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Abstract

This thesis is an ethnography of how young Travellers experience and negotiate urban space in the city of Galway, Ireland. This research builds upon the understanding that our relationships to space are mediated through our social and cultural identities. The core objective of the research is to understand how young Travellers’ movements through, access to and use of public and commercial urban space are shaped by their ethnicity. My research focuses on Travellers’ relationships to the socially constructed, policed and governed boundaries which control and regulate their spatial mobility. I also seek to determine whether young Travellers’ have developed tactics to resist or challenge attempts to limit their access to and use of urban spaces on the basis of their identity.

Drawing on de Certeau’s (1984) observational methodology of ‘walking’ to analyse daily urban life, this research documents young Travellers’ experiences in and of urban space, using focus groups, maps and interviewing to further explore the meaning and significance of these experiences. Through ethnographic analysis, I investigate how young Travellers’ temporarily resist and disrupt social and spatial boundaries and how the dominant systems of power authorise and inscribe these boundaries between young Travellers and urban spaces. I am aided in this analysis by theoretical lenses and perspectives drawn from the sociology of racism, the sociology of space, and social geography.

Situated within the field of Traveller studies (Ó hAodha, 2006; Bhreatnach, 2006a and 2006b; Helleiner, 2003.), the theoretical conclusions of this thesis connect the local to the global dynamics of anti-Traveller racism, and will be of relevance to scholars and activists both in Ireland and internationally. It contributes to theorisations of the character, operation and effects of anti-Traveller racism, particularly with respect to its spatial manifestations. Although there is an important body of work which addresses the relationship between anti-Traveller racism and space at the macro-level, in terms of the practice of nomadism, this is the first piece of research to examine the impact of racism on Travellers’ mobility at the micro-level. In doing so, this research advances upon understandings of the sedentarist nature of laws and policies which govern space (Delaney and Rucksthul 2006; James 2007; Crowley 2007), to reveal the hegemonic status of sedentarist ideology even at the micro-level. This thesis also highlights the
agency of young Travellers, who have developed a range of tactics to negotiate racialised boundaries and the risks associated with traversing them.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

1:1 Background

The virulent racism which we Travellers experience in Ireland is well documented (see McVeigh 2007 and 2012, Black 2005 and Hopkins 2007a and 2007b). Focusing on young Travellers, this thesis reveals that the effects of racism and discrimination on our lives extends to how urban space is experienced and to restrictions on our movement through and use of both public and commercial space. Through original empirical research, I identify the racialised boundaries which restrict our ability to activate our right to the city, and I reveal their character as socially constructed, policed and governed. My research reveals ways in which the majority culture and the State produce space as exclusionary for us.

The findings and theoretical contributions of this research are generated through an innovative methodological approach, involving engaging with young Travellers via ethnography, cartography and ‘walking in the city’ (De Certeau, M. 1984). In this manner, I have gathered accounts of, and reflections upon, micro-level spatial encounters within which young Travellers are faced with the meanings that others associate with the space in question, including conflicting ideas regarding access, function and entitlement which are linked to identity.

In an original contribution to both empirical and theoretical knowledge, I find that young Travellers’ experiences of space are intensively shaped by anti-Traveller racism, and that their engagement with and participation in urban life is shaped by a multitude of racialised boundaries, which are in turn created and sustained by everyday racialised spatial practices. I argue that city space is inherently sedentarist space, organised according to sedentarist values, whose primacy is defended in racialised spatial encounters. Despite their marginal relationship to the city, young Travellers nonetheless exhibit agency, developing a range of tactics to circumvent racialised boundaries and manage the risks associated with traversing them. Not all of these tactics are empowering however, and some involve hiding their ethnic identity as Travellers. Contributing both to the theorisation of anti-Traveller racism, its dynamics and effects, and to the body of empirical research which addresses minorities’ relationships to urban space, I assert that
Travellers in Ireland live in sedentary space and that culturally embedded anti-Traveller racism is an obstacle to activating an equal 'right to the city' (Lefebvre, H. 1974).

1:2 Research Question

The aim of this PhD research is to advance our understanding of how urban space is experienced by young Travellers (aged 14-21). In contemporary society, the spatial mobility of young people in general has been circumscribed by restrictions and regulations placed on their movement as a consequence of stereotypes associating them with unpredictability and irresponsibility (see for example Devlin 2005 & 2006; Cohan 1980; Falchikov 1986; Giddens 1993; and Griffen 2004). Following on from Leonard (2007), who investigated the manner in which children living in conflict zones manage their spatial mobility, this research contributes to a growing body of literature on young people’s relationship to space (see for example Leonard 2007). It illuminates our social location in new ways and it contributes to our understanding of the relationship between young Traveller’s experiences of space and the socio-political context within which they live.

Among young people, specific groups are more constrained in their use of space because of the status of their particular ethnic (and racialised) identity, but also religious and gender identities within their communities and wider society (Leonard 2007; Nayak 2004; Black 2005; Hopkins 2007a and 2007b; Power and Barnes 2011; Haynes 2002 & 2004). To date, much of the research on young people’s access to, and use of, space has focused on young people from ‘new ethnicities’, i.e. recent immigrants (Gilroy, 2004; Back, 1996; Hall, 1996; Nayak, 2004). In an Irish context, we Travellers, although an indigenous ethnic minority, arguably face the most virulent racism on the grounds of ethnicity (Helleiner 2003; McCann et al 1994; Fanning 2002; McVeigh 2007; 2012; Irish Traveller Movement 2009; Pavee Point 2005a). Although there is an extensive amount of literature on Traveller ethnicity, there is very little literature that focuses on the impact ethnic distinctiveness has on young Travellers’ spatial mobility and their social lives. This research will address the neglect of young Travellers within this strand of urban studies, through focusing specifically on their experiences of urban space.
Finally, this research attends throughout to the role young Travellers play in shaping their own experiences of space. I approach young Travellers as agentic beings, with the capacity to ascribe their own meanings to space and to affect the course of their spatial encounters. As such, the research pays specific attention to tactics that young Travellers have developed to address or avoid challenges to their access to and use of urban space (Le Lefebvre 1974).

1:3 Positionality

I came to this research as a result of my own personal experiences as a Traveller. I was born on a snowy November day when my mother had to bring me back to a small cold trailer at the side of a road in Swansea, Wales. The address written on my birth cert clearly states the name of the road and a number on the caravan (we were not the only family there) which immediately exposes my identity as a Traveller. We were fully nomadic Travellers for a few years. Moving around Britain, we experienced the ‘move, shift, go’ attitude and eventually moved into a high rise flat (similar to Grenfell) in the centre of London city. We stayed there for another few years before we moved back to Ireland. I can vividly remember pulling into a forest type area in my father’s home town and, within minutes, the police moving us on. One of the policemen knew my grandfather, who had lived in the town for years, and suggested to my father that he pull up in an abandoned railway station where we stayed for over two years before we moved into a house which my father bought.

As a young Traveller woman I have witnessed, and experienced first-hand, the effects of anti-Traveller racism. My deeply personal understanding of the lived realities and effects of racism prompted me to carry out this research. As a Traveller activist, I am particularly passionate about trying to address the complex social inequalities that exist for young Travellers. As a former coordinator of an afterschool project, I am particularly conscious of the marginal position of young Travellers; located at the intersection of two under-researched populations, the experiences of young Travellers have rarely been the subject of systematic research.
1:4 Methodological and Theoretical framework

The location for this research is Galway city which in 2008 became Ireland’s first Intercultural City (ECCAR). The Intercultural Cities Programme was developed by the Council of Europe (2009) to support cities in reviewing their policies through an intercultural lens and developing comprehensive intercultural strategies to help them manage diversity positively and realise the advantages of diversity. Given Galway’s proactive commitment to urban pluralism, the City was an appropriate locus for this research.

Working within the interpretive paradigm, I adopted an ethnographic approach to the research, a methodology which is “exploratory in nature” and enables “researchers to gain information about an area in which little is known” (Liamputtong and Ezzy 2005, cited in Dickson-Swift et al. p.329). The Galway Traveller Movement, a non-governmental organisation which advocates for the rights and interests of Irish Travellers in Galway city and county (GTM), agreed to publicise my research to potential participants. As a former employee of the organisation, I have an established relationship of trust with this gatekeeper and its clients, which advantaged me in recruiting a sample of young Travellers from locations across the city.

Data collection commenced via focus groups exploring participants’ access to, movement through, and use of public and commercial space in Galway city. Informed by the work of Leonard (2007), the discussions were aided by the technique of cartography, i.e. the collaborative mapping of the city according to how participants view and use space. I next immersed myself into the natural spatial practices in which young Travellers engage. Using de Certeau's methodology of walking in the city, I accompanied participants (by invitation) on naturally occurring trips through the city. I used an audio recording device to record data, including during spatial encounters and incorporating participants’ reflections on the meanings they associate with the spaces we traverse and use. I also invited participants over the age of 18 to engage with me in one-to-one interviews, where points arose on which I required additional clarification.

The analytic process involved the organisation of data into explicit themes; the identification and reporting of emerging patterns; and the development of emergent
theoretical classifications and propositions from the data (Lincoln and Guba 1985). My approach to space is informed by Lefebvre’s (1974) ‘Right to the city’, which understands space as socially constructed and produced. Analytically, this approach sees space as belonging to (and being controlled by) dominant groups, which usefully focuses the researcher on the plurality of meanings and uses that may be associated with an urban space. Lefebvre’s work is also particularly instructive regarding the manner in which space may be made exclusionary; his theories provide a framework for interrogating exclusionary encounters and boundary maintenance in public space.

De Certeau’s (1984) concept of ‘tactics’ draws our attention to the role of agency. First used in military theory, ‘tactics’ refer to techniques used to win battles. The concept is particularly useful in understanding the negotiations that occur within encounters where access to or through space is contested, through conflicting perspectives on entitlement and function for example. The concept of tactics is invaluable in understanding how people resist challenges to or limitations upon their use of and movement through space. Equally, focusing on tactics developed to facilitate mobility provides a useful lens through which to perceive the boundaries which people encounter in seeking to activate their right to the city. In this thesis a focus on tactics developed by young people to manage their mobility across and participation in the city as Irish Travellers illuminates the specific racialised boundaries which they encounter and, indeed, the character of the city in its entirety as sedentarist space.

As stated above, this thesis situates itself within the fields of Traveller studies. It contributes to theorisations of the character, dynamics and effects of anti-Traveller racism, particularly with respect to its spatial manifestations. Although there is an important body of work which addresses the relationship between anti-Traveller racism and space at the macro-level, in terms of a right to practice nomadism, this is the first piece of research to examine the impact of racism on Travellers’ mobility at the micro-level. In doing so, this research advances upon understandings of the sedentarist nature of laws and policies which govern space (see James, 2007), to reveal the primacy and defence the claims of the sedentary majority to space as pervasive, even at the micro-level.
1:5 Mapping the thesis structure

Chapter two details the theoretical framework used in this study. The chapter focuses on elaborating, and explaining the relevance of Lefebve’s (1974) theory of ‘the right to the city’ and Michell de Certaeu’s theory of ‘tactics’. I argue that these theories, in placing power and privilege at the centre of their analysis of the management and experience of urban space, are appropriate to interrogating the relationship between anti-Traveller racism and young Travellers’ experiences of the city.

Chapter three provides an exploration of the empirical literature which informs this research, focusing on Traveller studies, urban studies, and introducing the concept of the intercultural city. It is concerned with setting out the body of research which informs our understanding of Travellers’ relationship to space, and the manner in which other minorities experience urban space as exclusionary. The chapter finds a particular gap in knowledge with respect to the experiences of young Travellers in urban space.

Chapter four presents and explains my methodological choices, detailing the negotiation of access, sampling strategies, methods of data collection and analysis, and ethical considerations. The chapter argues for the value of a design which recognises young Travellers as experts in the interpretation of their own lived experience and creates opportunities for them to reflect upon, and share, the meanings that their social practices and encounters hold for them. The chapter also shares my own reflections upon my positionality as researcher, and specifically the manner in which the research was shaped by my own identity as an Irish Traveller.

Chapter five presents the experiences and meaning-making of the 48 young Travellers who participated in this research. Weaving together data gathered through cartography, focus groups, interviews, and ‘walking in the city’, the chapter begins by describing young Travellers’ experiences of anti-Traveller racism in using urban space. The next section discusses the tactics developed and used by the young Travellers to manage the experience of living in sedentarist space and of traversing particularly salient racialised boundaries. The concluding section discusses young Travellers’ explanations of the impact of living in racialised space on their sense of their own ethnic identity.
Chapter six provides a conclusion to the research. The chapter re-examines the findings of this study and presents the theoretical conclusions they support. I argue that young Travellers’ narratives of their experiences in urban space underscore the everyday banality of anti-Traveller racism, and the pervasiveness of sedentarist values. Young Travellers develop, and inherit, tactics to navigate racialised spaces. The necessity for these tactics, and of managing the risks of living in racialised space (via managing minority expressions of and majority reactions to Traveller identity) speak to the character of the city as sedentarist space and to the contrasting subjugated position of Traveller ethnicity in that spatial context.
Chapter 2: Locating the research theoretically

“All battles over space and place are in fact battles over spatialized social power” (Massey 1996, p.120).

2:1 Introduction

This chapter is divided into two main parts, part one is a theoretical analysis of the philosophical and historical origins of the right to the city, as developed by Henri Lefebvre. This section of the chapter commences by examining the philosophical framework that underpins Lefebvre’s broader social theory and informs his understanding and development of the right to the city. Part two examines the element of using tactics to claim the right to the city. This includes de Certeau’s understanding of tactics and the significance of using them as a form of resistance. The chapter concludes by evaluating the potential of the right to the city paradigm to promote spatial and social transformation for young Travellers in Galway city. The theoretical standpoint of this thesis is framed on urban theory derived from both Henri Lefebvre (1974) and Michell de Certaeu (1984). Drawing on Lefebvre’s theory of ‘the right to the city’ I argue that by using ‘tactics’ as described by de Certaeu that young Travellers’ assert their right to the city and challenge the anti-Traveller racism and spatial exclusion by resisting and negotiating the spatial boundaries. The idea of resistance against the powerful capitalist structure grew out of Lefebvre’s thoughts on urbanity as a social space that in turn triggers social mobilizations which then created spaces of separation and alienation. He argues that urban space is a space of the new mode of production where commodification takes priority and needed to be resisted through social revolution; an act of resistance. For de Certeau, this act of resistance takes the form of tactics.

---

1 Lefebvre’s work has been subject to challenge. Castells labelled him as “a left-wing exponent of mainstream urban sociology” (p.6). His critique contributed to Lefebvre’s marginalisation in both France and in English-speaking urban sociology. However, Harvey always admired him and acknowledged that it was Lefebvre that radicalised and politicised him (Ibid). His teachings and ideas were criticised for being either too radical or too utopian, his call for a ‘right to the city’ was related to discussion of an alternative society that can unite the masses in a revolution against the oppressive structure. Lefebvre’s work has been neglected until recently and what Lefebvre meant by ‘right’ in his ‘cry and demand’ for the ‘right to the city’ is still contested.
The concept of the right to the city defined by Lefebvre is described by the World Charter on the Right to the City (2005) as a human right, however it is also a concept which has been criticised for its lack of in-depth analysis and its use as a campaign slogan (see Fernandes, 2007; Mayer, 2009; De Souza, M. L., 2009; Earle, 2011). Nonetheless, it has created a vital platform for a rights based approach to the city (Brown et al 2010). Access and participation rights to the urban public space is necessary for a sustainable social environment and the structural dimensions of urban development are challenged by the social construction of the city and the right to the city theory rejects the notion that the neoliberal structure is the best structure and claims that “another, more democratic, socially just and sustainable form of urbanization is possible, even if such possibilities are currently being suppressed through dominant institutional arrangements, practices and ideologies” (Brenner 2009 p.198). The idea to have cities created for people rather than for the economic market and capital accumulation gave birth to the concept. A rights based approach to the city empowers both public space users to exercise their rights, and public space developers to protect users (Brown and Rakodi, 2006).

Lefebvre’s formulation of the right to the city developed in his famous book 'Le Droit à la ville' (1968/1974) has been a major contribution to urban studies. There have been growing concerns among social geographers and scientists that inhabitants of cities are becoming more disenfranchised through the greater powers of governance. “The move to create new super-institutions such as the World Trade Organization and the European Union has resulted in a greater power authorising new urban policies with the ideology of neo-liberalism” (Purcell 2002, p.100). Competitiveness in the global market is the main drive for policy makers that have moved away from local community demand. According to Lefebvre the city embodies boundaries which are contrasted with the urban that is much more diffused. The concept of diffusion came about through globalization in a shift from the city to the urban society. The diffusion of governance and the neo-liberal city is understood to be a process of repetition; urban spaces are turned into spaces of capital where profit becomes the main concern (Santos 2014). The increasing control of international corporations has relentlessly weakened the control of ordinary citizens. Lefebvre’s idea of the ‘right to the city’ accordingly maintains citizenship to suggest rights, duties and involvement in political groups. However, “political groupings can be
separate to the state based on geography, ethnicity, sexuality and gender” (Purcell 2003, p.566). The ‘right to the city’ for Lefebvre was strongly emphasised in his determination to celebrate diversity in that urban inhabitants, must have the ‘right to difference’. Nevertheless, it is clear that urban landscapes are geographically racialised and divided to accommodate different groups in society. Lauran Joseph (2008, p.36) suggests urban space produces “symbolic racial boundaries” whereby “race operates at a cultural and micro-interactional level”. She states:

“These boundaries are defined and maintained in different ways by each community; through experiences of hostility and hospitality in the two neighbourhoods, one learns where one can and cannot go without receiving an unfavourable reaction”.

The right to use the city and the right to belong is according to Harvey (2008, p.23) “far more than an individual right to access of resources but it is a right to change ourselves by changing the city in which we live”. To claim the right to the city one must be free to express identity, culture and needs; this can be difficult to do in the midst of territorialisation. Therefore, the right to the city, according to Purcell (2002), combines two leading rights; The first one is the right to appropriate urban space in which city dwellers are entitled to the ‘full and complete’ use of space in everyday life. The right to use the city to its full potential as an ‘oeuvre’ of diversity claims the right to live, work and play whereby dwellers can take control of their participation. The second is the right to participation in which dwellers can take a leading role in the decision making process in the production of urban space. As Dikec (2001) points out, “it entails the involvement of inhabitants in institutionalised control over urban life including participation in the political life, management, and administration of the city” (cited in Fenster 2007, p.44). However, as Harvey (2008, p.23) states, the right to the city

“is, moreover, a collective rather than an individual right since changing the city inevitably depends upon the exercise of a collective power over the processes of urbanization. The freedom to make and remake ourselves and our cities is, one of the most precious yet most neglected of our human rights”.

Immigrants into the urban city become marginalised as the cultural diversity is seen to threaten historical national culture. For Lefebvre it was not just the urban city creating these boundaries but through its social system of production. Similar to ‘space’, ‘race’ is also a social product of historical and geographical forces whereby processes are imbedded into actions and relations. The ‘right to the city’ was Lefebvre’s (1974)
declaration “for the recognition of the urban as the (re)producer of social relations of power, and the right to participation in it” (Gilbert and Dikeç p.254). The idea was a tactic to legitimise “the refusal to allow oneself to be removed from urban reality by a discriminatory and segregative organization” (Ibid p.255). Hence, the right to the city suggests a claim for social needs to be met such as accommodation, education, health, culture, mobility and equal participation. The following quote is perhaps one of the clearer definitions regarding the meaning of the ‘Right to the City’ in practice:

“In these difficult conditions, at the hearth of a society which cannot completely oppose them and yet obstruct them, rights which define civilisation...find their way. These rights which are not well recognised, progressively become customary before being inscribed into formalised codes. They would change reality if they entered into social practice: right to work, to training, and education, to health, housing, leisure, to life. Among these rights in the making features the right to the city, not to the ancient city, but to urban life, to renewed centrality, to places of encounter and exchange, to life rhythms and time uses, enabling the full and complete usage of these moments and places...” (Lefebvre, 1974; Schmid, 2012, p.43).

The right to the city provides a social lens to investigate the enjoyment of rights across different populations in the city. I view the right to the city as the right for equal access and use which promote and strive for diversity, inclusivity, and positive integration without any form of discrimination, a ‘safe, ‘healthy’, and ‘just’ city for all (The United Nations General Assembly 2016).

2:3 Tactics

I now theorise the city beginning with Michel de Certeau’s (1984) L'invention du quotidien (English Translation: The Practice of Everyday Life) which presents an understanding of how ‘tactics’ work in everyday life; for him, individuals have the abilities and skills to creatively ‘manipulate and re-invent things’. De Certeau introduced the concepts of ‘strategies’ and ‘tactics’ into social and urban theory where he revolutionised the concepts by positioning tactics as opposing components to strategies and not as subordinate. These concepts were first used in military theory in which ‘strategies’ are the overall campaigns required to win the war while ‘tactics’ are the tricks and techniques used to win battles. “So the tactic is subordinate to the campaign, which is subordinate to the strategy” (Goff, 2012, p.268).
For de Certeau strategies are always created by the powerful; those at the top who plan the layout of a city. Tactics are created by the non-powerful to resist these strategies; the city planners “may determine what streets there will be, but the local cabbie will figure out how best to navigate the lived reality of those streets” (Goff, 2012, p.268). According to de Certeau the design of the city is fashioned by strategies that are misconstrued to the ‘ideal’ ideology. At the top, ‘in-groups’ are initiated who are disconnected to the ‘ordinary man’ on the street. These in-groups are blind to the actions/tactics which are negotiated and undertaken that resist their strategies.

De Certeau’s (1984) definitions of the concepts are as follows:

**Strategies:** “I call a strategy the ‘calculus’ of forced relationships which becomes possible of a subject of will and power (a proprietor, an enterprise, a city, a scientific institution) can be isolated from the environment. A strategy assumes a place that can be circumscribed as proper and thus serve as the basis for generating relations with an exterior distinct from it (competitors, adversaries, clienteles, targets or objects of research). Political, economic and scientific rationality has been constructed on this strategic model”

**Tactics:** “I call a tactic on the other hand, a calculus which cannot count on a ‘proper’ (a spatial or institutional localization), nor thus on a borderline distinguishing the other as a visible totality. A tactic insinuated itself into the other’s place, fragmentarily, without taking it over in its entirety, without being able to keep it at a distance. It has at its disposal no base where it can capitalize on its advantages, prepare its expansions, and secure its independence with respect to circumstances. The ‘proper’ is a victory of space over time. On the contrary, because it does not have a place, a tactic depends on time- it is always on the watch for opportunities that must be seized ‘on the wing’. Whatever it wins, it does not keep. It must constantly manipulate events in order to turn them into opportunities” (Valerie-Ines de la vile and Eleonore Mounoud 2003, pp.102-103).

**2:3:1 Tactics as an everyday practice**

De Certeau (1984) focuses on individual daily life practices and actions that have an effect on societal meanings and perceptions. Although individual practices, are not random acts but are connected to each other and are linked to the societal domain. It is the plurality of everyday practices and their ‘systems of operational combination’, he argues, ‘which
compose a “culture”, He sees everyday practices as productive of cultures which are always in the process of being re-invented by the ordinary person who open up spaces for change through resistance that is often unanticipated by operational systems; the cultural practices of institutional powers creating strategies of control can be disrupted with tactical everyday practices. Where spatial practices are being increasingly controlled by “strategies”, resistance to power is being implemented by “tactics”. So according to De Certeau ‘strategies’ and ‘tactics’ distribute agency whereby social action can occur through everyday experiences, resistance and conflict. Strategic and tactical action can overlap and contradict each other, for example, the strategic action of an organized protest utilizes tactics that can influence and inform strategic policies that are created by a government agency. In contrast to strategic action De Certeau argues that:

“tactical forms of resistance have no visible place to exert influence; tactical actions cannot be autonomous from their target. They always insinuate into the Other, without seizing it entirely, but yet without being able to keep their distance. Since tactical action does not have a specific target it cannot separate itself from the I and the Other, therefore it can never win but it can seize the moment and manipulate its surroundings” (1984, p.60-61).

Performative spatial practices in public space are the vehicle for generating boundaries. Powerful agents use ‘strategies’ to draw boundaries in space whereby certain social groups are required to use ‘tactics’ in order to resist the dominant and negotiate the boundaries of social space.

The conceptualisation of some spaces such as ‘poor neighbourhoods’ has limited the strategic actions of the powerful groups which perceive that the urban poor distribute their own agency. The controlled ‘strategy’ of urban space is designed to manipulate the social order of space. According to Henri Lefebvre (1974) ‘representations of space’ are created by “the signs and symbols deployed by experts as they seek to control and order space” (Roy 2011, p.9).

De Certeau emphasised that people were not mere subjects of ‘strategies’ but were active agents (although unequal) using ‘tact’ such as walking and consumption… etc. These practices ‘resist’ the social production of space and invisible spaces become visible. Furthermore, unequal distribution of urban space generates a body of movement that is
associated with mobility or immobility. The ideologies of stratification have produced embodied practices that are connected to recognising the ‘strategies’ of the ‘lived’ environment. State power endeavours to evoke a non-reflexive knowledge of urban spaces. Reflexivity occurs through the use of ‘tactics’ which determines the dynamic processes of the city.

Individual spatial agency according to de Certeau (1984) is tactical rather than strategic responses to abstract space. Abstract space is created as a place of accumulation in which networks of practices are formed to advance the planned social order of a city. De Certeau’s (1984) idea that people are ‘active agents’ within these spaces is inconsistent in that the producing of boundaries is central. Strategies are put in place to filter out the ‘undesirable’ that cannot become ‘active agents’ in their own stories. City spaces are divided into categories that represent the use and identity of spaces depending upon the extent of the racial/cultural divisions created. A city “accommodates, assimilates, or stigmatizes racialized patterns through its form” (Keith 2005, p.255). The concept of tactics for de Certeau (1984) formulates an action/practice on the basis of tangible resistance to ‘power structures’ that occur in daily life. Nevertheless, these tactics are often negotiated and planned rendering to a social product of historical and geographical forces where tactics/actions are entwined with the composition, design and governance of the city. The commercialisation of city spaces excludes different groups from simply becoming ‘active agents’. ‘Strategies’ have methods that consistently attempt to control and regulate corresponding to discipline mechanisms in which the ‘social contract’ must be upheld. Spatial practices (tactics) are not permitted to disrupt the planned meaning of a space. De Certeau (1984) suggests that ‘tactics’ are utilised with no specific boundaries that are always on the lookout for opportunities to resist ‘strategies. According to him, tactical spatial practices in the urban realm are performed by the marginal to overcome and transcend the boundaries imposed by the powerful; the powerful claim ownership and tactics temporarily dissolve the barriers. These tactical spatial practices are often claims to the right to the city. De Certeau (1984) noted that power relations are played out in the urban area and the viewpoint of the city is a ‘theoretical simulacrum’ that is a misconstruction of practices.
The concept of human agency is engaged with social thought that has theorized whether or not individual human actions can have influence over the individual’s environment. Are people agentic beings that can shape their own experience of space with the capacity to ascribe their own meanings to space and to affect the course of their spatial encounters? Do spaces themselves have agency without the need for human actualisation? Vilder (2002) renders to the idea that humans are to some degree powerless to their environments. In contrast, De Certeau argues that humans are ‘active agents’ that can assert their ‘right to the city’ by utilizing specific ‘tactics’ to overcome spatial barriers. Agency is attributed to the action of human beings therefore, it is challenging to acknowledge that spaces themselves have agency, which influence human agency. Thrift (2000, p.556) contends the city to be “a set of networks of heterogeneous actors who are able to produce moments by forging connections, a field of a swirl of forces and intensities, which traverse and bring into relation all kinds of actors, human and non-human, in all manner of combinations of agency”. Human agency in everyday life for De Certeau (1984) begins by disputing the idea that ordinary people are passive bystanders that are directed by the force of the established rules and regulations. He contested Foucault’s (1975) theory of panopticism (function of disciplinary mechanisms as an apparatus of power) in which he argued that if ‘discipline’ becomes the ‘apparatus of power’ then people can manipulate and avoid those disciplinary mechanisms. The viewpoint of the city is a ‘theoretical simulacrum’ that is a misconstruction of practices. De Certeau (1984) used his unique methodology of ‘walking’ the streets, observing everyday ‘lived’ life through the lens of the ‘walker’. He confirmed the hypothesis that the significance of everyday life becomes paramount to the ‘real’ process of how a city is formed despite the larger power structures that are put in place. The everyday people of the city live ‘down below’, “below the thresholds at which visibility begins. Their bodies follow the tricks and thins of an urban ‘text’; they write without being able to read it” (p.93). The everyday ‘lived’ reality defines how the streets of a city are navigated by each individual. Influenced by Foucault (1975) and Bourdieu (1984), De Certeau (1984) emphasised that people were not mere subjects of ‘strategies’ but were active agents (although unequal) using ‘tact’ such as walking and consumption, etc. These practices ‘resist’ the social production of space and invisible spaces become visible. So according
to De Certeau (1984) ‘strategies’ and ‘tactics’ distribute agency whereby social action can occur through everyday experiences, resistance and conflict.

2:4 Urban space as a social space

“Every social space is the outcome of a process with many aspects and many contributing currents, signifying and non-signifying, perceived and directly experienced, practical and the theoretical” (Lefebvre 1974, p.110).

Deriving from Lefebvre’s (1974) most influential work, *The Production of Space*, space is understood to be essential in explaining power relations in society; the relations between society and space are central to everyday life. Lefebvre’s three dimensions of space (spatial triad), the ‘physical’, the ‘mental’ and the ‘lived’ are paramount to the understanding of spatial theory.

The triad of space is conceptualised as follows:

1. Perceived (physical) space refers to spatial practices which are what people do in social space. How people enact everyday life, what activities take place in space and how interaction and encounters succumb to the rules and regulations of the physical environment which deploy signs and symbols. Our perception of the everyday life is strongly influenced by categories which we use to describe different things. Spaces are given names which in turn creates places that are regulated in order to define what actions take place. Perceived space is organized by representations of space (Lefebvre 1974, p.38).

2. Conceived (mental) space refers to representations of space by the dominant group (state, urban planners etc.). How space should be used and what activity takes place in different spaces. The dominant conceptions of space regulate spatial practices hence we inhabit a produced space/representational space (Lefebvre 1974, p.38).

3. Lived space is also termed representational space (social). Space is seen as being produced and reproduced; space as a social product that impacts on the lived experiences of everyday life. Social space acts as a product of domination that determines interactions between people and their space and environments. Ordinary people living their everyday life mentally construct how they approach perceived space (Lefebvre 1974, p.38).
For Lefebvre, social space is diverse: “we are confronted not by one social space but by many— indeed, by an unlimited multiplicity or uncountable set of social spaces” (1974, p. 86). He is considered to be the founding father of a new approach in urban studies (Gottdiener 1994), ‘the socio-spatial approach’ replaced ‘human ecology’ that “grounded the relationship between social and spatial process” (Gottdiener 2005, p. 140).

Lefebvre (1974, pp 69-168) describes space as a social matrix that operates as a product of social relations, he adds that “space is never empty: it always embodies a meaning” (p.154). Therefore, since space is never transparent, it must be investigated through an analysis of ‘spatial representations’, ‘spatial practices’ and ‘spaces of representation’ and is the basis of many studies. For example, Munn (1996) and Rockerfeller (2010) both drew on Lefebvre’s work to connect ‘conceptual space’ to the ‘physical’ by arguing that ‘social space’ is both a ‘field of action’ and a ‘basis for action’. Rodman (2001) and Richardson (1982), on the other hand, relied on ‘phenomenology’ and theories of lived space to focus “attention on how different actors construct, contest and ground their personal experience” (cited in Low 2014). Low (2014, p.35) “proposed a dialogical process made up of the social production of space and the social construction of space to explain how culture is spatialised”.

Harvey (1973, 1996, 2012), emphasises the historical geographical materialist perspective of space, developing the idea of space by contextualising it in the movement of the capitalist accumulation and its crises. Gottdiener’s (1993, p.129) approach as “economic reductionist dependent on self-regulating movement of capitalism is in contrast to the ‘high abstraction’ of Harvey’s approach (1982) from a perspective of historical geographical materialism, realist geography draws attention to concrete study. Massey (1978) argues that “form of spatial organisation can have both a facilitating or impeding role on the general social process”. Consequently, space makes a difference on social relations and encounters. Castells (1977, p.479) analyses the urban space by exploring the role of the state and crises of capitalist society while Habermas’s (1989) and Sennett’s (1977) approach investigates the production of public space from the perspective of actions and practices. According to Lefebvre (1974) all space is a social product and always has been; assigned spaces produce social relations and social practices. The influence that space and social interaction have on each other is an important aspect of Lefebvre’s theory thus if space is a social product then it is “produced
and controlled by government surveyors and planners reflecting their power positions” (cited in Harding and Blokland 2014, p.128). As Osborne and Rose (1999, p. 738) suggest, space is always-already a social product, “a matter of discourse, of the immanent rules of formation the regularities and distribution that allow things to be said and understood about urban existence”. In this construction, space is not conceived as a fixated order, but an emergence catalysed by numerous practices and regulatory systems (Osborne and Rose, 2004).

2:5 Diversity in urban space

Recent scholarship has argued that studies of place, diversity and migration have been neglected by social scientific bias towards ‘metaphysical sedentarism’ (Cresswell, 2006), the assumption that society (indeed, civilisation) is, by default, static and bounded. The pervasiveness of sedentary logics can be seen in attempts to mythologize movement as ‘enabling fixity’ (Rapport and Dawson, 1998), to the framing of mobility and nomadism as a primitive and anti-social state of being in urban sociology (Park and Burgess, 1925). Over the past few decades’ urban spaces have transformed into spaces of compact socio-economic activity; urban planners are said to be taking on board sociologists’ plea for diversity which allows for creativity. As depicted by Sennett (1977, p.129) “differences are an overwhelming sociological fact” of cities and in urban scholarship there are significantly different perspectives on the issue of social diversity. Some studies claim that diversity encourages tolerance and creativity (Fainstein, 2005; Florida 2002; Sennett 1977). Others claim that diversity is over exaggerated (Wessel, 2009). Berger and Luckmann (1966) introduced us to a framework for theorising how individuals’ perceive different types of people in urban spaces, where encounters are according to Berger and Luckmann decorated with categorisations such gender, race etc. Goffman (1963) introduced the concepts of tie-signs and markers which entails the very process of visually decoding types of people and their relations through aspects such as objects, behaviour and expressions. Cities have always attracted diverse populations; a flow of people moving in and around city spaces trading goods and ideas creates a network society that allows for cultural, social and economic development (European Union 2011). While the interactions between society and social life are dependent on relations between individuals and different social groups, spatial encounters are acted out whereby we apply and ascribe meanings to the identities of space and people (Leonard, 2007). In everyday
life people have numerous encounters in space that are significant for our perception of the ‘other’. On first sight we encounter identities such as ethnicity, age, class and gender in which we already have a preconceived notion of the identity in question. The ascribed characteristics associated with certain social groups regulate our encounters through conceived space which determine the lived experience (see Goonewardena, K et al 2008). Lefebvre (1974) argues that the spatial practices of the powerful agents of spatial regulation tend to suppress difference rather than celebrate the diverse population of a city. Socially constructed differences in the urban space determine how space is accessed and used by different identities. Social inequalities and differences are produced and contested which can produce social and cultural conflict (Lamont and Molnár 2002).

According to Lefebvre (1974) urban space should be a welcoming space that accommodates the value of diversity. Nonetheless, he understands urban space as a social space of past conflicts whereby the group that conquered spatial power dominate and control the production of space. The struggle to claim space is a historical phenomenon that is constantly moving via the production process. Lefebvre sees urban space as an ‘oeuvre’ in that a city can only exist through its diversity. He writes:

“What does the city create? Nothing. It centralizes creation. And yet it creates everything. Nothing exists without exchange, without union, without proximity, that is, without relationships. The city creates a situation, where different things occur one after another and do not exist separately but according to their differences. The urban, which is indifferent to each difference it contains, itself unites them. In this sense, the city constructs, identifies, and sets free the essence of social relationships” (cited in Goonewardena 2008).

As Lefebvre (1974) points out the oeuvre is a space of creativity that continues to produce and reproduce itself through diversity. Individuals and groups of people get a sense of their identity based on ‘sameness’ or ‘difference’ which affects how urban space is contested. The level of sociability is produced in the different urban designs whereby the layout of the city can separate and isolate some groups through its physical and symbolic form. Different spatial practices and realities combine to the value and representation of different social groups. Lefebvre (1974) discusses space as being ‘absolute’ (economic and political space) and ‘concrete’ (experience and everyday life). For him the absolute dominates the concrete space while suppressing difference. However, he proposes that there is space for counterattacks against the absolute by exercising and embracing
difference as a tool for positive urban development. Rendering to Lefebvre’s proposal of the right to difference, urban dwellers have a right to “make known their ideas on the space and time of their activities; the right to use the centre, a privileged place, instead of being dispersed and stuck in ghettos” (1974).

The idea of social cohesion and diversity in the urban space is becoming increasingly popular both in everyday life and political dialogue (Council of Europe 2009). On the one hand, recent European migration flows have brought new meaning to urban diversity in which a focus on multiculturalism has gained the level of political attention that is required to bring about policies that accommodate and celebrate different ethnicities. On the other hand, some of these policies can separate and focus on the ‘otherness’ of people which causes tension, conflict and social dislocation (Bourdieu 1984). Policies on diversity focus on integration strategies that promote social interactions to bridge the gap between different groups of people, however, social researchers have proposed that disadvantaged groups lack access to resources which are apprehended by those who are more privileged (see Ferber et al 2009). The complex issue of urban diversity remains a concern for urban sociologists; inequalities are now discussed through dimensions that are stratified by the layering of society. Sociologists have traditionally discussed inequality in terms of poverty and social class; however, that is no longer the case. Modern sociology discusses a vast range of concepts and complexities that are interlinked and overlapped with social class. Structured society is now researched through varied assets and forms of inequality; it is no longer just about economics and production.

2:6 Urban Spatial Mobility

Spatial mobility can be determined by many factors such as infrastructure, transport, social and information networks, economic and social status etc. The increase in global spatial mobilities into cities has influenced the concentration of resources into particular spaces of economic and social activity which can enhance or limit the spatial mobility of some groups of people (Hu 2015). The ability to move in and around the city depends upon the mode of transport available and the economic cost, therefore access to employment, education and leisure become limited for some. Social research informs us of the connection between our social position in society and access to space which highlights the significance of spatial mobility where patterns of inequality are ingrained.
into the structure of the city (see Lefebvre 1974; Harvey 2008; Low 2014). The reproduction of urban inequality creates social hierarchies and institutions that dominate and control the urban space in which whose access is prioritised giving them enhanced spatial mobility (Lefebvre 1974). The conceived space becomes ingrained into the structure of the city and experiences of space take the form of micro-level social encounters within which participants are faced with the meanings that others associate with the space in question, including potentially conflicting ideas regarding access, function and entitlement (Lefebvre 1974).

The urban centre is a space of economic and social activity that constitutes a particular form of social fragmentation amongst its inhabitants. By studying urban spatial mobility, we can understand the contours that are shaped by movement in different spaces. People with high levels of mobility have a higher prospect of holding a more favourable social background in society. Lefebvre’s work is particularly instructive regarding the manner in which space may be made exclusionary; his theories provide a framework for interrogating exclusionary encounters and boundary maintenance in public space. Dávila (2013 p.17) states:

“Mobility is transforming urban living, leading to a rethinking of the way in which individuals and groups interact and participate in social activities. However this is a very heterogeneous phenomenon, and for some segments of the population, life continues to unfold primarily in local geographical spaces, in relative isolation from and without easy access to the opportunities and demands of the globalised city”.

The social differentiation within urban space constitutes a social policy of acting out the social divisions that are constantly reproduced (Lefebvre 1974). However, mobility is not static; changes and movements occur accordingly which portends to a society on the move. Everyday experiences of mobility have a significant impact on the quality of modern urban life. The European Union’s ‘freedom of movement’ principal is central to the theme of security and justice for all EU citizens; spatial mobility has become a defining characteristic of contemporary society. However, not all citizens have equal opportunities to move freely. Lefebvre’s (1974) work on the ‘right to the city’ concentrates on the right to difference whereby respect and celebration for social diversity is essential for basic citizenship rights.
2:7 Segregation in the urban space

Spatial segregation in cities is a historical phenomenon that is associated with the rigid divisions and distinctions made between rich and poor, good and bad, powerful and powerless; these divisions are mainly produced and re-produced by conscious acts by those who hold the power (Lefebvre 1974). Divisions based on the hierarchy of power produce social enclaves of involuntary or voluntary segregated communities. Involuntary segregation can occur from legal frameworks for example in the form of social apartheid for Travellers in Ireland. Voluntary segregation can be self-imposed in order to protect social identity and culture. Lefebvre (1974) informs us that people construct their own environments to meet their own particular needs and they do this within the boundaries or opportunities that are available. Modern cities have become internally differentiated such that spatial segregation can generate conflict over territory and the right to the urban space. “The city has never been a harmonious place, free of confusions, conflicts, and violence” (Harvey 2003, p.939).

Spatial segregation that occurs in city spaces comes in various forms such as racial, ethnic, class, religion, income and residential. The connection between urban spatial segregation and socio-economic segregation has long been established and is fabricated into the patterns of the urban grid. The physical and social separation between groups of people in the city not only supports segregation but it also reproduces it. Mats Franzén (2009, p.105) argues that “if people and activities are of different kinds, space can be supposed to be implicated in not only their reproduction, but also and more importantly, in their constitution”. The consequence of this is that planning policies are generally based on representations of segregation and not the lived reality thus the physical and symbolic segregation is reproduced. Lefebvre (1974) argues that space is produced by forces of power that attempt to organise and categorise space in a way that suits the particular State’s ideology. The structures of spatial segregation that are constantly reproduced have significant social consequences such as limitations for social interaction and participation. In turn, in order to understand the process of socio-spatial inequality in cities, the characteristics of the spatial and social distance between different groups need to be analysed with a view to the unequal distribution of land, services and goods that divides the urban way of life. The urban structure is produced by the powerful via their interests
and representations, and the state plays a key role in reproducing urban spatial divisions.

David Harvey (2009, p.42) states:

“Patterns of urban administration, policing, and regulation are all embedded into a system of governance that allows for the playing out of multiple interests in the murkey corridors of urban politics and through the labyrinthine channels of urban bureaucracy and administration. Certain rights are coded within these systems. But others are simply denied or, rendered so opaque by bureaucratic fudging as to be meaningless”.

Harvey is confirming Lefebvre’s theory of conceived space in that powerful agents reproduce their ideal of how a city should function in terms of spatial distribution. According to the UN Habitat (2014, p.11)

“The phenomenon of social segregation is [also] on the increase, with people of different socioeconomic status, cultural backgrounds or ethnic origins living in isolation within gated communities”.

These gated communities are what Lefebvre calls ‘ghettos’ where people become marginalised and isolated.

2:8 Race and ethnicity as a determinate of exclusion

Determinants of spatial exclusion and restrictions are complex; nonetheless, they can be explained by theories which are reflected in the empirical analyses of research. Lefebvre’s (1974) theory on the production of social space is one of an epistemological nature which can assist with our understanding of the racialisation of space. For example, Massey and Denton’s (1993, p.114) work, American Apartheid, argues “when it comes to housing and residential patterns ... race is the dominant organizing principle”. Race and ethnicity are spatially produced and reproduced through the routine of socially expressing identity and differentiating between others. Ethnic differences are linked to prejudice and discrimination which create hostilities (symbolic or physical) that are played out in urban space. The construction of race and ethnicity are reproduced through particular social formations that are governed and regulated by the politically and socially dominant group in society (see McVeigh 1992). Globally racial and ethnic groups are subjected to policies that limit their spatial mobility; spatial policies are enacted in order to maintain the power over space (see Lefebvre 1974; Soja 1980; Harvey 2008). Research has evidenced the link between race/ethnicity and space (e.g. Pulido 2000; Delaney 2002; Razack 2002;
The field of racial and spatial studies have shown us that we conceptualise space through our identity status. Racial and ethnic differences are produced by the spaces which we inhabit. Jennifer Nelson (2008) emphasised, how “groups marked as racially inferior’ have been “defined, confined, regulated, and eradicated . . . through the control of space” (p. 28).

Racial and ethnic minorities in urban areas are inclined to suffer from social disadvantage in which they are segregated and subordinated. Despite the increasing diversity of cities, spatial boundaries can be observed based on racial and ethnic divisions. Social geographers have pointed out the importance of power relations that inform us how people attach meanings to particular spaces (see, for example, Harvey 1973, 1989, 1996; Lefebvre 1974; Soja 1989, 1996; Massey 1993, 1994). Lefebvre states “One of the consistent ways to limit the economic and political rights of groups has been to constrain social reproduction by limiting access to space” (1974, p. 22). The process of racism creates an environment where some people can move freely while others are forced to move (for example, Traveller evictions). Caroline Knowles (2003, p.80) theorises the race and space connections:

“Space is an active archive of the social processes and social relationships composing racial orders. Active because it is not just a monument, accumulated through a racial past and present although it is also that it is active in the sense that it interacts with people and their activities as an ongoing set of possibilities in which race is fabricated”.

Multiple factors create racialised spaces whereby identity and social formation interact with the power relations of the production of space. Knowles (2003) outlines four ways through which racial and spatial processes intersect:

1) the contestations over our built environment;
2) the everyday embodied and performed social lives of people;
3) the movement (placement and displacement) of people; and
4) the social relationships engaged in by individuals and groups.

Conflicts over resources and access to space may play out as conflicts along racial lines. Ahmed (2012, p.177) for example explains how diversity “can entail insisting on belonging in institutional spaces where ‘others’ are not expected and/or assumed to be”.
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Numerous studies have examined socio-sexual relationships with particular spaces (see Castells 1989; Bell and Valentine 1995; Elizabeth Grosz 1995; Skeggs 1997; Bondi 2005). Gender is an imperative feature of urban life that is often overlooked; physical and social constraints are embodied into the daily life whereby like race and ethnicity, gender becomes a structural inequality. The reinforcement of gender inequality is produced through the social relations that are acted out on the basis of ‘fitting in’ to particular roles associated with gender. The processes of bordering on bodies allows us to examine how power can be inscribed into our bodies in ways that can deny particular activities relating to gender/sexuality which then excludes people by reproducing the enforced boundaries.

As Lefebvre (1974, p.319) wrote:

“it is impossible to say how often one pauses uncomfortably for a moment on some threshold – the entrance of a church, office or ‘public’ building, or on the point of access to a “foreign” place – while passively, and usually “unconsciously”, accepting a prohibition of some kind”.

The gender inequalities that exist between male and female has been structured throughout many imbalanced understandings of identity. Social identities are sanctioned in which the representations of the dominant identity produce the social space. As Lefebvre (1974) shows social space ‘is at once a precondition and a result of social superstructures’. The state plays a prominent role in ‘institutionalised ordering’. Low (2008, p. 37) states:

“The ordering of people can also be institutionalised. At a reception for a head of state all orderings are prescribed. Spaces between doctor and patient are regulated. On the basis of photographs, Marianne Wex (1979) has analysed the always similar orderings between men and women. He sits with his legs apart, holding his arms at a distance from his body; she keeps her legs firmly together and her arms close to her body”.

Once we understand the ordering of people as institutionalised we can come to grips with how gender is reproduced in everyday life. The gendered spatial practices deny mobility and access is predominantly gendered in which constrained access can dis-empower people. Research indicates that differentiated gendered patterns arise out of contextualising gender norms. As Maurice Merleau-Ponty (1965) remarkably demonstrates, “what we perceive through our bodies are not only things but also
‘interspaces between things’. What this means is that in perceiving through our bodies, we form syntheses in our everyday activities as a means of linking together a great multiplicity of objects to form spaces. In so doing, the body leads a noteworthy double existence” (cited in Low 2006, p.120). Gender is a marker of both social and economic stratification.

Stratification theory has materialised through debates on the emerging inequality in our societies. Social stratification is a system by which society ranks categories of people in a hierarchy. This system of hierarchy allows for the formation of a ‘pyramid’ structure with the less privileged and less favoured groups at the bottom. The stratification system not only apply to distinctions between economic and cultural capital but it can apply to ‘slavery, caste, estate and class’ (Macionis and Plummer 2008; McDonald 2009). Influenced by Pierre Bourdieu’s body of work Beverly Skeggs contributed to the theory of stratification. Coming from a working class background she challenged existing theories on class - she deliberated that none of the concepts applied to her. Bourdieu’s 1987 essay ‘What Makes a Social Class’ is in many ways controversial due to its “rejection of class formations or identifications from distributions of capital” (Savage et al 2010, p.114). Skeggs contested this idea and offered a contrasting analysis of class formations by constructing a theory on the difference between the dispersal of ‘social rewards’ and the dispersal of the chances of attaining these ‘social rewards’.

In popular discourse it is said that we live in a ‘classless’ society; class does not exist in contemporary understandings of social inequalities. This is an ambiguous idea; many scholars would argue that class matters more than ever. McDonald (2009, p.103) states “social class is the main form of social stratification in Ireland and in western industrialised societies today”. Skeggs has proved this with her ethnographic research on the formations of class and gender. The stratification theory that Skeggs offers is in the context of ‘class’ and the (dis) identification of class. The stratification of society produces numerous categories of class in which people are placed by economic, cultural, ethnic and gender status. Skeggs is one of the few sociologists who have discussed stratification in the context of gender. To understand the social processes in society it is clear women’s social class position needs to be understood. Along with Skeggs women, an overwhelming majority suffer from inequality based on gender. Joan Acker (1973, p.937) highlights some assumptions from literature that are made about women’s social
position. They are summarised as follows – Female status is equal to and defined by the connected male, the male is the head of the household and women are evaluated differently. They are unequal to men thus gender is unnecessary in stratification theory.

However, Skeggs study (1977) has demonstrated the importance of how gender is highly significant and initiated by society’s view on gender roles. This is most visible in the workforce; women are concentrated into the ‘feminine’ caring positions. Skeggs considers ‘experience’ as an interpreter for the processes of stratification. She claims that feminist theory ignores this “interpretative experience” and “recognition is one of the means by which experiences are interpreted” (1997, pp. 28-29). As human beings we recognise everything by placing them into categories of distinction. Within society women and men are categorised as different and are given roles according to their sex. Men are usually classified as the bread-winners and women as home-makers. Skeggs illuminated how women aspire to look desirable for men. She states (1997, p.111):

> “alongside the regulatory heterosexual aspects of desirability - whose standards, who monitors and who does the desiring – it was a way in which the women’s cultural capital was confirmed as worth having”.

Skeggs work offers an insight into how women are stratified into the sex that needs to be desirable through appearance; men on the other hand can be seen to be desirable through their economic capital.

2:10 Youth as a determinate of exclusion

The practice of identity construction for young people is profoundly influenced by space. Lillian Rodriguez et al (2012, p.264) express that “human development takes place through different scenarios of everyday life”; this development relies on interaction between “players (family, friends and teachers) and scenarios (home, neighbourhood, school, parks and streets)”. In contemporary society these interactions between players and scenarios have been severely impaired. Maurice Devlin’s study (2006) provides a clear picture of how youth interpret these divisions. He confirms that youth feel they are viewed as ‘trouble-makers’ or potential ‘trouble-makers’ (p.24). Overall, his study revealed that young people perceived themselves to be viewed negatively by the adult population and that they were the subject of stereotypical concepts and images resulting
in prejudicial and discriminatory actions. Predominately, both political and popular discourse concentrates on the assumption that young people are now more ‘out of control’ than ever. The safety of communities is considered to be threatened by youth; a demand for surveillance cameras and mosquito devices to be set up in public spaces is intensifying (Bowden, p.19). According to Scott (2002, p.306):

“Young urbanities form a marginalized age class; their movement is restricted, out of fear and distrust, within aims to protect, monitored by city surveillance methods within the security-obsessed fabric”.

There is an immense amount of literature available which examines surveillance in public space (Norris and Armstrong 1999; Wilson and Sutton 2003). Certainly, the result of this increased surveillance is that young people have been downgraded to potential criminals whereby they are now restricted and policed in the public sphere. Their ‘spatial practices’ are being increasingly controlled; evidently, boundaries have been created tightening young people’s mobility. In addition, Ireland’s economic growth has produced urban areas in which “open and green space is becoming less available” (Kerrins et al 2011, p.9).

In 1998, Karen Malone and Lindsay Hasluck conducted a study on young people’s perceptions and use of public space in Australia; this study found four main issues that affected their use of space. The first was the “physical” form of the neighbourhood in which Stilwell (1993) states “its maintenance and its importance placed on public and private spaces shape people’s perceptions about society” (cited in Malone and Hasluck 2002, p.22). The second issue was the “commercialisation of youth spaces”; the third issue was “restricted mobility whereby young people had bounded spatial ranges” and lastly “concern for their personal safety”.

Low (2008, p.33) informed us that public space is contested; she argues that “space should be seen as produced and producing”. Also, she suggests that “people are able to understand and explain why they create spaces” (p.37). Young people have to find their ‘own space’ which is generally in the streets (Cohen 1972; Pearson 1983; Roberts 2000). Roberts (p.20) suggested that actions such as graffiti (seen to be vandalism) are young people’s way of “making their own space” (also see Cresswell 1996). These spaces can act as a site of resistance (see Measor and Squires 2000). Cahill (1990, p.399) argued that
“the very presence of groups of preadolescents or adolescents in public space is apparently considered a threat to public order”. To be considered as such has resulted in limited access to public space for young people through the dominance of regulation and control.

The social production of urban space enforces the spatial exclusion of young people; the criminalisation of youth has occurred in response to conflict over the use of urban public space. The spaces that young people occupy are negotiated and contested in their everyday lives. As Lefebvre (1974, p.39) puts it ‘the dominated . . . space which the imagination seeks to change and appropriate”.

2:11 Conclusions

This chapter explained the theoretical framework for this study, I defined and described what the concept of ‘the right to the city’ means and discussed the significance of it for a diverse, just and equal city for all. In order to achieve ‘the right to the city’ some groups of people must use ‘tactics’. I explained how these tactics are framed around the dominant use of strategies to control urban space. My approach to space is informed by Lefebvre’s (1974) theory that space is socially produced with the ideals of the dominant group. The theoretical framework provided in this chapter has shown how urban space is produced and it excludes some people based on race/ethnicity, gender and youth.

The next chapter will examine the literature on Travellers’ relationship to race and space.
Chapter 3: Travellers’ relationship to race and space

Public space can be seen as the “stage upon which the drama of communal life unfolds” (Carr et al. 1992, p.3). Carr et al. (1992, p.19) declare that there are three dimensions to public space: responsive, because it is designed with users’ needs in mind; democratic, because it offers access to all; and meaningful because users “can make strong connections between the place, their personal lives and the larger world”. However, researchers such as Massey (2005) stress that the notion of public space being ‘unproblematically open to all’ is an idealised view given that public space is a production of social relations.

As Simmel asserted “spatial relations are not only determining conditions of relationships among human beings, but are also symbolic of those relations” (1971, p.143). This chapter examines the body of literature which explores a connection between public space and Irish Travellers. In the words of Carter (2007, p.100) “public spaces retain cultural and political meanings symbolically encoded in their spatial relations and built environment”. Traveller rights to public space in Ireland are strongly contested and this contestation is a key theme of this chapter. If we acknowledge that space is produced and is made meaningful by its users (Lefebvre 1974; Simmel 1971; deCerteau, 1984) then both the design and function of public space - according to Lefebvre, the ‘representations of space’ - reflect the “decisions about what - and who - should be visible and what should not [when talking about] concepts of order and disorder” (Zukin 1995, p.7). This chapter introduces the reader to Ireland’s Traveller community, with particular emphasis on the centrality of spatial politics to the history of Travellers and to our relationship to the State and the majority population. This review of the literature provides a framework for the subsequent analysis and interpretation of the data.

3:1 An introduction to Irish Travellers

Irish Travellers are an indigenous ethnic minority who are traditionally nomadic and distinct from the majority Irish population. Although the vast majority of Travellers are no longer nomadic, it is still a vital part of their identity and culture. As the Roma scholar Liégeois (1994, p.79) noted:

“whereas a sedentary person retains a sedentary mind-set even when travelling, Gypsies and Travellers, even when not travelling
remain nomadic. Even when they stop they are still Travelling People”.

MacLaughlin (1995 p.16) avows that Irish Travellers have a highly developed ‘geographical imagination’ (see also Harvey, 1973). In other words, ‘they think across time and place and regard geographical mobility as an integral, but by no means defining, feature of their way of life’ (MacLaughlin, 1995 p.16). Throughout history, varied terminology was used to describe Travellers in policy and in practice. Words such as ‘Tinker/Tynkr’, ‘Itinerant’, and ‘Gypsy’ were commonly used. However, these terms have now been rejected and replaced with the term Traveller. Jordan (2001) refers to the term Traveller as a “supposedly non-pejorative appellation”, adopted by the European parliament “as signalling the groups’ historic roots of a lifestyle of itinerancy, or mobility”. The Equal Status Act 2000 defines Travellers as “Traveller community’ meaning the community of people who are commonly called Travellers and who are identified (both by themselves and others) as people with a shared history, culture and traditions including, historically, a nomadic way of life on the island of Ireland”.

According to MacLaughlin (1995), the first mention of Irish Travellers was in the 5th century where they were referred to as ‘whitesmiths’ due to their association with the occupation of tin-smithing. However, Traveller history is largely unrecorded, partly due to Travellers oral tradition and historical neglect (O’hAodha 2008a; 2008bs).

According to the Central Statistics Office (2016) there are over 40,000 Travellers living in Ireland, accounting for just 0.6 per cent of the general population. Characterised by a much younger demographic profile than the general population, over 73 per cent of Travellers are under the age of 35. Travellers continue to experience significant disadvantage in terms of education, employment, accommodation, and health, as well as facing extreme discrimination and prejudice (AITHS, 2010; Watson et al.,2011; MacGréil, 2011). The life expectancy of Irish Travellers “remains similar to the life expectancy of the general population in 1945”, Traveller males live, on average, ten years less than the settled population while Traveller women can expect to live, on average, twelve years less than their settled counterparts and the suicide rate in the Traveller population is nearly 7 times higher, with 11 per cent of Travellers dying from suicide. The unemployment rate among Travellers stands at 82 per cent, while seven out of ten
Travellers have only primary or lower levels of education with just one per cent completing third level education (AITHS 2010; Watson et al 2017).

Scholarly social science research on Travellers in Ireland provides insights into the persistence and virulence of anti-Traveller racism (Helleiner 2003; McCann et al 1994; Fanning 2002). Drawing on a national survey of attitudes towards various groups, MacGréil (2010) reports that 60 per cent of the settled population in Ireland would not welcome a Traveller as a member of the family; 64 per cent reject Travellers on the basis of their ‘way of life’ and 18 per cent would deny Irish citizenship to Travellers. Tormey and Gleeson (2012) found that attitudes towards Travellers among young people are less favourable than attitudes towards any other group.

3:2 Nation building and the colonial legacy of anti-Traveller racism

Clashes of culture between nomadic and sedentary populations have a long history globally (McVeigh 2007 and 2012). In Ireland, anti-Traveller prejudice can be traced back as far as legislation enacted during the middle ages, which penalised and criminalised our nomadic lives and represented us as rogues and criminals, ‘reflecting the bias of the settled population’ (Helleiner 2010). Travellers were among those categories of person which colonial discourse constructed as ‘other’, the ‘other’ being ascribed the opposite qualities to those of the dominant group, which in turn had imbued itself with a moral superiority against which all other cultural values and traits would be judged as lacking (Ó hAodha, 2006, pp 75-79). According to Fanon (2008) this ‘othering’ paradigm creates racialised stereotypes, by demarcating

“distinct boundaries between the settled community and the Traveller community and as such, creates a psychological space where the dominant culture can project imagined negative traits on to the marginal Travelling community as its cultural inferior, in the same way the colonising English distorted the lens of how a black man must be seen in relation to a white man” (cited in Ó hAodha, 2006, p.147)

Racialisation “refers to the process of ‘racial formation’, the ‘naturalisation of racial groupings’ in biological terms (e.g., Miles 1989) or cultural terms (e.g., Goldberg 1993). Today, Travellers in Ireland live their daily lives experiencing racism, living with a racialised social identity which was created on the premises of racial inferiority has caused division and disparity between Travellers and non-Travellers (AITHS 2010; ITM
Lentin (2002 p.232) states Travellers are “Ireland’s largest racialised ethnic group”. The racialisation of Travellers has its history in broader global racialisation processes. In the 19th and early 20th centuries science was fascinated with race and thousands of indigenous people all over the world were put in zoos as human exhibitions to demonstrate racial difference (Purtschert 2015). Irish attitudes towards ‘tinkers’ and Travellers in the 19th century were influenced by social Darwinism (O’hAodha 2006). In colonial Ireland Travellers also found themselves positioned within the symbolic order of the dominant discourse on race (McVeigh 2012). For instance, ‘the presiding judge of Kilkenny Petty Sessions court suggested, to roars of laughter from the gallery, that four ‘tinkers’ would be fine attractions for the gawking public in Crystal Palace at the Great Exhibition’ (Connacht Telegraph, 1851, cited in Dooley).

The racialisation of Irish Travellers cannot be ascribed in its entirety to outside forces however. From the early days of the ‘free state’, the Irish government began a long process of ideological and political racialisation which focused on state building and re-inventing the national identity and culture (Mitchell 2011; MacLoughlain 2010). In the formation of the Irish State, the colonial ‘othering’ of Travellers was adopted and adapted to support the process of building a national Irish identity (O’hAodha 2006). Delaney (2002) argues that there was no room for Irish Travellers in this new republic. Othering was part of the process of Ireland’s nation building. McVeigh (2007, p.92) argues that “we measured ourselves against who we were not as citizens—neither having English values or the stigmatised view they had of the general population thereby permitting a racist dialogue in the public mentality in discourse regarding Travellers”. The process of building an Irish national identity thus involved the transfer of ‘colonial racialised stereotypes’ about the majority Irish onto Travellers (Fanning 2012; Ó hAodha 2006).

By 1931 we find MacGréine pleading:

“To those people who would seek to ‘civilise’ [the tinkers] … who refer to them as a ‘national problem’; ‘a nuisance to farmers’; and so on, I would say: Leave us our wandering tinkers. House them and they pine; they have no outlet for their restlessness. Why cage a bird? Why civilise a tinker?” (1931 p.177).

By the 1940s it became common practice to move Travellers off the land that was needed for building which would support the Irish state’s agenda of nation building and ‘civic
evolution’ (see O’hAodha 2006). These evictions were not handled in a ‘civic’ manner most of the time and conflicts over land usage became the main type of dispute between Travellers and the settled population. During The Emergency, anti-Traveller discourse manifested within Dáil Éireann; for example, in 1942, a Deputy O’Donnell racialised Travellers referring to us thus:

“…Tramps…gypsies…beggers…thieves…drunk…a nuisance…they breed like rabbits…” and he suggested that “the Roosevelt method might do something in the way of making such people useful citizens” (Dáil Éireann, Volume 93, 19 April, 1944). …

Such representations perpetuated views of Travellers that persisted from colonial times and were reimagined and reinvigorated during the formation of the Irish State (Ó hAodha, 2006, p.109-113).

3:3 The 1963 Report of the Commission on Itineracy

A national state assimilation and settlement policy for Travellers was established in the 1960s (GOI 1963). Many scholars claim that the progressive dilution of Traveller culture was not a deliberate or thought-out plan but a consequence of urbanization, commercial expansion, modernity and state-building (Mitchell 2011; MacLoughlin 2010). Nonetheless, it is well documented that anti-Traveller polices were developed specifically to eliminate Traveller culture and ethnicity by means of settlement and assimilation (OhAodha 2006; Power 2004; McVeigh 2012).

McVeigh et al. (2010, p.8) states “in the past, while there were sometimes tensions between sedentary and nomadic forms of existence in Ireland, the two could coexist symbiotically in relative harmony”. In the period since the formation of the Irish State, the 1963 Report of the Commission on Itineracy stands out as a key turning point in this history. The 1963 Report of the Commission on Itineracy was produced to “enquire into the problems arising from the presence of itinerants in considerable numbers” (p.110). This Report marked a key turning point in relations between Travellers

---

2 This was a period of Irish neutrality during the Second World War (see Spelman 2004)
3 Although the first state accommodation for Travellers was provided under the Housing Act 1931 there was no explicit government policy in relation to Travellers or Traveller Accommodation until the publication of Report of the Commission on Itinerancy in 1963
and the State in that it codified the State’s ideological opposition to nomadism in a manner which had not previously existed.

Established by the government in June 1960, the appointed members were George Claxton (Vice-President for Leinster of the National Farmers’ Association, Revd. G. Thomas Fehily (Director of the Dublin Institute of Catholic Sociology), Chief Superintendent Thomas S. McDonagh (Garda Siochana), Matthew Macken (County Manager for Counties Carlow and Kildare), Dr. Maurice S. McParland (County Medical Officer of Health for County Donegal), Dr. John B. O’Regan (Chief Medical Officer, Dublin Health Authority), Cornelius Meaney (President of the General Council of the Committees of Agriculture and then Teachta Dála, Proinsias S. O Tighearnaigh (M.A., a former Chief Inspector in the Department of Education; and Dr Angela Russell, Aidan D. McDonald (Assistant Principle Officer, Department of Local Government and the Hon. Mr. Justice Brian Walsh (a Judge of the High Court) was nominated to be the Chairman of the Commission (GOI 1963). No Traveller representative was appointed to the board.

On the 1st of July 1960, the inaugural meeting of the commission was held in Government Buildings, Merrion Street, Dublin. Mr Chares J. Haughey (who would later serve multiple terms as the Taoiseach or prime minister of the country) addressed the members of the commission where he stated “the concern of the Government at the lack of practical suggestions for dealing with these problems and drew attention to the acknowledgement in the terms of reference that there could be no ‘final solution’ until itinerant families were absorbed into the general community” (GOI 1963, p.111). The commission portrayed the Traveller issue as effecting the improvement of the subjects’ socio-economic status by means of assimilation, settlement and absorption. Thus the first systematic attempt by the Irish government to settle Travellers began with “the ultimate goal of settlement and spatial fixity which has remained the cornerstone of government policy towards Travellers ever since” (Crowley 1999, p.4). After the publication of this report, local authorities built halting sites (hardstands for the purpose of parking mobile homes - referred to by Travellers as trailers - and providing varying levels of amenities) on the basis that “provision of these sites should only be the first step of stabilisation” in a programme aimed at Travellers eventual assimilation (GOI p.11).
As the 1970s approached several acts and regulations were produced to assist in the Commission’s aim of forced assimilation and settlement (see Crowley 1999; AITHS 2010). The operation of caravan sites was introduced in 1968 which intended to commence on the building of large caravan sites in order to get Travellers to settle (see AITHS 2010). Although, many Travellers preferred the option of practicing nomadism, many believed the sites would permit them to continue travelling (OhAodhha 2006). Initially the caravan sites were to be temporary living quarters that would aid Travellers to eventually settle in houses (see GOI 1963). Conversely, they became permanent for the majority of those who moved into them (AITHS 2010). The location chosen for these sites were usually around five to six miles on the outskirts of a town or city, near garbage-dumps, industrial developments or just ‘left-over land’ (see findings chapter). Crowley (2009, p.14) states that:

“Permanent settlement was alien and destructive to the traditional Traveller way of life and many Travellers, particularly through their nomadism, struggled to avoid it. Travellers chose some aspects of the programmes and policies and rejected others. For example, many left houses and halting sites after short periods”.

By the 1980s, most Travellers were living in urban areas in regulated sites, in standard housing or on unauthorised sites where no official site was available. The unofficial and underserviced sites increased anti-Traveller racism and gave weight to the ‘culture of poverty’ theory\(^4\) and to the notion that the government’s settlement policy was needed to assimilate Travellers (Breathnacht 2006a and 2006b). Nonetheless, as Crowley (1999, p.14) states “it would seem that Travellers were not only despised because they were always on the move but also that they might stay and contaminate sedentary society’s social and geographical space”. One of the key obstacles to the implementation of government policy was the objection of settled residents to the location of halting sites in their localities. For example, the purpose of the Dublin Itinerant Settlement Committee was to “seek ways and means to so change public opinion that it would be possible for Local Authorities to implement the new Government policy” of settlement (Fehily 1974, p.6-7).

\(^4\) A fashionable theory of the time was that we were not a distinct ethnicity but a sub-culture created out of poverty
Despite the increasing migration of Travellers into urban centres and an economic dependency on the welfare state, most Travellers rejected government settlement and assimilation objectives (Helleiner 2002); the government’s ‘final solution’ was failing. Indeed, the assumption that the ‘problem’ of Travellers could be solved by encouraging the community to give up on the nomadic aspect of culture and assimilate into settled society by moving into standard houses had highlighted a divided Irish society i.e. ‘them’ and ‘us’. As Crowley (1999, p.6) states “The contradictions of placing responsibility for the settlement of a nomadic group in the hands of territorially defined local authorities became apparent almost immediately” and as a Dublin County Council official argued: “They [the County Council] were being asked to provide services for people who were not worth a damn to them” (The Irish Times, 10 November, 1964, cited in Crowley 1999).

3.4 The evolution of a rights-based approach to policy making

Increased conflict between Travellers, non-Travellers and local officials brought about a review of the settlement policy and, a decade or so after the Commission on Itinerancy sat, the Travelling People Review Body was established. This Body acknowledged that Traveller assimilation was unacceptable, and they suggested “that it is better to think in terms of integration between the traveller and the settled community” (cited in Crowley 1999). The review body also acknowledged Traveller identity, culture and traditions, yet retained “a commitment to Traveller settlement as necessary to Irish modernization” and to working with local authorities to provide basic facilities and serviced halting sites (cited in Crowley 1999, p.8). The serviced ‘temporary’ sites provided by the local authorities were very often overcrowded, squalid, and with very limited facilities. The un-serviced sites were primitive, lacking water supply, sanitation and refuse collection.

It is argued that Traveller spaces are configured to be a space of hardship where sendentarism seems like the only option available for Travellers (see Pavee Point 2011; ITM 2010; GTM 2010).

Although it has been argued that national policy is steering away from the assimilation approach Watt (2006, p.160) states that

“in short, assimilationist/exclusion policies towards Travellers continue to persist at local government level in Ireland and there are significant gaps between stated policy at a national level and local implementation”.
In 2001, the Citizen Traveller Campaign was established to address relations between the majority and Traveller populations, the character of which serves as an obstacle to the local implementation of national policy to provide Traveller specific accommodation. The State withdrew funding for the campaign after the organization launched a poster showing an image of the Irish flag with an eviction sign on a caravan, it read ‘Suddenly in a Caring Ireland, to be a Traveller is a terrible crime’. The poster was perceived to be critical of the Irish government’s plans to introduce anti-trespass laws which would impact on Traveller nomadism. The law in question, The Housing (miscellaneous provisions) Act 2002 was passed. This anti-trespass law gave local authorities more power to move Travellers off public and private land. Under this law “encampment has been criminalised” and “Travellers can be moved with less than twenty-four hours’ notice; if they do not move they can be arrested without a warrant. Fines of 3000 euro can be issued to Travellers or they can a face prison sentence” (Drummond 2007, p.7). Thus, although the recent history of relations between the State and Travellers is permeated by a rights-based discourse, there is little evidence of a dilution of sedentarist ideology. Indeed, Crowley and Kitchen (2007, p.130) assert the view that the evolution of the relationship between the parties might be characterised as developing “from one exclusively consisting of conformist regulation to one supplemented by coercion and co-option in return for recognition and rights”.

3.5 Ethnicity denial

A unique feature of the evolving relationship between the Irish State and Travellers in Ireland is the contradictory and simultaneous process of racialisation and de-ethnicisation. For example, the Report of the Commission on Itineracy 1963 proposed discriminatory policies justified by statements which speak to a deeply rooted ideology of sedentarist superiority (McVeigh 1997 and 2008), but despite the ascription to the category of Travellers of a range of negative characteristics based on their membership of a clearly identifiable, self-identifying and long-standing group, the State persisted in denying Traveller ethnicity.

Official denial of Travellers’ experiences of racism and rights has and continues to be shaped by a ‘de-ethnicisation’ process. While members of the Traveller community have long recognised and asserted our cultural distinctiveness, the State instead racialised
Travellers as ‘non-productive’ members of society (Helleiner 2002 and 2003, McVeigh 2007; 2012) producing Travellers as racial subjects that can, and must be, subject to a policy of assimilation in order to become ‘normal’ racial beings (McVeigh 2012). The first official denial of Traveller ethnicity was published in the Report of the Commission on Itineracy 1963 (p.37) where it stated:

“Itinerants (or travellers as they prefer themselves to be called) do not constitute a single homogeneous group, tribe or community within the nation, although the settled population are inclined to regard them as such. Neither do they constitute a separate ethnic group. There is no system of unified control, authority or government and no individual or group of individuals has any powers or control over the itinerant members of the community”

In the UK Travellers had been recognised as an ethnic group since 2000 and in the North of Ireland since 1997 (McVeigh 2009). In Ireland, Traveller campaigns for ethnicity rights dates to the 1980s.

Numerous academic studies have supported these claims. For example, Gmelch and Gmelch (1976 p.226) specifically identified Travellers as an ethnic group stating “they form a distinct ethnic group within Irish society” and Okely (1983, p.18) stated “the term ‘Traveller’ does not imply a drop-out from the sedentary society, as is so often supposed by outsiders, but full membership of an ethnic group”. Kenny (1994) declared Travellers were ‘a nomadic ethnic group’ with a right to travel. As Barth (1969) specified, and as theorists including Eriksen (2010), Maybury-Lewis (1997) and Jenkins (2008) have later emphasised, ethnicity is not merely cultural difference per se. Rather, “it is putative difference made relevant through interaction” (Eriksen 2010, p.251). In the words of Maybury-Lewis (1997, p.61):

“Ethnic groups do not form therefore because people are of the same race, or share the same language or the same culture. They form because people who share such characteristics decide they are members of a distinct group, or because people who share such characteristics are lumped together and treated by outsiders as members of a distinct group”.

Ní Shúinéar systematically applied the concept of ethnicity to Irish Travellers, and using Barth’s (1970) definition of ‘ethnic group’ she stated, “we are dealing with a group that fulfils all the objective criteria to qualify as an ethnic group” (1994, p.60). While Ní
Shúinéar concentrated on objective criteria, O’Connell concentrated on the subjective element, “ethnicity is something which is produced in historically specific contexts and it emerges, changes and adapts in meaning over time” (2002, p.111-112). He stated:

“It is through the processes of interaction with other cultural groups, whereby certain features are interpreted as giving a group its identity, that ethnicity is constructed… While acknowledging that there is a subjective dimension in recognising one’s distinctive identity as different from that of others, as well as an objective process whereby others select traits which form the basis of differentiation, ethnicity is not just a matter of personal choice”.

By 2003 Tovey and Share (p.469) were in a position to state that:

“it is widely recognised that there has been a radical transformation of how the position of Travellers has been interpreted over the past twenty-five years; from subgroup of the poor or subculture to a distinct ethnic group”.

In 2007 McVeigh (2007) stated that within the academic arena Traveller ethnicity is “so self-evident that it does not require more detailed discussion” (p.16). As he (p.16) asserts the

“stricter legalistic definitions of Mandla v Lee⁵ remains the ‘acid test’ for Traveller ethnicity” and, therefore, “most academic commentators tend to accept Irish Traveller ethnicity fairly unproblematically”.

Not all academics have adopted this stance however. For example McCarthy’s Master’s thesis (1972, p.6, cited in Ní Shuinéar 1997, p.44) adopted the government’s view stating:

“…it is a basic assumption of this study that the Irish travellers are not gypsies and do not constitute a separate ethnic group with an entirely separate tradition and culture. Poverty is considered to be basic to itinerancy in this study.”

Nonetheless, by 2000 Ireland’s equality legislation (Equal Status Acts) defined Travellers, not as an ethnic minority, but as a separate group meriting protection (McVeigh 2007, p.96). In 2006 the Equality Authority recognised Travellers as an ethnic minority and recommended the Irish government do the same (Crowley 2006, p.65). The

⁵ The Mandla Vs Dowell Lee case of 1983 was an “Act to make fresh provisions with respect to discrimination on racial grounds and relations between people of different racial groups (Race Relations Act, 1976). Irish Travellers were recognised as an Ethnic group in the UK when Lord Fraser ruled that the Mandla Vs Dowell Lee criteria had been satisfied.
persistent refusal of the Irish State to recognise Traveller ethnicity in the face of these internal pressures elicited an international response. For example, the *International Convention on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination* (CERD), the *European Commission against Racism and Intolerance* (ECRI), *The European Framework Convention on National Minorities*, the *Rights of the Child European Commission* and the *EU Race Directive* all expressed concerns regarding the Irish authorities’ position on Traveller ethnicity.

The Irish State persisted in an official denial of Traveller ethnicity until March 2017 (see Holland Feb 28th, 2017). Crowley (1992) asserts that within that period the debate over ethnicity recognition was “constructed as if occurring between two compact and discrete contenders: The Irish state on one side and the Traveller community on the opposing one” (cited in Brandi 2013). The risks in this debate were, and are still, high – the collateral damage is Traveller culture, and concurrently the legitimacy of assimilation as a policy objective. The struggle is not yet over, the State’s recognition of Traveller ethnicity has not been enshrined in legislation and its legal standing remains in doubt.

**3.6 Contemporary anti-Traveller racism**

Modern media representations of Travellers continue to feed negative stereotypes of our culture, by continuing to frame our cultural identity as one ‘that generally embody[s] negativity as defined by the fictive homogeneity that is the ‘us’ (Ó hAodha, 2006, p.79). At the same time, sporadic expressions of prejudice by individuals in positions of authority, often without consequence, create a climate in which there is arguably a ‘permission to hate’ (Perry 2001). For example, in 2012, while presiding over a case involving a Traveller man, Mr Justice Seamus Hughes stated “…I suspect that he comes from a certain ethnic background… they are like Neanderthal men living in long grass, abiding by the laws of the jungle” (cited in Bohan 2012).

In Ireland, opinion polls consistently rank Travellers as being held in lower esteem than any other group, Brown’s (2004, p.2) study found that 21 per cent of respondents believed that Travellers should not have the same rights as the settled community and anti-Traveller racism is “more instinctive, more deeply ingrained and less subject to correction by liberal sensitivity”. The Millward Brown IMS study 2004 (for the KNOW racism
campaign) also found the majority population to have negative attitudes towards Travellers – 68 per cent agreed that there is discrimination towards Travellers; 72 per cent agreed that the settled population is not willing to accept Travellers among them; 13 per cent agreed that Travellers should have less rights; 23 per cent agreed that the life and culture of Travellers should be abolished, 48 per cent agreed that Travellers do not make a positive contribution to society. Likewise, O’Connell and Winston’s study (2006) found Irish Travellers were the ‘least popular and most socially distant group of people in Ireland’. Donncha O’Connell, writing in Racially Aggravated Crime - The Irish Experience (2004) calls racism against Travellers a “practically Irish form of racism” (cited in Galway Traveller Movement 2006) and Fanning (2002, p.5) stated:

“it would be difficult to exaggerate the extent of racism and discrimination against the Travelling people in Irish society and the extent to which it remains justified within racialised discourses that construct the Travelling people as deviant and inferior”.

Helleiner’s (2002, p.328-329) findings show that the racism encountered by Travellers is rooted in evaluations of our culture as inferior or invalid:

“Travellers in Southern Ireland are constructed as an indigenous Irish minority and constructions of ‘racial’ difference in terms of such signifiers as colour, physiognomy, genes, or ‘blood’ have been largely absent from Traveller-related discussion. Much more common has been a dominant construction of Travellers as a population distinguished not by ‘race’, but rather by a negatively evaluated ‘way of life’, exemplified by specific features including itinerancy, trailer-living, particular occupations, and poverty”.

Thus she defines anti-Traveller racism as “a form of inferiorised difference that does not invoke biological inferiority, but rather notions of undesirable cultural difference” (2000, p.328-329).

3:7 Travellers and Space

The decisions and actions of powerful groups define space based on their interpretation of how space should be used. Space is divided to cater and function for different identities and activities according to their importance (Lipsitz 2007). Lefebvre (1974, p.314) described the situation thus:
“The ruling classes seize hold of space as it comes into being (their political action occasions the establishment of space, but it is synonymous with it), and they then use that space as a tool of power, without for all that forgetting its other uses: the organization of production and of the means of production –in a word, the generation of profit”.

Space is produced into spaces of labour, housing, leisure, consumption and production. Within these spaces lived space is produced through the interrelations between people and the signs and symbols of domination and power. Consequently, space is reproduced by the political power which has its own ideologies and discourses about space that influence the particular ways that space is divided and reproduces social relationships. Lefebvre points out that “there is dependence between ideology and political power which earth, labour and capital are under the control of the state”. Additionally, with this power and the ideology of this power the “spatial, social and economic formation of space” (Lefebvre 1974, p327) is produced.

The ideology of sedentarism is an “ethnocentric instrument of power”, and since it involves a spatialisation of social order, sedentarisation belongs to the realm of what Lefebvre (1974) calls “‘dominated’ space”, ‘a site of hegemonic forces”. As he puts it: “space has become for the state a political instrument of primary importance. ... It is thus an administratively controlled and even policed space” (p.117). The contemporary strategy of restricting Travellers’ mobility via confining the exercise of nomadism to static life on local authority provided halting sites, manifests a social order in which local authorities decide on the design and location of Traveller space (Delaney 2003) and is rooted in an ideology which views Traveller nomadic identity as a threat to society (Helleiner 2006). Equally the effect of anti-trespass laws has been to “make many of the spaces central to the maintenance of Traveller culture legally unenterable” (Crowley and Kitchin 2007, p.19; see also Mitchell 1997). Bancroft (2005, cited in Crowley and Kitchin 2007) draws on these laws to illuminate the hegemonic status of sedentarist ideology in the production of space, declaring:

“the legislation is symptomatic of the 'taken-for-granted' nature of sedentary socio-spatial hegemony - the importance of space to the government's' ability to (re) produce their authority and the notion that the state has the right to step in and act when citizens are perceived not to be exercising their 'freedoms' in appropriate ways”.
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Table 3.1: Legislation affecting the spatialisation of Irish Travellers (Crowley and Kitchin 2007)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legislation</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Function</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Local Government (Sanitary Services Act) section 31</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>Control of Temporary Dwellings. This Act has the power to move caravans if considered unsanitary or likely to cause a nuisance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Planning and Development Act</td>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Empowers local authorities to remove Travellers who are camped unofficially and to confiscate their dwellings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act.</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>Section of this Act empowers local authorities to remove Travellers who are camped unofficially to an official site anywhere within a five-mile radius of where they are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government Act 1994</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Strengthened a local authority's powers to make bye-laws in relation to the use of temporary dwellings under the Local Government Act, 1948</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal Justice (Public Order) Act</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>The relevant sections that would later impact on Travellers are 'confiscation of goods' and 'provision of identification by defendant.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual Trading Act</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>This Act requires market traders to apply to each local authority for a casual licence for any market in their area, this results in increased costs for engagement in market trading. Previously only one licence was required for the whole area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act / Provisions</td>
<td>Year</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control of Horses Act</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>Places restriction on the ownership of horses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing (Traveller Accommodation) Act</td>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Section 32 gives increased powers of eviction to local authorities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3:9 Travellers: Right to the city

With numerous regulations, laws and restrictions on camping and mobility Travellers are constricted from following the centuries old tradition of moving from one place to the next. A large and growing number of Irish Travellers live in cities (Census 2015), the proportion of Travellers living in urban areas stands at 82 per cent. The exercise of nomadism has been restricted to spaces away from the settled population and producing subjects without full rights to self-determination and to city spaces. State policies and practices continue to locate Travellers into urban ‘dead zones’, and in doing so Travellers’ rights, needs and aspirations have been virtually ignored. The right to self-determination is enshrined in the UN Declaration on the Rights of Indigenous Peoples (see UN 2008) yet the state’s conception of Traveller rights in Ireland restricts the activation of such rights to a ‘spatial imaginary’ (Pavee Point 2008) and a ‘material reality’ that benefits the interest of the settled population at the expense of Travellers’ needs and wellbeing.

This thesis will explore the relationship between the spatial marginality of Traveller accommodation in the urban area, but also the Traveller’s experience of the wider city space. As Lefebvre argues, with respect to immigrants, the issue is not just one of marginalisation but is about access to social and basic needs. According to Gilbert and Dikeç (2008, p.258) tolerating the presence of immigrants in cities is “not enough if they cannot move freely on the streets, in the media, in universities, in government positions, and in society at large”. This thesis poses the question of whether, given the racism to which they are subject in Irish society, indigenous Travellers can activate this right to the city.
Chapter 4: An integrated ethnographic approach

4:1 Introduction

The objective of this chapter is to offer an account of the methodology that was used in this study and the rationale that underlies the decisions taken. I adopted an ethnographic approach to examining the lived experiences of young Travellers in urban space. The aim of the data collection and analysis carried out for this thesis was to create new empirical and theoretical understandings of young Travellers experiences of urban space.

The chapter begins by discussing the ethnographic approach adopted. It then details and explains the process of negotiating access, the sampling strategy, the specific methods of data collection employed and the analytic process. I then discuss the ethical principles that informed this research and the manner in which I addressed ethical issues arising. I also discuss the verification procedures that I utilised in undertaking this research. Finally, I consider my own reflexivity; “the process of a researcher’s self-reflection upon their biases, preferences, and theoretical predispositions” (Schwandt 2001, p.224).

4:2 Research Design

The research design refers to how you plan, structure and realise your research as well as all the decisions you make throughout the study. MacMillan and Schumacher (2001, p.166) describe it as “a plan for selecting subjects, research sites, and data collection procedures to answer the research question”. The research question determines the research design, which has to be coherent and complementary, as the design acts as a link between your research question and the implementation of your research (De Vos 1998; Blanche and Durrheim 2004). Saunders et al., (2003, p.83) provided the following diagram which summarises the significant dimensions of the design that need to be considered before beginning any research.
As my study was exploratory and descriptive in nature, and sought to foreground the lived realities of my participants, I chose to work within the interpretivist paradigm using qualitative methods.

### 4.3 Qualitative research

Qualitative research is an umbrella term which involves various research strategies, flexible combinations, which are used to gather trustworthy data. Qualitative research aims to investigate issues in society by getting to the ‘heart’ of the topic through people’s words and actions. Catherine Marshall and Gretchen B. Rossman express the view that “qualitative research is pragmatic, interpretive and grounded in the lived experiences of people” (cited in Hogan et al 2009, p.4). These lived experiences allow sociologists to delve into the subjective meaning of issues for participants. Indeed, to gain an insightful and in-depth understanding of the social world of the participants, one first needs to recognise how society is viewed by the informants i.e. their ‘lived reality’. Patton (2002, p.39) defines qualitative research as:

“a naturalistic approach which seeks to understand phenomena in context-specific settings, such as real world settings, where the researcher does not attempt to manipulate the phenomena of interest...it is any kind of research that produces findings not
arrived at by means of statistical procedures or other means of quantification, but instead the kind of research that produces findings derived at from real-world settings where the phenomena of interest unfold naturally.”

Dianne Watt (2007, p.91) confirms the significance of this naturalistic approach to achieving verstehen when she states:

“People’s behaviour becomes meaningful and understandable when placed into the context of their lives and the lives of those around them. Without context there is little possibility of exploring the meaning of an experience”.

As Heppner et al. 1999, p. 246) puts it, “qualitative researchers want to study behaviour in context and might even go so far as to contend that it is the interpretation of the context that is the essential process to be studied”. This allows us to get to the depth of the ‘true’ human experience and to study the “how and sometimes the why participants construct meanings and actions in specific situations” (Charmaz, 2006, p. 130).

As I previously stated, the purpose of this research is to develop a better understanding of Travellers’ relationship to urban space and the interplay between race and space. The qualitative method adopts a holistic approach, the emphasis is placed on the way in which the participant interprets their social world (Bryman, 2008). I chose to work within the qualitative paradigm as I wanted to access the young people’s understandings of their everyday life experiences, and the processes by which they make meaning of them.

4:4 Verstehen

The concept of verstehen is associated with Wilhelm Dilthey and Georg Simmel. Both sociologists understood it as the “social actions” which occur through the “inner-motives of acting individuals” (Hervé 1988, p.143). However, I adopt here the definition developed by Max Weber; he understood it to be “a method of empirical science which attempts to understand the meaning of actions and not the motives” (Weber cited in Hervé 1988, p.143). The claim that qualitative research achieves verstehen is an assertion of the authenticity and trustworthiness of the insights it produces.

Verstehen is dependent on mutual friendship and trust. To become mentally close to the participant it is necessary to establish rapport, and create a comfortable environment, to
encourage openness and enthusiasm. However, there is no set procedure which guarantees the researcher will achieve verstehen. Seale et al. (2007, p.1443) verify that “research situations are unique and involve contingent processes of interaction; so that there is always the possibility that what worked on one occasion may not suffice on others”. Nonetheless, qualitative research can advantage us in supporting verstehen. In contrast to quantitative research, qualitative methods can get into the issues behind the numbers and statistics by exploring and understanding the subjective meaning of the subject matter.

4:5 Ethnography
Ethnography’s roots lie in the work of anthropologists who devised the approach as “a means of compiling scientific information on the world’s cultures” (Sandstrom and Sandstrom 1995, p. 167). Derived from the Greek word ‘Ethnos’, meaning people, and ‘graphy’, meaning to write, ‘ethnography’ simply means to write about people and their everyday lives within a social setting which provides meanings to social and cultural practices (Marvasti 2004). The focus of this research on questions of ethnic identity, racialisation and inter-cultural encounters makes ethnography an ideal choice for this research project.

Ethnographic research is oriented to gaining insight into the cultural lives of participants and the meanings associated with social life. Ethnography has distinctive characteristics: research is conducted on-site in a natural setting; the ethnographer is both the observer and participant; multiple data collection methods are applied; long-term commitment is required, and the ethnography is presented as a discussion of holistic narratives and interpretations (Seale et al 2007; Sangasubana 2011). Denzin and Lincoln (1998, cited in Hogan and Donnelly 2009, p.47) noted that “

“ethnographic methods are characterised by the collection of relatively unstructured empirical materials, a small number of cases, and a writing and style of analysis that are primarily interpretive, involving descriptions of phenomena”.

Thus, ethnography is an anthology of qualitative research methods combined, that has a focus on the close observation of the social and cultural practices and interactions of the group. Ethnography cannot be conducted through a prescribed set of methods, it involves the use of multiple methods that require the researcher to be flexible; i.e. the researcher
has to be willing to become a “bricoleur” or a “jack of all trades” (Denzin and Lincoln 1998, p.4). The methods utilised to collect data in this research project were focus group interviews, walking, observation, field notes and mapping. My primary and most effective method in the field was participant observation, described by Bernard (2011, p.259) in the following extract:

“Spend lots and lots of time in studying a culture, learn the language, hang out, do all the everyday things that everyone else does, become inconspicuous by sheer tenaciousness and stay aware of what’s really going on”.

Fieldwork in ethnography is crucial for documenting people’s beliefs and practices from a subjective perspective which cannot be detached from the complex issue of everyday demands and conflicts. Fetterman (1989, p.28) reveals that “cultural interpretation involves the ability to describe what the researcher has heard and seen within the framework of the social group’s reality. In describing ethnography, Hammersley and Atkinson (1995, p.1-2) stated:

“In its most characteristic form it involves the ethnographer participating, overtly or covertly, in people’s daily lives for an extended period of time, watching what happens, listening to what is said, asking questions – in fact, collecting whatever data are available to throw light on the issues that are the focus of the research”.

Some researchers claim that ethnography can produce insights that is impossible to obtain by other methods (Burgess 1984; Field 1991; Wolcott 1995; Hammersley and Atkinson 1995). By spending long periods of time with the participants the ethnographer focuses on the lived experiences of everyday life which allows for true examination of human behaviour within the social context. Ethnography is particularly useful for making distinctions and seeing patterns in data; this allows for an in-depth and open-ended investigation into the phenomena that prohibits generalisability, but permits transferability.

4:5:1 Urban Ethnography

Ethnography is a broad church and encompasses a variety of traditions. For this research, I have chosen to adopt the approach of urban ethnography. The rationale for this approach is that it presents me with an opportunity to capture rich data that will illuminate the lived realities of the urban space for young Travellers in a European city that prides itself on
its multi-cultural and inclusion ‘strategies’. Urban ethnography is appropriate to observing the social interactions of my participants in context, probing their perspectives, and documenting urban ‘strategies’ and ‘tactics’ (De Certeau 1984).

In pursuing an urban ethnography, it is vital that the researcher is deeply engaged in the lives of the participants and the social structure of the place of study. I draw upon the highly respected urban ethnographers Robert Park et al.’s. (1925, cited in Brewer 2000, p.13) view of the “city as a social laboratory”. Park told his students to:

“Go and sit in the lounges of the luxury hotels and on the doorsteps of the flophouses; sit on the Gold Coast settees and on the slum shakedowns; sit in the Orchestra Hall and in the Star and Garter Burlesk. In short, gentlemen, go get the seat of your pants dirty in real research”.

While cities are often discussed in terms of their ‘physical’ functionality, modern urban spaces are indeed social ‘laboratories’ where human experience, memory and emotions, social relationships and interactions determine how the city is negotiated on an everyday basis. By utilising an urban ethnographic approach for this study, I am facilitated to observe the macro-level social structure of the city under investigation as well as the micro-level social interactions of the young Traveller.

The choice of urban ethnography was particularly apt for this study as space has an important place within the tradition. Previous research (Lebvere 1974; Joseph 2004; Colombijn and Erdentug 2002) has shown that spatial encounters are acted out through the interrelations between people and their environment in everyday life. Urban spaces operate with a particular purpose and audience that conforms to the myth of the ‘ideal city’; urban utopias claim to have an emphasis on equality, social justice and freedoms however to achieve this rules are put in place that are restrictive with regard to the urban structure. The experience of everyday life in urban space depends upon who can follow the rules; divisions are created, and social justice is obstructed. Urban ethnography provides me with a framework for observing the socio-spatial practices of young Travellers in the city while analysing urban divisions.
4:6 Sampling and access

4.6.1. Access

As a Traveller researcher and a well-known activist, I had privileged access to participants, a task which occupies a considerable amount of time for most researchers (Patton, 2002). As Van Maanen and Kolb (1985 p.11) state access usually “involves some combination of strategic planning, hard work, and dumb luck”. Gaining access requires the researcher to gain a reputation of reliability and honesty. When conducting an ethnographic research project, which requires more intensive engagement than, for example, an interview study, it is particularly important to show commitment to the community without judgement. As a respected member of the Traveller community I was advantaged in gaining access.

Gatekeepers have been identified as important mediators for researchers and the researcher can establish legitimacy by working through them. Where the gatekeeper has already established trust with the community, the researcher can benefit from their assistance. However, there is a power imbalance between the researcher and the gatekeeper, gatekeepers may seek to control access not just to a group but to individual participants. Even when they are well-meaning and propose people whom they feel are best suited to a study, they can limit the potential group of participants (Sime 2008). For this reason, the role of the gatekeeper was restricted to advertising the research, rather than identifying individual participants. This volunteer strategy was also key to ensuring that no potential participant felt that their position relative to the gatekeeper might be compromised by a refusal to participate in the research.

All organisations (or people involved in organisations) across the city that had a strong relationship with the Traveller community were contacted and given information about my research. I had previously worked with one of the Traveller organisations contacted, but was not employed with them at the time of the research. Not all those who participated in the research were connected to organisations contacted; some heard about the research through their networks and contacted me.
4:7:2 Voluntarism

Voluntarism should entail that the participant is given a free choice to get involved in the study and confirm that any exposure to risk is done knowledgeably and willingly (Cohen et al 2007, p.52).

As this research involved young people under the age of 18, it was necessary to acquire signed consent from their parents for their participation in the research. However, I also sought assent from the young people to ensure that their participation was entirely voluntary.

Since my research took an ethnographic approach, there were times when my participants brought their friends along with them to focus groups and walks. Where individuals joined planned focus groups and walks while they were in process, I briefly explained my research and asked if they were happy to participate; afterwards I gave them a copy of my research description where it stated that they could pull out at any time for any reason. Even where it is not feasible to acquire written consent, it is the duty of the researcher to obtain reasonably informed consent by providing reasonable information to ensure the participant is fully briefed on the nature of the study.

4:6:4 Profile of Participants

As part of the aims of this study, participants were drawn from the young Traveller population across Galway city. I recruited 48 participants in total, involving Travellers between the ages of 14-21 years, 5 male participants and 9 females were over the age of eighteen, while 21 females and 13 males were under the age of eighteen. All participants lived in diverse accommodation across various parts of the city.

The walking groups (where I walked through the city and the participants’ locality with them to experience their daily lived reality) consisted of six people or less. I conducted seven focus groups in total, and three one-to-one interviews with those who are over eighteen who wished to expand on issues raised during the focus groups.
4.7 Methods of Data Collection

As an ‘insider’ adopting an ethnographic approach, it was important to me to bracket my own assumptions and experiences in order to foreground the experiences and meaning making of my participants. Therefore, I utilised methods of data collection that would facilitate gaining multiple vantage points on my participants’ subjective realities. My collection of ethnographic data via focus groups, observation and mapping allowed me to reach more trustworthy conclusions than a single data source would have permitted. Using different kinds of data helped provide rich descriptions of the experiences of, and tactics developed by, the young Travellers. At the point of analysis, the triangulation of data sources helped me to discover consistencies in participants’ accounts across time, space, age and gender. As Hatch (2002, p.160) points out,

“Finding several quotations that accurately and clearly convey your ideas is a final check on your analysis. If you have too many good examples to report, that’s a sign that your findings are well supported”.

4.7.1 Focus group interviews

The focus group method was employed in order to gain insights into shared experiences of the city, including perceptions and practices of movement based on identity. Neuman (2003, p.396) suggests that focus groups are beneficial especially when a ‘natural’ setting is required. The group context allows participants, particularly marginalised groups, to openly discuss their opinions and ideas more easily. This held to “…provide collective power to marginalised people” (Liamputtong 2011) amplifying the voice of the participants (Warr 2005). The group format is also appropriate to sensitive research topics, which are likely to elicit discussions of criminal victimisation, discrimination and racism. It provides for mutual support within the group facilitating people “… to speak about uncomfortable and formidable topics” (Liamputtong 2011, p.114).

The first phase of data collection for this research began with focus groups, they were conducted over a period of one year in combination with walks and observation. Each focus group lasted between 50 and 90 minutes and took place in locations suggested by the participants themselves. Following the ethical guidelines of the SAI the focus groups were audio recorded and they included invitations to recount experiences and events relevant to the issues under study.
I explored how young Travellers talk about their ‘Traveller identity’ and how that relates to their use and negotiation of urban space. My questions were guided, and sought to address the gap in the literature of young Travellers experiences of racism in the urban space. Much of the focus groups were occupied by discussions of a map-making process which acted as a stimulus for the focus groups as well as a source of data. Liamputtong (2010, p.3) advocates that “a moderator’s primary aim is to facilitate discussion rather than to direct it”. He says (2010, pp.4-5) focus groups have numerous important features. These are summarised as follows:

- In-depth discussions are enabled with a small group of people.
- It is focused on a particular area of interest.
- Interactions are a unique feature to focus groups.
- The researcher plays a major role in obtaining good and accurate information.
- The participants usually have shared social and cultural experiences.

All of these features applied to my research. The free flow form of discussions enabled me to generate a rich understanding of how the young Travellers viewed space and allowed me to study the collective memory and the socially shared knowledge. As a component of my research design, the focus groups allowed me to gain an in-depth understanding of the young Travellers perceptions of urban space, their spatial practices and the impacts of spatial segregation and exclusion.

4:7:2 Cartography

Using maps in qualitative research has been shown to be “valuable” to understanding young people’s “perceptions” of their location in a city (Morrow cited in Darbyshire et al 2005, p.422, also see Leonard 2007; 2008). Drawing on similar studies (Leonard 2007; 2008), in order to explore the young Travellers ‘perceptions’ and use of urban space, I presented focus group participants with a large map of Galway city and coloured stickers; each young person was given a strip of green and red stickers. The young Travellers were asked to place green stickers in the spaces they felt more safe in, and the red stickers represented spaces where they felt more at risk. Each participant in each focus group worked on the same map. Each of the participant’s stickers were numbered, allowing me to distinguish each participants’ data afterwards (in total I used 6 maps). This mapping was interwoven into the focus group process. The maps were a focal point for discussion during the exercise and a reference point for the remainder of the focus group.
I found it notable that the young Travellers found the process enjoyable, as instead of just answering questions in a formal group setting they could gather around a visual prop that made them more comfortable and open. Using the map, I asked the young people to think about their locality and their connection to the city and their relationship to city spaces. Giving them the coloured stickers and asking them to place them on the map helped them to express themselves in a manner beyond the typical focus-group context. As a highly visible means of representation, mapping brought about a means of non-verbal expression which allowed for quiet participants to engage with the research in a comfortable manner.

4:7:3 The Walking Method

Inspired by De Certeau’s (1984) flâneur, I used walking as part of my ethnographic data collection processes. Walking is a “social activity that can be used as a method to study places and people” (Shortell and Brown 2016, p.14). The walking method fitted well with my study as I wanted to capture the social and cultural aspects of young Travellers mobility in the city. The advantage of the walking method according to Shortell and Brown (2016, p.89):

“is that walking is slow enough to capture rich information, including sights, sounds and odours. The presence of the researcher in the space studied, and the interaction with people also allows for a critical reflection about that space. The effort of walking itself can also influence the researchers' state of mind, helping to suspend judgement”

Although subjective, the walking method is also “coherent and systematic, and can be used to understand the complex social and physical factors behind the patterns observed” (Shortell and Brown 2016, p.155) in other methods.

I understand walking as a ‘mundane’ spatial practice, but also a productive activity that is overflowing with complexities. Drawing on de Certeau (1984), walking is to the “urban system” as speaking is to language, walking allows us to see how the city works, it tells us where we can and cannot go, and it shows us spaces for resistance. Experience and sense of place determines the ‘walker’s’ routes and memory is intertwined with perception. De Certeau noted ‘strategy’ as the ruling ‘power’ that created the routes of a city in which people walk ‘blindly’ towards their destination.
However, people will sporadically take a conscious decision to ‘tactically’ resist some routes based on experience/memory/representation. People take opportunities to resist ‘strategy’ by taking their own unique route not intended by ‘voyeurs’. Where spatial practices are being increasingly controlled by “strategies”, resistance to power is being implemented by ‘tactics’. The everyday ‘lived’ reality defines how the streets of a city are navigated by each individual. According to de Certeau (1984) the city grid/map provides the paper and ink while people provide the story which changes continually over time. Like patchwork, the city has numerous significant stories strewn together to make up a unified whole. Walking in the city, instead of observing from the ‘top down’ lends new meanings to urban spaces which were not originally planned. The ability to ‘discover’ new meanings and negotiations creates a vacuum of creative power connected to the act of walking making it an influential tactic.

Methodological strategies such as walking aid our understanding of how the strategies of spaces can be challenged, re-organising the operation of those spaces. Walking is not only a means of transportation, it is also a means of ‘reading the city’ (Middleton 2011). Walking around urban spaces with my participants allowed me to see the city from their perspective, as well as giving me first-hand experience of the physical structures and routes which they were referencing. Everyday experiences of walking in the city for the young Travellers are imbued with an awareness of where they are going, which streets to take and how long they will stay in the city. Walking with my participants gave me insight into their spatial knowledge of the city and how it can be negotiated. To uncover this knowledge, I asked my participants spatial questions while walking with them. Walking with my participants allowed me to perceive racialised boundaries between Traveller and non-Traveller space, which are sometimes ephemeral and impermanent. During one of my first walks around the city I noticed that many city spaces were constructed as ‘settled spaces’ at different times, and were often avoided by the young Travellers.

Extracts from my field notes July 2016

...today was a warm sunny today, walking through Eyre Square with the young Travellers. We stopped and sat down on the steps in front of the Galway Hooker statue. We were there for about 15 minutes when a group of young men who looked to be in their twenties came from behind us and sat near us. They were loud and boisterous (perhaps under the influence of alcohol) and then they looked at us and we heard one of them saying “fucking Knackers” everywhere these days”...we all looked at each other and I could sense the tension rising...Jane asked the boys “what are ye on about Knackers for?” and the young
men laughed and began to shout “get up off there ye knackers, (singing and waving hands around) move it, move it, move it”... Margaret stood up and said ‘we are entitled to be here so we won’t move’, we all stood up and there was a stand-off between the group of young men and our group for a few minutes... with the group of young men suggesting that they own the space and ‘knackers are not allowed’... After about 5 minutes Bridgie stated that “it was not worth it” so we should move, we started to walk away and the group of boys were laughing with a sense of ‘claiming’ and ‘winning’ the space...

October 2016
...it was evening... as we reached the end of Shop Street, the group stopped and looked around, I asked why we had stopped and Bridget replied that ‘we were thinking which way is the best way to go’, I suggested we sit in Spanish Arch for a while but since it was after 7pm and getting dark another one of the girls said ‘no we can’t only settled people go there after dark. Mary suggested that the settled young people who go there do so to ‘drink, take drugs and cause trouble’...

The walking method formed an important component of the research design, as to know the city is to engage with it. As Barthes (1982, p.35-36) puts it “the visual experience is a decisive element” in negotiating the city. Recent scholarship on the methodology of walking in the city can be found in Butler (2006); Leonard (2007); Low (2009); and Mitchell and Kelly (2010).

4:8 Data Analysis

Data analysis is a process of managing and ordering a mass collection of data to bring meaning and structure (Marshall and Rossman 1999) to a research project. It is often described as a messy and ambiguous process which can be time-consuming. However, it is also described as the “heart” of the project where the researcher makes sense of, interprets and theorises the data that they have collected (Schwandt 2007, p.6). Mason (1996, p.7) describes data analysis as “a range of techniques for sorting, organising and indexing qualitative data”. Data analysis begins almost simultaneously due to the “iterative, cyclical nature” of the qualitative research process (Crabtree and Miller 1999, p.xvi) and for ethnographers, data analysis commences from the beginning of the research study and continues to the final words written in the ethnographic narratives. Throughout this process, the researcher must make decisions that are “as much a test of the ethnographer as it is a test of the data” (Fetterman, 2010, p. 92).
Ethnography involves many different levels of analysis. Accordingly, I kept a diary on me at all times, and at the end of each day I completed my field notes concurrently with data analysis. Field-notes were read multiple times before being condensed and summarised, and at the end of each interview and walk I recorded notes into my diary that helped me to access and identify themes arising. All audio recordings were personally transcribed which allowed me to protect the identity of the young people as well as being able to immerse myself into the data. However, this was not without drawbacks as I sometimes found it very difficult to step back from the data, a difficulty that was further intensified by my insider status (see section 4.11 on reflexivity).

According to Vanderstoep and Johnston (2009, p.167)-

“The first step in data analysis is to look for themes. We may not know a priori (that is, before we begin) what these themes are, but they may become evident during the analysis of data. One way in which you recognize a theme is when you begin to see the same idea repeated within a case and/or repeated across cases. You want to look for words, phrases, or behaviours that meet the criteria of frequency across cases, dominance in emphasis, and repetition within cases”

The identification of these patterns/themes began with a mass collection of information that was compared, contrasted and sorted manually. I opted to manually code the data generated rather than use a qualitative data analysis computer software package because I needed to get as close as possible to the data. The data gathered in this study was then analysed thematically. This approach “seeks to unearth the themes salient in a text at different levels” (Attri de-Stirling 2001, p.387). Ritchie and Lewis (2003, p.261) recognise four key stages to analysing data - “identifying initial themes or concepts, labelling or tagging data, sorting the data by theme or concept and summarising or synthesising the data”. Managing and analysing data is not essentially a linear, rigid process, as you immerse yourself into the data further themes or concepts are revealed offering a clear account of the conceptual process by which interpretation of the data was developed. Themes were discovered during the focus groups and walks and continued to emerge throughout the writing up process.

Analysis was an ‘iterative process’ (Hammersley and Atkinson 2009, p.158) which “involves moving back and forth between concrete bits of data and abstract concepts, between inductive and deductive reasoning, between description and interpretation”
(Merriam, 1998, p. 178). As I analysed the young Travellers’ narratives, a description of their everyday lives began to take shape and it soon became clear that many experiences were shared. Thus, the theoretical insights arrived at in this research are illustrated “with sufficient instances of data so that theoretical statements become convincing, because they are understood to be linked with life-experiences that everyone can recognise” (Seale 2000, p.88).

4:9 Ethics

Ethicism was core to this research, from conceptualisation and research design, to data collection and analysis, through to the final completion of this thesis (Edwards and Mauthner 2002, p.19). In making research decisions I had an ethical responsibility to safeguard the interests of the participants and to report my findings truthfully and accurately (Bryman 2004; Mauthner et al. 2002; Seale et al. 2004; Creswell 1998; Flick 2006). In the early stages of this project (long before I had any contact with potential participants) I submitted a research proposal to the FAHASS Ethics Committee in the University of Limerick. I informed the committee of the details of my study and submitted the relevant documentation with my application, before subsequently receiving ethical approval (reference number: 2014_12_16_AHSS). I am conscious however of the limitations of procedural ethics, particularly in the context of ethnographic research with its flexibility and permeable boundaries. As such, I maintained my commitment to ethical research throughout the process. I made use of the “virtue ethics of skills” model which argues that researchers’ ethical instincts, feelings and reflective skills, including their sensibilities in undertaking conversations with the research participants should be emphasised (Edwards and Mauthner 2002, p.20). Additionally, I was guided by the Sociological Association of Irelands’ (SAI) ethical guidelines.

4:9:1 Confidentiality and anonymity

The participant has the right to know “how far they will be afforded anonymity and confidentiality” (SAI 2008, p.6). Before I spoke to any of my participants I needed to consider what constituted harm to them (see Bryman 2004, p.509; Ryen, 2004). Using focus groups presented difficulties in guaranteeing confidentiality given that there were numerous participants in each focus group. Any one of these participants could have decided to disregard the confidentiality of individual members in that particular group.
These issues were discussed openly in assembling focus groups. Group participants were aware that others might divulge information they shared, which could be damaging to their situation. Their mutual acceptance of this shared risk seemed to set the participants at ease. I gave a commitment to the participants that they would not be identifiable in any output of the research. I also spoke to the participants at the start of each walk and focus group asking them to respect the privacy of other participants and maintain confidentiality as regards what was said in the groups and walks.

From my first conversation with potential participants or parents/guardians/gate-keepers of potential participants I emphasised the importance of confidentiality and anonymity; all the participants accepted that they would be given pseudonyms. Additionally, each participant was offered the opportunity to check their respective transcripts to ensure that I had reproduced the data accurately and protected their confidentiality.

Finally, Bryman (2004, p.510) speaks of the need to exercise care in maintaining the confidentiality of records, ensuring that identities, and records, notes etc., made about participants be kept secure and confidential, so as to ensure that individual participants are not identifiable. This requirement has been adhered to rigorously.

4:9:2 Informed Consent
An informed consent letter should include a well-defined account of the study and state the function of the research being undertaken. When writing such a letter it is the responsibility of the researcher to make sure that the chosen participant can fully comprehend all the information within. Comprehension is the key requirement for informed consent. The participant should fully understand everything related to the research and the language used should be based on the reading ability of the individual (Oliver 2003). The research was explained clearly to both the young people and their parents.

In addition to the provision of information letters, face to face explanations were provided to both the young people and their parents in most cases. The participants were informed about the research through Traveller organisations, homework clubs, youth clubs, sports clubs etc. I visited these centres and explained my research to the potential participants asking them to discuss the opportunity to participate with their parents/guardians. I
organised a meeting with parents/guardians explaining my research verbally and participants and their parents had 7 days to consider their participation before consent was sought.

In the case of children, consent was required from the parent and assent from the child before the child’s participation was confirmed. In the case that a child did not wish to participate although their parents were eager for them to do so, the child could choose to sit out the focus group or to sit in but not contribute, the child could also walk with the group without having to contribute.

There were times when it was not possible to get written consent. For example, in a natural setting other young people who were not part of my intended sample could join the group. As aforementioned, in such situations I still explained the research to participants and sought verbal consent.

Throughout this study, I was aware of consent as a process, rather than a finite point. As such, I engaged in the on-going negotiation of consent with my participants. I consistently repeated their right to pull out of the research at any time and for any reason without judgement or without it interfering with their relationship to gatekeepers.

4:10 Verification Procedures, Transferability and Trustworthiness:
Silverman (1993) argues that issues of validity and reliability apply to qualitative studies in the same way as they do to quantitative studies. As such, this qualitative research incorporates many of the qualitative strategies for validation. Creswell (2007, pp.201-203) enumerates eight verification procedures which are appropriate to qualitative research: prolonged engagement and persistent observation in the field; triangulation and multiple sourcing of data; peer review and debriefing for external checks; negative case analysis; clarifying of researcher bias; member checking; thick description; and external audits. It is recommended that researchers engage in at least two of these procedures in order to ensure credibility and enhance the transferability of the research. As an attempt to ensure the trustworthiness of the conclusions of this study, a number of steps were taken to maximise the quality of the data and consequently also the results. The verification procedures engaged in are as follows:
4:10:1 Prolonged engagement and persistent observation

Prolonged engagement and persistent observation are techniques that involve the investment of sufficient time to ensure accurate understanding of the phenomenon under investigation (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Prolonged engagement requires that the researcher be in the field sufficiently long enough to detect and take account of distortions that might otherwise creep into the data - personal distortions must first be dealt with. In this study, I believe that I spent sufficient time in the field (a period of twelve months), which enabled me to gain a deep level of understanding. This long engagement in the field and persistent observation allows the researcher to identify what is most relevant to the phenomenon by sorting out irrelevancies.

4:10:2 Triangulation

The technique of triangulation is a process, involving the use of different methods, sources, areas of expertise, and theories to provide corroborating evidence and depth in the methodological proceedings (Creswell 1998, p.202). Patton (2002) suggest there are four different types of triangulation, which I document in the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Forms of triangulation</th>
<th>Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Methods triangulation</td>
<td>Using different data collection methods, e.g. a combination of qualitative and quantitative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data triangulation</td>
<td>Using multiple sources of data e.g. checking interviews against written documents e.g. comparing the perspectives of people from different points of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator/Analyst triangulation</td>
<td>Using multiple investigators of analysts of data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theory triangulation</td>
<td>Using different perspectives for interpretation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: Triangulation in qualitative research (Paton 2002)

In this research I focused on methods and data triangulation. I utilised multiple methods of data collection, including participant observation, focus groups, interviews and cartography. I also engaged with multiple data sources (48 participants); and multiple
perspectives (under eighteen and over eighteen, different genders, living in different types
of accommodation and from different geographical areas across the city).

4:10:3 Peer review

The peer review process is an external check of the quality of the research. The peer
reviewer acts as the person who keeps the research trustworthy by critiquing and asking
questions about the emerging interpretations, meanings and understandings. This
technique was employed in multiple ways throughout the research process. I submitted
my work to annual panel review meetings in the Department of Sociology at the
University of Limerick. These reviews entailed my supervisors and another academic
from the Department reading two pieces of my work and a report documenting my
progress throughout the previous year. These de-briefing sessions were hugely beneficial,
they provided me with the opportunity to receive significant feedback and
recommendations. In addition, I met with my supervisors who served as my primary peer
de-briefers. They reflected on the process with me and discussed any specific incidents
that arose and data that emerged. Their questioning forced me to reflect on aspects of my
work, which I might not have considered, prompting me to ask new questions of myself,
the participants and the data which helped to uncover taken for granted perspectives and
assumptions. Furthermore, throughout the research process, I presented my work at a
number of national and international conferences where both academics and (perhaps
more importantly) members of my community could ask me questions about my research.
In addition to this, I had many discussions with gatekeepers throughout the duration of
the project and I also discussed my research with many of my colleagues involved in
Traveller activism.

4:10:4 Member Checking

In qualitative and ethnographic research, realities are best described by both the
participants and the researcher (Creswell 2012). Member checking is a systematic
technique of sharing data, analysis and interpretations with the participants to obtain their
feedback on the credibility of the findings and interpretations (Lincoln and Guba 1985;
Cresswell 2012). The purpose is to find out whether the data analysis is congruent with
the participants’ experiences. It does not seek to confirm a fixed reality, rather it aims to
provide an opportunity to the researcher to detect and correct any possible misrepresentations (Maxwell, 1996).

I engaged with this technique in an informal manner throughout the course of the fieldwork. I verbally carried out member checks as the opportunities arose during the normal course of observation and conversation. This allowed me to seek clarifications and make sure their realities corresponded with my interpretations, but I also saw it as a useful way to give power and voice to the young Travellers.

4:10:5 Rich Thick Description

Rich thick description means that researchers need to write low-inference descriptions to help enhance accuracy in the description in the study. It is the foundation for qualitative analysis and reporting and also a way of achieving transferability (Lincoln and Guba, 1985). Creswell (1998, p. 203) describes the use of rich thick description as the means by which the reader can “step into” the research setting and by describing the phenomenon in sufficient detail the reader can come to their own evaluations and conclusions as to whether the findings can easily be applied to other times, people, settings, and situations as a result of mutual features (also see Lewis 2009; Bryman 2004; Lincoln and Guba 1994; Geertz 1973). To achieve this, I included elements of the raw data in the thesis in order to provide a rich thick description of the young Travellers’ experiences. I sought to bring readers the experience through the participants’ “actual language, dialect, and personal meanings” (Johnson and Christensen, 2012, p. 267). Accordingly, I hope that the reader will be able to ‘step into’ the ‘rich’ framework within which this study is positioned.

4:10:6 External Audit

The credibility of research can be enhanced by using outside experts to assess the quality of the study. Creswell (1998, p.203) states that an external consultant who has no connection with the study should “examine both the process and the product of the account, assessing their accuracy… In assessing the product, the auditor examines whether the findings, interpretations and conclusions are supported by the data”. I employed this technique by presenting my findings at a number of conferences/lectures/presentations and through having some of my work published.
Therefore, in so far as was possible I subjected my methodology, findings and analysis to external comment and critique. I am confident that as a result of these procedures the reader will have belief in the validity of my research.

4:11 Reflexivity

Schwandt (2001, p.224) suggests that reflexivity “refers to the process of a researcher’s self-reflection upon their biases, preferences, and theoretical predispositions”. Reflexivity then is the practice of locating the researcher within the research process, rather than claiming the position of a disinterested outsider. The practice of reflexivity requires that the researcher acknowledges their active role in shaping the construction of knowledge and interrogates the manner in which this is shaped by their own biography (Hammersley and Traianou 2012). The point, as England (1994, p.242) succinctly argues, is to include a diversity of voices “without colonising them”. She holds that entirely avoiding “appropriation” is impossible in the process of generating knowledge, but researcher reflexivity at least offers the potential for its modification. For the ethnographer, reflexivity is vital as the researcher is an essential component of the knowledge gained and cannot be separated from the phenomenon under study, without examining our own personal emotions and perspectives it becomes extremely difficult to develop a true understanding of the meanings behind the phenomenon. According to Berger (1972) how we view and interpret is influenced by our own social worlds, thus, our own experiences and beliefs are understood from our position and cultural location. In order to maintain standards of quality the researcher is required to become critically aware of their own prior assumptions / biases and any possible impact that these assumptions / biases may have on the research process. Creswell (2007, p.179) notes that being reflective is a necessity because our values and beliefs are replicated through our work, therefore reflexivity forces the researcher to have “an ongoing conversation with yourself” (Berg 2009, p.198).

As stated earlier, I acknowledge that as a Traveller I brought prior attitudes and beliefs to the process and they may have influenced the research process at some level. The young Travellers may have said something or acted in a way they thought I wanted them to (McGrath 2000). Alternately, my own assumptions about the research question may have influenced my interpretation of their narratives. According to Crang and Cook (2007,
p.109) there is “one crucial difference between ethnographic approaches and other qualitative methodologies”; in ethnography, “the subjectivity of the researcher is seen as intrinsic to the processing of data and a degree of reflexivity in making sense of the sense making of others is expected” (Van Hulst 2008, p.148).

As qualitative researchers we need to be open about any of our prior assumptions, etc. This will allow the reader to make an informed decision on what the researcher has concluded and whether any of the researchers’ biases have impacted on those conclusions (McGrath 2000, p.7; Flick 2006). Being aware of my own biases allowed me to take precautions in order to maintain some objectivity. Moreover, in an attempt to avoid generalising the young Travellers, I continually sought different perspectives from different people in different locations across the city. By undertaking such a rigorous and systematic process I was able to minimize the impact of my biases and to ensure (as much as possible) that the theory generated was contextually sensitive, persuasive and relevant.

According to Gouldner (1970, p.497) the aim of reflexivity is “not to remove his/her influence on others but know it, which requires that he/she must become aware of himself as both knower and as agent of change”. Reflexivity for me was about researching myself and reflecting on my own personal beliefs and values both as a researcher and as a member of the researched group. As an insider researcher, my reflexivity often pushed me beyond my comfort zone, by this I mean that I had to engage in a deep self-reflection which brought feelings of discomfort which ultimately made me more aware of my identity, position, and the value of conducting this type of research.

The practice of reflexivity requires that the researcher acknowledges their active role in shaping the construction of knowledge and interrogates the manner in which this is shaped by their own biography (Hammersley and Traianou 2012). I come from Ireland’s only indigenous ethnic minority. I grew up in a society where my community are seen to be the ‘other’- I have experienced and witnessed many incidents where the ‘us’ and ‘them’ dichotomy was evident. Growing up in this divided society has had a huge influence on my social and political beliefs. From a very early age, I became aware of how people were treated differently based on their identity which has given me a desire for social justice and led me to become a Traveller activist.
When I started my Bachelor of Arts degree in 2006 I did not know that I was going to become an activist. In fact, I had the idea of becoming a secondary school teacher on completion of my English and History degree, however, that all changed when I did a module in history about Travellers. I was shocked and horrified to learn of the many atrocities we faced as a community and how we have been treated over the centuries in Irish society. Nonetheless, the more I learned, the more my history and identity began to unravel - this was a time of self-reflection. When I completed my degree, I wanted to have a fresh start so I moved to Galway city with my partner. This move was life-changing for me. I had been unsuccessful in obtaining a place on a postgraduate course in the National University of Ireland, Galway, to become a teacher, which forced me to go through another stage of self-reflection. After a few months of living in Galway and becoming tired of being in precarious employment, I spotted an advertisement for a part-time job in the Galway Traveller Movement. They were looking for a Teacher Assistant for their Afterschool Project and I decided to apply for it. I flourished in this position and it did not take long for me to climb to the coordinators position. Within this position I became an activist. By working with young Travellers every day on a halting site I got closer to and more familiar with my community. My identity and my knowledge of the political and social position of my community developed.

After three years of working in the afterschool I decided that I wanted to further my education and applied to do a Masters of Sociology degree in the University of Limerick and was accepted. While still living and working in Galway I managed to commute to Limerick to gain my degree; it was very tiring, but I was focused. The sociological perspective connected many dots for me and I began to see how the young people in the afterschool project thrived in a safer space and this triggered my curiosity in examining the connection between race and space.

My identity as a Traveller was clearly influential in my decision to undertake this study, but I feel that this research would not have been as effective without my past experiences and history. From the very beginning of this research I knew that being of Traveller ethnicity would be both an advantage and disadvantage for me. My role as a researcher and a participant were sometimes in conflict; managing my closeness to the community became very emotional for me as I felt I had to distance myself and step back a little from my status as a Traveller activist involved with community issues, which was almost
impossible as it is my everyday life outside of academia. Nevertheless, after a process of many months of reflection and discussion with my supervisors, I realised that I did not have to distance myself entirely, rather, I had to learn to be more reflexive with my own perspectives and meanings.

Bernard (2002) notes the availability, willingness and the ability to communicate experiences in a reflective manner is significant. Hirschmann (1998, p.362) argues that “It is often difficult to gain critical purchase on a context from within the context itself; one must be often outside it at the same time that one is ‘inside’ it”. This is why as insider researcher I needed be vigilant for “the constant need for reflexivity… insider researchers have to have ways of thinking critically about their processes, their relationships, and the quality and richness of their data and analysis” (Smith, 1999, p. 137). Being aware of my role as both the researcher and a Traveller helped me to strive to be aware of the ‘power’ of my position as the researcher, what Mindell (1995) describes as my ‘rank’:

“a conscious or unconscious, social or personal ability or power arising from culture, community support, personal psychology and/or spiritual power. Whether [we] earned or inherited our rank, it organizes much of [our] communication behaviour” (1995, p.42).

According to Kanuha (2000, p. 444):

“An insider researcher enhances the depth and breadth of understanding a population that may not be accessible to a non-native scientist, questions about reflexivity, and authenticity of a research project are raised because perhaps one knows too much or is too close to the project and may be too similar to those being studied”.

However, as aforementioned my insider status gave me a certain amount of legitimacy (Adler and Adler, 1987) and it allowed the young people to be more open with me which provided me with a greater depth to data gathered. Talbot noted this in her study; “at the end of their interviews, several mothers said they would never have shared certain aspects of their experience if I had not been a bereaved mother also” (1998-99, p. 172 cited in Dwyer and Buckle 2009). I believe this was also the case in this study, the young Travellers were more willing to share their experiences because there was an understanding of shared distinctiveness and experiences.
I understood that the young Travellers were the ‘expert’ interviewees and it was my job to listen and allow them to direct the discussions and inform me of their experiences from their perspectives. New issues emerged through the focus groups and walks therefore my data became increasingly rich as my fieldwork progressed. Although, I prompted some of the questions there were many answered which I had not asked about. Spyrou, (2011 p.160) underscores the need not just for the process of reflexivity but also the researcher needs to show a willingness to be reflexive and transparent, he states that reflexive research “accepts the messiness, ambiguity, polyvolality, non-factuality and multi-layered nature of meaning in ‘stories’ that research produces” (Spyrou, 2011, p.158).

According to Roberts and Sanders, (2005, p.42)

“The process of reflexivity is an ongoing encounter between the researcher and the other. As an ethnographer it is essential to establish openness as it cultivates tolerance of the researcher while at the same time generates willingness to share on the part of those researched”

The process of analysing my data was extremely difficult for me because the young people’s experiences triggered memories of my own similar experiences. Feelings which I had long buried began to rise to the surface and I became angry with myself for not being able to distance myself from my participants. In addition to this, throughout the research I had still been living with everyday anti-Traveller racism. After many sleepless nights and various conversations with my supervisors I learned how to reflect upon and manage my feelings which subsequently allowed me to deeply engage in the process. When engaging in data analysis, I took note of my prior bias/assumptions. I believe that by employing such a rigorous and systematic process I have ensured that my research is sensitive, persuasive, and valid. Throughout the research process I persistently returned to the data to check my analysis. Consequently, on reflection I firmly believe that I have produced trustworthy findings and theorisations.

By embracing reflexivity, I discovered that research is capable of facilitating a greater understanding of who we are as people and, in a wider sense, “the cultural milieu that has spawned us ethnographers” (Hedican 2006, p.5). I found myself reflecting a lot on my own reactions and feelings to what I observed around me, and questioned why I felt these things. This process was essential if I was to “come clean” and be “less likely to unwittingly impose my perspectives on the accounts and actions of research informants”
(Gilgun 2010, p.3). Dei (2005) claims that the researcher must become a “learner rather than a purveyor of expert knowledge”, which means making the research a process of “self-discovery and self-examination”. I acknowledge that my personal history is related to the research topic and my decision to undertake this research. However, throughout this study, I have remained reflexive regarding both my insider and activist status. I did not take on the role of the ‘privileged expert’ and I have done my best to highlight the young Travellers’ knowledge and experiences.

4:12 Conclusion

In this chapter, I have described the philosophical assumptions and methodological framework that underpin the research methods utilised and the subsequent findings discussed in the following chapter. The methodology deployed in this study draws upon a range of qualitative methods to produce an urban ethnography. This methodology was utilised in order to gain access to an understanding of the lived experiences of young Travellers negotiating urban space. The following chapter discusses these experiences and the tactics used by the young Travellers to activate their right to the city.
Chapter 5: Young Travellers’ lived experience of urban space

5:1 Introduction

Contemporary research on the links between urban space and racism is increasing; recent years have seen a growing attention to racialised urban centres and the manner in which experiences of racism influence ways of navigating through the city (McCallum 2005; Leonard 2007; Selzer and Heller 2010; and Anderson 2015). There is a range of evidence that young Travellers face many ‘participation barriers’ in accessing public services such as youth services (see Mahon 2011). Research such as the All Ireland Traveller Health Study (2010) documents problems in accessing land to live on – common land, traditional sites etc. Refusal of access to public amenities is also well documented (Crowley 2005; GTM 2006; AITHS 2010; ITM 2014; Pavee Point 2015 and Watson et al 2017). Studies on Travellers, in this context, generally focus on services such as education, health, and accommodation, and on access to employment. Both types of studies are integral to understanding inequalities and exclusion experienced by Travellers, however, little or no attention has been given to the everyday experiences of racism in urban public spaces that have direct social and spatial impacts upon the lives of young Travellers.

Based on an ethnographic study of young Travellers in Galway city in Ireland, this chapter presents evidence that young Travellers’ experiences of urban space are shaped negatively by their identity and the racialised nature of space within that context. In this chapter, I document experiences of anticipated and actual racism in urban space to show how young Travellers’ experiences of the city are impacted by their identity and more specifically by anti-Traveller racism. As stated earlier, this research involves participants aged between 14 and 21 years old, therefore the stories I present are those of young people who are at the stages of developing from early to late adolescence and to young adulthood. Research has concluded that young people perceive and experience space differently to adults (Leonard 2007, 2008 and Leonard and McKnight, 2010) and their experience is related to identity (Gotham and Brumley 2002). In the case of the young Travellers who participated in this study, this chapter will show that they experience urban space as racialised and racialising. Participants in this research experience urban space as requiring the negotiation of actual and anticipated discrimination and hostility (Brunson and Weitzer 2011) on the basis of their Traveller ethnicity. This argument is supported by evidence of spatial practices which manifest as tactics (DeCerteau 1984), i.e. acts of
opportunistic resistance and adaptation which address the need to make the best of space intended for someone else. This chapter details the tactics developed and deployed by the young people who participated in this doctoral research.

5:2 Design of the city

How space is contested and negotiated is central to the separation between Travellers and the majority population. Travellers view space differently and as nomads we tend to have a close connection to the land whereby boundaries are unobserved or tactically manoeuvred (Joyce 2015). Galway city’s Traveller population has arguably been subject to production and re-production of spaces that generate, uphold and signify ethnic separation for generations. These embodied spatial divisions are not made up of blatant signs/labels stating, ‘No Travellers Allowed’, nevertheless, spatial divisions are created by practices such as segregating Travellers in locations on the outskirts of cities. This opening section of chapter five presents a description of the spaces within Galway that are central to young Travellers’ experiences of the city and draws on ethnographic data to point to where the top down ‘strategies’ of planners and politicians have contributed to creating static spaces within the city as sedentarist or Traveller. Cudsworth (2010, p.2) defines ‘sedentarised spaces’ as spaces that “fails to recognise the particular cultures of Europe’s varied Traveller communities”. Just as Kobayashi and Peake (2000, p.394) understand ‘whiteness’ to be “indicated less by its explicit racism than by the fact that it ignores, or even denies, racist indications”, ‘sedentarism’ and anti-Traveller racism in Ireland plays out in similar patterns, it depicts, denies and justifies racism as normal since we are non-conformists to ‘standard’ sedentarised societal values and norms. For example, as Noonan (1998, p.154) argues:

“the presence of a community committed to a nomadic lifestyle (and a lack of attachment to land as property) and to independence from wage labour (one of the central features of industrials capitalist economies), Travellers (in both rural and urban setting) symbolized anachronistic and deviant values”.

As Zoe James (2004, p.8) asserts sedentarist policy-making too often “implies that nomadic living is an expression of…dissent, demonstration or protest”.
5:2:1: Introducing Galway

Located on the west coast of Ireland, Galway city is a historical medieval city surrounded by the vast Connemara landscape to the North, the hills of County Clare to the South, the river Shannon to East and the Aran Islands to the West. The city sits where the River Corrib meets the Atlantic Ocean making the city both a riverside and seaside city that is home to a population of 79,504 (GOI 2016) residents. The city is a bustling tourist city known for its diversity and culture. To the arriving tourist, the city displays its cultural and artistic aspects, from the historical to the contemporary. It is a city of creativity that has been developed and portrayed as an inclusive city. The city has a thriving arts scene where culture and heritage flourishes. According to the census the city is the “most multicultural location in Ireland with 18.6% of the population recorded as non-Irish” (GOI 2016). Cunningham, at the Connacht Tribune (2017), went as far as to say “Galway City is Ireland’s capital of multi-culture”. According to City Council (2015), it “is the only area in Ireland with a major urban centre that comes in the bottom half of the country's crime rankings at 13th on the list. It consistently records below average levels for most categories of offences”. In 2015, the city was named the ‘Friendliest City in the World’ by US magazine Travel and Leisure, and again in 2018 it was ranked in the top ten ‘Friendliest City in the World’ by Condé Nast Traveler. Although my participants were proud and happy about their city being ranked as the ‘Friendliest City in the World’ – they commented on how it is not their experience:

Maggie (aged 17) ...I don’t know how they came to that conclusion... maybe it is the friendliest for tourists and stuff and I’m delighted for Galway but it aint friendly towards us that’s for sure...(hahaha), friendly, as if...

Helen (aged 16) ...it can be a friendly city for some people I suppose, coz there is always something going on, I never took much notice of it before but I suppose it’s not such a friendly city for us...for us Travellers it feels like the city hates us...they don’t want us...it’s annoying...

The visual representations of sedentary culture are displayed with pride for all to see. However, positive visual representations of Traveller culture are largely non-existent. Traveller culture is most visible in Galway city through manifestations of sedentarist control perceptible only to those who know the history of Travellers; for example, boulders, height, and low-level barriers or frames which highlight the criminalisation of
nomadism. The city’s tourists can avail of the opportunity to take a ride around the city on a horse and cart, however Travellers are prohibited from riding around the city on their horses. The city has a bustling market, trade and busker scene in which legislation and by-laws make it difficult for Travellers to obtain the licences\(^\text{6}\); all these activities were traditionally associated with Travellers and now many feel they have been expelled from participating as the following comments confirm:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Paddy (aged 16)} & \ldots \text{there is nothing in the city that says we are part of it, am nothing, nothing at all…they won’t let us go anywhere or do anything…}\n\\
\text{John (aged 21)} & \ldots \text{they’ve stopped us from doing everything, we can’t do nothing now, everything we do is ‘against the law’…they put laws in place so we can’t be who we are without breaking the law and then we are seen as the bad ones…they want us to turn us into settled people and for us to just disappear…}\n\\
\text{Kathleen (aged 14)} & \ldots \text{no…they, they don’t want us involved in anything, we are pushed out of everything and anyway you just kinda kinda get stuck am well not stuck but kindof you just stay around your own area really…}\n\end{align*}
\]

Young Travellers in this study saw no representation of their identity, history or culture within the city and expressed a sense of disconnection to the people and architecture that occupy those spaces. Walcott (1997) describes this experience as the ‘absented presence’.

\textit{5:2:2 Commercial and Recreational Areas}

As a tourist city with a rich cultural heritage and a National University, Galway is a commercial and recreational centre, being the largest city in the West and a “key driver for economic and social activity” (Galway Chamber of Commerce 2018). The following areas are the zones that were most prevalent during this research:

\textsuperscript{6} The Casual Trading Act 1995 requires market traders to apply to each local authority for a casual licence for any market in their area, this results in increased costs for engagement in market trading. Previously only one licence was required for the whole country. This act particularly affected the Traveller population as the nomadic aspect of the community meant trading usually involved moving back and forth through different counties, with this Act Travellers could no longer trade in different counties without first obtaining a different licence for each county which cost both time and money making it a tiresome and tedious process therefore dismantling part of the Traveller economy.
Located at the end of the main city centre shopping area, Eyre Square is a park which acts as a focal point for the city. As the above image shows it is an inner city public green space. Located right beside the railway and bus station, it is one of the first areas to be seen, and many visitors’ first impression of the city. The park provides seating, and open green areas, which – rather than serving only an aesthetic function – are used by locals and visitors alike for sports, picnics and other leisure activities. The park incorporates a small children’s playground. It is an area of social significance for the city as it is a place where many people gather, from tourists to students to residents. It is often used as a meeting point and open outdoor events occur within the open green space gathering crowds of people both young and old. It is an area where musicians often busk, showcasing the diverse talent of the city. Young people use the area to hang out with friends, with a party atmosphere often palpable as young people socialise.
Shop Street above is one of the busiest streets in the city. It is both a commercial street where shop after shop offers goods, and a recreational area populated with restaurants, pubs, cafes and a market. The street provides everything from goods to food, accommodation and entertainment. Street performers from musicians to dancers entertain people as they walk through. The street connects Eyre Square to the Spanish Arch. At the end of the street is the famous chip shop McDonaghs, which displays a framed hand-beaded pocket made by a Traveller which is a cultural symbol of the community. Traveller women would exchange such items when they met up in different places so that they would remember the person who gave it to them and the space they were camping in.
Located at the end of Shop Street, the Spanish Arch is a waterside area where many young people gather. This area also hosts street performers entertaining the crowds. It usually gets busier at night-time as it - and Quay Street, which connects the Spanish Arch and Shop Street - become part of the night-time economy. The following image shows the presence of Travellers at the Spanish Arch at the turn of the 20th century:

![Image of the Spanish Arch](https://www.google.ie/maps/place/Spanish+Arch/@53.2710828,-9.0547835,17z/data=!4m5!3m4!1s0x485b96fb6a544d97:0x5ba65c5d31029116!8m2!3d53.2697482!4d-9.0540754)
Salthill is a seaside resort within walking distance of Galway city centre (approximately 5.5km), the area consists of many businesses such as shops, restaurants, cafes, pubs etc., and it hosts the city’s aquarium as well as a number of casinos and a seasonal carnival. Salthill is also a recreational area with a long stretch of beaches and a diving board. It
offers magnificent views of Galway bay and the Clare Hills. The area provides many activities from walking to swimming to surfing to collecting species such as seaweed, shells and perri winkles. It is an area where many young people gather and socialise. The end of the promenade hosts a golf course and a camping site. Salthill also hosts a Traveller Halting site in the centre of the village where Travellers have been part of the community for generations.

5:2:7 Ballybrit

Figure 7: Ballybrit Race Course, Image from Horse-Racing.ie

Ballybrit is an area on the East side of the city, it is an important area for this study as many Travellers either live in or close by the area. It is also the location of a race course which hosts the annual Galway (horse) Races. Historically, during the 1900s, these races would be attended by many Travellers, however today, although many still attend, access can be limited. Additionally, some Travellers took part in trading, busking and showmen activities (usually outside the gates of the venue), these activities have been clamped down on as part of the larger process of commercialisation and privatisation of public spaces. Travellers today can be fined and imprisoned (I personally know some Travellers that this has happened to) under the 1995 Casual Trading act if caught taking part in any of these activities.

Outside the zone of the Racecourse is a semi-rural residential area which is host to a halting site and some social housing with many brownfield sites. Some of these

---

10 A 7 day horse racing festival in Galway
brownfield sites are used by Travellers for their horses, as spaces for horses are not provided for when allocating Travellers ‘culturally appropriate accommodation’. In 2016, the army bomb disposal unit had to evacuate residents from the halting site as an explosive device was found at the site (see Kelly 2016). In that same year non-Traveller residents of Ballybrit joined forces with nearby residents of Ballybane to oppose any attempt to build another halting site in the area. Cllr McDonnell stated the “… issue is that over 80% of the Travelling community in Galway is on the east side of the city. We want fairness. All three electoral wards in the city should take their fair share”, and described halting sites as a “failed entity” (Bradley 2017). This characterisation of Travellers as a burden to be shared was used openly and without consequence. I argue that the only reason that halting sites have become a ‘failed entity’ is because they have been designed according to the sedentary perspective of what culturally appropriate accommodation should look like (see below for discussion).

5:2:8 Residential Areas

Of the young people participating in this study who live in standard housing, the vast majority live in social housing located on the boundaries and outskirts of the city centre, either in estates which are composed of mixed, privately owned and local authority owned housing, or on estates consisting exclusively of social housing. Thus the residential areas discussed in this study were mainly located in areas which are considered to be relatively disadvantaged. As stated above Galway has the highest proportion of Travellers nationally of “2.3% (national 0.6%)”, it is also the “third most affluent local authority area” (GOI 2016). The following image shows the level of affluence in the city:
The next image shows the levels of Traveller spatial segregation in Galway city in comparison to other groups in Irish cites:

*Figure 8: Image from Census HSE 2016*
Figure 9: Image by Ireland after Nama.

The red represents a very high degree of segregation through to green which is a relatively low degree of segregation.

The next image shows the Traveller households by accommodation type in Galway city:
Figure 10: Image from Galway TAP 2014-2018

5:2:9 Halting Sites

The following table presents a recent assessment of the number, capacity and condition of the official halting sites located in Galway city.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Accommodation Type</th>
<th>No of Households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Standard Housing</td>
<td>193</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private Rented &amp; on HWL</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Schemes</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing Accommodation</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voluntary Housing</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenant Purchase</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Ownership</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent Halting Sites</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transient Site</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Halting Site</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAS</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long Term Leasing</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supported Projects</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless Services</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>518</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In general, each bay has a space for a trailer as well as a ‘hut’, which includes a kitchenette and shower area. Not all sites in Galway offer ‘huts’, some only offer spaces for trailers with a prefab/box acting as a utility room containing a basic sink, toilet and shower. As discussed in the literature review, the nature of the halting site provides for a connection to nomadism, in the sense of living in a trailer and retaining the means to travel, even if this is not used or is only used for brief periods of time. This also facilitates people to retain a relationship to traditional Traveller economic roles – trading small goods and horses at seasonal fairs and festivals for example (see AITHS 2010). The sites also permit extended family to remain together.

Islands of Traveller-majority space, the halting sites, were, on an everyday basis experienced by participants as less risky. Settled citizens do not frequent or visit halting
sites without a specified purpose – primarily as agents of the State - thus there are far fewer non-Travellers present on halting sites on a day to day basis. Younger participants highlight that many non-Traveller parents will not permit their children to visit them at halting sites. Older participants do in a minority of cases have settled friends who visit them at the halting site, but, in at least some cases, the parents of the teenagers might not be aware that they do so.

In this research, participants did not report experiencing acts of hostility from non-Traveller citizens on halting sites, perhaps because of their reduced presence. However, Travellers can still experience anti-Traveller racism on halting sites. In the halting sites this racism is perpetrated not by other users of the space, but by the authorities that govern that space, in the manner discussed in the literature review. Police-enforced forcible evictions can occur even on permanent and transient halting sites (sometimes under the disguise of health and safety issues such as overcrowding: see Pavee Point 2016). Of course unofficial sites are even more precarious spaces, characterised by the ever present risk of being moved on, which can include forcible eviction without an alternative.

Because the halting sites are subject to the governance and policing of settled authorities, these are not spaces over which the participants perceive they have ultimate control. Halting sites are monitored spaces, they are inspected by local authorities on a regular basis (once a year, sometimes twice) and some of the Galwegian halting sites also include the physical or virtual presence of the settled authorities on site, in the form of a caretaker from the local council and, in extreme cases, CCTV monitored externally by settled authorities (local council).

In Galway, these Traveller spaces are physically or symbolically segregated from the remainder of the city, bounded by high walls and all accessed via a single entrance/exit which has a height barrier controlled by settled authorities. The height barriers ensure that the exit and entrance of both trailers (caravans) and horse boxes must be pre-arranged. There is no emergency access to the site, including for fire services. In this sense, halting sites are not Traveller ‘territory’ per se, in that they are both governed and policed by settled authorities. Some of the participants described halting sites as ‘open prisons’. However, not all sites are experienced in the same way.
Given that the permanent halting sites do not provide safety or security and the designs do not cater adequately to Traveller culture, it is clear that they reflect settled people’s stereotypical understanding of what culturally appropriate accommodation should be. The last constructed permanent halting site in the city was completed in 1996 (Galway City Council 2014-2018).

5:2:10 Group Housing

Only one young person in this study lived in group housing. Group housing is uncommon and difficult to gain access to. In Galway, there are three group housing complexes in two locations both in the East of the city, all are located on the outskirts of the city and away from the commercial centre. Although they are intended to permit extended families to live in proximity, families allocated to the same complex may not be related or may be very distantly related. On average group housing consists of 6-10 houses forming a semi-circle with a central concrete space. Many have only 2-3 bedrooms (GCC 2014-2018), which can contribute to overcrowding. The conditions of the housing can be poor (A GTM report published this year found the local City Council to be in breach of TEN human rights, see Varley, 2018). In some cases, Travellers may refuse to occupy houses in the group housing complex because of the standard of accommodation. The Independent Review of Traveller Specific Accommodation (Housing Agency 2017, p.34) identified that the “cultural needs of the community was not understood or met when allocating families and the quality of the housing was “not fit for purpose”.

As local authority housing, group housing complexes are located in areas with a concentration of social housing. Most are constructed as cul de sacs at the end of larger housing estates. They are surrounded by low walls which form a relatively unobtrusive physical barrier between the group housing and the remainder of the housing estate in which they are located. In most cases the houses are single storey. There are no height or other physical barriers controlling entry or exist to the group housing complexes.

Group housing is not culturally appropriate accommodation in its current form. There are no spaces provided for people to keep trailers or horse boxes. Each house has space to park their car, and a front and back garden. In all three cases they have been built adjacent to brown field sites, yet none of the three group complexes include a provision of land.
that might be used to pursue traditional Traveller activities, such as horse care or metal recycling. Some residents, consequently use their gardens or the brown field spaces to store scrap metal or keep horses. This can cause conflict with settled residents, and sometimes other Traveller residents, as well as with landowners. Whether or not a Traveller wants to live in group housing is very individual, but among those who want to live in standard housing the conditions of group housing are raised as an issue. In many senses, the only concession that group housing offers to Traveller culture is the proximity to other Travellers (see Pavee Point 2015, AITHS 2010, ITM 2014).

5:3 Mapping Sedentarised Space

Michel de Certeau (1984, p.93) asserts two different views of the city, firstly, urban planners and demographers see the city from the top down; lifted from the grasps of the city, ‘voyeurs’ are at a distance; this provides the illusionary image of ‘knowledge’; they become self-proclaimed ‘visionaries’ - “It’s hard to be down when you’re up”. In contrast, everyday ordinary walkers see the city from the bottom up which determines their perspectives and practices, their encounters and interactions with one another and their relationship to the city itself which in turn governs their use of specific spaces. This section draws on the cartographic excercises and related focus group discussions, which were central to this research to explore young Travellers’ perceptions and experiences of safer and more unsafe spaces in an Irish city that is highly regarded and acknowledged as a bastion of inter-culturalism and a melting pot of different ethnicities and identities.

For Travellers, the city is a landscape of division manifested in physical and symbolic boundaries based on ethnic identification. As described in the methodology chapter, the method utilised cartography to focus the discussions of the participants’ experiences of traversing through and using urban space in Galway. Specifically, the focus groups commenced by asking the participants to mark up a map of Galway city, identifying ‘safe’ and ‘risky’ spaces. I asked the participants to place green stickers where they felt relatively safe, where they had had few experiences of racism or discrimination, or where, if they did experience racism and discrimination, they felt sufficiently empowered to challenge it. They were asked to place red stickers where they had experienced incidents of racism or discrimination, where they felt unwelcome or that they did not belong, or where they felt they had to ‘prepare’ before entering or seeking to access the space. The
marking-up of the map and the subsequent discussions of the maps were recorded. In all cases the participants explained their cartographic decisions. Each individual participant’s red and green stickers were numbered so that their marking-up of the map could be attributed to them. However, the maps are primarily collective products of the separate focus groups. In a minority of focus groups, the participants discussed their marking-up with me as they worked on the map, in most cases they discussed their marking-up with me after they had finished working on the map, but even in these cases they discussed the mapping process with each other as they produced the finished map. This mapping exercise, as is demonstrated below, therefore provided a valuable visualisation of, and stimulus for discussion of, the participants’ collective experiences of racism and discrimination in Galway, as well as an opportunity to discuss individual outlier experiences. Of 48 participants, only one stated that they had not experienced any anti-Traveller racism or discrimination in Galway and this person placed only green stickers on their map.

The following section presents each of the six maps and a summary of the relevant focus groups’ descriptions of the meaning and significance of the spaces marked thereon. The conclusion to this section summarises the extensive commonalities among the six maps, as well as the small number of differences identifiable across the focus groups. What emerges is a picture of Galway city as a risky, highly sedentarised space, and of anti-Traveller racism as a phenomenon which is distributed across space, but manifesting in subtly different ways, to different degrees of severity and on the part of different actors in different urban ‘zones’.
The map is marked with a red X to highlight the city centre which consists of residential, commercial and leisure zones. The city centre and its surroundings were the areas in which most, young Travellers felt negative experiences were most prevalent.
The above map shows us that this group of participants found the city centre, located at the centre of the map, to be one of the most problematic areas of the city. The cluster of red stickers in this commercial zone evidences their perception of the prevalence of racism in this area. The city centre lacks any cluster of green areas suggesting that the young Travellers found the city to be one of the most challenging areas to negotiate, with specks of green here and there, these specks were individual places which they felt were less risky. Salthill, the coastal area to the south west of the city centre, is marked with both red and green clusters. The young Travellers felt more risk in the commercial area of Salthill, marking these with red stickers, and less risk further down the promenade on the beach where there were non-commercial recreational facilities such as a public diving board. There is a green space directly to the south of the city centre, marked with a mixture of red and green stickers, it is a small grassy area at the edge of the commercial area that forms the centre of the night-time economy, and where young people gather and socialise. Participants in this focus group disagreed over whether this was a ‘safer space’ or not. Some perceived it as safe and some did not. Further west along the bay there is a cluster of red, which overlays a few green stickers, placed on a location of a Hotel. This Hotel is
one of a few that allow access to Travellers and is regarded as largely a safe space. In the areas surrounding this semi/rural hotel, however, participants located experiences of racism from locals: the village and areas surrounding the hotel were however regarded a risky space by this group of participants. There is a red cluster in the north east of the city in a large green area which is the Ballybrit area where the Galway races take place every year. The young Travellers in this focus group talked about how the community had always been involved in horse racing but they now had little or no access to this activity. There is an adjacent cluster of red in the north east side of the city where a Business Park is located. It is used by young people as a space for ‘hanging out’ and informal sports. This is also a risky space for these participants. The Westside commercial and residential area, directly north of Salthill was experienced as a ‘safer space’ with the exception of a Hotel.

The north-western most and south-eastern most clusters of red displayed on the map are both zones recognised by participants as areas of contention with respect to the use of public land. In contrast there are three outermost green clusters which all represent forms of Traveller accommodation. Indeed, the clusters of green stickers dispersed around the inland areas of the map also identify locations where the participants either lived or had friends and family living there, giving them a sense of ownership over territory. The single exception is the large cluster of green located to the West of the city centre, which is both a residential and commercial area. In this focus group, therefore, Traveller accommodation and standard housing occupied by Travellers were invariably perceived as safe spaces, while unofficial sites were invariably perceived as risky spaces due to their precarity. There were more isolated green stickers on the map which represented parks or individual commercial premises where individual participants felt welcome.
There were important commonalities and differences between the experiences depicted in maps one and two, both relating to the experiences of over 18s. As we can see this group seemed to experience higher levels of risk. It is worth noting that this group was dominated by men, while the first group was dominated by women. In both cases, the city’s commercial centre is experienced as a risky space where racism is experienced and anticipated. The same isolated ‘safer spaces’ within the city centre which were identified in the first map are also identified here. Again the Spanish Arch grassy area to the south of the city centre is contentious, with respect to whether or not it is a safe space.

There were interesting contrasts between how participants in this focus group perceived the south western seaboard compared to the group which produced map one. Without any exposure to each other’s maps, both groups identify the same spaces as significant. However, the spaces have oppositional meanings for them with respect to safety and risk. It is noteworthy that participants in this group lived on the West of the city and therefore felt more claim over the coastal area, whereas the group which produced map one came from a range of locations across the city. Indeed, participants in this focus group felt that Travellers from outside of the locality would not be received by non- Traveller locals in the same way that they were as the following quote suggests:
“...we are accepted by most of the people around here, they have no problem with us most of the time but sometimes when its busy and other Travellers pull up then they can get a bit bitter with us and stop us from going into places, they think as well that we can control the others like asking us to ‘sort ye’re crowd out’, I think they are used to us but get frightened then when other Travellers are here...”.

The commercial area of Salthill was experienced as a ‘safer space’. The focus group discussion indicated that as locals they were known to non-Travellers, and they were treated better than they might expect elsewhere from strangers. The discussions did suggest that these locals may have been less likely to experience hostility and discrimination in this area. Demonstrating the importance of the discussion to interpreting the maps, however, it is important to note that this ‘better’ treatment has its limits, and did not eliminate experiences of racism from within the ‘safer space’ of Salthill. The participants who produced this map spoke about being subject to anti-Traveller discrimination in the summer months, when (in their view) non-Travellers would respond to the presence of visiting Traveller families by denying access to all Travellers “they stop us all.” Throughout the year, the actions of one Traveller can impact on the treatment of all Travellers, the community experiencing refusals of access to commercial premises where one Traveller might have been in conflict with the management “if one Traveller, even if we don’t know that person and that person say had some sort of argument with them, then they bar us all, for no reason only that we are Travellers too”. Thus, in interpreting the maps, it is important to note that ‘safer spaces’ are defined as such relative to the experiences of participants in other spaces.

The diving board area was an area of risk where the participants felt unwelcome. This contrasts with the perceptions of the groups which produced map one, who regarded the space as safer. The group which produced map two was composed of more men than women and the men in particular cited experiences of hostility and confrontations with non-Travellers around the use of the diving board. Over 18 women, in neither group, mentioned attempting to use the diving board.

As with the group that produced the first map, this group also perceived the same hotel as a safer space. Both groups had experienced hostility in the area surrounding the hotel, but while the first group perceived this as defining the locality as a risky space, this group
refused to allow such experiences to define the area around the hotel as risky. As one stated:

“We are entitled to use the hotel too so they have no choice to put up with us”.

Thus, while the group that produced map one acknowledges a difference in their experiences of the hotel and its milieu, the group that produced map two used the map to lay claim over a space which was important to them as the location of a commercial space in which they were welcome.

As with the group which produced map one, this group experienced the Westside commercial and residential area, directly north of the diving board as a ‘safer space’. Like the first group, this group also experienced the site of the Olympic boxing club as a safer space. Like the first group, the race course is largely experienced as risky. Both groups experienced the business park on the northeast of the map as risky. Merlin Park, the largest green area on the south east of the map is perceived by both groups as largely a risky space.

In terms of differences in perceptions of residential spaces, the two sites of Traveller accommodation are perceived differently by those who produced maps one and two. The first group perceived the sites as safe and the second perceived them as risky. On the East of the map, spaces that are identified as safe in map one are identified as risky in map two. It is worth noting that the participants in group two were all from the West of the city. The participants in group one, because of active roles within the wider Traveller community may have had access to a wider range of sites across the city than those who participated in group two. This group explained these zones as risky because “the guards are always up around there...” Both groups identified all unofficial halting sites as risky spaces.

There is a red cluster under the square of the city which is an area that is underdeveloped. Group one perceived it as safe for them but stated that the residents in these areas are “always under threat of eviction...they get moved around the whole time...and no alternative is provided...”. The cluster of red in the east is where Bushy Park is located.
Map three shows the city centre as the most problematic zone, the stickers on this map were much more spread out with few clusters. The majority of the red stickers can be seen to depict the high level of anti-Traveller racism perceived in the city. The isolated green specks in the city centre are individual places where the young Travellers feel relatively safe from racist incidents. Again the zone around the Spanish Arch area is seen to be risky with the exception of two of the participants seeing the zone as a safe space. The south side of the city has no red stickers, most of the participants in this group lived in this area where they suggested that “we stay around our own area” and “we live around here” and they did not feel like they experienced any racism in these areas. Although there are no red stickers, the young Travellers stated that “they hate us but we don’t care…we have each other…let them do what they want…they are full of badness…” As this group was under the age of 18 they had less spatial mobility and were much more confined to their homes hence their perception of home being a safe zone. In addition, it is interesting to note that this group found the racecourse to be a safe zone as just behind the course is the location of a halting site. To the West of the city along the bay from the commercial zone to the diving board is perceived as a safe zone. The green areas along the bay were discussed as places of “fun” and the rest of the green areas were areas where their friends
and relatives lived. The red stickers to the left is Barna village and Knocknacarra which are classed as affluent residential zones. This group of participants talked about these zones as “posh areas” where “they don’t want us hanging around there…the community centre there are always running us every time we go near there…my cousins live around there but they are not seen as part of the community like a community centre is for the whole community but sure I suppose that don’t mean us”…The green clusters to the north of Salthill is Westside, this area was perceived to be a largely safe zone with the exception of the commercial zone where the Westside shopping centre is located. The two lone red stickers to the East and the one below them is the location of the NUIG campus and its sports facilities and villages. The participants did not specify why these were risky zones however one young boy stated “college is not really for Travellers…it’s more for settled people isn’t it, what’s in there for us sure…what can they teach us, years going to college and end up with nothing because you’re not going to get a job, at the end of the day no matter how much you learn you are still a dirty Traveller at the end of the day…” another young girl suggested that “it might be good to go to college because you can bring what you learn with you and try do good for the community but I would be very nervous about going on my own with no one to support me…”.

5:3:5 Map Four: Under 18s Mixed

Figure 15: under eighteen mixed
Again, with this group the most problematic area can be seen in the city centre with green areas marked on the outskirts of the city. These green areas represented areas where they had a family connection living in the area. Like group three Salthill, Knocknacarra and Westside were seen as safer zones where most of the participants lived. The only red cluster on the West-Northwest side was around an affluent residential zone where the young Traveller’s felt unwelcome as they transited from the green zones of Salthill towards their friends and family in the green zones to the East. In contrast to group 3 the red zones to the south of the city is an area in a residential zone called Bothermore/Wellpark which hosts a cemetery, a Greyhound Racing field, a cinema and a shopping area. The young Travellers in this group discussed how they had experienced racist incidents in both the cinema and shopping area. The red cluster to the southwest is another residential area and unlike group three who perceived it to be a safe zone this group had a mixture of feelings, three participants placed green stickers here and two placed red. When I asked about their reasons the two who placed the red said they had experiences of discrimination and it makes them uncomfortable while the three who placed the green stickers said they had seen discrimination but had not experienced it directly. The green cluster to the right of here is also a residential area near Merlin Park which is perceived by this group as a safer zone and interestingly the race course is not marked.

5:3:6 Map Five: Under 18 boys

Figure 16: Group of six, all boys under eighteen
Again with this group we can see high levels of perceived risk as the only green stickers are placed in clusters that represent places to which they have a definite claim. Worryingly, the city centre has no green stickers which shows it to be one of the most problematic zones for the young Travellers. In addition, this group did not place any green stickers to the East side of the city. This group also marked Bohermore/Wellpark, the residential area to the right, Bushypark and the Racecourse as risky zones. What is surprising is that within these zones the young Travellers had relatives and friends who lived there and like group two the boys in this group suggested that the local residents did not like them coming into the area, which suggests that local residents may be more comfortable with the Traveller neighbours they know. Ballybrit was also pointed out to be a place of risk as was the Merlin Park Hospital, as these young Travellers often played in the adjacent Merlin Park Woods. On the West side of the city we can see all along Salthill bay, the Promenade, the golf course, the Campsite and zones in Westside as problematic areas. For this group there were only five green clusters all on the west side of the city. The green cluster in Salthill village is the location of a Halting site and the green cluster to the Northwest is Westside where a local boxing club is located. The green clusters to the East are Galway’s Business Park and Bushy Park, areas to which some of the participants had particular claim. The findings from this map suggest that this group perceive many spaces to be unsafe.
Like all groups, this group also found the city centre to be the most problematic zone and like map five there are no green stickers to the East side of the city. The two risky zones here are Ballybane and (like group five) Ballybrit. To the west side of the city along the Bay, the only red cluster represents the commercial zone and unlike group five this group marked the diving board area as a safe zone. Like the over 18 groups it seems the girls did not experience hostility here while the boys did. Again this is perhaps because it is mostly the boys who use the diving board and conflict over the use of space makes it a risky zone for the boys. In contrast to the boys, the girls in this group placed a spread of green stickers around the west side of the city.

5:3:8 Analysis

The areas of the map where no stickers were placed do not signify areas that were free from risk, but rather that these were perceived as transitory spaces (passages) between more significant places. These are ‘in-between spaces’, spaces that can be streets, estates, pathways etc. where the young Travellers pass through to go to other places. They are generally passages that connect to different areas across Galway and are sometimes the shortest way to get to another place. These passages can sometimes be hostile as some are considered to be ‘posh’ areas where they would be made feel unwelcome.
My findings speak to prevalent anti-Traveller racism in Galway city. Public spaces are experienced by young Travellers as sedentarised spaces that play a distinctive role in excluding them from the city. Within the spaces in which the young Travellers live, experiences and expectations of racism are common everyday realities, these racialised experiences are multi-layered and their experiences indicate a belief in sedentary power that contributes to the normalisation and acceptance of anti-Traveller racism.

The ideology of sedentarism involves exercising authority and power over space as a dominant ‘ethnocentric instrument of power’ and since it is a spatialisation of social order, sedentarisation belongs to the realm of what Lefebvre (1974, p.117) calls “dominated space, ‘a site of hegemonic forces’”. As he puts it: “space has become for the state a political instrument of primary importance. ... It is thus an administratively controlled and even policed space”. The constrictive sedentary control of city spaces has legally criminalised Traveller culture and successfully enhanced the Irish government’s mandate to regulate and restrict mobility i.e. the ‘Traveller problem’ (GOI 1963). As can be seen from my maps the young Travellers’ spatial mobility in Galway city was severely restricted, and even residential areas in which Travellers live were sometimes viewed as spaces of risk.

Standard housing represents spaces in which Travellers live amongst the non-Traveller population either in or beside social housing estates. Within these areas risk usually involved disputes with neighbours where Traveller culture was not understood or tolerated. For example, the following narrative from Jane suggests that some neighbours are not willing to interact or engage with Travellers but attempt to stop their cultural activities:

“It was when my (relative) died lord have mercy on him... he was a good man and loved the horses he did, so we hired out a horse and cart for the day just to park outside the door of the house, you know as a sign of respect to him...the horse was no more than an hour outside the door when the guards were up telling us the resident committee called them about the horse...we were already grieving and then for that to happen, they’ll get no luck for it...we had to ring the man to tell him to take away the horse again, they wouldn’t even let us respect our dead, how is that right...and then not one of them were brave enough to come to the door and talk
Some of the young people talked about the risks associated with bringing their horses and sulky (two-wheeled horse-drawn vehicle) into their estate while others talked about losing out on part of their culture because they could not have horses while living in standard housing. Others talked about having to travel miles across the city to access their horses, and when they did sometimes their horses would be gone. Having asked where the horses had gone, most answered “the council took them...we have to pay big money to get them back even with all the paperwork...sometimes you just haven’t got that kind of money so you have to leave them...”. Other risks encountered in shared spaces were where neighbours also did not understand the importance of extended families to Traveller culture and did not welcome Travellers from outside the zone.

Traveller-specific accommodation refers to halting sites and sometimes group housing. These zones might at first glance be perceived to be Traveller space as Travellers are the only residents, however, these spaces are controlled and governed by non-Travellers and these supposedly culturally appropriate homes do not cater for many aspects of culture. For example, these Traveller-specific accommodations never cater for horse culture; the space to keep horses is not provided for and in most cases there is no space to keep horse boxes. As a result, nearby ‘brownfield’ sites are used which creates spatial conflict. Another risk associated with Traveller-specific accommodation is the impact of segregation on young Travellers, for example, Nora discusses how this has affected her:

“...I hate it...just because we want to be able to practice our culture they throw us out away from everyone as if our culture needs to be hidden instead of to be seen as the beautiful thing it is as a part of Ireland, I am sure the tourists would like to see our side of Ireland too...they say we can practice our culture here but we can’t really...how can we...with us away from everybody then it’s we are out of sight out of mind...let us rot...how can you make friends with anyone when there’s no-one around...how can we be part of the city when we are dumped like a piece of rubbish...”

Another associated risk was the perception of being watched all the time, since these zones are controlled and governed by authorities such as the City Council or the Police - the young Travellers stated that these spaces were like “open jails” and “concentration camps".
Sedentarised spaces occupied by Travellers are generally constrained and regulated spaces of governance that offer limited positive spatial experiences. The right to use the city is restricted where the community exists and manoeuvres within spaces of hostility and spaces designed and governed from a sedentary viewpoint. Travellers are required to navigate sedentary space “as a condition of existence” (Anderson 2015 p.10). The city centre has been highlighted as the most problematic sedentarised space where risks of hostility are perceived to be highest since it is the zone where young Travellers regularly move through or attempt to gain access to commercial spaces.

5:3:9 Conclusion

The field of racial and spatial studies have shown us that we conceptualise space through our identity status. Racial and ethnic differences are produced by the spaces which we inhabit (e.g. Anderson 2009 and 2015; Feld and Basso 1996; Pulido 2000; Delaney 2002; Razack 2002; Knowles 2003; Bullard 2007; Lipsitz 2007; Woods and McKittrick 2007; Nelson 2008; Bullard and Wright 2009). Knowles (2003) outlines four ways through which racial and spatial processes intersect: 1) contestations over our built environment; 2) the everyday embodied and performed social lives of people; 3) the movement (placement and displacement) of people; and 4) the social relationships engaged in by individuals and groups. According to Crowley (2007, p.129) the spatial and racial division between Travellers and non-Travellers:

“is symptomatic of the ‘taken-for-granted’ nature of sedentary socio-spatial hegemony – the importance of space to the government’s’ ability to (re) produce their authority and the notion that the state has the right to step in and act when citizens are perceived not to be exercising their ‘freedoms’ in appropriate ways”

This section has mapped the sedentarised space of Galway city. The maps have highlighted young Traveller’s perceptions and experiences of safer and unsafe spaces in the city. This process has highlighted the contested nature of Travellers’ claims to a right to access and use much of the city’s public and commercial space. Moreover, the mapping process has highlighted that even residential areas in which Travellers live are not unproblematically perceived as safe spaces.
The forty-eight participants involved in this study lived in various types of housing. Although on the maps the majority of the green stickers were placed around residential zones in which Travellers live which might suggest that these are perceived to be areas of safety, however, this is not the case, the results of this research shows that while many of the young Travellers placed little or no red stickers around such residential zones, they also expressed their dissatisfaction with living under *the control of others* where they had to *'play by their rules'* and some provided details and narratives of racist experiences that occurred within those zones. Nelson (2008, p.28) emphasized, how “groups marked as racially inferior’ have been “defined, confined, regulated, and eradicated . . . through the control of space”.

As a sedentary space, Galway has enclaves or ‘islands’ of Traveller-specific accommodation where Travellers feel they have a little more claim over their territory. The meaning of home for Travellers is linked to the cultural aspect of nomadism (AITHS 2010). Even if the physical action of moving is limited or non-existent, nomadism is still highly valued as an important component of the culture and identity. As one young girl put it “I have lived in a house all my life and never travelled...I would love to but... I am still a pure full bred Traveller, it’s who I am, and it’s part of me...my culture...I will someday please god... (Maggie aged 14). As Maggie confirms nomadism is intertwined with identity and culture and the eagerness to practice nomadism is always there. Deleuze and Guattari (1987) used the term ‘Nomadology’ to describe this particular mind-set or a way of viewing the world. However, this research highlights that Traveller-specific accommodation, including halting sites, is located within someone else’s space i.e. sedentary space which they make use of as best they can. Moreover, this space is designed and governed from a sedentary viewpoint. For example, Irish Travellers who want to live in culturally appropriate homes are zoned to the outskirts of the city and/or are blocked off from society behind high walls. The American researcher Yale Rabin (1990) notes that zoning has become a strategic mechanism for protecting the ‘privileged property from undesirables’. Massey and Denton (1993) argue that race is a dominant organising principle in housing and residential patterns.

Globally, racialised and ethnic groups are subjected to policies that limit their spatial mobility; spatial polices are enacted in order to maintain power over space (see Lefebvre; Soja and Harvey). Lefebvre (1974) argues that the spatial practices of agents of spatial
regulation tend to suppress difference rather than celebrate the diverse population of a city. Even though cities have become much more diverse it is clear that neighbourhoods have become much more segregated and excluded. Urban strategic policies and regulations produce racialised spaces that marginalise and isolate those with different cultural and political settings. The failure to recognise particular cultures within the urban sphere speaks to the policy of conformity in order to claim the ‘right to the city’.

5:4 Experiences of Racism

Despite not being recognised by the State as an ethnic minority at the time of data collection, the young Travellers who participated in this study were able to name their experiences of hostility on the basis of their Traveller identity, as racism. All but one participant in this study reported they had directly experienced racism and such experiences were more often than not a regular occurrence. In fact, more than half of the participants reported having experienced racism almost on a daily basis. One young girl stated, “it happens every time we go in...”. The boys were more likely to report experiencing racism in sports/leisure settings or while being in the presence of the police while the girls were more likely to report experiencing racism in commercial settings such as shopping centres, shops, entertainment venues, cinema, restaurants, hotels, pubs and cafes etc. This section documents the everyday racism experienced by the young Travellers’ in the city of Galway. The following section is focused on experiences of racism in relation to policing. I have given this section its own space as policing is integral to understanding how the Community experience space.

5:4:1 Responses to Dress

Dress is a form of communication (Weber and Mitchell 1995 and Kuchler and Miller 2005) that is performed in public space. Ann Brach (2012) explained how clothes are a performance of identity which can act as a medium between the body and the public. The significance of dress as a marker of identity has long been established by sociologists where clothing has been explored as operating tools of class identity, Bourdieu (1984) analysed clothing as a marker of class distinction and Davis (1992) suggested clothing was a code whereby people send and receive messages through dress. As such, dress becomes a form of identity communication that confers identity and communicates social position (Higgins et al 1995).
Dress can be a historical expression of cultural identity e.g. traditional dress, styles can be adapted and adopted to reflect modern society while redefining identity borders. For example, Travellers were traditionally seen as ‘colourful people’ with bright colourful barrel-top wagons however clothes also defined differences in identity, Traveller women wore a different dress style and had colourful ‘pockets’ around/under their skirts that symbolised the nomadic life. In the case of this study, not this traditional dress but rather contemporary stereotypes which construct some dress styles as markers of Traveller identity, are relevant. As such, dress continues to constitute a way in which ethnic difference is made visible in shared public spaces.

Helen (aged 15): “...they don’t wear the clothes that we wear, we wear our clothes to stand out and they wear theirs to look like everyone else...we like bright colours, they seem to like ‘blah’ colours...like boring colours...but then some of them dress the same as us these days...”

Patrick (aged 17): “…it’s very easy to know who is a Traveller and who isn’t just by looking at what they are wearing...”

Margaret (aged 20) “...people always say ‘oh sure how can people tell you’re a Traveller’ but it’s easy for them, all they have to do is look at what we are wearing, we like to keep ourselves looking well and that can be our downfall sometimes...”

One of the most common triggers for hostility in my study was dress. The racialisation of Traveller identity in the context of ‘dress’ has been explored and exploited by many reality T.V. shows (see for example the My Big Fat Gypsy Weddings series) broadcast across Ireland, Europe and even the USA. The depictions of young Traveller girls dressed in flamboyant costume reproduces the perception of Traveller identity as fixed; this particular style of dress is perceived to be a maker of identity that signifies Travellers status, positioning us as inferior, which then translates into the negotiation of everyday spatial encounters:

Mary (aged 20): “…I hate the way they think we all dress like that, ever since that Gypsy wedding stuff we can’t put on a bit clothes without thinking is this too Travellerish or not Travellerish enough, it’s like we are stuck in a fashion box and depending where we are going and we are either in that box or out of it...”

It is worth noting that participants in this research had either embodied or internalised stereotypes of ‘Traveller style’.
Maggie (aged 16): “...I know people think some Travellers go overboard at times but there is nothing wrong with wanting to look good...I think...just, what we think looks good is different to what they think looks good, I love when the fair is on coz then we can go all out...”

All young Travellers in this research reported dress as a factor in their negotiations of urban space, although the girls reported that dress was always a factor and the boys reported that it was only a factor when entering spaces that were deemed to be overwhelmingly occupied by non-Travellers and security.

Helen (aged 15): “...yeah if we are going to Traveller things then we dress more like a Traveller than we would if we were going somewhere where there is a load of settled people, it depends really...”

5:4:2 Responses to Accent/Tone

Another manifestation of racial profiling and racism perceived by the young Travellers was linguistic discrimination. Linguistic profiling is equivalent to visual ethnic profiling where language and how one speaks tells others much about us. Distinctive dialects which might be unused by others with the same language often invoke perceptions and stereotypes. Baugh (2002, p.158) states:

“Whereas ‘racial profiling’ is based on visual cues that result in confirmation or speculation of the racial background of an individual, linguistic profiling is based upon auditory cues which can be used to identify other linguistic subgroups within a given speech community”.

All the young Travellers reported that how one spoke had an impact on their negotiations of urban space although some emphasised that the boys found it much more difficult to alter their accents and more often experienced linguistic discrimination as a trigger for a negative encounter:

Michael (aged 18): “...once they hear your voice...they know then that you’re a Traveller, especially when there is a few of us together...”

Paddy (aged 19): “...we stay quiet going in the door, just smile but don’t look them in the eye...”

James (aged 18): “...it’s hard for some Travellers to not sound like Travellers coz some of us have very deep accents, you’d know
The young Travellers believed that how they spoke was an identifier of their identity. Preston et al (2000, p.9) highlighted that ‘language attitude’ is after all, “not really an attitude to a language feature; it is an awakening of a set of beliefs about individuals or sorts of individuals through the filter of a linguistic performance” so people’s attitude towards Travellers in general is reproduced in the particular encounter and the ‘Traveller accent’ acts as a cue to trigger discrimination.

Due to Irish Travellers having a separate language (i.e. Cant/Gammon), some Travellers’ pronunciation of some words would be considered not to conform to ‘standard English’. However, as Lippi-Green (1994, p.166) states

> “people cannot give a definition of standard English, “most people will draw a very solid basic distinction of ‘standard’ (proper, correct) English vs. everything else; Why can't they see that the word is spelled a-s-k, not a-x?”; that sounds so ignorant”.

Milroy and Milroy (1985) termed this linguistic discrimination as a ‘standard language ideology’, it is a “homogeneous spoken language which is imposed from above, and which takes as its model the written language. The most salient feature is the goal of suppression of variation of all kinds” (cited in Lippi-Green 1994, 166-167).

Although not all the participants experienced negative reactions to their accent, all acknowledged that it was a factor in discrimination and racism within the city of Galway. As Bridgie (aged 21) put it: “...once they recognise our voice as being Traveller then that’s it... we often have to get settled friends to ring places for us in case they recognise us to be Travellers...like hotels... and things...”. Accent is one of the characteristics, along with dress, that are used to identify Travellers as ‘different’ and often serves as a trigger for discriminatory treatment. Prejudices held against the community are activated when one hears speech patterns associated with that community. Just as Lippi-Green states (1994, p.169). “the underlying message is clear: there is a right and a wrong way to talk, and it is perfectly acceptable, even judicious, to censor and punish those who do not conform”. Sixteen boys out of eighteen reported to have experienced racism because of their accents while eleven out of thirty girls reported it.
5:4:3 Racial slurs

All of the participants in this study reported they have had racial slurs directed at themselves or their community in the course of using or passing through urban space. Some of the young Travellers discussed being in areas where they would overhear the slurs or in situations where their identity was not exposed and people would freely talk negatively about the community as if the racial slurs were part of a “normal conversation” that is acceptable. Mary Bridget (early 20s) provides an example of this:

“...I was at the bar waiting to get served...a group of boys and girls...they didn’t know I was a Traveller and they just start talking to me, telling me to be careful of the ‘knackers’ over in the corner...it’s disgusting, that’s what it is...”

Thomas (early teens) stated:

“Yeah, like one day I was playing a match, I play Gaelic football, anyway every time I got the ball I could hear people shouting ‘knacker’ even people that were cheering our team were doing it like ‘come on knacker’ they were saying...

Fieldnote extract November 2016

Today was a difficult day for me, many of the experiences of racism reported to me were very similar experiences to the ones I had...Mary Bridget’s story reminded me of the time during my Masters degree when our class was on a break, the sociology lecturer had been discussing triggers of class distinctions such as clothing and accessories. A group of us were outside and the class conversation continued, one person said ‘oh it’s like how all the knackers wear those Dolce & Gabbana jackets, every one of them I see has those jackets on’. The others agreed and laughed while I just smirked (a reaction where I just said to myself, here we go again) and walked away. As it was the beginning of the course, my classmates did not know I was a Traveller and felt it acceptable to use racial slurs and be verbally abusive towards my community...

Rapport (2005, p.46) notes:

“ethnic slurs serve as a kind of shorthand way of referring to the negative qualities associated with any particular group. They are quite specific. Hispanics might be called “spics” and Jews “kikes”; each term would stand for a specific cluster of traits assumed to be typical of Hispanics and Jews”.
“Knacker is a racist term” (ENAR 2013) which is deeply offensive to the Traveller community, but is an ethnic slur that continues to be used with impunity by politicians, judges and members of the general public. The consistent use of the word knacker in Ireland reflects the hostility of the general population; it is a word that is constantly being challenged by both Travellers and human rights bodies however, its use continues to be justified.

Verbal abuse was a common experience among the participants. Some of this abuse is likely to have amounted to threatening, abusive and insulting behaviour, a public order offence. In many such incidents the offender specifically used the racial slur ‘knacker’:

John (mid-teens) “...he just kept roaring at me to get away ‘you knacker’... or I will kill you, I was by myself...

Patrick (mid-teens) “...they always do the low blow of calling you a ‘knacker’, they know it gets under your skin and then they just mock you by trying to copy how we talk; it’s so annoying...

Mary (early-teens) “I was called a knacker so many times now, I couldn’t say how many, one time I was walking down the road by myself and a few boys across the road started to call me names saying ‘where are you going knacker’ and they began to follow me, I just took off running”

It was common for racial slurs to be deployed during altercations which had already begun, and usually occurred when Travellers attempted to negotiate their use of space. However, there were times when the slur constituted the entirety of the interaction. Literature on minority ethnic groups has often highlighted the experience of racism in public spaces, such as streets, parks etc. “Ney (1987) reported that verbal abuse (e.g., cursing, threatening, humiliating) is more likely than are physical forms of abuse to change a child’s view of the world and alter his or her self-perception” (cited in Jay 2009 p.86).

Field note extract July 2016:

During a discussion today I was told about an incident that happened to an over 18 year-old young Traveller girl trying to get in to a pub on a night out and she was called a ‘knacker’ by a bouncer. Her story brought me back to the time when I had experienced a similar incident. On a night out in Limerick city, my partner (Travelling Showman background) was told by a bouncer that ‘he can come in, but not your knacker girlfriend’. Some participants connected the term ‘Knacker’ with the term ‘N****r’ and suggested that it is used to retain a dominant social identity:
Julia (late-teens) “...it’s the very same as using the N word for Black people, they know it’s wrong but keep using it, they do it to let you know what they think of you, to keep you down beneath them...like they are better than us...”

Jimmy (late-teens) “…ah sure now, who knows why they keep calling it, it’s like the Blacks, they do it to keep us in our place...they don’t want us to have any rights, I’d say they are afraid in case we pass them out...”

The racial slur ‘knacker’ is arguably ‘place-specific’ to Ireland, and as perhaps the social acceptability of the term. For example, in 2011, the prosecution of a man for inciting hatred against Travellers failed, although he set up a facebook page calling for “the use of ‘knacker’ babies as shark bait (see PILA 2011). In 2013, an Irish district judge used the term to describe the defendants who happened to be Travellers (see Bohan 2013). In every discussion I had with the young Travellers in this study the slur ‘knacker’ came up and it was clear that it effected all the young people and their use of space.

5:4:4 Anti-Traveller hate crime

Research has shown that hate crimes against Travellers are not challenged or acknowledged in the same way as similar acts towards other minority ethnic communities (James, 2013; Joyce et al 2017). According to the Council of Europe, Travellers and Roma experience higher levels of hate crime and discrimination than any other minority in Europe (Haynes and Schweppe 2017). Ireland remains one of the last European countries to introduce hate crime legalisation; therefore, crimes which are motivated by hostility towards Travellers in Ireland cannot be prosecuted as hate crimes per se (Joyce et al 2017). All participants in this study knew of someone whom they believed had experienced anti-Traveller hate crime and a few reported having directly experienced it:

Michael (mid-teens) “...they burnt down their trailer, they didn’t want Travellers beside them”

Paddy (late-teens) “…he was told he deserved the beating just because he is a Traveller, like that was the only reason, that’s pure evil, it’s a sin...”

MaryEllen (mid-teens) “…we were on the side of the road and nearly everyone that passed us would throw stones at the trailer calling knackers, one morning we woke up with knackers spray painted all over the trailer and the wheels slashed, we went through pure torture there...”
The young Travellers described experiences of responding physically to being spat at, pushed or bumped into intentionally, sometimes resulting in fights. This was more likely to be the case among the boys, who asserted their physical superiority saying “They might start it but we sure do finish it”. The same speaker acknowledged however “then the problem is we are the ones that get in trouble not them”. Hate crime scholars distinguish between hate crime and hate crime incidents; “hate crime is a criminal offence that is perceived by the victim or any other person to be motivated by hostility or prejudice and a hate incident is any non-crime incident which is perceived by the victim or any other person to be motivated by hostility or prejudice” (The Traveller Movement 2016, p.3). According to the Traveller Movement (2016, p.2) hate incidents include:

“being turned away from a pub because you are a Gypsy, Roma or Traveller (this may be unlawful discrimination; see TM’s information guide on race discrimination by service providers), offensive anti-Gypsy graffiti, posters or signs in a public place, such as ‘Travellers not welcome’ (p.2).

Discrimination against young Travellers was also reported as prevalent in Galway city as the following section illustrates.

5:4:5 Refusal of access

The most frequent forms racism, discrimination and hate incidents cited by participants included refusal of access, being followed around by employees of commercial organisations, and being stopped and searched by Gardaí without cause. Equal participation for the young Travellers in urban space is challenged by such treatment:

*Maggie (mid-teens)* “…yeah one night, my sister and a few of the girls bought tickets to see…in…and when they got to the door they were not allowed in, they were looking forward to it for weeks, it was so disappointing for them, I felt sorry for them, god help us, they just went to the Chinese and came home again”

I would argue that the refusal of access for Travellers in modern Ireland speaks to a situation on par with that described in the 1963 *Report of the Commission on Itinerancy* where it states:

“They are not permitted to enter many public houses and public houses where they are served are avoided by many of the settled population… the majority of the settled population wish to avoid any contact with itinerants in any form and break off any contact that is established as soon as possible...” (GOI 1963).
However, today Travellers know more about their human rights and are beginning to use them to bring offenders to court. In December 2017, a hotel was fined 3000 euro for refusing a Traveller family access and service to lunch (see Gordan Deegan 2017) and four Traveller men were compensated 6000 euro each after being refused access and service from a bar (see Russell 2017). There are many more cases where no actions are taken for refusal of access and the young people evidenced a high level of awareness of the potential for discrimination:

John (late-teens) “…all the lads go to (place)...hardly no buffers go in there…”

Margaret (late-teens) “…we stay away from them places, once you know one Traveller got stopped a few others try and they get stopped then you know they won’t let in Travellers so what’s the point in even trying and ruining …

Kathleen (late-teens) “…the hardest is trying find some place that will accept us coz most places won’t…they just hate us…and we have to live with that and try to work around it…”

Young Travellers in Galway city exchanged multiple such experiences:

Bridgie (mid-teens) “My sister had to change her wedding date 3 times because she couldn’t get any place to hold the reception, then she got a settled person to ring this hotel and they had a free date so she booked it for her. On the day of the wedding they found out we were Travellers and cancelled it that morning, said they made a mistake of double booking, it’s always the same excuses”

Kathleen (late-teens) “…they won’t even let us into…for a cup of coffee and a sandwich…”

Paddy (mid-teens) “…they never let any Travellers in anywhere, a load of racists is what they are, always saying the same thing, we’re not allowed in, we’re just not allowed in, no reason, we just have to accept it…I know it’s not right but that’s just the way it is, always has been, always will be, we are not human in their eyes, if they could they would just kill us all…”

All participants stated they had experienced refusal of access and it was so normalised to the point of it being ‘a fact of life’ where spatial rights and the right to the city was denied resulting in Travellers being segregated and isolated to their residential areas.

Galway city provides, in theory, for a diverse population, however, in practice, Galway’s Travellers are excluded by everyday experiences of racism including refusal of access.
Such practices are deeply-rooted in Irish society as is illustrated by the National Traveller Survey 2017 which reported that 35 per cent of people would avoid Travellers. The National Traveller Women’s Forum stated, “It reflects the hate experienced by Travellers in their everyday lives.” (cited in Holland 2017).

5:4:6 Residential segregation

In 2016 “the European Committee of Social Rights in a first ever Traveller Collective Complaint has found the Irish government to be in violation of Article 16 of the European Social Charter on five grounds including on the grounds of insufficient provision of accommodation for Travellers and concluding that many Traveller sites are in inadequate condition” (cited in NT MAB’s newsletter May 2016). Across Europe nomadic or semi-nomadic groups are often residentially segregated. For example, in Slovakia “more than half of the Roma population live in spaces that are segregated or separated from dominant non-Roma communities” (Filčák and Steger 2014, p.229). The European Association for the Defence of Human Rights (2012, p.11) state that “in several European member states, Roma people are victims of "ghettoisation", meaning that they are made to live in campsites or in specific parts of town, away from the rest of the population”. Young Travellers living on official halting sites described their spaces as ‘left-over’ spaces that are also enclosed:

*Kathleen (late-teens)* “...they always throw us to spaces that nobody wants, it’s the ‘left-over’ space, that’s the only way to describe it and then they put a big wall around us...where there is nothing around the place only dumps and factories or into houses where nobody wants us…”

*Patrick (early-twenties)* “...we are caged in like animals, even when we are in houses we are still caged in so I really don’t know how then they want us to live...they put us into places that are run-down or out into the middle of nowhere...”

Galway city has a history of segregating Travellers (See Helleiner 2002 and GTM 2006). Moved away from the urban centre, Travellers have been marginalised to the outskirts of the city (See AITHS 2010). This residential segregation is a result of discrimination in the housing sector and it contributes to a vicious cycle of social and spatial exclusion. According to de Certeau (1984 cited in Mitchell and Kelly).

“Crucially, in so ordering space, strategy “rejects the relevance of places it does not create” and frames those spaces which fall
outside it as a “wasteland” which are, inevitably, to be enfolded in within the scope of strategy”

The contemporary strategy of segregation was formed on the historical basis of Travellers nomadic identity being viewed as a threat to society (McVeigh 2007 and 2012); national strategies of enforced/assimilated settlement have created a concentration of power whereby local authorities decide on the design and location of Travellers’ space. For example, one of the transient sites and one of the permanent sites in the city are located right next door to the city’s dump where odours are emitted into the environment every day:

Mary Bridget (late-teens) “...the summer is the worst sure, ... you couldn’t stay there, coz then the rats start coming out, they do be everywhere, they eat through the walls and all…”

Ann (early-teens) “...you wouldn’t expect a dog to live the way they want us to live…”

Weafer (2001, p.35) notes:

“Not only is the question of accommodation perceived by Travellers to be closely linked with their sense of identity but there is also ample evidence to suggest that accommodation is also closely associated with other key dimensions of Travellers’ lifestyle, such as health, education, access to credit and the economy”.

All the sites in the city are built to a design that serves to hide the community from the view of passers-by - surrounded by four concrete walls on average between 8 and 14 feet high, accessed by the entrances that have barriers with height restrictions and need unlocking with a key if higher vehicles (fire engines, ambulances, other caravans etc.) need access. The City Council hold control of this key and govern who goes in and out of the sites. The sites have high levels of security and some include cameras pointing into the sites, set up to monitor the community.

Margaret (late-teens) “...you wouldn’t know who’d be sitting behind those cameras watching us all the time...yeah paedophiles or anything how would we know”

Mary (late teens) “Oh God bless the mark ...”

William (late-teens) “...I would describe it like an open jail, we are prisoners in our own homes, we have nothing out here...we
can’t even climb the wall when a voice comes out of the speaker
telling us to ‘get down’, they watch us like a hawk…”

Biddy (early-twenties) “…it’s like a concentration camp or
something; it’s made to make us feel miserable…”

These perceptions of spatial confinement and monitoring are related to the design of
supposedly ‘culturally appropriate homes’.

Field note extract August 2016

Today I visited the Travellers living on the two sites beside the city dump, there was no
public transport so I got a taxi out there. Most of the Travellers knew me from my former
role as co-ordinator of the afterschool which was based on the permanent site. Although
I have worked on the sites and knew the conditions that the Travellers were living in,
today I really took a closer look at the design and location, coming away from the sites
now I am very emotional thinking about how Travellers space have been deliberately
designed to confine and control my community. The sites are not designed to allow any
level of comfort or pleasure and are in fact designed to keep us living in such harsh
conditions until we comply to the settled way of life. My emotions are conflicting between
sadness, anger and pride, how we have survived through the hardships without losing
our strong sense of community is an achievement and gives me pride to celebrate our
identity and culture… My emotions are conflicting today; I have a heavy heart; I believe
we have come to an impasse that will continue for quite some time.

As a distinct ethnic community, Sibley, as referenced by Power, has written that Irish
Travellers, “are often institutionally, politically and spatially invisible, as they are
relegated to the ‘defiled’ and neglected inner city or urban peripheral areas” (Sibley 1981,

A strategy of residential segregation exacerbated by locating Travellers in undesirable
locations must be considered detrimental not just to a people, but also a culture: “the
question of accommodation is regarded by many Travellers to be intrinsically connected
to culture and identity” (GTM, 2006). By not providing suitable culturally appropriate
homes, the local authorities are pushing Travellers into local authority accommodation.

More generally, according to the ITM (cited in GTM 2006)

“the overemphasis on standard housing provision is having a
detrimental effect…Travellers are being encouraged to accept
housing...where their first choice is a halting site. Once a family
accepts a house there is little hope of them ever living in a halting
site again”.
Pavee Point (2005) contends that “many local authorities persist in the assimilationist approach to Traveller accommodation”. Galway County Council’s Policy Statement (2014) on the provision of Traveller Accommodation speaks to this point, it states:

“Galway City Council will only provide Traveller specific accommodation for the City Council’s indigenous Traveller households. For this purpose, the City Council will only regard a Traveller household as indigenous where they have been resident in the administrative area for at least three years immediately prior to the adoption of the City Council’s Traveller Accommodation Programme 2014-2018 or any continuous five-year period in which an accommodation applicant was previously a tenant of, or resident, in the City Council’s administrative area... Where families – consistent with Traveller culture – wish to leave their accommodation for short periods (not exceeding 6 weeks) they must obtain prior written approval. Otherwise the property will be deemed to be abandoned”.

In March 2017, a motion was put forward by Fianna Fáil Cllr Peter Keane to eliminate halting sites entirely from the city’s Traveller Accommodation Plan. The council was legally advised that it was “unlawful” to eliminate culturally appropriate accommodation from the plan (see Maher 2017). Local politics becomes a factor in the creation and location of Traveller space. The control and management of the space is played out in the arena of ‘sedentarist’ interpretations of what constitutes an acceptable way of life. Travellers’ access to accommodation has historically been a controversial policy issue. It has recently become a more complex issue since the 2015 Carrickmines tragedy. People living on halting sites have now become targets for possible eviction under the guise of health and safety.

5:5 Policing young Travellers in urban space

5:5:1 Introduction

This section will present my findings on how young Travellers are policed in Galway city. The relationship between Travellers and An Garda Síochána has always been a troublesome one and reports of discrimination towards the community are not unexpected given that it is so widespread within the general population (ITM 2014 and Pavee Point 2015). Young Travellers in this study repeatedly asserted that An Garda Síochána as an organisation was ‘institutionally racist’. The Macpherson Report (1999) stated that:

“Institutional racism consists of the collective failure of an organisation to provide an appropriate and professional service to
people because of their colour, culture or ethnic origin. It can be seen or detected in processes, attitudes and behaviour which amount to discrimination through unwitting prejudice, ignorance, thoughtlessness, and racist stereotyping which disadvantage minority ethnic people”.

The above definition provides an understanding that institutional racism is not only about individuals but organisations as a whole that can unintentionally practice discriminatory behaviour through racist stereotyping. Note how the following comments highlights the young Travellers understanding of institutional racism without the use of the conceptual label:

Marie (late teens) “they don’t even think they are being racist; they think it’s just normal to treat us like animals, always trying to control us”.

David (early twenties) “It’s the whole system really, they just think it’s normal to act the way they do against us like they don’t believe they are being racist and then how can you prove it when the whole system is like that, you get nowhere with it”

There was a widespread knowledge of institutional racism among the participants albeit without the use of the whole concept and most perceived AGS as an organisation which is institutionally racist towards the community however the young Travellers stress that they believed AGS was only practicing what ‘they have been taught’ by the state and society i.e. ‘they know no better’.

5:5:2 Policing context

Several scholars suggest that the Garda Síochána became firmly established as “one of the striking successes of the new state” (McNiffe 1997, p.175), and as one of the ‘in-groups’ of Irish society (MacGréil 1996). MacGréil (1996, p. 271) stated that “it would be difficult to find a police force in any other country with such a high national standing”. However, recent controversies such as the whistle-blower controversy suggest that this is no longer the case, nevertheless, An Garda Síochána’s (2015) Public Attitude Survey (which pre-dates many of these crisis) found that 85% of the public trusted the Gardaí and the “majority view the organisation as “friendly or helpful”, “community focused”, “modern or progressive”, and “effective in tackling crime”.
An Garda Síochána play a significant role in Ireland’s society, as an unarmed national force it has always had elements of community policing that relied on ‘the good will of the people’ to aid them in enforcing the law; they are a unique force in that they not only police cultural and community events but they also participate in them, bringing a sense of unity between them and the community (Garda Síochána Inspectorate 2007). However, as a predominately homogeneous (Irish, white, catholic) force it is evident that the lack of ethnic diversity within An Garda Síochána has created an organisational absence of knowledge on how to deal with other communities. In 2006, the GTM noted that AGS is overwhelmingly composed of ‘settled people’ (p.125) and in 2011, Pavee Point noted ‘that there are still no full Traveller members of the force’, (in a recent development I personally know of a young Traveller man who has graduated as a full member). Some of the young Travellers also noted the absence of Travellers in the Garda force:

Johnny (late-teens) “I don’t think I have ever heard of a Traveller guard”

Martin (late-teens) “Na, why would a Traveller ever become a guard like just imagine a Traveller guard, it would be hard coz they would have to be against their own then wouldn’t they but like how could they stick it listening to the other guards talking bad about Travellers and stuff, nah I think it is impossible for a Traveller to be a guard here in Ireland”

S: So do you think a Traveller could be a guard anywhere else?

Patrick (mid-teens) “Yeah I do coz guards in other countries, they have all different people in them don’t they, like here it is the ‘buffer’ squad nothing but settled people in everything”

The social and ethnic transformation of Ireland in the last few decades has highlighted the lack of diversity within An Garda Síochána and little knowledge about racism within the organisation has impacted upon effective policing (Garda Representative Association 2014). The lack of cultural and diversity training within AGS was specifically highlighted after the case of two blond Roma children who were removed from their parents based on the racial profiling of Roma and the historical stereotype that Roma are ‘child stealers’ (see Marron et al. 2016).

In the last few years, An Garda Síochána has attempted to engage with other organisations to gain knowledge through diversity and anti-racism training. For example, Local Traveller Interagency Committees were set up nationally after the recommendation
published in 2006 by the High Level Group on Traveller issues, these interagency committees were set up to “ensure that the relevant statutory agencies involved in providing the full range of services to Travellers, would focus on improving the integrated practical delivery of such services” (HLGTI 2006) and one of the main recommendations was “to ensure that law enforcement is included as part of the proposed integrated approach” (p.11). As part of the interagency approach Traveller organisations offer training to AGS however this training is generally only provided to Ethnic Liaison Officers which make up only 2 per cent of the force (O’Gorman 2016). With the development of the Local Traveller Interagency Committees; some advances are being made, nonetheless, this study revealed that the young Travellers felt advances made by community Gardaí that are not mirrored by the Gardaí on the streets:

Willie (late-teens) “The ones that do be at Traveller events and stuff are alright because they know more about us and have a better understanding, like at least they would talk to ya in a civil manner, you can even have a joke with some of them”

Sara (late-teens) “They are not like the other guards are they, they are more friendly but you rarely see them, it’s the other lads that give us hassle, the ones on the streets and stuff, like, you only meet the nice ones at something like Traveller pride or something”

A clear distinction was made between community Gardaí and the general Garda force therefore, for the purpose of this study the following references to An Garda Síochána does not include community Gardaí.

5:5:3 ‘No in-between’: over-policing or under-policing

Travellers are significantly over-represented in the Irish prison system with Traveller men being between five and eleven times more likely to be imprisoned than the general population and Traveller women between eighteen and twenty-two times more likely (see Pavee Point 2011). The knowledge of there being a higher risk of imprisonment for Irish Travellers considerably undermines Travellers’ confidence in the criminal justice system and reinforces the belief that the community receive harsher treatment for similar offences committed by non-Travellers (Pavee Point 2011). All participants in this study perceived that because they are Travellers that they are over-policed and their identity as a Traveller acts as a trigger for negative encounters with the criminal justice system. Another concern
expressed was that when an incident did occur it was perceived to quickly escalate with
the arrival of the Gardaí in high numbers:

Katie (late-teens) “it gets blown way out of proportion, there do be about fifty guards turning up to settle one small little tiff or something…”

John (late-teens) “They always come in around the site searching for things, god only knows what they do be looking for, they don’t know themselves”

Similar statements were made by Mulcahy and O’Mahony’s (2005) Traveller participants. Many of the young people in this study cited Garda patrols near halting sites or estates with large numbers of Travellers living in the area, “they are always around, we just ignore them most of the time”. Excessive use of resources to monitor Travellers is perceived by the young people as a way of “keeping an eye on us”.

A sense of persecution is common among the community and is heightened when information on high-profile cases of discrimination and violence towards the community is distributed to the public where the perpetrators actions are justified and the community’s perception of there being excessive lenient sentences for the perpetrators.

Greenfields et al. (2014, p.5) state:

Gypsies, Travellers and Roma are significantly under-represented as victims in criminal justice processes, whereas they are significantly over-represented as offenders in criminal justice systems throughout Europe. There is a subsequent mistrust of criminal justice processes and personnel, particularly police, amongst Gypsy, Traveller and Roma communities and a lack of willingness amongst those communities to therefore engage with them to either report crime or victimisation.

Throughout this study the young Travellers repeatedly gave similar narratives to the following:

Patrick (late-teens) “they think us all criminals, they are always watching us to catch us doing something, always thinking that we are up to something even when we are the ones that has had a crime committed against us, there is no in-between with them it’s always our own fault”.

Cultural representations of Travellers legitimize wrongdoings through their construction of Travellers as ‘uncultivated beings’. The frequently racist descriptions and distortions of Traveller society stems from ethnocentrism, rooted in the popular belief of the superior
value of sedentarism (McVeigh 1997) and the desirability of “... promoting their absorption into the settled community” (1963 Report).

The common stereotypical image of Travellers as ‘socially deviant’ informs policing policies towards Travellers and State, institutional and disciplinary control of the Community is legitimated through stereotypes associated with ‘uncivilised’ people who cannot uphold any social contract (Powell 2007, James 2013).

Throughout the focus group conversations, it was clearly evident that these young Travellers viewed the police force as a form of social control, which represented sedentary authority, operating as “racist pigs” that “cannot be trusted”. Travellers’ experiences have shaped their view of the force as symbolising an enemy that is antagonistic towards Travellers’ way of life, as James (2007) states “Travellers experience policing through enforcement and not community engagement”. After a history of oppression and acculturation by the State it is of no surprise that Travellers relationship with the state body of An Garda Síochána is troublesome. Travellers are at high risk of having frequent and unwelcome encounters with Gardaí. As one Garda report stated-

“From a policing perspective much of the interaction between the Traveller community and the Police is in a negative context and this makes it difficult to develop any degree of trust between both groups” (Garda Síochána 2001: 8 cited in Mulcahy 2012; see also Pavee Point 2011).

Mulcahy and O’Mahony’s (2005) research found that marginalised communities such as Travellers “accept misconduct towards them by the police as fact” and they also view the police as agents of the state that are utilised to ‘control’ and ‘contain’ them. Although research on Travellers and An Garda Síochána is sparse, both public and academic discourse outline a relationship based on tension and mistrust (James, 2007; Mulcahy, 2012).

5:5:3 Eviction

Out of a total of 48 participants within this study every one of the young Travellers had experienced eviction either directly or indirectly. Three of the young people had previously been evicted from an unofficial camp in the city, and were still living in
precarious circumstances. Two participants were living on a temporary site where they were continuously under the threat of eviction. Twelve participants were living on official permanent sites which were considered secure, although since the conclusion of fieldwork Travellers on official sites in Galway have been given eviction notices under the guise of health and safety (no sites in Galway have been built or expanded in over 25 years) and no alternative accommodation has been offered. All participants living on sites (official or unofficial) noted how there is a general sense of threat of eviction after the Carrackmines tragedy in 2015. The remaining participants lived in social housing estates across the city; these estates were generally located in socio-economically disadvantaged areas.

For generations, the main dispute between Travellers and the state has been one relating to spatial allocation. The state’s failure to provide Travellers with the space for functionally operating transient sites, and its introduction of anti-nomadic legalisation has created a pattern of evictions across the country where Travellers cannot practice their cultural and political rights in relation to movement (ITM 2014). Among the general Travellers population there is a widespread feeling of Garda persecution that is amplified by their role in enforcing evictions (ITM 2016 and 2014; Pavee Point 2011 and 2005). The regressive Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act 2002 and other eviction legalisation has increasingly enforced harsh and speedy evictions of Travellers deemed to be living in unauthorised sites. When these evictions occur, the police force has the responsibility to enforce the laws. The police have powers to physically remove Travellers from unauthorised sites (that are nonetheless their homes) as set down in the ‘Criminal Trespass Legislation’: Public Order Act 1994 (as amended). The legislation permits the police to

“direct individuals to immediately leave land and remove all objects they had brought onto the land (including their homes i.e. caravans). While earlier housing legislation had restricted evictions if no alternative accommodation was available, such conditions are not included in the Public Order Act. The amendment is known colloquially as the ‘criminal trespass legislation’” (ITM 2015).

The following description of an eviction is from a young Traveller woman in her early twenties who had directly experienced the process:
“We had nowhere to go, we were parked outside the gates of the site and we got notice from the council that they are evicting us but not giving us any other place to go. It was scary waiting the months out for the guards to come and move us and then one day it happened. ... it was freezing cold when the council turned up with a load of guards telling us to go or they will take our trailers off us so we had no choice to move on but once we parked up in another place they came and moved us again, they did it three or four times. They kept telling us to register as homeless and the council will then put us in B&B’s but sure how can we separate from one another, we can’t and they just don’t understand that”.

The general lack of cultural understanding is one of the issues that was repeatedly discussed among the participants, however, those who had directly experienced eviction were less likely to be outspoken about the Gardaí’s practices of enforcement than those who had heard about evictions from relatives and friends\textsuperscript{11}, who were much more vocal, for example note how this boy (mid-teens) describes an eviction that happened to his cousins:

“They were just after getting up for school when they heard the sirens coming up the road and all the children were afraid coz the squads just came in screeching and guards jumping out of their cars, banging on the trailer doors with their batons, some of them even had guns and had balaclavas on, ...said it was very scary. The guards were roaring and shouting for them to leave and then they started to drag and shove the trailers with them all inside of it, beating the sides they were...they arrested a few of the men but they let them go again when they said they would move, they have been moved from different places ever since, the guards won’t give them a minutes’ peace”

ITM (2014) noted that “the frequent use of armed response units and large numbers of Gardaí, when State officials are ‘visiting’ halting sites creates a conflictual stance whereby the Gardaí are no longer “their” police force”. For example, in 2016, when 23 families were evicted from Woodland Park halting site on the outskirts of Dundalk, Co Louth there were “up to forty’ Gardaí members present including masked members of the Emergency Armed Response Unit” (Tom Murray 2016).

The increased forced evictions (ITM 2015 and Pavee Point 2016) of Travellers in recent years has a disproportionate effect on young Travellers as they are particularly vulnerable

\textsuperscript{11} The reason being, those who have experienced eviction were still living in precarious circumstances and had a fear of speaking out due to the risk of being moved on again.
to the effects of expulsion from their local community when they are placed or forced outside populated areas where they become isolated and have no access to services or facilities. Complying with national anti-nomadic legalisation and practice, enforced evictions are a regular occurrence in Galway city (see GTM 2014). Once a family has been evicted from an area it starts the sequence of being moved by the Gardaí numerous times from different spaces of the city until the family move out of the urban arena or are pushed into sedentary housing (GTM 2014).

5:5:4 Stop and search

Participants in this study perceived ethnic profiling to be a practice that is routinely carried out by the police in relation to Irish Travellers. The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (ECRI) defines ethnic profiling as “The use by the police, with no objective and reasonable justification, of grounds such as race, colour, language, religion, nationality or national or ethnic origin, in control, surveillance or investigation activities”. As noted at various points in this study young Travellers cited incidences of stereotyping at every level of society, including at the level of policing. All participants held that ethnic profiling was a common occurrence and had either happened to them or known or heard of someone from the community who had experienced it. Boys were more likely to report being profiled by AGS with 17 out of 19 reporting that they had experienced it while only 3 girls reported to have been profiled.

The Council of Europe’s Commissioner for Human Rights, Thomas Hammarberg (2009) states:

“Members of minorities are more often than others stopped by the police, asked for identity papers, questioned and searched. They are victims of “ethnic profiling”, a form of discrimination which is widespread in today’s Europe. Such methods clash with agreed human rights standards. They tend also to be counterproductive as they discourage people from cooperating with Police efforts to detect real crimes... There should be an objective reason why a certain individual is stopped and searched, a reasonable and individualised suspicion of criminal activity. The colour of your skin, your dress or visible religious attributes are not objective reasons”.

Research highlights that when the police act in an aggressive manner towards minorities, community relations are negatively impacted upon and minorities’ attitudes towards the
Police are based upon their experiences that are generally negative. Tyler (2004) notes how stops and searches are often incorporated into “hot spot” policing, the young Travellers in this study suggested that these ‘hotspots’ are usually located around Traveller spaces:

*Thomas (early-twenties)* “they are always around where we are, if there is a few Travellers at all in any place you can guarantee there will be guards around waiting to stop and search us”

*Frank (early-twenties)* “everywhere we are you can bet your life on it there are guards around waiting”

The 2009 EU-MIDIS European Union Minorities and Discrimination Survey from the EU Fundamental Rights Agency (FRA 2009) showed that Ireland had the second highest rate of police stops in the EU. Writing of the Irish context, Mulcahy and O’Mahony (2005, p.23) noted that

“police often resort to more intrusive and abrasive measures, such as stop when the level of trust is diminished” and they also found the use of stop and search to be a common occurrence in relation to Travellers; one of their participants described it as ‘a typical ruse used by members of the force when harassing Travellers’.

John (early-twenties) in my study stated “You can’t go nowhere with them, always stopping us about something, to them we have done something wrong just for being a Traveller”. Throughout this study individual stories of stop and search were repeatedly discussed with similar themes, some examples include:

*(boy, late-teens)* “I think they just stop us to get a laugh out of us or something, they seem to enjoy stopping us and hassling us”

*(boy, early-twenties)* “I was stopped many the time for no reason but once they stop you they will try find something to put you away, that’s why you can’t argue with them coz they would lock you up there and then”

*(boy, late-teens)* “Whenever they see a Traveller van they stop it and search it, it’s just part of their routine, I’d say when they are being trained they are taught to suspect every Traveller for every crime”

Early experiences of stop and search arguably strengthen the perception of prejudice on the part of the police. In their day-to-day encounters with the police, young Travellers feel the Gardaí are only there to ‘hassle’ them:
(boy late-teens) “...everywhere we go they just hassle us for no reason, it starts off with the small questions like ‘where are you going’ and stuff but it always ends up where they are searching you because they say ‘oh you fit the description’ but they don’t tell you what description...

(boy, mid-teens) “...they try to rise you coz they want you to start roaring and shouting so they can lock us up but it is very hard to stay quiet when they are blaming you for something you didn’t do and calling you names, once myself and ...were in Eyre Square when two guards came over asking us what we were doing there as if we don’t have the right to stand there like everyone else, we said we are doing nothing but they said ‘oh ye are always up to something, ye’re crowd are never innocent, I know ye’ like there was nothing we could say only ‘we are doing nothing’ but then they searched us and when they found nothing they told us to go home...”

Note the recollection of the police reproducing the stereotype that Travellers are criminals ‘ye’re crowd are never innocent’. The ITM (2014) stated that “Gardai casually dropping into an unrelated conversation stating they know other family members who have criminal records, makes innocent people feel criminalised and racially profiled”. Participants in this study believed that the Gardaí use stop and search powers specifically as a means of social control:

(Girl, late teens) “...they don’t care if we are in the wrong or not that’s not what they are there for, they are there to try catch one of us doing something wrong or even to just let us know they are watching us, like when there is a fair on or something they are always stopping the cars for green diesel, you never see them stopping cars at other things unless there are a load of Travellers at it”

(boy, mid-teens) “...it seems to me, they stop us, just to let us know they are in control and make us feel like we are doing something wrong even when we are doing nothing...”

Bradford and Loader (2015, p.85) state:

“Intercepting people, asking them to account for themselves, temporarily detaining them, searching them for illicit goods and substances and are ‘deeply inscribed in institutional structure and organizational behaviour (and) part . . . of the DNA of policing (p.254).

Poor relations between Gardaí and Travellers were highlighted in this study, including assertions of harassment and confrontational policing to exert social control. Bradford
(2017, p.9) suggests that if “policing is to do with the endless task of asserting a particular version of social order, then police stops are and probably always have been an important part of this effort”. Traveller nomadic culture represents such a threat to the social order of sedentarism. In 2004, An Garda Síochána Human Rights Audit found that institutional racism against Travellers was common within the organisation and ‘the worst personal relationships were with Travellers’.

5:5:5 ‘Driving while being a Traveller’

Research has shown there is a link between ‘driving while a minority’ and the use of urban space. A report on ‘driving while Black’ carried out by Gideon’s Army in collaboration with Nashville Community organisations and leaders (2016) found “traffic stop practices impose a severe disparate or discriminatory impact on the predominantly black and low-income communities” (p. 7). Gary Webb (1999) exposed the extent of racial profiling of Black and Brown drivers “stressing the degree to which a previous police focus on safe driving was diverted into one focused on a needle-in-the-haystack search for drug couriers and largely reliant on very inefficient “behavioural” and racial profiles” (cited in Baumgartner et al. 2016).

As a sedentary force, the Irish Police are embedded in a culture which holds specific stereotypes of Travellers (James 2010, Pavee Point 2011). Discrimination, prejudice and racism from the Gardaí were raised by participants in this study, as the following statements show:

Dan (early twenties) “Sometimes it’s not even the word ‘knacker’ that annoys you coz then once they say it you know where you stand, it’s the remarks they make to each other under their breath and you catch one or two words like once two guards stopped me and while one of them were checking out my driver’s licence I heard the other one saying something to him and I caught the word ‘animals’ and asked what they were saying, they just said ‘oh animals, have you any animals in your possession?’ like I knew that’s not what they were on about but what could I do?”

All five male participants over the age of eighteen described incidents of harassment that involved allegations of misconduct by the police, one such incident is described as follows:

Michael (early twenties) “they pulled me over in the car and told us to step out, I asked what for? we did nothing, I had tax and
insurance and was not speeding or anything, I should have known not to drive down that road coz they are always stopping around there coz it’s close to the site. Anyway when I asked what we had done one of them kicked the car and said ‘Get the fuck out of the car knacker’ so we had no choice but to step out, once I opened the door one fella grabbed me by the shoulder and kneed me into the back of my legs so I was bent over the bonnet with my hands behind my back and handcuffed. The kept me like that for about twenty minutes just tormenting me, they were laughing at me and saying stuff like ‘remember the master always has control over his animals and ye belong in a jungle’, when I said I would complain them they told me that they would lock me up for a long time so I then said nothing and they laughed saying ‘the cat has got his tongue now’. Eventually they un-cuffed me and gave me a kick into my back and said ‘off with you now and remember we have the power boy’, I just got back into my car and went away home”

The data shows a pattern of participants reciting the use of the word ‘animal’ by the Gardaí in relation to Travellers. One girl described the feeling of ‘spotting’ the Gardaí ‘pulling’:

*Nora (early twenties)*“When I see them my heart do be going real fast, even though you know you’ve done nothing wrong and everything on the car is up to date, you can’t help panicking, the sweat just starts pouring out of ya and then you look guilty for no reason. Once they let you pass then you just let out a breath of relief”

These findings concur with international research relating to driving while ethnic. In 2015, the US Department of Justice released the results of its investigation of the Ferguson Police Department where they found Black drivers to be twice as likely to be stopped and searched, “but were 26% less likely to be found in the possession of contraband”, the report stated that:

“the lower rate at which officers find contraband when searching African Americans indicates either that officers’ suspicion of criminal wrongdoing is less likely to be accurate when interacting with African Americans or that officers are more likely to search African Americans without any suspicion of criminal wrongdoing. Either explanation suggest bias, whether explicit or implicit” (cited in Baumgartner et al 2015 pp.4-5).

Baumgartner et al (2015, p.9) found “Blacks are 200% more likely to be searched and 190% more likely to be arrested after being pulled over for a seat belt violation; 110% more likely to be searched or arrested following a stop for vehicle regulatory violations;
Within my study, the young Traveller drivers suggested that the police target them while driving and they believed that they were much more likely to be stopped:

*John (early twenties)* “...they watch us driving out of the site and follow us down the road, you wouldn’t even see them until you down the road and they come up behind you flashing their lights...they always do it to Travellers but never really to settled people”

**5:5:6 Surveillance**

The spatial containment of Travellers on the outskirts of the city represents ‘ghettoisation’ that evokes a reality of containment and control. Agreeing with Cowan and Lomax (2003, p.284), I argue that, Ireland’s policy of containing Travellers and subjecting us to increased surveillance and monitoring is to “determine compliance effectively, enforce and sanction particular codes of conduct and ways of life” i.e. sedentary ways of life. Duneier (2016) “argued that the iconic ghetto can no longer be defined as hypersegregated places where poor and working-class African Americans and Latinos live but needs to be reframed as a space for invasive social control and police surveillance” (cited in Logan and Oakley 2017 p.1036). Note how the young Travellers of Galway city described ‘invasive social control and police surveillance’:

*Michael (mid-teens)*: “...they are always around the site watching us, we can’t relax at all with them, they just wait for us to act wrong in some way or another...”

*Catherine (late teens)*: “…we were in the site one day and there was some kind of a celebration going on, I forget what it was for now...but anyway the guards were parked outside the gates the whole day long just sitting there...we just tried to ignore them but how can you enjoy yourself with them watching over you...they have no reason to sit there...and if anyone went over then and asked them what they are doing there they would tell ya they will arrest ya, you get no law with them at all”

*Patrick (late teens)* “…they just drive into the site and park up for a few minutes...they just sit in the squad and watch us...when we ask why they are there they just say ‘because we are’ or ‘we’re just checking everything is alright, like what are they checking I’d like to know...”

The historical ‘othering’ and racialisation of Travellers as a community who are ‘socially corrupt and deviant’ has created the notion that it is legitimate and justified to perceive
the community as a ‘suspect community’ and as having a ‘corrupt’ way of life is a legitimate focus for suspectification. Over-generalised and inaccurate stereotypical views of the ‘usual suspects’ provides a further example of the systematic racial inequalities manifested in anti-Traveller racism. The conceptualisation of Travellers as a suspect community impacts upon social cohesion and since the community are distinguished from the rest of Ireland’s population as a ‘suspect’ community, it is believed that they constitute more of a threat. As Hardt and Negri (2000, p.194) note, cultural racism “is hatred born in proximity and elaborated through degrees of difference”. Throughout the focus groups, the young people spoke about suspectification:

*Thomas (early twenties)*: “they always suspect us for something, if Tommy the Traveller did something up in Dublin then Tommy the Traveller here in Galway will be the blame too”

*Kathleen (mid-teens)*: “…we always get blamed for everything, when something goes wrong they just automatically look at the Traveller, the Traveller did it…”

Paddy Hillyard’s (1993) study of the impact of the Prevention of Terrorism Act (PTA) on Irish communities in Britain explains the concept of suspect community, he stated:

“a person who is drawn into the criminal justice system under the PTA is not a suspect in the normal sense of the word. In other words, they are not believed to be involved in or guilty of some illegal act [...] people are suspect primarily because they are Irish and once they are in the police station they are often labelled an Irish suspect, presumably as part of some classification system. In practice, they are being held because they belong to a suspect community”.

Similarly, Travellers in Ireland are suspect primarily because they are Travellers, as the registering of a Traveller baby as ‘suspect’ on the PULSE system confirms - note that this is explained below. The fixing of the Travellers as collective rather than as an individual ‘suspect’ has been reproduced and is reinforced through the stereotypical image portrayed in media and in government policy. There is evidence to suggest that Travellers have always been considered a ‘suspect community’ and since the publication of the Report of the Commission on Itineracy in 1963, the notion of Travellers as ‘suspects’ has been applied. One example of suspectification in Galway city provided by participants was as follows:

*Paddy (mid-teens)* “…like one time someone’s bike was missing from the estate and straight away the guards were at our door”
Such practices position us as a ‘suspect’ community. This profiling influences the young Travellers spatial practices. Recurrently throughout this study, young Travellers asserted that they have been subjected to police accusations of ‘go away boy, you would rob the eye of your own mother’s head, it’s the Traveller way’ and ‘of course it was ye that took it, who else was it’. The association of identity being linked to illegal or suspicious behaviour is echoed in everyday mainstream society involving actual abuse and racist jokes. For instance, one young boy described being called a thief in a sports clothes shop by a private security guard before being searched and when nothing was found to be stolen the security guard laughed and said to the young boy ‘you might not have stolen something today but if I didn’t search you, you could steal the next day’. This type of suspectification positions Travellers as being inextricably associated with a criminal identity and surveillance of a ‘suspect’ community is justified. James Carr (2013) identified how the Irish Muslim community are ascribed a ‘suspect’ identity legitimising police intimidation and aggressiveness and Marinaro (2009) suggested that there were two extremes when it came to policing Roma in Italy as a ‘suspect’ identity, those two extremes are exile and surveillance. All participants in my study felt they were belonging to a ‘suspect’ identity and the police could “act anyway they want” towards them, ‘exile’ and ‘surveillance’ in Galway city was evident.

5:5:7 Police Reporting

Travellers in Ireland live their daily lives experiencing racism, the racial divide is deeply ingrained into Irish society where hostility and violence towards my community is seen to be justified because of our ‘difference’ to the mainstream settled population. As my findings show Galway city is rife with incidents of anti-Traveller racism and discrimination however my findings also highlight the fact that reporting is not used as a tactic for my participants. As Ireland does not have legislation against hate crime there is subsequently no data on hate crimes per se, though in “November 2015, the Irish police service are understood to have introduced a number of additional bias motivation markers including for anti-Traveller and anti-Roma hate crime” (Joyce et al 2017 p.332). In 2014,
a sixteen-day old baby was among those recorded on the system as a potential criminal based solely on their Traveller identity (see Pavee Point 2014; 1 Debates: Travellers on the PULSE system 2014). Therefore, whether or not anti-Traveller racism can be recorded, it is extremely difficult for Travellers to trust a system that is known for the ethnic profiling of our community. Most of the incidents of racism and discrimination recounted to me were not reported to any authorities let alone to be recorded as a complaint by the police. The common and frequent experiences of racism in this study is worrying, the everyday nature of bias motivated hostility was normalised by the participants and many racist incidents were seen as a normal everyday occurrence as the following shows:

“…Oh god, sure now, it happens so often you just learn to take no notice of it, you have to just ignore it…”

“…You just learn to ignore it, you can’t let it get to you, you can’t let it drag you down because it will do that if you start thinking about it, you just have to get on with life… you let them win if you let it affect you…”

“…they hate us, you can see it everywhere, everyday there is something but that’s just how it is, isn’t it, it has always been that way and it always will be, there is no changing it no matter what you do…that’s Ireland for you…”

Since anti-Traveller incidents are so normalised by the participants and the community as a whole they are rarely reported leaving a huge gap in the data. Hate crimes in general recorded by the Irish police are inadequate and according to the OSCE Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights there are a range of different reasons why racism and hate crime in general is under reported, including

“A belief that nothing will happen…; Mistrust or fear of the police…; Fear of retaliation . . .; Lack of knowledge of hate crime laws . . .; Shame . . .; Denial . . .: Fear of disclosing their sexual orientation . . .; Fear of disclosing their ethnic, religious or political affiliation . . .; Fear of arrest and/or deportation” (2009, pp. 34–35).

For most of the participants in this study, the incidents were such an everyday occurrence that it made it logistically impossible to report every incident as Nora explains:

“Sure how could you report everything…there’s no way it could happen because you would be in the Garda station every day of the week, you might as well move in altogether…every day sure
there is something, it might be a big thing or a small thing but it happens all the time...no point in reporting, it happens too often to report everything...

Everyone in the room agreed with Nora and it was a sentiment spread across all focus groups. Furthermore, most felt like they would not be taken seriously if they did report an incident and it would be their word against the offender. Some of the participants knew how to report an incident while others did not know the appropriate body or mechanisms for reporting. The general perception across all focus groups was that “nothing would be done about it anyway”:

Sharron (late teens): “…they don’t care, they would just go ‘yeah yeah whatever’ and fob you off, they are more concerned with who you are and what we were doing in such a place anyway, they just throw the blame back on ourselves likes it’s our own fault or something…”

Mikey (early teens): “…are you serious? As if anything would be done about it…we all know nothing would happen, it’s a waste of time…a load of hassle for nothing…”

Patrick (early twenties): “…what’s the point in complaining to the guards, the shades themselves are racist, they do nothing about, I reported something one time…a good while ago… and they told me to get out of the station unless I want to go into the cell…”

And for Johnny (late teens) reporting was just not worth the risk:

“…it’s not worth reporting…too much questions…about stuff that has nothing to do with it…by the time they are finished with you you could be arrested or put on their books so they can keep an eye on you…they know you then and then you are fucked, you wouldn’t get a minutes peace with them…”

These findings suggest that the main barriers to reporting racist and hate crime incidents was the perception that nothing would be done about it and lack of trust in the Irish police force. The fear of being ‘hassled’, ‘questioned’ and ‘arrested’ was significant and the conflicted relationship between Traveller and the police is understood within the context of systemic structural institutional anti-Traveller racism and inequality. "A study commissioned by Amnesty International (Mulcahy and Loyal 2001, p.18) found that “almost four in five Travellers responding stated that they had experienced racist incidents and that one in four racist incidents were at the hands of the Gardaí” (Joyce et
There is a growing concern across Europe that anti-Traveller racism is rising and it is ‘the last acceptable form of racism’ (see Council of Europe 2012; O’Connell 2013; The Traveller Movement 2017). The internalisation of the normalisation of racism was evident within this study and the young Travellers living with a racialised social identity within a racialised divided city experience pervasive racism that is ‘seen on the street but not seen on data/paper’. The normalisation of anti-Traveller racism is deep rooted into the structure of Irish society. Stuart Hall uses the idea of a ‘reservoir of racism’ where racism is a vast resource which can be drawn upon in many different social situations (cited in Lentin and McVeigh 2002, p.38). As my study has highlighted urban Galway has a ‘reservoir’ of anti-Traveller racism that is drawn upon within the spatial context. As my maps and interviews show the impact of this racism effects spatial mobility and since this racism is normalised it goes unreported and the cycle continues.

### 5:6 Tactics

The concept of ‘tactics’ was first introduced into social and urban theory by De Certeau (1984) where he positioned tactics as tools utilised as opposing components to the strategies of the dominant. Therefore, he regards tactics as resistance tools that become essential in the everyday spatial practices. Henry Lefebvre’s (1974) theory of the ‘Right to the city’ places ‘tactics’ as the small victories against the dominant ‘strategies’ that claim, defend and produce spaces catering to the needs of the neoliberal society which in turn displaces the needs of the everyday urban dweller. Tactics allow the everyday urban dweller to reconfigure social space to suit their needs as a form of resistance to the oppressive systems in place.

Racism and discrimination in urban Galway are active everyday risks for young Travellers, the everyday struggle of finding ways to cope create tactics that are highly organised; avoiding triggers for negative encounters is part of the cultural tool kit used by young Travellers operating through direct and indirect experiences of hostility. Although the non-Traveller population rarely enters Traveller space, Travellers have to enter and navigate sedentarised space “as a condition of existence” (Anderson 2015). This study investigated the tactics which young Travellers in Galway city employ to negotiate urban spaces which they experience as intended for others and as hostile to them. This section describes the main tactics identified in young Travellers’ descriptions of the
means they have developed and deployed to counteract hostile spatial encounters. It is significant to note each tactic utilised by the young Travellers are socially and spatially informed and although most of the participants perceived them to be successful forms of resistance it is clear that they can be very disempowering as they are acts of normalised obedience to racialised spaces.

5:6:1 Compliance

Compliance is a behaviour that is influenced by social norms. According to Fabrigar and Norris (2017 p.1) a social norm “refers to the ways people influence the beliefs, feelings, and behaviours of others” while “compliance is when an individual changes his or her behaviour in response to an explicit or implicit request made by another person”. This study has found some evidence of a high level of compliance among the young Travellers to the sedentary societal norms of hierarchy and superiority of sedentarised space. 32 out of 48 participants admitted to using the tactic of compliance to negotiate urban spaces although their level of compliance varied from natural compliance to law, rules and regulations to compliance in which would aid them in negotiating their ‘right to the city’ and its public spaces, compliance generally meant to “accept that we are never going to be treated any differently” and “you just have to go along with them”. That is not to say that these young people are willingly complying but they are in fact using it as a tactic that can be utilised in certain negative encounters that allow them to overcome the negativity and seize an opportunity of retreat. The tactic of compliance is a tactic that is often utilised by other minority groups across the world as a form of resistance to the dominant group. Non-dominant minorities, compared with majority groups, often have greater engagement in risky encounters where compliance can sometimes act as a successful tool in negotiation (see Malhotra and Bazerman 2008). Cialdini and Goldstein (2004, p.591) state that “in all cases” of compliance, “the target recognizes that he or she is being urged to respond in a desired way”. Research tell us that Black and Muslim communities use compliance as a way of avoiding negative encounters with the police (see Futterman et al 2016 and Carr 2016). After decades of sanctions for non-compliance to sedentary norms, young Travellers have learned how to use compliance to their advantage. For example, in relation to being stopped on the street by the police Jimmy (mid-teens) has learned that compliance will keep him from being arrested:
“Oh you just have to be nice to them otherwise you get nowhere with them, they would just arrest you and throw you into the cell for a couple of hours. I remember one night myself and (name of person) were walking down by the Dock road and two guards stopped us, asked us where we were going, took our names and told us to go home. We just told them our names and walked on home, no point arguing with them sure we have no rights...”

“...Another night I was walking home by myself and a squad pulled up beside me, they got out and asked loads of questions, my name, where I live, where I’m going, they would nearly ask ya what you had for breakfast then they searched me and sent me off...”

On both encounters Jimmy felt he had to comply with the police, he had learned the tactic of compliance as a means of staying out of trouble when stopped. I asked him did he report the encounters and he stated:

“No who you gonna report to? ‘the guards’, sure they’d only laugh at ya and run ya, nothing can ever be done, we just have to put up with it that’s all... anyway what’s to report, I got away from them didn’t I? Sure that’s the main thing isn’t it? Well then you can see I got what I wanted which was to get away and that’s the end of it...”

Jimmy began to get a little frustrated with me for asking if he reported the encounters because he felt that he had succeeded in his aim of ‘getting away’ by complying and no more action was needed. As my findings confirm Travellers are at high risk of having frequent and unwelcome spatial encounters with Gardaí. Researchers have noted the “intergenerational transmission of conduct norms” (Brunson and Weitzer 2011). With regard to young Travellers, their etiquette towards the Gardaí is learned from parents and relatives as well as from direct experiences. From a young age Travellers learn to perceive the Gardaí as the enemy and the only plausible behaviour during encounters is either compliance or retreat. The tactic of compliance used by the young Travellers is not an internal attitude change but an attempt to gain acceptance through behaviour that involves projecting an image that is consistent with the goals of those they are complying to i.e. “...you’re better off to just play along with them, tell them what they want to hear...”.

Turner et al (2010) notes that compliance is induced by altercating messages, making it clear that “a person with ‘good’ qualities would comply” and “only a person with bad qualities would not comply”. The willingness of the young Travellers to comply
demonstrates the effective use of tactics used to overcome negative encounters; they do not passively conform to compliance but do so as an informed decision of a tactical procedure of resistance against the status quo. They learn how to ‘perform’ within the social structure of the sedentarised city. In the discussions in the focus groups the tactic of compliance was generally discussed as a performance to gain rights that are seen as a given, such as the right to use public and commercial spaces in the city. For example, the following discussion shows compliance being utilised in trying to gain access to a hotel for a wedding:

MaryAnne (early twenties) “…before I got married last year I was looking for a place to have the reception and after getting refused from loads we finally got one. This place told us we can have it for the night if we only have 60 people even though they had room for 150 and we had to pay the full amount, not just the deposit months before the wedding and they told us that there will be a few guards undercover there for protection and the bar would close at eleven, we had to be out of there before twelve…it was pure racism but it was either go along with it or have no place, so we just took it…”

Kathy (late teens) “…yeah I know the place your on about, they do that to all Travellers but at least they allow Traveller weddings, a lot of places run you before they even talk to you, I suppose it is better than no place so you just accept it.

Complying to accept racism in exchange for the use of commercial spaces highlights the extent of racism towards the community and shows how compliance is used as a tactic of coping with anti-Traveller racism i.e. the comment “at least they allow Traveller weddings” suggest this place was not as bad as others which demonstrates the impact of extreme anti-Traveller racism. The spatial context where compliance was used was mainly in commercial spaces within the city centre zone.

5:6:2 Passing

To gain a more favourable social identity some people construct and enact the social interaction tactic known as ‘passing’. It is a common tactic used to ‘fit in’ to the more favourable group in society and is employed to resist social oppression. Passing is used to describe how people can change their appearance and/or behaviour to be accepted as part of a particular group. Particularly, racial passing is a significant tactic utilised to disrupt the racial order of space, the dominant control of space is connected to the
racialisation of groups and as Nelson (2008) emphasised “domination itself revolves around how groups marked as racially inferior have been defined, confined, regulated, and eradicated through the control of space” (cited in Neely and Samura 2011). Traditionally as a nomadic community and perceived to be a racially inferior group in Irish society our spatial activities have long been controlled and regulated, the intersection of space and race is socially embedded and the tactic of passing temporarily breaks the cycle of racialised space.

The concept of passing was first introduced to describe the phenomenon of light skinned African Americans ‘passing’ as white. Since then the concept has been widely used in research to describe how other marginalised groups engage in the act of ‘passing’ in order to gain a more favourable social position. It is a tactic formalised through the normalisation of oppression (Brown 1991) and is spatially used to ‘gain mobility’ by taking on the dominant identity (Yee and Wagner 2013). Although, passing is seen by Hitch (1983) as a ‘process’ of ‘concealment of identity’ Sanchez and Schlossberg’s (2001) explanation that it is not “erasure” or “denial” but a “creation of an alternative set of narratives” is confirmed by my participants as the tactic of passing is only temporarily used and is a ‘performance’ (Rohy 1996) that is ‘managed’ by the ‘process’ of ‘playing down identity’ (Goffman 1963). So as most of the literature confirms, the tactic of passing negotiates with social identity so it requires a social performance to be acted out in different ways depending upon the location and situation.

Passing is a spatial tactic as it is utilised to maintain a particular status to gain spatial and social mobility. The racialisation of space and in this case the sedentarisation of space has made it essential for the tactic of passing to be used in social spaces of hostility. In this study cohort, it is significant to note that all of the participants who reported using passing stated that they intentionally chose to pass as ‘settled’. Passing manifested in different ways for the participants, some clearly stated that they rarely utilise passing while others stated that it was an everyday tactic, while others commented on other Travellers being fully engaged in passing. The young people reported two main conditions that were relevant in their deliberations on passing: ‘fit in’ and ‘risk’. The normalisation of anti-Traveller discrimination was clear and the young Travellers managed passing by engaging in a performance, creating a character of perceived ‘settled’ identity. Within this study, to fit in was measured by the success rate of being seen as ‘settled’ and the
young Travellers perceived that they successfully conformed to the established social role and expectations of being a ‘settled’ person:

*Maurine (late-teens)* “We try not to look too much like a Traveller, you know, you would kinda know what not to wear, you’d try make yourself reale innocent looking or something, yeah like butter wouldn’t melt, you’d be reale soft spoken like, try not to give them any reason to stop you again, we do try act like pure buffers” ‘laughter’ “so they would leave us alone and let us in”

*Anne (early-twenties)* “it’s all about how we look, like if you go in dressing like a pure Traveller...sure you know there will be hassle”.

*James (early-twenties)* “once you look like one of them you’d be alright, you get into places easier”

Spaces of risk usually included spaces that were either spaces that were high in security or spaces that were occupied with crowds of people where there was a possibility of high levels of negative encounters. The young Travellers talked about how they sometimes ‘needed’ to act ‘settled’ because ‘people are always weary of Travellers’. The structural exclusion of Travellers from the city has normalised the hostility directed towards the community. Using the tool of ‘disguise’ to ‘pass’ was evident across all focus groups conducted; dressing and behaving to be seen as ‘settled’ in order to use urban spaces is a manifestation of the racism experienced by young Travellers when their racialised identity is detected. Fisher and Loren (2003) discuss how clothes are used “paradoxically to blur the boundaries of the body”, young Travellers use clothes to blur their ethnic identity while altering their demeanour to ‘pass’. The ability to transform their social identity through dress has created a semi-controllable tactic that allows the young Travellers to negotiate their spatial practices. Davis (1985) states “clothing communicates symbolically the social identity, namely how a person wants and seeks to appear in society”. Seeking to appear ‘settled’ was seen by the young Travellers as a tactic only to be used when occupying ‘sedentarised’ space. Passing was a tactic that they utilised on such a regular occurrence that they could be considered to be bi-cultural as they are living in two different worlds, one where they talk and behave as ‘settled’ people expect them to and another where they can talk and behave as themselves- Helen (late teens) “…you learn how to talk and act like them so they won’t know you’re a Traveller…”
Seeking to pass as ‘settled’ not only tells us how the young Travellers experience their identity as racially inferior but it also tells us about the racialised nature of urban space in Galway city. The spatial practice of passing reveals how social relations are impacted upon by negotiating identity, the passing behaviours reveal the existence of invisible racialised boundaries that Travellers have to traverse as the following comments indicate:

*Kevin (late teens)* “...a few Travellers have a job but they have to hide the fact that they are a Traveller, they often heard people at work talking bad about Travellers but they have to stay quiet or they will lose their job...

*Tony (mid-teens)* “...some Travellers try acting like buffers and then others go too far altogether thinking they are better than you...

*Margaret (late teens)* “...well you know sometimes you just have to pretend to be a buffer, act like them, talk like them, dress like them, once they think you are one of them they treat you like one of them, it’s all only for show though...

For Margaret and most of the other participants passing was seen as a form of resistance and where passing was successful it was felt as a ‘win’ and a resistance to the racialised spatial order of Galway city. The tactic of passing is used as a survival skill that is only activated when the young Travellers enter spaces that are considered to be sedentary spaces such as the urban arena; passing is also a form of resistance to mainstream society where the young Travellers attempt to occupy settled spaces covertly, so it conforms to de Certeau’s (1984) idea that tactics can slip by unnoticed and disrupt strategies. As a spatial tactic, passing for the young people was utilised mainly when spaces were perceived to be anti-Traveller and attempting to gain access to spaces. Sociologists and cultural geographers have made it clear that social relations are impacted upon by young people having to negotiate identity however not only do young Travellers have to negotiate identity but they have to cloak it. Massey et al (1992) states that “a city can provide stability and a sense of unproblematic identity”; for young Travellers this statement could not be further from the truth. This research has discovered Traveller youth to be in a state of extreme instability where they feel the need take on another identity and drop their Traveller one (the process of un-doing). The challenge for the young people in urban space is that they need to make the choice of being invisible or prepare themselves for a possible negative encounter. The construction of the settled identity as a privileged and hegemonic position of integrity marginalises and excludes...
them based on how ‘settled we look’; they are constantly negotiating the tension between settled and Traveller identity. Altering their identity to ‘pass’ as settled people, young Travellers negotiate their racialised social positions by consciously disguising their Traveller identity through dress, behaviour and accent on a regular basis for short periods of time.

5:6:3 Hiding in plain sight

Young Travellers at the margins of the racialised boundary of the dominant sedentarised spatial order in Galway city navigate and express this boundary by constructing sameness with the settled population, they negotiate their experiences of racialisation and discrimination by performing ‘settledness’ not only in visible identity i.e. passing but also in behaviour. There is a slight distinction between hiding in plain sight and passing; passing refers to a performance of an alternative identity and hiding in plain sight refers to ‘hiding’ or ‘cloaking’ a stigmatised identity. Fordham and Ogbu's study (1986) introduced the notion of ‘acting white’ referring to the activity of ‘camouflaging’ however hiding in plain sight for these young Travellers is not particularly acting settled but is a lack of performing settled while hiding their stigmatised identity i.e. being invisible. Hiding in plain sight plays a significant role in negotiating the urban space. According to Kanuha (1997, p.34) camouflaging “occurs when one behaves as if she is not part of the stigmatized group to which she actually belongs, by engaging in performances such as modifying one's manner of dress or physical appearance, avoiding contact with others like yourself, or remaining silent when one's group is being publicly disparaged”.

Although, hiding in plain sight is not camouflaging it does have the component of avoiding contact with others like yourself in order to use spaces as the following will show:

**Martin (early-twenties):** “I use the gym...they don’t know I’m a Traveller, if they did I wouldn’t be allowed in...I go by myself and if I see other Travellers in there I don’t bother with them...they are the same with me...we could know each other well but it’s better to pretend we don’t coz they might figure out then that we are Travellers and stop us from using the gym...”

Martin’s fear of his identity being detected is a credible fear that he will be stopped from using the gym as we can see from a leisure centre in another part of the country where they had a ‘three Travellers at any one time” policy in place which was provided to
Travellers in writing (see Deegan 2017). The tactic of hiding in plain sight requires a high degree of knowledge in navigating identity. During the focus groups some young Travellers told their stories of ‘hiding in plain sight’ with a sense of winning (as if they went behind enemy lines):

*Katie (early twenties) “There’s a place in the city that hates Travellers, they never let Travellers in but sometimes we get in anyway, we don’t really dress up much just a pair of jeans and heels, we straighten our hair and wear only silver jewellery, we go in before the bouncers start work at 6, the boys go in about 20 minutes before us, we pretend to be there to watch some match or something. Then when the bouncers come on they don’t really notice us most of the time, it’s like we are in disguise (laughing)”.*

Bell Hooks (1992) claims that ‘black’ people possess a special knowledge of ‘whiteness’, understanding its borders and delineations and how to navigate them. This study has revealed that young Travellers similarly possess a special knowledge of ‘settleness’ which is highlighted in the ways in which they negotiated settled norms featuring as a source of suspicion against Travellers. Hiding in plain sight in social situations is seen as a common social coping strategy for the young people:

*Johnny (late teens) “…you just try blend in with the crowd like walking into a disco or something just start talking to other people and pretend you are with them…it’s the only way”*

*Anne (late teens) “…hold a settled boy’s hand going in…the most innocent looking boy you can find…they would never refuse you coz they think you are a settled girl”*

The dominant sedentary representations of space produce spaces that employ sedentary codes therefore re-producing the dominant sedentary urban ideology. If Henri Lefebvre (1974) suggests space to be a social product I would argue that space is also a political product that is created to interest certain and specific groups; since there is no space specifically to interest Travellers in the city the dominant ideology becomes clear. As we know, the ideology of space is historical; the historical myth of Travellers in Galway being a health risk to the city (see Helleiner 1995, 2000 and 2003) has created a collective dominant ideology of discounting and racialising the community in the urban space. On the borders of the city, young Travellers impression of the interior city concedes to the idea of settled space being equipped with boundaries; the codes of these boundaries are often invisible to the settled population but are quite clear to Travellers. The process of hiding the Traveller identity in plain sight in urban space can be seen through the
manifestation of what W.E.B. Du Bois (1989) calls a “double-consciousness, a sense of always looking at one’s self through the eyes of others, of measuring one’s soul by the tape of a world that looks on in amused contempt and pity”.

5:6:4 Armouring

Young Travellers are equipped with effective tactics for coping with police encounters; researchers use the term ‘armouring’ (Brunson and Weitzer 2011) to describe the process; parents arm their children with tactics that are most effective to their situation. According to Bell and Nkomo (1998, p.286) “Armor is a form of socialization where a girl child learns the cultural attitudes, preferences, and socially legitimate behaviours for two cultural contexts”. Faulkner (1983, p.196) characterised the concept of armouring as “specific behavioural and cognitive skills used by Blacks and other people of colour to promote self-caring during direct encounters with racist experiences and/or racist ideologies”. Young Travellers are taught ways to amour and protect themselves from racism at a very young age, they are armed with tools to effectively counter and manage experiences of racism:

John: “…you just learn how to handle it…you just know what to do when you get into a situation…you know what works best to get you out of it…”

Mary: “…we learn what to say and what not to say with them, you have to go along with them and that’s that”.

During the focus groups, I asked the young people what parents had told them to do when stopped by the police and I received similar responses to the advice given to Black communities in the United States of America. Brunson and Weitzer’s (2011) study found several of the respondents to provide advice to youth on how to act around police, the advice is summarised:

• Do not be rude to police, always say yes sir, yes sir, don’t be hot-headed
• Do not run
• “Be cooperative” and “just be quiet”
• Keep your hands in plain view where they can see them.
• Obey, do what they say

The young Travellers’ parent’s advice was very similar:
• “Don’t open your mouth, be Quiet, do not argue with the guards, don’t be cheeky, no back-talk”
• “Keep still, don’t act all fidgety”
• “Don’t Run”
• “Stay calm, don’t let them draw your temper out”
• “Don’t be cheeky”
• “Do what they say”

According to Van Ausdale and Feagin (2001, p. 189-190) “since racism exists at all levels of society and is interwoven in all aspects of social life, it is virtually impossible for alert young children either to miss or ignore it. Brian Fanning (2009) talks about the psychological impact of children witnessing parents performing submissive behaviour as children can recognise a parent’s change of behaviour. Far from being oblivious to racism, “children are inundated with it from the moment they enter society” (Ausdale 2001). Coming from my own experience as a Traveller I agree with Ausdale. Young Travellers learn early of their social and cultural status in Irish society, many incidents of racism and discrimination are witnessed by children from the moment they are born:

Mauire (early teens) “…I was in the car with my brother when he got arrested...they pulled over the van just after leaving the site and were roaring straight away...they told him to get out of the van...he had tax and insurance and everything but they wouldn’t listen so he just got out and they arrested him...left me there by myself...I’d to walk back up the road to the site...one of the boys got the van...I hate seeing him bow down to them”

Both direct and indirect experiences of hostility and discrimination has an effect on the children’s self and group concepts; awareness of racist attitudes and practices of the majority population become obvious at an early age. Warnings and stories from parents, grandparents etc. feed into the young people’s own perceptions of those they will encounter. Throughout all my focus groups and walks, the young people talked about their parent’s experiences and suggested that their own experiences are:

“not much different only that it was different times”, “I know mommy and Dada had it hard but they always say ‘oh in my day...ye have it too easy these days’, like, I know they were evicted and moved on loads of times until they got a house but we are stuck now, people call us settled Travellers but we are in limbo coz we are not settled people, we are still Travellers and people still treat us bad”, “Mommy warns me every time I go
outside the door to stay away from..., I know she just trying to protect me”, “like do you know when you hear about the stuff that happened Travellers it just makes you mad coz that stuff is still happening to us today...oh like evictions and not being allowed go anywhere, it’s like we are stuck in time, like, will I be telling my grandchildren the same stories I was told?, when will it stop?”. Maggie (early-twenties)

The burden of past/historical and present experiences of racism is evident by how the young people in this study negotiated their space in the city:

Field note extract August 19th 2016

...As I walked with the young people today they suggested we go into an amusement centre but only 2 of us at a time and wait a couple of minutes before the next two enter, I asked them why is this and one boy suggested it was because that’s the only way they get in and their parents had told them to...

As stated above, recently an un-named leisure centre in Ireland was fined for having a ‘three Travellers only at one-time rule’ (Deegan, G. 2017). These types of racist policies tell us that the Traveller parent’s advice is coming from real experiences. The young Travellers instrumental use of space is shaped by their ‘duel memory’ of experiences in which codes of navigation are passed down from parents; they learn how to manage or avoid negative encounters by following these codes that are intended to reduce the risks. Brunson and Weitzer (2011, p.426) demonstrated “the existence of a code of conduct designed to reduce the chances of unwanted police contact and also shows that males and African Americans who disregard the code face a unique risk”.

The historical and on-going events of anti-Traveller legalisations and practices aimed at absorption and assimilation, suppressing and rejecting ethnic identity while simultaneously committing cultural genocide has led to severe trauma that is being passed down from generation to generation. The intergenerational effects of trauma are transmitted through the narrative of memory where the events are told and re-told, re-claiming the collective memory; combined with real life experiences the young Travellers have the extra burden of a ‘dual memory’. This ‘dual memory’ is developed upon past events of injustice suffered by Traveller parents and it continues to develop by contemporary forms of injustice that form a subconscious masked system of intense grief. According to Alexander (2004, p.1)
“this cultural trauma occurs when members of a collectivity feel they have been subjected to a horrendous event that leaves indelible marks upon their group consciousness, marking their memories forever and changing their future identity in fundamental and irrevocable ways”.

The prolonged exchange and engagement of trauma reveals itself through the profound psychological effects it has on young Travellers in Galway city. Within the urban space the young Travellers encounter trauma when their physical space is threatened by negativity directed towards their ethnic identity that reinforces and activates the ‘dual memory’ in order to overcome some of the internalised racialisation. The casual relationship between the dual memory and the structured system of weaving between spaces seems to act as not only a challenge but as a progressive social response to exclusion. The intergenerational trauma disguises itself by acting as a social protection that can negotiate spatial encounters by enlightening the young Travellers with tactics. The objective qualities of this triggers the subjective emotional response of dismissing societal responsibility for the traumatic events which then become distorted; the dominant organisers of the events indicts the victims as perpetrators of their own plight leaving them with a sense of humiliation without solving the issue. The pain endured by generational trauma is suppressed by governing bodies that continue to ignore the impact of their anti-Traveller attitudes which creates yet another layer of trauma by silence.

5:6:5 Conclusion
This section has analysed and discussed the primary tactics utilised by the young Travellers in this research. The four main tactics of compliance, passing, hiding in plain sight and armouring reveals the spatial and social context that young Travellers find themselves in. The socio-spatial marginalisation of young Travellers’ is generated and reproduced through the open and discrete social process of the dominating sedentarism that occupies and governs urban spaces. The racialised spaces mark a location of social privilege that have expressions of hate encouraging the absence of racialised ‘bodies’ as can be seen in my maps. Exclusion through the experience of racism in the urban city contributes to the feelings of internalised racism, young Travellers’ turn ‘inward’ believing that non-Travellers are superior and that racism in urban public spaces is ‘a fact’ and tactics are needed to navigate those spaces. The cultural hegemony of sedentarism in Ireland makes it difficult for Travellers to avoid perceiving themselves through the eyes
of those who consider them to be inferior; “they see us as dirt and you just can’t help feeling like dirt then, it makes you question yourself” (James mid-teens). The pervasive ideology of Irish settled ethnocentrism creeps into every aspect of life for young Travellers’ and their social reality, “it replaces their natural outlook and understanding of the world with that of what has been moulded for them by those who subdue them” (Fanon, 2016).
Chapter 6: The spatial construction of Traveller subjugation

6:1 Introduction

What about race can we understand better through the lens of space? How is racial inequality organised spatially? How do spaces come to be known and used in racialised terms? These are the questions that were the starting point for my research and I was driven to examine these questions specifically through the lens of Travellers’ experiences of space. Specifically, I sought to use these questions as a means of interrogating whether and how young Travellers’ experiences of urban space are shaped by their identity as Irish Travellers, by sedentarism and by anti-Traveller racism. My motivation for carrying out this research came from my own childhood experiences as an actively nomadic Traveller where I witnessed and encountered numerous acts of anti-Traveller hostility centring on the use of space, and from my contemporary experiences as a Traveller activist, a role in which I regularly encounter community members who have been denied access to, or egress from aspects of urban space, or whose transit through space is otherwise restricted because of their identity as Irish Travellers.

Although sociological in orientation and drawing heavily on urban studies, I locate this research theoretically within the field of Traveller Studies, as my primary purpose has been to document and theorise the manner in which young Travellers experience racism in urban space.

6:2 Transferability

This study of the experiences of young Irish Travellers living in the city of Galway provides empirical evidence of the banality of anti-Traveller racism and the hegemonic status of sedentarist values. It documents the marginal position of Irish Traveller identity in the national culture, and the manner in which this is made manifest at a local level in young Travellers’ experiences of urban space. This research has documented multiple narratives of encounters between young Travellers and members of the majority population which highlight the manifestation of anti-Traveller racism in denial of access to commercial premises; police stops; and racial harassment in public space; experiences of discrimination and hostility which limit young Travellers’ capacity to activate their right to the city and indeed to participate in urban space on an equal basis. Both the
commonplace character and normalisation of these experiences speaks to a reality which rather than being specific to the city of Galway, is rooted in a hierarchical ordering of sedentarist and traditionally nomadic cultures, an ideology of sedentarist superiority (McVeigh 2007; 2010 and 2012), which operates on a national scale and has deep historical roots in the philosophy of social Darwinism and bourgeois nationalist ideals (MacLaughlin 1998).

Quoting Toni Morrison’s (1992, p.4) conception of a “wholly racialised world”, Delaney (2002) asks what this would look like in practise. This research goes some way to answering that question with respect to Irish Travellers and the findings of this study speak to the city as a wholly sedentarist space. Theoretically, my findings provide transferable insights into the lived experience of what Delaney (2002) refers to as ‘racialised space’ and ‘spatialised race’. Young Travellers experiences reveal a different spatial reality structured by the racialisation and subjugated position of their ethnic identity, which requires the use of structured\textsuperscript{12}, controlled\textsuperscript{13} and refined\textsuperscript{14} tactics to participate in and traverse sedentarist ‘racialised space’ and claim their right to the city. The banality of the social processes through which Travellers are excluded from public space normalises anticipation of anti-Traveller hostility in urban space and sustains the absence of racialised ‘bodies’. Equally, the material conditions, stigmatisation, segregation, and sedentarist policing and governance of ‘Traveller space’ contribute to the maintenance of inequality on the basis of racialised difference in Galway, i.e. the ‘spatialisation of race’.

This final chapter presents the theoretical conclusions of this thesis with respect to the mutually constitutive relationship between racialisation and space, as it is experienced by Travellers.

\textsuperscript{12} Structured in the sense that tactics have been built and continue to be built in response to different experiences

\textsuperscript{13} Controlled because the young Travellers find themselves controlling their bodies and actions in accordance to dominant settled society

\textsuperscript{14} Refined because the tactics are regularly altered as the young Travellers learn which are successful or not.
6:3 Invisible presence

The historic denial of Traveller ethnicity has permitted local authorities to either deliberately or subconsciously render the historical presence of Travellers and Traveller culture within the urban area invisible. For young Travellers ethnicity is an important aspect of their personal identity. Yet, their identity is not visible in the city that they, and many of their parents and grandparents, call home. In Galway City, the city museum’s single Traveller-centric exhibition was an exception (see Galway City Museum). Traveller culture has not been designed into the city. There are no roundabouts, statues or buildings that symbolise Traveller history or identity. According to Bridge and Watson (2003) and Appadurai (2001) ‘the subject's experience is determined by narratives which give origin to a double process; on the one hand the individual shapes the city, and on the other the city shapes the individual’. The invisibility of Traveller culture in the urban space speaks to the marginal position of the ethnic group in the mind-set of the city authorities and their absence from positions of influence. According to Cook and Whowell (2011) policing public space is “about making ‘troubling’ populations selectively invisible and visible in public space”. I argue that the invisibility of Traveller culture and identity in the city not only excludes young Travellers from public spaces but it also constructs them as ‘socially deviant’, a ‘suspect community’. Exclusion from public space feeds into the negative stereotypes of Travellers as ‘trouble’, as the lack of social contact invests (often negative) media and political representations of Traveller culture with greater power. The lack of visibility of Traveller culture in the urban city centre also contributes to feelings of isolation; young Travellers are aware that their identity poses a risk when going into the city. Biggart et al (2009) “found that among 7-12-year-old Traveller children there was an ‘acute and widespread’ sense of exclusion”.

6:4 The macro-level racialisation of Traveller’s relationship to space

According to Neely and Samura (2011, p.1934) “racialising bodies and groups has always been linked to the theft of land and the control of space”. Anti-nomadism and anti-Traveller racism have long shaped the socio-spatial reality of Travellers’ lives. The history of Travellers in Ireland is characterised by policies oriented to fixing Travellers in space, informed by racialising constructions of nomadic identity as a threat to society (Bancroft 2000). At the same time, spaces traditionally associated with and key to the maintenance of Traveller culture have been placed out of bounds, appropriated for the
exclusive service of sedentarist values. Travellers have been subjected to gradual forced settlement where ‘closure and control’ (see Levitas 2005; Crowley 2014 and Wood 2017) act as an instrumental tool of sedentary power. The aim of many laws addressing Traveller’s relationship to space has been to “make many of the spaces central to the maintenance of Traveller culture legally ‘unenterable’ (Crowley 2007). In Mitchell's (1997) terms, “Traveller space has been annihilated by law” and as Bancroft (2005) says “the legislation is symptomatic of the 'taken-for-granted' nature of sedentary socio-spatial hegemony” (cited in Crowley 2007).

6.5 Traveller-specific accommodation as racialised space

Based on the findings of this research, I theorise Traveller-specific accommodation as racialised spaces of exclusion within the city. Policies providing for Traveller-specific accommodation become apparent in this research as miserly concessions to a ‘non-normative’ culture. Such accommodation may appear initially as isolated reserves of Traveller primacy within sedentarist space. I argue however that this research shows how the spatial segregation of Travellers can serve both as an integrative and protective device to the stigmatised Traveller population, and as a tool of confinement and control (see Powell 2013). This research has found that when young Travellers operate in these segregated spaces they feel like they can “be themselves” away from the gaze of settled society, however they are also conscious that even these spaces are subject to sedentarist values.

I argue that, being owned, governed and controlled by authorities which espouse sedentarist ideologies, Traveller-specific accommodation exemplifies the evolution of policies controlling Travellers’ relationship to space in line with a wider movement “from one exclusively consisting of conformist regulation to one supplemented by coercion and co-option in return for recognition and rights” (Crowley 2007). Rather than promoting Traveller culture, I assert that in their current form they contribute to segregating and marginalising us into racialised spaces that are not culturally appropriate. The static reality of ‘culturally appropriate’ accommodation is not altered by the presence of bays and trailers; the confinement of Travellers to designated spaces serves to maintain the control and dominance of the sedentary majority over urban space. In its current form, Traveller-specific accommodation is the exception which underscores the totality of
6.6 Traveller-specific accommodation and the spatialisation of race

The spatial fixing and separation is one of the most visible manifestations of anti-Traveller culture, i.e. accommodation which reflects a nomadic tradition but does not cater for it, reproduces a stigmatised image of Travellers, which I argue exemplifies the manner in which the constitution of space can in turn contribute to racial formation and racial order. The strategy of sedentarism has manoeuvred visible Traveller culture (because many Travellers live among the majority) into constrained and regulated spaces that have limited majority population contact (Bancroft, 2005). Halting sites are “spatial manifestations of the racial phenomenon because they are spatial forms of othering” (Neely and Samura 2011). In a context of virulent anti-Traveller racism, many young Travellers operate in these spaces by default. This segregation promotes social distance and, I argue, constructs Travellers as ‘needing to be controlled’ because our most visible tradition is restricted and limited to be practiced only in designed confines, or outside of the law.

In some cases Traveller-specific accommodation is located on ‘left-over spaces’, unwanted by the sedentary majority. As this research exemplifies, these racialised spaces of exclusion are often invisible spaces that are located in urban peripheral spaces. Wacquant (2004, p.6) suggests that the ghetto-

“might be most profitably studied...alongside the reservation, the refugee camp, and the prison, as belonging to a broader class of institutions for the forced confinement of dispossessed and dishonoured groups”.

Halting sites, in their current form, can be defined as ghettos, like Anderson’s (2014) ‘iconic ghetto’, wherein Black people usually were relegated to the least desirable sections of a city, often “across the tracks” from the white communities, or in the “black sections” of town. The construction of halting sites in marginal locations is, as Powell (2007) states, “a further example of the way in which Travellers are channelled to specific locations and away from mainstream residential settlements”.

sedentarist space – to quote Delaney (2002, p.7) “there is no ‘outside’ to a wholly racialised world” and there are no islands of Traveller autonomy in sedentarist Ireland.
Sibley (1998) declares that the ‘Gypsy camp’ represents a form of ‘administered squalor’. Such spaces do not lend themselves to positive valuations of Traveller culture either on the part of the majority population or on the part of Travellers themselves. The configuration of ‘culturally appropriate’ accommodation as a space of hardship (see Pavee Point 2011; ITM 2010; GTM 2010) contributes I argue, to concretising the hierarchical ordering of Traveller culture as inferior. Drawing on Greenfields and Smith (2015), I argue that the spatial confinement of Travellers is complicit in racial formation, while our confinement in conditions of material deprivation serves to legitimise racist public attitudes towards Travellers.

6:7 Racialis-ed/ing spatial encounters in a wholly sedentarist space

Young Travellers interpret the city as a racialised space that “don’t want us here” and that is “racist”. As geographer Staeheli (2001) points out, the very presence of certain bodies in public space can be a political act. The racialised conflicts and negotiations over the presence of young Traveller bodies within urban space confirms the hegemonic status of sedentary culture within the ethnic imaginary of Galway city. This racial order is not just revealed but sustained through these spatial encounters. Challenges to the legitimate presence and participation of Travellers in the urban space signal and defend the sedentary population’s control over the spaces that Travellers occupy. Cheryl Harris (1993) highlights how white people’s control requires an ‘unjust (dis)placement’. The development of tactics by young Travellers is reclamation of agency, and a means of circumventing this unjust displacement. The tactics developed and deployed by the young people do not, however, either challenge or resist the hegemonic status of sedentarist values. It is important to state that such acts of resistance do happen and the community of Irish Travellers as a whole has a long and proud history of organising to advocate for their rights (see Pavee Point; ITM and GTM) and many charismatic and outspoken leaders who challenge anti-nomadism and anti-Traveller racism at the highest levels. This research, however, exemplifies the obstacles to self-advocacy for the ordinary young Traveller, doubly devalued and disadvantaged in encounters with settled adults by their age and their ethnicity. For the young people in this study, the totalising character of sedentarist culture makes direct challenges to sedentarist privilege and anti-Traveller racism risky. These risks are acknowledged also by their parents, who caution them against direct conflict with settled people. Tactics such as compliance, passing and hiding
in plain sight do not challenge the existing racial order as such, but are the safest option for young Travellers living with the anticipation of hostility and discrimination and without the anticipation of access to justice. The parallels with the tactics and logics in evidence among young Black men (in particular) living with the risks of contemporary racism, including police racism, in the U.S.A. are striking (Anderson 1995). City spaces have long been governed with the aim of control, discipline and expulsion (see Foucault, 1975), and contemporary cities such as Galway use the same strategies of “keeping order: police and security personnel use discipline to keep order in public spaces, where crude expulsion is in principle often illegal. A key feature here is the way in which, once identified as ‘for the common-good’, many of these surveillance and control mechanisms are accepted and uncontested by individuals and communities, who themselves become active in their enforcement” (Fopp, 2002).

6:8 Summary

The right to the city for young Travellers “is like a cry and demand” (De Certeau 1984). The proudly cosmopolitan city of Galway does not, in this analysis, welcome the culture of Travellers belonging to the city; the ideology of sedentarism has produced urban space with a dominant set of codes which do not include nomadism. The sharp contrast between the bleak environment of ‘Traveller space’ and the internationally lauded beauty of Galway’s public space reflects a larger and more deeply rooted hierarchical ordering of cultures; the social distance between the settled and Traveller populations is immense and, as one of Galway city’s councillors asserted, “Let’s be honest, no councillor or no neighbourhood will want a halting site next to them” (Crowe, Connacht Tribune 2016).

The construction of racialised space in Galway city reflects the wider social, cultural and historical embeddedness of anti-Traveller racism in Ireland and beyond. The concentration of ‘settled’ power in the design, governance and policing of the urban space has constructed a divided city that excludes young Travellers. Glenny (2012: p.vii) outlines that people in Europe are becoming more intolerant to cultural and social diversity with a huge rise in anti-gypsy discrimination since the 1990s. This European trend is perpetuated in a more globalised Ireland as its population accesses outside media, as well as indigenous, State and independent media which too often reinforce negative views of Travellers.
The racialisation of Travellers, in turn, constructs each individual as a ‘representative’ of the community. All the young Travellers in this study discussed feelings of annoyance and frustration due to having to act as a representative of the community whenever they ventured into public spaces. Always having to think about how your actions are going to reflect on the community arguably creates a dissonance that prevents one participating in and enjoying urban space as an individual.

The racialised spaces of the city encourage the absence of racialised ‘bodies’. Racialised space has necessitated an instrumental approach to the city. Going into the city was never about just hanging around for the young Travellers participating in this study. Equally, it is the existence of racialised space that has necessitated the development of a highly organised and detailed system of spatial navigation. The spatialised racial order is manifest in young Travellers’ accounts of being denied access to space, tightly surveilled, and stopped and searched. Indeed, it is manifest in the necessity of tactics to navigate the city, tactics which are in turn shaped by Travellers’ ‘dual memory’ of experiences of hostility in which codes of navigation designed to reduce the risk of encountering racism are passed down by parents. The intergenerational communication of tactics designed to counteract anticipated danger speaks to a culture of fear within the community, which is arguably informed by past and present experiences, not just of encounters at the micro-level in urban space, but also of eviction, imprisonment and institutionalisation.

According to Uslaner (2002, p.91) “race is the life experience that has the biggest impact on trust”. Generations of discrimination and oppression inflicted upon the Traveller community have conceivably contributed to young Travellers’ difficulties in trusting ‘outsiders’. Certainly, the issue of trust, or rather lack of trust, was a central theme in my data and was linked to past and present social and spatial experiences. According to Smith (2010, p.461)

“greater levels of distrust among members of ethno-racial minority groups can also be attributed to ethno-racial socialisation or to the mechanisms, whether subtle or overt, deliberate or unintentional, through which verbal and nonverbal messages are conveyed to the younger generation about race and ethnicity”.
Having received messages of distrust from parents and extended family, young Travellers learn not to trust ‘outsiders’- and the social confinement and isolation this feeds, in turn contributes to reproducing the distrust.

The character of the tactics deployed in anticipation of hostility speaks also to the creeping influence of hegemonic sedentarism on young Travellers’ self-perception: “it replaces their natural outlook and understanding of the world with that of what has been moulded for them by those who subdue them” (Fanon, 2016). Many of the tactics deployed spoke to the performance of a ‘trustworthy citizen’, defined in accordance with the values of sedentarism. The hegemony of sedentarist values privileges the perspective of sedentary residents facilitating the principle of ‘I am what you say I am’. The ubiquity of racist stereotypes influences young Travellers to internalise sedentarist ideas, beliefs and attitudes about us and our community. Patterns of internalised racialisation result in, what Lipsky (1987, p.5) refers to as ‘internalised stereotypes’:

“Patterns of internalised racism have caused us [as Blacks] to accept many of the stereotypes of Blacks created by the oppressive majority society. We have been taught to be angry at, ashamed of, anything that differs too much from a mythical idea of the middle-class of the majority culture—skin that is “too dark,” hair that is “too kinky,” dress, talk, and music that is “too loud”.

The high volume of negative images and messages about Travellers disseminated to the public are absorbed and harboured through the unconscious act of evaluating in-group identities through the lens of out-group stereotypes. Some participants noted how the widespread negative descriptions of Travellers in the media undermined Traveller culture and identity which reinforced a sense of Traveller inferiority. Some feelings of shame were raised during the discussions which indicate internalised racism.

Internalised oppression and racialisation are psychologically distressing; constant exposure to the oppressive system of racism ultimately bestows young Travellers with feelings of negativity towards self and community. Hall (1986, p.26) defines internalised racism as “the ‘subjection’ of the victims of racism to the mystifications of the very racist ideology which imprison and define them”. That the performance of an other ‘person with ‘good’ qualities’ is provoked by the risk perceived in spatial encounters speaks loudly to the spacialised character of race.
I have argued throughout this thesis that Irish Travellers are unable to activate their right to the city and that Traveller identity is a barrier to access and participation in urban space. My findings show a racially ordered hierarchy that influences the way in which young Travellers navigate the city. I focused on the development and deployment of tactics (De Certeau 1984) as a means by which to unpack the racialisation of space as a lived reality for young Irish Travellers. The results of this analysis also sensitised me to the ways in which the ordering of space, and the movement of certain bodies out of or to the peripheral or hidden parts of that space, contributes to racial formation.

6.9 Controlling public space? Building a new urban space?

The State’s spatial management and control of Travellers is intended to preserve the existing social and spatial order (Bancroft 2005) and has the effect, whether by design or otherwise, of sedentarising and assimilating us. City planning in Ireland has a long history of spatial differentiation, including the production of distinct areas containing small groupings of Travellers. Indeed, the Report of the Commission on Itineracy (1963) made it possible and justifiable to contain and isolate my community into particular parts of the city, simultaneously depriving us of a quality of resources and interactions that are enjoyed by the majority culture. As my data shows, this differentiation is still manifest today. In a UN debate on securing the right to the city Safier (2005) stated that there are a

“number of cities where rights to the city are not only being refused or abused in practice, but systematically violated and denied…In these cities what is in question is not who is excluded from a “Right To the City” on grounds of their status as citizens or inhabitants, immigrants or others, nor the scope and access of participation in the governance of the city. It is rather the status and treatment of whole groups of people on the grounds that they do not and should not be allowed to share the same urban space and society because of their affiliation or ‘belonging’ to a particular collective cultural community national, ethnic, religious, linguistic and therefore are denied both equality and justice where the right to the city is concerned” (UNESCO 2005, p.30).

Lefebvre (1991, p.59) asserts that as “Change life!” ‘Change society!’ … mean nothing without the production of an appropriate space’ (Lefebvre 1991, p.59). So how do we rise
to Lefebvre’s challenge to produce appropriate space? By understanding that spatial exclusion and spatial divisions are constructed politically, economically and socially, we can work towards re-balancing the spatial scales. I assert that we need to build interaction and mutual respect if we are to address division and competition between communities within the city. I further argue that this socio-spatial shift requires a greater dispersion of power, an engagement with the “alternative urbanisms that are practiced by spatially excluded populations” (Davis 2016, p.12) which official stakeholders will experience as a departure from the framework of hierarchies and order that underpin their authority and legitimacy.

The balance of socio-spatial power continues to be in favour of the State, in urban areas inequality and exclusion generally result from some form State ordering of territory (Lefebvre 1974) ranging from modernist urban planning practices on the one hand to police control over urban spaces on the other (Ibhawoh, 2014). Efforts to impose social and spatial order in Ireland include a history of curbing Traveller movement. This thesis has argued that Government attempts to produce spatial and social order have contributed to a set of inter-related spatial, social, economic, and political problems that have served to reinforce divisions between Traveller and sedentary populations. At the micro-level, spatio-racial practices of exclusion shape young Travellers’ everyday life and their right to the city is infringed upon. According to my data, produced in respect to the case of Galway city, the stakeholders who have the power to tip the scale towards respectful engagement with ‘alternative urbanisms’ are local authorities, the police, commercial bodies (particularly in the lesire and hospitality industries), public services, sporting clubs and organisations, and ordinary citizens. The data tells us that there are many shortcomings to the manner in which these stakeholders treat young Travellers as city dwellers and citizens. The data makes it clear that, among some members of the majority culture, there is a crucial lack of understanding about Traveller culture and identity. Equally, the same cohort displays a lack of respect for Travellers’ claims to space and a lack of critical reflexivity regarding their own privileged access. In turn, young Travellers’ own understanding of their identity is informed by their treatment as ‘inferior social beings’, and they regard discriminatory and other hostile actions as unlikely to attract consequences. As stated throughout this thesis, the tactics adopted by young
Travellers are not empowering enough to tip the scales of power and challenge the institutions of spatialised race or racialised space.

A socio-spatial shift necessitates the acknowledgement that multiple forms of anti-Traveller racism exist, including less conscious forms characterised, not by malicious intent and overt hostility, but by the normative power of hegemonic sedentarism informs logics of governance and control which deny my community any socio-spatial control or justice. This situation not only impacts on Travellers, but the whole population of the city. Social distance and a lack of mutual understanding makes it difficult for both Travellers and the sedentary majority to enjoy shared public spaces and thus fully activate their right to the city. Going forward, I argue that we need to focus on building awareness among both the sedentary population and Travellers of their mutual interest in bridging that divide and generating understanding. The production of a new shared city space requires “correcting imbalances, restoring broken relationships – with healing, harmony and reconciliation” (Ibhawoh 2014, p.4). I argue that a more equitable relationship will benefit both communities. Some brief recommendations for urban planners/NGO’s/the Police etc. are as follows:

- Policy- specific policies, programmes, plans and targets, equality proofing to support appropriate and sustainable forms of Traveller culture. Strategies for improving cultural capacity of mainstream services.

- Train for better practice

- Consult- opportunities for meaningful participation by Traveller stakeholders in decision making.

- Monitor and Audit- data collection and monitoring against targets. Dedicated, ongoing research effort and an evaluation of outcomes.
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