

# ULRR

## Evaluation of anti-discrimination interventions targeting the links between political discourse, antigypsyism and collective action, In Ireland.

Item Type	Report
Authors	O'Connor, Ashley;Minescu, Anca;Völgyesi, Arpi
Publisher	<a href="https://polrom.eu/">https://polrom.eu/</a>
Download date	2026-03-09 12:34:58
Item License	<a href="https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/1.0/">https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/1.0/</a>
Link to Item	<a href="https://hdl.handle.net/10344/9739">https://hdl.handle.net/10344/9739</a>

**Identifying Evidence-Based Methods to Effectively Combat Discrimination of the Roma in the  
Changing Political Climate of Europe (PoIRom)**

***Evaluation of Anti-discrimination Interventions Targeting the Links between Political  
Discourse, Antigypsyism and Collective Action***

**Workpackage 4 Country Report: Ireland**

Prepared by Ashley O'Connor, Anca Minescu and Arpi Völgyesi

<https://polrom.eu/>

PoIROM — REC-AG-2017 / REC- RDIS-DISC-AG-2017



**Executive summary**

- **A review of prejudice reduction and anti-discrimination interventions addressing Travellers in Ireland** was conducted in May-June 2019 resulting in a collection of 23 entries. **The Classification Table** designed to provide an overview of these interventions was analysed, concluding that interventions could be best described and clustered in 3 categories: **Educational Interventions & General Diversity Training (category 1), Interactive, Experiential and Intergroup Interventions (category 2), and Public Showcasing Interventions (Category 3)**. The majority of the documented interventions in our research belonged to the first category.
- In line with the objectives of the PoIRom project looking into the impact of political discourse and normative predictors of antigypsyism as well as the potential to engage in collective action in solidarity or against the Traveller community, we designed **a protocol for follow-up focus group discussions with organizers and participants in various interventions**. We were interested in the psychological processes that facilitate or hinder interpersonal and intergroup relationships during the interventions. A set of 7 topics was identified which highlighted several potential social psychological processes at work: identity, engagement, funders (political discourse), collective action, gender issues, normative context, emotions
- We conducted **3 focus groups** with members from 2 organizations and researchers who worked in a community setting with Traveller and Settled people, in order to conduct a psychological evaluation of interventions. The thematic analysis of these discussions revealed 3 main themes: **how group identities are defined and how the divisions within and between groups are formulated** (theme 1), **the lack of cohesion in approaching anti-Traveller racism and Traveller social inclusion** (theme 2), and **the possibility and need of creating political solidarity with the Traveller and other minority groups** (theme 3). Participants discussed the barriers as well as opportunities in achieving systemic change in decreasing prejudice and discrimination and promoting social inclusion.
- We conclude with **recommendations addressed at funders and government organizations, at community organizations and at individuals** working with anti-discrimination and social inclusion interventions at the grass-roots.

## ***Aims and Objectives***

The main aim of the research presented in this report was to identify and evaluate prejudice and discrimination intervention methods in Ireland. We collected, classified and analysed interventions running in Ireland in 2019. Furthermore, we conducted focus groups with a small subsample of the organizations running interventions, to assess whether and how interventions have the potential to improve intergroup relations and encourage societal change. Overall, we aimed to formulate a systematic overview linking social psychological theory with grass-roots practices in interventions to prevent prejudice and discrimination.

The objectives of the research in Workpackage 4 were:

- To create a database of anti-discrimination interventions\* targeting 3 main processes: political discourses of hate and nativism, antigypsyism, and the willingness to engage in collective action in solidarity or against Travellers in Ireland.
- To identify best practice in anti-discrimination interventions
- To identify which methodological approaches organizers and participants consider to be most effective in reducing prejudice and improving relations between the Irish Settled majority and the Irish Traveller minority.
- To evaluate the experience of both organizers and participants of prejudice and anti-discrimination intervention.

\*By “intervention” we mean any activity whose explicit goal was to improve the attitudes of the majority towards the Traveller minority, or to improve relations between the majority and minority groups.

In order to achieve our aim, we designed a **two-phase plan**. We present each phase separately (methods, data and results, for each phase). We then present our recommendations for practice and conclusions, drawing on the results from both phases. **Phase one** includes the methods used to gather and analyse the interventions along with results of this analysis. **Phase two** describes the method, analysis and results of the focus groups.

## ***Phase 1 – Intervention Classification Database***

### **Objectives:**

- To gather and classify anti-discrimination interventions aimed at reducing Traveller prejudice in Ireland.
- To analyze this data
- To use the analysis to inform the composition and running of focus groups with people who ran and participated in these interventions.

## **Research Strategy**

The process for conducting this piece of research consisted of three steps.

**Step 1:** Based on PoIROM objectives, we designed a classification table. Then we conducted an internet search for interventions and the data was screened based on inclusion/exclusion criteria; interventions matching the criteria were included in the database.

**Step 2:** We analysed the interventions database using **content analysis to identify clusters/categories** that would best describe the interventions. Three main categories were generated.

**Step 3:** Guided by the theoretical models from the PolRom project and the classification of interventions in the 3 clusters we identified which organizations to invite to the focus groups and **designed focus group questions**. These questions were to be used to guide the focus groups and gather information to better understand how the interventions worked, how they were run, and evaluated by the organizers and participants.

### Step 1 - Method of data collection for the intervention table

The aim of the POLROM project was to identify evidence-based methods to effectively combat discrimination of the Roma in the changing political climate of Europe. It addresses majority attitudes towards Roma and the Traveller community and the evaluation of interventions aimed to reduce antigypsyism and influence collective action for or against the Traveller community. Based on these objectives of the larger PolRom project, we designed an intervention classification table considering the following aspects of interventions.

Firstly, while we did not exclude interventions in which Travellers and Roma participated, given the scope of the overall project, we specifically searched for **interventions in which the majority (Settled population in Ireland) participated**. However, these seemed to be few, given that the Decade of Roma Inclusion (2005-2015) promoted interventions focused on Roma and Traveller inclusion, but did not target improving majority attitudes.

Secondly, given that the **normative context in Europe** is one of prejudice and institutionalised racism towards the Roma and Traveller communities, we wanted to investigate how (or if) the interventions were funded and designed to address norms of tolerance and antiracism. In order to do this we wanted to know **who ran and funded** the interventions, i.e., the government (despite or on the background of institutionalised racism) or NGO groups with a specific agenda (politically driven or aimed to decrease prejudice). We also recorded any link to national or local policy in order to capture these normative aspects.

Thirdly, in order to effectively evaluate the interventions from a psychological standpoint and in order to make accurate recommendations, we needed to understand how the activities actually worked and what psychological mechanisms might have been targeted. This required a **description of activities**, who they involved, and how they were realized (i.e., public for a versus ongoing community level activities).

Lastly, as the evaluation part of any project is key to building further recommendations, we wanted to know if there was already **an evaluation completed by the organisation once the intervention was finished**. However, practical and funding constraints often led to most interventions concluding with no formal evaluations. The main reasons seemed to include short term funding projects, which do not have time or money built in for an evaluation and the lack of psychological expertise to run comprehensive behavioural and attitudinal assessments of change. Therefore, it was important to record if there was an evaluation.

Considering the above considerations, **we designed the Classification Table** (See Figure 1) to record the following for each intervention:

- The name of the intervention and link to its website/materials/information page
- Target group – **majority (priority) or minority or both**.

- **Who ran the intervention** (government organization or an NGO) and was there a **policy link**;  
The agent responsible for the programme implementation and the source of funding
- What were the **activities** and what were **psychological processes** involved? (The goal of the intervention; and Procedure and projected outcome of the intervention)
- **Was there an evaluation**

**Figure 1: Classification table.**

Name of the intervention (website)	1. Intervention outcome –	2.Target group	3.Procedure	4. Link to policy?	5.Agent	6. Evaluation of their impact	7.Comments	8.Follow up with Focus group

**Data collection**

The data collection for the intervention table was conducted between **May and June 2019**. In accordance with the procedure that the research team agreed on, the following selection criteria we used for including the interventions in the database:

- An online search was conducted for interventions aimed at reducing discrimination or prejudice towards the Traveller community
- Interventions that were conducted in the period from 2005 up to 2019 were included
- Intervention which contained materials either specifically targeting Traveller-related prejudice, discrimination, integration, or racism in a broader sense but also including aspects relevant to anti-Traveller-prejudice, were included.
- The search included community projects, awareness campaigns or trainings, events, as well as research activities with any potential experimental intervention built-in.
- Interventions could only be included if information on them was available online between May to June 2019.
- Interventions or activities which focused solely on Traveller issues regarding housing, healthcare and education and which did not have an anti-discrimination angle were excluded.
- Interventions directed at attitudes and interactions between groups were included.
- Activities or programs which had a focus on the wider promotion of tolerance among the majority population (settled) aimed to decrease prejudice and discrimination in general (not specifically targeted to Travellers) were included.

We used these criteria to screen interventions and at the end of this phase, the initial pool of interventions in Ireland included 23 entries. We then gathered the relevant information on each of these entries and added them to the Classification Table (Appendix 3). The Table includes references to more than 23 particular interventions, because one larger project or NGO would typically run a series of programs (i.e., specific interventions).

## Step 2 – Analysing the Classification Table to identify Clusters/Categories of Interventions

Outlined below are steps we took in the initial analysis of the Classification Table.

Grounded in the method set out by Schilling (2006), the intervention table was analysed using content analysis. Content analysis is a method of analysis for which reliability is very important, reached by using multiple data coders. Two separate coders analysed the Classification Table based on a deductive approach: the interventions were coded based on our theoretical knowledge of the psychological mechanisms present in anti-discrimination and prejudice reduction interventions. We also referred to results to date (surveys from representative samples in all 5 countries), from the larger PoIRom project.

Based on these theoretical and empirical considerations, we originally identified 3 clusters as follows:

1. Interventions targeting norms and political discourse around tolerance and racism more generally.
2. Interventions targeting antigypsyism directly
3. Interventions with a collective action component or related to public involvement or events

We organised all the collected interventions according to these clusters, and further analysed the match between the theoretical clusters and the Irish interventions. Some interventions from the same entry (i.e., potentially organized by the same organization), had to be re-categorised. With the ambition of maximizing the similarities within each cluster/category, as well as the differences between the clusters/categories, we refined our cluster definition. The final 3 clusters/categories were labelled as: **Educational Interventions (General Diversity Training), Interactive, Experiential and Intergroup Interventions; and Public Showcasing Interventions.**

### Data

We describe the interventions and our analyses of the Classification Table, by focusing on the generated 3 clusters/categories of interventions. These categories also capture the theoretical knowledge available concerning the level at which prejudice reduction interventions work; i.e individual, intergroup and societal level interventions, and are in line with a previous systematic assessment of similar interventions in Scotland (McBride, 2015). For a snapshot of the clusters, please see Table 1.

The Appendix 3 Table contains all anti-discrimination and prejudice reduction interventions with the relevant information filled in the Classification Table. It is important to note that this list is not intended to be entirely exhaustive. It is possible that similar interventions were carried out during this time period but did meet the inclusion criteria but could not be included for a myriad of reasons. For example, some organizations do not have a website, others do not share details of the projects online and some do not have contact details or intervention information.

**Table 1: Classification of Interventions according to Clusters**

Clusters/Categories of Interventions	Reference to Appendix 3, Numbers indicate the respective interventions
<b>Category 1: Educational Interventions (General Diversity Training)</b>	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6,9, 10, 12, 15,16, 17, 18, 19
<b>Category 2: Interactive, Experiential and Intergroup Interventions</b>	20, 21, 22
<b>Category 3: Public Showcasing Interventions</b>	7, 8, 13, 14,22, 23

The final clusters/categories we used to classify the interventions are described below. For each category we give an overview and an example of our analyses of the psychological processes at work. In Appendix 2, we further expand on the analysis of specific interventions, which we designated as “best practice” in each of the 3 clusters.

**Category 1. Educational Interventions (General Diversity Training)**

This category contains interventions with procedures that are mainly educational, and information based and are frequently at the normative level. The main purpose of these interventions is to convey information to the participants. They are frequently, but not exclusively, carried out in school/educational settings. They are most likely to be influenced by the political discourse of the country or funder. Included in this category are general diversity interventions, diversity training for law enforcement etc, training the trainer, training NGO’s in human rights. To increase the impact of these interventions, the information is sometimes combined with discussion, peer-based learning, and cooperative learning. These interventions can use both direct and indirect contact (such as use of peer-stories) to reduce prejudice and induce empathy and perspective taking in participants.

Overall, the **education-based interventions** were the most common form of intervention, with 15 of these interventions appearing. For the most part these interventions were conducted by large, national organisations and were funded by the government, sometimes directly (Department of Education) and other times through different agencies (Pavee Point). Most of these interventions were information based and targeted majority group prejudice. Eight interventions were focused on the wider population, four were specific to a school environment and three were directed at tackling racism in sport.

Some addressed the issues of prejudice and discrimination towards the Traveller community directly, raising awareness around issues of segregation and inequality and to change attitudes. One such interventions is the **Yellow Flags Program**, which aims to support primary and secondary schools to become more inclusive of all cultures and ethnicities, celebrate diversity and challenge racism and discrimination. Other interventions take a more indirect approach tackling racism in general, promoting inclusion and raising awareness for the need for hate speech legislation. For example **‘Show racism the Red Card’** aims to tackle racism and inclusion through sport and the **‘No Hate Speech Movement’** aims to reduce the acceptance of hate speech online and lobby for legislation.

## Category 2: Interactive, experiential and intergroup interventions

This category contains interventions where the procedures are focused around explicit contact and interactions between the majority group and the Traveller population. Here intergroup contact is key. Studies have shown that intergroup contact can have positive changes in attitudes and contact intentions, can reduced prejudice, intergroup anxiety and increase empathy and trust with the outgroup (Kende, Tropp, & Lantos, 2017, Kuchenbrandt, Eysel, & Seidel, 2013).

The **second category of interventions** encompasses interventions that focus on intergroup contact between the settled and the Traveller Communities. These types of interventions aim to reduce discrimination by closing the 'gap' between *settled people and Travellers*, by facilitating quality contact between the groups and prompting respect for diversity. There are 3 interventions in this category in the Irish intervention database. This category has the least amount of intervention within, however discussion with the focus group participations does show that intergroup activities are present on the ground. It can therefore be inferred that perhaps a lot of these kinds of interventions are run at a very grassroots level and do not appear online. An example of this type of intervention is ***Donegal Travellers Project – Building Intercultural Communities Project (BIC)***, their aim is to develop positive relationships and the inclusion of and between Black Minority and Ethnic communities, including Travellers and Roma and the settled population

## Category 3: Public Showcasing Interventions

This category contains any one-off events which are public and involve the general population and aim to reach a wide audience. Here there may be intergroup contact, but it can be implicit as well as explicit. The contact may be superficial without any real engagement between the groups. These types of intervention endeavour to change norms by prompting diversity and values of harmony and universalism, challenging stereotypes, showcasing culture and encourage respect of cultural diversity and raise awareness of structural inequalities (Váradi, L., 2014; Thomas, E. F., & McGarty, C. A., 2009; Powell, A.A., Branscombe, N.R., & Scales, T.C, 2005)

This category of interventions is represented by **public events** which involve and target the **general population**. These types of interventions also aim to facilitate interaction but have the advantage of targeting a vaster public. However, the intergroup and interpersonal contact is often superficial, and the interaction is not measured or controlled, limiting its impact at reducing prejudice going forward (Scacco & Warren, 2018). In our Irish database, there are five of these kinds of showcasing interventions. An excellent example of this type of intervention is '***Traveller Pride Week' run by the Irish Traveller Movement***, a week of cultural celebration and promotion of the Traveller community. It involves the active participation of members of the Traveller community at all stages of the project (planning, implementation etc.). It celebrates and promotes Traveller culture.

### Step 3: Designing the procedure and research questions for focus groups

Guided by the theoretical models from the larger PoIRoM project we analysed the intervention categories, as well as examples identified across the 3 clusters/categories, using a thematic analysis approach (Braun and Clarke, 2006). The focus was to identify psychological processes that are typically involved in prejudice reduction and anti-discrimination interventions. The aim of the focus groups was to find out about the experience of organizers and participants in order to evaluate which type of interaction, and which type of activities might best lead to improved intergroup relationships between Travellers and the settled population. We identified 7 topics, based on the clusters of interventions, the theoretical insights and objectives of the PoIRoM project. The focus group questions were designed around these 7 topics, to assess how the interventions worked, how they were run, and how they were evaluated by organizers and participants.

The 7 topics are as follows, and the precise questions that we used as guides for the running of the focus groups are presented in Appendix 1.

#### 1) Identity

The theme of identity emerged throughout the database. The interventions in the database use identity in many ways in order to change attitudes and reduce discrimination, this is supported by the psychological literature. The results of the analysis show that different aspects of identity are employed in order to elicit change. Some interventions use common ingroup identity as a mechanism to reduce prejudice, these aims to activate social categories that both the members of the majority and the minority group belong to and identify with. Others interventions aim to change perception of what one's ingroup identity consists of, different methods are used to change the way participants see themselves as members of different groups and make identities more inclusive (for example a community level identity with the town/village/city, rather than an ethnic based division). Subthemes include: was there a collective identity established by the intervention, did the intervention aim at identity changes; were people empowered or demotivated by participating in the interventions with the "Other" group, and was there a sense of solidarity resulting from the intervention?

#### 2) Engagement with the Intervention

Engagement was the second theme. Given the wide range of activities and interventions in the database, it was obvious that there are differences in the degree to which potential participants actually engaged and to the barriers that people might have had to overcome to engage in the intervention at all.

Subthemes included the following aspects: Is the intervention preaching to the converted (i.e., did the interventions attract people who were already tolerant?); was there a potential selection bias in the design or participation of certain people to the interventions (i.e., location of intervention and means of transportation differ between participants). Was attendance mandatory and if this was so how was the engagement of the participants (i.e., just tick a box, or actual active participation)?

#### 3) Funders & Political Discourse around the Intervention

An ever-present theme when evaluating interventions aimed at prejudice-reduction is that of funding. Who is willing to sponsor an intervention? Which organization does the funding come from, and to what degree is the funding conditioned by the political agenda of the funders? How long an intervention program is also depends on funding, as well as the extent to which prejudice reduction is the main objective of the intervention as opposed to a side-effect, or a “necessary evil” (i.e., a particular funder demands ethnic or gender diversity in participation, which leads to the inclusion of minority group participants). It is necessary to identify how and if the political agenda of the funding organisation affected the content and the delivery of interventions.

#### **4) Collective Action as a Consequence of the Interventions**

As one of the main objectives of the PoIRom project was to determine the factors that could increase solidarity movements on behalf of the Traveller/Roma groups, we were interested in how interventions involved any elements of engaging in collective action. This is different than the engagement theme, which referred to how people took part in the actual intervention. The focus of the collective action theme is about the consequences of interventions, in the long term, after participating in the interventions. We wanted to investigate the link between intergroup contact and support for social change actions, for example, signing petitions, supporting the Traveller’s in their struggle for social justice and inclusion etc. Previous research suggests that minority participation in interventions may lead to them to being demotivated to engage in collective action. In other words, for a Traveller person might decrease their support for the collective political agenda of all Travellers, after participating in an intervention. As opposed to this, a settled person (majority group) might treat the intervention as only the beginning of a longer term engagement on behalf and in solidarity with the Traveller minority.

This theme highlighted the importance in understanding whether the intervention motivated or demotivated people to engage in further collective action to combat racism and discrimination against Travellers, from the perspective of both the minority and majority groups, of the organizers and participants alike.

#### **5) Gender Issues**

Guided by previous research identifying specific gender roles within the Traveller and Roma communities, as well as the experience of gendered racism from the perspective of these groups, we identified gender as a theme to be explored more in depth during the focus groups. Particular subtheme interests were: if the interventions were gender specific (i.e., addressed only to women or only to men); if the interventions addressed both genders, which people were more likely to participate and engage more, and were there gender specific barriers to engagement? Were gender specific stereotypes about Traveller men and women affect or determine the content of the interventions? Does experiencing prejudice and discrimination affect Traveller men and Traveller women differently?

#### **6) Normative Context**

Also discussed under the theme of “Funding and Political Discourse”, the issues of the normative expectations in the context of the interventions are a key focus of the PoIRom project. It was

important to be able to assess the norms around anti-Traveller prejudice. Particular subthemes were: How politically correct is antigypsyism/anti-Traveller prejudice in the country, county and at the local levels where the intervention is implemented? How does this affect the intervention, in terms of the topic of the intervention, as well as the approach and potential success of the intervention? What are the explicit and implicit norms around anti-Traveller or pro-Traveller attitudes? Was there a normative bias in the design (idea) versus the implementation of the intervention (reality); Did the intervention reinforce stereotypes or on the contrary?

## 7) Emotions

Both the literature and the survey data collected in the PoIRom project indicated to the crucial role of emotions in enforcing and or decreasing negative stereotypes, social distance and support for Travellers/Roma more generally. Thus, we were interested to hear from the organizers and participants in interventions to what degree their interventions address the specific emotional reactions of all involved? Was the engagement of the emotions part of the intervention design, or was it just a reality at the implementation stage? In particular, how did interventions deal with the emotions of anger, hope, sympathy, empathy and fear/threat. Previous research shows that morality and the ability to perceive the emotions of others humanize other groups, helping to achieve the end goal of prejudice reduction, i.e. empathy reduces prejudice. Was this also the case in the interventions included in the focus groups?

### *Phase 2 – Focus groups with Anti-Discrimination Intervention organisers.*

#### **Objectives:**

- Conduct focus groups with organisers and participants of anti-discrimination interventions.
- Analyze the focus group discussions in order to make best practice recommendations for future interventions.

#### **Research Strategy:**

The process for conducting the second phase of this project consist of three steps:

1. The focus group protocol was designed, potential participants were contacted with an invitation, and the focus group discussions were conducted.
2. The focus group discussions were analysed with thematic analysis

#### **Step 1 - Focus group design and data collection**

- a) Method of selecting focus group participants.

Based on the content analysis and the categorisation process of the interventions, it was evident that in Ireland, the interventions in Categories 1 and 2 were the most common. Therefore, the focus group participants were selected accordingly, to investigate the specific examples of the most representative interventions. An email with information about the project and the focus groups was drafted and then sent to the relevant people involved in 5 different projects.

- b) Describe the focus group participants.

We decided on the composition of focus groups as follows: include the organiser of the intervention/event, specifically a person who ran it or was directly involved in the delivery in some way, and two service user/participants; if both members of the settled and Traveller communities were involved then it should be a minimum of one from each group. Two researchers were to participate to support the discussion as well as observe and facilitate the subsequent data coding.

c) Conducting the focus group discussions

We originally planned to conduct the focus groups in person, in the Social Identity Lab in the Department of Psychology at the University of Limerick. Due to the COVID-19 lockdown, all in person focus groups were rescheduled to be conducted (and recorded) online via Microsoft Teams. The procedure was clearly explained to the participants before the online meetings began. Two researchers facilitated all focus groups.

From the 5 projects we invited, only 3 participated to the focus groups. The organizations of the three focus groups had funding by large scale EU or/and government funding scheme, yet ran their activities at grassroots community levels. The organizations operated under substantially different remits, and each organization typically runs a wide range of interventions, that we classified under the first 2 clusters/categories: Category 1-Educational Interventions (General Diversity Training) and Category 2-Interactive, Experiential and Intergroup Interventions.

**The first focus group** involved participants from West Limerick Resources, which is a community development organisation supporting positive change in the lives of people and groups in the country of Limerick. The organization works with many different groups of people, but we spoke to two members of the organization who work directly with members of the Traveller community. This focus group contained two project managers, two researches, but unfortunately no participants or members of the Traveller community could attend due the COVID -19 crisis. The focus group discussion lasted 2 hours.

**The second focus group** was with the Donegal Traveller Project, which is an independent, locally based community development organisation working for and with the Traveller Community and other minority groups, in Donegal. For over 20 years, the organization has supported Travellers to articulate their identity, to organise collectively and to work towards the realisation of their rights (refer website). This focus group contained six people, who are involved in the design and delivery of the many different interventions, most interesting to us was the Building Intercultural Communities (BIC) Project. However, the focus group ended up yielding many more insights about a wider range of interventions and how to decrease antiGypsyism and increase solidarity with other minority groups living in Donegal. The focus group consisted of one member of the Traveller community, who worked for the project and was an activist, an American migrant, an African migrant, who both lived and worked in Ireland for over 20 years, as well as 2 other Irish colleagues working on Traveller health and Roma inclusion. Two researchers also participated. The focus group discussion lasted 2.5 hours.

**The third focus group** was with two researchers from the University of Limerick, based on a recent project involving Traveller-settled interactions in a particular town in the West of Ireland. Given the difficulties in recruiting more organizations for the focus groups, and including the voice of the Travellers and Settled people as participants in interventions, we decided to obtain insights from these researchers. The researchers had interviewed community residents of Traveller ethnicity and also Irish

Settled people. The researchers shared their insights into the experiences of those interviewed, people who had previously participated in interventions or programs around personal development, inclusion, community and area development in their town.

## Step 2 – Analysis and Results of the Focus Group Discussions

We conducted a thematic analysis on the notes and transcriptions of the focus groups, according to Braun and Clarks (2006). Themes were identified at the latent or interpretative level and are rooted in a constructivist paradigm (Boyatzis, 1998, Taylor & Ussher, 2001), given that the conversation was moderated by the 2 researchers, who guided the conversation with a view to cover the previously identified 7 topics. After familiarizing ourselves with the data (Phase 1), we conducted open coding (Phase 2), in order to establish recurring nodes/concepts in the data. We then searched for themes, by finding similarities between the initial codes (Phase 3). We developed the final themes (Phase 4) to reflect the main considerations of the focus group participants with respect to the interventions they discussed.

We present the findings of the thematic analysis of the content of the 3 focus group discussions. The emerging themes had a partial overlap with the 7 topics we had identified based on the classification table and theoretical and empirical findings of the PoIRom project. We present an overview of the findings in Table 2. The 3 themes and the respective sub-themes are discussed in detail below.

**Table 2: Overview of Themes and Subthemes from the Focus Group Discussions**

THEMES	SUB-THEMES
<b>THEME 1: IDENTITY AND POLARIZATION</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Group Identities</li> <li>2. Polarization within the Traveller community/ Divisions within the Traveller community</li> <li>3. Cultural awareness and stereotypes</li> <li>4. Gender Issues</li> </ol>
<b>THEME 2: LACK OF COHESION IN APPROACHING ANTI-TRAVELLER RACISM AND TRAVELLER SOCIAL INCLUSION</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Trust, hopelessness and relationships</li> <li>2. Funding: Sustainability and tokenism</li> <li>3. Engagement Issues</li> </ol>
<b>THEME 3: CREATING POLITICAL SOLIDARITY WITH THE TRAVELLER AND OTHER MINORITY GROUPS</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Representation</li> <li>2. Solidarity and Systemic Change</li> <li>3. Intercultural Training</li> </ol>

### THEME 1: IDENTITY AND POLARIZATION

The largest theme captures aspects of identity and polarization, in the way participants in the focus group described their activities and engagement across various interventions. There are 4 sub-themes. First, the sub-theme of “Group Identities” illustrates how positionality with respect to the Traveller-Settled divide takes many forms, from the ethnic divide, to the organizer-participant divide, and sometimes also between authorities and the common people/residents. The second sub-theme captures particular divisions (hierarchies) within the Traveller community, of which the community itself is highly aware of, but which also crucially affect the interactions with the community from the point of

view of interventions' organizers. The "Polarization within the Traveller community/ Divisions within the Traveller community" sub-theme discusses how important it is to understand the particular community one works with, in a particular location, with a particular demographic, set of values and needs. The next 2 sub-themes go more in depth about the particularities that one should consider when working with the Traveller community, namely: one should have good "cultural awareness" and knowledge of "stereotypes", as well as understanding some of the "gender issues" specific to Traveller culture and social norms.

### 1. Group Identities

**Group identities** was a core issue for all focus group discussions, where participants talked about themselves and their experiences by identifying very **clear and salient boundaries between Settled people/organizers/authorities, on the one hand, and the Irish Travellers/community residents/community activists, on the other hand, respectively.**

The focus group discussions indicated the presence of "vast differences" between the prescribed norms of the 'identity' of the settled community and the Traveller 'identity'. This led to a perceived clear separation of the two groups and a distinct ingroup/outgroup or an 'us vs them' dynamic. This Othering of the groups makes prejudice and discrimination (for the majority) and marginalization and separation (for the minority) easier to explain and sometimes justify. It makes it difficult for the Traveller community to engage with the settled community, and similarly members of the Settled community organizations or authorities find it very difficult to build bridges and trust with the Traveller communities.

It came up multiple times across all of the focus groups that members of the Traveller community, particularly women would not be comfortable being "the only Traveller" in a setting, gathering or project activity. The Traveller community is not comfortable engaging with the settled community. At the grassroots level, in the local towns, tensions are high between the Traveller and settled communities. In a particular town the settled community feel the Travellers have taken over the town and there is a sense of grief and loss. In another location, Traveller and other minority group members cannot gain access to football grounds due to the suspicions of the Settled community. Yet, in most settings, the Traveller voices and concerns (i.e., about their living conditions or their children) seem to be silenced and marginalized.

### 2. Polarization within the Traveller community/ Divisions within the Traveller community

One of the key identity issues emergent from the discussions was to be cognisant of the differences within the Traveller community and not treat all members of the Traveller community as a homogenous group. Recognition of the ethnic status of Travellers and respect for their culture is very important to the Traveller sense of identity. One constant reminder from the focus group participants was how important it is to remember that one Traveller or a large Traveller organisation, cannot and does not speak for all Travellers. While they share a group identity, they are still, like all groups a collection of individuals. Similarly, this preference to be "treated as an individual" is also a coping mechanism that allows for the establishment of trust in working relationships. In all activities, both Travellers and Settled people have to prove that they do not represent their highly stigmatised or heavily prejudiced groups, respectively. To establish common ground and trust, participants have to interact as individuals rather than representative members of their respective groups.

Beyond the “treat me as an individual” approach, there is also the “we are a different group than the other Travellers/Settled people”. Within the Traveller community, like any community, there is criticism of some group members by other group members. For example, the Traveller community in the Limerick town of Rathkeale is well-established having been in the town for many years. It was mentioned in the focus group that the members of the wider Traveller community in the West and South of Ireland are reluctant to engage or be associated with the Traveller community in Rathkeale. There appears to be a hierarchy in the Traveller community that seems to be partly based around wealth and occupations. The Travellers from Rathkeale go abroad to make money, while the ones from other towns in Limerick stay in Ireland, and it is noted that the ones going abroad make substantially more money. It is a common belief in the community that the members of the Rathkeale community see themselves as “above the rest”. Similarly, from the perspective of the Settled Irish and organizations wishing to engage with the Travellers, there is an observation of “not all Travellers are the same”, and that regional and community based differences are key to establishing good working relationships with the Traveller community.

This point is very important when designing interventions, it should be very clear in majority interventions which aim to dismantle stereotypes that Travellers, like settled communities, should be viewed as a diverse group with internal stereotypes and divisions, and should be approached as individuals. Across focus groups, participants insisted to fight against the tendency of ‘painting everyone with the same brush’.

From an organiser and funding perspective, highlighting the divisions and individualised approach to grass-root level projects is equally important. While some funders might have one community in mind (for example the rich and well-off group of Travellers in a particular location), organizations have to highlight the needs and differences between these and other more disenfranchised Traveller groups. Preventing funding for some projects because of the reputation of some sub-groups only leads to deepening the divisions within the Traveller community as well as between Travellers and the wider Irish society.

### **3. Cultural awareness and stereotypes**

There are very strong and embedded stereotypes associated with the Traveller community in Ireland and this creates significant barriers, which prevents a lot of activity from going ahead (e.g. football, gatherings, raising the standards of living, engaging with the authorities). Considering the embedded nature of the stereotypes in the case of Travellers, an ethos of cultural awareness should be a prerequisite to all and any anti-discrimination interventions. As evidenced from the experience of the members of the focus groups, a lot of the prejudice and the reluctance to engage in intergroup activities stems from a lack of understanding of one another and their cultures. Stereotypes are to be expected when we consider intergroup relations but in order to prevent these stereotypes from informing dangerous prejudice and legitimizing discrimination, cultural awareness and respect must be built into all interventions. Participants in our focus groups were thankful to have had the experiences and the opportunities to understand Traveller culture, local customs and communities, as well as the Settled people’s perspectives on the issues.

Another aspect of cultural awareness theme is its importance in the designing of interventions and. One of the constant reminders across focus groups was that the levels of cultural awareness in interventions designed for the Traveller community are not up to standard. An example used was mother and baby groups not designed to deal with the complex issues faced by Traveller mothers (such as domestic violence, alcoholism, unemployment, mental health problems). Another example is in how the Traveller community usually has to voice their concerns only through 1 or 2 representatives of the authorities or local organizations, because it is only those few people they can trust and who listens to the community concerns. In other words, only a few representatives of local authorities or organizations have the necessary level of cultural awareness.

#### 4. Gender issues

The subject of gender differences presents serious considerations concerning gender identity, which need to be considered when developing interventions for Traveller inclusion. It is also important to take into account the clearly defined roles of men and women within the Traveller community. Points raised through the focus groups were problems engaging Traveller men in interventions and intergroup interventions not reflecting the Traveller specific gender needs for men and women alike (e.g. Mother and Babies groups, Men's sheds). Below we outline some of the main points pertaining to gender.

- **Presentation.**

Presentation, particularly for men, is a major *component of identity* in the Traveller community. Presenting a certain image, masculine, breadwinner, getting married and having a wife and kids, is a very important part of being a Traveller man, these image expectations can have a profound effect on Traveller men. It can force them to hide their aspirations for certain careers or other parts of their identity (i.e., see sexuality below). As above, where we discussed the importance of cultural awareness when designing interventions, the same applies to the awareness of gender presentation.

- **Sexuality**

A reoccurring theme from the focus groups was the complex relationships the Traveller community have with sexuality. A sub theme of homophobia also emerged. Homosexuality is not widely accepted in the Traveller community, particularly for men, causing a complex system of intricate outcomes, which have far-reaching effects (knock-on impact on families) and should be considered when developing intervention and working with the community.

Following on from the points made under the presentation subtheme, it was stated in the focus group that Lesbian Travellers are more accepted, as it is considered more discrete and some girls just do not marry and stay at home with their parents, which is not the case for men. As mentioned above men are expected to marry and have kids and so many are forced to do so and do not come out. Gay men may be beaten and forced to get married. If they refuse to get married, then they could be disowned.

These issues surrounding sexuality are essential when attempting to engage with communities. The relationships within the Traveller community are complex and need to be understood, as merely condemning them is not a solution to inclusion.

## THEME 2: LACK OF COHESION IN APPROACHING ANTI-TRAVELLER RACISM AND TRAVELLER SOCIAL INCLUSION

The second main theme underlying the focus group discussions was a preoccupation of all participants with longer term impact and sustainable social inclusion of the Traveller communities. Despite engaging in multiple intervention programs, despite being able to overcome various barriers, despite having expertise in how to reconcile cultural differences, all the participants in the focus groups recognized the difficulty in having long-term impact via the interventions and projects they have been involved in. The sub-themes explaining the complexity of these issues are “trust, hopelessness and relationship”, issues related to the remit of interventions established by the “funders”, issues related to “engagement” of people in interventions.

### 1. Trust, hopelessness and relationships

Creating trust with local communities is a very important part of securing the success of community development projects and anti-discrimination interventions. One way to address this is to build a positive relationship and trust between community workers, settled communities and the Traveller community.

One way the focus group participants proposed was engaging in “a barter type” process. Historically, bartering plays a big role in Traveller culture, and this can be effectively utilized to engage members of the Traveller community with community projects. Another way to increase engagement with members of the Traveller community is to ensure that members of the community are involved in the design and implementation of interventions and hold positions in community development organizations. Including Travellers in this way ensure that they are represented when discussing issues concerning them and that the anti-discrimination interventions are culturally appropriate, and endorsed by the community. **This building of positive relationships with members of the Traveller community is vital in producing effective intervention, ensuring quality intergroup contact and dismantling the racist and prejudiced normative context.**

It is key for organisers to build positive relationships with the Traveller community and these in turn lay the foundation for building more positive relationships between the Traveller community and the settled community. The importance of an awareness of the unique aspects of Traveller culture was mentioned as a necessity when trying to form these relationships (this is captured in theme one, subtheme on “cultural awareness and stereotypes”). Positive relationships with the Traveller community not only increase engagement with interventions but also encourages people to join the local organisations, increasing solidarity (which will also be discussed under theme 3).

There is however an issue with the experience of hopelessness on both sides: Travellers and organizers of interventions. For the Travellers, there is the expectation of being ignored, not heard, not taken on board, and not benefited by the interventions designed “for them”, but not “with them”. For the members of the settled community working with organizations, local authorities, there is the fear that projects will fail, that the Traveller participants “will not show up”, that it is difficult and takes time to build the bridges. The hopelessness directly experienced in the difficulties and barriers that have to be overcome for a community project to work is also implicitly fuelled by the normative context of low expectations from the most marginalized and stigmatised group in society. Focusing on success stories is not sufficient, when the long-term impact and engagement do not guarantee a more sustainable societal change in prejudice reduction and social inclusion.

## 2. Funding: Sustainability and Tokenism

The two main issues when it comes to funding were address in the focus groups: a) **Lack of sustainability** due to short term funding and the support for project-based interventions rather than community-development interventions. The second issue was around b) **Tokenism**, namely the inclusion of Travellers in the remit of the project just to get funding without designing the project with a Traveller focus in mind.

- a) The lack of sustainability in projects and interventions was discussed to be caused by short timelines of funding streams and funding that predominantly supports only “project” rather than “community development” interventions. This came up repeatedly across all the focus groups. This lack of sustainability causes many different problems. Firstly, the short streams of funding prevent projects from creating comprehensive, long term programs which create lasting change and support in communities. Secondly, the short-term projects lend themselves to high turnover of staff, and as previously mentioned, building relationships with members of the Traveller community is very important and time-consuming. A constant turnover of staff makes it very difficult to cultivate these kinds of positive relationships. Lastly, the constant turnover of staff and the starting of new projects over and over, leads to a lack of trust and fatigue within the communities who are participating. Rather than seeing growth and change, they just see short term projects come and go.
- b) **Tokenism** or the mere inclusion of the Traveller community in interventions just to get funding is a significant barrier to a sustained and long-term societal impact of interventions. If Travellers are just included to ensure funding it means that the project has not been designed with the Traveller community in mind. Research findings in previous and the current PolRom project indicates antigypsism (anti-Traveller prejudice) as a unique type of prejudice and needs to be targeted in very specific ways. Discounting the particular nature of antigypsism, and complexity of building trust that can overcome the structural and individual racism present major barriers to inclusion of Travellers in interventions, as well as a significant change in settled people’s attitudes. Due to funding pressures, local organisations might “feel they need to have Travellers involved” in a tokenistic way. This leads to reluctance of the Traveller community to engage, and to an erosion of the already difficult relationships. For example, there are roughly 30 community groups in Rathkeale, none of which have Travellers involved in the organization/management of these groups. Considering this, it is easy to understand why Travellers do not want to engage with the initiatives of the community groups, “the people involved do not know anything about them” and do not seem like they want to.

## 3. Engagement issues

As mentioned above, funding can give rise to serious problems when it comes to engagement in interventions. If a program is designed without consultation and early involvement of the Traveller community, participation in this program will be problematic. Engagement requires the overcoming of barriers: the presence of very negative stereotypes of the Travellers, lack of trust and bridges with the community, and the absence of one or certain individuals from both communities, which can act as mediators.

One major issue highlighted by various participants was the importance of personal relationships, which guarantees short-term success of a project/activity, yet undermines systemic change and institutional commitment to decreasing prejudice and discrimination. Thus, while we heard stories of key community workers or representatives of the Garda (Irish Police) establishing very

trustworthy personal relationships with the Traveller communities, and therefore guaranteeing communication and engagement, these were felt to be too fragile, temporary and insufficient. The idea of “having to start it all over again” every time a new project or a new person comes around highlights how the engagement in interventions is not “a given”, but a hard-fought battle.

Another issue was the agenda of the funders. The focus groups brought up the point that there is a lack of projects that create opportunities for Travellers to develop skills or engage in activities that are relevant to the individuals, the community and the local area. There are generational differences here also, and gender differences, which are not acknowledged by the local authorities and funders of interventions. From the perspective of the majority settled population, there are also not enough projects directed at the main issues of anti-Traveller attitudes. In the absence of a cohesive systematic approach to address anti-Traveller prejudice or discrimination, the engagements of the settled people are also temporary and insufficient to create sustainable change in the intergroup relationships.

### THEME 3: CREATING POLITICAL SOLIDARITY WITH THE TRAVELLER AND OTHER MINORITY GROUPS

The last theme emerging from the focus group discussions is about the perceived need for solidarity with the Travellers and other minority groups, in order to foster long-term systemic and positive change. The main arguments are that, given the lack of a cohesive approach to anti-Traveller prejudice and discrimination, one viable channel of action is to unite the voices of multiple disenfranchised groups in order to improve the situation of all. Thus, participants discussed the challenges in creating this political solidarity due to the credibility and challenges of “community representation”, the idea of minorities bringing their voices into a unified front, and lastly the need for a specific type of intercultural training to be rolled out in the Irish society, more broadly (especially the public sector).

#### 1. Representation: Who represents whom?

A recurring theme that the groups spoke of was representation and potential issues surrounding representation: who speaks on behalf of which group within the Traveller community? The consensus from the focus groups was that the members of the Traveller community need to be involved in the design and running of interventions, in order to effectively promote inclusion and reduce discrimination towards the Traveller community.

The critical issue of representation could be diluted in importance if the scope of interventions is broader and aimed to more/other disadvantaged groups, including Travellers, but not exclusively focused on them. This point was argued in one of the focus group who discussed the advantage of including members of all minority groups in the community in the organization and running of the particular interventions (the Donegal Traveller Project had great success with involving members from all different groups within the community in their BIC Project, <https://donegaltravellersproject.ie/our-work/building-intercultural-communities-project-bic-2/>)

From a Traveller activist perspective, the issue of representation sometimes also backfires. They have to prove that they are able to take part in interventions to local organizations, and thus represent their communities. Yet the more successful they are in “proving themselves”, the less “representative of the Travellers” they are perceived to be – by both their own communities and the settled people. “You are one of us, not one of them” is a paradox and a problem experienced by Traveller activists, and more generally people who wish to be involved, on the background of the

stereotype that “Travellers don’t get involved”. Lastly, local Traveller groups do not feel represented by larger activist organizations that typically act at the national level in lobbying for Traveller rights and social inclusion.

Similarly, the people from the local organizations/authorities who want to engage with Travellers, have to prove themselves as “not being prejudiced”, and “not being like other Settled people”, before a working relationship can be established. These issues of representation are related to the issues discussed in Theme 1 around the divisions and polarization within and between communities, as well as the issues discussed in Theme 2 around trust, hopelessness and establishing positive relationships.

## **2. Solidarity and Systemic Change**

A key, recurring theme, particularly with the Donegal Traveller Project Focus group was the importance of Solidarity between minority groups, the idea of “being stronger together than apart”. A lot of the issues faced by minority groups stem from societal structures which reinforce hierarchies (particularly ethnic and class-based ones). Solidarity in the form of a united front was suggested as an effective way to address this. One example used was the pressing need for Hate Speech Legislation to protect minorities from racism and discrimination. If groups representative of a range of minority groups joined together, they could lobby for this legislative change as a larger and “louder” group, with a “unified voice”.

**Creating bridges between** communities would also decrease prejudice and discrimination more widely, by highlighting the humanity and individuality (rather than group stereotypes) of people who live in heavily marginalised and stigmatised communities. This can be done by eliciting pro-social (positive emotions) such as empathy. Participants in the focus groups discussed instances where interventions focused on quality contact cultivated positive emotions and relationships between people from very diverse backgrounds.

Fear and hopelessness were emotions that emerged in the conversation when discussing how members of the Traveller community feel about the future. What is necessary is that the settled community and funders understand the worries and particular needs (the voices) of Traveller and other minority groups. While the normative context, media and institutionalised racism often highlights issues of criminality and illegality in relation to Travellers, as well as other minorities (for example the asylum seekers accused of bogus claims), the aspects that would “humanize” people from these groups go unnoticed. The participants in the focus groups acknowledged the power that this awareness of Traveller emotions has in building bridges and form positive relationships.

### ***Example of a successful intervention promoting solidarity: The Men’s Shed***

*This intervention was a project ran for all minority group men in the local area: Traveller men, Polish, African. Its aim was to break down barriers, improve relationships and great solidarity. Initially the project was supposed to consist of a 4 week cooking session, but it ended up running for 13 weeks and also included a woodwork workshop. The Men’s Shed was very popular, participants loved it and were very engaged.*

*To begin with, the inclusive remit leads to some problems with who should and should not be included and led to underlying racist attitudes rise to the surface. The Traveller men did*

*not want the Roma men to be involved (clear identity separation). There was also a racist mentality towards the Polish men ‘they are coming here to take our jobs’. There was also some “jockeying” (competition) for who is the most marginalised among all the minorities. Part of the key to success of changing these attitudes and engaging the men was the choice of activities, the organiser chose activities which were applicable to everyday life, helped them gain skills and were interactive, helping to cultivate friendships. It was an all-around very positive experience. Instructing the intervention this way the Men’s shed broke down the barriers to inclusion and the stereotypes through high quality, positive and sustained intergroup contact.*

### **3. Intercultural training**

The importance of intercultural awareness when trying to reduce prejudice and increase inclusion cannot be understated. Previous research shows how awareness of the cultures of your own and other groups helps dismantle stereotypes, makes you see the realities that other people face and helps foster prosocial emotions such as empathy and hope.

While there is intercultural awareness training currently available the focus group participants had some vital points to make regarding how it could be improved and delivered with greater effectiveness, and aiming at a systemic change.

- ➔ **For whom and who is training?** Intercultural awareness training should be mandatory in organisations, especially all of the public sector. At the moment, these trainings typically “preach to the converted”. There should be diversity in the people who deliver the training.
- ➔ **Content with specific focus on Irish Travellers:** Confront and unpack the entrenched nature of prejudice against Travellers, which was quoted as “being a fundamental problem in Ireland today” and “part of the Irish soul, which must be confronted”. Include specific acknowledgements of the most marginalised groups i.e. Travellers and Roma (rather than general diversity training)
- ➔ **Type of delivery:** Participants must move out of their comfort zone and confront potentially uncomfortable feelings. Should offer a look into someone else's reality. The training should include components of self-questioning, history and information about structural inequality. Post training reflection should be built in and encouraged.

### **General Conclusions & Discussion**

The main conclusions based on the analysis of the Classification Table of all interventions included in our dataset and the focus group discussions are overall encouraging, yet leaving room for considerable improvement. Overall, we can see a wide range of activities aimed to tackle antigypsism and discrimination in Ireland, some with a very specific target involving a Traveller focus, some still too general or superficial in scope and reach. There are positive movements towards a more systemic approach that would decrease prejudice and discrimination in general and in particular towards Travellers. There are, however, particular sector and cultural specific barriers that paint a dismantled picture of Traveller-Settled relationships.

We summarize the main “take-home” messages of this workpackage on interventions in Ireland below:

- The interventions in our database focusing on anti-Traveller prejudice and fighting against Traveller discrimination, were predominantly classified as **Educational Interventions and General Diversity Training** (Category 1). The focus group discussions raised particular concerns with these kind of interventions: they are too general (not Traveller-focused), they are not compulsory for people working with communities and in the public sector, they are often superficial in their impact unless their delivery includes self-reflection and challenges of one’s world-view.
- The interventions categorised as **Interactive, Experiential and Intergroup Interventions** (category 2) were perceived by the participants in the focus group discussions as the ones with the greatest potential to decrease prejudice, increase social inclusion and trust between communities. However, the fundamental issue with these interventions lies in their typical short-term and localized reach, largely due to funding and political agendas, illustrating a piecemeal approach to social inclusion. Their implementation also depends on very personal individualised relationships of trust (built over time after overcoming serious barriers dividing the Travellers from the rest of the society). Instead, interventions should rely on wider institutional commitments and long-term engagement between the Traveller community and local organizations or government/authorities.
- **Public Showcasing Interventions** (Category 3) were seen as important for raising cultural awareness and a sense of positive identity and pride among the minority groups more generally, and Traveller communities in particular. The most impactful showcasing events however, are the ones which were built via interpersonal and intergroup contact activities, which brought the Traveller community in touch with non-Traveller people (both Irish and of other nationalities). In other words, when they are a “result of community work”, these showcasing interventions are seen as a positive development in dismantling negative stereotypes about Travellers and promoting positive intergroup relationships. In general, without the background of collaboration and long-term engagement of communities, these interventions still have very positive effects in building pride and cultural awareness for the Traveller communities.
- **Political Solidarity and Representation** was one of the main take home points from the first two focus groups particularly the one with the Donegal Traveller Project. The DTP was set up in collaboration between the Traveller and the settled community in Donegal, and this was seen as a strength. Furthermore, the focus on building solidarity with other minority groups was aimed

at amplifying the voices of all disenfranchised groups that are often unheard when in isolation from each other. The work of West Limerick Resources is also based on including Traveller people in the design, organisation and running of particular interventions. The collaboration and representation from the Traveller community are seen as crucial to the success of local interventions.

- **Sustainability and Long-Term Changes in Intergroup Relations:** If interventions are to be successful in tackling prejudice and discrimination, the short-term nature of the interventions and community work sector is seen as a serious obstacle to systemic change and impact. While a targeted approach for specific communities exists, an institutional level approach to addressing inequality and inclusion in a cohesive and comprehensive manner is missing. The community work sector has changed in recent years with more of a focus on “service provision” as opposed to a holistic, community development approach. This current approach offers little in the way of longer-term engagement and has a piecemeal approach with short term funding projects and high staff turnover. This results in fatigue, lack of trust and engagement within communities. It was the suggestions of the focus group participants that long-term approaches with human rights and community development as key principles would be the best approach to systemic change in social inclusion and prejudice reduction.
- **Intercultural training and cultural awareness and competencies.** All participants recognized the crucial role of recognizing, respecting and reconciling cultural differences when working with Travellers in Ireland. The historical divide between the Travellers and the rest of the society harbours ignorance and stereotypes that prevent positive intergroup contacts. In order to decrease prejudice and engage with the Traveller communities, organizations at all levels should invest in the intercultural competence training of their staff, and have an institutional long-term commitment to engaging with the Travellers. The current trainings and lack of implementation across the board are presented as major barriers: the content and delivery of these trainings are lacking, and people who should attend them (e.g., the funders, the coordinators of organizations, as well as the grass-roots community workers) often do not. There is a recognition that when done well, the intercultural competence trainings are transformative and significantly improve intergroup attitudes and relationships. Without familiarity and knowledge of one’s own and Traveller’s cultural habits and norms, the success of any intervention is unlikely.

### **Recommendations**

The results of the classification of interventions and focus group discussions were fruitful in leading to a list of recommendations and the creation of best practice examples, in the form of a toolkit (which will be available on the PoIRom website <https://polrom.eu/>).

#### **For Funding Agencies and National/Local Authorities**

1. A human rights approach should direct investment in interventions aimed to decrease prejudice and discrimination against Travellers. This means that the normative context of the country and localities should be positively encouraging of inter-group/inter-communities collaborations. Hate speech and hate crime legislation should be introduced in Ireland, to signal the importance of respecting others irrespective of their background. In the presence of very pervasive, entrenched and negative stereotypes about Travellers in Ireland, a normative change is needed to accompany any intervention aimed to decrease prejudice and discrimination.
2. A community-development approach should be prioritised as opposed to a service-provision, project based approach to antigypsism work, promoting tolerance and decreasing anti-Traveller prejudice and discrimination. The lack of long term funding erodes the sustainability of any successful impact of interventions, because it involves high turn-over of staff and communicates a “tick-box exercise” approach. Community-development long term investment in interventions would signal a sustained interest in social inclusion, capacity building and positive inter-group/inter-communities contacts.
3. Given the general normative context which typically portrays the Traveller community in a negative light, it is absolutely essential that comprehensive intercultural awareness and competence training is required of all employees involved with anti-Traveller prejudice/discrimination interventions or social inclusion projects more generally (including those working in the funding bodies). Building trust across the divide between the Traveller and the settled communities or local organizations is crucial for the implementation and success of any intervention. This will be enhanced if people are taught to question their own prejudices and biases, to understand the wider history of intergroup relationships and structural nature of institutionalised and everyday racism, and to recognize, respect and reconcile cultural differences.

#### **For Community Level Organizations**

1. The inclusion and representation of Travellers in the organisations, at design and implementation stage of Traveller-targeted interventions are highly recommended. This will help building bridges with the Traveller community, but essentially will focus the work on issues that are relevant and culturally appropriate from the Traveller perspective.
2. Fostering solidarity between different minority groups, and highlighting the political potential of a unified voice for community grievances was highlighted as a way of engaging in divided communities. When funding is scarce, when relationships take time to develop and the effects of any particular intervention are short-lived and difficult to monitor, the focus on longer-term community involvement and solidarity can lay the foundations for sustainable engagement with interventions (and the organizations running these).

3. Intercultural competence and awareness training should be delivered on an ongoing basis to community workers as well as the larger society. These trainings could be seen as a way of consolidating trust between communities, and between communities and organizations, as well as ensuring a constant exchange of experiences and expertise that many community workers develop in one to one relationships. The trainings should be targeted at the specific minorities in the locality, and involve intercultural trainers with various backgrounds and experiences.

**For Individuals Engaging in Interventions aimed to decrease anti-Traveller prejudice and discrimination**

1. Building bridges and trust between communities and challenging negative stereotypes are essential for developing working relationships in the implementation of interventions. This takes time, it is often personal, but it could and should be sustained by wider community and organizational supports and commitment. Being mindful of the local history and recent relationships between groups, organizations and communities will help position oneself in these relationships (i.e., how much does one need to “prove” him/herself before it is taken seriously by the other group depends on previous experiences with representatives of those groups).
2. Becoming interculturally competent and increasing one’s awareness of cultural differences, the norms, values and complex identities of the Traveller community in Ireland is crucial. Thus training and collaborating with Travellers are essential ingredients in successful interventions. Being self-reflective of one’s own biases and socialized knowledge is a great asset in working across cultural divides.
3. Fostering solidarity within and between groups is a way of amplifying one’s political voice, and gaining attention from the local and national governments/organizations. Solidarity can be built between different minority groups, but also, crucially between those who participate in any given intervention across ethnic divides, or organizer/participant differences. Getting to know and be involved with another group’s plight cultivates empathy, decreases prejudices and builds political efficacy.

## ***Bibliography***

Kende, A., Tropp, L. & Lantos, N. A. (2016). Testing a contact intervention based on intergroup friendship between Roma and Non-Roma Hungarians: Reducing bias through institutional support in a non-supportive societal context. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 47, 47-55.

Kuchenbrandt, D., Eyssele, F., & Seidel, S. K. (2013). Cooperation makes it happen: Imagined intergroup cooperation enhances the positive effects of imagined contact. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 16(5), 635–647. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430212470172>

MacBride, M. (2015). *What works to reduce prejudice and discrimination? A review of the evidence* (ISBN: 9781785447235). Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research. <https://www.gov.scot/publications/works-reduce-prejudice-discrimination-review-evidence/>

Powell, A. A., Branscombe, N. R., & Schmitt, M. T. (2005). Inequality as ingroup privilege or outgroup disadvantage: The impact of group focus on collective guilt and interracial attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 31, 508-521.

Schilling, J. (2006). On the pragmatics of qualitative assessment: Designing the process for content analysis. *European journal of psychological assessment*, 22(1), 28.

Thomas, E. F., & McGarty, C. A. (2009). The role of efficacy and moral outrage norms in creating the potential for international development activism through group-based interaction. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 48, 115-134.

Váradi, L. (2014). *Youths trapped in prejudice: Hungarian adolescents' attitudes towards the Roma*. Springer Science & Business.

### **Appendix 1 – Focus Group Questions.**

The topics identified based on previous research and the Classification Table.

1. Identity
2. Engagement
3. Funders (Political Discourse)
4. Collective Action
5. Gender Issues
6. Normative Context
7. Emotions

#### **Focus Group Questions**

Q1: Identity.

Aim: How do you observe the collective identity change? (was there a difference before and after)  
Empowered or demotivated?  
Is there a sense of solidarity?

Q2: Engagement.

Aim: Who engages with the intervention? Is there a sense of preaching to the converted?  
Are the attendees activist in general or in the case of festivals or art based interventions are they attending because they are an artist?  
Are they participants/attendees already tolerant?  
In your experience running this intervention (or others) have you reached an unexpected category or group of people? (elaborate)  
How do you advertise? Recruit participants?  
Is participation in the event mandatory (formal) or voluntary? Both may have different implications in terms of selection bias and engagement.

Q3: Funders.

Aim: Does the funder have an agenda? Did the political discourse of the funding organisation effect the content and the delivery of the intervention? In the case of an NGO did they challenge the type of action that the political discourse called for?

Suggested Questions:

Did the funding source and their political discourse (bias, intentions) surrounding the Roma population condition (effect) the content of the intervention and the participants.

Is the intervention fit for purpose (Does it achieve the outcome)?

Is it easy to apply? (practicality)

[Political discourse, collective action and prejudice all assessed]

Q4: Collective Action.

Aim: To investigate whether the intervention motivate or de-motivate people? Did the intervention have majority and Roma/Travellers participants? Did the effects on motivation differ depending on the group?

We are concerned with the *Psychological Processes*.

How did the organisers see the differences in collective and individual identity?

Was there an intention to stay mobilised after the intervention?

Engagement: Ask the focus group participants about the contact and the engagement which occurred during the intervention.

Was there intergroup contact and interaction between Roma and majority population.

What type of contact was there?

What was the quality of the contact?

What effects did they think the contact had?

(the literature suggests that different types of contact will have different effects)

Q5: Gender Issues.

Is the intervention gender specific?

Did men or women participated more in the intervention? Generally in these types of activity do men or women engage more?

Are there any gender specific stereotypes or beliefs in the content of your intervention?

Probe for discussion- Does Antigypsyism look different for men and women? How do their experiences of antigypsyism differ?

What type of cultural specific issues arise – Gender specific dress? Country specific dress?

Q6: Normative Context.

How political correct is Antigypsyism in your country? How does this effect the interventions? Discuss in relation to:

Design (Idea)

Intervention (Reality)

Does it re-inforce stereotypes?

Is it effective?

What is the outcome?

Investigate both the explicit and implicit normative context. [Assess both political discourse along with political correctness in the country]

Q7: Emotions.

To what degree does your intervention address emotional reactions or engage the emotions of the participant?

Anger

Hope

Sympathy

Empathy

Fear/threat.

Theoretic background: Morality and perceived emotions humanize people – which shows the group as people too (humanize)- helping to achieve the end goal of prejudice reduction. Empathy reduces prejudice.

Interventions can employ as mirroring. For example, if an intervention shows gypsy children being excluded and shows the experiencing fear and sadness, children can mirror these emotions and feel empathy. The intervention provides an emotional map

Does your intervention provide an emotional map?

*Appendix 2: Best Practice Examples.*

**Category 1. Educational Interventions (General Diversity Training)**

<p><b>Best practice example: The Yellow Flag Program</b> (<a href="http://yellowflag.ie/">http://yellowflag.ie/</a>) <a href="https://itmtrav.ie/strategic-priorities/education/the-yellow-flag-programme/">https://itmtrav.ie/strategic-priorities/education/the-yellow-flag-programme/</a></p>	
<p><b>Who runs the intervention? What is the targeted group?</b></p>	<p>Government financed, ran by the Irish Traveller Movement, to be implemented in secondary schools (Civic, Social Political Education - CSPE Curricula)</p> <p>The intervention is aimed at secondary school children in the junior cycle, aged from 12-15.</p> <p>Provides guidance on how to engage in collective action to fight discrimination (“Going beyond the School Walls”; school diversity policies)</p>
<p><b>Why is this best practice</b></p>	<p>This intervention was chosen as best practice as it is a ready-to-use learning curriculum which includes both students and teachers actively in the running of the project, it is developed in collaboration with a Traveller organisation. They are based both on best practice, social psychology and educational theory. It works on both the individual and societal level. On the individual level it provides counter stereotypical information, information on the experience Travellers have with prejudice (perspective taking) and promote awareness and respect for Traveller culture, these have all been shown to reduce prejudice at an individual level (Table ??). On a societal level Yellow Flags aims to raise awareness about structural inequalities and change norms to value and include diversity, reflecting the best practice from the literature.</p>
<p><b>What is involved (socio-psychological mechanisms)</b></p>	<p>Provides education about the historical and sociological information about the situation of the Irish Travellers, which makes people understand the larger picture, and structural causes of inequality and marginalization.</p> <p>Provides intercultural training and an understanding of social psychological processes such as stereotyping, stigma and discrimination. This may increase one’s openness to engage or connect with a member of the minority group.</p> <p>It provides a baseline for political solidarity with the Irish Travellers.</p>

PoIROM — REC-AG-2017 / REC- RDIS-DISC-AG-2017

<b>Risks and Barriers</b>	<p>Risks in implementation: bureaucratic process of funding; part of a curriculum that is not adequately and consistently taught across Ireland.</p> <p>Barrier:</p> <p>Institutionalized racism against Irish Travellers.</p> <p>There is a special set of pedagogical and psychological skills in teaching about diversity. In the absence of these skills, some of these lessons can backfire. When people feel threatened in their identity, they could harden rather than dismantle their stereotypes about a minority.</p>
---------------------------	--

<p><b>Best practice example: The Yellow Flag Program</b> (<a href="http://yellowflag.ie/">http://yellowflag.ie/</a>) <a href="https://itmtrav.ie/strategic-priorities/education/the-yellow-flag-programme/">https://itmtrav.ie/strategic-priorities/education/the-yellow-flag-programme/</a></p>	
<p><b>Who runs the intervention? What is the targeted group?</b></p>	<p>Government financed, ran by the Irish Traveller Movement, to be implemented in secondary schools (Civic, Social Political Education - CSPE Curricula)</p> <p>The intervention is aimed at secondary school children in the junior cycle, aged from 12-15.</p> <p>Provides guidance on how to engage in collective action to fight discrimination (“Going beyond the School Walls”; school diversity policies)</p>
<p><b>Why is this best practice</b></p>	<p>This intervention was chosen as best practice as it is a ready-to-use learning curriculum which includes both students and teachers actively in the running of the project, it is developed in collaboration with a Traveller organisation. They are based both on best practice, social psychology and educational theory. It works on both the individual and societal level. On the individual level it provides counter stereotypical information, information on the experience Travellers have with prejudice (perspective taking) and promote awareness and respect for Traveller culture, these have all been shown to reduce prejudice at an individual level (Table ??). On a societal level Yellow Flags aims to raise awareness about structural inequalities and change norms to value and include diversity, reflecting the best practice from the literature.</p>

PoIROM — REC-AG-2017 / REC- RDIS-DISC-AG-2017

<p><b>What is involved (socio-psychological mechanisms)</b></p>	<p>Provides education about the historical and sociological information about the situation of the Irish Travellers, which makes people understand the larger picture, and structural causes of inequality and marginalization. Provides intercultural training and an understanding of social psychological processes such as stereotyping, stigma and discrimination. This may increase one’s openness to engage or connect with a member of the minority group. It provides a baseline for political solidarity with the Irish Travellers.</p>
<p><b>Risks and Barriers</b></p>	<p>Risks in implementation: bureaucratic process of funding; part of a curriculum that is not adequately and consistently taught across Ireland.</p> <p>Barrier: Institutionalized racism against Irish Travellers.</p> <p>There is a special set of pedagogical and psychological skills in teaching about diversity. In the absence of these skills, some of these lessons can backfire. When people feel threatened in their identity, they could harden rather than dismantle their stereotypes about a minority.</p>

**Category 2: Interactive, experiential and intergroup interventions**

<p>Best practice examples Cat 2: Donegal Traveller Project: Building Intercultural Communities Project (BIC)  <a href="https://donegaltravellersproject.ie/our-work/building-intercultural-communities-project-bic-2/">https://donegaltravellersproject.ie/our-work/building-intercultural-communities-project-bic-2/</a></p>	
<p><b>Who runs the intervention?</b> <b>What is the targeted group?</b></p>	<p>The Donegal Traveller Project is a NGO, it is one of the longest established and largest locally based community development organisation working for, and with, the Traveller community.</p> <p>It was established by Travellers and members of the settled community in Donegal.</p> <p>This was an 18-month long project funded under the Peace IV Programme through Donegal County Council; match-funding for this project has been provided by the Executive Office in Northern Ireland and the Department of Rural and Community Development in Ireland.</p> <p>The project is targeted at minority and majority group. The aim is to develop positive relationships and the inclusion of and between Black Minority and Ethnic communities, including Travellers and Roma.</p>

**PoIROM — REC-AG-2017 / REC- RDIS-DISC-AG-2017**

<p><b>Why was it chosen as best practice</b></p>	<p>This intervention was chosen as best practice due to its grassroots, community based nature and its success in involving the whole community, not just the settled community and the Traveller people but also Black minority and ethnic communities in the area.</p> <p>Its focus is not only on reducing majority prejudice but also focusing on supporting the minority groups in improving inclusion. They work to provide supports to remove barriers and facilitate inclusion.</p> <p>The intervention illustrates best practice as it draws on all three levels which the literature supports; individual, intergroup and societal level, combining them to create a cohesive approach. On the individual level it provides cultural competency training which aims show counter stereotypical information and promote awareness and respect for Traveller culture, these have all been shown to reduce prejudice at an individual level. The group runs a myriad of events and workshops based on intergroup contact, which as shown in the table above increase empathy and reduces prejudice in the majority group On a societal level the DTP aims to raise awareness about structural inequalities and change norms to value and include diversity, reflecting the best practice from the literature.</p>
<p><b>What is involved (socio-psychological mechanisms)</b></p>	<p>The first step of the project was to create a baseline document, which maps out diversity in the county, this shines a light on the existing diversity, promoting the value of diversity and highlighting the need for intercultural awareness. A program was then put together with engagement of the community as a key element in the design.</p> <p>There was also training to deliver Intercultural Workshops and Cultural Competency Training offered, to increase awareness of cultural diversities and respect for multiculturalism.</p> <p>Key elements of the program were the support and promotion of community activation, social inclusion, social justice and equality, these work to reduce prejudice, stereotyping and increase pro-diversity collective action (psychological mechanisms).</p> <p>Intercultural events were used to showcase cultural diversity and give opportunities for intergroup contact, which is shown to reduce prejudice.</p> <p>The project aims to provide support for inclusive local decision-making structures, in order to address some of the systematic, structural inequality.</p> <p>The project also offers support for minority groups in the form of English Language Support, Community Work and Skills Workshop, helping with effective, healthy acculturation processes and inclusion.</p>

**Category 3: Public Showcasing Interventions**

Best practice: Traveller Pride Week/Events (<https://itmtrav.ie/strategic-priorities/anti-racism-interculturalism/traveller-pride/> ; <https://itmtrav.ie/news-events/events/traveller-pride-events-2019/>)

**Who runs the intervention?  
What is the targeted group?**

This intervention is a festival and nationally is organized by the Irish Traveller Movement and is ran yearly spanning two weeks. The festival includes a range of events taking place around the country which are ran by several different organisations.

It is funded and supported by The Traveller Roma Inclusion Unit of the Department of Justice.

This intervention is aimed at both the Traveller Community and the settled communities. It aims to instil pride in Traveller culture and highlight achievements within the Traveller community, strengthening their identity and self-esteem. The festival concludes with an awards ceremony.

The events of the festival are open to the settled community and are used to showcase the Traveller culture and achievements of the community. Also showcased at these events are the outputs from intergroup projects between both communities, displaying the power of contact and cooperation in forming relationships between groups.

This intervention was chosen as best practice mainly due to its effects on the Traveller community itself while also prompting the value and uniqueness of Traveller culture. This intervention operates on the societal level, firstly it promotes Traveller culture to all society and showcases the achievements of the Traveller community. It also raises awareness about structural inequalities, this can have effects on both the majority and minority groups. Raising on hierarchies and structural inequalities is shown to encourage majority group members to engage in collective action to aid minority group members. The literature also shows that this kind of intervention can motivate to discuss intergroup differences and intergroup conflict, and this approach can empower them to stand up for their rights and get engaged in activism. It can also encourage them to accept majority group allies.

PoIROM — REC-AG-2017 / REC- RDIS-DISC-AG-2017

<p><b>What is involved (socio-psychological mechanisms)</b></p>	<p>The purpose of the event is foremost to showcase Traveller Pride, expressing intrinsic pride in one’s group increases self-esteem and strengthens ingroup identity which in turn offers psychological protection. It also allows membership of the Traveller community to display their agency, creating a platform to demonstrate the political, cultural and healthcare activities taking place within the community. Previous studies show the importance of majority group acknowledgment of and respect for the agency of the minority group. This respect for agency is important in generating ally ship collective action(solidarity) rather than helping-based collective action (donations etc).</p> <p>Raise awareness and provide the settled community with information surrounding some of the inequalities faced by Travellers.</p> <p>Showcasing the unique qualities of Traveller culture and the things that can be achieved in communities through cooperation can lead to changes in social psychological processes such as stereotyping, stigma and discrimination. Decreases in these negative processes may increase one’s openness to engage the Irish Travellers.</p>
<p><b>Risks and Barriers</b></p>	<p>Risk in implementation: Lack of attendance from the settled community, which may diminish the opportunities for using information to dismantle stereotypes, prejudice reduction and intergroup contact; a weeklong event to showcase pride and achievement may not have lasting impact without follow up.</p> <p>Barriers: Lack of awareness that the events are taking place.</p> <p>The racism and prejudice towards Irish Travellers is deeply engrained in society along with fear, this may deter people from going even if they aware of the events.</p> <p>Intergroup contact at these events is not certain and members of both communities may not engage with each other of their own accord. Merely observing the results of the previous intergroup projects may not be sufficient in decreasing prejudice and encourage people to engage with future interventions.</p>

**Appendix 3: Classification Table and Overview of Interventions in Ireland**

	Name of the intervention (website)	1. Intervention outcome –	2.Target group	3.Procedure	4. Link to policy	5.Agent	6. Evaluation of their impact	Comments
1	<u><a href="https://www.paveepoint.ie/information-session-for-february/">Pavee Point - Monthly information session</a></u> <u><a href="https://www.paveepoint.ie/information-session-for-february/">https://www.paveepoint.ie/information-session-for-february/</a></u>	Increased awareness and acceptance among majority group (attitude change)	Mainly majority: geared to a wide audience, or targeted to specific groups or levels of expertise.	Monthly presentation on issues facing Travellers and Traveller culture	<u><a href="https://www.paveepoint.ie/project/national-traveller-romainclusion-strategy/">Link to mission of Pavee Point</a></u> <u><a href="https://www.paveepoint.ie/project/national-traveller-romainclusion-strategy/">https://www.paveepoint.ie/project/national-traveller-romainclusion-strategy/</a></u>	NGO- Traveller activist and advocacy organization (Pavee Point)	none	
2	<u><a href="http://theredcard.ie">Show Racism the Red Card</a></u> <u><a href="http://theredcard.ie">http://theredcard.ie</a></u>	To tackle racism and promote integration.”	Majority	Anti Racism Education Workshops & Training, Anti Racism Creative Competition for Schools & Youth Services, resources include our video, education pack, factsheets, downloadable interactive resources and online training module, featuring highprofile sportspeople such as Ireland international footballers	<u><a href="http://theredcard.ie/wpcontent/uploads/pdfs/show_racism_the_red_card_factsheets.pdf">http://theredcard.ie/wpcontent/uploads/pdfs/show_racism_the_red_card_factsheets.pdf</a></u>	Office for the Promotion of Migrant Integration at the Department of Justice and Equality,	<i>“. Our educational materials are very accessible and have been very successful”</i>	

PoIROM — REC-AG-2017 / REC- RDIS-DISC-AG-2017

3	Yellow Flag Programme. <a href="http://yellowflag.ie/">http://yellowflag.ie/</a>	Supports primary and secondary schools to become more inclusive of all cultures and ethnicities, celebrate diversity and challenge racism and discrimination”	Majority	A practical series of 8 steps that brings issues of interculturalism, equality and diversity into the whole-school programme. It works with students, staff, management, parents and wider community groups so that issues (...) can be understood and taken outside the school setting into everyone’s personal lives. · It is an award scheme, on successfully completing the following 8 steps and being evaluated externally, the school is awarded its Yellow Flag.	<a href="http://yellowflag.ie/the-8-steps-a-quickguide/">http://yellowflag.ie/the-8-steps-a-quickguide/</a>	European Union - Asylum, Migration and Integration Fund · Department of Justice and Equality, Ireland	none	
---	---	---	----------	--	---	---	------	--

PoIROM — REC-AG-2017 / REC- RDIS-DISC-AG-2017

4	Gypsy, Roma and Traveller History Month (GRTHM)	Promote knowledge of the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller History, Cultural and Heritage. Disseminate information on positive Gypsy, Roma and Traveller contributions to British Society	Majority, minority	activities and information in schools, museums, libraries and the media Free Gypsy, Roma and Traveller History Month Assembly Pack (Worksheets, fact files, etc.)	<a href="https://www.twinkl.co.uk/resource/t2-t16580-gypsy-romaand-traveller-historymonth-assembly-pack">https://www.twinkl.co.uk/resource/t2-t16580-gypsy-romaand-traveller-historymonth-assembly-pack</a>	Organised in 2001 in Brent by Traveller Education Service + local Irish Traveller community. National event from 2008	none	originating from the UK, organised with the support of local Irish Traveller community
5	Equality and Intercultural Programme at NYCI (National Youth Council of Ireland). <a href="https://www.youth.ie/programmes/equality-intercultural/">https://www.youth.ie/programmes/equality-intercultural/</a>	Research to support youth work organisations to engage more effectively with young people from minority ethnic backgrounds.	Majority, minority	training programmes, resources (, policy development, advice, and networking opportunities. research to support youth work organisations to engage more effectively with young people from minority ethnic backgrounds	<a href="https://www.youth.ie/documents/outside-in-transforming-hatein-youth-settings/">https://www.youth.ie/documents/outside-in-transforming-hatein-youth-settings/</a>  <a href="https://www.youth.ie/wpcontent/uploads/2018/11/NYCI-8-stepsinclusive.pdf">https://www.youth.ie/wpcontent/uploads/2018/11/NYCI-8-stepsinclusive.pdf</a>	NGO - National Youth Council of Ireland	none	aims to tackle prejudice & discrimination against all kinds of ethnic minorities (not exclusively travellers)

PoIROM — REC-AG-2017 / REC- RDIS-DISC-AG-2017

6	Immigrant Council of Ireland – Anti-Racism Campaign. <a href="https://www.immigrantcouncil.ie/campaign/anti-racism">https://www.immigrantcouncil.ie/campaign/anti-racism</a>	Dual goals of promoting the diversity among transport staff and the key message there is no room for racism on board.	Majority	Annual anti-racism transport campaign. Anti-Racism Hotline		NGO Immigrant Council of Ireland	- none	focusing on rather Muslims than travellers
7	Planning for Diversity – National Action Plan Against Racism 2005–2008			Five radio commercials. Anti Racist Workplace Week. 21 March – International Day/European Week Against Racism			none	
8	National Traveller and Roma Inclusion Strategy 2017 – 2021	Involve the active participation of members of the Traveller community at all stages of the project (planning, implementation etc.). Celebrate and promote Traveller culture. Promote a	Majority, minority	Traveller Pride Week #TPW2019. International Roma Day (8 Apr)	<a href="http://www.justice.ie/en/JELR/National%20Traveller%20and%20Roma%20Inclusion%20Strategy,%202017%202021.pdf/Files/National%20Traveller%20and%20Roma%20Inclusion">http://www.justice.ie/en/JELR/National%20Traveller%20and%20Roma%20Inclusion%20Strategy,%202017%202021.pdf/Files/National%20Traveller%20and%20Roma%20Inclusion</a>	Department of Justice and Equality	none	

PoIROM — REC-AG-2017 / REC- RDIS-DISC-AG-2017

		positive image of Traveller Culture to the wider settled community			<a href="#">on%20Strategy,%202017-2021.pdf</a>			
9	Child abuse Prevention Programme (Stay Safe)	to reduce vulnerability to child abuse and bullying through the provision of a personal safety education programme	Majority, minority	Anti-bullying. Training for staff, booklets, lessons on safe and unsafe situations, bullying, inappropriate touch, secrets, telling and stranger danger.	<a href="https://www.education.ie/en/Publications/Policy-Reports/AntiBullying-Proceduresfor-Primary-and-PostPrimary-Schools.pdf">https://www.education.ie/en/Publications/Policy-Reports/AntiBullying-Proceduresfor-Primary-and-PostPrimary-Schools.pdf</a>	PDST - Professional Development Service for Teachers funded by the Teacher Education Section (TES) of the Department of Education and Skills (DES)	none	

PoIROM — REC-AG-2017 / REC- RDIS-DISC-AG-2017

10	Traveller Cultural Awareness Training (TCAT) Programme	The TCAT programme aims to improve Travellers' health through the provision of education on Traveller culture. to health service staff and other public service staff so to make their services more accessible and thus have an impact on Traveller health outcomes.	health service staff	One day workshop raising awareness, providing information, identify the main barriers experienced by Travellers, identify ways of moving forward	<a href="https://www.hse.ie/en/about/who/primarycare/socialinclusion/about-socialinclusion/researchreports/traveller-culturalawareness-trainingprogrammeevaluation-2018.pdf">https://www.hse.ie/en/about/who/primarycare/socialinclusion/about-socialinclusion/researchreports/traveller-culturalawareness-trainingprogrammeevaluation-2018.pdf</a>	Regional Traveller Health Network in association with the Health Promotion Department of the HSE	<a href="https://www.hse.ie/eng/about/who/primarycare/socialinclusion/aboutsocialinclusion/researchreports/travellerculturalawareness-training-programmeevaluation2018.pdf">https://www.hse.ie/eng/about/who/primarycare/socialinclusion/aboutsocialinclusion/researchreports/travellerculturalawareness-training-programmeevaluation2018.pdf</a>	
----	--	---	----------------------	--	---	--	---	--

PoIROM — REC-AG-2017 / REC- RDIS-DISC-AG-2017

11	The Action Plan on Bullying (2012)	Encourages individual school authorities to identify, and participate in, anti-bullying programmes which best meet the needs of their particular school and the context	majority, minority	- research based training and support services, seminars, workshops and courses on bullying prevention	<a href="https://antibullyingcentre.ie/training/">https://antibullyingcentre.ie/training/</a>	ABC National Anti Bullying Research and Resource Centre, (DCU Institute of Education, Dublin).	none	
12	NCCA Intercultural Guidelines for Schools	"to reflect the emergence of a more culturally diverse society	schools (majority)	Guidelines for school on Intercultural Education in the Primary School Curriculum. School Planning, Classroom Planning, Integrated thematic planning, Intercultural education opportunities across the curriculum, Assessment and Cultural Diversity, Language and Interculturalism	<a href="https://www.into.ie/ROI/InfoforTeachers/SocialInclusion/InterculturalEducation/NCCAInterculturalGuidelines.pdf">https://www.into.ie/ROI/InfoforTeachers/SocialInclusion/InterculturalEducation/NCCAInterculturalGuidelines.pdf</a> <a href="https://www.ncca.ie/media/1976/intercultural_education_in_the_postprimary_school.pdf">https://www.ncca.ie/media/1976/intercultural_education_in_the_postprimary_school.pdf</a>	National Council for Curriculum and Assessment	none	

PoIROM — REC-AG-2017 / REC- RDIS-DISC-AG-2017

13	European Network Against Racism Ireland. <a href="http://enarireland.org/about-us/">http://enarireland.org/about-us/</a>	aims to work collectively to highlight and address the issue of racism in Ireland through the promotion and monitoring of EU and global anti-racist initiatives	majority	Anti-Racism Month. European Action Week Against Racism	<a href="http://enarireland.org/anti-racism-month2019/">http://enarireland.org/anti-racism-month2019/</a>	ENAR Ireland (European Network Against Racism Ireland) is a national network of anti-racism civil society organisations	none	
14	Sport Against Racism <a href="https://www.sari.ie/">https://www.sari.ie/</a>	Using sport as a medium to promote social inclusion, cultural integration and peacebuilding at home and abroad, addressing the issues that violate human rights such as racism.	majority	SARI Soccerfest -annual Fair Play Football Cup (World Refugee Day). - Stick with Diversity(exhibition of various stick games) - Count us in. -United through sport DVD. - Living together through Football	<a href="https://www.sari.ie/projects/">https://www.sari.ie/projects/</a> <a href="https://www.sari.ie/programmes/">https://www.sari.ie/programmes/</a>	NGO (Sport Against Racism)	none	

PoIROM — REC-AG-2017 / REC- RDIS-DISC-AG-2017

15	Action Against Racism Group. <a href="http://enarireland.org/action_against_racism/">http://enarireland.org/action_against_racism/</a>	Take action against racism	majority, minority	- actions to promote anti-racism and interculturalism in ireland	<a href="http://enarireland.org/wpcontent/uploads/2015/10/Action-AgainstRacism-Promoflyer.png">http://enarireland.org/wpcontent/uploads/2015/10/Action-AgainstRacism-Promoflyer.png</a>	ENAR Ireland	none	
16	Cultúr Migrant integration and Anti-Racism Project	To promote integration within Irish society. Presenting opportunities to explore issues of racism and develop relationships with similar organisations working in this area, to focus on interagency actions in combating racism.	targeting primarily migrants (but all ethnic minorities are represented)	European Action Against Racism Week. Anti Racism Day (information stands, guest speakers, food from different cultures). Cultur Annual Human Rights Day (same as above + certificate awards)	<a href="http://cultur.ie/">http://cultur.ie/</a>	Cultúr Migrants Centre - Celebrating Diversity	none	

PoIROM — REC-AG-2017 / REC- RDIS-DISC-AG-2017

17	NCCRI - National Consultative	Committee on Racism Promote inclusion and equality needs majority, minority Reported on and monitored incidents of racism, conducted extensive research, promoted interculturalism and Traveller awareness, and conducted anti-racism workshops.	Majority	Web based anti-racism training resources. Anti-bullying resource	<a href="https://www.irishtimes.com/news/director-of-racism-bodycriticises-its-closureat-time-of-increasedhostility-1.1274840">https://www.irishtimes.com/news/director-of-racism-bodycriticises-its-closureat-time-of-increasedhostility-1.1274840</a>	Department of Justice		
18	"MANY VOICES ONE GOAL" 2008	Combat 'Racism' in football, Promote participation among minority ethnic & multicultural communities, Contribute to the wider process of integration	majority	Guidance document for reporting and tackling racism within football, July 2008	<a href="https://www.fai.ie/sites/default/files/atoms/files/Tackling%20Racism%20booklet.pdf">https://www.fai.ie/sites/default/files/atoms/files/Tackling%20Racism%20booklet.pdf</a>	FAI (Football Association of Ireland), National Governing Body of Sport	none	

PoIROM — REC-AG-2017 / REC- RDIS-DISC-AG-2017

19	NO HATE SPEECH MOVEMENT IRELAND. <a href="http://www.nohatespeech.ie/">http://www.nohatespeech.ie/</a>	reduce the levels of acceptance of online hate speech; raise awareness of hate speech online	majority, minority	Information. Online resources. Activities promoting human rights. Blog. How to react guide.	<a href="http://www.nohatespeech.ie/_resources">http://www.nohatespeech.ie/_resources</a>	NYCI - National Youth Council of Ireland	none	
20	Racism Stops Here – Galway City Action Against Racism. <a href="http://gtmtrav.ie/racism-stopshere-galway-city-action-againstracism/">http://gtmtrav.ie/racism-stopshere-galway-city-action-againstracism/</a>	Putting a spotlight on the racism experienced by the Traveller community in Galway City, to combat racism, racial discrimination, xenophobia and related intolerance.	majority	A workshop promoting intercultural approaches. Street action to highlight Travellers' experiences of racism	<a href="http://gtmtrav.ie/strategic-areas/">http://gtmtrav.ie/strategic-areas/</a>	Galway Traveller Movement	none	
21	Wexford Local Development – Traveller Participation Programme. <a href="http://www.wld.ie">http://www.wld.ie</a>	To promote equality, develop antidiscrimination measures and to mainstream equality equality work. Supports for Travellers to have their voice heard, to participate in networks and decision making structures, locally, regionally & nationally	minority, majority	Deliver local community development actions specifically focusing on involving members of the community. Meitheal Programme – anti-bullying mentoring programme	<a href="http://www.wld.ie/travellers/travellerparticipation/">http://www.wld.ie/travellers/travellerparticipation/</a> <a href="https://www.wld.ie/programmes/meithealprogramme/">https://www.wld.ie/programmes/meithealprogramme/</a>	NGO - Wexford Local Development	none	

PoIROM — REC-AG-2017 / REC- RDIS-DISC-AG-2017

22	Donegal Travellers Project - BUILDING INTERCULTURAL COMMUNITIES PROJECT (BIC)	Aims to develop positive relationships and the inclusion of and between Black Minority and Ethnic communities, including Travellers and Roma.	majority, minority	Establish a baseline document which maps out diversity in the county. Design and deliver programmes to promote engagement with the project, to support community activation, social inclusion, social justice and equality. English Language Support. Intercultural events. Supporting the inclusion in local decisionmaking structures. Community Work Skills Workshops	<a href="http://donegaltravellersproject.ie/ourwork/buildinginterculturalcommunities-projectbic-2/">http://donegaltravellersproject.ie/ourwork/buildinginterculturalcommunities-projectbic-2/</a>	NGO - Donegal Travellers Project	none	
23	Kilmallock Women's Craft Project	To build bridges between two communities through what they have in common, that is, their daily lives and the history of their town	majority, minority	contact, two groups blending into one for the creative project, opening dialogue, working on the craft piece, later on display at an exhibition		Kilmallock Traveller Group & Kilmallock Women's Group	none	