black and white TV set
7. Colour TV set
8. Radio
9. Tape player/Tape recorder/Record player/CD
10. Telephone

56. Do you raise animals or birds?

1. Yes. What? _____ how many? _____
- _____ how many? _____
- _____ how many? _____
- _____ how many? _____
2. No

57. Do you have land in property?

- Yard 1. Yes, how much? ____ 2. No
 Agricultural land 1. Yes, how much? ____ 2. No

58. Do you cultivate the agricultural land in your property? 1. Yes 2. No

59. Working units (lime kiln, forge, brickyard, foundry, basketry etc.)

1. No 2. Yes, what? _____

60. Agricultural tools and machinery:

1. Manual tools 4. Circular
 2. Agricultural accessories (plough, harrow) 5. Others _____
 3. Tractor

61. Transportation means

1. Wagon 3. Land car 5. Other
 2. Car 4. Truck

VI. PROBLEMS AND SOLUTIONS

62. What do you think is the most important in order to succeed in life? (one answer only)

1. Have school education 4. Work hard 7. Family to support you
 2. Have good luck 5. Have money 8. Other, what
 3. Have a profession 6. Have connections 9. Do not know

How satisfied are you with

	Very satisfied	Satisfied	Neither satisfied, nor unsatisfied	unsatisfied	Very unsatisfied	Do not know / do not answer
63. The house you live in	1	2	3	4	5	
64. The goods in your house	1	2	3	4	5	
65. Your food	1	2	3	4	5	
66. Your health	1	2	3	4	5	
67. Your revenues	1	2	3	4	5	
68. Your life, in general	1	2	3	4	5	
69. Your education	1	2	3	4	5	

How do you think that the local authorities below treat the roma, in comparison with other ethnic minorities?

	better	same	worse
70. School	1	2	3
71. Hospitals, medical units	1	2	3
72. Town Hall	1	2	3
73. Court, District Attorney	1	2	3

74. Police	1	2	3
-------------------	---	---	---

73. How do you evaluate the relations between rroma and the other inhabitants of the locality?

1. No problems 2. Small misunderstandings 3. Conflicts

74. Have you voted in the 2000 Elections?

1. Yes 2. No

75. What is the most important problem of your family right now?

Which of the following problems seriously affects you and your household? Chose one answer for each aspect	Major problem	It is a problem, but not serious	It is not a problem
76.Lack of a job	1	2	3
77.Economic hardships	1	2	3
78.Discrimination in access to jobs	1	2	3
79.Crime	1	2	3
80.Lack of education opportunities	1	2	3
81.Weak family ties	1	2	3
82.Lack of respect for the elderly	1	2	3
83.Housing problems	1	2	3
84.Limited possibilities of free movement	1	2	3
85.Limited access to social services	1	2	3

Who do you think could solve the problems that you face?

	In an important measure	In a small measure	Not at all
86. Through own forces	1	2	3
87. Presidency	1	2	3
88. Government	1	2	3
89. Parliament	1	2	3
90. Political parties	1	2	3
91. Non-governmental organisations (Charities)	1	2	3
92. Rroma organisations	1	2	3
93. Local authorities	1	2	3
94. European Union	1	2	3

95. What is your nationality?

- 1. Romanian
- 2. Hungarian
- 3. Rroma / Gypsy, Group _____
- 4. German
- 5. Other nationality, which _____

96. Profession of the grandfather from the father's side _____

97. Profession of the father-----

98. Religion:

- 1. Orthodox
- 2. Catholic
- 3. Other, which _____

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE OPERATOR

99. In the close proximity of the household (block, street from village etc.):

- 1. There are only rroma families
- 2. There are rroma and other ethnic groups living together
- 3. There are some rroma families, but the area is mainly inhabited by other ethnic minorities
- 4. There are no other rroma families
- 5. Cannot estimate

100. Cultivate their yard or not (if they have one) 1. Yes 2. No

101. How do you evaluate the material state of your household?

- 1. Very rich
- 2. Rich
- 3. Average
- 4. Poor
- 5. Very poor

102. Are there any symbol of traditions? (multiple answers)

- 1. Large skirts
- 2. Coins in the hair
- 3. Kerchiefs
- 4. Hats
- 5. Beard
- 6. Twisted moustaches
- 7. Jewellery on the hand and around necks
- 8. Black magic objects
(cowry shell, mirror, fortune -telling cards)

103. Locality: _____ 1. Town 2. Village

104. Address: Street: _____ **No.:** _____

105. Operator: _____

106. Time when interview is concluded: ____/____

107. Duration _____ minutes

108. Date : _____/_____/_____

Fiche of the locality

TOWN HALL / LOCAL COUNCIL

1. Please estimate the number of rroma people living in the locality (in your opinion, not related to the census data): _____

2. Number of rroma households: _____

3. What types of rroma groups live in the locality? 1. _____
2. _____
3. _____

4. What is the percentage of rroma amongst beneficiaries from social support?

5. What are the main activities undertaken by the rroma people in the community?

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

6. What kind of living standard ensure these occupations to the respective categories? (fill in the appropriate cell)

Living standard					
Activity	Very high	High	Average	Low	Very low
1					
2					
3					
4					

7. In the locality (chose the option or options that describe the local situation):

1. Rroma live in compact communities, isolated from the rest of the community

2. Rroma live amongst the Romanians, dispersed along the locality

8. Is there a possibility that, in your locality, rroma families be given 1-2 hectares of land in property?

9. Would you consider this an appropriate solution to problems of the rroma?

10. What do you think are the problems related to the rroma community from your locality?

11. What solutions would you propose for solving these problems?

SCHOOL

1. Please estimate the number of roma living in the locality (in your opinion, not related to the census data): _____

2. Number of roma households: _____

3. What types of roma groups live in the locality?
 1. _____
 2. _____
 3. _____

4. Please fill in the table below

	Total	Roma children
Number of pre-school pupils		
Number of pupils		
School abandon		

5. Please estimate what is, on average, the school attendance frequency of the roma children, in comparison with other children? (fill in the right cell)

		Grades I - IV	Grades V - VIII
1	Much lower		
2	Lower		
3	Same		
4	Higher		
5	Much higher		

6. What do you think are the problems related to roma children in your locality?

7. What solutions would you propose to solve these problems?
