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The diverse economies of housing:

patterns of inequalities in Romanian suburbia

✓ Explore the links between housing and socioeconomic stratification
✓ Explain patterns of (dis)advantage in housing consumption

Theoretical framework:
The ‘diverse economies’ cake

- Polanyi, 1957
- Schneider, 2015 ✓ 10-70%
- Cameron and Gibson-Graham, 2003 ✓ Ontological programme
The ‘diverse economies’ cake

CAPITALIST ECONOMY
- The private firm
- Wage, bonuses...
- Private property
- Banks, etc
The ‘diverse economies’ cake

- **CAPITALIST ECONOMY**
- **ALTERNATIVE CAPITALIST**
  - State-owned, non-profit, private
  - Wage, bribes, barter, alternative currency

© Hazel Henderson 1982
The ‘diverse economies’ cake

CAPITALIST ECONOMY

ALTERNATIVE CAPITALIST

NON CAPITALIST
- Cooperative, charity, slave
- Unpaid
- Sharing, gifting, picking, DIY, sweat-equity, theft

© Hazel Henderson 1982
The ‘diverse economies’ cake

CAPITALIST ECONOMY

ALTERNATIVE CAPITALIST

NON CAPITALIST

ANTI CAPITALIST

- The command economy
Provision by diverse economies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Period</th>
<th>Rural Society</th>
<th>Communist Period</th>
<th>Post-communist Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pre-1945</td>
<td>80% HO</td>
<td>70-90% self-build</td>
<td>80-95% state build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1946-70</td>
<td>65% HO</td>
<td>95% self-developed</td>
<td>95% self-developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971-90</td>
<td>80-95% state build</td>
<td>95% self-developed</td>
<td>95% self-developed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>For profit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001-11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land reforms, Self-build, Privatization, For profit.
### Provision by diverse economies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-room</th>
<th>2-rooms</th>
<th>3-rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>€44,400</strong></td>
<td>38m²</td>
<td><strong>€56,400</strong></td>
<td><strong>€70,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>€46,500</strong></td>
<td>31m²</td>
<td><strong>€56,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>€84,700</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNIST**

**CAPITALIST**
## Provision by diverse economies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1-room</th>
<th>2-rooms</th>
<th>3-rooms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Old</strong></td>
<td>€44,400</td>
<td>€56,400</td>
<td>€70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>New</strong></td>
<td>€46,500</td>
<td>€56,200</td>
<td>€84,700</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>( m^2 )</th>
<th></th>
<th>( m^2 )</th>
<th></th>
<th>( m^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-room</strong></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-rooms</strong></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-rooms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**COMMUNIST**

**CAPITALIST**
Provision by diverse economies

**SELF-BUILD (non capitalist)**

- €120,000
- €38,500
- €47,000

**SELF-DEVELOPED (alternative capitalist)**

- €329,000
- €210,000
- €89,900
The affordability of everyday life and diverse economies

- Income from wage, remittances, gifts, sharing (overcrowding), imputed rent, tax evasion, bribery, family care, borrowed tools (Pavlovskaya, 2004)

No data:
- **Limitation 1**: EUROSTAT SILC has questions but not answers on informal income
- **Limitation 2**: No construction period
Descriptive analysis

Aim 1: mapping residents’ socioeconomic profiles by relevant housing types

Differently intertwined diverse economies:

- Urban flats
- Rural flats
- Urban houses
- Rural houses with inside water
- Rural houses with no inside water

EUROSTAT SILC: Trends 2007 and 2016

- Income quintiles, employment status, education, age, household type
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% total stock</th>
<th>Fast polarization</th>
<th>Extreme disadvantage</th>
<th>Residualisation</th>
<th>Persistent advantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Houses</td>
<td>Flats</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Urban R with water</td>
<td>Rural R no water</td>
<td>Urban Rural</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% total stock</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Aim2: Explain trends in (dis)advantageous modes of occupancy by housing types

MODES OF OCCUPANCY

- Housing cost overburden
- Overcrowding
- Under-occupation

- We have just developed our statistical models (multinominal logistic regressions) and now focus on interpreting the results.


