

---

Ivan  
ROGIĆ

SOME  
SOCIO-ECOLOGICAL  
DETERMINANTS OF  
ROMANI SETTLEMENTS



**Introductory barrier.** The compilation of a typological scheme of Romani settlements comes up against two basic difficulties.

The first difficulty is that existing Romani settlements **physiognomically differ very little**. As far as it can be seen, three groups of factors have influenced the physiognomic “surface”. The first is rooted in the traditional Romani inclination of temporary residence at a chosen place. Even though, this tendency was markedly weakened in the second half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, at least in the everyday life traditions in Croatia, it has left a trace in a kind of **lack of concern** towards the environment of the settlement. Clearly, the Roma now live in permanent settlements and that except for negligible examples, there is no longer data that supports the survival of the nomadic tradition (Pitomača – only settlement with temporary residence). However, on the other hand, traditional lack of concern for the environment of the settlement is clearly evident. The second group of factors that influences the physiognomy of Romani settlements is **endemic poverty**. Even though examples of successful families and individuals can be found in Romani groups, it is unarguable that the group, as a whole, are in the claws of endemic poverty. Against this background, indifference towards the habitat of the settlement is additionally amplified. The third group of factors that influences the physiognomy of Romani settlements is rooted in the fact the Romani builders are, in the main, **“wild” builders**. The adjective “wild” is not used here in passing (Rogić, 1990). This describes a method of building that threatens building norms in two ways: First, it breaks the laws that conventionally regulate building and property relations. When building is limited to this kind of transgression it is usually, although euphemistically called “irregular” building (or more precisely: illegal). However, “illegal” building is substandard and refers to the method of building. Thus, the used building mate-

rial and plan, functional organisation, access to infrastructure networks and similar determinants in this form of “wild” building are substandard, or exceedingly below building standards and so their constructions are “unlawful” or illegal. Thus, **the tradition of lack of concern, poverty and “wild” patterns of building** crucially determine the physiognomic surface of the Romani settlement. When applying measures of physiognomic difference, it is almost impossible to separate particular types of Romani settlement. Only one physiognomic type will be continually repeated.

The second difficulty is that **it is not possible to convincingly differentiate the economic basis**, which determines the status of the settlement. As far as the data shows, there is no special difference between the economic basis of Romani settlements in cities and Romani settlements in rural areas. Local differences are certainly present. However, they are not adequate for a sound typological scheme, compared to those that divide urban and rural settlements, tourist and industrial, etc. It is useful here to turn to the research results on the most important sources of income in Romani households.

**Table I**  
The most important sources  
of income in Romani  
households

Source of income	County in %									
	Zagreb	Sisak-Moslavina	Varaždin	Primorje-Gorski kotar	Brod-Posavina	Osijek-Baranja	Istria	Međimurje	Other	Total sample
Agrarian economy (agriculture)	0.9	.0	3.8	.0	1.0	2.0	.0	1.8	.0	1.1
Breeding and sale of livestock	.0	.0	.0	.0	2.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	0.2
Employment	7.1	16.7	2.5	61.1	12.0	6.0	59.2	6.0	.0	17.6
Work abroad	2.7	1.0	.0	1.1	6.0	.0	2.0	.0	.0	1.3
Cottage industry	1.8	4.1	3.8	7.8	5.0	3.0	5.1	2.8	.0	3.6
Temporary, seasonal work	24.1	20.8	28.8	3.3	23.0	34.0	21.4	38.7	33.3	26.9
Transport (truck, horse, etc.)	0.9	1.0	.0	.0	.0	1.0	.0	.0	.0	0.3
Collection of raw materials (metal, glass, paper, etc.)	42.9	32.3	42.6	1.1	16.0	6.0	3.1	10.6	38.7	19.7
Odd jobs (washing windcreens, selling door-to-door)	13.4	4.2	7.5	5.5	5.0	3.0	4.1	6.9	6.6	6.4
Rent (renting of office space, flats, property, shares, etc.)	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	1.0	0.5	.0	0.2
Pension	2.7	5.2	2.6	1.1	15.0	2.0	11.2	3.2	1.3	4.8
Social welfare	59.8	79.2	88.8	45.6	69.0	89.0	52.0	83.4	97.3	74.2
Help from relatives	4.5	.0	1.3	10.0	1.0	1.0	3.1	2.8	2.7	2.9
Begging	4.5	.0	6.3	1.1	4.0	1.0	2.0	9.2	2.7	4.1
Fortune-telling	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	5.1	.0	.0	0.5

Source: Field study 2004

This distribution shows that the main source of income is **social welfare**, if we consider the total sample. It is well-known that this not a “profitable” activity, which would help establish differences which are a consequence of work activities. In other words, it is not incorrect to say that the main source of income is non/activity. **Temporary seasonal work** is in second place. This is limited to particular seasons of the year. Considering the poor educational qualifications and professional competencies of the Romani population, it is evident that the work that they do is at the bottom of the economic pyramid. In short, these sources of income do not have the power to shape a specific economic foundation of a settlement. Income from formal employment and collection of waste and “scrap” raw materials are in third place. Evidently, formal employment is a more prominent source of income in two counties only: the County of Istria and County of Primorje-Gorski kotar. In other counties, it is noticeably inconspicuous. In these counties, important sources of income are from collection of raw materials (metal, glass, paper, etc.) in contrast to employment. Evidently, this is the most important source (except in the two counties mentioned above). The other sources of income are marginal, and are mainly related to “odd jobs”, begging and similar.

In short, the economic practices of Romani groups are not structurally connected to the use of specific developmental assets or with the shaping of a specific professional subculture. For this reason, there is no special generator of settlement differences according to which the Romani settlement could be classified in terms of their fixed connections with particular sectors of activity or particular professions. In this respect, on the contrary, they are similar. These are settlements **with economically dependent populations**. Dependency is, on the one hand, tormenting. However, on the other it is the source of a specific behaviour that is a result being a **rentier**. Since a suitable expression is lacking, the term **a rentier of poverty** is appropriate.

Thus far, it can be concluded that a conventional physiognomic and functional base for a typological classification of Romani settlements is not especially useful. Three **secondary** features remain. The first is **positional**. This allows us to differentiate where Romani structures are located: in the town, in the village, or in a rural area. The second feature is **the degree of separation**. There are clear differences between Romani settlements that are parts of existing settlements and Romani settlements that are detached structures. The third feature is **genetic**. According

to this feature, premises initially built for other purposes and housing built for family residence can be differentiated. Needless to say, the unassuming physiognomic or functional differences where they are indisputable need to be taken into account. A few types of settlement are apparent.

**1. Town settlement structures.** There are several settlement subtypes in the town area. It is useful to differentiate these types for basic orientation purposes in working out a suitable programme of renovation and renewal

**1.1. A small group of houses or individual houses.** There are many examples of this type. They are either a group of separate family houses sometimes built in harmony with the ambient or small groups (ten structures at the most). They can be found in Zaprešić, Sveti Ivan Zelina, Jastrebarsko, Karlovac, Bjelovar, Garešnica, Grubišno Polje, Delnice, Gospić, Otočac, Virovitica, Šibenik, Vodice, Knin, Pula, Umag, Čakovec, Mursko Središće, and other cities. Strictly speaking, they are not especially a settlement phenomenon. Instead they are a conventional symbol of town differences, without which even the smallest towns cannot be imagined without these symbols.

**1.2. Settlement structures that have come about by taking over premises that were initially built for other purposes.** In the main, these are barracks or similar constructions. The Roma have taken over these premises gradually, depending on the local opportunities. Some of the well-known sites include the barracks in "Mario Gennari" in Rijeka, occupied since 1968 after being abandoned by construction workers; the barracks in Bakar, a similar outcome; army barracks in Gerova, in the town area of Čabar; the locality of Šijan in Pula; barracks in the suburb of Sopot (in New Zagreb) as well as the barracks in Plinarsko naselje, Zagreb. These are constructions with minimum sanitary conditions made up small units that are approximately 15-30m<sup>2</sup> in size. As a rule, roofs and walls of these constructions are problematic. Electricity is not even available in the suburb of Sopot, New Zagreb. According to an interviewer, the electricity pole is there, but they have no access to electricity. At these addresses, living conditions are markedly miserable. Moreover, it is apparent that the town's homeless persons, with the most modest needs, do not compete for these addresses.

**1.3. Romani fragments in town settlements.** This group is numbered. Well-known examples can be found in Varaždin, Čakovec, Bjelovar, Ludbreg, Koprivnica, Crikvenica, Virovitica, Garešnica, Slatina, Osijek, Beli Manastir, Pula, and Zagreb. The settlements Ferenščica, Kozari pu-

tovi, Savica, and Petruševac are well-known in Zagreb. The main feature of this group of Romani settlements is that they are **rooted in already existing or in structurally set up parts of the town**. Romani builders, as a rule, behave similarly as when they build their “own” detached settlements at the edge of the town or in an area outside town. Thus, Romani fragments come about at the margins of existing town areas, on “no one’s” land (that is owned by the town in the first place). Frequently, these sites are close to rubbish dumps or an industrial zone where waste originates. The main building unit is the family house, which cannot always be defined as such. The layout plan of the settlement is usually chaotic. However, data shows that, in these types of structures the basic technical infrastructure is **better** than in other Romani constructions. As a rule, the Romani parts of already existing suburbs have access to communal and social infrastructure **like the rest of the settlement**. Of course, this equality is not so geometrically balanced in all cases. The survey results obtained in this field study show how Romani inhabitants inadequately use the mechanisms of local government that are available in their settlements. It is therefore reasonable to assume that despite initial, normatively guaranteed possibilities, there are asymmetrical patterns of infrastructural privileges at work. Still, they are not endangered by this. Romani inhabitants, together with other inhabitants of this type of settlement share a common “infrastructural fate”. The statement of a local Romani inhabitant in Ferenščica illustrates this well. In response to a survey question on the quality of communal and social infrastructure, the respondent concisely concludes: we have everything (referring to the main infrastructure network), but there is a need to improve employment opportunities. The opportunities, in the towns mentioned above, are not all similar. However, it is evident that Romani fragments of an existing settlement have more difficulty aligning with the settlement’s environment. In their aspirational schemes, aspirations of an “average” citizen are most clearly reflected.

**1.4. Detached Romani settlements in the town.** Most of these settlements emerged in the “golden” years of socialist industrialisation and urbanisation between 1960–1975. This period is special according to many determinants that have been analysed elsewhere (see Rogić, 1990). One of these already mentioned determinants is “wild building”. This is not an exclusive building “style” of Romani groups. On the contrary, as a type of “grey” right to public assets (read as nationalised private land) the system generously divided this among the numerous participants of

the “egalitarian union” (Županov, 1995), and in this way shaped the legitimation of the system that “revolutionarily” protected the future of “employed people and the working class”. In different cyclical dramatisations of socialist social rights, always started **subsequently**, many of these settlements and constructions were labelled lawful because the “wild” builders had already carried out their plans. However, it was easier for buildings that were not erected in an extremely substandard way (i.e., buildings that were “only” illegal but met acceptable building standards) to change this label. It is not about resistance to the system. The system was continually trying to legitimate the system’s protector of society’s lowest stratum. Instead it is a fact that the substandardness of many “wild” structures was so evident that the most imaginative application of law, not even in socialist times, could not turn it into anything lawful. In the morphology of “wild” construction, at least in the initial stage during this period, **these structures are closest to the favella**. The Romani group had “bad luck” that structures were mainly built in this way. This could not have been different since they were only just marginally included in the newly formed group of industrial workers. It is worth asking: did the Romani “elite” back then want anything else? In short, Romani builders have remained the most consistent “wild” builders in Croatia. Of course, over the past few decades, circumstances have improved. Builders have obtained better building materials, houses have expanded, and the environment has become more ordered. However, some features of “wild” settlement have stubbornly “crossed” through time. There are five basic features. These are: the **chaoticness** of the settlement “plan” as a direct impression of the spontaneous approach used in building a settlement; **detachment** from the rest of the town, as a rule, adjacent to heavy traffic, industrial zones or rubbish dumps; **reduction** of infrastructural networks: electricity, water, the eventual removal of rubbish and telephone; **unlawful** house building, which hinders law regulation and the improvement of housing conditions; **predominance of detached family houses**, Romani settlements do not typologically differ significantly from other settlements with family builders, but there is a great difference in quality to the detriment of Romani houses. The term **para-urban settlement** is used for this type of settlement in the analytical literature. One more feature needs to be added: they emerged, as a rule, in town spaces as **negatively marked** in earlier territorial symbolic schemes of the town. (Or Romani “wild” builders have strengthened this latent aspiration.)

The territorial “portrait” of such settlements is determined by two main features. The first feature is a **clear aspiration for separate, detached settlements**. The second aspiration is a **marginal, peripheral position** independent of this or that side of sociality that describes and intersects existing town reality. Seizure of the town’s margins in urban clashes between particular town groups **is not** an ambiguous indicator of less or loss of social power.

The reason is simple: in the conception of many town groups, the town’s margins are desired areas among other groups e.g., the rich and powerful. In the struggle to acquire these town areas the periphery is **structurally** divided according to axes that determine contrasts: ecological/cultural oasis – zone of accumulated risks. Detached Romani settlements, in the main, are located where marginal town areas are predominantly risky. According to the drafted scheme, the genesis of the described Romani fragments in already existing town settlements can be explained. Respectively, the examples of Ferenščica or Kozari putovi in Zagreb are instructive. The mentioned settlements **were not** “model” settlements during the period of intensive socialist urbanisation; they are Trešnjevka, Trnje and Novi Zagreb. As a result, Ferenščica, Kozari putovi and related settlements are pressed “towards the bottom” on the hierarchical ladder of desirable/important settlements. In this context, the territorial path of Romani groups is predictable. Their work, professional and social aspirations only marginally correspond to the central political and ideological figures of the system. The Roma prefer to “wander about” than be under factory discipline. They prefer to be occasional crafts persons rather than full-time employees, etc. For this reason, they can only compete for settlements on the margins, that is, beyond the borders of “model” settlements. There, “no one’s” space is suitable for “wild” usurpation. There, with more spill over of “grey”, a specific informal union between the system and participants from the margins is shaped. On this basis, the **models of settlement – peripheral hybrid** are established, where “wild” builders and dual family economics, work on the side and craft initiatives, informer’s optimism and inn “folk” subculture are directly connected. In this wide circle, in which nuances determine **shadows of the system**, extension is to the area of the town’s margins. Undoubtedly, when socialist urbanisation lost its momentum, various participants “down below” who were not only the main favourites but considered ideally and typically as **unimportant, revolting, unappealing** had more possibility and a more important role. The

gradual improvement of these settlements is predominantly the result of decades of residue success and non-success of these participants. As a result there is a thin difference that does not disappear between these types of settlement and those that are more centred. In short, the presence of Romani settlements in former established town settlements can be interpreted using the same pattern of peripheral separation. The difference between them and marginal town areas with detached Romani settlements is that town settlements with Romani fragments were no longer positioned in the “strict” periphery. An almost exclusive form of Romani migration into Croatian towns can be found in places where detached Romani settlements are unmistakably maintained.

Detached Romani settlements appear predominantly in towns where other Romani settlements were set up before the formation of different town parts. Some of the well-known are: Capraške Poljane in Sisak; Palanjak in Sisak; Radićeva street in Kutina; a locality in Varaždin; Žlebic in Koprivnica; Rujevica and Mihačeva Draga, in Rijeka; a settlement near Barutane, in Delnica; Glogovica and “Josip Rimac” in Slavonski Brod; “At the Orthodox church” in Beli Manastir. As a rule, these are structures in groups that are the most numbered.

**1.5. Conventional town settlements.** Their main feature is that the Roma **did not** actively model them. **They did not model the settlement or the houses in which they live.** Moreover, the settlements and houses emerged during the town’s evolution in which the Roma were not even present. During a particular period, the Romani population moved into these settlements and acquired permanent residence there. A settlement called **Vodnjan** in Istria is a representative example of this group. Namely, a small Romani group moved into deserted houses where Italians and Croatians (who decided to be Italian citizens after World War II) had lived until the end of the 1940s. The Roma, of course, were not the only group that took over these deserted houses. They are integrated in a larger migratory contingent. Field research shows that these Roma have shaped their social survival according to patterns used by other groups. For example, family structures, professional styles, measures of personal and community welfare, work aspirations and territorial behaviour are related. For this reason, stereotypical misperceptions about the Roma are not projected onto them as a group whose lifestyle is incompatible with conventional styles of town/civil life in Croatian towns. The survey report on Romani parts of town settlements, where tendencies of forming detached

settlements have faded, shows that Romani aspirations are **most related** to aspirations that are based on social survival of the Roma in Vodnjan and similar settlements.

**1.6. “Black holes”.** If the hygienic, communal and building qualities of Romani settlements in their entirety are compared to other settlements where other Croatian inhabitants live, it is easy to see that only a small number of Romani settlements can successfully avoid this depressing label. Still, it is possible to separate some extreme examples. Clearly, most of them are outside of town and in rural areas. However, they can also be found in town areas. According to the available data, there are more of these examples; these are groups of Romani houses in Popovača, near the fairgrounds; a group of Romani houses in Orlovac, in Karlovac; a Romani group in Sveti Đurđ; a Romani group at the locality Vučja jama, in Brod on the Kupa; a Romani group in Slatina, in the settlement Kozica; and a Romani group in Glogovica in Slavonski Brod. A common definition of the mentioned places is not possible. The only thing that can be pointed out is that these structures are at the margins of town areas. Their “blackness” is determined by two basic facts: the absence of technical and communal infrastructure, complete or partial electricity, as well as markedly poor building materials (sheet metal, cardboard, wood, trailers, nylon). At these sites, there are no larger Romani groups. However, this fact is not particularly comforting. Undoubtedly, their settlement practices are **conventional in homelessness**.

**2. Romani settlements in rural areas.** It already has been mentioned: from a structural perspective there is no adequate reason to expect settlement types that are not in town areas. The main difference, as in town settlements, can be attributed to different positions, distances and “genetic determinants of the settlement. Within this framework, of course, a specific ruralisation of lifestyle needs to be taken into account. However, it needs to be remembered that this is manifested in a context that is mainly resistant to profound differentiations according to the urban-rural scheme thanks to the manifold decline of conditions and styles. Ruralisation is vaulted in limited and marginal traces.

**2.1. Small group of houses or individual houses.** They are visible in many municipalities. For example, in the settlement Svinjarec, municipality of Dubrava; in the settlement Brezine, municipality of Farkaševac; in the settlement Pulska, municipality of Luka; in the settlements Donja Kupčina, Lijevo Sredičko, Dvoranči, Topolovec Pissarovinski; in Lesovac, municipality of Šandrovac, in De-

žanovac and Ivanska in the same municipality; in the settlement Domankuš municipality of Rovišće; in the settlement Narta, municipality of Štefanje; Konjsko Brdo, municipality of Perušić; Popovac; in the settlements Kneževi Vinogradi; Đevrske; Hlapčina; Štrukovec; Sveta Marija; and elsewhere. They are either individual houses or a smaller group of houses in the existing rural settlements. Similar to the town areas, they are not structures that are special phenomena as a result of their features. Simply, they are a part of the conventional varying context of rural settlements in particular regional areas. Larger social control, a characteristic of small settlements, certainly reduces the probability of scattered Romani inhabitation of small settlements. However, there are examples, where demographic exhaustion of these settlements has weakened the mechanisms of social control so that those groups with migratory intentions are more open than we think they are.

**2.2. Settlement structures that have come about by occupying houses that were initially built for other purposes.** In the available documentation, we could not find typical examples of this. It is reasonable to assume that there are examples, but they have not been documented. In a number of settlements, in different areas of Croatia, groups of Roma have occupied abandoned houses. As a rule, the state of these houses is problematic and it cannot be said that they are suitable for use. Strictly speaking, they do not completely belong to this group. However, it still can be said that this entails occupying a house intended for other purposes, more precisely, for demolition. Where it was possible – the Roma “occupied” these derelict houses.

**2.3. Romani fragments in rural settlements.** Examples of this have been noted in a smaller number of settlements. Examples can be found in the settlement Karlovec Ludbreški; in the settlement Lučice, in the town area Delnica; in the settlement Pribislavec, in the town area Čakovec; in the settlement Goričan in the municipality area Goričan; in the settlement Tenja (also known as Velika Bara or Šangaj). There are surely more, but the available data is limited to these examples. The relatively small number allows us to hypothesise that this pattern of territorial behaviour is **less suitable** for the Roma. Surely, the main reason is related to the fact that Romani builders, as a rule, build on land that does not belong to them, that is, municipality or town land and then lastly on privately owned land. In rural settlements, in between particular parts, there is simply less of “no one’s” land, especially

larger areas, suitable for building Romani streets or larger neighbourhoods. The “interpolation” of individual houses, or smaller groups of houses is easier. The data shows that there are more of these settlements. On the contrary, the “building” of larger Romani parts in a settlement is much harder, under the circumstances. The already mentioned data on an analogous type in town areas shows that the town area is more suitable for this type of territorial behaviour. There is a larger “offer” of “no one’s” /town land and the informal forms of social control are not tight.

#### **2.4. Detached Romani settlements in rural areas.**

Based on the insights presented in the previous section, it is reasonable to assume that the tendency of forming detached settlements is **strongest** in the territorial behaviour of Romani groups in rural areas. It is strong in the town area as well. As a rule, those town margins are markedly low on the ladder of desires. They are in fact **sociofugal**. In rural areas, the choice of place for detached settlements is not markedly connected to their sociofugality, as in towns. In other words, the adjective “separate” or “risky” cannot be used to describe these locations as in towns. However, on the other hand, the already drafted scheme related to the economic behaviour of the Roma shows that even in rural areas the Roma do not want to distance themselves from important waste areas, especially industrial as well as road and rail networks for different “initiatives” ranging from exchange to begging.

Orientating examples are the settlement Gračanica; settlement in the municipality of Velika Ludina; Puškarići near Ogulin; Gornje Selo near Oštarija; Strmec Podravski; Sveti Đurđ; Karlovec Ludbreški; Omišalj, on the island of Krk; Brod on the Kupa; Donja Dobra; Čandrište; Pitomača; Lončarevo; Piškorovec; Kuršanec; Palanjak; Bistrinci; Bolman; Sitnice; Parag I and Parag II, next to the settlement Trnovec (along the border with Slovenia); Držimurec; Kotoriba; and others. Data shows that the patterns of settlement formation and infrastructural difficulties in these settlements are similar to those settlements in town areas. However, the general advantages of town settlements compared to rural ones needs to be taken into account. These include greater possibility of using technical, social and the communal infrastructure. If this **contextual** variable is considered, then the living conditions in this group of settlements are in the main of a dark grey spectrum colour.

**2.5. Conventional Romani rural settlements.** The available data shows that there are in fact none of these settlements. Nevertheless, the settlements in County of Vu-

kovar-Sirmium should be mentioned. The Romani rural population in this county is closest to the conventional living conditions of an average village.

**2.6. "Black holes".** When the living conditions in rural Romani settlements are compiled, the competition for membership in this sad group would be more than harsh. Nevertheless, it is possible to differentiate some completely marginal examples. According to our evaluations, they are: Strmec Podravski and Donja Dubrava. The ground is predominantly swampy in Strmec Podravski. The available data shows that a large number of "houses" have been built in a small area: 19 made out brick and 45 huts. Electricity is available in the settlement but the quality of water is a problem since it is pumped directly from the swamp.

The settlement Donja Dubrava is situated between the embankment and a bed of the Drava, on the border between the counties of Međimurje and Koprivnica-Križevci. Since this is a flood area, every water level change of the Drava is risky. These inhabitants can use a telephone, but there is no water or electricity. Even though the total number of "objects" is relatively small (about 15) this fact does diminish the discomfort: the settlement is simply unsustainable.

It is not incorrect to include a small Romani group near Brod on the Kupa into this group. Out of the three settlements, not one has basic technical infrastructure (electricity, water). In addition one of these settlements is built out of "cardboard barracks", that is, material that is characteristically found in favellas.

Three examples are on a list that is completely black. However, identification does not imply that the unmentioned examples deserve lighter coloured adjectives.

## Size

---

There are four basic groups that were differentiated in the presented typological scheme that can reliably outline size. They are settlements that emerged like parts/fragments of town and rural settlements and those detached settlements. The other groups are marginal in terms of size. The **number of inhabitants** in a discussion on size offers orientation. Data on the surface area of Romani dwellings can also be found but this is unfortunately unsystematic. For this reason, this data is not used. Moreover, data on the number of inhabitants are based mainly on evaluations

As a rule, Romani settlements in town areas, like other town parts, or detached settlements are the largest

according to **number of inhabitants**. On the other hand, if the absolute size is taken into consideration a **picture of small /or smaller** structures is evident. Among the peak numbers, there are approximately 1,050 inhabitants in Ferenščica, a settlement in Zagreb. In the Romani settlement “Josip Rimac”, in Slavonski Brod, it is estimated that there are 1,150 Roma. In Capraške Poljane, a settlement in Sisak, the Romani population is approximately 600. Estimations show that there are 650 Roma in Kutina. In other town settlements, the estimations indicate lesser numbers, in the range of 100–450 inhabitants. In smaller towns, the number is frequently less than a 100.

Why is the presented data important? This generally indicates the **scarcity** of Romani town settlements. In other words, the Roma cannot compete by relying on their statistical size. Small settlements such as these can hardly get labelled: crucial case or something similar, which would place them in a better position with regard to priorities in programmes of infrastructural renewal. Related to this is the already mentioned professional and economic base of these settlements; it is not difficult to anticipate how miserable a settlement’s perspectives are in their struggle for a better future. Thus, it is clearly anticipated that Romani parts in larger town settlements will **have better chances**. To their benefit, (even though this is limited) units of local government, where they are established, are at work or the wider local lobby networks, according to territorial needs, attempt to meet Romani needs.

Romani settlements in rural areas are **smaller** compared to urban areas. Some examples include: Gračanica, with a population of 270; Strmec Podravski with 420 inhabitants; Kuršanec with 700 inhabitants; Parag I and Parag II with a total of 900 inhabitants; Bistrinci with 500 inhabitants; and Piškorovec with a population of 700. The range of settlement size is approximately between 100 – 700 inhabitants. Settlements with more than 700 inhabitants are very rare. Still, there are a few settlements with less than 100 inhabitants, but their number is relatively inconspicuous in the overall distribution. Thus, there are **small and very small settlements**. Considered from a socio-ecological perspective, it is more than evident that their size **per se** – is limited. They are, simply too small for successful and autonomous supervision of their own development. Two more factors also need to be added. The first is notorious: according to all measures in Croatian research **rural areas are “spaces beyond”** (see Štambuk, Rogić & Mišetić, 2002). Thus, as a whole, rural areas have difficult access to development (if at all). The second factor is, the

already mentioned professional and economic (in)competencies of the Romani group, especially in the village. This is simply of poor quality. For this reason, it is improbable that this type of settlement, even though there are clear aspirations to separate, as a whole, that **they will be able to support themselves as independent structures in the long-term**. The programmes of sanitation and regulation of the living conditions will have, in the main, occasional and limited effects.

### Infrastructure in Romani settlements

Table 2  
Evaluation of settlement  
infrastructure quality

For discussion of the quality of the communal and social infrastructure in Romani settlements the provided data in the following tables is useful.

Infrastructure	Evaluations in counties in %								
	Zagreb			Sisak-Moslavina			Varaždin		
	Not a problem	Somewhat important	Very important	Not a problem	Somewhat important	Very important	Not a problem	Somewhat important	Very important
Electricity	39.3	8.0	52.7	21.9	9.4	68.8	12.5	7.5	80.0
Waterworks	36.6	7.1	56.3	33.3	16.7	50.0	13.8	5.0	81.3
Sewerage	34.8	8.9	56.3	2.1	12.5	85.4	2.5	3.8	93.8
Telephone network	49.1	18.8	32.1	46.9	30.2	22.9	47.5	30.0	22.5
Footpaths	31.3	19.6	49.1	.0	13.5	86.5	.0	17.5	82.5
Paved streets	30.4	19.6	50.0	1.0	4.2	94.8	.0	15.0	85.0
Grocery shop	55.4	14.3	30.4	20.8	26.0	53.1	26.3	37.5	36.3
Specialised shops	44.1	30.6	25.2	38.5	37.5	24.0	42.5	40.0	17.5
Kindergarten	49.1	12.5	38.4	9.4	20.8	69.8	18.8	36.3	45.0
Primary school	52.7	9.8	37.5	21.9	13.5	64.6	25.0	31.3	43.8
Health clinic or surgery	45.5	8.9	45.5	19.8	18.8	61.5	27.5	21.3	51.3
Social club	39.3	26.8	33.9	7.3	30.2	62.5	22.5	51.3	26.3
More jobs	5.4	11.6	83.0	3.2	10.8	86.0	5.2	14.3	80.5
Ordered settlement	19.6	17.9	62.5	1.1	15.8	83.2	.0	11.3	88.8
Religious institutions (church, mosque, etc.)	52.7	19.6	27.7	42.7	33.3	24.0	26.3	42.5	31.3
Cemetery	64.3	20.5	15.2	66.7	17.7	15.6	67.5	17.5	15.0
Public transport stop	58.9	8.9	32.1	38.5	24.0	37.5	21.3	30.0	48.8
Organised removal of rubbish	50.9	7.1	42.0	57.3	15.6	27.1	22.5	25.0	52.5

Table 2  
(continued)

Infrastructure	Evaluation in counties in %								
	Primorje-Gorski kotar			Brod-Posavina			Osijek-Baranja		
	Not a problem	Somewhat important	Very important	Not a problem	Somewhat important	Very important	Not a problem	Somewhat important	Very important
Electricity	21.1	11.1	67.8	33.0	3.0	64.0	46.0	5.0	49.0
Waterworks	18.9	8.9	72.2	29.0	5.0	66.0	24.0	10.0	66.0
Sewerage	3.3	4.4	92.2	4.0	1.0	95.0	17.0	18.0	65.0
Telephone network	25.6	28.9	45.6	29.0	21.0	50.0	39.0	26.0	35.0
Footpaths	6.7	26.7	66.7	5.0	27.0	68.0	19.0	24.0	57.0
Paved streets	5.6	13.3	81.1	14.1	11.1	74.7	18.0	19.0	63.0
Grocery shop	28.9	18.9	52.2	42.0	22.0	36.0	26.0	24.0	50.0
Specialised shops	38.9	45.6	15.6	52.0	36.0	12.0	49.0	31.0	20.0
Kindergarten	15.6	15.6	68.9	11.0	23.0	66.0	16.0	26.0	58.0
Primary school	24.4	26.7	48.9	12.0	15.0	73.0	36.0	21.0	43.0
Health clinic or surgery	18.9	12.2	68.9	9.0	12.0	79.0	17.0	17.0	66.0
Social club	21.1	30.0	48.9	15.0	22.0	63.0	21.0	30.0	49.0
More jobs	1.1	10.0	88.9	3.0	.0	97.0	1.0	4.0	95.0
Ordered settlement	.0	12.2	87.8	.0	2.0	98.0	9.0	19.0	72.0
Religious institutions (church, mosque, etc.)	13.3	27.8	58.9	35.0	21.0	44.0	57.0	12.0	31.0
Cemetery	22.7	35.2	42.0	59.0	17.0	24.0	58.0	17.0	25.0
Public transport stop	28.9	33.3	37.8	15.0	15.0	70.0	33.0	19.0	48.0
Organised removal of rubbish	31.1	21.1	47.8	36.0	14.0	50.0	40.0	14.0	46.0

Table 2  
(continued)

Infrastructure	Evaluations in counties in %											
	Istria			Medimurje			Other			Total sample		
	Not a problem	Somewhat important	Very important	Not a problem	Somewhat important	Very important	Not a problem	Somewhat important	Very important	Not a problem	Somewhat important	Very important
Electricity	59.8	6.2	34.0	20.0	11.6	68.4	29.3	18.7	52.0	30.7	9.0	60.3
Waterworks	59.8	4.1	36.1	10.6	8.3	81.0	37.3	10.7	52.0	27.2	8.4	64.4
Sewerage	52.6	9.3	38.1	2.8	9.7	87.6	5.3	.0	94.7	13.2	8.1	78.7
Telephone network	44.3	34.0	21.6	32.6	26.0	41.4	46.7	8.0	45.3	39.1	25.1	35.9
Footpaths	58.8	23.7	17.5	9.3	29.6	61.1	2.7	9.3	88.0	14.9	22.6	62.5
Paved streets	61.7	17.0	21.3	12.0	20.8	67.1	2.7	4.0	93.3	16.4	15.0	68.6

Infrastructure	Evaluations in counties in %											
	Istria			Medimurje			Other			Total sample		
	Not a problem	Somewhat important	Very important	Not a problem	Somewhat important	Very important	Not a problem	Somewhat important	Very important	Not a problem	Somewhat important	Very important
Grocery shop	66.7	11.5	21.9	39.4	21.3	39.4	26.7	29.3	44.0	37.9	22.1	40.0
Specialised shops	74.0	18.8	7.3	46.8	27.3	25.9	56.0	24.0	20.0	48.8	31.6	19.6
Kindergarten	53.6	21.6	24.7	20.0	18.1	61.9	22.7	25.3	52.0	24.0	21.2	54.7
Primary school	57.3	11.5	31.3	29.6	18.5	51.9	45.3	25.3	29.3	33.5	18.5	48.0
Health clinic or surgery	45.8	9.4	44.8	19.0	14.4	66.7	48.0	18.7	33.3	26.5	14.4	59.1
Social club	49.5	29.9	20.6	25.5	38.9	35.6	26.7	22.7	50.7	25.6	32.0	42.4
More jobs	12.5	9.4	78.1	6.9	11.1	81.9	6.9	6.9	86.1	5.2	8.9	85.9
Ordered settlement	35.4	32.3	32.3	1.9	19.4	78.7	2.7	6.7	90.7	7.5	16.0	76.5
Religious institutions (church, mosque, etc.)	42.7	13.5	43.8	28.8	30.2	40.9	52.0	20.0	28.0	38.1	24.8	37.1
Cemetery	42.3	10.3	47.4	67.1	17.1	15.7	74.7	13.3	12.0	59.0	18.3	22.7
Public transport stop	51.5	23.7	24.7	31.6	26.5	41.9	44.0	18.7	37.3	35.8	22.3	42.0
Organised removal of rubbish	52.6	22.7	24.7	24.7	11.6	63.7	37.3	17.3	45.3	37.9	15.5	46.5

Source: Field study 2004

Some of the given data in the tables is instructive.

(a) Considering the survey sample as a whole, convincingly it can be seen how the smallest share of the sample (only a minor percent) stated that **more jobs and an ordered settlement** are not a problem. On the other hand, convincingly most expressed that more jobs (85.9%) and an ordered settlement (76.5%) are markedly important. The mentioned priorities hold a similar position in each county. It can be concluded that there is a **social potential** on the basis of which a long-term and stable mobilisation of the Roma in these settlements could be shaped. This possibility is challenged by a few relevant factors; some of these have already been mentioned. However, we should not “jump” to optimistic conclusions just on the basis of the presented findings and then establish how the mentioned potential can be linearly activated. In this respect, local developmental policies are important. Just how competent are local self-governing units (where there are Romani settlements) is an issue outside the framework of this analysis. It should be noted that towns – the size of Sisak have difficulties formulating these types of policies and more difficulty can be expected in smaller units in a predominantly rural network of settlements.

(b) Out of the three basic public utilities (electricity, waterworks, sewerage), most agreed that sewerage is clearly

important. Namely, as many as 79% claimed that this is very important in terms of further development of the settlement, while only 13.2% of the respondents claimed that this is not a problem. It is well-known that sewerage is the “torture” of many Croatian settlements. In comparison to the other mentioned public utilities, sewerage is the **slowest developed**. On the other hand, a number of Croatian addresses use septic tanks in the absence of a sewerage system. Thus, it is not obvious why the absence of a sewerage system, in view of the septic tank possibility, is a problem in Romani settlements. It seems that this reaction implies the expectation that this is someone else’s responsibility rather than one’s own, i.e., the use of a septic tank is a widespread practice among the non-Roma population. Still, the other two utilities are in a better state. Nearly a third of the respondents (30.7%) stated that electricity is not a problem in the settlement. On the other hand, as many as 60.3% respondents stated that electricity is an important priority with regard to orderliness in the settlement. This alludes to the fact that electricity is available in many Romani settlements, but the Roma cannot pay their electricity bills so they are the “victims” of disconnection. The available documentation shows that electricity is accessible in most Romani settlements.

Considering the basic models of public utility facilities, present in Croatian urbanisation, it is reasonable to anticipate that the percentage wise share of respondents that are satisfied with waterworks in the settlements will be less than the percentage wise share of respondents that are satisfied with electricity. The findings indicate that this is the case. Less (even though this is insignificantly less) 27.2% of the respondents claimed that waterworks are not a problem in the settlement. On the other hand, nearly 65% state that waterworks are very important and necessary. This percentage indicates a clear lagging of Romani settlements. This is also evident in the available town-planning documentation.

(c) The three basic institutions of social infrastructure: the kindergarten, primary school and health clinic are not a problem for 24–33% of the respondents. Approximately, the same share of respondents claims that electricity and water are not a problem. However, on the other hand, significantly less express the importance and urgency of their building – between 48–59%. The first percentage refers to a primary school. It can be concluded that this network is “closer” to Romani settlements. However, the percentage that refers to the health clinic (59%) and kindergarten (55%) indicates that the opportunities in

this perspective are, to put it very mildly, substandard. Besides the primary school network, the other networks of social infrastructure are completely unsuitable to meet needs of the community.

(d) Paved footpaths, paved streets and similar improvements **are at the very initial stage**. It is evident that their shortage is visible not only in rural settlements, where it is usual and more probable but also in town settlements.

(e) The telephone network is not a source of problems for, approximately 40% of respondents while public transport is not a problem for approximately 36% of respondents. Even though both data show, like all the others previously mentioned, the obvious substandardness, it is evident that the “softer” forms of technical services, with less obligatory investment in huge and expensive equipment, break through Romani settlements more easily. The same conclusion can be drawn for the share of respondents satisfied with the organisation of rubbish removal.

(f) The bad news also extends to the data on the remaining municipal services. Responses suggest how respondents have the least difficulty with – death. The respondents have the “least problem” with burial places. Similarly, they have the least difficulty with places of worship. Evidently, that ‘a Romani perspective of the other side’ is somewhat brighter than the perspective on this side.

(g) Thus, considered as a whole, Romani settlements according to the respondents’ perception are **markedly substandard in terms of infrastructure**. Of course, in this sense, a town settlement is somewhat better. However, just “townness” does not guarantee a better quality infrastructure. Greater differences are evident between settlements in particular county areas. Generally considered, the better ones are in the Counties of Istria and Osijek-Baranja as well as the City of Zagreb. However, despite this, the paramount conclusion is that Romani settlements are at the extreme margins as a result of their substandardness. In essence, there is a simple paradox at work. It can be schematically formulated in the following way: **it is more probable that settlements will be better equipped if they are of less Romani origin**. In the three mentioned areas, there are more of these settlements that are less Romani so the total picture has less black/grey tones.

### Ideas about desirable settlements

---

It is well-known that entirely precise ideas are usually evaded in research of this kind based on surveys. This is not because of the methodological framework restrictions. Rather

simply, most of the respondents are not capable of clearly defining more important territorial aspirations. This statement does not only apply to the Romani group but also to other groups that are present in Croatian settlements. Nevertheless, it is possible to propose some basic ideas on a desirable settlement. These ideas have been reduced to a few **orientation** desires and thoughts. As they are, they certainly cannot be used as a completed plan of action. However, they undoubtedly contribute a clearer boundary determination between particular possibilities that define an action base of a renewal programme and settlement revitalisation.

**The main descriptor of the settlement.** For its identification, it is useful to consider the distribution of data in the following table.

**Table 3**  
Characteristic features of  
lifestyle in the settlement

Features	County in %								
	Zagreb			Sisak-Moslavina			Varaždin		
	Not at all	Somewhat	Clearly	Not at all	Somewhat	Clearly	Not at all	Somewhat	Clearly
Great role of tradition	23.1	33.7	43.3	31.8	43.5	24.7	29.9	35.8	34.3
Threatened by the polluted environment	30.9	16.4	52.7	1.0	15.6	83.3	5.1	8.9	86.1
The possibility of acquiring a good standard in a short time	51.4	21.9	26.7	58.2	32.9	8.9	56.8	27.0	16.2
Safe everyday life	29.7	30.6	39.6	19.4	35.5	45.2	13.9	46.8	39.2
The possibility of living according to one's own choice	25.2	31.8	43.0	20.5	46.6	33.0	16.0	36.0	48.0

**Table 3**  
(continued)

Features	County in %								
	Primorje-Gorski kotar			Brod-Posavina			Osijek-Baranja		
	Not at all	Somewhat	Clearly	Not at all	Somewhat	Clearly	Not at all	Somewhat	Clearly
Great role of tradition	3.8	28.2	67.9	26.6	40.4	33.0	29.3	34.8	35.9
Threatened by the polluted environment	13.7	27.4	58.9	5.3	14.7	80.0	23.2	31.6	45.3
The possibility of acquiring a good standard in a short time	81.8	7.8	10.4	59.1	20.4	20.4	57.6	21.7	20.7
Safe everyday life	39.2	22.8	38.0	10.3	41.2	48.5	13.0	37.0	50.0
The possibility of living according to one's own choice	33.3	24.0	42.7	22.6	25.8	51.6	18.0	31.5	50.6

Table 3  
(continued)

Features	Counties in %											
	Istria			Medimurje			Other			Total sample		
	Not at all	Somewhat	Clearly	Not at all	Somewhat	Clearly	Not at all	Somewhat	Clearly	Not at all	Somewhat	Clearly
Great role of tradition	5.7	31.0	63.2	27.2	42.8	30.0	32.3	38.5	29.2	23.6	37.2	39.2
Threatened by the polluted environment	32.3	39.8	28.0	12.2	18.3	69.5	9.6	28.8	61.6	15.0	21.7	63.3
The possibility of acquiring a good standard in a short time	42.2	16.7	41.1	48.9	22.8	28.3	50.8	33.3	15.9	55.2	22.4	22.4
Safe everyday life	7.7	38.5	53.8	17.8	28.7	53.5	8.2	26.0	65.8	17.9	33.6	48.5
The possibility of living according to one's own choice	17.0	33.0	50.0	20.6	26.9	52.6	15.6	35.9	48.4	21.0	31.7	47.2

Source: Field study 2004

The given data shows in a convincing way that the majority of the respondents agree that the main distinguishing feature of the settlement in which they live is that their **life is endangered by conditions**. More than 60% of the respondents completely agree that this is a characteristic feature of their lifestyle while an additional 20% claim that the threat is “somewhat” present. On the other hand, only 15% of the respondents think that hazard is not a feature of life in the settlement in which they live. The **polluted environment** is the source of hazard in most cases. This is also due to the chaotic availability of municipal services. Moreover, many Romani settlements were set up near larger industrial polluters or larger rubbish dumps, which many Roma see as an important “resource”. Likewise, the majority convincingly agree that people in these settlements cannot count on fast life successes or on speedy improvements of life opportunities and welfare. In other words, according to the Roma, their settlements are dangerous places in terms of health and life where **only a minority** believe that they have the possibility to acquire a good standard in a short time and live according to their desires.

However, nearly 50% of the respondents maintain that the possibility of a safe everyday life is “obvious” in this, not especially enchanting context. This is like the possibility to live according to one’s choice. Both findings need to be read as linked. Their more precise meaning is comprehensible in the context of endemic poverty and poor literacy, which as the data shows is paramount in these settlements. In these contexts, the mentioned state-

ments indicate a type of **social autarky**, which permeates their relation towards their settlement. The settlements, according to the respondents, are risky and dangerous. In the main, they are chaotic. However, on the other hand, in this **social isolation**, everyday life is relatively successfully monitored and lived with minimum external pressure. Since eventual external pressure would be targeted at change of the ecological configuration and technical systems as well as lifestyles on an independent income, the Roma think of this change in terms of its **limiting nature** with respect to their autonomy until now. Thus, dedication to the settlement, despite the negative main descriptor, is considerable. Paradoxically, minor deprivation enslaves, but it seems that major deprivation – liberates.

**What type of settlement?** The distribution of responses, which indicates their main needs is shown in table 4.

**Table 4**  
What type of settlement do the Roma want?

Features of the settlement	County in %									
	Zagreb	Sisak-Moslavina	Varaždin	Primorje-Gorski kotar	Brod-Posavina	Osijek-Baranja	Istria	Međimurje	Other	Total sample
An ordered and clean settlement with nice fronts/facades	31.3	50.0	42.6	17.8	33.0	17.0	1.0	52.5	58.7	35.3
A settlement with public utilities (gas, electricity, water, sewerage...)	6.3	26.1	35.0	26.6	12.0	18.0	1.0	23.5	14.7	18.2
A settlement with ordered traffic infrastructure	3.6	31.3	22.5	28.9	10.0	17.0	.0	24.5	28.1	18.5
A settlement with different social infrastructure (school, kindergarten, playground, cultural centre...)	1.8	7.2	6.3	6.7	4.0	4.0	.0	15.2	5.3	6.7
An urbanised settlement (building permit)	0.9	1.0	5.1	7.8	1.0	6.0	.0	1.9	5.4	2.9
A rural type of settlement	0.9	.0	1.3	.0	.0	2.0	.0	4.6	.0	1.4
Settlements like other “non-Roma” settlements, nothing special	43.8	29.2	26.3	27.8	42.0	40.0	32.7	18.4	21.3	30.3
Big, grouped settlements	4.5	.0	1.3	.0	1.0	.0	3.1	3.2	.0	1.8

Source: Field study 2004

In this table, two groups are evidently larger than others: the group of respondents that dream about an ordered/clean settlement and a group of respondents who want settlements that are similar to other “non-Roma” settlements – nothing special. At a level of meaning, it is not incorrect to assume how the respondents link these two responses. Ideas about a desirable settlement directly rest on

**cleanliness and related ecological descriptors** and on the **non-Roma difference** – more precisely on the similarity of Romani settlements with other non-Roma settlements. The possible confusion here may be caused by the use of the words: Romani and non-Romani settlement.

In this section, they do not denote specific determinants inseparable from ethnic or socio-cultural identity. They denote, on the contrary, the difference between settlements that are municipally and economically “normal” and settlements that are municipally and economically substandard, which in this research has operatively qualified as Romani. Thus, the aspirational reaching out of the respondents for non-Romani settlements indicates their yearning to snap out of sad/grey settlement neglect. In short, the central aspirations of the respondents can be understood as a wish for a settlement-that-is-like-every-other. They do not cease to be Romani with respect to the determinants of Romani identity. However, they cease to be Romani by erasing the configurations of neglect.

In light of this data, the insight mentioned earlier is not erased. The forces of social autarky are still effective. However, the functioning settlement framework is simply transferred to an existentially and municipally less dangerous/risky place. Only as much as it is “less” dangerous/risky, is it more similar to non-Romani settlements. Aspiration, in essence, only shows the main direction of desired settlement **position** of Romani inhabitants. It does not include the desire to change some limiting characteristics of the **inhabitants themselves**. In this respect, aspirations are not so unambiguous.

**Configuration of desires up close.** The concrete outline of desirable settlements can be seen in table 5

If the “Romani” results are compared to results obtained in other cases, it is evident that the basic pattern of housing aspirations is similar. Their main points of reference are: a house with a vegetable plot and yard; pedestrian zone; a low-rise building; and small town. Their expression among the Romani group does not distinguish them, but, on the contrary, **makes them similar** to the majority population.

However, there are three points of reference that are impossible to neglect. The surveyed Roma more often express that they wish to live in settlements **with town streets** (74%) and in **newer settlements with modern architecture** (63%). Still, **less** respondents 44.3% want to live in a Romani settlement with other Roma and **more** 55.7% want to live in another (non-Romani) settlement.

Table 5  
Where would the Roma most prefer to live?

Determinant of the settlement	County in %									Total sample
	Zagreb	Sisak-Moslavina	Varaždin	Primorje-Gorski kotar	Brod-Posavina	Osijek-Baranja	Istria	Medimurje	Other	
Along a river	34.5	29.2	24.4	83.1	48.0	42.4	29.9	35.0	31.3	38.4
Away from a river	65.5	70.8	75.6	16.9	52.0	57.6	70.1	65.0	68.7	61.6
Close to the town centre	75.5	63.5	53.2	67.1	71.0	68.0	74.0	66.8	52.2	66.5
Away from town centre	24.5	36.5	46.8	32.9	29.0	32.0	26.0	33.2	47.8	33.5
In a settlement with town streets	68.2	71.9	75.9	63.8	67.0	82.0	86.8	75.5	73.1	73.9
In a settlement without typical town streets	31.8	28.1	24.1	36.2	33.0	18.0	13.2	24.5	26.9	26.1
In an older part of the town with classical (traditional) architecture	40.7	40.6	27.8	33.3	21.0	42.0	23.5	43.9	53.7	37.2
In a newer settlement with modern architecture	59.3	59.4	72.2	66.7	79.0	58.0	76.5	56.1	46.3	62.8
In a house with a vegetable plot and yard	94.5	96.9	94.9	96.4	90.0	96.0	87.9	93.5	91.0	93.5
In an apartment building or family house without a vegetable plot and yard	5.5	3.1	5.1	3.6	10.0	4.0	12.1	6.5	9.0	6.5
In a pedestrian zone	70.0	82.1	83.3	78.8	90.0	80.0	84.2	86.3	73.1	81.6
In a zone with town traffic	30.0	17.9	16.7	21.2	10.0	20.0	15.8	13.7	26.9	18.4
In a low-rise building	92.7	94.8	94.9	97.1	89.9	94.0	86.8	93.0	95.5	93.1
In a high-rise building	7.3	5.2	5.1	2.9	10.1	6.0	13.2	7.0	4.5	6.9
In a big town	57.0	29.2	29.1	72.6	37.0	18.2	44.3	30.0	21.2	36.5
In a smaller or small town	43.0	70.8	70.9	27.4	63.0	81.8	55.7	70.0	78.8	63.5
In a Romani settlement	22.9	45.8	57.0	55.3	47.0	46.0	19.2	48.1	56.7	44.3
In another (non-Romani) settlement	77.1	54.2	43.0	44.7	53.0	54.0	80.8	51.9	43.3	55.7
In a village	24.5	62.5	82.3	5.7	52.0	60.0	17.0	79.2	85.1	54.8
In a town	75.5	37.5	17.7	94.3	48.0	40.0	83.0	20.8	14.9	45.2

Source: Field Study 2004

The first two are related to the insights presented in previous sections. **Ground-plan order, new buildings and modernity** are features of a town-planning directive that resulted in the building of a number of settlements during the socialist period. These features were not threatened in the period following 1990. Romani desires **directly** express a **negation** of abandoned/"wild" settlements where most of them now live. In this respect, they want to live in settlements that are similar to other settlements.

However, the third determinant deserves a special comment. Over half of the respondents desire to live in a

settlement where there is **no** Romani community, at least where this community has a role in administration and the orienting development of the settlement. However, on the other hand, less than half of the respondents state that the already mentioned determinants of a desirable settlement are **directly connected to the presence of the Romani community** in that type of settlement. Two hypotheses are useful in the reading of the obtained differences.

The first hypothesis indicates that there is a strong sub-group in the Romani population in which the accumulation of life and social successes is connected to weaker “overriding” links with other members of the group. A number of insights, even though unsystematic, show that a number of Roma who have succeeded in life (whatever that means) socially represent their success by underlining similarities or affiliation to the majority/non-Romani population. In other words: they do not emphasise/dramatise their Romani roots. According to this scheme, the accumulation of life successes leads to the social and symbolic distancing from Romani groups. Of course, the mentioned 55% of the respondents that do not wish to live in Romani settlements cannot be classified into this group mechanically. We do not have the necessary data for this type of classification. However, it can be unambiguously maintained that the choice of a non-Romani settlement as desirable is related/connected to this type of orientation.

The second hypothesis shows that the Romani population live on an independent income more than they depend on economic opportunities. This, as other reliable data shows, is maintained in a context of limited functional literacy and reduced professional and social competency. *The rental of poverty*, thus, appears in the wider sub-cultural configuration; its strength is predominately absorbed from the social autarchy of the Romani group, where its marginal quality only can maintain it as a rational acceptable fact. It seems that the critical separation of Romani identity and social autarchy has not advanced. This means that some of the important patterns of Romani identity, especially traditional **lifestyles**, in Romani self-representation appear, as a rule, closely tied to the social autarchy of the group and living on social welfare. Indirectly, this structurally blocks the evolution of particular determinants of Romani identity and the possibility of directly linking socially successful behaviour and Romani identification. According to this scheme: to be a Roma means being at the social/sub-cultural margin. It needs to be noted that social overheads and reduction **is not** an exclusive product of a

global society. The Romani *rentiers of poverty* get the most from this; as a specific Romani “upper layer” they are interested, first of all, in rewarding dependence and only marginally in training the Romani group for roles as social participants capable of more than just living on an unearned income. It certainly needs to be mentioned that 44% of the respondents cannot be mechanically classified into this group dedicated to understanding the Romani identity as a skill of living on an independent income. However, it is unambiguous that the expression of these desires is related to the outlined orientation.

Both of these hypotheses imply that the Romani group **is not homogeneous** in comparison to the central developmental issue of the group: how to cross the margin and become a successful group, at least as much as the others and not repress or disintegrate traditional determinants of Romani identity?

**Desirability of institutions.** The desirability of a number of institutions of social infrastructure can be seen in the next table. It should be noted that the respondents were not asked to make choices but rather ranked the given list of institutions according to their desirability.

**Table 6**  
The desirability of local institutions

Rating	County				
	Zagreb	Sisak-Moslavina	Varaždin	Primorje-Gorski kotar	Brod-Posavina
1.	Health clinic, chemist's	School and kindergarten	School and kindergarten	Health clinic, chemist's	Health clinic, chemist's
2.	School and kindergarten	Health clinic, chemist's	Health clinic, chemist's	School and kindergarten	School and kindergarten
3.	Grocery shop	Grocery shop	Grocery shop	Grocery shop	Sport-recreational facilities
4.	Fair, market	Sport-recreational facilities	Sport-recreational facilities	Religious place of worship	Grocery shop
5.	Religious place of worship	Cultural-entertainment facilities	Religious place of worship	Sport-recreational facilities	Fair, market
6.	Sport-recreational facilities	Fair, market	Fair, market	Fair, market	Cultural-entertainment facilities
7.	Cultural-entertainment facilities	Religious place of worship	Cultural-entertainment facilities	Cultural-entertainment facilities	Religious place of worship
8.	Catering establishment (inn/café)				

Table 6  
(continued)

Rating	County				
	Osijek-Baranja	Istria	Medimurje	Other	Total sample
1.	Health clinic, chemist's	School and kindergarten	School and kindergarten	School and kindergarten	School and kindergarten
2.	School and kindergarten	Health clinic, chemist's	Health clinic, chemist's	Grocery shop	Health clinic, chemist's
3.	Grocery shop	Religious place of worship	Grocery shop	Health clinic, chemist's	Grocery shop
4.	Sport-recreational facilities	Grocery shop	Sport-recreational facilities	Sport-recreational facilities	Sport-recreational facilities
5.	Fair, market	Fair, market	Religious place of worship	Fair, market	Fair, market
6.	Cultural-entertainment facilities	Sport-recreational facilities	Fair, market	Cultural-entertainment facilities	Religious place of worship
7.	Catering establishment (inn/café)	Cultural-entertainment facilities	Cultural-entertainment facilities	Religious place of worship	Cultural-entertainment facilities
8.	Religious place of worship	Catering establishment (inn/café)	Catering establishment (inn/café)	Catering establishment (inn/café)	Catering establishment (inn/café)

Source: Field study 2004

The obtained results clearly show/state the previously outlined findings. In all counties, as in Croatia as a whole, the first and second place was precisely taken up by three basic institutions of social infrastructure: the school, kindergarten and health clinic/chemist's. In short, these are institutions of education and health. On the other hand, in the whole surveyed area, like in most counties, except for the County of Osijek-Baranja, the catering establishment (inn/café) is last in terms of importance and desirability to the Roma. A religious place of worship is last on the list in the County of Osijek-Baranja. Considering that Romani settlements in this county were predominantly part of the existing settlement network, there is no need for religious places of worship because they already exist there.

Sport-recreational facilities and grocery shops are in the middle of the range. It is evident that there is less need for cultural-entertainment facilities. In the main, they are in second to last place (in five out of nine area groups), or in third to last place. The only exception is in the County of Sisak-Moslavina where these facilities are middle of the range.

These results reflect the existing circumstances that predominate in Romani settlements and the obtained distribution offers a useful general indicator of the aspirational

framework in which the idea of a desirable settlement is shaped. It is evident that the central aspirational forces are related to an ordered settlement, where it is comfortable to live and where the basic welfare of children and youth as well as health care **is guaranteed**. In general, the respondents express how they want to substitute para-urban improvised pressured living for settlements where there is visible/present **systematic public welfare** for a quality life of their inhabitants. Occasional municipal service investments and improvements in this respect are not adequate. An **institutional network** that can continually monitor and transform “wild” settlements is needed.

### Who is the settlement?

A few special questions are masked behind this seemingly unusual heading. Their common link is with a certain “inventory-making” of the community which was shaped in the analysis of Romani settlements.

**The authority of the community.** A detailed analysis of the authority of a settlement community in survey research of this kind comes up against many practical difficulties. Thus, the analytical demands in this case are clearly reduced. The discussion is on two findings. The first is visible in the next table.

**Table 7**  
Sources of information in settlement

Source of information	County in %								
	Frequency of use								
	Zagreb			Sisak-Moslavina			Varaždin		
	Never	Sometimes	Often	Never	Sometimes	Often	Never	Sometimes	Often
Croatian TV	10.7	29.5	59.8	10.4	21.9	67.7	15.0	30.0	55.0
Local TV	33.0	33.9	33.0	20.8	35.4	43.8	40.0	38.8	21.3
Foreign TV stations (satellite)	72.1	10.8	17.1	91.6	5.3	3.2	82.5	10.0	7.5
Croatian radio	35.7	30.4	33.9	33.3	35.4	31.3	25.0	37.5	37.5
Other radio stations	40.2	33.9	25.9	37.5	36.5	26.0	47.5	35.0	17.5
Daily paper	44.6	29.5	25.9	66.7	22.9	10.4	57.5	32.5	10.0
Weekly paper	66.1	24.1	9.8	71.9	19.8	8.3	68.8	26.3	5.0
Talks with members of family or friends	.0	10.7	89.3	4.2	15.6	80.2	3.8	17.5	78.8

Table 7  
(continued)

Source of information	County in %								
	Frequency of use								
	Primorje-Gorski kotar			Brod-Posavina			Osijek-Baranja		
	Never	Someti- mes	Often	Never	Someti- mes	Often	Never	Someti- mes	Often
Croatian TV	1.1	28.1	70.8	8.0	14.0	78.0	5.0	18.0	77.0
Local TV	9.1	44.3	46.6	43.0	35.0	22.0	39.0	31.0	30.0
Foreign TV stations (satellite)	25.0	46.6	28.4	65.0	19.0	16.0	79.0	12.0	9.0
Croatian radio	31.5	36.0	32.6	18.0	36.0	46.0	14.0	30.0	56.0
Other radio stations	34.8	40.4	24.7	41.0	34.0	25.0	13.0	32.0	55.0
Daily paper	41.1	43.3	15.6	54.0	34.0	12.0	62.0	24.0	14.0
Weekly paper	68.9	24.4	6.7	65.0	27.0	8.0	73.0	24.0	3.0
Talks with members of family or friends	.0	2.3	97.7	4.0	12.0	84.0	.0	14.1	85.9

Table 7  
(continued)

Source of information	County in %											
	Frequency of use											
	Istria			Medimurje			Other			Total sample		
	Never	Some- times	Often	Never	Some- times	Often	Never	Some- times	Often	Never	Some- times	Often
Croatian TV	9.2	22.4	68.4	8.3	33.8	57.9	10.7	25.3	64.0	8.6	25.8	65.6
Local TV	34.7	37.8	27.6	43.5	31.5	25.0	28.0	30.7	41.3	34.0	34.8	31.2
Foreign TV stations (satellite)	43.9	33.7	22.4	85.6	8.8	5.6	90.7	6.7	2.7	72.2	16.0	11.8
Croatian radio	21.4	44.9	33.7	25.0	37.5	37.5	18.9	51.4	29.7	25.0	37.2	37.8
Other radio stations	33.7	40.8	25.5	44.4	28.7	26.9	42.7	32.0	25.3	37.8	34.1	28.2
Daily paper	39.2	38.1	22.7	63.4	29.6	6.9	56.0	37.3	6.7	54.9	31.8	13.4
Weekly paper	57.1	27.6	15.3	75.9	19.4	4.6	69.3	28.0	2.7	69.3	23.8	6.9
Talks with members of family or friends	.0	17.5	82.5	3.7	13.0	83.3	2.7	21.3	76.0	2.2	13.5	84.3

Source: Field study 2004

The given data shows that most respondents mention two sources of information most often: **Croatian TV and Talks with members of family or friends**. The first source, as it is known, is a public company; its main job is to inform. Since many studies have shown that television is the most effective public media, it is not especially surprising that the Roma watch it often. However, the other mentioned source: talks with members of family or friends, is

not, evidently a specialised source of information. Moreover, oral speech is the medium that this circle most often uses. Considering the level of literacy among the Roma, it is not incorrect to assume that oral speech is their only medium. However, despite the technical “simplicity” of their main medium, the informational authority of family/friend circle is based on the percentage of respondents who put this in first place. The group of respondents who “often” use the family/friend circle as a source of information is nearly **20% more** than the group that “often” watches Croatian TV. In other words, despite the strength of particular information companies, a particular strong source of information is the family/friend circle in Romani settlements. This is a **parallel type of** informing that directly depends on mutual communication that is predominately face-to-face. Clearly, the authority of the family/friend circle as a source of information would not be established, especially in light of competing professional television companies, if it were not **structurally dependent** on the authority of family/friend networks in other areas of everyday life. This indicates that the **network** of wider family units that are present in particular settlements is the basic mechanism and framework of differentiation of the settlement community. The network breaks up and “filters” external influences that range from simple pieces of information to far-reaching demands and limitations.

The role of the family/friend network, in light of the circumstances, is not extended to the duty of provoking change in the settlement. Its job is to define patterns that are obligatory for members more clearly. The duty of provoking change is addressed to those participants “outside”. The data in the following table suggests this hypothesis.

**Table 8**  
Who needs to be the main initiator of improving the quality of housing?

Initiator	County in %									
	Zagreb	Sisak-Moslavina	Varaždin	Primorje-Gorski kotar	Brod-Posavina	Osijek-Baranja	Istria	Međimurje	Other	Total sample
Municipality/town	80.2	90.4	80.0	92.0	78.7	79.8	90.1	80.3	90.1	83.8
Inhabitants of the quarter/settlement	19.8	9.6	20.0	8.0	21.3	20.2	9.9	19.7	9.9	16.2

Source: Field study 2004

It is visible that a convincing majority of the respondents consider that the town or municipal administration has the responsibility of provoking change/improvement.

If this considered practically, this response is not without foundation. The town and municipal authorities deal with money, technical matters and land anyway. In comparison to their potential, the possibilities of the Romani community are more than humble.

However, it needs to be remembered that the duties of improvement initiators are not directly dependent on the mentioned possibilities. They emerge out of a deeper circle of “ecological” duties where the local community itself knows best what “hurts” in the area and how to produce the main actors of change/improvement. The Romani responses “skip” this fact. The respondents’ message reads: The initiator needs to be someone who has authority. The thought of a partnership between the settlement community and external initiators of change has just been announced.

**Who is the “boss” in settlements?** The distribution of responses to questions on the institutions or individuals who influence the development and living conditions of the settlement were obtained in the same basic way. This distribution is shown in the following table.

**Table 9**  
Who influences settlement  
development and living  
conditions?

Subject of influence	Counties in %								
	Degree of influence								
	Zagreb			Sisak-Moslavina			Varaždin		
	Not at all	To some degree	Noticeably	Not at all	To some degree	Noticeably	Not at all	To some degree	Noticeably
State, government	41.9	34.3	23.8	48.2	43.4	8.4	46.5	39.4	14.1
Town/municipal government	40.2	30.8	29.0	42.9	45.1	12.1	49.3	33.3	17.3
Experts	63.5	27.1	9.4	83.3	16.7	.0	78.6	17.1	4.3
Settlement inhabitants	30.0	39.1	30.9	18.9	58.9	22.2	19.5	45.5	35.1
NGOs that promote human rights and liberty	52.5	27.3	20.2	72.8	23.5	3.7	63.4	26.8	9.9
Romani associations	44.5	23.6	31.8	45.3	45.3	9.5	48.7	28.9	22.4
Political parties	74.0	13.0	13.0	85.2	12.5	2.3	87.1	7.1	5.7

Table 9  
(continued)

Subject of influence	Counties in %								
	Degree of influence								
	Primorje-Gorski kotar			Brod-Posavina			Osijek-Baranja		
	Not at all	To some degree	Noticeably	Not at all	To some degree	Noticeably	Not at all	To some degree	Noticeably
State, government	52.1	28.2	19.7	25.3	45.3	29.5	50.5	31.2	18.3
Town/municipal government	45.8	34.7	19.4	18.4	48.0	33.7	26.8	43.3	29.9
Experts	63.5	27.1	9.4	83.3	16.7	.0	78.6	17.1	4.3
Settlement inhabitants	22.2	46.9	30.9	21.1	49.5	29.5	22.4	35.7	41.8
NGOs that promote human rights and liberty	53.3	25.0	21.7	38.2	40.4	21.3	49.4	31.5	19.1
Romani associations	14.5	34.2	51.3	35.5	36.6	28.0	27.8	33.0	39.2
Political parties	63.6	27.3	9.1	71.6	17.9	10.5	82.8	9.7	7.5

Table 9  
(continued)

Subject of influence	Counties in %											
	Degree of influence											
	Istria			Medimurje			Other			Total sample		
	Not at all	To some degree	Noticeably	Not at all	To some degree	Noticeably	Not at all	To some degree	Noticeably	Not at all	To some degree	Noticeably
State, government	28.6	47.6	23.8	35.8	40.6	23.5	29.6	49.3	21.1	39.2	39.9	20.9
Town/municipal government	26.1	35.2	38.6	28.6	48.1	23.3	20.5	46.6	32.9	32.4	41.5	26.2
Experts	68.3	24.4	7.3	67.5	21.5	11.0	81.3	10.9	7.8	71.7	21.2	7.0
Settlement inhabitants	28.7	41.5	29.8	26.6	35.5	37.9	26.8	45.1	28.2	24.5	42.9	32.6
NGOs that promote human rights and liberty	48.2	32.5	19.3	59.4	29.1	11.5	73.5	13.2	13.2	56.4	28.3	15.3
Romani associations	24.1	27.6	48.3	42.9	45.0	12.2	61.6	19.2	19.2	38.7	34.2	27.1
Political parties	62.0	19.0	19.0	74.6	20.3	5.1	86.8	5.9	7.4	76.2	15.3	8.5

Source: Field study 2004

According to the respondents, **experts and political parties** are entirely marginal. Less than 10% of the respondents express their “distinct” influence respectively. On the other hand, a convincing majority, more than 70% of the respondents in the total sample, claim that experts and political parties do not have influence in Romani settle-

ments. Approximately 20% of the respondents claim that the State government has a “distinct” influence, while 40% claim that this influence is not strong, but present. **Town/municipal government and Romani associations** have a somewhat stronger influence in settlements than the State government. According to the Roma, non-governmental associations in the third civil sector **are not** especially successful (only 15% said that they have “distinct” influence) in their settlements compared to Romani associations. According to the respondents, the inhabitants of the settlement have the strongest influence. Closer inspection of the distribution of responses reveals that the main influence in the total sample can be divided into a triangle: **settlement inhabitants–Romani associations–town/municipal government**.

From the research results, an optimistic hypothesis can be put forward: that the inhabitants of Romani settlements are influential even within the triangle of main actors. However, on the other hand, the reality of Romani settlements directly challenges this hypothesis. Endemic neglect is not a special sign of power among the inhabitants of this type of settlement. At least, not of power that is required for long-term and deep-rooted improvement. In essence, both statements are not incorrect. The Romani inhabitants are really influential, more than any other entity in the settlement. However, on the other hand, the range of that influence is limited to “patching up” the holes in the landscape of neglect. In other words, they are influential, **but without power and they are incapable of “producing” settlement development**. For this reason, the responsibilities of stimulating local development are addressed to external participants; first of all to town/municipal government followed by Romani associations.

**What can the community do?** Answers to this question are in the next table.

According to the respondents, the distribution of responses show that settlement communities can only do **marginal jobs**, like putting settlement into order, cleaning, and rubbish removal. The response: **nothing** is in second place. In other words, the community cannot do anything. The groups of respondents who express the possibility of entrepreneurial behaviour or the building up of internal solidarity between settlement inhabitants or long-term investment in schooling are marginal. It is not difficult to see that the obtained results are compatible with the professional potential of the Romani population that live in the surveyed settlements. Considered from this perspective, the responses do not contradict some “realisticness”.

Table 10

What can the community of the settlement do to improve the settlement?

Community potential	County in %									
	Zagreb	Sisak-Moslavina	Varaždin	Primorje-Gorski kotar	Brod-Posavina	Osijek-Baranja	Istria	Međimurje	Other	Total sample
Participate in putting settlement into order, cleaning, rubbish removal and similar	13.4	43.8	32.5	10.0	34.0	28.0	.0	30.0	42.7	25.9
Give suggestions/advice/initiatives	.9	.0	1.3	.0	.0	1.0	9.2	1.0	1.3	1.5
Be the work force in actions	2.7	3.1	1.3	18.9	.0	7.0	.0	5.0	.0	4.3
Invest in schooling	3.6	1.0	1.3	.0	2.0	.0	.0	6.9	1.3	2.5
Participate in building and maintaining the communal infrastructure	1.8	18.7	8.8	11.1	3.0	.0	.0	5.1	12.0	6.2
Nothing	8.9	11.5	15.0	5.6	16.0	15.0	2.0	6.5	10.7	9.6
Improve mutual relations, help financially	18.8	1.0	7.6	13.3	6.0	10.0	7.1	5.0	1.3	7.7
Invest in the opening of some facility (shopping, service, entertainment)	.9	3.1	1.3	.0	2.0	2.0	.0	.5	.0	1.0

*Source:* Field study 2004

However, on the other hand, that type of community, as can be seen, has considerable integration authority. **Incongruence** between developmental inability and integration authority is too evident to be a marginal fact. For its explanation, we do not have reliable empirical sources. For this reason, we are limited to a hypothesis that is supported by unsystematic insights only. According to this hypothesis, the size of the mentioned incongruence is a direct indicator of the strength of the Romani **parasitic elite** that monitors the main integration patterns of the Romani group. On the one hand, this influential group dramatises Romani inability for professional self-building and for collective development. Thanks to this, it **successfully absorbs** (even though limited) sources of social welfare of these marginal groups. In addition, it directly monitors “grey” activities such as odd jobs, begging and similar, where women and children are mostly “employed”. On the other hand, it dramatises “internal” issues about authority and in this way widens the possibility of supervising the integration patterns of Romani community members. As far as it can be seen, **the main obstacle is internal – obstructing the modernisation of a Romani lifestyle**. Like all related modernisation events this is necessary to start the shifting of education/schooling values of young members – to the top. The **unconditional** investment in education in this way becomes the foothold of reconstruction of other fundamental objectives of the group and their lifestyles.

The following two tables follow the same pattern. It useful to draw attention to the percentage of Roma that participated in jobs to clean up the settlement; this shows that there is an above average majority that are prepared to work to improve the settlement. This data is not compatible, at best, with the pessimistic evaluation about how the community cannot do anything on its own. Substitute this with the previously mentioned parasitic entrepreneurial elite, which is oriented more directly by a need for education, competency and effectiveness, the already mentioned percentage becomes a more useful indicator of the limits of development mobilisation of the Romani group. These are limitations at the public utilities level, at least.

Table 11  
Past actions of putting settlement into order

Action	County in %									
	Zagreb	Sisak-Moslavina	Varaždin	Primorje-Gorski kotar	Brod-Posavina	Osijek-Baranja	Istria	Medimurje	Other	Total sample
Putting into order, cleaning the settlement, rubbish removal	26.8	47.9	48.8	38.9	76.0	57.0	22.4	34.6	49.3	43.1
Building and maintaining traffic infrastructure	5.4	2.1	1.3	32.2	1.0	2.0	1.0	4.1	.0	5.3
Deratization	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	1.9	.0	.4
House building	3.6	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	.9	.0	.6
Digging canals for electricity, water	.0	11.4	.0	4.4	.0	1.0	1.0	1.4	.0	2.1

Source: Field study 2004

Table 12  
Did the respondents participate in putting the settlement into order?

Participation	County in %									
	Zagreb	Sisak-Moslavina	Varaždin	Primorje-Gorski kotar	Brod-Posavina	Osijek-Baranja	Istria	Medimurje	Other	Total sample
No	48.0	31.1	31.7	35.9	32.6	48.9	87.2	35.3	43.4	43.3
Yes	52.0	68.9	68.3	64.1	67.4	51.1	12.8	64.7	56.6	56.7

Source: Field study 2004

**The scope of being domiciled.** A convincing majority of the respondents 92.3% consider themselves as “local” participants “at home” in the settlements in which they live. It is a fact that most settlements were set up on seized, predominantly town or municipal land, and that the history of these settlements do not extend beyond

forty years. This evidently does not affect assessments of feeling at home that can be seen in the following table.

**Table 13**  
How do inhabitants feel in their settlement?

	County in %									
	Zagreb	Sisak-Moslavina	Varaždin	Primorje-Gorski kotar	Brod-Posavina	Osijek-Baranja	Istria	Međimurje	Other	Total sample
Local	91.8	96.9	95.0	92.2	88.0	94.0	74.5	98.1	94.7	92.3
Newcomer	8.2	3.1	5.0	7.8	12.0	6.0	25.5	1.9	5.3	7.7

Source: Field study 2004

This finding is not atypical. Following a number migratory waves, the scope of being domiciled is not strictly dependent on place of birth. It depends, first of all, on the place of life investment and place where success has been accumulated. Considering the daily quality of life in Romani settlements, it is reasonable to assume that this does not secure an awareness of home. However, the facts show the reverse. The surveyed Roma report that they feel at home. This is clearly shown in the next table.

**Table 14**  
Readiness to change address because of better life conditions

Counties	Degree of readiness to change address in %											
	Move to another quarter or location in place of living			Move to another place or town within region			Move to another region in Croatia		Move to another state			
	Not ready	Undecided	Ready	Not ready	Undecided	Ready	Not ready	Undecided	Ready	Not ready	Undecided	Ready
Zagreb	29.1	.9	70.0	51.4	3.6	45.0	67.9	2.7	29.5	78.4	3.6	18.0
Sisak-Moslavina	33.3	4.3	62.4	43.6	8.5	47.9	73.4	2.1	24.5	84.4	1.0	14.6
Varaždin	39.7	3.8	56.4	50.6	6.3	43.0	75.0	1.3	23.8	90.0	2.5	7.5
Primorje-Gorski kotar	24.7	10.1	65.2	51.7	12.4	36.0	83.9	8.0	8.0	89.7	2.3	8.0
Brod-Posavina	58.9	8.4	32.6	62.9	7.2	29.9	63.9	7.2	28.9	54.1	3.1	42.9
Osijek-Baranja	46.5	8.1	45.5	51.0	9.0	40.0	67.7	8.1	24.2	65.0	2.0	33.0
Istria	38.1	5.2	56.7	49.5	11.3	39.2	70.8	9.4	19.8	75.5	9.2	15.3
Međimurje	42.7	1.9	55.4	49.3	3.3	47.4	78.0	4.2	17.8	87.4	.0	12.6
Other	52.0	4.0	44.0	65.3	2.7	32.0	82.7	1.3	16.0	94.7	.0	5.3
Total sample	40.6	4.7	54.7	52.1	6.7	41.2	73.8	4.9	21.3	80.1	2.4	17.5

Source: Field study 2004

Generally speaking, inasmuch as the (eventual) place of residence is farther from the present place of living, the number of persons ready to move is less. Roughly, **every second respondent** is prepared to change address within

the framework of the same settlement. Nearly 40% are prepared to change their address within the same region. The share ready to move within Croatia and abroad is almost equal, varying around 20%. Thus, even though life in the settlements where they live is predominantly determined by endemic misery and municipal service neglect, the **majority** of the surveyed Roma are not ready to change address for better life conditions, **unless it is in the same settlement**. This fact describes them as a **realistic group**. Namely, their professional competencies and educational qualifications are already meagre for successful competition in the labour market. A change of address would not bring about perceptible improvement. However, on the other hand their “realisticness” cannot be interpreted partially like the impression of lifestyle that is shaped and monitored in Romani communities by the already mentioned parasitic elite. Since **living on an independent income** is predominant, the search for better life perspectives implies **separation from the paradoxically main development assets**. A type of closed vicious circle surfaces. Misery is necessary. Still, the “rent” is spent on the – removal of poverty. However, since poverty is a source of income its “removal” has to be monitored in the long-term so that it is not removed from the roots. Thus, besides temporary relief, support **has to** generate new actors of poverty. In this context, active territorial behaviour is simply not a rational behaviour. This implies a fundamental modernisation of Romani lifestyle. It is not necessary to caution that the successful and long-term benefits to the Romani community can only be shaped outside of the sketched pattern.

Table 15  
Is a change of address  
planned in the near future?

Similar insights are shown in the distribution of results in the next table.

Change of address	County in %									
	Zagreb	Sisak-Moslavina	Varaždin	Primorje-Gorski kotar	Brod-Posavina	Osijek-Baranja	Istria	Međimurje	Other	Total sample
In another part of the city/village	.9	5.2	6.3	3.4	1.0	5.0	7.1	7.4	5.5	4.9
In another settlement in the county area	6.3	1.0	11.3	.0	.0	3.0	1.0	5.6	4.1	3.7
In another part of Croatia	1.8	.0	.0	.0	.0	.0	1.0	.5	.0	.4
Abroad	.9	.0	.0	1.1	7.0	4.0	3.1	.5	.0	1.8
I intend to move but I still do not know where	9.8	10.4	6.3	23.6	13.0	8.0	18.4	12.0	2.7	11.8
I do not intend to move	80.4	83.3	76.3	71.9	79.0	80.0	69.4	74.1	87.7	77.4

Source: Field study 2004

The Roma, contrary to the ingrained representations **are not nomads**. At any rate, the inhabitants of present-day Romani settlements, where this study was conducted, are not nomads. Less opportunity to compete with other groups in terms of professional competency and education as well as their dependency on an independent income in Romani settlements determines their identification as a **reserve group**. It is not probable that this fatal position can change without the modernisation of Romani lifestyles. Compulsory schooling/education of the younger generations is significantly the first and certainly the starting point of future changes.

Responses in the following table show that the previously mentioned insight is slowly marking the experiences of the Roma themselves. Even though the largest group, with approximately 40% of respondents, stated that their children will stay on to live in the same settlements, every fifth expressed that they will leave, if they have not already, and every third is not sure.

**Table 16**  
According to respondents' opinion how many children will stay on in the settlement?

Evaluation	County in %									Total sample
	Zagreb	Sisak-Moslavina	Varaždin	Primorje-Gorski kotar	Brod-Posavina	Osijek-Baranja	Istria	Međimurje	Other	
I believe that they will stay	42.0	42.7	31.6	47.2	43.0	24.0	51.0	28.7	53.3	38.7
I think that they will move away	14.3	10.4	29.1	27.0	6.0	23.0	14.6	27.3	9.3	18.9
One or more children have already moved away	3.6	3.1	1.3	1.1	.0	8.0	4.2	6.5	2.7	3.8
I don't know, can't say	33.0	41.7	29.1	18.0	32.0	36.0	19.8	34.3	32.0	31.3
I don't have children	7.1	2.1	8.9	6.7	19.0	9.0	10.4	3.2	2.7	7.3

Source: Field study 2004

It is obvious that the share of the respondents who claim that their children will not move away is larger in counties where the total developmental perspectives are larger/more varied. In other words, where the possibilities of modernisation, at a principle level at least, are larger and more accessible to younger Roma, it is reasonable to expect a higher number of younger people. In the same way, in accordance with compulsory modernisation of the Romani way of life, new models of their integration into Croatian society certainly need to be formulated. The existing model is without perspective.