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ABSTRACT: The sociological research whose results are given in this paper was conducted in the month of July 2009 in the rural community of Sarmizegetusa, located in Hunedoara County on the border with Caras-Severin County. There has been investigated a total of 174 households and the main issues addressed are the following ones: house and living conditions, family structure, household income, the comfort of the house.
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The issues that stir currently the people living in the rural community of Sarmizegetusa are generally the same which worry the entire Romanian society. The main problems that trouble the vast majority of people are the raising prices and health related issues (Figure 1).

Slightly more than half of them are concerned about instability / economic crisis, linked of course to the subsequent price increase. A quarter of respondents perceive also the political instability, although this is more a distinct phenomenon in the case of Romania. Almost the same percentage holds the unemployment rate, but even though its proportions are increasing, we speak here about a rural community where the effects are felt to a lesser extent compared to the urban community; the villagers have other options related to agricultural activities which can ensure a minimum subsistence conditions.

A positive aspect would be that people are optimistic about the future of the village and of youth, the percentage of those who are concerned about these issues is below 10%. While future related issues concern most of the people, present life in the village is considered as being generally satisfying (Figure 2); only an insignificant
percentage sees it as unsatisfying (6.3%) and most of the villagers consider it very pleasant and enjoyable (55%) and over a third doesn’t consider life pleasant or unpleasant.

Figure 1. The problems which most concerned about the people (%)

A – price increase   F – juvenile offences / crimes
B – health problems  G – problems related to the youth living in the village
C – economic instability  H – problems related to the future of the village
D – political instability I – problems related to property right
E – unemployment J – others

Figure 2. Assessment of life today (%)

The degree of satisfaction on life today is significantly correlated with how the society looks and over two thirds of respondents are satisfied with the appearance of the village (Figure 3).
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The main reasons for discontent are related primarily to infrastructure, low income and lack of jobs (Figure 4).

Figure 3. The degree of satisfaction on the look of the locality (%)

Figure 4. The reasons why people are not satisfied with the life they are having in the village

Figure 5 illustrates that infrastructure is by far the most pressing problem, the measures to be taken so as life of local inhabitants becomes more enjoyable point to infrastructure, i.e.: the arrangement and lay asphalt on roads; the drinking water network; the sewerage system.

The responsible persons for what has not been achieved so far are mainly the former local leaders, and, to a lesser extent, the political class (Figure 6).
Of course, there shall always be problems be solved but, nevertheless, as suggested by data in Figure. 2, the degree of satisfaction with the settlement is high, the reasons for this state of gratitude are the good living conditions but also the ancestral feeling displayed towards the birthplace and the beauty of the area (Figure 7.).
In general, family incomes are relatively high in Sarmizegetusa rural community, over one third having over 2000 lei and more than half above 1500 lei, while 14.3% of the families situate within the ranges of up to 700 lei (Figure 8).

Figure 8. Household income (%)

Figure 9 shows the structure of the household in relation to the number of members; consequently, there can be noticed that most families consist of 3-4 persons (43%). One can say that the families of Sarmizegetusa are relatively numerous, although 38% of them have less than three persons. However, almost one fifth of them is made of more than four persons and those with more than two persons hold 62%. Compared to traditional rural family, the normal family living in Sarmizegetusa community, on average, is made of fewer members but, compared to other rural communities, it is higher than average.

Figure 9. Number of persons per household (%)
Due to social and economic reasons, the tradition that says that young couples should have more children has been affected during the transition period, both in the whole Romanian society and, therefore, in the rural community.

Figures 10 and 11 show the situation of siblings in the family of origin and the number of children of respondents. After comparing the data from the two figures, it is quite clear that there is a downward trend in the number of children in families. Consequently, if the percentage of couples with more than two children (brothers - Figure 10) in the family of origin more than is about 40%, the percentage of families own more than two children is nearly four times lower (about 10% - Figure 11).

Also, the percentage of families of origin with two siblings, is 10% higher than that of their own families with two children and the percentage of families with one child is almost half that of their own families with a child.
It is undeniable that the comfort of country house increased after 1989 and this is quite normal, but today the village still faces some major problems that affect the life of villagers, the most acute being the infrastructure. The origin of the dwelling / house of those interviewed is mostly the heritage - the rate of two-thirds - and the actual contribution rate of one third (built or purchased by the owner) of those who hold them (Figure 12).

![Figure 12. Where the house comes from (%)](image)

The age of house (Figure 13) correlates with its origin, that is legacy; the overwhelming majority of houses are more than 20 years old and only a negligible percentage of houses are younger, aspect that shows that in the past 19 years there has been built very little. Of course, this situation can be explained to a certain extent and trend of young people to migrate to the city.

![Figure 13. House age (%)](image)

Housing in terms of floor space is very good; only 14% of houses having only two rooms and just more than half are with 3 - 4 rooms and one third are with more than 4 rooms (Figure 14).
The material used for the building of houses is brick walling for the overwhelming majority of cases and roof is fully of tile, covering specific for mountain areas. The houses are floored, in almost equal proportions, with floor board and with parquet and only a negligible proportion has another structure.

The main heating source in the house is the tiled stove in most cases; only 6% of houses have their own heating system and, of course, the fuel that is being used is wood in all situations. The facilities of the household / dwelling show a high degree of comfort. Almost all houses have furniture, stove, refrigerator, colour TV, washing machine. Relatively high rates have also registered the radio, the phone, the radio-cassette, the vacuum cleaner, and other more.

For rural areas, the personal computer and the car display important figures (each of one 37% of households) and satellite antenna meet the needs for information and entertainment in 29% of households.

With regard to other facilities such as the kitchen, the bathroom, the toilet, the drinking water or sewerage network, there is still enough room for the normal demands of the early XXI century. Except the issues related to infrastructure and which have been mentioned above, Sarmizegetusa community displays a developed social and economical level, largely holding conditions for rural tourism, the Dacian vestiges being essential in this respect.
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