# Integration every other day

# Public reasoning on Roma / Gypsy segregation in Romania

**Cosima Rughinis**

**2007**

*'I'm sure I'll take you with pleasure!' the Queen said. 'Twopence a week, and jam every other day'.*
*Alice couldn't help laughing, as she said, 'I don't want you to hire ME – and I don't care for jam'.*
*'It's very good jam,' said the Queen.*
*'Well, I don't want any TO-DAY, at any rate.'*
*'You couldn't have it if you DID want it,' the Queen said. 'The rule is, jam to-morrow and jam yesterday – but never jam to-day'. [1]*

*Abstract*

*Achieving ethnic integration has gradually become accepted worldwide as a legitimate objective of the state and a public good – although only relatively recently so, and against significant public opposition. Resistance to integration of Roma / Gypsy and other racial / ethnic minorities is still widespread. This paper attempts to discuss reasons and causes of this resistance, by conceptualizing ethnic integration as a "dear public good" distinct from "cheap public goods", and by looking at clues that people use to find correct answers to moral problems. The paper will focus on the residential and educational segregation of the Roma people in Romania - a persistent state of affairs in the first decade of a new century.*

---

[1] Lewiss Carroll, "Alice through the looking glass", available on-line at URL
http://www.cs.indiana.edu/metastuff/looking/lookingdir.html

# 1 The empirical puzzle

The question that prompted this research is: how can we explain the active support for decisions that lead to ethnic segregation in the case of people who otherwise openly condemn segregation? How can we account for a systematic difference between discourse and behavior regarding decisions that enforce segregation?

## Research methodology

### Empirical data

This article relies on qualitative fieldwork data which I collected in the period 2003-2006, and on quantitative survey data from the Roma Inclusion Barometer conducted by the Open Society Foundation in November 2006.

I have conducted interviews in several Romanian localities where local authorities decided to relocate Roma communities[2] in separate housing facilities, situated at the outskirts of the locality: Dorohoi (Suceava County), Piatra Neamt (Neamt County) and Roman (Neamt County). Piatra Neamț and Roman have also been included in my previous IPF fellowship as case studies, and therefore I could trace the evolution of the situation. The Dorohoi  housing project is more recent, and I have visited the residents immediately after their relocation and a couple of months later. I have also conducted interviews in Radauți (Suceava County), where Roma residents had also been relocated but in a different pattern, including a central social housing facility and a peripheric (but not actually isolated) neighborhood. In my previous IPF project I have visited similar neighborhoods in Cluj-Napoca (Cluj County) and Tîrgu-Mureş (Mureş county).

---

[2] They were not completely ethnically homogenous, since some residents (an un-quantified but low proportion) were Romanian (or sometimes Hungarian). Still, the communities were defined at local level as "Roma / Gypsy", and little mention was made of them actually being ethnically mixed.

More details on Roma housing and segregation in Romania and the history of some of these neighborhoods can be found in the report of my previous IPF research (Rughiniş 2004a).

In the following pages I will use the quantitative data to highlight some interesting problems in the distribution of attitudes towards ethnic integration, which I then formulate as an "empirical puzzle". Subsequently I try to account for this puzzle by identifying special structures of reasoning in decisions that relate to ethnic segregation of the Roma/Gypsy. I use fragments from interviews to illustrate this particular logic of reasoning.

## Causal mechanisms that produce segregation

Different sociological explanations of ethnic segregation converge on at least one finding: *the persistence or aggravation of segregation may occur independently of widespread racism.* Of course, racist beliefs and attitudes are often translated into behaviors that enforce separation of ethnic groups. Nevertheless, the same effect can result in social situations where people are not, actually, racists – but they act rationally in a situation that is informed by historical racial or ethnic inequalities (such as unequal preferences for interaction with members of various racial / ethnic groups, or economic inequalities between racial / ethnic groups[3]).

One important idea behind this explanation is that segregation often occurs (or is increased) as a result of the aggregation of individual actions which are prompted by non-racist beliefs and preferences, such as a slight preference to live in a neighborhood where one's own groups is a majority (Schelling 1971) or the desire to protect the value of one's own house, in a market where dominantly black neighborhoods are significantly less valued than mixed or white ones (Kelly 2004, p. 12).

---

[3] In the following pages I will mainly refer to "ethnic groups", although much of the reviewed literature refers to "racial" difference because it is written in the North American context.

A second idea is that often segregation is reproduced voluntarily by both dominant and dominated groups, often without racist justifications and despite widespread awareness of its deleterious consequences at social level (and especially on the dominated category[4]). Decisions that contribute to ethnic segregation may be made as the result of a deliberation process that weighs different costs and benefits at individual level. For example, minority parents may actually want to send their children to segregated schools, while fully aware of their lower quality, because they provide benefits such as lower expectations for financial contributions or expenditures, or because they are closer to home and thus safer for little children[5].

These two related arguments do not deny the significance and, in some case, the seriousness of racist attitudes and behaviors. I will use the volitional definition of racism formulated by J. L. A. Garcia – as "racial dis-regard or even ill-will" (Garcia 1999, p. 13). Garcia reviews a series of alternative definitions of racism – such as cognitive definitions, based on beliefs about racial superiority, or experiential definitions, based on the choice of a person to deceive oneself and indulge in racial superiority illusions. I agree with his assessment that "Hate, ill-will, is, at least, the core of the phenomenon. A morally lesser, but still grave, related form of racism consists in racially based or racially informed disregard – that is, an indifference to another's welfare on account of the racial group to which that person is assigned"(*ibid*.). I therefore use a definition of racism that stresses the willingness to maintain or even aggravate the situation of disadvantage in which a particular racial category (in this case, Roma / Gypsy people) finds itself. From this perspective, I believe that many of my respondents during fieldwork were not racist –

---

[4] For example schools with a majority of Roma pupils in Romania (and other European countries) are systematically poorer, more crowded and more precariously staffed than non-Roma schools, and this is widely known: "The likelihood of overcrowded classes in primary schools in which Romani pupils prevail[4] was more than 3 times higher than for all rural schools. For secondary schools in which Romani pupils prevail this likelihood was more than 9 times higher than for the whole system. (…) Schools in which Romani pupils prevail indicated a shortage of qualified teachers almost two times higher (83.5%) than that of all rural schools (43.5%)" (Surdu 2003, pp. 12-13).

[5] In Dorohoi, for example, the mostly Roma community in the remote Fabricii neighborhood actively campaigned to maintain their local primary school, despite opposition from county educational authorities who believed that it is a segregated facility.

although some were ethnically prejudiced in relation to Roma. Of course, media analysis (Popescu 2002, Tarnovschi 2002) and even survey data indicate that racist attitudes associated with ethnic prejudice are still present on a significant scale in Romania. Nevertheless, I will not analyze racist attitudes and behaviors or their consequences in this article[6].

My following arguments start from a *broadly rational-choice perspective* on ethnic segregation that tries to account for this phenomenon as the result of rational actions of individual actors, who pursue what they perceive to be their own interests and, to some extent, public interests, with no intention or desire of harming people in a given ethnic category.

In the following paragraphs I will explore the attitudes of non-Roma people towards ethnic segregation of the Roma, according to the Roma Inclusion Barometer-OSF survey. Then I will attempt to account for their particularity by conceptualizing ethnic integration as a particular type of public good (which I term a "dear public good"), and looking at the decision processes by which people evaluate the desirability of that public good.

### The empirical puzzle

An interesting finding of the analysis of RIB survey data is that (verbal) support for educational integration of the Roma pupils among non-Roma respondents, while reaching high levels of around 80%, *is not influenced, or is even slightly negatively influenced by education* (see Table 5 and Table 6[7]).

---

[6] Although interviews sometime indicate that segregation is aimed at explicitly in order to isolate residents from the general population: "People who live there are people who can no longer integrate in society (…) years and years in jail, not for a single felony, for tens or maybe hundreds of petty crimes that add up. They are people who do not want, who cannot adapt to living in a block of flats; they have no education because this is how it was then, so these people, the vast majority, 90% are like this. They are people who are opaque to information, people with whom one cannot discuss" (Mayor, Roman).

[7] But Roma respondents constantly advocate the necessity for state support and de-segregation more than non-Roma respondents, in survey answers.

If we study the influence of education in a multivariate regression model for the non-Roma population, we can see that not only that the effect of schooling is not positive, but it is negative (although low)[8]. For example, data in Table 1 illustrate influences of four variables on the subject's approval of reserved places for Roma pupils in high schools.

**Table 1. Approval of quotas for Roma pupils in high-schools – linear regression model. Source: RIB – OSF Bucharest, Nov. 2006**

|  | Influence | Beta | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Respondent age | Negative | -.082 | .010 |
| Respondent schooling | Negative | -.129 | .000 |
| Urban residence | Positive | .122 | .000 |
| Approval of teaching Romani language in schools | Strong positive | .254 | .000 |

Model for non-Roma respondents aged 18-65

R square=9%

The dependent variable is: "To what extent do you approve of quota places for Roma pupils in high-schools?" ("Very little", "little", "much", very much")

This is also true for the influence of non-Roma respondents' education on their attitudes on state support for Roma organizations (see Table 2).

**Table 2. Approval of State support for Roma organizations – linear regression model. Source: RIB – OSF Bucharest, Nov. 2006**

|  | Influence | Beta | Sig. |
|---|---|---|---|
| Respondent age | None | -.019 | .500 |
| Respondent schooling | Low negative | -.074 | .018 |
| Urban residence | Low negative | -.072 | .020 |
| Approval of teaching Romani language in schools | Strong positive | .484 | .000 |

Model for non-Roma respondents aged 18-65

R square=24%

The dependent variable is computed as the sum of the following indicators: "To what extent do you approve of State support for Roma cultural organizations?" and "To what extent do you approve of State support for Roma political parties?" ("Very little", "little", "much", "very much")

These data indicate that, on average, policy and decision-makers, who are selected from the educated segments of the population, have *no special disposition* to reduce ethnic segregation as compared to other persons by virtue of their education – and they may

---

[8] It is interesting that other forms of discrimination in Romania – such as against gay people – vary significantly (in their verbal expression) according to age and education.

even be more reluctant than the average. *Generational* differences are also not significant.

A particularly relevant variable for understanding general attitudes towards ethnic integration is agreement with allowing the *Romani language as a school discipline* – agreement which is rather infrequent amongst both non-Roma and Roma (see Table 9). I have used this question as an indicator whether Roma people are usually defined as people with specific (negatively stereotyped) behaviors, or as a cultural category. Data in Table 1 and Table 2 indicate that this variable is a very important predictor of the attitude towards ethnic integration, having a *strong positive influence*.

How can we account for the low/negative influence of education on opinions on ethnic integration? Moreover, how can we explain the high positive influence on the same topics of the opinion on Romani language in schools (interpreted as a cultural definition of Roma ethnicity)?

## 2   Reasoning on ethnic integration

### Integration as a "dear public good"

There are many types of goods that people praise in theory and avoid in practice, most of them in the category of public goods (low pollution, conservation of species, punctuality), or goods that initially produce time-delayed rewards (exercising, healthy eating, spending more time with one's children, watching less TV). We can term them "un-tempting goods". Where does ethnic integration fit into this array of goods?

We can classify the un-tempting goods in four broad categories according to two criteria: whether they are mainly for *private or public consumption*, and whether they require mainly *monetary* or *non-monetary contributions*. For example, we can pay in cash for air quality, for conservation of the species, for improved public lightning and for increased social services to the poor. It may be that it is more efficient or more ethically rewarding if we also contribute with our time and attention, but usually it is not necessary for us to

do so. On the contrary, exercising, eating healthy food and watching less TV cannot be bought; they require our bodies and minds, for given amounts of time. This feature is more prevalent with goods that produce delayed private rewards, than for public goods – although the association is be no means perfect.

As it is summarized in Table 3, promoting ethnic integration by one's actions requires the second type of costs – specifically, it requires engaging in potentially unpleasant interactions with stigmatized persons. *No amount of money paid by non-Roma taxpayers will decrease segregation if they choose to live, work and study apart from the Roma people*.

This feature aggravates the problem of segregation because, presumably, as societies get richer, people's willingness to pay for common goods increases, but their willingness to spend their lives in uncomfortable settings in order to promote public welfare stays the same.

**Table 3. Un-tempting goods according to type of costs and allocation of benefits**

|  | **Public** goods | Goods with **private & delayed** rewards |
|---|---|---|
| Financial contributions<br><br>**"Cheap" goods** | Law and order<br>Decreasing pollution<br>Biodiversity<br>Social assistance<br>Public lightning | Eating food with no preservatives<br>Buying health / retirement insurance |
| Non-monetary contributions (body, mind & time)<br><br>**"Dear" goods** | Responsible voting<br>Refraining from low level corruption<br>Enforcing ethical principles in our workplace<br>Interacting with stigmatized people | Eating a balanced diet<br>Exercising<br>Taking a course in German<br>Working long hours |

If we focus on public goods, we can use the type of contribution to classify them in *"cheap" versus "dear" public goods*. Cheap public goods can be paid for with money; they may actually be expensive in financial terms, but people need only sacrifice some of their income to attain them. On the contrary, dear public goods involve contributions that

affect our way of life. They may require, for example, spending time, paying attention[9], engaging in uncomfortable interactions or taking risks.

**Table 4. Dear public goods**

| Dear public goods | Type of contribution |
|---|---|
| Responsible voting | Time<br>Paying attention to political debates and policy outcomes<br>Engaging in political debates to shape one's opinion |
| Refraining from low level corruption | Engaging in uncomfortable interaction with public officials etc.<br>Taking risks for oneself or for close persons (services may be withdrawn by discontented providers) |
| Enforcing ethical principles in our workplace | Engaging in uncomfortable interaction with colleagues<br>Taking the risk of job hardships |
| Interacting with stigmatized people | Time<br>Engaging in uncomfortable interaction |
| Enrolling one's child in a classroom with Roma pupils Moving in a neighborhood with Roma neighbors | Engaging in uncomfortable interaction with Roma parents, neighbors etc<br>Taking risks related to the child's peer-group or educational performance<br>Taking risks related to family members' safety |

Of all public goods, the dearest ones are those which require taking risks related to the well-being of one's own family, including risks related to safety, health, or educational performance. Becoming involved in a setting with Roma participants (be it a classroom or a neighborhood) is perceived as such a public good. Promoting ethnic integration may not only be seen as uncomfortable, but also defined as a cost that we impose on other people, especially on people which matter to us.

## Clues in moral reasoning

People rely in their moral reasoning on different clues to indicate which course of action is good and which course of action is wrong.

---

[9] It is interesting that expressions that "spending time", "paying attention" or even "spending one's life" have a monetary connotation – although they are actually very different in kind from spending and paying. Even the saying "time is money" is generally used to highlight exceptions from the powerful moral and economic law that time is not money.

For example, a common clue is that *causes that require one to sacrifice oneself are morally right*, since morally condemnable deeds are usually pleasant. Of course, this can be deceiving in some situations – sometimes even horribly so. Hannah Arendt explained the general moral collapse of the German society during the Third Reich by such a series of misapplied clues. "Evil in the Third Reich had lost the quality by which most people recognize it – the quality of temptation. Many Germans and many Nazis, probably an overwhelming majority of them, must have been tempted not to murder, not to rob, not to let their neighbors go off to their doom (for that the Jews were transported to their doom they knew, of course, even though many of them may not have known the gruesome details), and not to become accomplices in all these crimes by benefiting from them. But, God, knows, they had learned how to resist temptation" (Arendt 1994, p. 150).

We can identify three such moral clues that are relevant to judgments that people make on ethnic segregation: principles versus consequences, money versus wellbeing, and egoism versus altruism. *All three are usually deployed such as to indicate the acceptability of segregation.*

It is also important to underline that these clues lead to acceptance of segregation *only* when one starts from the assumption that *interaction between a non-Roma and a Roma person is a cost, with virtually zero benefits for the non-Roma*. Since Roma people are defined mostly in terms of problematic behavior and/or physical characteristics, non-Roma people see little to gain from communication with them. At best, there will be nothing to lose either – but what is the point in taking the risk?

### Egoism versus altruism

As Arendt implicitly argued, the altruistic quality of a decision is often seen as a sign that this must be a correct decision. In the case of ethnic segregation, decisions that enforce separation often seem altruistic, since they do not benefit directly the decision maker. For example, the neighborhood administrator in Piatra Neamt recalled the attempt of a Romanian man to move in the Roma area; she discouraged him out of sympathy and understanding for his situation:

> "We have all sorts of applications. This amazes me – for example, a night guard came, a
> Romanian (…) So, the Mayor directed him to us. I looked at him, he had a white

> shirt, he was a guard, so he had a job. I told him, 'I don't think that you can move there, you won't make it'. So, his wife was pregnant. If I put him there, I just destroy that man. So, it is in vain that they say…because this is not discrimination. I am fond of Gypsies; I am keen on them. So I do not discriminate, but still, in order for people to live together, they must be of a similar social condition. You know… For example, you cannot put an university professor together with Aunt Maria, because she wakes up in the night to yell at the kids, and he wants to study or… Like this, it doesn't necessarily mean discrimination. Their leaders cannot understand this, and they say "let's move them here and there in flats"… I can't do this." (Neighborhood administrator, Piatra-Neamț)[i]

School principals, teachers and even parents who promote segregated classrooms also have in mind the interests of somebody else than themselves – namely, the non-Roma pupils, who, they believe, will be adversely affected by learning alongside Roma pupils.

### Principles versus consequences

People are used to balance principles and consequences in their daily ethical reasoning. Some principles take only a few negative consequences to be bent, others are more robust. The principle of ethnic integration is one of the first to be discarded when practical necessities seem to require it. The ideal of integration is rather seen as an ideal *for a counterfactual world*, which can almost never be put in practice because of objective reasons concerning the current state of facts. To paraphrase the White Queen speaking to Alice in "Through the looking glass", integration is good yesterday and tomorrow, but never today.

Consequences of meaningful interaction with Roma persons are expected to be bad, from a non-Roma perspective. Only 35% of non-Roma would approve of a marriage between their child and a Roma partner (see Table 10) – an indicator that, in their view, such a relationship can bring no good. This is particularly interesting in light of the fact that marriages do not occur at random, but are a result of a choice of the two partners. Still, most non-Roma see Roma ethnicity as a more powerful indicator for the human value of a person than a hypothetical choice made by their adult offspring.

This negative assessment of the benefits of inter-ethnic interaction for non-Roma stems from a behavioral definition of ethnicity. Roma are widely seen by non-Roma to be those people with "problematic" behavior, and maybe also with a darker color. Cultural

12

features (such as language or even clothing) are not part of the common non-Roma theory of what it means to be Roma. In Table 8 we can see, for example, that non-Roma respondents declare that they identify a person as Roma / Gypsy according to her looks, behavior, and color – unlike Roma respondents who pay more attention to speech patterns, clothing and language. Of course, asking people how do they recognize a Roma / Gypsy person is not really useful for understanding their spontaneous classification mechanisms, but rather as an indicator of their theories on Roma ethnicity. Non-Roma people seem to define Roma ethnicity mostly as a collection of common biological and behavioral features – where common behavioral features probably refer to ethnic stereotypes, most of which are negative. Roma people prefer to see signs of their ethnicity in speech and clothing, which are non-biological and less value-laden in themselves.

The idea that Roma residents lead gradually to the decline of the neighborhood is widely shared among non-Roma respondents (even more so when the Roma are also poor, as it is the case with people who depend on the decisions of public officials for obtaining housing):

> "As you can see, speaking about adaptation, in Iaşi and in all other towns in Romania, when there were two or three Gypsy families in one building, in ten-fifteen years the entire building was like this: dirty; full of crooks, and bastards… People moved out because they lived in discomfort, comedy, and scandals… Because the law cannot do anything, this is the truth, people preferred to move out, and so they moved an entire building. They are a big problem, really![ii]" (Mayor, Roman).

> "It's like a rotten apple, a rotten apple – a small germ, who putrefies the apple. One brings in a decently looking building two or three Gypsy families, and in two or three years all Romanians move away, or all Gypsies come there, something happens. It will not go well."(Journalist, Cluj-Napoca)[iii]

Therefore, despite an awareness of the fact that segregation is ethically wrong and factually damaging for Roma residents, public officials balance arguments such as to reach a favorable conclusion for segregated settings:

> "Ideally one should not keep them clustered, one should disperse them in several locations throughout the town. But we don't have any housing. To build something you are

13

> faced with land and money problems… (…) But in the end, one can do nothing. Their neighbors live in terror because of them. Nobody wants them. Even people who live there, of whom we could say that they are related… even they don't want to live together any more"[iv] (Civil servant in housing department, Tîrgu Mureş).

### Money versus well-being

People are used to the idea that acquiring well-being may involve financial sacrifices, either direct payments (from their own purses) or indirect payments mediated by the State. It is also accepted that social well-being may involve personal financial sacrifices – which will indirectly translate into a loss of comfort or other life style adjustments. Still, the idea that social well-being may rely on direct non-financial sacrifices is far less discussed or accepted.

There are some non-financial involvements for the sake of public good which are relatively present in the public discourse in Romania – such as military service, blood donation, reporting corruption or domestic violence incidents and cleaning accumulated snow in front of one's house.  Antidiscrimination posters have also inserted the idea that we should refrain from discriminative acts – especially against Roma children and HIV positive persons. Direct interaction with Roma people, for the sake of that interaction or for the sake of a greater good, has no place in this puzzle, at least yet.

This distinction is also related to the issue of what type of contributions is the state entitled to demand from citizens. Financial contributions for public goods are usually accepted as a principle – even if the amount or the spending strategy may be disputed. Does this mean that the State is also entitled to demand non-financial contributions from citizens?

D. Garth Taylor makes a similar distinction in his analysis of widespread white resistance in Boston to school integration by means of compulsory busing measures, in the 70's. Research data from the respective period indicated that white supremacist beliefs were no longer the main argument against busing – but were replaced by a combination of fear of consequences and principled judgments stating that the State cannot force citizens to integrate. He concludes: "white resistance to mandatory desegregation is rooted in fears of minority concentration and in the belief that, as a social policy, mandatory desegregation is unfair, unjust, and likely to produce social harm. Fear of minority

concentration and the injustice frame are the perceptions that currently justify, or, in Myrdal's term, "rationalize" antibusing protest. They provide explanations, in contemporary terms and in everyday language, for the applicability of the doctrine of voluntary compliance (…) – the view that discrimination is illegal but that desegregation is not mandatory" (Taylor 1986, p. 192).

## 3  Designing policies to confront ethnic segregation

The dilemma of ethnic segregation differs from other types of social dilemmas insofar as the agents of the state (public officials but also school principals, teachers etc) have little incentive to act against it. Like small-scale corruption, for example, ethnic segregation is thus a *persistent social dilemma* – lacking an easily available hierarchical solution.

Obstacles against ethnic segregation are of such a nature, that devising *financial incentives* to encourage the involvement of skilled people in professional interaction with Roma people may not be an effective approach (Kanev and Vassileva 2004). Misalignment of interests between the public principal and the professional agents is aggravated by lack of genuine expertise in addressing the social exclusion of Roma. The widespread definition of the Roma people exclusively in terms of underdevelopment and social problems is a trap even for well-meaning professionals, discouraging meaningful communication and encouraging a paternalist attitude (Gay y Blasco 2003).

Given the high positive influence that a cultural definition of Roma has on non-Roma people's attitudes towards ethnic integration, we can say that *an insidious form of segregation is the one that happens in school curricula and textbooks*. The history and experiences of Roma people are all but totally ignored in the Romanian curriculum, as are the Roma literature or music. This confines Roma ethnicity to a stereotyped behavioral definition that discourages curiosity and willingness of non-Roma to interact with Roma people.

In this context, decision-making in complicated situations about the correctness of actions that lead to segregation is a process heavily biased towards segregationist conclusions, even when the decision-maker herself is not racist. Arguments against segregation that

focus on principles (such as avoiding discrimination and promoting equality of opportunity) are easily overridden by practical considerations at various levels of policy-making. The fact that segregation is often requested by other people makes it seem as an altruistic behavior for the decision-maker, granting it additional moral legitimacy.

These argumentative patterns that encourage segregationist decisions explain why educated persons are equally prone to support ethnic integration as less educated persons. The roots of support for segregation come not only from racism, prejudice or the impulse to increase one's self-esteem by descendent comparison, but also from carefully balancing principles with outcomes and one's own preferences with other people's preferences. Deciding in favor of segregated settings often has the appearance of a thought-through, altruistic decision – and this appeals to educated and less-educated people as well.

The hierarchical solution (imposing ethnic integration in schools, banning segregated residential projects, busing children to distant schools) is a proven (though partial) remedy to the problem of segregation, which is still missing in Romania. Still, I believe that it should be complemented by a clear and persistent public message stating that

(1) Ethnic integration cannot be solved by cash payments – it requires principled action from all citizens;

(2) Meaningful Roma / Gadje interaction is possible, and it provides unexpected private rewards for both sides.

## References

Arendt, Hannah (1994) [1964]. Eichmann in Jerusalem. A Report on the Banality of Evil. New York: Penguin Books.

Danova, Savelina (2004).Patterns of Segregation of Roma in Education in Central and Eastern Europe. In Public Interest Law Initiative, Separate and Unequal. Combating Discrimination against Roma in Education. Budapest: Public Interest Law Initiative. Available on-line at URL http://www.pili.org/en/content/view/350/53

Garcia, Jorge (1999). Philosophical analysis and the moral concept of racism. In Philosophy & Social Criticism, vol. 25, no. 5, pp. 1-32.

Gay y Blasco, Paloma (2003). "This is not a place for civilized people": Isolation, enforced education and resistance among Spanish Gypsies. In Carolyn Strange şi Alison Bashford (Coord.), Isolation: Places and Practices of Exclusion (pp. 208-221). London: Routledge

Kanev, Krassimir, and Vassileva, Kalinka (2004). Local Initiatives: Desegregation in Bulgaria. In Public Interest Law Initiative, Separate and Unequal. Combating Discrimination against Roma in Education. Budapest: Public Interest Law Initiative. Available on-line at URL http://www.pili.org/en/content/view/350/53

Kelly, Terrence (2004). Practical Rationality in Social Scientific Explanation: The Case of Residential Segregation. In Philosophy of the Social Sciences, vol. 34, no. 1, pp. 3-19.

Miller, Gary (1992). Managerial dilemmas. The political economy of hierarchy. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Popescu, Claudia (2002). Imaginea romilor în mass-media. In Rudolf Poledna, Francis Ruegg and Călin Rus (coord.), Interculturalitate. Cercetări şi perspective româneşti. Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană.

Rostaş, Iulius and Nicoară, Mona (2004). Advocacy Strategies to Combat Segregation. In Public Interest Law Initiative, Separate and Unequal. Combating Discrimination against Roma in Education. Budapest: Public Interest Law Initiative. Available on-line at URL http://www.pili.org/en/content/view/350/53

Rughiniş, Cosima (2004a). Social Housing and Roma Residents in Romania. CEU: Policy Documentation Center. Available on-line at URL *http://pdc.ceu.hu/archive/00001919/*

Rughiniş, Cosima (2004b). Cunoaştere incomodă. Bucureşti: Printech

Schelling, Thomas C. (1971). Dynamic Models of Segregation. In Journal of Mathematical Sociology, vol. 1: 143-186.

Surdu, Mihai (2003). Desegregating Roma schools: a cost-benefit-analysis. Available on March 13, 2004 on the author's site at www.policy.hu/surdu

Surdu, Mihai (2002). The Quality of Education in Romanian Schools with High Percentages of Romani Pupils. In Roma Rights, issue 3–4/2002.

Tarnovschi, Daniela (2002). Identitatea romilor. Construct istoric şi mediatic. In Rudolf Poledna, Francis Ruegg and Călin Rus (coord.), Interculturalitate. Cercetări şi perspective româneşti. Cluj-Napoca: Presa Universitară Clujeană.

Taylor, D. Garth (1986). Public Opinion and Collective Action. The Boston School Desegregation Conflict. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press

## Appendix

**Table 5. In your opinion, is it good or bad… Source: RIB – OSF Bucharest, Nov. 2006**

| | For Romanian and Roma to live in the same neighborhood? (%) | | For Romanian and Roma pupils to learn in the same classroom? (%) | | For Romanian and Roma pupils to play together? (%) | | For Romanian and Roma people to intermarry? (%) | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Non-Roma | Roma | Non-Roma | Roma | Non-Roma | Roma | Non-Roma | Roma |
| **Very bad** | **8** | 1 | **4** | 1 | **6** | 2 | **15** | 5 |
| **Bad** | **27** | 9 | **18** | 8 | **19** | 6 | **27** | 14 |
| **Good** | **49** | 51 | **58** | 48 | **57** | 51 | **42** | 42 |
| **Very good** | **11** | 37 | **15** | 41 | **14** | 39 | **11** | 35 |
| **I don't know** | **5** | 3 | **4** | 3 | **5** | 2 | **6** | 4 |
| **Total** | **100** | 100 | **100** | 100 | **100** | 100 | **100** | 100 |

**Table 6. Desirability of educational integration, for non-Roma respondents aged 18-65. Source: RIB – OSF Bucharest, Nov. 2006**

| | | Gymnasium or less | Vocational schooling, high-school | College, university |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Roma and non-Roma pupils should learn together | No | 23.7% | 24.7% | 19.0% |
| | Yes | 76.3% | 75.3% | 81.0% |
| Total | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Differences are not statistically significant for p=0.05 (Chi square test)

**Table 7. Option for more state funding for Roma projects, for non-Roma respondents aged 18-65. Source: RIB – OSF Bucharest, Nov. 2006**

| | | Gymnasium or less | Vocational schooling, high-school | College, university |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| The state should allocate more funds for the Roma people | No | 45.6% | 62.9% | 57.4% |
| | Yes | 54.4% | 37.1% | 42.6% |
| Total | | 100.0% | 100.0% | 100.0% |

Differences are not statistically significant for p=0.05 (Chi square test)

**Table 8. „How do you know if somebody is Roma / Gypsy?" Source: RIB – OSF Bucharest, Nov. 2006. Spontaneous answers were recorded and then re-codified.**

| Criterion (respondents answers are re-codified) | „Romanized" Roma | Other type of Roma | Non-Roma |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Aspect, looks** | 9 | 9 | **17** |
| **Behavior, customs, character** | 7 | 7 | **13** |
| **Color** | 14 | 13 | **23** |
| **Language, accent, vocabulary** | **19** | **15** | 10 |
| **Clothing** | **15** | **14** | 9 |
| **Language spoken (Romani)** | **23** | **17** | 10 |
| **I don't know** | 8 | 20 | 10 |
| **Other answers** | 6 | 5 | 9 |
| **Total** | 100 | 100 | 100 |
| **(Cases)** | (607) | (697) | (1224) |

**Table 9. Romani children should learn the Romani language in school Source: RIB – OSF Bucharest, Nov. 2006**

| | „Romanized" Roma | Other type of Roma | Non-Roma |
|---|---|---|---|
| Totally disagree | 19 | 10 | 23 |
| Rather disagree | 18 | 28 | 28 |
| Rather agree | 24 | 28 | 26 |
| Totally agree | 39 | 34 | 24 |
| Total | 100 | 100 | 100 |

Differences are not statistically significant for p=0.01 (Chi square test)

**Table 10. Would you accept that your son or daughter marry a person of the following ethnicity… (% affirmative answers) Source: RIB – OSF Bucharest, Nov. 2006**

| | „Romanized" Roma (% „yes") | Other type of Roma (% „yes") | Non-Roma (% „yes") |
|---|---|---|---|
| **Romanian?** | 82 | 69 | 95 |
| **Hungarian?** | 61 | 55 | 58 |
| **Roma?** | 98 | 94 | 35 |

[i] „Acolo la primarie sunt tot felul de cereri. De-aia pe mine ma uimeste, de exemplu, a venit un paznic, un paznic de noapte... roman... (...) Asa, ca d-nul primar l-a indrumat să vina la noi. M-am uitat, camasa alba, curatel, deci el paznic, asa, o meserie; i-am spus: "Nu cred ca mata poti să te muti acolo, nu rezisti...". Deci el, cu sotia insarcinata cu un copil. Pai daca eu l-am bagat acolo, l-am distrus pe omul ala. Deci tot, degeaba zice, să nu faci, ca doar nu face o discriminare, mie mi-s foarte dragi ei, tiganii, am o boala cu ei. Deci nu fac discriminari, dar totusi, ca niste oameni să convietuiasca, trebuie să fie cam  de aceeasi conditie. Stiti, nu... De exemplu, un profesor universitar nu poti sa-l pui să stea cu tanti Maria asta, ca aia se trezeste să tipe noaptea la copii, şi ala vrea să studieze sau... Deci asa niste chestii, nu inseamna neaparat discriminare. Liderii lor nu pot să inteleaga chestia asta, zice: "Nu, sa-i mutam asa, prin blocuri..." - nu pot." (Administrator PubliServ, GOC – Izvoare, Piatra-Neamt)

[ii] „Aşa cum vedeţi, apropo de adaptare, şi în Iaşi e valabilă treaba şi în toate oraşele ţării, ţiganii când într-o scară au existat vreo două trei familii de ţigani, în vreo zece cincisprezece ani de zile întreaga scară era la fel: mizerabilă, cu şmecheri, cu golani... oamenii s-au mutat de acolo pentru că trăiau în disconfort panaramă, scandal se legau de copii şi atunci omul a preferat, pentru că legea nu are ce să le facă, până la urmă ăsta este adevărul, oamenii au preferat să se mute din scările ale şi aşa au mutat o scară întreagă. Sunt o mare problemă, să ştiţi!" (Primar, Roman)

[iii] „E ca un măr putred, un măr putred - un mic germene şi face mărul praf. Aduci într-un bloc care arată decent două trei familii de ţigani şi în doi ani de zile ori se mută toţi românii ori de acolo vin toţi ţiganii, ceva se întâmplă. Nu va fi bine." (Ziarist, Cluj)

[iv] „Ideea ar fi nici să nu-i laşi grupaţi pe ei, să-i dispersezi în mai multe puncte ale oraşului. Dar nu avem nimic construit. Pînă ajungem să construim e problemă de teren, problema de bani... (...)Dar pînă la urmă nu ai ce să faci. Vecinii sunt terorizaţi de ei. Nimeni nu-i vrea. Nici chiar cei care stau acolo, şi care putem să spunem că sunt rude între ei, nici ei nu mai vor să stea împreună." (Functionar public, Departamentul locativ al Primăriei, Tîrgu Mureş)