



**„BABEŞ-BOLYAI” UNIVERSITÄT, CLUJ-NAPOCA
FACULTY OF SOCIOLOGY AND SOCIAL ASSISTANCE
DOCTORAL SCHOOL OF SOCIOLOGY**

URBAN SEGREGATION
Quantitative and qualitative manifestation in Cluj

ABSTRACT OF THE DOCTORAL PAPER

Scientific coordinator

PhD Student

Prof. Univ. dr. TRAIAN ROTARIU

PÁSZTOR GYÖNGYI

**Cluj-Napoca
2013**

Table of content

I. Introduction	4
II. Urbanization and segregation.....	6
II.1. Urban ecology. Chicago School of Sociology	7
II.2. New Urban Sociology. Socio-spatial approach	22
II.2.a. Structural orthodox Neomarxism	26
II.2.b. Antistructural Neomarxism.....	27
II.3. Convergent and divergent urbanization.....	30
II.4. The Characteristics Of Urbanisation in Eastern Europe.....	32
III. Characteristics of urbanization in Romania.....	36
III.1. Urbanization in between 1945 and 1989.....	36
III.2. Urbanization in Romania after 1989.....	46
IV. Inequality and poverty.....	51
V. Some aspects of the social history of poverty in the local context	59
VI. Urban poverty.....	65
VI.1. Theoretical aspects of urban segregation	68
VI.2. The causes of urban segregation.....	69
VI. 3. Typology of segregated areas.....	73
VII. Residential segregation and urban poverty in Romania	75
VIII. Historic, social and toponimical landmarks of segregation in Cluj.....	83
IX. Research Methods.....	93
X. Residential segregation in Cluj	98
XI. Case studies: Segregated areas in the city of Cluj.....	124
XI.1. Classic Slum: Plpilor.....	124
XI.2. Brownfields: Byron Street.....	143
XI.3. Mănăştur: Gârbău Alley. Typical and atypical workers area.....	157
XII. Effects of residential segregation	174
XII.1. Degradation of physical space.....	176
XII.2. Quality of housing.....	177
XII.2.a. Lack optimal housing stock.....	177

<i>XII.2.b. Housing as the reproduction of social inequalities mechanism</i>	179
<i>XII.2.c. Housing distribution mechanism</i>	181
XII.3. Lack of social oportunities.....	184
XII.4. Quality of life.....	192
<i>XII.4.a. Material and impersonal needs</i>	194
<i>XII.4.b. Social needs</i>	197
<i>XII.4.c. Personal development needs</i>	201
XII.5. Cultures of segregation.....	202
<i>XII.5.a. Culture versus structure and the terms</i>	202
<i>XII.5.b. Factors and specific behaviors in segregated areas</i>	206
XIII. Concluzions.....	216
Bibliography.....	226
List of tabelle.....	241
List of graphics.....	242

Keywords: residential segregation, social inequality, spatial inequality, segregated areas, pauperization, city of Cluj

Introduction

This paper focuses on the spatial processes considering social inequality at the level of the town of Cluj in context of the past 20 years after the fall of the Communist regime. The broad literature of the social inequalities in Romania (see Zamfir E., 1995; Zamfir C., 2001; Molnar, 1999, 2009, Péter, 2006, 2007) deals in detail with its qualitative and quantitative aspects, but there are only a few authors analyzing the territorial aspects of social disparities (see Stănculescu – Berevoiescu, 2004, Mionel, 2010, Pásztor, 2003, 2004, 2006, 2007). There are particularly missing those analyses focusing mainly on the tendencies of segregation and the approaches on the qualitative perspective of the processes of urban segregation and poverty.

The social context of segregation of the former Socialist countries is specific to the egalitarian policies promoted by the Communist system. These were manifested besides the political and economical decisions also in the distribution system of the residential space. The main purpose of Socialist modernization and urbanization was the abolishment of the “old society”, the dissipation of the traditional communities; social homogenization and the creation of the New Man (see Kligman, 2000).

One of the conceivable programs to obtain this purpose was to modify the structure of the residential funds (Mihăilescu – Nicolau – Greorghiu - Olaru 1994) through the construction of districts of block of flats offering a living space for all social categories. The residences were in state property, and the right of distribution such as of the jobs fell under the jurisdiction of the central administration. As a consequence the change of jobs and residence was rarely met so the residential segregation was much inferior compared to the one on the Western states. (Ladányi, 1989).

After switching to market economy the majority of the residential funds were transferred in the property of the residents (it became private property) and along with this the demand and supply, the prices were also adjusted to the rules of the market.

The question that is at hand in this case is whether the social and economic changes imply alterations also at the level of urban structure similar to the ones in Western Europe?

In my research I was trying to find answer to the following questions:

1. How the models of urban segregation can be described at the beginning and in the end of the 20 years period?

2. In what degree the characteristics of the residential fund define the recent tendencies of residential segregation?
3. What are the qualitative aspects of segregation: what are the social opportunities available in the area, how can be described the quality of life and what are the cultural patterns?

Theoretical Aspects

It is essential to define segregation even though it is one of the most frequently used terms in the sociological literature. The significance of this is sustained by the emerged confusion in the literature due to the complexity and ambiguity of this concept and the meanings it was assigned. In sociological sense segregation relates to the territorial and implicitly social separation of the different social categories along racial, ethnic, cultural or socio-professional characteristics. This always has a physical-territorial aspect, meaning that for people living in physical proximity the odds are to have similar characteristics, respectively behavioral aspects: the relative resemblance is manifested in the values, attitudes, opinions and the lifestyle of the place. (Pásztor – Péter, 2007: 530).

Sociological theories make distinction between two major types of segregation: 1. *Volunteer* - in the case of the favored social categories and 2. *Forced* - in the case of the disfavored categories. Though the effects of both phenomenon are socially undesirable, the serious social problems are caused by forced segregation, so in this paper we are focusing on these aspects. Considering that social segregation is a predominantly urban phenomenon, its investigation and theory-making became important with the strong manifestation of the urbanization processes and the problems caused by them (ex. racial conflicts; social, racial and residential inequalities; social disorganization; or legitimacy shortage). In order to understand the processes of segregation we first need to be aware of the processes of pauperization and urbanization.

The first main chapter of the paper shows in an inductive logic the main theoretical approaches of the urbanization process, also the urbanization processes in Romania. Then I will enumerate the theories considering inequality and poverty, and some aspects of the social history of the phenomenon in real context. The row of contextual aspects will be closed by the main

theoretical approaches of urban poverty and segregation annexed with some examples of urban segregation in Romania.

Historical, social and toponymical landmarks of segregation in Cluj city

As a consequence of industrialization in the Communist period Cluj had an important attractive force in the region; the number of its population grew considerably, being tripled during the 20th century. The main cause of the abrupt ascension of population between 1930 and 1992 was the rural-urban migration and the forced modernization (industrialization and urbanization) specific to the Socialist system. The Socialist-type intervention remodeled not only the economic and social structure of the town but also its aspect; the systematization policy had transformed and redirected the modernization and urbanization processes. Despite the systematization of the road network the downtown kept its historical aspect, not being significantly touched by the big systemization processes due to the Socialist era. Today by being a civic and administrative center it also became an economic center. The center of Cluj (Unirii Square and the adjacent streets) was left untouched but it was broadened with other squares having the role to be the symbol of the Socialist regime. Both alternative socialist centers – Lucian Blaga square and Mihai Viteazu square – are situated outside of the old fortress of the town. To this central economic and administrative sector are attached other ones, some being expanded to the peripheries of the town. These are for instance the industrial (Dâmbul Rotund, Iris, Bulgaria) and residential zones (the different residential areas). The functions of these areas/sectors cannot always be delimited for some of the industrial zones gives place to residential building belonging to the companies.

During the implementation of the famous systematization plan of the town, as part of the demolition programs the impoverished zones were erased and large districts of blocks of flats were built in their place. These were uniformed buildings of lower quality and diminished comfort, built of prefabricated elements. The greatest achievement of the Socialist systematization considering the town of Cluj was the five residential districts of blocks of flats built beginning with the 1950s, these standardized spaces offering a living place for the majority of the population.

The main purpose of Socialist modernization and urbanization was the suppression of the „old society” and the traditional communities. One of the possible ways to carry this purpose out

was the modification of the housing fund, the destruction and replacement of the old houses with blocks of flats. (Mihăilescu – Nicolau – Greorghiu – Olaru, 1994). The residents of the demolished buildings were given housing in the newly built residential districts.

In the time period after 1990 the town of Cluj lost for about 20 000 members of its population. The economic profile of the town has a strong inclination towards the service sector, is special bank and finance, research and education sector. The real estate structure of the town becomes more complex, the past 20 years contributed to the consolidation of some relevant social processes. Alongside the old houses and Socialist blocks of flats districts there are emerging a good number of new houses of the upper and upper middle class (Gheorgheni, Europa, Buna Ziua), and also Capitalist style blocks of flats targeting the needs of the new middle class (Baciu, Florești).

Research Methods

To understand the causality of relations between the pauperization and stratification processes were needed to obtain a series of quantitative and qualitative data. The sources of the quantitative data were the following: a. Detailed data on census section of the censuses in years 1992 and 2002, b. Two data bases with statistic dates considering real estate price in years 2006 and 2012, c. Data from two representative investigation at the level of Cluj carried out by the Sociological Department in 1999 and the Center of Research of Interethnic relation in 2002 considering the residential mobility and the perception of the town, d. Data from the FIS Direction, Real Estate Evidence of the Town hall of Cluj. Quantitative data provided by the administrators of the block of flats considering the number, age, occupation of tenants, the time of their move in and the monthly expenses.

The qualitative data results from observation, half structured interviews carried with people living in the segregated zones, or parts of the town going through a pauperization process, also the administrators of the blocks of the mentioned areas. The interviews were carried out between 2006 and 2012, offering this way the possibility to apprehend not only moments of a given time but some of the specific processes of the period. For a more detailed image the qualitative data was completed with systematic filed observation, method used to reveal the hidden but extremely important aspects of segregation and pauperization.

Residential Segregation of the Town of Cluj

According to Shevky and Bell (1955) the most variable statistics in measuring the social status are: economic situation measured by employment, the level of education and housing, demographic characteristics and ethnic structure. According to the Census in 2002 the population of Cluj was: 79.23%, Romanian ethnicity, 19,27% Hungarian ethnicity, 0,8% Rrom ethnicity and 0,7% other. These ratios are not divided evenly in the different districts of the town. There are districts where the frequency of a given ethnicity is underrepresented compared to the average. Meanwhile this is relatively small and stable in the case of the Romanian and Hungarian population, the index of segregation is very high in the case of Rrom (there is a strong escalation in the period between 1992 and 2002) and other ethnicities. In the case of the Rrom ethnicity the segregation indices (0,81) mean that more than 80 percent of the Rrom population should move to another zone of the town in order that their segregation ratio become zero. This level of dispersion of the different ethnicities in Cluj is due on one hand to the segregation processes based on the residential mobility; on the other hand it can be explained by the processes along which the town was formed.

In the case of the level of education the segregation indices mostly similar to the ethnic ones shows that the town is much differentiated. At the first analysis we can conclude that the level of segregation considering education declined during the 1990s, the values of the segregation indices being extremely varied. Those with superior studies have a higher representation in the Center and resident areas (of houses or blocks of flats) in the close vicinity of the Center, like Andrei Mureșanu, Grigorescu or in the area of Dorobanților and Pata streets; and having a much lower presence in the marginal districts like Baciú, or Iris. In the meantime those not completing any level of education are living in a higher rate in the marginal districts of the town.

As a conclusion we can state that the town of Cluj is relatively segregated in all the dimensions proposed for analysis: economic situation, level of education and housing, demographic characteristics and ethnic structure. Though most of these are due to the historic processes playing role in the formation and construction of the town there are also emerging some disquieting tendencies. The highest indices of segregation can be observed in the case of the Rrom ethnicity, a population with a high, respective low level - in some cases a complete lack - of education, such as the case of the population over the age of 60.

The analysis of the spatial aspects of social inequality through the prism of residential inequalities is an approach used by the first urban ecology theorists such as by nowadays economists and sociologists. The differences are important for the following reasons: first - the difference in the average prices of the homes in the different zones means that the purchases of a new residence would be less accessible in one zone than the other; second - the proportions and rate of accumulation of capital will vary between the different zones, due to the level of price and of inflation. This way the place of residence influences the level of financial benefits (or losses) coming from the property transactions; third – these differences are conditioned socially, or by occupation, income or gender (Hamnett, 1992).

In first instance of the statistic analyses (using the means of regression analysis) we were searching those indicators which influenced the price of a real estate and its extent. Then using the method of comparing the average values we analyzed the average price in each district. Our purpose was to find out in what degree the place of the real estate, and its character influences its price, or in other words in what the degree the social differences become spatial ones? As an outcome of the regression analysis it can be stated that it is the size of the real estate that has the strongest impact on the price, its location also plays an important role in this equation. To find out the contents of these differentiations we compared the average price of the apartments in each district. At the end of the year 2012 the average price for an apartment in a blocks of flats was 906 Euro/m², and the average size of an apartment for sell was 55m² (48,832 Euro) The lowest prices had those apartments in the new districts built in years 2000 and the blocks of flats built during the Communist regime in the industrial zone of the town. Considering the prices of the houses the stratification in general is mostly similar, but there can be found a slight difference compared to the character of the districts of blocks of flats. The average price was 993,7 Euro/m², the average price being 139.953 Euro.

According to an research carried out by the Research Center of Interethnic Relations the citizens of Cluj have a very outlined image of the impoverished zones of the town, an image that mostly comply with the outcomes of the research of real estate market. However an interesting case is the area named Plopilor, where the real estate prices mark a poorer area but this is not reflected in the mental maps.

Case Studies: Segregated Zones in Cluj

By analyzing the physical structure and the contents of the mental presentations we can assert that despite the homogenization policies of the Communist regime there are emerging and persisting segregation processes in the town leading to the appearance of poor and disadvantaged neighborhoods. Cluj has physically degraded zones where the poor are withdrawing. In compliance with the purpose of my research I have chosen different places for case studies, three of these are representing a specific type of segregated districts: Iris, zone Byron and Muncii, Mănăştur, zone Gârbău and Plopilor - houses.

The Classic Slum: Between the Waters

One of the researched places is the Plopilor district. It is a small place, with houses, narrow, hidden streets behind the blocks of flats built in the 1960s, close to the bank of Somes river. The first colony formed in the mentioned place dates back to the beginning of the 19th Century. It appeared because of the Mill Chanel which by being a source for energy for the treadmills of the town was also used for transporting the logjams from the Gilau Mountains (Pillich, 1985: 60). The place where woodworkers has settled down still exists. The oldest houses built at the end of the 19th century are formed of one or two rooms a kitchen, without other premises in the building. The wood outhouse was situated in the courtyard, such as a wood shed used as deposit. These houses are narrow, shallow and dark. Many of these houses host families with numerous members (lots of children). One of the most numerous families which has ten members - 2 parents and 8 children – are living in one of the mentioned houses with two rooms.

The houses build in the next period - during the first part of the 20th Century – also have one or two rooms and a kitchen. But these are larger, more roomy and brightly. Both types of houses are typical worker houses, occurring in the other parts of the town. The zone was proposed for demolition. The investments in the years 2007-2008 has changed the image of the place: the waste water and mud had mostly disappeared from the streets, the sewage disposal is more efficient. But there is no positive change in the life quality of the habitants, in some aspects it got even worsened. Though water and sewer system is would be available a large number of people cannot afford to pay for this service.

Already at the time of the first filed research the seriously degraded aspect of the houses was overt. Some of the deteriorated and small houses had broken or destroyed roof so that the rain entered inside destroying the plaster of the wall. One could also observe some newly refurbished or built houses, the majority being small and being built of used construction material. These houses are not only of very poor quality, but built completely illegally with no authorization for construction from the local government. These were built by the members of the family, without expert guidance and construction plan. This led to situation when there was no stairs going up to the second floor of the house, so the owner are using an improvised exterior ladder built later to enter their homes or though they are heating with wood there were no chimneys built. Only a very small percent of the newly build houses respects al urban standards, also having authorization for construction.

Analysing the pauperization processes of this district it can be observed that there was an intensive mobility wave getting intensified in the 1990s. We are not facing a situation when the slum appeared as a consequence of pauperization of its habitants, but rather troug and invasion of impoverished population, or of a population exposed to impoverishment. The first significant tide of migration took place in the 1970s, when Cluj was declared a closed town, decision made in order to stop the the migration of the population from the adjacente regions towards the town. Buing a house in Cluj became a strategy for the migrant categories, for having ownership in the town gave the right to automatically become legal resident of the town. Living in a hand-to-mouth situation the only possibility to buy a house was available in the places where smaller building were affordable, or where the houses were not nationalized.

The second tide of migration took place in the 1990s, though in a smaller instance, and it continoues untile the present. This category of habitants are called “new comers”, always contrasted with the “old” habitants, made up of the people coming during the first migration tide and some of the workers of the old colony. The “new comers” represents the largest category today, most of the mare poor, and mostly Rroms. The real estate prices are very low, bellow the price of the price of a two room apartment. Most of the pople moved in this period of time bought their houses with money from selling their apartements.

There were formed very well defined borders visible by the life style and the physical aspect of the houses. There is an extremely rigorous border between the tw ocategories, both defining themselves in the “we” and “they” categories, these being the basic categories according to

which the neighborhood relations are formed. These mental borders are strict and well defined, but also seen as something that cannot be overcome. The conflicts usually appear in the proximity of the borders formed by the interior of the territory, and also at the exterior demarcation points, especially between the inhabitants of the neighboring blocks of flats.

Unaffected Industrial Zones: Byron Street

Situated at the northern periphery of the town, at the left bank of the Someș river, east of the Railway Station the Iris district is one of the former industrial zones of the town. During the time of Socialist industrialization most of the facilities of the heavy industry were built in the district. Soon after these blocks of flats were built for the factory workers, mostly along the main street (Muncii), and close to the factories, like the apartment houses on street Byron. At the end of Byron street, expanding to West was located the so-called Bufnita colony, gradually demolished by the mid 1960s. Bufnita was the suburb next to the brick factory, inhabited by Rom brick makers. In its place there were built industrial units and houses. The former inhabitants of the colony were moved in the newly built blocks of flats built on Byron street, or other places in Someșeni and Becas districts.

Byron street is situated next to the Brick Factory and represents the limes between the house district and the industrial zone, being limited by two borders: on the left by the wall of the Brick Factory, on the right by a pit/ditch. The street is separated both physically and mentally from its surroundings.

In the last two years there were carried out significant investments in the area. In 2010 the formerly muddy street was asphalted resolving the problem the pedestrian and car traffic was facing during rainy weather. The asphalt was carried out only on the main street, the internal courtyard was left untouched being muddy in present time, too. In years 2006-2008 a construction company refurbished two blocks of flats which mask the other deteriorated building from the direction of the Sobarilor street.

At the beginning of the street there are two buildings built in 1951. These were the first buildings. In 1960s there were built blocks of flats along the street. These are two leveled brick buildings, covered with tiles, having an outside access for the apartments on the second floor. There were built a number of 8 buildings of this kind in 3 parallel rows facing the inside

courtyard. Each has an exterior staircase, balconies with banister. The total number of apartments is 24. The living surface of the apartments is 31 square meter, each having two rooms (a room and a kitchen) and a pantry. Each building has one bathroom and toilet used by all the habitants. The first level apartments have direct entrance from the courtyard, and those on the second level from the balconies. The apartments were obtained by allocation, the tenants being mostly workers, first generation citizens of the town or families from the Bufnita colony who were working in the nearby factories. The buildings were offered for purchase after 1990. With the exception of one block and two apartments these are in private property. Two of the blocks were bought by investors. One is empty now, but in the other different companies have their offices, workshops (repair shop, bakery), a market and a pub run their business. A single block is still in the property of the local council being populated by Rroms.

In the courtyard of the blocks situated in the western part of Byron street there were built hostels for workers in the beginning of the 1970s. The following companies had these kind of buildings: Mucart, Libertatea, Flacăra and Clujana. At the end of the 90s (1997-2000) the buildings were privatized (sold by the factories owning them). Mucart, Libertatea and Flacăra still functioning in that time sold the building/apartments for their employees (hire purchase) or former tenants. Clujana, after its bankruptcy in 1999-2000 sold all the building in one transaction. The rooms of these buildings are 10,21 square meters. Each room has a basin, at the end of each hall there is a bathroom and a toilet. Right at this moment the former Clujana hostel is named "Nato", evidently a pejorative name obtained for the precarious conditions. After the insolvency procedure was started in 2000 the rooms were sold on the free market. For some of the tenants did not have enough financial background to purchase the rooms a number of them were bought by investors who have not moved in, instead offered them for rent for the people already living there. The hot water service was ceased at the beginning of the 90s, the homes were not connected to the gas system. The electric meters were installed only in November 2001 by the Electrica. The showers are long time destroyed in the commonly shared bathrooms, though because of the lack of hot water nobody would use them.

According to the Police Inspectorate of Cluj County the Byron Street area is one of the most unsafe places in town. The data recorded shows a very high frequency of offenses and crimes, the scandals caused by the local gangs and slashers are recurrent. The official controls of the local police are very frequent. The habitants of the "Rrom block" confess that the lack of official

documents force them to hide, to stay in their homes, and that they only let in known persons. The presence of the official bodies causes fear among them, their presence being repressive and of symbolic teasing.

Even if for the outsider the population of the street seems homogenous in reality it is strongly stratified. The strongly objectivized physical limits are organized along ethnic lines. The Rom population is physically segregated, they are separated at the end of the street in block stigmatized as “little Dallas”. Above the ethnic variable the internal stratification is produced by two other variables: the moment of arrival in the area and the property of the home. The revenues are mostly seasonal, only in very few cases are there regular incomes. Above the resources offered by the different social services people use marginal resources for their everyday life, this being the central element of their survival strategy: they collect waste, the most wanted are those of metal, but they often collect cardboards, plastic and glass. The men are sometimes called to do various occasional jobs, usually hard, physical labor that is poorly paid (hoeing, unloading goods, transporting goods, construction). The life of the inhabitants is constantly moving on the verge of legal-illegal, many tenants are undocumented, many are working in the black market. Deviant comportment and illegal activities like prostitution and illegal trade (food, alcohol) are frequent.

Mănăstur: Aleea Gârbău Zone. Typical and atypical worker district

Gârbău Street is situated in the Western part of the district, in North East-South West, close to the edge of the town. The blocks located here were built at the beginning of the 70s (1972-1974), and it were expanded with two blocks in the late 80s (1987-1988). Apparently the street with ten floor blocks and asphalted road is not different from a typical street. The difference at the first glance is that the density of the blocks are higher, and the number of those “being” in the street is larger than usually, more specifically the number of those who “are not going somewhere” is large. They are just simply there.

The homes are of a reduced comfort with one or two rooms (second or third category), the residents receive them as employees of various factories. At the beginning of the street at number 4 and 8 there are situated two blocks different from the others. They look like buildings built in the middle of a central space, and the other blocks would surround them. Their physical state is more deteriorated than of those surrounding them, and in both cases the outside plaster is falling,

some of the windows are broken and the window of the entrance door is replaced with plywood. These 3rd category studios formerly were worker hostels.

The privatization of the homes has resulted in increased mobility. The relocation had two specific mechanisms: one descendent (impoverishment), meaning the relocation in these blocks, and the other ascendant, meaning the relocation from these blocks. Analyzing the social stratification of the residents, one can observe the important differences from the previous two locations (Plopilor and Byron Street): the rate of those who are single and of those having no children is high. The majority of the youths living here are renting the homes. In their case the lack of jobs and the poverty that follows this phenomenon reaches a high level. Their incomes results from social-security benefits and various seasonal jobs. Illegal activities and criminal facts are often met in their case according to the responsible police officer. The prison sentences for theft are frequent, so police patrols are part of the everyday routine. These frequent controls are made by the officer in charge for that sector who has a good knowledge of the tenants which can lead to abuse of office. The officer can frequently return to those homes where one knows that official documents are deficient or missing.

As a consequence of the structural characteristics of space the mental limits are less objectified physically for the neutral elements of the location become delimitating elements. The conflicts usually emerge more at the interior limits than at those exterior. The most frequent and intense conflicts are between the different categories of age, older people seldom feel themselves on danger.

The Effects of Urban Segregation

In the light of these assertions I would like to conclude the effects of urban segregation in the short or medium term, both micro social – affected individuals and communities – and macro social level. Thus, one of the first and immediate effects of segregation is *the degradation of the physical* space, of infrastructure, the alteration or lack of water sources, pollution and the *decreased quality of housing*. Often these unwanted effects are transposed in the mental map imprinted in the memory of both the tenants and the other citizens of the town. This way the mental and physical borders are institutionalized between *they* and *we*, making it harder the integration of these affected by segregation.

Another negative impact of segregation is the *lack of social opportunities* such as the *lack of optimal education opportunities* for children, *lack of job opportunities* for the adults which lead to insufficient income, hence to a lower quality of life for the majority of population. Concentration of poverty means that there are less positive models available for the children, and the lack of these models of success the children in segregated zones are not able to imagine how they could succeed. The very high cost of living compared with the realized incomes, the poor and unhealthy diet of the leads to deterioration of health.

The segregated neighborhoods are often characterized by the emergence of a distinct culture. This culture of shortages is defined by a feeling of marginality, helplessness, dependency and inferiority. These people are like strangers in their homes, feeling that the existing institutions are not serving their interests and needs. Physical isolation leads to cultural isolation: those marginalized have resentments toward the mainstream culture considering it being hypocrite.

I. According to urban sociology *the degradation of the physical space* is the first visible effect of segregation: the poor and deteriorating infrastructure, lack of public services, lack of public lighting, pollution. The situation of the spaces researched from this point of view is special since in all three locations there have been investments done in the last 6-7 years. These interventions changed the appearance of the areas, the streets are cleaner, and the dust, mud and the dirt have disappeared from the streets. But the exterior changes did not resolve the problems of the tenants whose poverty and social exclusion has not changed. Contrary, the investment made intensified the presence of police patrols in order to supervise the area, and the tenants complain that they are exposed to atrocities from the part of the authorities. A police car is present daily in Byron Street, in the are called Between the Waters people are fined for the waste left on the street of for disturbing the public order.

II. *The quality of housing* is a direct reflection of the mechanisms by which social disparities work in general. The lack of optimal housing stock at the level of the researched community is problematic not only for the small residential areas but also because of their poor quality. Whether they are in a house or in a flat the homes usually have one room and one kitchen shared by all family members. Sometimes 2-3 persons, but mostly 4-5 or even more are sharing the place. Considering the relations between social inequalities and those of housing and also the

casual relations they have two major approaches differentiates: a) inequalities in the costs of sustenancies and b) social inequalities reflected in the modalities and possibilities of living of the different classes and social categories.

III. Lack of social opportunities. The term “social opportunity” is generally used in sociology to refer to the idea that people have different opportunities which are based on the environment they live, their social networks and living conditions etc. This means that a segregated space always raises obstacles before different opportunities like access to education or obtaining an appropriate job. (Geer, 1966).

In none of the three researched zones access to education is not very problematic since there are available schools in each district of the town. But the mere existence of schools does not solve the problem, providing access to the educational institutions and the educational success of the disadvantaged children. Even though school dropout is relatively high, the compulsory schooling (eight grade) after which only a small part continue their studies. As a general rule most children are sent to school to attend the compulsory classes, but their chances to continue their studies after graduations is minimal. One can meet in all three places children dropped out of school or never enrolled in school mainly because the lack of identity papers. The parents are rather pessimistic on the chances of their children to pursue a higher educational level other than compulsory. They do not even consider that school can contribute to “success of life”.

The first difficulties children must cope with is that their parent cannot afford the high cost of education: supplies, textbooks, class fund – there are only the direct costs which are with other indirect expenses such as clothing, shoes, transportation fees and food. The lack of positive examples results that school carrier will be extremely short and difficult. This also contributes on the long term to the failure to integrate in the labor market. Only a couple of years of schooling – more than the parents had – are insufficient to obtain a job with stable income.

The relation between housing and work can be seen at first as non-space relation: the job can be one of the reasons that lead outside the living space. Occupation, and the existence or lack of a job is a domain crucial in observing the effects of the economic and social disadvantages resulting from factors such as gender, age, ethnicity, social class and others. Contrary to the popular stereotypes about the residents of the poor, segregated zones that they are “unserious” and “lazy”, most of the population in the area surveyed work intensely and have exhausting jobs, but their work is unseen and unaccounted. Work means something different here than usually.

The predominant profiles of activities in the areas investigated are: 1. *Housewives and unemployed or people who have never attended the formal work market.* It is hard to find man without any experience at the formal work market, but the activities generating income are rather fluctuating.

2. *Occupations at the formal work market in domain that implies routine and physical effort, also a situation of subordination.* One will meet here sanitation employees, those working in construction, car wash, sales person, taxi driver, professional driver, maids.

3. *Informal occupation in legal activities.* In the case of the communities researched this kind of income generating activities are the most frequently met.

4. *Occupations in illegal activities.* The typical situation is to commercialize goods not intended for trading (primate of aid) or stolen.

We can conclude that the works carried by the majority of the researched people are hard and unsafe, the works conditions are poor with huge level of risks. The peripheral position on the labor market also means a peripheral position in the social security system: these people are not eligible for health insurance, are not protected by contracts, do not receive benefits such as annual, maternity or health leave, and have no chance to get a pension. It is not only their present, but also their future is in danger.

IV. The quality of life refers to the “more or less satisfying character of life” (Bălăţescu, 2007: 81). The health situation is essential for its existence or lack is also important in the two other areas of welfare. The availability of medical services is not expressed in spatial but in existential terms or the nonexistence of health insurance. Due to lack of contractual jobs most of the people do not have health insurance thus they are deprived of free specialized medical control. Disease is ubiquitous in these areas. Almost every household has someone ill. The lack of health and the impossibility of accessing medical treatment is a daily problem.

Material and impersonal needs are measurable through revenues and the quantity and quality of goods and services that may be accessed through them. Consumption mostly depends on the volume and regularity of income. To use the term consumption as an expression of stylistic choice in the case of marginalized persons of the segregated areas sounds almost cynical. Consumption means purchasing the very basic needs. In a situation when housing is an unsure

and overcrowded space property consist of some goods and the consumption is reduced to food, often potato, onion and cabbage.

Despite the different nature of social relations in the three investigated areas there are some common characteristics derived from the segregated character of the marginalized categories. The relationships with relatives (friends) not being enough to guarantee an adequate performance mutual help and mutual support occur at small distances. For their social and economic situation is similar subjects become more intense in the social relationships. In case the functionality becomes the source of survival, individuals tend to create substitute kinship relations. (Péter, 2007). These relations are mainly created for mutual support and help, filled with emotional content and trust, forming this way relations alike those of kinship relations. Joint deployment of activities such as housework, shopping, sometimes cooking or washing the laundries already outweigh the occasional attention status transforming into a permanent reciprocal support.

IV. Culture of segregation. During field research I have met three cultural patterns and their derivations. The first, called “**survivors**” is characteristic for those whose major purpose is to survive. It is characterized by a short term horizon where everything happens in present mode. Especially due to irregular and small income life becomes a survival capacity here and now. There exists no any kind of investment for in the situation when the goods are hardly enough for the present needs, there is no future day. In these situations people adopt different mechanisms for solving the psychological distress: escape and compensation. Escape lies in failing to acknowledge ones situation if one is not able to find solutions anyway, and also the tendency to find short time pleasures. “If only I would have money for cigarettes and drink” is the usual sentence that expresses this need. Compensation lies in spending all of the disposable resources at the moment one gets them. The deprivation is so high that in the rare moments they can afford they compensate themselves by buying useless and expensive products. The family model is the extended one, though not the traditional one in which three four generations were living in the same household. In this case the nuclear families form individual households connected with neighboring households of other relatives (children, parents, sisters, brothers etc) of neighbors forming substitute kinship relations. (see Péter, 2007). The supportive relationships has to pass trough the classic barriers of traditional nuclear families forming a strong network of mutual support. The number of children is relatively large, we can talk of families with 3-4 children sometimes even 8.

The second category is named „**ethos quasi-worker**”. It is characteristic for those who are employed in the formal work market, and present various characteristics of the work culture. (see Clarke – Critcher – Richard, 2006). The most important characteristic is that these people are integrated in the work market, having regular income. The sociological literature calls these category: the working poor. (Newman, 2000; Shipler, 2005) Despite having a regular job and income they are not able to realize enough income for a decent life, living below poverty limit. Most of them earn the minimum wage, or in some cases not being formally hired not even that much. Having the small incomes they are facing a number of obstacles that make it difficult finding and keeping a job, saving money or maintaining a positive sense of self-evaluation. Their material status does not differ much from that of survivors, the significant difference consisting in regular incomes which helps in forming of a longer term horizon. Alongside with work – a value in itself being the activity trough which humans become worthy member of the society – the process of planning of expenditures is the one by which they are different from the other categories becoming “thrifty man”, or “headed man” without which it is impossible to survive. The family model is the nuclear one with a relatively small number of children. One can rarely meet a family with more than 2 children. In most of the cases the marriage relationships are long term. Even if the woman is assuming the traditional roles takes care of the household and raising the children the father participates in family life and decision-making. Constant concerns of these families are the children even with fewer resources they invest in their future.

The last category of these patterns is the one called: “**of neighborhood**”. The values and attitudes related to this are the ones concerning what one commonly connect to the “life of the district”. A cultural pattern specific to the youth whose reaction towards the lack of resources and opportunities is rioting. Being mostly segmented individuals or categories one can rather speak of common cultural characteristics rather than of a common created identity (White, 1999, Venkatesh, 2009). Though is a cultural pattern associated with young man, characterized by traditional masculine attitudes and values (see Willis, 2000, Nylund, 2007) of this world are part girls too. The characteristic activities for this category are the income generating activities, especially trade with all kind of second-hand of illegal articles, also discussions on street or different pubs. A small part of its members are still in school with a negative attitude toward education. Work activity is not part of their life, neither as a purpose nor as part of real life. Their

revenues are generated by small businesses or delicvency. Their long term goal is the enhancement of these activities on a larger scale.

Conclusions

Despite the homogenization goals of the Communist system there were created structural and social conditions for residential stratification and segregation so along with the appearance of market mechanisms this phenomenon was initiated and consolidated in time. Although during the time of Socialist systematization extreme poverty (a reality in the marginal districts) was eradicated, the slums were demolished (for ex. Bufnița, under the Hill and others), and those living in the mentioned districts were moved to newly built blocks of flats. This policy failed to solve the social problems, poverty was only dispersed in the different zones of the town. Poverty was “hidden” but in the meantime due to the housing allocation system of more significant number of population was exposed to poverty and segregation. As a result of this process one cannot find in Cluj those traditional slums, but areas built-up with blocks expanding in a larger space. The only exception is the area with houses in the Plopilor district. During the Socialist period this was not considered an impoverished district. It was only after 1989 that the processes leading to segregation started.

Though it was not the goal of this paper to analyze all types of exclusion of urban segregation present in Cluj, focusing only on those ones which could be considered as being the causes of the inherited housing structure, there are some major risks that needs to be mentioned. One of them is the emergence and consistent growth of an informal district near the dump deposit of the town (of *shanty town* type). The process was enhanced by the local authorities trough the construction of modular social locations in the area where there were moved disfavored groups of people. The other risk is that the new residential areas built during the economic bum of 2000s are also exposed to segregation. A major part of these districts are situated in present at the periphery of the town or in the adjacent villages. These overcrowded places with virtually nonexistent public spaces and poor infrastructure are mostly unpopulated because of the financial crisis. The unfinished, unpopulated and abandoned buildings in the marginal locations are exposed to the danger of becoming areas of refugee for the poor population.

As a conclusion we can state that along with the classical aspects related to education and occupation the residential structure is an essential element in providing social opportunities that is influencing the pauperization of different social categories. In case segregation is defined as a vicious circle (Henderson – Ledebur, 1972) it will become a trap for those included in it, without no real chance for escape.

Bibliography

- Abraham, Dorel (1991): *Introducere în sociologia urbană*, București: Editura Științifică.
- Alcock, Pete (1997): *Understanding Poverty*, London: Macmillan.
- Allardt, Erik (1993): "Having, Loving, Being: An Alternative to the Swedish Model of Welfare Research." In Nussbaum, M. - A. Sen (eds), *The Quality of Life*, Oxford: Clarendon Press. p. 88-94.
- Andorka Rudolf (2001): *Bevezetés a szociológiába (Introducere în sociologie)*, Budapesta: Osiris.
- Baker, J. (1995): "Survival and accumulation strategies at the rural-urban interface in north-west Tanzania", In IIED, Urban poverty: Characteristics, causes and consequences, *Environment and Urbanization*, Vol 7. No 1.
- Băltătescu Sergiu (2007): Calitatea vieții In. Zamfir Cătălin – Stănescu Simona eds. *Enciclopedia dezvoltării sociale*, București: Polirom, p. 81-86.
- Bascom, William (1973): „A városi afrikai és világa” In. Szelényi Iván ed. *Városshociológia*, Budapesta: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó, p. 285-302.
- Beck, Ulrich (2003): *A kockázat-társadalom. Út egy másik modernitásba*, Budapesta: Századvég.
- Benedek József (2004): „A romániai urbanizáció jellegzetességei az utolsó évszázad során” In. *Tér és Társadalom*
- Belkis, Dominique – Coman, Gabriela – Sârbu Corina – Troc Gabriel (2003): „Construirea urbană, socială și simbolică a cartierului Mănăștur” In. *Idea* 2003/15-16 p.135-159
- Bianchi, Suzanne M. – Farley, Reynolds – Spain, Daphne (1986): "Racial Inequalities in Housing: An Examination of Recent Trends" In. Momeni, Jamshid A. ed. *Race, Ethnicity and Minority Housing in the United States* Westport, Connecticut; Greenwood Press, p. 19-30.

- Bounds, Michael (2004): “*Urban Social Theory: City, Self and Society*” New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bourdieu, Pierre (2008): Az iskolai kiválóság és a francia oktatási rendszer értékei In. Pierre Bourdieu et al *A társadalmi egyenlőtlenségek újratermelődése*. Budapest : General Press.
- Bourgois, Phillipe (2001): Culture of Poverty In. *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences*. Waveland Press.
- Brucan, Silviu (1996): *Stâlpii noii puteri în România*, București: Nemira.
- Bullard, Robert D. (1986): “Blacks and the American Dream of Housing” In, Momeni, Jamshid A., ed. *Race, Ethnicity and Minority Housing in the United States* Westport, Connecticut: Greenwood Press, p. 53-68.
- Burgess, Ernest – McKenzie, Roderick D.– Park, Robert E. eds. (1925): *The City*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Burgess, Ernest W. (1973): A városfejlődés: hipotézisek egy kutatási javaslatához In. Szelényi Iván ed. *Városshociológia*, Budapest: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó, p. 147-160.
- Cannadine, David (1982): „Residential Differentiation in Nineteenth-Century Towns: From Shapes on the Grown to Shapes in Society” In. J.H. Johnson – C. G. Pooley eds. *The structure of Nineteenth-Century Cities*, London: Crom Helm, p. 235-252.
- Castel, Robert (1995): *Les Métamorphoses de la question sociale*. Paris: Fayard.
- Castells, Manuel (1972): „Urbanization” In. *The Castells Reader in Cities and Social Theory* (2002) Ida Susser ed., Blackwell, Oxford
- Castells, Manuel (1977 [1972]): *The Urban Question. A Marxist Approach*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Castells, Manuel (1983): *The City and the Grass Roots. A Cross-cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements*, London: Edward Arnold.
- Chelcea, Liviu – Letea, Puiu (2000): *Romania profunda in comunism*, Bucuresti: Nemira.
- Clark, William A. V. (1986): “Residential Segregation in American Cities” In *Population Research and Policy Review* 5 p. 95-127.

- Clarke, John – Critcher, Char – Johnson, Richard (2006): *Working Class Culture: Studies in History and Theory*. Classic Texts Set Vol 6, London: Center for Contemporary Cultural Studies.
- Cockerham, William (2007): *Social Causes of Health and Disease*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Csanádi Gábor – Ladányi János (1992): *Budapest térbeni társadalmi szerkezetének változásai*. Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Csedő Krisztina – Ercsei Kálmán – Geambasu Réka – Pásztor Gyöngyi (2004): *A rurális bevándorlók. Az elsőgenerációs kolozsvári városiak társadalmi szerkezete*, Cluj: Scientia.
- Cséfalvay Zoltán (1994): *A modern társadalomföldrajz kézikönyve*, Budapest: IKVA Könyvkiadó.
- Csetri Elek (2001): „Kolozsvár népessége a középkortól napjainkig” In. *Kolozsvár 1000 éve*, eds. Dáné T. K., Egyed Á., Sipos G., Wolf R., Cluj: Erdélyi Múzeum Egyesület, p. 7-28.
- Csizmady Adrienne (1996): “Lakótelep és társadalmi szegregáció” In *Szociológiai Szemle* Vol. 3-4.
- Cucu Vasile (1970): *Orașele României*, București: Editura Științifică.
- Danziger, Sheldon H. – Haveman, Robert H. (2001): *Understanding Poverty*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Davis, Kingsley – Moore, Wilbert E. (1999): “A rétegződés néhány elve” In. *A társadalmi rétegződés komponensei*, Angelusz Róbert ed., Budapest: Új Mandátum.
- Denton, Nancy A. (2006): “Segregation and discrimination in housing” In *A Right to Housing: Foundation for a New Social Agenda*, eds. Rachel G. Bratt - Michael E. Stone - Chester Hartman, Philadelphia: Temple University Press, p. 61-81.
- Downs, Roger M. – Stea, David (2004): Térképek az elmében – Gondolatok a mentális térképezésről (Részlet) In. *Településkutatás. Szöveggyűjtemény* Letenyei László szerk. Budapest: L'Harmattan, p. 593-613.
- Duncan, Otis Dudley – Duncan, Beverly (1955): „Residential Distribution and Occupational Stratification” In. *American Journal of Sociology* 60/5 p. 493-503

- Duneier, Mitchell (1992) *Slim's Table. Race, Respectability, and Masculinity*. Chicago: Chicago University Press
- Djuvara, Neagu (2002): *O scurtă istorie a românilor povestită celor tineri*, Bucuresti: Humanitas.
- Echenique, Federico – Fryer Roland G. (2007): “A Measure of Segregation Based on Social Interactions” In. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics* 122 (2) p. 441-485.
- Edlund, Matthew – Tancredi, Laurence (1985): “Quality of life: an ideological critique” In. *Perspect Biol Med* 1985/28 p. 591-607.
- Egyed Ákos (1997): *A korszerűsödő és hagyományörző Erdély I-II*, Csíkszereda: Pallas-Akadémia.
- Elias, Norbert – Scotson, John L. (1962): *The Established and The Outsiders*, London: Sage Publications.
- Ellen, Ingrid G. (2000): *Sharing America's Neighborhoods: The Prospects for Stable Racial Integration*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Enyedi György (1988): *Special Features of Urbanisation in East-Central Europe*, International Edition: Forthcoming.
- Esping-Andersen, Gosta (1990): *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*, Cambridge: Polity Press & Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Feagin, Joe R. (1983): *The Urban Real Estate Game*, New York: Prentice Hall.
- Feagin, Joe R. – Sikes, Melvin P. (1994): *Living with Racism: The Black Middle-Class Experience*, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Ferge Zsuzsa (1991): *Szociálpolitika és Társadalom*. Budapest: ELTE Szociológia Intézet, T-Twins Kiadó.
- Fraser, James G. (1965): *Az aranyag*, Budapest; Gondolat Kiado
- Freeman, Linton C. (1978): “Segregation in Social Networks” In. *Sociological Methods Research* Vol. 6 no. p. 411-429.

- Fischer, Claude (1975): „Towards a Subcultural Theory of Urbanization” In. *American Journal of Sociology*, Vol 80, p. 1319-1341.
- Fischer, Claude (1982): *To Dwell Among Friends: Personal Networks in Town and City*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Flanagan, William G. (1993): *Contemporary Urban Sociology*, Cambridge: University of Cambridge.
- Gaál György (2001): „Kolozsvár kétezere esztendeje dátumokban” In. *Kolozsvár 1000 éve*, Dáné T. K., Egyed Á., Sipos G., Wolf R. Eds. Kolozsvár: Erdélyi Múzeum egyesület, p. 376-435.
- Gans, Herbert J. (1996): „From ‘Underclass’ to ‘Undercaste’: Some Observations About the Future of the Post-Industrial Society and its Major Victims” In. *Urban Poverty and Urban Underclass Debate* (coord). Mingione Enzo, Oxford: Blackwell, p. 141-152.
- Gans, Herbert J. (1962): „Urbanism and Suburbanism as Ways of Life” In. *Human Behavior and Social Process*, Arnold Rose ed., Boston: Houghton Mifflin Co., p. 625-648.
- Gans, Herbert J. (1962b): *The Urban Villagers: Group and Class in the Life of Italian-Americans*, New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Gans, Herbert J. (1973): *More Equality*, New York: Random House, Pantheon Books.
- Gans, Herbert J. (1984) *Cities in Recession: Critical Responses to the Urban Politics of the New Right*
- Gheorghe, Nicolae (1998): „Segregare’ In. *Dicționar de sociologie* coord. Cătălin Zamfir, Lazăr Vlăsceanu, București: Editura Babel.
- Giddens, Anthony (2011): *Sociologie*, Bucuresti: Nemira.
- Gottdiener, Mark (1985): *The Social Production of Urban Space*, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Gottdiener, Mark (1994): *The New Urban Sociology*, New York – San Francisco – St. Louis: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Gould, Peter – White, Rodney (1986): *Mental Maps* Boston: Allen & Unwin.

- Granovetter, Mark (1982): „The Strength of Weak Ties. A Network Theory Revisited” In: *Social Structure and Network Analysis*, Marsden, Peter V. – Lin, Nan eds. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.
- Greer, Scott (1966): “Promblems of Housing and the Renewal of the City” In *Social Problems*, ed. Howard S. Becker, New York: John Wiley and Sons, p. 517-548.
- Guest, Avery M. (1979): “Residential Segregation in Urban Areas”, In *Contemporary Topics in Urban Sociology*, Schwirian, Kent P ed., Morristown, New Jersey: General Learning Press.
- Gyáni Gábor (1990): A városi mikroterek társadalomtörténete (Istoria micro-spațiilor urbane) In *Tér és Társadalom* 4. 1990.1, p. 1-13
- Hall, Peter (1999): *Orașele de Mâine. O istorie intelectuală a urbanismului în secolul XX.*, București: Editura All.
- Hamnett, Chris (1992): The Geography of Housing Wealth and Inheritance in Britain In. *The Geographical Journal*, Vol. 158, No. 3 (Nov., 1992), p. 307-321
- Henderson, William L. – Ledebur, Larry C. (1972): *Urban Economics: Processes and Problems*, New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Hannerz, Ulf (1969): *Soulside*, New-York: Columbia University Press.
- Hannerz, Ulf (1993): „The Cultural Role of World Cities” In. *Humanising the City? Social Contexts of Urban Life at the Turn of Millenium* ed. A. Cohen – F. Katsuyoshi, Edinburgh, p. 69-83
- Hegedűs József – Tosics Iván (1993): *A lakásrendszer szociológiai és közgazdasági megközelítése* manuscris, Budapesta.
- Henslin, James M. (2005): *Social Problems. A Down to Earth Approach*, Prentice Hall.
- Hatos, Adrian (2006): *Sociologia educației*, București: Polirom.
- Hawley, Amos (1950): *Human Ecology: A Theory of Community Structure*, New York: Ronald Press.
- Hawley, Amos (1986): *Human Ecology: A Theoretical Essay*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Hoyt, Homer (1973): „A városi struktúra klasszikus modelljének újabb torzulásai” In. *Városshociológia* ed. Szelényi I., Budapest: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó, p. 161-181.
- Hunya Gábor (1990): „Románia területi fejlődése és regionális politikája” In. *Románia 1944-1990*, Budapest: Atlantisz.
- Hobsbawm, Eric J. (1968): “Poverty” In *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* McMillan and Free Press.
- Kardhordó Károly (1942): „Néhány szó a román községekről a 228. számú rendelettvény figyelembe vételével” *Magyar Kisebbség* XXI, 1942/7-8.
- Gail Kligman (2000): *Politica duplicității. Controlul reproducerii în România lui Ceaușescu*, București: Humanitas.
- Kleit R G (2008): Neighborhood segregation, personal networks and access to social resources In Carr, James H. – Kutty, Nandine eds. *Segregation: The Rising Costs for America*, New York: Routledge,
- Konrád György – Szelényi Iván (1969): *Az új lakótelepek szociológiai problémái (Problemele sociologice ale noilor cartiere)*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó.
- Kotlowitz, Alex (1992): *There Are No Children Here*, New York: Anchor.
- Kovács Zoltán (2002): „Az urbanizáció jellemzői Kelet-Közép-Európában a postszocialista átmenet idején” In. *Földrajzi Közlemények* Vol. 1-4 p. 57-78.
- Kumar, Krishan (1995) *From Post-Industrial to Post-Modern Society: New Theories of the Contemporary World*. Oxford: Backwell Publishing.
- Ladányi János (1989): „Changing patterns of Residential Segregation in Budapest” *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, Vol. 13
- Ladányi, János (2004): “Társadalmi és etnikai csoportok lakóhelyi szegregációja Budapesten, a poszt-kommunista átmenetben”, In *WEB Szociológiai Folyóirat* Vol. 13.
- Ladányi János - Szelényi Iván (2004): *A kirekesztettség változó arcai*. Budapest: Napvilág Kiadó.

- Lamont, Michèle – Small, Mario Luis – Harding, David J. (2010). Reconsidering culture and poverty In. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* Vol. 629 (1) p. 6–27.
- Lazăr, Marius (2003): „Cluj 2003 – Metastaza ostentației. Ilustrate în alb și negru din Clujul tricolor” In. *Idea* 2003/15-16 p. 125-134.
- Lees, Andrew (1985): *Cities Perceived: Urban Society in European and American Thought 1920-1940*, New York: Columbia University Press.
- Lenski, Gerhard E. – Lenski, J. (1987): *Human Societies: An Introduction to Macrosociology (5th edition)*. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Letenyei László (2004): *Településkutatás. A települési és térségi tervezés társadalomtudományos megalapozása*, Budapest: L'Harmattan.
- Lewis Oscar (1966): *La Vida*, New York: Random House.
- Lewis, Oscar (1968): *Sanchez gyermekei*, Budapest: Európa könyvkiadó.
- Larissa Adler Lomnitz (1997): *Networks and Marginality: Life in a Mexican Shanty Town. Studies in Antropology*, San Francisco: Academic Press.
- Lungu, Gheorghe (1983): “Impactul urbanizării asupra structurii populației R. S. România” In. *Revista de statistică*. XXXII, Nr. 12.
- Malinowski (1972): *Baloma* Budapest: Gondolat Kiado
- Marcuse, Peter (1996): „Privatization and its Discontents: Property Rights in Land and Housing in the Transition in Eastern Europe” In. *Cities after Socialism. Urban and Regional Change and Conflict in Post-Socialist Societes* ed. Gregory Andrusz – M. Harloe – Szelényi Iván, Oxford: Balckwell Publishers, p. 119-191.
- Marcuse, Peter (1996b): „Space and Race in the Postfordist City: the Outcast Ghetto and Advanced Homelessness in United States Today” In *Urban Poverty and the Underclass* ed. Mingione, Enzo, Blackwell Publishers, Malden, p. 217-233.
- Marica, George Em. (1997): „Psihologia mahalalei” In. *Studii sociologice*, Cluj: Fundația Culturală Română.

- Massey, Douglas S. – Denton, Nancy A. (1988): The Dimensions of Residential Segregation, *Social Forces*, 67 (2), p. 281-315.
- Massey, Douglas S. – Denton, Nancy A. (1993): *American Apartheid: Segregation and Making of the Underclass*, Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- Massey, Douglas S. – Fisher, Mary J. (2000): „How segregation concentrates poverty” In. *Ethnic and Racial Studies* 2000/23 p. 670-691.
- Massey, Douglas S. (2001): “Residential Segregation and Neighborhoods Conditions in US Metropolitan Areas” In. *America Becoming: Racial Trends and Their Consequences* vol I. ed. N. J. Smelser – W. J. Wilson – F. Mitchell, Washington DC: National Academy Press p. 391-434
- McCoy, Deborah – Vincent, Jeffrey (2008): Housing and Education: An Inextricable Link In. Carr, James H. –Kutty, Nandine eds.: *Segregation: The Rising Costs for America*, Routledge, New York.
- Mihăilescu, Vintilă – Viorica Nicolau – Mircea Giorghiu – Costel Olaru (1994): „Blocul între loc și locuire” *Revista de Cercetări Sociale*, 1994/1.
- Mionel, Viorel (2012): *Segregarea urbană. Separați dar împreună*, București: Editura Universitară.
- Mingione Enzo ed. (1996): *Urban Poverty and Urban Underclass Debate*, Oxford: Backwell.
- Molnar, Maria (1999): *Sărăcia și protecția socială*, București: Editura fundației România de Măine.
- Molnar, Maria (2009): *Households Income In Romania before Economic Crisis.*” The International Conference on Economics and Administration, Faculty of Administration and Business University of Bucharest, Romania ICEA – FAA Bucharest, 14-15th November 2009, Conference paper
- Müller, Peter (1981): *Contemporary Suburban America*, Englewood Cliffs, New-York: Prentice Hall.
- Musil, Jiří (1982): *Urbanisation in Socialist Countries*, MacMillan and Free Press.

- Newman, Katherine (2000): *No Shame in My Game: The Working Poor in the Inner City*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation Vintage Books
- Nicolae Ion (2002): *Suburbanismul ca fenomen geografic în România*. București: Editura Meronia.
- Niedermüller Péter (1994): „A város és városi kultúra: antropológiai megközelítés” In. „*Jelbeszéd az életünk*” *A szimbolizáció története és kutatásának módszerei*, Kapitány Ágnes – Kapitány Gábor coord., Budapest: Osiris-Százavég, p. 555-566.
- Nylund, David (2007): *Beer, Babes, and Balls*, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Norman, Barry (1987): *The New Right*, Croom Helm.
- Oroveanu, Mihai T. (1986): *Organizarea administrativă și sistematizarea teritoriului Republicii Socialiste România* București: Editura Științifică și Enciclopedică.
- Park, E. Robert (1925): The City: Suggestion for the Investigation of Human Behavior in the Urban Environment In. *The City*, R. Park – E. Burgess – R. McKenye eds., Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Park, Robert E (1926): „The Urban Community, as a Spatial Pattern and a Moral Order” In. *The Urban Community*, ed. Ernest W. Burgess, Chicago: Chicago University Press, p. 21-31.
- Pasti, Vladimir – Miroiu, Mihaela – Codiță Cornel (1997): *România – Starea de fapt Vol I. Societatea*, București: Nemira.
- Pásztor Gyöngyi (2003): „Slumosodás és elszegényedési folyamatok Kolozsváron” In *Erdélyi Társadalom* 1 p. 51-66,
- Pásztor Gyöngyi (2004): „Un caz de segregare locativă: Clujul anilor 90”, *Studia Sociologia* 49 p. 75-94.
- Pásztor Gyöngyi (2004b): „Monostor(ok)-kép(ei), Monostor(ok)-tudat(ai). Kolozsvár egyik lakótelepének mentális tér-képeről” (Imagini și identități Mănășturene. Hărțile mentale ale unui cartier Clujean) In *WEB* 13 p. 17-24
- Pásztor Gyöngyi (2006): *Városszociológia. Elméletek és problémák*, Cluj: Editura Universitară Clujeană

- Pásztor Gyöngyi (2006): „Pauperizare și în zona intermediară a Clujului” In. *România Socială. Drumul Schimbării și al integrării Europene* vol II. Petru Iluț, Traian Rotariu, Laura Nistor eds., Cluj: Editura Eikon.
- Pásztor Gyöngyi (2007): „Structură urbană” In. *Enciclopedia dezvoltării sociale*, Cătătil Zamfir – Simona Stănescu coord, Iași: Polirom.
- Pásztor Gyöngyi - Péter László (2007): „Inegalități de locuire” „Ghetou și ghetoizare” „Segregare socială și spațială” In. *Enciclopedia dezvoltării sociale*, Cătătil Zamfir – Simona Stănescu coord, Iași: Polirom.
- Péter László (2003) „Elszegényedés és szegregálódás egy ipari kisvárosban” In *WEB* 2003(11) p. 21-28
- Péter László (2006) *Vázlatok a szegénység szociológiájához*. Kolozsvár: Kolozsvári Egyetemi Kiadó
- Péter László (2007): „Impoverishment and the Rise of New Urban Poor in Romania: Coping with Poverty”. In *Studia Sociologica Babes-Bolyai*, LII (1), p. 79-107
- Pillich László (1985): *Városom évgyűrii*, Kolozsvár: Kritetion Könyvkiadó.
- Piven, Francis Fox – Cloward, Richard A. (2000): *Why Americans Still Don't Vote: And Why Politicians Want it That Way*, New York: Beakon.
- Planwerk (2003): „Mănăstur – Orientare în masă” In. *Idea* 15-16 p. 160-165.
- Polányi, Karl (1966): *Primitive, Archaic, and Modern Economics: Essays of Karl Polanyi* eds. Dalton, George, Boston: Beacon Press.
- Rex, John A. (1968): “The Sociology of a Zone of Transition” In. *Readings in Urban Sociology* ed. Ray Pahl, London: Pergamon Press, p. 211-231.
- Riesman, Leonard (1966): *The Urban Process*, New York: Free Press of Glencoe.
- Rotariu, Traian – Mezei Elemér (1999) „Asupra unor aspecte ale migrației interne recente din România.” In: *Sociologie Românească* serie nouă 3. p. 5–38.
- Ronas, Per (1984): *Urbanisation in Romania*, Stockholm

- Rosas, Rocio Enriques (2001): Social Networks and Urban Poverty In. *Development and Society* 30/2 p. 41-56
- Sandu, Dumitru (1987): *Fluxurile de migrație în România* București: Editura Academiei RSR.
- Sandu, Dumitru (2005): „Comunitatile de Romi din Romania”,
[http://www.anr.gov.ro/docs/statistici/PROROMI Comunitatile de Romi din Romania 18 7.pdf](http://www.anr.gov.ro/docs/statistici/PROROMI_Comunitatile_de_Romi_din_Romania_18_7.pdf)
- Salvanu, Marioară – Keszi-Harmath Sándor (1980): „Város és városiasodás” In *Ember, város, környezet* Cluj-Napoca: Korunk.
- Șerbu, G. R. (1962): „Structura economică și socială a populației localităților asimilate mediului urban din R .P. R.” *Revista de statistică*. XI, Nr. 1.
- Satterthwaite, David (1995): “The under-estimation and misrepresentation of urban poverty” In. IIED Urban poverty: Characteristics, causes and consequences. *Environment and urbanization*, Vol 7 No 1.
- Shevky, Eshref – Bell, Wendell (1955): Social area analysis In. *Stanford Sociological Series*, No 1, Stanford University Press.
- Simmel, Georg (1950): The Metropolis and Mental Life In K. Wolf ed. *The Sociology of Georg Simmel*, New York: Free Press.
- Shipler, David, K.(2005): *The Working Poor*, New York: Rusell Sage Foundation Vintage Books.
- Sjoberg, Gideon (1973): A preindusztriális város (Orașul preindustrial) In. *Városshociológia* ed Szelényi I., Budapesta: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó, p. 108-122.
- Stănculescu, Manuela Sofia – Berevoiescu, Ionica coord (2004): *Sărac lipit, caut altă viață*, Nemira, București.
- Stricker, Alex – Yinger, John (1998): “Do Real Estate Brokers Choose to Discriminate? Evidence from the 1989 Housing Discrimination Study,” *Southern Economic Journal* Vol 64: 880–901.

- Szirmai Viktória (1996): „Közép-európai új városok az átmenetben” (Orașe noi est-europene în tranziție) *Szociológia Szemle* 1996/3-4
- Szelényi Iván (1973): Bevezető tanulmány (Studiu introductiv) In. Szelényi Iván ed., *Városshociológia (Sociologie urbană)*, Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó, Budapest, p. 7-40,
- Szelényi Iván (1990): *Városi társadalmi egyenlőtlenségek (Inegalități sociale urbane)*, Budapest: Akadémiai Kiadó
- Szelényi Iván – Kostello, Eric (1998): “Outline of an institutionalist theory of inequality: The case of socialist and postcommunist Eastern Europe.” In. *The New Institutionalism in Sociology* eds. Mary C. Brinton – Victor Nee, The Russell Sage Foundation, New York, pp. 305-326
- Szelényi Iván (1996): „Cities under Socialism – and After” In. *Cities after Socialism. Urban and Regional Change and Conflict in Post-Socialist Societies*, ed. Gregory Andrusz – M. Harloe – Szelényi Iván, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers, p. 286-317
- Thernstrom, S. – Thernstrom, A. (1997): *America in Black and White: One Nation, Invisible*, New York: Simon and Schuster
- Townsend, Peter (1984): *Why are Many Poor*, Fabian Tract 500 (Fabian Society)
- Thrasher, Frederic M. (1963): *The Gang. A study of 1313 Gangs in Chicago*, Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Trebici, Vasile – Hristache, Ion (1986): *Demografia teritorială a României* Ed. Academiei, București
- Troc, Gabriel (2003): „A tömbházak mögött” avagy a munkásnegyedek jelenlegi állapotáról („După blocuri” sau despre starea actuală a cartierelor muncitorești) In. *WEB* 2003/11.
- Turner, Margery A. - Fortuny, Karina (2009): *Residential Segregation and Low-Income Working Families*, Urban Institute, Washington, DC.
- Varga E. Árpád (1994): „Városodás, vándorlás, nemzetiség” (Urbanizare, migrație și etnicitate) In *Erdélyi Szemle* 1994/5-6. pp.156-197.

- Vécsei Károly (1993): A migráció és urbanizáció egyes vonatkozásai Romániában (Unele aspecte ale migrației și urbanizării în România) In. *A Központi Statisztikai Hivatal Népeségtudományi Intézetének történeti demográfiai füzetek* 12. sz. Budapesta
- Weber, Max (1967): *Állam, politika, tudomány (Stat, politică, știință)*. Budapesta: Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó.
- Wilson, William J. (1987): *The Truly Disadvantaged: The Inner City, the Underclass, and Public Policy*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Wilson, William J. (1996): *When Work Disappears: The World of the New Urban Poor*. New York: Random House.
- Wilson, William J. (2010): Why Both Social Structure and Culture Matter in a Holistic Analysis of Inner-City Poverty In. *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* Vol 629 No 1 p. 200-219.
- Wirth, Louis (1973): Az urbanizmus mint életmód (Urbanismul ca mod de viață) In. Szelényi Iván ed. *Városszociológia (Sociologie urbană)*, Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó, Budapesta, p. 41-63.
- Wratten, E. (1995): „Conceptualising urban poverty”, in IIED, 1995, ‘Urban poverty: characteristics, causes and consequences’ In *Environment and Urbanization*, Vol 7 No 1.
- Yinger, John M. (1995): *Closed Doors, Opportunity Lost: The Continuing Costs of Housing Discrimination*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation
- Zamfir, Elena (1995): „Sărăcia: teorii și factori”, în Zamfir C. - Zamfir E. (coord.), *Politici sociale. România în context European*, Editura Alternative, București.
- Zamfir, Cătălin (2001): „Situția sărăciei în România, dimensiuni, surse, grupuri de risc”, In. *România Socială* 2001/2, pp. 44-62
- Zoloth, Barbara S. (1976): Alternative measures of school segregation In. *Land Economics*, vol 52, p. 278–298.
- Vacquant, Loic (2001): *Os Condenados da Cidade*, Rio de Janeiro: Revan.
- Vencatesh, Sudir (2009): *Gang Leader for a Day*, New York: Penguin Books Limited.

Weitzer, Ronald (2009): Sociology of SexWork In. *Annual Review of Sociology* No 35. 35, p. 213–234.

White, William Foot (1999): *Utcasarki társadalom. Egy olasz szegénynegyed társadalomszerkezete*, Budapest: Új Mandátum.

Willis, Paul (2000): *A skacok*, Budapest: Új Mandátum.

Wirth, Louis (1973): „Az urbanizmus mint életmód” (Urbanismul ca mod de viață) In. *Városszociológia (Sociologie urbană)* ed. Szelényi Iván, Közgazdasági és Jogi Könyvkiadó, Budapest, pp. 41-63.