URBAN ROMA, SEGREGATION AND PLACE ATTACHMENT IN SZEGED, HUNGARY

György Málovics, Remus Creţan, Boglárka Méreine-Berki and Janka Tóth

ABSTRACT:
Recent research in segregated areas has shown that Romani people are marginalized in Central Eastern Europe and that desegregation has become an important part of the agenda in local development policymaking. This paper aims to push forward this issue and to better understand how Roma living in segregated urban areas relate to the places and communities in which they live. The research therefore links the particular field of Romani Studies to wider developments in the social sciences, and especially to global debates on insecure/informal housing and (neo)ghettoization, by ascertaining how Roma people's personal attachment to place functions as a basis for their everyday activities in the ghetto and surrounding area(s). The analysis is based on a participatory action research (PAR) process carried out in Szeged, Hungary, with local scholar–activists, Roma representatives and Roma families living in local segregated spaces. The findings suggest that the world of Roma in segregated neighbourhoods is characterized by a strong feeling of place attachment fundamentally shaped by social relations and the features of those neighbourhoods, but certain centripetal forces alienate inhabitants from these spaces. This is important because existing place attachment to segregated Roma communities as a living environment is a contradictory situation for the affected Roma, which is characterized by 'dual bonds': traditional relationships based on strong bonding capital and reciprocity still exist and represent significant material and emotional support for families and the places they inhabit, while at the same time communities are becoming more fragmented, with the most marginalized often being excluded from this "net of space protection".

Introduction

Spatial segregation and the presence of ghettos limit life opportunities in numerous ways for people living within their boundaries (Wacquant 2001; Wacquant 2008; Powell 2013). The same applies to 'gypsy ghettos' (segregated Roma neighbourhoods) in a Central Eastern European (CEE) context (Vincze and Raţ 2013). A recent study states that approximately 3% of the Hungarian population (300,000 Roma people) live in segregated environments (in 'gypsy areas') (Domokos and Herczeg 2010) and that at least 1,633 segregated spaces exist based on ethnicity. 'Desegregation' of urban Roma ghettos has become an official goal of Hungarian local development policy: 'Desegregation plans' are mandatory elements of integrated urban development strategies (IUDS) in major Hungarian cities.

The focus of this paper grew out of the need for information for local political processes. Previous examples of desegregation in Hungary showed that processes that concentrate mostly on spatial deconcentration might be followed by reduced well-being and resegregation (Dupcsik 2009). This paper aims to explore the place attachment of segregated urban Roma. We used observations from a participatory action research (PAR) process that has been taking place in Szeged, a major Hungarian city, for more than six years. The research focuses on two segregated areas comprising 400 Roma inhabitants. The question we address is 'In what ways do marginalized urban Roma feel attached to the place where they live, and what shapes this attachment?'

By connecting Romani place attachment to the recent literature on the segregated Roma communities and the (neo-)ghetto (Marinaro 2003, 2015; Powell 2008; van Baar 2012; Maestri 2014), we link the Szeged research to wider debates and geographies. The paper serves to link

the particular field of Romani Studies to extensive developments in the social sciences and especially to global debates centred on place attachment versus marginalization, insecure/informal housing, and ghettoization. PAR methods provide a long-term engagement with Roma communities and lend particular strength to understanding segregated Roma issues. The empirical material provides new evidence on the framework of place attachment among urban Roma people in the segregated areas of Szeged. It highlights the dichotomy of place attachment in segregated neighbourhoods within a rather neglected Central Eastern Europe context.

Our results reinforce Powell's (2008) idea that the marginalization of Roma people takes place at a micro-level in everyday social relations. Understanding these interdependencies facilitates a better understanding of how segregated neighbourhoods can be '*double-edged sociospatial formations*' (Wacquant 2001, 103). We also highlight Roma peoples' place attachment to segregated areas by introducing strategies for marginalized urban Roma in Hungary to deal with the informalities (Marinaro 2017) which characterize segregated Roma living areas.

The paper is divided into four sections. First, we outline the theoretical framework with reference to the sense of place and place attachment in segregated areas. Second, we provide a brief mapping of Roma segregation in the Szeged context before detailing the PAR methods utilised in our research. The next section presents the empirical material and focuses on the experiences of place attachment among marginalized Roma residents. The final section concludes by calling for more engagement with place in accounting for the weak position of Roma within segregated urban European societies.

Roma people's sense of place and place attachment in segregated areas

While other ethnic minority groups tend towards desegregation, 'the trajectory of the Roma in Eastern Europe is towards ghettoization' (Wacquant 2012; Powell 2013, 127) or hyper-ghettoization (Powell and Lever 2017). The stigmatization and marginalization of Roma have a long history in Europe: Roma are seen as Europe's 'outsiders' (Powell and Lever 2017), while the power of group stigmatization has become highly relevant in recent decades (Creţan and Powell 2017), demonstrating a strong European 'Romaphobia' (van Baar 2011). A significant amount of research deals with the marginalization and urban spatial segregation of Roma in Europe (Creţan and Turnock 2008; Marinaro 2015; Powell and Lever 2017). While Marinaro (2003, 2015, 2017) analyses the neo-ghettos in Rome – from the policies which led to their coming into being (Marinaro 2003) and the role of the neo-ghettos as a tool for social control (Marinaro 2015) to the informalities and adaptation strategies which characterize these areas (Marinaro 2017) – Powell (2008) and Powell and Lever (2017) investigate the social disidentification, stigmatization and segregation of Gypsies and attendant spatial aspects, highlighting that these are the results of power differentials within society. Moreover, van Baar (2011, 2012) argues that international and national policies for the activation of Roma contribute to further discrimination and dehumanisation. Lancione's (2017) ethnography shows how a particular 'urban atmosphere' leads to the eviction of the Roma people in Bucharest. This stream of literature also highlights that Roma (neo-)ghettos (i.e. segregated Roma neighbourhoods, as well as Roma camps and villages) limit life opportunities in numerous ways for people living within these boundaries but potentially provide advantages like protection and solidarity for their inhabitants (Wacquant 2012).

However, the literature on how Roma feel in relation to the ghettoized places they inhabit is scarce. Kabachnik (2010) notes that geographers highlighted the significance of analysing racialisation and how Roma are made to be seen as 'out-of-place', but this focus 'may inadvertently reinforce the myth of the placeless Gypsy, when not countered with a discussion of the importance of place for Roma' (199). Additionally, Lewicka (2011), calls for 'a particular focus on the role which various forms of social capital play in creating people's emotional bonds with places and in facilitating their willingness to act on behalf of the places' (226).

Experiences involving a specific place play a key role in the creation of a sense of place for an actor. Whereas the traditional view of place is seen as a stable, historically continuous and bounded entity, the concept of place as a basis for social interactions describes the features of the current globalized world spaces of today (Massey 2004). Thus, a sense of place is developed through knowledge and experiences of a place, possibly blending the physical characteristics of a land with feelings which have occurred in relation to that place. Agnew (2011) stressed the fluidity and dynamic character of places as they respond to interconnections with other places. Consequently, places tend to have permeable rather than fixed boundaries and are internally diverse rather than homogeneous with respect to their social and other attributes even as they express a certain a common experience and performance.

Kabachnik (2010) criticized geographers for saying that place is not important for nomads just because they often move. Since we are dealing with settled Roma, the space connection is more important to the Roma population under consideration. For instance, Gay y Blasco observed that Spanish Roma (Gitanos) 'show little interest in establishing practical or symbolic holds over the places they are made to live' (1999, 16). The reason shared with Blasco by the Spanish Roma was that since they had been moved before, they felt powerless during such

events. However, we can argue that this was because the government resettled Roma often, causing them to fail to create attachments to their homes. Van Baar's (2011) discussion on nomadization is relevant in this context. He argues that despite their sedentary way of life, Roma are often 'nomadized' in discourse to avoid the development of permanent housing solutions.

Our results suggest that attachment to place is tied to an exact location. *Home* is often described as the quintessential place, and it is often keenly felt to be wherever one's family is. Created place characteristics are very important, but because of embeddedness, the concrete place is also significant. Reflecting on current debates on Roma marginalization and ghettoization, our results demonstrate that the marginalization and stigmatization of Roma take place at a micro-level in the day-to-day social relations (Powell 2008) between Roma and 'the others'. These results facilitate a better understanding of the benefits within Roma ghettos and the strategies that should be developed for the marginalized urban Roma to deal with the informality (Marinaro 2017) which characterizes their living areas.

Charting Roma segregation in context

The present analysis is based on an ongoing participatory action research (PAR) process. Out of the 160,000 inhabitants of Szeged, the number of Roma is estimated to be around 4,000–5,000. Approximately 400 of these people live in the two isolated segregated Roma neighbourhoods. In the smaller area, there are approximately 125 inhabitants living in four buildings (16 flats) situated on the outskirts of the city. The larger ghetto is approximately double that size and located within walking distance of the city centre. We refer to these as the 'smaller segregated' and 'larger segregated' areas in our analysis.

Cooperation between local marginalized Roma and scholar–activists within the framework of the PAR project started in 2011. Since then, Roma have identified numerous

problems to address, including the discrimination they face; extreme poverty and lack of access to subsistence goods; poor and uncertain housing conditions; lack of legal, stable job opportunities; and an inability to provide for their children's future (e.g. by helping them to succeed in school).

Methods

The present analysis is based on two sources of data. Three scholar–activists are involved in numerous actions together with marginalized Roma families and Roma leaders within the PAR project, including supporting certain marginalized Roma families, volunteering in Roma community centres and participating in political activism. These scholar–activists 'do not split their work from their life' (van der Meulen 2011, 370). Their action-oriented involvement enables them to (1) make idiographic observations concerning diverse spheres of the life of the local Roma, and (2) enrich the conventional 'researcher versus subjects' roles via the peer perspective, allowing all voices and (unconventional) viewpoints to be expressed and to address 'undiscussables' (Bradbury and Reason 2003, 165).

The topic of extreme poverty is a highly sensitive area for research, and the world of segregated urban areas can be a relatively 'closed' one and difficult to approach. Common actions and related commitments (for using PAR as a research approach) are prerequisites of trust and of engaged and honest participation in the research for the marginalized groups.

Scholar–activists' PAR experiences were recorded in research diaries according to various requirements. Diaries were kept in lined notebooks and using MS Word. Notes (entries) were made as soon as practically possible after events.

Furthermore, 23 semi-structured interviews were carried out by the same scholar–activists with a total of 26 people living in segregated Roma neighbourhoods. Topics included personal stories of interviewees, daily activities, life in the segregated neighbourhood, important places and activities, relations to public institutions and social relations. Interviews were recorded and transcribed (Tables 1 and 2).

Our research is thus methodologically tied to the stream of current research which applies intense and long-term fieldwork combining activism and personal engagement with qualitative methods to provide a structured observation and analysis of the lived experiences of marginalized and segregated Roma (Grill 2012; Marinaro 2015, 2017; Lancione 2017).

Qualitative content analysis was carried out on these sources of data based on the research question. To create an open data analysis process, we created *in vivo* codes in the first step. Later, codes were organized into categories – in accordance with recommendations from grounded theory (Strauss and Corbin 1997) – and their relationships were analysed. All interviews were analysed by two researchers. Results were compared and discussed until an agreement was reached.

Limitations

The generalizability of the results from the present study is limited because of its qualitative and case study character. Even two segregated neighbourhoods within the same city could be rather different (Marinaro 2017). However, our results show a similarity to situations within other segregated urban Roma neighbourhoods in Hungary and even in the wider CEE region (Vincze and Raţ 2013).

One of the most important goals of PAR is the empowerment and emancipation of partners (Mullett 2015). Although empowerment is a complex and multilevel phenomenon, in our case we cannot say that we have managed to live up to that goal so far. One of the main challenges here is *time*. We have been working with marginalized Roma segregated people since 2011, while fundamental social changes with clear-cut results demand much more time.

Furthermore, we have involved Roma partners in the PAR project directly, but most of them were not especially interested in the research results. Thus, although it was Roma partners that set the research questions, there is much work to do on further collaboration with Roma toward deep involvement in the analysis.

Data collection and analysis were carried out by researcher PAR participants. Although the distinction between researcher and non-researcher roles disappears in an ideal PAR process (Arieli *et al* 2009), we have yet to reach that point within the present PAR process. In such cases, the intensity of participation as researchers might be influenced by different factors (the capabilities, interest and life situation of participants; habits, norms and terrains of communication, etc.; Mullett 2015).

Results

People and place within segregated Roma neighbourhoods

Our research showed numerous factors which Roma emphasize as benefits of place attachment concerning their life in the segregated Roma neighbourhoods, that is, the integrative and protective aspect of the ghetto (Wacquant 2012; Powell and Lever 2017). The first group relates to charity services provided by local organizations (government authorities and NGOs) directly and exclusively for families living in the local segregated Roma neighbourhoods – which is not without contradictions if we reflect on this from a critical perspective (Marinaro 2015). Services

include: community centres and afternoon school programmes close to the neighbourhoods; a support network of local middle-class families; and *ad hoc* social aid organized by local Roma and non-Roma NGOs. The intensity of support is far stronger in the smaller segregated area compared to the larger one.

The physical characteristics of segregated Roma neighbourhoods exert a dual influence on the marginalized Roma's attachment to segregated places. The presence of free, open space within these neighbourhoods and the chance to make relatively unregulated use of it – as an informality (Marinaro 2017) – provide opportunities for farming (both vegetable gardening and the keeping of livestock, such as pigs and chickens) for people living in the smaller segregated neighbourhood. Open spaces are used to engage in informal economic activities (Marinaro 2017), vital for many Roma in fulfilling their subsistence needs. These activities include '*lomozás*' (the collection of cast-off goods for resale or reuse) and '*vasazás*' (scrap metal collection). In addition, open space and unregulated use enable inhabitants (1) to store different waste wares and materials until they can be sold later at the local flea market and (2) to protect themselves from market fluctuation (e.g. falling metal prices). Collecting firewood from nearby places is also very important since winter is an extremely difficult season for most families when many face difficult choices.

Such advantages are absent in the larger segregated neighbourhood – gardening is impossible because of the presence of mice and rats and the impossibility of protecting private property, thus limiting opportunities to use open spaces. Unsettled housing rights offer significant advantages for families in the smaller segregated neighbourhood and for approximately half of the inhabitants of the larger segregated area by providing cheap housing

(e.g. through the absence of rents and other expenses). A Roma female interviewee stated that: 'It is good that we do not have to pay here. Because if we had to, we couldn't'.

On the other hand, unsettled and poor housing conditions – uncertain housing and related continuous danger and rumours of eviction, overcrowded flats and lack of basic amenities (water, sewage and electricity) – pose significant problems (Photo 1). Danger of eviction is always present just like in other countries within the CEE region (e.g. Lancione 2017), with many Roma people thinking of leaving the ghettos to flee eviction and poverty (see Grill 2012).

Unsettled housing rights prevent people from being able to increase the level of amenities for their flats and access to public services. Moreover, the segregated community is discriminated against in terms of location (Wacquant 2008) by both local and national authorities, e.g. with ambulance and police hardly ever appearing in emergencies. This means that marginalized Roma clearly have little or no control over their environment (Powell 2008; Lancione 2017).

The community in segregated Roma neighbourhoods and certain aspects of its functioning also represent important benefits for inhabitants. Community members spend a great deal of time together. People just 'come and go, visiting each other', 'they could not live without the others'. Children are always playing together. Older children often take care of younger ones, and adults often watch each other's children. The segregated area is a safe place for everyone, including children since they are always being looked after by someone in an environment where strangers rarely enter. The discussion of childhood and intergenerational mixing in Roma families is not new. For instance, the work of Ryan Powell (2016) is helping us understand childhood conditions as 'habitus' in the case of the Roma.

Social relations represent material benefits for inhabitants. People assist one another with basic goods when in need, including: food; work around the house (repairing broken tools and household devices, and feeding other inhabitants' livestock with their food waste); support with administrative matters; common service purchasing (TV and Internet); small temporary loans; taking care of each other's children (e.g. taking them to school) when someone is involved in a public work programme (rather similar to 'activation work' in Slovakia; van Baar 2011, 2012) or when someone is looking for a temporary job; and providing shelter for relatives and friends who have become homeless (temporarily or for longer periods). Therefore, this issue of mutual exchange connects to points raised in Wacquant's ghetto; he observed that it played an ambivalent role.

Indeed, strong social ties translate to (1) strong community expectations towards goods sharing and (2) a lack of an 'isolated' private sphere for many families, both limiting opportunities for personal and family material development. Such ties within communities are moderated by an intra-community hierarchy (Marinaro 2015), conflicts and fragmentation. In the smaller segregated area, most inhabitants have long known each other well. They grew up together, share a long common past and emphasize benefits related to community functioning and a feeling of community, while also mentioning the downsides related to conflicts. '*Fights*' happen among family relations. The larger segregated neighbourhood is characterized by a relatively high level of fluctuation: embedded inhabitants have lived in the segregated area for decades, but a significant number of flats within this space are empty, with people simply moving in and out. Divisions and conflicts emerge between newcomers and embedded inhabitants, who, as noted above, have long known each other well. One of the interviewees stated that: 'Those who have property or legally rent here would literally kill illegal squatters'.

Consequently, social capital and community solidarity are deployed by disidentification and stigmatization among marginalized Roma (see Powell 2008), an action related to previous acts of desegregation within the city, which had launched the first wave of 'newcomers'. The latter is in keeping with Marinaro's (2017) argument concerning the neo-ghettos in Rome. Moreover, community functioning and perceptions of community support are restricted to subgroups such as friends and relatives.

While segregated areas in Szeged provide benefits for their inhabitants in numerous ways, problems associated with segregated Roma neighbourhoods have led one Roma parent to observe that 'it is not possible to raise our children in a normal way in this area because children learn stupid, bad things' (see Table 3). This issue influences their school performance in that they experience patterns related to addiction and crime on a daily basis in and around segregated Roma neighbourhoods. This is consistent with Wacquant's idea of the need for a private sphere in the ghetto (see Powell 2013).

The neighbourhood

The area(s) around segregated Roma neighbourhoods (or 'the neighbourhood') is/are a source of significant benefit for the marginalized urban Roma. For the inhabitants of the larger segregated area, the presence of cheap shops to buy basic goods (food and clothes) is vital because of the levels of poverty – such opportunities are lacking in the smaller segregated area. Nearby markets and flea markets are important for the community of both segregated Roma neighbourhoods since they provide opportunities for buying cheap goods and selling materials acquired through the informal economic activities of 'lomozás' (see above) or 'kukázás' (collecting items from rubbish bins).

Good, long-term personal relationships with individuals through local public institutions are important for community members. Examples include employees of the nearby family support office, certain local policemen, school teachers, local craftsmen providing temporary ware loans free of interest (paying for goods with short delays) – including grocery stores, a butcher's, second-hand clothing shops and pharmacies – and local doctors. These ties are stronger in the case of the smaller segregated area – probably because it is situated on the outskirts of the city, in a former village that was attached to the city in 1973, and while retaining its village-like character, it is less densely populated. Relationships among people within the neighbourhood – including customer service provider relations – are more personal. This represents significant 'support' for the marginalized Roma – e.g. food, furniture and firewood as support in exchange for work. Certainly, the case of the Roma in Szeged is not unique in this sense because mutual aid and relationships with non-Roma people are highly relevant even in Roma camps in Italy (Maestri 2014).

In the case of the smaller segregated space, relationships with the local primary school are of vital importance. All children from the segregated area attend this school (integrated with local non-Roma children), and most parents went here as children. The presence of other peers and the long experience of parents with the school represent a sense of security for both children and parents. This issue is expressed by an interviewee as follows:

> I took him here because all Roma children attend this school. If he had to go to a school among Hungarians, he could not fit in.

Roma segregation in schools is a heated topic in the recent Roma literature (O'Nions 2010; Powell 2016; Powell and Lever 2017) and through PAR we should further reflect more on

solutions for those 'different and unequal' (O'Nions 2010) and for school desegregation in Szeged (Photo 2).

Such relations and their perceived importance are not characteristic of the larger segregated space. This might stem from its central position within the city: the character of the neighbourhood is more city-like with larger-scale institutions (including shops and schools) and fewer intense personal relations (Figures 1 and 2).

Beyond segregated Roma neighbourhoods and 'the neighbourhood'

Commuting – reaching the city centre from the outskirts of the city to access basic public services or to fulfil mandatory administrative duties – often presents unresolvable financial difficulties. The ability to remain healthy is limited both by poverty and by the physical environment within segregated Roma neighbourhoods. Numerous marginalized Roma cannot buy medicines or basic medical aids (e.g. glasses for children) prescribed by doctors and thus experience stress, hopelessness, anxiety and addiction.

Many marginalized Roma families are unable to use integrated places within the city. Privately owned, market-based urban spaces (cinemas, cafes, bars and restaurants) are out of reach because these families lack material resources and experience discrimination. The latter is further reinforced by the collective emotional barrier erected by the dominant group (Powell 2008). As a PAR researcher–participant, a member of a local NGO, articulated it:

> In cases when someone wants to join them [marginalized Roma] in getting out of the ghetto, he/she experiences Roma emotions he/she has not experienced before. You could really see how the Roma encounter reactions of neglect from other people.

Most families are not even able to participate in free, centrally organized urban recreational events or festivals because of (1) the costs of commuting, (2) the presence of private businesses since 'children want everything but Roma cannot afford a single thing', and (3) the absence of a feeling of safety due to an ongoing experience of stigmatization at the hands of native Hungarians.

Discussion and conclusions

This paper makes a contribution not only empirically and methodologically, but also in terms of its links to the recent literature on segregated Roma communities (van Baar 2011, 2012; Marinaro 2015, 2017; Powell and Lever 2017). The theoretical advancements of this paper thus link the Szeged research to wider debates and geographies on Roma living in European segregated areas. First, the results from this paper show that characteristics of both place and community relations are important determinants of place attachment: Roma people are not placeless (Kabachnik 2010). Social connections within marginalized Roma neighbourhoods are shaped by dual ties (Méreiné-Berki *et al* 2017). Thus, traditional relationships based on strong bonding capital and reciprocity still exist and represent significant material and emotional support for families and the places they inhabit. Intense human relationships, 'a we-I balance in favour of the We' (Powell 2016), represent strong expectations towards sharing and the lack of a private sphere, which cause difficulties in personal and family material development as well as isolation from unwanted behaviour patterns (e.g. addiction and crime). Second, there is a process of disintegration taking place: communities are becoming more fragmented, members only offer each other aid in times of great need and the most marginalized are often excluded from even this 'net of space protection' (Messing and Molnár 2011).

The physical characteristics of segregated Roma neighbourhoods exert a dual influence on place attachment. Segregated Roma neighbourhoods are 'beyond-the-pale' areas for local and national authorities – where public utilities take no responsibility for basic public services, including public lighting, sewage and waste collection. Such informalities (Marinaro 2017) represent negative consequences (including poor housing conditions and an untidy environment) as well as benefits. These are related to limited living costs through cheap housing and the opportunity for the relatively unregulated use of open spaces, thus allowing certain subsistence strategies, or informal/autonomous economic and social activities (Marinaro 2017), to contribute to place attachment.

The relationship of marginalized Roma to the ghetto neighbourhoods is further shaped by factors reaching far beyond the neighbourhood. Place attachment is shaped by wider social processes, actions and (lack of) bridging social capital in places other than the segregated neighbourhood and its surrounding area(s). These factors are strongly associated with poverty, prejudices, discrimination and stigmatization. An essential example of their effect on place attachment is the ability to use public spaces. Through poverty and ethnic stigmatization, the Roma are not able to use these spaces as equal members of the local community – they do not have the tools to 'appear in public (spaces) without shame' (Sen 1999, 71) and perceive themselves as inferior (Powell 2008; Powell and Lever 2017) to native Hungarians. The same applies to the substantial institution of primary schools – Roma pupils are marginalized even within integrated primary schools and within integrated classes – and not only because of the lack of multiculturality (O'Nions 2010), but also due to general ethnic stigmatization, poverty (lack of proper clothes and supplies) and reduced expectations within the class. These issues contribute to an aversion to formal schooling (Marinaro 2003; Powell 2008).

The substantial phenomenon of exclusion reinforces Powell's (2008) and Powell and Lever's (2017) idea that marginalization and stigmatization of Roma communities take place at a micro-level in the day-to-day social relations and that to understand marginalization we must look beyond merely policy-oriented approaches and consider wider (historical) social processes and power differentials within society. Moreover, the politics and policies concerning the marginalization of Roma often stem from 'political pragmatism' (Marinaro 2003, 2015; Powell 2008; O'Nions 2010; van Baar 2012).

Place attachment among marginalized urban Roma is therefore a rather strong and contradictory phenomenon, varying from one segregated neighbourhood to another and influenced by social relations, the physical characteristics of the neighbourhoods, relations between neighbours and processes within the wider society. People are usually born into ghettos or move there because of their poverty. The informalities and beyond-the-pale nature of the segregated Roma neighbourhoods might serve as rather contradictory magnets (Lewicka 2011) for the extremely poor – simultaneously attracting them to and alienating them from the Roma ghetto – working as dual ties. Anchors are just as contradictory. As support is experienced within the community and throughout the neighbourhood, both informal personal relations (as intermediary social capital as well as supportive institutional representatives as linking social capital) and street-level bureaucrats might be considered as positive anchors. Poverty, prejudice, stigmatization and the absence of a feeling of safety as alienating factors in integrated spaces seem to be anchors that are at least as significant in prohibiting marginalized Roma from leaving segregated areas. A question for further research remains how to effectively struggle against hundreds of years of social and spatial exclusion, while a deeper engagement with place becomes

essential in accounting for the marginal position of Roma within ghettoized urban European societies.

REFERENCES

Agnew J 2011 Space and place in **Agnew J and D Livingstone** eds. *Handbook of geographical knowledge* Sage, London

Arieli D, Friedman V J and Agbaria K 2009 The paradox of participation in action research *Action Research* 7 263–90

Creţan R and Turnock D 2008 Romania's Roma population: From marginality to social integration *Scottish Geographical Journal* 124 274–99

Creţan R and Powell R 2017 The power of group stigmatisation: Wealthy Roma, urban space and strategies of defence in post-socialist Romania *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* Available at: http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/120714/

Bradbury H and Reason P 2003 Action research: An opportunity for revitalizing research purpose and practices *Qualitative Social Work* 2 155–75

Domokos V and Herczeg B 2010 Terra Incognita: magyarországi szegény- és cigánytelepek felmérése – első eredmények *Szociológiai Szemle* 3 82–99

Dupcsik C 2009 *A magyarországi cigányság története. Történelem a cigánykutatások tükrében, 1890–2008* Osiris, Budapest

Gay y Blasco P 1999 *Gypsies in Madrid* Berg, Oxford

Grill J 2012 'Going up to England': Exploring mobilities among Roma from Eastern Slovakia *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 38 1269–87

Kabachnik P 2010 England or Uruguay? The persistence of place and the myth of the placeless Gypsy *Area* 42 198–207

Lancione M 2017 Revitalising the uncanny: Challenging inertia in the struggle against forced evictions *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* Available at: http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0263775817701731

Lewicka M 2011 Review. Place attachment: How far have we come in the last 40 years? *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 31 207–30

Maestri G 2014 The economic crisis as opportunity: How austerity generates new strategies and solidarities for negotiating Roma access to housing in Rome *City* 18 808–23

Marinaro C I 2003 Integration or marginalization? The failures of social policy for the Roma in Europe *Modern Italy* 8 203–18

Marinaro C I 2015 The rise of Italy's neo-ghettos *Journal of Urban History* 41 368–87

Marinaro C I 2017 The informal faces of the (neo-)ghetto: State confinement, formalization and multidimensional informalities in Italy's Roma camps *International Sociology* Available at: http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/0268580917706629

Massey D 1991 A global sense of place *Marxism Today Magazine* June 24–29

Méreiné-Berki B, Málovics G, Toth J and Creţan R 2017 The role of social capital and interpersonal relations in the alleviation of extreme poverty and spatial segregation of Romani people in Szeged *Journal of Urban and Regional Analysis* 9 33–50

Messing V and Molnár E 2011 Bezáródó kapcsolati hálók: szegény roma háztartások kapcsolati jellemzői *Esély* 2011*/*5 47–74

Mullett J 2015 Issues of equity and empowerment in knowledge democracy: Three community based research examples *Action Research* 13 248–61

O'Nions H 2010 Different and unequal: The educational segregation of Roma pupils in Europe *Intercultural Education* 21 1–13

Powell R 2008 Understanding the stigmatization of Gypsies: Power and the dialectics of (dis)identification *Housing, Theory and Society* 25 87–109

Powell R 2013 Loïc Wacquant's "ghetto" and ethnic minority segregation in the UK: the neglected case of Gypsy-Travellers *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 37 115–34

Powell R 2016 Gypsy-Travellers/Roma and social integration: childhood, habitus and the "we-I balance" *Historical Social Research* 41 134–56

Powell R and Lever J 2017 Europe's perennial "outsiders": A processual approach to Roma stigmatization and ghettoization *Current Sociology* 65 680–99

Sen A K 1999 *Development as Freedom* Oxford University Press, Oxford

Strauss A and Corbin J 1997 *Grounded theory in practice* Sage, Thousand Oaks CA

van Baar H 2011 Europe's Romaphobia: Problematization, securitization, nomadization *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* 29 203–12

van Baar H 2012 Socio-economic mobility and neo-liberal governmentality in post-socialist Europe: Activation and the dehumanisation of the Roma *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 38 1289–1304

van der Meulen E 2011 Action research with sex workers: Dismantling barriers and building bridges *Action Research* 9 370–84

Vincze E and Raţ C 2013 The social and cultural formation of "Gypsy ghettos" in Romania in a European context *Sociologica* 58 5–22

Wacquant L 2001 Deadly symbiosis – When ghetto and prison meet and mesh *Punishment & Society* 3 95–133

Wacquant L 2008 Ghettos and anti-ghettos: An anatomy of the new urban poverty *Thesis Eleven* 94 113–18

Wacquant L 2012 A Janus-faced institution of ethnoracial closure: A sociological specification of the ghetto in **Hutchison R and B D Haynes** eds. *The ghetto: Contemporary global issues and controversies* Westview, Boulder CO 1–32