

Article

Not peer-reviewed version

Social Work Practice with Beggars and Vagrants in Romania. Lessons from the Past for a Better Future

[Cristina Ilie](#)*, [Ionut Serban](#), [Adrian Nicolae Dan](#)

Posted Date: 14 April 2024

doi: 10.20944/preprints202404.0831.v1

Keywords: social work; beggars; vagrants; Romania; good practices; sociological survey



Preprints.org is a free multidiscipline platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Article

Social Work Practice with Beggars and Vagrants in ROMANIA. Lessons from the Past for a Better Future

Cristina Ilie ^{1,*}, Ionut Șerban ² and Adrian Nicolae Dan ²

¹ University of Craiova, Romania

² University of Craiova, Romania

* Correspondence: cristin_il@yahoo.com; Tel.: +0040766291455

Abstract: Social support in working with beggars and vagrants has always been and still is a challenge for all social protection systems. This paper aims to analyze the social work system in working with vagrants and beggars, starting with the presentation of the concept and seeking to evaluate the evolution of this particular sector of the social protection system in Romania, presenting, on one hand, the legislative changes and, also, the situation found in reality which could be (slightly) different. In the paper we describe two research models, a case study, which starts from the situation found in Romania and is based on the model of good practice (social enterprises) developed by Nicolae Minovici in the interwar period (1934) and also presents the opinion of citizens from Craiova city, investigated during a sociological survey conducted in 2021-2022 on a sample of 1494 persons, on the opportunity to set up such centers for beggars and vagrants in Romania. The article seeks to extract the good practices used by the national system for the purpose of comparing and issuing proposals to regulate and improve the current situation in Romania.

Keywords: social work; beggars; vagrants; Romania; good practices; sociological survey

1. Introduction

Analyzing the specific literature, we can delimit three notions, which are often used to designate people who end up practicing begging: "the beggar", "the vagrant" and "homeless person".

The "beggar" is "the person who asks for alms" [1] "to procure the necessities of life" [2]. The same sense but adding also the "poor" attribute is found in the Cambridge dictionary: "a poor person who lives by asking others for money or food" [3]

While the Explanatory Dictionary of the Romanian Language, define the "vagrant" as the person "who wanders aimlessly on the roads, who wanders aimlessly" or "a man without a stable occupation, without a fixed abode" [1], the Cambridge dictionary adds as well the "poverty" dimension: "a person who is poor, does not have a home or job, and moves from place to place" [3].

In Henri Pieron's "Vocabulary of Psychology", vagrancy is framed in the typologies of the beggar, thus, the vagabond is seen as "a type of beggar, homeless, without a job and without means of subsistence" [4] (p. 369).

"Homeless" or a "person without a shelter" [1] is considered that "person who does not have normal legal access to adequate personal housing, both for dependent reasons and independent of his will, who does not have a fixed / stable home and who are in need and looking for a permanent home" [5]. "Homeless are considered all those who are unable to keep, maintain and live in adequate housing from their own resources and those unable to have a personal home without the help of the local community" [6] (p. 72), [5] (p. 420).

Even if *de jure* these vagrants / beggars / homeless are citizens with full rights, *de facto* they are, in most cases, "problematic ghosts" for local authorities, people whose rights are neglected or even violated frequently. As Bregman (2021) [7] points out, "A <homeless vagrant> [is] a man without name, family or history who, if he dies in the street, is not even entitled to a Christian burial."

We can consider the "vagrant" as including both the concept of "homeless" and that of "beggar".

Mitrofan and Badea, develop the idea that it is difficult to define this population, due to the major differences. There are differences in age, health (they are healthy individuals and physically or mentally ill persons), professional status (professionally qualified and unskilled) and the differences can continue [8] (pp. 13- 18). Badea and Constantin (2002) [9], identify the portrait of the vagabond as being outlined by various theories, like the theory of social competition, the theory of psycho-social vulnerability and desocialization syndrome.

The theory of social competition roots in Ch. Cooley's theory (1894) [10], and in its essence underlines that the competition is neither good, nor bad, but the conditions (proper / improper) make the difference. For homeless the competition is unfair, they are always among the losers due to their lack of power and capabilities to compete even for access to basic resources [11]. The theory of psycho-social vulnerability explains the circumstances and consecutive behavior of vagrants and beggars, seeking "to transform the poverty dialogue from the consideration of factors that lead to homelessness to the common needs of all people. Vulnerability is a characteristic of human existence that carries with it the imminent or ever-present possibility of harm, injury, and misfortune" [12]. The theory of desocialization underline the fact that people living in the street (like homeless/ vagrants / beggars) have lost their social relations and have little or no institutional support [13,14] .

On the other hand, Ocobock [15] (p. 1) identifies a series of terms, used in the literature, to analyze the same social category of poor, unemployed and highly mobile people, thus: "beggars, vagrants, vagabonds, tramps, bums, mendicants, idlers, indigents, itinerants, the underclass, and the homeless".

Vexliard [16], sees the vagabond as an adult who does not adapt to the norms of social life, presenting a kind of desocialization, either as a result of circumstances or as a result of his special character.

Currently, in English the most commonly used terms to refer to the poor are "beggars" and "vagrants". But the term "vagrants" in the seventeenth century referred to the "marginalised group: they were overwhelmingly illiterate and politically powerless" [17] (p. 3). In that century, "the most commonly used words were: beggar, rogue, vagabond and vagrant" [17] (p. 5).

For Vexliard, in the modern and contemporary era, the condition of obtaining a legal income by a salaried job has become the main source of vagrancy, the individual becoming the victim of cold and impersonal economic (capitalist) forces and so on. The transition from a predominantly agrarian society to an industrial society leads to the exclusion of a significant percentage of its members, producing poverty and automatically vagrancy and begging [16]. Industrialization also leads to a massive migration in the urban environment, producing rural uprooting [18] all over the (modern) world, from South Africa [19] to China [20]. With the technological development, automatization and reduction of jobs, the affected people being unemployed and being deprived of material means, they end up wandering and begging. Also, capitalism produces extreme poverty and increasingly favors begging [21,22]. We cannot exclude vagrancy even in states with a socialist system, because this phenomenon is not strictly economic, although a lower percentage can be speculated due to the low unemployment rate and drastic sanctions for deviant behaviors [23,24].

Rajendra Kumar Sharma identifies ten categories of beggars, as follows: religious beggars; pseudo-religious beggars; tribal beggars; able-bodied beggars; invalid beggars; physically-handicapped beggars; mentally unsound beggars; child beggars; professional beggars; part-time beggars [25] (pp. 93-94). (Sharma, 1998: 93-94).

In Romania, there are no solid and current data on the number of beggars, but as this phenomenon is closely related to rooflessness, we can get an idea by outlining the situation of homeless people. Data on the number of adult homeless / roofless are few [26] and controversial, research shows that there are around 14-15,000 roofless [27,28], but there are also outliers (165,000) resulting from a wrong interpretation of the data and categories included in the Population and Housing Census - RPL 2011 [29] "people registered in collective living spaces or are homeless". "The National Strategy regarding the Social Inclusion of Homeless People for the period 2022-2027" [26] emphasizes the fact that the RPL 2011 indicated a number of 1524 roofless, a value much lower than the estimates of local public authorities (165,000 homeless). We notice that the authorities do not

distinguish between roofless and homeless (see ETHOS typology developed by FEANTSA) [30]. Poverty and social exclusion are 2 of the factors that generate phenomena such as begging and rooflessness. According to INSSE data, in 2022 one in 5 Romanians (21.2%) was below the poverty line, and one person in four (24.3%) was affected by severe material and social deprivation [31]. The same study shows that "the rate of risk of poverty or social exclusion" (AROPE) was 34.4%, in 2022, corresponding to a number of 6.5 million people". In terms of the relative poverty rate (AROP) in the EU-28, Romania ranks 25th with 21.2%, the EU-28 average being 16.5% [31].

2. Materials and Methods

In this paper we used two research methods: a) a case study describing social work practice with beggars and vagrants in Romania, which is based on the model of good practice in this field developed by Nicolae Minovici and b) a sociological survey, which presents the opinions of Romanians on the opportunity to set up social enterprises for vagrants and beggars.

2.1. Background for Methodology

2.1.1. A Case Study: Social Work Practice with Beggars and Vagrants in Romania

The model of good practice in the field of social work with beggars and vagrants implemented in Romania by doctor Nicolae Minovici

At the beginning of the twentieth century, due to transition from a traditional agrarian to an industrial society, Romania encountered massive waves of people hit by poverty and subjected to the phenomenon of vagrancy and begging. Thus, around 1900-1910, Bucharest had the appearance of a city in the East, both in terms of architecture and especially because of the people who populate it. "You could not cross the street because of the crowds of vagrants and beggars, who were begging every moment; especially in the feast days, they pulled you by the clothes, threatening to smear and tearing your clothes. There was in Bucharest, at that time, one of these nests of vagabonds which we sometimes meet the description in the literature of the Middle Ages. The authorities afraid of this situation, have decided to put an end" [32] (pp. 247-248).

Thus, the City Hall and the Prefecture empowered the forensic doctor Nicolae Minovici to take measures to combat vagrancy.

Minovici started working in the field of social work with beggars and vagrants, based on a principle "recommended by scientists": assistance through work. Simpler, everyone who can work: should work. These criteria determined Minovici to divide the people which required assistance in three categories:

1. "the elderly, to whom society has to offer its support, pursuant to work they performed to the state during their youth
2. the children, minors that the state must assist, considering the work that they will be able to perform in the future, always in favor of the state
3. the disabled people who, especially, are not working, crowding the streets as beggars and vagabonds, who henceforth will win their existence not by public mercy, but as a result of their own capital, namely, by working" [32] (p. 249).

Minovici founded an Office for social work with beggars in 1902.

In his work, Minovici was supported by local authorities by providing asylums, accommodation rooms, places for work and also benefited from police support. Also, he had the support of the public, who welcomed with sympathy his work. To all those who gave their adherence to their work of assistance, were offered a badge. They fixed the badge in front of the house members, near the bell. It was enough that the beggars, who could still escape the vigilance of the guardians, to see this plate to depart at once, knowing that there lived a member of the assistance.

For the accomplishment of the program based on these principles, Minovici deployed this activity for a period of five years. The harvest was rich: 13.000 beggars and vagabonds were picked up from the streets of Bucharest. Of the beginning of their separation, a simple observation was made,

that their majority was uprooted from the province. It was the attraction has always exercised the big cities on the rural population.

By checking out the claimed "disabled" condition of the beggars, Minovici and his team were surprised by the large number of impostors (pretending to be disabled).

After the "sorting" process, they have hospitalized the elderly in asylums granted by the local authorities.

The identified healthy people have formed a workforce colony targeting economic sectors like agriculture, gardening, poultry breeding etc. The results have been extraordinary, because after three months, there are no traces of beggars left in the farm. All beggars went to Minovici and said: "Sir, give me permission to leave, I prefer rather to work home for myself and for my family, than in your farm" [32] (p. 250). To obtain the permission to leave the colony, they took the commitment not to beg. The colony was established in Băneasa (at the edge of Bucharest city).

For all material aids and the volunteer contributions that were offered by different citizens, directly to the social work office that Nicolae Minovici founded, they send the protected persons for cleaning, cutting wood and other housework and when they could not offer such services, they send to the contributors' products from the farm: chickens, eggs etc. [32].

The material success has allowed them not only to provide assistance to their residents, but with the surplus they settled on the Kisseleff street, 62 benches for public disposal, six metal fountains, a metal stand with a painted map. They also distributed and placed in different spaces and public institutions, garbage baskets with labels of the social work office [32] (p. 251).

When sorting of this population of vagrants, Minovici came across a large number of abandoned children, not knowing the homes of their birth, nor their parents or their relatives. These poor street children did not have any education or, worst, had the criminal education from the street.

The observation identified as a result of a systematic study of the physical and mental state of the vergant-children have helped Minovici to determine their abilities in relation to professional work. As a effect to that, they have been separated various groups: drivers, cooks, restaurant boys, gardeners, boys for cleaning the shop windows etc.

Minovici settled for the children a school and boarding school with dormitories and special refectories.

Despite the fact that a large number of the children had been sentenced seven or eight times before, they no longer committed any offense, as long as they remained under their assistance. Minovici said: "You could see very well, how they knew to appreciate the situation of having a small house, for themselves, who previously slept on the paving stones, in gardens and under the bitumen boilers".

Five years on a road, Minovici and his team took an intense fight against this scourge and looking at the newspapers at the time we could say that Bucharest was one of the first cities in Europe, that has made great progress in this regard. There were no more traces of beggars in the streets, so crowded once by their cohorts.

The problem was that after these years of hard work, Minovici had to withdraw, because the authorities, released for that moment by the tedious burden, thanks to the Social Work Office for Beggars and Vagrants activity, have not given the expected support, despite that they appreciated the work completed by the Office, and worse, they did not continue to apply the measures that Minovici carried out. It was not long until the evil has returned: beggars, quickly learning that Minovici was no longer responsible of controlling this area, invaded again the capital [32] (p. 251).

In exchange, it was created the Ministry of Labour and Social Protection, with numerous staff members. It was also made a special law on social protection etc; but as to the effectiveness of all this, it seems that the results were not the expected ones [32].

2.1.2. Begging and Vagrancy from the Communist Period to the Current Situation in Romania

The communist regime spread in Romania from 1945, with a supremacy that lasted from 1947 until 1989. Communism, aimed a radically transformation of the entire society [33] (p. 142). The economy was focused on industrial development, through which, according to the strategy and

official policy of the time, with some different accents or nuances from one stage to another, the aim was to transform Romania into an industrial-agrarian state [34]. The nationalization of industrial and financial means of production took place between 1948-1952. From 1949 to 1962 the communists laid the foundations and implemented the process of collectivization of agriculture with the stated purpose of modernizing Romanian agriculture and introducing socialist structures to villages, thus transferring agricultural land to state ownership [34] (p. 425). This process affected the entire rural population of Romania, which in 1948 represented in fact the majority of the country's population, approximately 12,000,000 inhabitants out of a total of 16,000,000 [35] (p. 14). During the communist period, people were forced to work, the state taking care of employment, so we are witnessing the reduction of begging and vagrancy. Even in the Constitution of 1948, art. 12 specifies: "Labor is the basic factor of the economic life of the State. It is the duty of every citizen..." [36].

Moreover, on April 11, 1970, a Decree was issued sanctioning all those who did not respect the rules of social coexistence, public order and peace, or evaded the "citizen's duty" to work. Parasitic life was associated with vagrancy, begging, prostitution, unemployment, hooliganism, vandalism etc. Social parasitism was sanctioned with a misdemeanor imprisonment from one to six months or with a fine. In reality, they wanted to identify and punish all those who refused for various reasons to join the general effort to build a socialist society after completing their studies. This was also the reason why, since November 1976, two other laws required the registration of all persons fit to work in the records of work directions. The tightening of labor legislation has been directly linked to the economic crisis [37], the slippage in industry and the regime's need to use all human resources to carry out its economic plans. The society was urged to mobilize for setting up special teams to identify social parasites. Thus, campaigns were launched against "lazy people" and "vagrants" [38]. The persons who were not employed, being forced to earn their living through occupations considered illegal, were included in the article of law "vagrants" and sentenced to work, or sent there administratively, without trial [34] (p. 566).

With the fall of communism, the democratic regime was established in Romania. A decade of instability and economic decline followed, as a result of a vicious administration, and now Romania's economy has become relatively stable, although it faces a number of serious problems such as: low wages, non-taxation of almost half of the population living in the rural areas, high tax evasion and an increased number of socially assisted people, people who face severe poverty and are at increased risk of social exclusion [39,40]. Thus, the phenomenon of begging and vagrancy expanded, finding us once again in the presence of a structural vagrancy, this time determined by capitalism.

The Criminal Code of 1968, both in the original version and in the republished versions from 1973 and 1997, maintained the crimes of vagrancy and begging [41]. The 2004 Criminal Code, maintains the crime of begging and eliminates the crime of vagrancy [42]. Only the Criminal Code of 2009, eliminated the two crimes [43]. Currently, begging is a misdemeanor and is defined by Law No. 61 of 1991 for sanctioning violations of rules of social coexistence, public order and peace (republished), as follows: "repeatedly appealing to mercy the public, by a person fit for work, as well as the determination of a person to commit such deeds" (art. 2), and this can be punished with a fine from 100 to 500 lei [44].

However, the current Romanian Criminal Code punishes other acts related to the phenomenon of begging, such as "exploitation of begging" (art. 214). Also, article 215 refers to "the use of a minor for the purpose of begging" and article 216, regulates "the use of the services of an exploited person" [43].

In the Social work Law of Romania, no. 292/2011, we find defined homeless persons, as representing "a social category formed by single persons or families who, for singular or cumulative reasons of social, medical, financial, economic, legal or due to force majeure situations, live in street, temporarily living with friends or acquaintances, are unable to support a rental property or are at risk of eviction, are in institutions or penitentiaries from which they are to be discharged within 2 months, respectively released and have no domicile or residence" (art. 6) [45].

In Romania access to housing is seen as a fundamental human right, being mentioned in the Constitution, but this is only in theory, "at political discursive level but, not in practice" [46]. So, "every

form of denial of this right seriously harm the people confronting homelessness, leading to marginalization and social exclusion" [46] (p. 25).

In our country, "the social work benefits for preventing and combating poverty and the risk of social exclusion are intended to ensure the minimum financial means necessary for daily living, as well as supplementing the income or means of the person or family who do not have the necessary resources to meet a minimum standard of living and is based on livelihood testing. The main form of support for preventing and combating poverty and the risk of social exclusion is the minimum insertion income" [45] (art. 55). Social work benefits "for preventing and combating poverty and the risk of social exclusion are granted for certain periods of time or for specific situations" [45] (art. 11).

Social services "addressed to homeless people, aim at providing accommodation for a determined period, associated with the provision of counseling services and social reintegration or reintegration, in accordance with the identified individual needs" [45] (art. 57). "The local public administration authorities have the responsibility for setting up, organizing and administering social services for the homeless. For street children, for the elderly alone or without children and people with disabilities living on the street, the local public administration authorities have the obligation to set up in their territorial area adequate social services adapted to their needs. For people living on the streets, the local public administration authorities have the obligation to organize emergency shelters during the winter" [45] (art. 58).

2.2. Study Design, Setting and Participants: A sociological survey on combating begging and vagrancy in Craiova

The empirical research, related to the present study, is a sociological survey, using the questionnaire technique and the sampling by rates (age category and gender). Because the begging and vagrancy (associated with homelessness, but not only) phenomena are mainly found in cities in Romania [27], we have chosen to make a quantitative research only among urban residents. We have constructed the sample, by selecting a number of 1294 inhabitants of Craiova city, aged over 15 years (598 men and 696 women), out of a total of 258.919 people from Craiova over 15 years old (119.677 men and 139.242 women).

By the sample of 1294 persons, we have made a percentage of investigation of 0.5%. Sampling was calculated for a probability of 99% and a margin of error of +/- 3.6%

Data collection was carried out by questionnaires administered on-line in the period November, 2021 - February, 2022.

The Questionnaires applied was distributed as follows (Table 1):

Table 1. The sampling rates based on the age and the gender (Craiova city).

Age groups	Gender	Number of persons	Sample
Total	Total	258919	1294
	Male	119677	598
	Female	139242	696
15-19	Total	12700	63
	Male	6533	32
	Female	6167	31
20-24	Total	13161	66
	Male	6562	33
	Female	6599	33
25-29	Total	16310	81
	Male	7679	38
	Female	8631	43
30-34	Total	24572	123

	Male	11750	59
	Female	12822	64
	Total	25550	128
35-39	Male	12375	62
	Female	13175	66
	Total	26886	134
40-44	Male	13022	65
	Female	13864	69
	Total	23308	117
45-49	Male	10982	55
	Female	12326	62
	Total	26052	130
50-54	Male	11809	59
	Female	14243	71
	Total	18605	93
55-59	Male	8196	41
	Female	10409	52
	Total	21925	110
60-64	Male	9910	50
	Female	12015	60
	Total	18828	94
65-69	Male	8391	42
	Female	10437	52
	Total	13345	67
70-74	Male	5817	29
	Female	7528	38
	Total	7324	37
75-79	Male	2900	15
	Female	4424	22
	Total	6319	31
80-84	Male	2356	11
	Female	3963	20
	Total	4034	20
More than 85	Male	1395	7
	Female	2639	13

The hypothesis from which we started is that in Craiova there are enough homeless people and beggars to cause a state of concern or even fear to the citizens.

Another hypothesis formulated was that the respondents consider that it would be opportune to set up social enterprises that aim at the integration of homeless people.

2.3. Survey Instrument

In the next section we will present the main results of the quantitative research. the applied questionnaire included 20 questions, 15 content questions and 5 identification questions (open, closed and mixed questions), but in this material we have chosen to present the results of 8 of the questions.

But, before we present the results, we need to make some mentions. The revolutions in Central and Eastern Europe (1989-1990) brought not only freedom and democracy, but also generated massive phenomena of social disorganization, diminishing social control, massive social and economic polarization, entire social groups being exposed to the economic hazard generated by an uncontrolled economy and inadequate social protection. A study conducted in Poland [47] regarding the phenomenon of begging shows that "the dynamics of the phenomenon of begging in modern Poland is characterized not only by the increase of its scale, but also by the great diversity of the begging population itself." We can firmly state that Romania and the other former socialist countries in Central and Eastern Europe have recorded dynamics similar to those of Poland. Król (citing L. Stankiewicz, 2002) identifies 6 categories of people exposed to the phenomenon of begging and causing concern for citizens: a) working poor (have a permanent source of income, but below the poverty line); b) unemployed poor and c) poor pensioners (whose ratio income/ basic expenses place them also under the poverty line); d) poor pathologists (addicted to alcohol, drugs and others) have small chances of getting out of their situation, facing the risk of extreme poverty; e) poor homeless people and f) poor disabled and chronically ill [47] (p. 55).

Q.1: Do you think begging is a worrying phenomenon in your city?

A percent of 85% of the respondents consider that begging is a worrying phenomenon in their city while 9% do not consider it to be worrying, and 6% cannot appreciate the seriousness of the phenomenon. The phenomenon of begging is relatively visible in Craiova, every year the police fines for begging approximate 200 people [48]. The phenomenon becomes problematic from the perspective of citizens, because as studies show, beggars spend most of their time in crowded public places, such as the city center, metro or bus stations, in front of churches, in intersections, in front of restaurants or in supermarket parking lots, thus being very visible to the population [47].

Q.2: Do you find the number of homeless people you see in the city worrying?

A percent of 92% of respondents consider the number of homeless people to be worrying, while 6% do not consider it worrying and 2% cannot assess the seriousness of the situation. The phenomenon of homeless people is also visible in Craiova, approximately 150 people annually benefit from the services of the centers for homeless people in Craiova [49–52].

Q.3: Why are you most afraid when approached by a beggar or a homeless person?

When asked about the fears they have when approached by a beggar or a homeless person, 53% said they fear verbal aggression, 19% physical aggression, 14% said they have a feeling of pity and 10% said they are not afraid.

In fact, such fears of citizens in relation to beggars and homeless people are exposed in many articles and books. For instance, Kelly S. Johnson explains in detail in the book "The Fear of Beggars: Stewardship and Poverty in Christian Ethics" the fears that surround us when we come into contact with beggars, as follows: "fear of poverty, fear of conflict or that the beggars might turn violent, fear that neither giving nor refusing will be morally satisfactory, fear that behind one beggar stand a thousand others, fear that any one of us can be a beggar some day, we fear that if we give in to the insistence of a beggar, other needs may appear or other people in need who want to be helped and thus we immerse ourselves in their requests, we fear the entanglements of gratitude" [53] (pp. 5-6).

Q.4: Do you think that the activity of the centers where homeless people are accommodated is enough to solve the problem?

A percent of 77% of Craiova residents consider that the activity of the centers that deal only with the accommodation of homeless people is not enough, and 15% consider it sufficient to solve this social problem. The respondents' impression of the insufficient activity carried out by the centers that deal with the problems of homeless people comes largely from the fact that people still see homeless people on the streets, which led them to this conclusion.

In fact, in Craiova there is only one center whose sole purpose is the accommodation and care of homeless people, with the possibility of these people being housed temporarily in other types of centers. Thus, in Craiova we operate the Emergency Social Center for the Homeless "St. Vasile", which has a capacity of 52 places and provides homeless people from the municipality of Craiova with accommodation services in a residential system and meal service (3 meals/day) and support

specialized for social reintegration, such as medical assistance, counseling for social, professional, psychological, family, spiritual integration; counseling for social, professional, psychological, family, spiritual integration; accompaniment in order to obtain documents and identity documents or civil status, support for finding a job, a home, access to professional training/retraining courses, etc [50].

Q. 5: Do you consider that an establishment of social enterprise, in which to accommodate the homeless and sent them to perform various paid activities/services, would be functional?

92% of the respondents considered that it would be useful, a center created in the form of a social enterprise, in which the homeless people to be accommodated and to perform paid activities in the city, in the form of providing services. 3% did not consider such an investment opportune.

Simion Teasdale (2010) mentioned in his article "Models of social enterprise in the homelessness field", several models of social enterprises developed worldwide, which seem to work. Among these models we find elements of the Minovici model in Romania, such as the development of the principle of social reintegration through work [54].

Q.6: What types of lucrative activities do you think would be suitable for such a social enterprise?

For this kind of social enterprise 73% of the respondents considered cleaning activities to be suitable, 15% said construction activities and 7% mentioned other activities, in fields such as cooking, tailoring, agriculture etc.

In Tesdale paper describing models of social enterprises we find examples such as: the establishment of recycling centers for objects that other people no longer want and the resale of these objects in these centers with homeless people working [55], or the establishment of sales-type businesses newspapers in the street by homeless people [56] or the employment of homeless people in the maintenance activities of some buildings [54]. At the same time, there are also social models that involve both professional training, life skills development and mediation on the labor market [57–59].

Q.7: Do you think that the establishment of social enterprises, in the form of agricultural farms, in which homeless people can be accommodated and work for self-sufficiency and for the sale of products, would be functional?

93% of the respondents considered that would be functional a social enterprise, in the form of agricultural farms, in which homeless people can be accommodated and work for self-sufficiency and for the sale of products and 2% did not consider such an investment opportune.

Moreover, worldwide we find several initiatives based on the model of farms where homeless people work, such as the Homeless Garden Project in California, USA or The Plant-Ação Project, in Juiz De Fora, Brazil [60,61].

Q. 8: For the integration of beggars and vagrants, do you think that the social enterprise that offers services to other companies or the social enterprise established in the form of an agricultural farm would work better?

A 61% of the respondents considers that social enterprise established in the form of an agricultural farm are better than social enterprise that offers services to other companies and 45% consider the opposite.

As a result of the analysis, we can conclude that the research hypotheses have been confirmed and we believe that it is appropriate to set up social enterprises in which beggars and homeless people to be accommodated and directed to lucrative activities.

3. Conclusions and Recommendations

The State has the power "to change people's life course", "to influence people's social life through welfare programs aimed at protecting citizens from risks and guaranteeing them resources and opportunities" [62,63]. In this context, we propose to the Romanian Government the model of good practice in the field of protection of homeless people and vagrants, in the sense of following the models of good practice, adopted long ago in our country.

Analyzing the good results obtained by Nicolae Minovici on organizing social work with beggars and vagrants on scientific bases, we think that in working with this disadvantaged social group is a model of good practice.

Thus, the model of "Băneasa Agricultural Colony" could now be transferred through the creation of "social insertion enterprises" [64,65]. Social economy structures are encouraged to use staff from vulnerable groups and to reinvest their profits in order to maintain their jobs and preserve a self-sufficient model necessary for the survival of its members. Tax facilities could encourage such initiatives and encourage the initiators of these structures to integrate beggars and vagrants to whom they should also offer the opportunity for apprenticeships in the workplace.

The re-piloting of the Dr. Minovici model can today be supported by mixed national-European funding, in the form of a specialized social service, by accredited public or private providers.

The model of Vocational Education for Minors can be taken over by signing agreements for practice and vocational counseling between social services providers and public, private and mixed institutions.

Author Contributions: C.I., I.Ș. and A.N.D.. participated in the design of the study; C.I. contributed to the data collection; C.I., I.Ș. and A.N.D. contributed to the data analysis and interpretation; C.I.. was the principal investigator, designed the study, was responsible for the statistical analysis and interpretation, and wrote the article. All authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Funding: This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement: The study was conducted according to the guidelines of the Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the Ethics Committee of the University of Craiova.

Informed Consent Statement: Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.

Data Availability Statement: The anonymous data presented in this study are available on request from the corresponding author.

Acknowledgments: We would like to kindly thank the study participants as well as the staff at the centers for their help and support, without whom this work would not have been possible.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest

References

1. Romanian Academy. "Iorgu Iordan" Institute of Linguistics. *Dicționarul Explicativ al Limbii Române*, 2nd Edition; Univers Enciclopedic: Bucharest, Romania, 1998.
2. Romanian Academy. Institute of Linguistics from Bucharest. *Dicționarul Limbii Române Moderne*; Editura Academiei: Bucharest, Romania, 1958.
3. Cambridge Dictionary, n.d., *Beggar*, Available online: <https://dictionary.cambridge.org/dictionary/english/beggar> (accessed on 10 January 2024)
4. Pieron, H. *Vocabularul de psihologie*; Univers Enciclopedic : Bucharest, Romania, 2001.
5. Dan, A. Lipsa de locuință (homelessness). In *Dicționar de Politici Sociale*; Pop, L.M., Ed.; Expert : Bucharest, Romania, 2002.
6. Avramov, D. *Homelessness in the European Union. Social and legal Context of Housing Exclusion in the 1990s*; FEANTSA: Brussels, Belgium, 1995.
7. Bregman, L. Funeral for a Homeless Vagrant? Religious and Social Margins. *Religions* **2021**, *12*, 30. [CrossRef]
8. Mitrofan, L.; Badea, V. Desocializarea persoanelor adulte fara adapost: versantul psihopatologic al excluderii sociale. *Revista de psihoterapie experiențială* **2007**, no. 37, 13-18.
9. Badea, V; Constantin, M. *În umbra societății; SPER: Bucharest, Romania, 2002.*
10. Cooley, C.H. Personal Competition: Its Place in the Social Order and Effect Upon Individuals; With Some Considerations on Success. *Sociological Theory and Social Research: Being Selected Papers of Charles Horton Cooley*. Originally published in *Economic Studies* 4 No. 2. **1894**, 163-226. https://brocku.ca/MeadProject/Cooley/Cooley_1899.html.
11. Clements, L. Winners and Losers. *Journal of Law and Society* **2005**, *32*, 1, 34-50.
12. Weaver, J.D. Beyond Child Welfare – Thories on Child Homelessness. *Washington and Lee Journal of Civil Rights and Social Justice* **2012**, *21* (1).
13. Chareyron, S.; Domingues, P. Take-up of social assistance benefits: The case of homeless. *TEPP* **2015**, No. 07.
14. Brousse, C. Le réseau d'aide aux sans-domicile : un univers segmenté. *Economie et statistique*, 2006 Available online: <https://www.insee.fr/fr/statistiques/fichier/1376413/es391-392b.pdf> (accessed on 12 January 2024).

15. Ocobock, P. Introduction: Vagrancy and Homelessness in Global and Historical Perspective. In *Cast out: Vagrancy and Homelessness in Global and Historical Perspective*; Beier, A.L., Ocobock, P., Eds.; Ohio University Press: Athens, USA, 2008.
16. Vexliard, A. *Introduction a la Sociologie du Vagabondage*; L' Harmattan : Paris, France, 1998.
17. CASS. Centre of Corpus Approaches to Social Science. *Language surrounding poverty in early modern England: constructing seventeenth-century beggars and vagrants*, Lancaster University: Lancaster, U.K., 2014.
18. Niță, A.M.; Ilie Goga, C. Cultural values of urban population. Case study: Cultural values of the Romanians in the regions South-West Oltenia, South-Walachia and West. *Sociology and Social Work Review* **2017** 1(1), 6-21.
19. Mokhele, T.; Mutyambizi, C.; Manyapelo, T.; Ngobeni, A.; Ndinda, C.; Hongoro, C. Determinants of Deteriorated Self-Perceived Health Status among Informal Settlement Dwellers in South Africa. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2023**, *20*, 4174. [CrossRef]
20. Su, Y.; Hu, M.; Wu, Y. Rural Land Transfer and Urban Settlement Intentions of Rural Migrants: Evidence from a Rural Land System Reform in China. *Int. J. Environ. Res. Public Health* **2023**, *20*, 2817. [CrossRef]
21. Jordan, B. Begging: The global context and international comparisons. In *Begging questions*; Dean, H. Ed.; Policy Press: Bristol, UK, 1999, pp. 43-62..
22. Goyal, O. P. *Anti-social patterns of begging and beggars*; Gyan Publishing House: New Delhi, India, 2005.
23. Ionete, C. *Vagabondajul autentic*; Lumen: Iași, Romania, 2006.
24. Zubkova, E. The Excluded: Begging in the Postwar Soviet Union. *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales-English Edition* **2013**, *68*(2), 259-288.
25. Sharma, R.K. *Social problems and welfare*; Atlantic Publishers and Distributors: New Delhi, India, 1998.
26. MMSS. Ministry of Labor and Social Solidarity. *Strategia națională privind incluziunea socială a persoanelor fără adăpost pentru perioada 2022-2027 (The national strategy for the social inclusion of homeless people for the period 2022-2027)*. Available online: http://www.mmuncii.ro/j33/images/Documente/MMSS/Transparenta_decizionala/Anexa_Strategia_persoane_fara_adapost_01072022.pdf (accessed on 14 January 2024).
27. Dan, A.N. *Politici de locuire: România încotro? O analiză comparativă a României în contextul ECE și UE*; Editura Universității din București: Bucharest, Romania, 2006.
28. Dan, A.N. Persoanele adulte fără adăpost (PAFA/ Homeless). In *Riscuri și inechități sociale în România. Raportul Comisiei Prezidențiale pentru Analiza Riscurilor Sociale și Demografice*, Preda, M., Ed.; Polirom: Iași, Romania, 2009., pp. 203-205.
29. INSSE. Comisia Centrală pentru Recensământul Populației și al Locuințelor (Central Commission for the Population and Housing Census). *Comunicat de presă 2 februarie 2012 privind rezultatele provizorii ale Recensământului Populației și Locuințelor – 2011 (Press release February 2, 2012 regarding the provisional results of the Population and Housing Census - 2011)*, 2012. Available online: <https://insse.ro/cms/files/statistici/comunicate/alte/2012/Comunicat%20DATE%20PROVIZORII%20RPL%202011.pdf> (accessed on 19 January 2024).
30. FEANTSA. *ETHOS - European Typology on Homelessness and Housing Exclusion*, 2005. Available online: <https://www.feantsa.org/en/toolkit/2005/04/01/ethos-typology-on-homelessness-and-housing-exclusion> (accessed on 21 January 2024).
31. National Institute of Statistics of Romania. *Press release no. 293/ 17.11.2023: In 2022, one in five Romanians was affected by poverty*. Available online: https://insse.ro/cms/sites/default/files/com_presa/com_pdf/saracia_si_excluziunea_sociala_r2022.pdf (accessed on 21 January 2024).
32. Minovici, N. L'assistance sociale, il y a vingt-cinq ans, en Roumanie. *Revista de Drept Penal și Știință Penitenciară* **1934**, 4-6, 247-253.
33. Ilie Goga, C. The Romanian detention system during the communist regime: between the rule of law and the social realities. *Analele Universității din Craiova. Istorie* **2015**, *28* (2), 139-150.
34. PCACD. Presidential Commission for the Analysis of the Communist Dictatorship. *Final report*; Bucharest, Romania, 2006. Available online: https://www.wilsoncenter.org/sites/default/files/media/documents/article/RAPORT%20FINAL_%20CADCR.pdf (accessed on 22 January 2024).
35. Cătănuș, D.; Roske, O. Eds. *Colectivizarea agriculturii în România. Dimensiunea politică, vol. I, 1949- 1953*; INS: Bucharest, Romania, 2000.
36. Romanian Constitution of 1948.
37. Otovescu, A.; Frăsie, C.; Motoi, G.; Otovescu, D. *Criza Mondială ; Pro Universitaria* : Bucharest, Romania, 2011.
38. Anton, M. Parazitismul social. Reguli și norme pentru societatea omului nou. *Studii și Materiale de Istorie Contemporană* **2015**, XIV, 33-48.

39. Zamfir, C., Ed. *Politici sociale în România: 1990-1998*; Expert : Bucharest, 1999.
40. Zamfir., E.; Preda, M.; Dan, A.N. Sources of social exclusion în Romania. Part II. *Romanian Journal of Sociology* **2005**, XVI (1-2), pp. 219-250.
41. Romanian Criminal Code of 1968.
42. Romanian Criminal Code of 2004.
43. Romanian Criminal Code of 2009.
44. Law no. 61 of 1991, updated, for the sanctioning of acts of violation of some norms of social coexistence, public order and tranquility.
45. Law no. 292 on 2011 on Social Work.
46. Dan, A.N. Homelessness prevention in the context of evictions in Romania. *Sociology and Social Work Review* **2018**, 2(1), 6-29.
47. Król, K. Spatial and social structure of the phenomenon of begging in Poland. In *Teaching Crossroads: 13th and 14th IPB Erasmus Weeks*; Silva, E; Pais C.; Pais L.S., Eds.; Instituto Politécnico de Bragança, Bragança, Portugal, 2018, pp. 45-58.
48. Local Police Craiova. *Public notice: beggars fined and sent home*, 2019. Available online: <https://politia-locala-craiova.ro/articol.php?id=574> (accessed on 23 January 2024).
49. Local Police Craiova. *Activity report for 2023*. Available online: https://politia-locala-craiova.ro/assets/uploads/bilant_PLMC_2023_comp.pdf (accessed on 24 January 2024).
50. Metropolis of Oltenia. *Moment de bilanț al Centrului Social de Urgență pentru persoane fără adăpost „Sfântul Vasile” (Balance sheet of the Emergency Social Center for homeless people “Sfântul Vasile”)*, 2022. Available online: <https://mitropoliaolteniei.ro/2022/01/10/moment-de-bilanț-al-centrului-social-de-urgenta-pentru-persoane-fara-adapost-sfantul-vasile/> (accessed on 24 January 2024).
51. TVR. Romanian Television Craiova . *Interview of the day – Helping the homeless for 15 years*, 2024. Available online: <https://tvr-craiova.ro/stiri/interviul-zilei-de-15-ani-in-ajutorul-celor-fara-adapost/> (accessed on 24 January 2024).
52. Social Work Department Craiova. *The development strategy of social services in the municipality of Craiova 2019-2024*, 2019. Available online: <https://www.spascraiova.ro/profil/informatii-publice/88> (accessed on 24 January 2024).
53. Johnson, K.S. *The Fear of Beggars: Stewardship and Poverty in Christian Ethics*; Eerdmans Publishing: Cambridge, England, 2007.
54. Teasdale, S. Models of social enterprise in the homelessness field. *Social Enterprise Journal* **2010**, 6(1), 23-34. [CrossRef]
55. Clarke, A.; Markkanen, S.; Whitehead, C. Emmaus. *Sharing in Success: An Economic Evaluation of Emmaus Village Carlton*; Cambridge Centre for Housing and Planning Research, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, England, 2008.
56. Swithinbank, T. *Coming up From the Streets: The Story of the Big Issue*; Earthscan: London, England, 2001.
57. Great Britain. Department for Communities and Local Government. *Places of Change: Tackling Homelessness through the Hostels Capital Improvement Programme*; Department for Communities and Local Government: London, United Kingdom, 2006. Available online: <https://www.scie-socialcareonline.org.uk/places-of-change-tackling-homelessness-through-the-hostels-capital-improvement-programme/r/a11G00000017qTYIAY> (accessed on 25 January 2024).
58. DiMaggio, P.; Powell, W. 'The iron cage revisited' institutional isomorphism and collective rationality in organizational fields. *American Sociological Review* **1983**, 48, pp. 147-160.
59. Carroll, N.; Burke, M.; Carroll, M. A Case Of Social Entrepreneurship: Tackling Homelessness. *Journal of Business Case Studies* **2010**, 6 (5), 83-96.
60. Glowaski, P.; Reti, I. H. *Paul Glowaski: Garden Director, Homeless Garden Project*. UC Santa Cruz: *Regional History Project Oral Histories: Santa Cruz, USA*, 2010 Available online: <https://escholarship.org/uc/item/1b78n0s9> (accessed on 02 February 2024).
61. Nolasco, C.; Simiqueli, R.; Pinto, V. The Role of Urban Agriculture in the Re-socialisation of Homeless People: An experience in Juiz De Fora, Brazil. *Urban Agriculture Magazine RUAF* **2009**, 22, 32-33.
62. Grignoli, D.; Șerban, I. Propulsive Welfare for the “risk societies”: a project for solidarity and communication in the social-health system. *Sociology and Social Work Review* **2018**, 2(2), 6-16.
63. Ilie Goga, C.; Niță, A.M. Perception of disabled people on their image and status in society. *Sociology and Social Work Review* **2018**, 2(1), 49-55.
64. Law no. 219 on 2015 on Social Economy.
65. Arpinte, D.; Cace, S. ; Cojocaru, Ș. Social economy in Romania. Preliminary approach. *Revista de Cercetare și intervenție socială* **2010**, 31, 64-79.

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.