

**TRAILERS AND
TRIBULATIONS: CRIME
DEVIANCE AND JUSTICE IN
GYPSY AND TRAVELLER
COMMUNITIES**

**A thesis submitted to the University of
Cardiff, in fulfilment of requirements of
candidature for the Degree of PhD.**

2010

Anne Foley

School of Social Science

UMI Number: U514049

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI U514049

Published by ProQuest LLC 2013. Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.
Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code.



ProQuest LLC
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346

Declaration

This work has not been accepted in substance for any degree and is not concurrently submitted in candidature for any degree.

Signed.....*Anne M Foley*.....(candidate)
Date.....*26.1.2011*.....

Statement 1

This thesis is being submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of PhD.

Signed.....*Anne M Foley*.....(candidate)
Date.....*26.1.2011*.....

Statement 2

This thesis is the result of my own independent work/investigation, except where otherwise stated. Other sources are acknowledged by explicit references. A bibliography is appended.

Signed.....*Anne M Foley*.....(candidate)
Date.....*26.1.2011*.....

Statement 3

I hereby give consent for this thesis, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed.....*Anne M Foley*.....(candidate)
Date.....*26.1.2011*.....

Abstract

Throughout history the Gypsy and Traveller community have been viewed with both curiosity and suspicion. While recent years has seen a resurgence of interest in the needs of, and policing of, Gypsies and Travellers by academics, suprisingly few studies have approached the informal community justice system developed by this community. Through a primarily ethnographic approach that also consisted of fifteen interviews with members of the Gypsy and Traveller community and eleven interviews with key-stake holders, this research explores how Gypsies and Travellers deliver justice within their community by developing a greater understanding of their moral codes and their relationship with, and recourse to, official agents of social control.

The research shows that the Gypsy and Traveller community adhere to a strict moral code. This at times conflicts with the values held by the wider British society. This has meant that the Gypsy and Traveller community have had to adapt to their environment, becoming bricoluers; drawing on some facets of the dominant British society while at the same time other aspects are rejected and replaced with their own cultural values. Crime is understood through the notion of harm, and techniques of neutralisation are applied to attitudes of crime and deviance.

The research also highlights how informal community justice is operated through a system of restorative justice. Through the use of shame, those who transgress the moral boundaries become reintegrated into the community. However, the severity of some offences is so great the only course of action is the exclusion of the individual. Here shame becomes disintegrative. The community have very limited recourse to official agents of social control. This in part is due the lack of legitimacy seen by Gypsies and Travellers in the policing of their community.

Acknowledgements

This thesis is the result of many years work that would have not been possible without the support and guidance from a number of people and organisations. I would therefore like to take this opportunity to thank everyone.

First and foremost gratitude must go to the members of the Gypsy and Traveller community who participated in this research. I would like to thank 'Chantelle' and 'Shuana' for their work on this project, particularly for their assistance in recruiting other members of the community. I would also like to thank Chantelle's mum for the space she provided to conduct some of the research. Connie and Tom also deserve special thanks, their support and hard work was much appreciated. I hope that I have kept faithful to my promise and represented their world as accurately as possible.

Secondly, I would like to thank my supervisors Mike Maguire and Lesley Noaks. I do not think I could have asked for better supervisors, they have given me invaluable support and have been inspirational. Thanks must also go to Sara Delamont who gave up her precious time to help me in the early stages of this research, thank you.

I would also like to take this space to thank my colleagues in SOCSI in particular Chris Pac-Soo, Rachel Taylor-Swann, Rob Smith, Jaki Needs, Becky Dimond and Gerbrand Thelon and the Criminology department. I must also thank Cheryl Allsop, Dennis Eady, Lee Gregory, Jess Paddock, Jane Gullick and Megan Butcher for reading through my chapters. Thank you all for your support, the nights out and propping me up!

So many thanks must go to my mum for her unending support without which this venture would not have been possible. Thanks Mum and Rob for always believing in, and having faith in me, even when I had none.

This project was funded by the Economic Social Research Council their financial assistance is gratefully acknowledged.

*In loving memory of the Big Bopper
(Dad)*

Table Of Contents

| | |
|--|-----------|
| Declaration | i |
| Abstract | ii |
| Acknowledgements | iii |
| Dedication | iv |
| Table Of Contents | v |
| Glossary Of Terms | viii |
| | |
| Chapter One: Introduction | 1 |
| | |
| Research Questions | 1 |
| <i>Defining Gypsies And Travellers</i> | 2 |
| <i>Gypsy And Traveller Communities</i> | 4 |
| <i>Perceptions Of Gypsies And Travellers</i> | 6 |
| | |
| Gypsies And Travellers, Crime And Justice | 7 |
| | |
| Structure Of The Thesis | 10 |
| | |
| Chapter Two: Conflicting Values | 13 |
| | |
| Introduction | 13 |
| | |
| Crime And Value Consensus | 14 |
| <i>Bricolage</i> | 18 |
| <i>Value Consensus</i> | 19 |
| <i>Rites And Rituals</i> | 21 |
| <i>The Role Of Pollution And The Creation Of Symbolic Boundaries</i> | 22 |
| | |
| Theoretical Explanations | 24 |
| <i>Techniques Of Neutralisation</i> | 24 |
| <i>The 'Established' And The 'Outsider'</i> | 26 |
| | |
| Conclusion | 31 |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Chapter Three: Informal Community Justice | 33 |
| Introduction | 33 |
| Governance From ‘Below’ | 34 |
| <i>Community Justice</i> | 36 |
| <i>Community Courts</i> | 37 |
| <i>Blood Feuding</i> | 39 |
| <i>Gossip And Labelling</i> | 40 |
| <i>Avoidance</i> | 41 |
| Theoretical Explanations Of Informal Community Justice | 43 |
| <i>Shaming And ‘Ladge’</i> | 44 |
| <i>Restorative Justice</i> | 45 |
| Democratic Accountability And ‘Policing’ | 48 |
| <i>Policing</i> | 48 |
| <i>Police Actions</i> | 49 |
| <i>Policing Legitimacy</i> | 51 |
| Conclusion | 52 |
| | |
| Chapter Four: Methodology | 54 |
| Introduction | 54 |
| <i>Ethnographic Methods</i> | 55 |
| Access | 57 |
| <i>An Impartial Bystander: My Role In This Research</i> | 62 |
| Ethics | 68 |
| Methods | 70 |
| <i>The Participants</i> | 70 |
| <i>Interviewing Gypsies And Travellers</i> | 71 |
| <i>Photographic Facilitated Interviews</i> | 75 |
| <i>Written Accounts</i> | 76 |
| <i>Observing Gypsy And Traveller Communities</i> | 78 |
| <i>Field-Notes</i> | 80 |
| <i>Interviewing Key-Stake Holders</i> | 81 |
| Data Analysis | 83 |
| Conclusion | 84 |

| | |
|---|------------|
| Chapter Five: Moral Codes | 87 |
| Introduction | 87 |
| Value Consensus And Conflicting Values | 88 |
| <i>A Nomadic Tradition</i> | 89 |
| <i>Moral Codes</i> | 91 |
| <i>Bricolage</i> | 95 |
| Symbolic Boundaries | 96 |
| <i>Rites And Rituals</i> | 96 |
| <i>Mochadi And Marrie-Mae</i> | 100 |
| <i>Identity And 'Othering'</i> | 102 |
| Conclusion | 105 |
| | |
| Chapter Six: Gypsies' And Travellers' Attitudes Towards Crime And Deviance | 106 |
| | 106 |
| Introduction | |
| Outsider Crime | 109 |
| <i>Stealing</i> | 109 |
| <i>Illicit drug Use</i> | 115 |
| <i>Organised Crime</i> | 117 |
| Crime From Within | 120 |
| <i>Stealing</i> | 120 |
| <i>Sexual Abuse</i> | 121 |
| <i>Domestic Violence</i> | 123 |
| <i>Serious Violent Crime</i> | 125 |
| Conclusion | 126 |
| | |
| Chapter Seven: Gypsy Justice | 128 |
| Introduction | 128 |
| Types And Use Of Informal Community Justice | 130 |
| <i>Creese</i> | 131 |
| <i>Fighting</i> | 134 |
| <i>Gossip And Avoidance</i> | 136 |
| Restorative Justice | 138 |
| <i>Shame</i> | 139 |
| <i>Reacceptance Ceremonies And Degradation Ceremonies</i> | 144 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| <i>Gestures Of Reacceptance</i> | 148 |
| Conclusion | 149 |
| Chapter Eight: ‘Policing Legitimacy And Engagement With Gypsy And Traveller Communities | 151 |
| Introduction | 151 |
| The Relationship Between Gypsies And Travellers And Agents Of Social Control | 154 |
| <i>Poor Relations</i> | 155 |
| <i>Good Relations</i> | 161 |
| Gypsies’ And Travellers’ Engagement With The Police | 164 |
| <i>Engagement From ‘Within’</i> | 164 |
| Conclusion | 170 |
| Chapter Nine: Discussion | 172 |
| Introduction | 172 |
| <i>A Typology Of Gypsies And Travellers</i> | 173 |
| <i>Bricolage Communities</i> | 174 |
| <i>The Role Of Pollution</i> | 175 |
| <i>Symbolic Boundaries</i> | 176 |
| Do Gypsies And Travellers Have a Common Set Of Shared Values? | 176 |
| <i>Conflicting Values</i> | 177 |
| <i>Harm And Techniques Of Neutralisation: Understanding Attitudes To Crime</i> | 180 |
| <i>The ‘Outsiders’</i> | 185 |
| How Are Deviant And Criminal Acts Dealt With, Or Resolved By Gypsy And Traveller Communities? | 188 |
| <i>Modes Of Informal Community Justice</i> | 190 |
| <i>Forms Of Informal Community Justice: Restorative Justice</i> | 190 |
| How And When Do Members Of The Gypsy And Traveller Community Have Recourse To Formal Agents Of Social Control? | 192 |
| <i>The Relationship Between The ‘Police’ And Gypsies And Travellers</i> | 193 |
| <i>Recourse To Official Agents Of Social Control</i> | 194 |
| Conclusion | 196 |

| | |
|--|------------|
| Chapter Ten: Conclusion | 198 |
| Introduction | 198 |
| Crime, Justice And Policing Of Gypsies And Travellers | 199 |
| Policy Implications And Directions For Future Research | 201 |
| | |
| Bibliography | 206 |
| Appendices | 222 |

Glossary Of Terms

| | |
|-------------------|--|
| <i>Baro Ladge</i> | A Gypsy term used to mean great shame |
| <i>Chavies</i> | A Romani word for children |
| <i>Chilki</i> | A term used by Gypsies and Travellers to describe dirt – this differs for Mochadi and Marrie-mae |
| <i>Creese</i> | A Romani word for a Gypsy community court – the spelling of this may vary and is sometimes spelt <i>Kris</i> |
| <i>Culchen</i> | A Gypsy term that describes items that are clean and free from pollution |
| <i>Gorger</i> | A Romani word used to describe a non-Gypsy and Traveller, the term translates to ‘Outsider’- the spelling can vary with some publications using <i>Gorgios</i> |
| <i>Ladge</i> | A term used to mean shame |
| <i>Marrie-Mae</i> | A Rom word for pollution |
| <i>Mochadi</i> | A Romani word pollution |
| <i>Wrom</i> | An alternative spelling for Rom Gypsies |

Chapter 1:

Introduction

Research Questions

The aim of this research is to examine the attitudes of Gypsies' and Travellers'¹ towards crime, how members deal with those who transgress the moral boundaries of their community, and also, the dealings and the relationship they may have with official agents of social control. The research is based primarily on ethnographic methods underpinned by three research questions, within which are contained a number of sub-questions. These can be summarised as:

1. *Do Gypsies and Travellers have a common set of shared values?*
 - a) What attitudes do Gypsies and Travellers have towards crime and deviance?
 - b) Are these attitudes underpinned by a Gypsy and Traveller moral code?
 - c) Do the values shared by the Gypsies and Travellers conflict with those of the wider community?

2. *How are deviant and criminal acts dealt with, or resolved by Gypsies and Travellers?*
 - a) What customs and rules do Gypsies and Travellers adopt in responding to deviance?
 - b) When and how are these methods of social control used by Gypsies and Travellers?

¹ It has been recommended by the Welsh Assembly Government that the terms Gypsies and Travellers should always be capitalized. For further details on this please refer to www.wales.gov.uk.

3. *How and when do Gypsies and Travellers have recourse to formal agents of social control?*
 - a) What kinds of relationships are developed between Gypsies and Travellers and official agents of social control?
 - b) In what circumstances do Gypsies and Travellers make use of official agents of social control?

This chapter provides a broad background and context for the research, including a discussion of definitional issues and a brief summary of topics prominent in previous studies. It also underlines the importance of gaining a greater understanding of each of these research questions. The chapter will then move on to provide a synopsis of each of the following chapters. This will guide the reader through this thesis, and provide an analytical and theoretical framework for the research, thus proffering an explanation of how this will inform the answers to each of the research questions as outlined above.

Defining Gypsies And Travellers

The Office of Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) defines Gypsies and Travellers as:

A person or persons who have a traditional cultural preference for living in caravans and who either pursue a nomadic habit of life or have pursued such a habit but have ceased travelling, whether permanently or temporarily, because of education needs of their dependent children, or ill-health, old age or caring responsibilities (whether of themselves, their dependants living with them, or the widows and widowers of such dependants), but does not include members of an organised group of travelling show people or circus people, travelling together as such (ODPM 2004: 11).

This definition is extremely limited in that it fails to recognise a large section of Gypsies and Travellers who would certainly define themselves as belonging to this ethnic minority group. For example, this definition does not account for Gypsies and Travellers that have become housed and had their travelling lifestyle curtailed, for reasons such as legislation. Again, other groups who would class themselves as Gypsies and Travellers such as Fairground people and Boat Dwellers are absent from the definition offered by the ODPM.

A more useful description is provided by Clark (2006) who rather than set a rigid definition of what is a Gypsy and Traveller, offers a typology of different categories of Gypsies and Travellers. Hence, the term Gypsy and Traveller is a somewhat broad label used to describe a number of groups that fall within this ethnic minority category. Using this approach currently in the UK the term 'Gypsy and Traveller' is used to include, Welsh Gypsies, English Gypsies, Irish Travellers, Rom, Fairground Travellers, Boat Dwellers and New Age Travellers (see Clark 2006, Bancroft 2005, CRE 2006 and Murdoch and Johnson 2004). Through the provision of a typology Clark (2006) is able to recognise the varying cultures that can be recognised as emerging from a Gypsy and Traveller background. Thus Clark acknowledges that Gypsies and Travellers are not a homogeneous community: each group of Gypsies and Travellers have their own unique culture and language (Murdoch and Johnson 2004). If we take Romani Gypsies as an example, and here English and Welsh Gypsies are included, these groups speak a mixture of English and Romani, whereas Irish Travellers mix English with Shelta and Cant (see Clark 2006 and Murdoch and Johnson 2004). It is important here to note that the focus of this research was Welsh Gypsies, English Gypsies, Irish Travellers and Rom Gypsies. The reason for this was in part due to access, but also resulted from the populations present in the particular communities and localities I selected for research.

Official estimates of Gypsies and Travellers residing in the UK is somewhere between 180,000 and 300,000, these figures are based on the bi-annual Caravan count (January 2009). This equates to 1,547 in Scotland, 850 in Wales (an increase of four percent from the previous year) and 17,865 in England. However, there are a number of issues relating to the counting of Gypsies and Travellers and it is suggested that this approximation greatly underestimates the total currently residing in the UK (see Murdoch and Johnson 2004). Importantly, official estimates only account for Gypsies and Travellers living in caravans and as such fails to include members of the community that are housed. Despite the problems associated with the counting of Gypsies and Travellers they are recognised as the largest ethnic minority group in Europe (CRE 2006). Surprisingly, for such a large population, relatively little is known about Gypsies and Travellers, and what is known tends to be based on myths and stereotypes

(Clark 2006). I will return to this shortly when I discuss the perceptions of Gypsies and Travellers, but first let us look in some detail the 'Gypsy and Traveller communities' I will refer to throughout this research.

Gypsy And Traveller Communities

As noted above, I focused this research on Welsh Romany Gypsies, English Romany Gypsies, Irish Travellers and Rom Gypsies. This has ramifications in terms of the empirical data that will be discussed in subsequent chapters (see chapters five, six, seven, eight and nine). As will be shown, different groups of Gypsies and Travellers have adopted the customs and rituals of their culture to fit the needs of their ethnic group. Nevertheless what is apparent, despite discrepancies in the rites and rituals performed by each 'group' the outcome appears the same, which is the maintenance of their cultural and ethnic heritage. This is more eloquently stated by Acton *et al.* (1997) as; '*polarised variations of a common structure*' (Acton *et al.* 1997: 238) meaning that alternative systems are employed by different groups of Gypsies and Travellers. Acton *et al.* (1997) are critical of what they see as the:

fragmentation of ethnographic work, as sociologists and social anthropologists have described the practices of "their" group without locating them in any broader historical and structural context. (Acton et al. 1997: 238).

Acton *et al.* (1997) argue that research into specific groups of Gypsies and Travellers need to acknowledge that there are various ways in which one can express Romany identity. Hence Gypsy and Traveller communities that have not been included within this research may indeed have alternative customs and codes than the ones that will be described here. While I cannot state conclusively it is possible that they too have adapted their customs as an alternative means to maintain their 'Romany' culture (see Acton *et al.* 1997).

The term 'community' is a somewhat problematic concept (see Buerger 1994, Cohen 1985 and Duffee 1980). Indeed, community can be understood in a number of ways such as; localities in which the 'territorial' community embodies those who live within a specific space. Alternatively communities can be understood through identities such as a 'black community' or 'working class community' (see Seagrave

1996 and Willmott 1987). Yet this definition fails to recognise the fluidity of communities, for instance the black community is not homogeneous and experiences can differ due to a range of variables such as age, gender, location and so forth. A more useful definition is offered by Cohen (1985) who argues, communities are constructed by a sense of belonging an individual feels towards a specific group. In this way communities can be seen as a social construct in which members not only share something in common but crucially are able to *distinguish themselves in a significant way from members of a putative group* (Cohen 1985: 11). In a similar vein Fernback (2007) defines community as; *a symbolic process of collective experience and cultural meaning* (Fernback 2007: 52).

Acknowledging the difficulties in defining community, I have used a concept that accounts for both locality and Cohen's social construct of identity. The localities I selected for this research was two-fold. Firstly, as will be discussed in the chapter titled 'Methodology' I conducted the majority of fieldwork on two authorised encampments in south Wales. These sites were selected as I had already established contacts with local residents in previous research I had conducted with Gypsies and Travellers (see Foley 2006, 2005). Secondly, research was conducted in various parts of England, access to these groups was established from networks at specific conferences aimed at Gypsies and Travellers and fairs attend by this group.

At each of the locations explored, there were different groups of Gypsies and Travellers. For example, one site could be defined as being predominately Irish Traveller, whereas other sites as Welsh Romany or English Romany. That is not to say however, that sites were exclusive to particular groups of Gypsies and Travellers, hence on each site one would find a combination of groups albeit smaller in population. Therefore when I allude to 'Gypsy and Traveller communities' it is in part these localities I refer to. However, community has also been used to describe the different groups of Gypsies and Travellers that participated in this research as outlined above (i.e. Welsh Romany, English Romany, Irish Travellers and Rom Gypsies). I am unable to include the experiences of New Travellers, Fairground Travellers and Boat Dwellers, nor do I take into account 'housed' Gypsies and Travellers and those living on

unauthorised sites. As I acknowledge above the groups omitted in this research may have opposing methods in dealing with conflicts, the police and systems of justice. While I do not speak for these groups as Acton *et al.* (1997) concede to exclude them entirely would fail in locating them in the broader social and historical context of being '*Romany*'.

Perceptions Of Gypsies And Travellers.

Throughout history, Gypsies and Travellers have been viewed with both curiosity and suspicion. This stigma, together with public policy initiatives, has served to exclude these communities from the 'settled' society, forcing them to live on the fringes of our towns and cities (Greenfields 2006b). Moreover, Gypsies and Travellers are often labelled as deviant and '*outlaws*' through discourse in the media, by the police and by politicians (Richardson 2006). Similar to other socially disadvantaged groups, Gypsies and Travellers are over represented within the criminal justice system (James 2007).

Discourse in social policy debates, too, has generally been negative about the Gypsy and Traveller lifestyle (see Cemlyn 2008, Vanderbeck 2005, Bancroft 2005, Hester 2004 and Ni Shuinear 1997). So much so, Cemlyn (2008) concedes:

The human rights of Gypsy Travellers are violated across many dimensions (Cemlyn 2008: 157).

Violations of the Gypsy and Traveller communities' Human Rights have included restrictions on the nomadic lifestyle of Gypsies and Travellers that have resulted in the enforced settlement of the community. Policies targeted at young people in Gypsy and Traveller communities have also involved the removal of children from their families and their '*Gypsy way of life*' (Cemlyn and Briskman 2002). Mainstream services in the UK are aimed at those who conform to a sedentary lifestyle; this means that many services fail to engage with Gypsies and Travellers, resulting in a lack of safe places to live, and health and education needs being neglected (see Hester 2004). Lack of engagement is further compounded when one considers the level of victimization experienced by many Gypsies and Travellers. One third of the UK population admit to some form of prejudice towards Gypsies and Travellers (Stonewall 2003). Hostility is so great

towards Gypsy and Traveller communities that members experience forms of victimization on almost a daily basis (see Foley 2006). Some of the hostility experienced by Gypsy and Traveller communities is fuelled by media representations of Gypsies and Travellers (Cemlyn 2008)

Within the media, Gypsy and Traveller communities have often been portrayed as 'lawless', having little regard for the values of British society. While there are numerous examples that one could draw upon to illustrate this point, here a small selection will be offered. A recent BBC documentary that looked at the behaviour of Gypsy and Traveller children was titled *'The Gypsy Child Thieves'*. As we can see from the name, the programme depicts Gypsy and Traveller children living outside of the law, and the documentary fuelled stereotypes of the dishonest and unruly nature of Gypsies and Travellers. Vanderbeck (2003) studied the portrayal of Gypsies and Travellers in the media and was able to conclude that these marginalised communities are consistently misrepresented and that such representations could lead to a mistrust of the community in the wider society. Headlines such as The Sun's *'The Sun's War On Gypsies Free For All'* and the Daily Mails *"'British Values Mean Nothing To Me,' Say's The Gipsy² Mother Who Forced Her daughter To Marry At 13"* and *"Caught In The Act: The 'Gipsy' Child Thieves Who Could Teach Fagin A Trick Or Two"* (The Sun 2006 and The Daily Mail 2008) would certainly appear to validate Vanderbeck's (2003) claim.

Gypsies And Travellers, Crime And Justice

Despite the number of negative headlines, evidence would suggest that Gypsies and Travellers are far from lawless, and abide by a strict moral code, a code, ironically that may at times lead them into conflict with the majority community (see Morris 2001). Such evidence has emerged from a relatively small number of in-depth studies aimed at understanding the lifestyle and culture of Gypsies and Travellers, and how this may impact on their attitudes towards crime and deviance (see James 2007, James 2006, James 2005, Bancroft 2005, Vanderbeck 2005, Dawson 2000, Gmelch 1986 and Okely 1983). Most notable is the work of

² This is the spelling used in the media headlines.

Judith Okely (1983) who offers one of the most extensive insights into the culture of Gypsies and Travellers, and their values and belief systems. Nevertheless, this work is dated and it would be useful to explore to what extent these values systems still prevail today.

As previously noted, alongside the attitudes towards crime maintained by Gypsies and Travellers, the research described in this thesis is also concerned with the varying means available to Gypsy and Traveller communities to deal with those who transgress their moral boundaries. A recent report by the Ministry of Justice stated that to date there is a very limited body of research pertaining to Gypsies and Travellers access to justice. From what can be determined, it seems that these vulnerable communities have limited redress to the Criminal Justice System (CJS) (Mason *et al.* 2009). It is noted by Mason *et al.* (2009) that there is a real need for a greater understanding of the reasons why this access is constrained for Gypsies and Travellers. Alongside this, previous research has provided evidence to show that Gypsies and Travellers have developed their own informal system of justice, rather than relying on official agents of social control to deal with disputes in their communities. There is some evidence to suggest that Gypsies and Travellers adopt similar strategies to small-scale tribal communities (Okely 2005 and Weyrauch 2001 and 1997a).

The methods used by small-scale tribal communities can vary from informal resolutions to formal community justice (Redfield 1967, Bohannan 1957 and Leach 1954). The notion of community justice has long been explored by anthropologists, for instance, Leach's (1954) study of the Kachin of Burma showed how this community adopt the informal strategy of avoidance to deal with deviants, whereby deviants are ignored for a specific period of time. Similarly Colson (1974) found that Tongans developed a range of sanctions such as avoidance, ostracism and exile for deviant transgressions. Blood feuds are also common, (see for example, Lee 1979) being used as a means to seek reparation for a deviant act. At the more formal end of informal community justice, evidence has shown how tribal communities operate a court system which takes precedence of over state sanctions (Gibbs 1963, Bohannan 1957, Coser 1956 and Leach 1954). There is some evidence to suggest that Gypsies and Travellers operate

similar systems to those mentioned above. Indeed, as Okely's (2005) anthropological study showed, Gypsies and Travellers used both avoidance and blood feuds, whereas Caffery and Mundy (1997) state that a court known as a 'Creece' is used for serious transgressions. Whilst the work of Okely (2005) and Caffery and Mundy (1997) offer an important insight into the types of community justice that may be used by Gypsies and Travellers, to date there has been no systematic study on this issue in the UK.

Informal community justice has seen a resurgence in interest over recent years through the likes of Stenson (2001) and Crawford (2002) among others. Hence while this notion remains important, very little is known of the role of informal community justice among Gypsies and Travellers which this research will aim to redress. Thus this thesis recognises an important gap in current research in terms of justice and could go some way in redressing the imbalance of research in this area as noted previously by Mason *et al.* (2009).

In recent years there has been a growing body of literature pertaining to the policing of Gypsies and Travellers. Most notable is the work of James (2007, 2006 and 2005) who offers an important account of police tactics towards Gypsies and Travellers, many of which, as James (2007) suggests 'go beyond normative limits' (James 2007: 379). While James (2007, 2006 and 2005) also highlights a number of more effective and less stringent tactics in the policing of Gypsy and Traveller communities, she notes that there is no consistency to these (see James, 2007 and Coxhead 2007). Hence, it would be interesting to evaluate whether the practices employed by the police have any consequences in terms of the extent to which Gypsy and Traveller communities communicate or cooperate with official agents of social control. It is for this reason the policing of Gypsies and Travellers has been included in this current research. As James (2007) notes:

The desire of Gypsies and Travellers to continue living nomadically or semi-nomadically has led to their using a number of tools to 'survive' their policing experiences. Such tools have resulted in the engagement of the Gypsy and Traveller communities in aspects of their own governance (James 2007: 380).

Structure Of The Thesis

Having outlined the aims of this research and shown how it attempts to redress the gaps in current research on Gypsies and Travellers in terms of how they define deviance and their use of formal and informal systems of justice, I will briefly describe the structure and content of each chapter.

The next two chapters review previous literature in terms of its contribution to the three main research questions set out at the start of this chapter. These two chapters have been separated so that a clear focus on the research questions can be achieved. The first of these chapters, 'Conflicting Values', concentrates on literature pertaining to the first research question. It will establish a theoretical framework that will help to conceptualise the value systems maintained by Gypsy and Traveller communities. The literature in question suggests that Gypsies and Travellers adhere to a strict moral code, which is informed by many of the rites and rituals that form part of their culture. This allows Gypsy and Traveller communities to create a symbolic boundary between themselves and the wider society. Moreover, it will be argued; again based on previous literature that Gypsy and Traveller communities attitude toward crime are strongly influenced by the notion of 'harm', with acts that are seen as 'harmful' being more likely to be classed by Gypsies and Travellers as criminal and or deviant.

The second review of literature, chapter three ('Informal Community Justice') aims to address the second and third of the research questions outlined above. Here, a framework that acknowledges the different mechanisms available to Gypsy and Traveller communities will be proffered. It will show how Gypsies and Travellers focus on the notion of shame, an important social control mechanism, which has implications for how justice is delivered within Gypsy and Traveller communities. The final part of this chapter will explore previous work on the relationship between Gypsies and Travellers and the police. A broad definition of the police will be applied in order to account for the diverse groups who are charged with '*policing*' Gypsy and Traveller communities (Jones 2003).

Chapter four, 'Methodology' will present a detailed account of the ethnographic methods used to address the questions identified above. As will be described the bulk of the fieldwork was based on ethnographic methods and interviewing. This chapter, also draws attention to the ethical issues encountered during all stages of this research, from the design through to writing up of this thesis. An account of how these issues were addressed will be offered. It has often been noted that access into Gypsy and Traveller communities can be problematic (see Weckman 1998). This chapter will identify the ways in which this was achieved, describing the process of renegotiating access, and how eventually access was sustained. Alongside this, my own role in researching Gypsies and Travellers will be outlined, together with the consequences that this may have had for the data collection process, both positively and negatively. The chapter will draw to a close with an explanation of the analytical framework, and what I perceive to be some of the limitations of the methods employed.

Chapters five through to eight of this thesis present the findings of the research, analysing and discussing them in relation to the research questions and the theoretical literature that is set out in chapters two and three.

In chapter Five, 'Rites, Rituals And Symbolic Boundaries', a detailed description of the social world of Gypsies and Travellers will be presented. This will be important in contextualising important concepts that have resonance throughout all areas of this current research. It will provide an account of how Gypsies and Travellers organise their social world, through the varying rites and rituals that are preformed. It will discuss the importance of identity among Gypsies and Travellers, which is achieved through the creation of symbolic boundaries. The moral codes of Gypsy and Traveller communities will be outlined, explaining how and when these may conflict with the values professed by the wider society. The chapter concludes with a theoretical explanation of how Gypsies and Travellers are able to separate themselves from those who they see as failing to abide by the moral codes adopted by their community.

Chapter six, 'Gypsies' And Travellers' Attitudes Towards Crime And Deviance', provides empirical evidence and adopts a theoretical position on how Gypsies and

Travellers perceive crime. It explores the attitudes of Gypsies and Travellers to crimes both within and outside of their community. It offers an account of crimes that are seen as acceptable and crimes that are off limits according to Gypsies and Travellers.

In Chapter seven, titled 'Gypsy Justice', an outline of the different mechanisms of informal community justice employed by Gypsies and Travellers will be presented. Here, the varying techniques used to deliver justice will be embodied within a theoretical framework that understands the importance of shame. A distinction between two forms of shame will be discussed in order to illustrate the impact of this concept on the offender(s), the victim(s) and the community. These two forms of shame, reintegrative shame and disintegrative shame, have significance for the rehabilitation of the offender, which results from the perceived seriousness of the offence as understood by Gypsy and Traveller communities.

The final empirical chapter, 'Policing Legitimacy And Engagement With Gypsy And Traveller Communities', (chapter eight) offers the Gypsy and Traveller perspective on the policing of their community, drawing on evidence to illustrate both the 'good' and 'bad' relations between these two groups. The chapter then turns attention to the notion of policing legitimacy and how this informs the recourse Gypsies and Travellers have to official agents of social control.

Chapter nine, 'Discussion', illustrates how the empirical evidence outlined in chapters five through to eight, not only addresses the research questions underpinning this thesis, but also builds upon previous research to add knowledge about Gypsies and Travellers more generally.

Finally, the 'Conclusion' will draw each of these chapters together. It will highlight the importance of this research and how it informs debates about the relationship of justice, not only of Gypsies and Travellers, but also of other marginalised communities and more specifically, how their access to justice may be impeded. This final chapter will also offer a discussion on the potential impact of this research on future policy developments.

Chapter Two:

Conflicting Values

Introduction

This chapter sets out to consider previous literature that may be of relevance to this current research. It plays particular attention to how attitudes about crime and deviance are constructed. The central focus therefore, is on the first of the research questions underpinning this current study. That is, *do Gypsies and Travellers have a common set of shared values?* It examines the somewhat limited body of work pertaining to Gypsies and Travellers in general and more specifically, their attitudes towards crime. This is expanded upon through an examination of how the attitudes held by Gypsy and Traveller communities may conflict with the attitudes professed by the wider society. In understanding such attitudes, and potential conflicts, I draw upon previous research conducted on excluded communities as this could offer a broader framework. This provides a backdrop for exploring theoretical explanations into how these attitudes are constructed. In doing so we turn to the work of Sykes and Matza (1957) to show how techniques of neutralisation afford individuals the opportunity to rationalise their actions.

The chapter will begin by examining literature on moral codes and the 'myth' of value consensus. This will be achieved by exploring the research relating to attitudes towards crime and how many groups fail to abide by the norms held by the majority of society. Here the work of many anthropological studies may be of use, helping to contextualise the varying and alternative attitudes to crime and deviance held by divergent groups (see Turnbull 1974, Malinowski 1961, Bohannan 1957 and Leach 1954). Alongside this, more contemporary work focusing on marginalised communities (see Mason *et al.* 2009) and ethnic minority groups (Blagg 2008 and Wardak 2000) will be considered and the relevance assessed to the question set out above. Within this section, the

importance of rites and rituals will be discussed, in order to demonstrate how ceremonies provide an important framework for the moral codes adopted by Gypsies and Travellers.

The previous chapter highlighted the relevance and importance of this study, illustrating the lack of knowledge and understanding of the social world inhabited by Gypsies and Travellers. At present there is a limited but growing, albeit slowly, body of research exploring Gypsies' and Travellers' attitudes towards crime and deviance. In contrast, there have been a number of moral panics concerning the behaviour and lifestyle of Gypsies and Travellers. As noted in the previous chapter, much of what is understood about Gypsy and Traveller communities is based on conjecture and stereotypes (see Cemlyn and Clark 2005, Vanderbeck 2003 and Gmelch 1986). This form of negative discourse is not exclusive to the media, as MacLaughlin (1999) notes, there is a '*historical and geographical loathing*' of Gypsies and Travellers (MacLaughlin 1999: 36) who have been constructed as dirty and dangerous (also see Mayall 1992).

Crime And Value Consensus

There are many forms of crimes commonly associated with Gypsies and Travellers. These crimes are somewhat varied, often centred around the lifestyle and work choices of the members of Gypsy and Traveller communities. To gain a greater insight into these crimes Dawson (2000) is able to provide us with a list of crimes associated with Gypsies and Travellers. While he found no evidence to suggest that Gypsies and Travellers were engaged in a higher level of criminal activity than any other group in society, he could discern a number of crimes that have been associated with this community. Many were considered 'harmless' and included crimes such as, poaching and bare-knuckle fighting, which as Dawson explains, were not seen as crimes by Gypsies and Travellers. Shop-lifting, vehicle crimes, social security fraud, tarmacing scams and conning and stealing from the elderly, were all linked to Gypsies and Travellers in Dawson's (2000) study, and again these were seen as 'harmless' acts by members of these communities. Other crimes listed by Dawson comprised of antique scams and thefts, caravan thefts, major crimes and connections with the IRA. The data cited by Dawson (2000)

formed part of a Gypsy and Traveller survey conducted in the 1960s and as he is able to concede, this may be somewhat outdated and the behaviour of Gypsies and Travellers and the perceptions held of them by the wider society may have moved on. Nevertheless, his study does provide a useful starting point for this current research. Indeed, it will be useful to see if these attitudes have indeed changed, or if such attitudes prevail. One issue highlighted by Dawson (2000) which is worthy of a fuller exploration is the concept of 'harm' and we will return to this later in the chapter.

The idea of certain forms of crimes being ascribed to specific groups in society is certainly not new, Hall *et al.* (1978) first demonstrated this, showing how mugging had become synonymous with young black males in the UK. A more recent study by Blagg (2008) explored crimes linked to the Aboriginal populations in Australia. Blagg was able to demonstrate how petrol sniffing, drugs and violence have become equated with Aboriginal youths. In a similar vein gang membership and gang activities have been linked to Chinese communities (Chin 1996) and Puerto Rican youths (Bourgois 1999). Moreover, as Young (1999) points out, the lifestyle of many marginalised groups' has forced them to live outside of the law. This is eloquently illustrated by Blagg (2008) noting, the state has consistently attempted to erode many aspects of Aborigine culture as it conflicts with the Eurocentric laws and state institutions. This renders many of the customs and rites practiced by the Australian Aboriginal populations outside of the law. Okely (1983) presents a similar account, in which she contends that the dominant society has consistently attempted to control aspects of Gypsies and Travellers lifestyle, which conflict with the majority norms and values. Indeed, Gypsies and Travellers resistance to some of the values held by the wider society suggests they are seen as a threat to the dominant social order (Okely 1983). Moreover, Sellin (1938) argues that laws have traditionally reflected the values of the dominant group in society, so much so they exclude those who fail to conform to their values. Evidently, there are many aspects of the Gypsy and Traveller lifestyle that suggest they are on the periphery of the law.

An example of this can be seen in attitudes toward education among Gypsies and Travellers. The role of education and how it impacts on Gypsy and Traveller

communities is discussed by Levison and Sparks (2004) where the reluctance of Gypsy and Traveller parents to allow their children to remain in formal education after the age of twelve is noted. The reason behind this is complex. Adult members do not want their children to pick up what they see as 'Gorger' habits, such as promiscuous sexual behaviour and illicit drug use. This is compounded by customs prohibiting sexual education. Another facet of this refusal, is the need for children to work within the family unit. Yet, non-attendance in education means that Gypsies and Travellers deviate from a number of education requirements as set out in Education policies (Levison and Sparks 2006). Such actions lead Gypsy and Traveller communities to appear lawless and flaunting the laws of the land (Vanderbeck 2003 and Sibley 1995).

Further transgressions of the norms and laws of the wider society have been discussed by Gmelch (1986) who found that many of the common occupations of Gypsies and Travellers led them to being labelled as deviant by the wider society. According to Gmelch (1986) many of the occupational services provided by Gypsies and Travellers meant they were:

regarded as marginal: as peripheral occupational subcultures providing petty services... (Gmelch 1986: 310).

These services include scavenging for items such as scrap metal which they may obtain illegally. Therefore, by providing for their family '*by whatever means possible*', Gypsies and Travellers are adhering to their moral obligations to their kin but may be breaking the law in doing so (Gmelch 1986: 311).

Perhaps the most contentious activity conducted by Gypsies and Travellers is their right and desire to travel. On the one hand, Gorger society views the travelling behaviour of Gypsies and Travellers as being '*aimless, unpredictable and irrational*' (Okely 1983: 125). Yet, for Gypsies and Travellers their need to access land temporarily or permanently is a constant source of tension. Hostility stemming from the nomadic lifestyle of Gypsies and Travellers can be found in many areas of society. One clear example is provided by a Conservative MP, Andrew MacKay who claimed:

They (i.e. law abiding citizens) want to get on with their lives in peace, but they want protection under the law when they are invaded by this scum. They are scum, and I use the word advisedly. People who do what these people have done do not deserve the same human rights as my decent constituents going about their everyday lives (Hansard 15/01/2002).

Yet on the other hand, legislation relating to authorised and unauthorised encampments is far-reaching. For instance, the Town and Country Planning Act 1947 limited the number of stopping places available to Gypsies and Travellers and prosecutions for stopping on road sides resulted from the Highways Act 1959. More recently, the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act (CJPOA) 1994, gave greater powers to the police and local authorities to evict Gypsies and Travellers camping illegally and the Anti-Social Behaviour Act 2003, allowed the police to move Gypsies and Travellers from unauthorised sites if there was an authorised site in the vicinity. Legislation pertaining to encampments is complex and remains ambiguous to members of Gypsy and Traveller communities and those responsible for the 'policing' of encampments (Mason *et al.* 2009 and James 2007, 2006). It is evident the Office for the Deputy Prime Minister (ODPM) is unclear about legislation when they state:

There is no clear, widely understood national policy towards accommodation for Gypsies and other Travellers... (OPDM 2004: 2).

Despite any definitive understanding of legislation concerned with encampments the bottom line would suggest that:

if there are not sufficient sites where Gypsies may lawfully stop, then they will be without the law whenever and wherever they stop (Clement and Morris 2001: 5).

Regardless of attempts to prohibit travelling and the setting up of unauthorised camps, travelling remains an integral part of the Gypsy and Traveller lifestyle (James 2007, Clement and Morris 2001, Lomax *et al.* 2000, Campbell 1995 and Okely 1983). In pursuing a nomadic lifestyle Gypsies' and Travellers' way of life has become criminalised through the range of legislation outlined above (James 2006, Clark 2006, Clement and Morris 2001, Bancroft 2000 and Campbell 1995). In order to overcome such problems Gypsies and Travellers have been forced to accept some values held by the wider society and reject those that impact on their

life (Okely 1983). In doing so, Okely (1983) suggests that Gypsies and Travellers have been forced into becoming '*bricoluers*' that is, the cutting and pasting of a different range of attitudes and beliefs. In this sense, Okely is arguing that Gypsies and Travellers have learnt to cut some of the values held by the settled community and paste them onto their values and belief system, thus rejecting other values that are seen as inconsequential to their community.

Bricolage

Bricolage was first developed as a concept by Levi-Strauss (1966) and was used to demonstrate how primitive communities were able to adapt to their environment, gathering a range of raw material to construct myths. More recently, the term has been used by Cultural Sociologists, most notably the 'Birmingham School's Centre for Contemporary Cultural Studies' (CCCS). For Instance, Hebdige (1979) showed how youth cultures were resourceful in '*cutting 'n mixing*' from different cultures, time and space. In his original discussions on bricolage, Levi-Strauss (1966) merely used the term to illustrate how myths were constructed from a range of resources from the past, and attached to current tools available within primitive communities. The concept has however, been developed to recognise power relations in society, as such it has been used to explain alienation within society among marginalised groups (Comaroff 1985, Okely 1983, Hebdige 1979 and Hall 1979). For example, Hebdige (1979) applied the concept of bricolage to demonstrate how working class youth cultures were able to incorporate existing styles to develop a new style and culture; in doing so, it is argued that young men were able to resist the dominant culture. Correspondingly, Blagg (2005) is able to illustrate this concept among Aboriginal populations in Australia and how they cut and paste between tribal law and the law of Australia.

It would appear from the above discussion that Gypsies and Travellers through their rejection of certain norms and laws, have differing attitudes from those professed by the wider society, thus deviating from the value consensus in society. Traditionally, value consensus was seen as the bedrock for social order, enabling and maintaining social stability and social solidarity. It assumes that

within society there is a general agreement of the accepted and unaccepted norms and behaviour patterns (Comte 1998, Parsons 1968 and Durkheim 1984). Yet, very few social scientists would put forth such arguments today, as the notion of value consensus has long been contested within criminology.

Value Consensus

Many early anthropologists through their research on tribal communities were important in highlighting the idea of alternative value and belief systems. The anthropologist who is often credited with drawing attention to conflicting norms is Malinowski (1966) who recognised the importance of informal methods of control among tribal communities. As such, Malinowski was able to understand how rules and norms were developed. Like many of his contemporaries he did not refer specifically to deviance or norms, but he did explain how behaviour became regulated and the process by which transgressions were dealt with. Bohannan's (1957) study of the Tiv; a tribal group based in the Sudan area of Africa provides a clearer account of how values adopted by tribal communities conflict with those of the wider society. Bohannan (1957) successfully shows how definitions of norms and values led to ambiguity between the Tiv and western society, so much so that this was a constant source of tension and conflict. A further interesting and in-depth account of conflicting norms is provided by Turnbull's (1974) anthropology of the BaMbuti tribe of Zaire. He found that although stealing was strictly prohibited between BaMbuti members, the tribe actively stole from other tribes. In doing so, they failed to see any offence in their actions despite causing conflict with other tribal communities who had alternative values toward stealing.

More contemporary research is able to reinforce the conflicting values highlighted by these early anthropological studies. They are able to recognise that Britain is a culturally diverse society and as such different social groups often have opposing morals and norms (see Blagg 2008, Wardak 2000, Bourgois 1999 Young 1999, Chin 1996 and Gilroy 1995). As Blagg (2008) concedes:

Oppositional cultures develop attitudes and behaviours which are deliberately in opposition to those of the mainstream and they provide an alternative source of status and respect (Blagg 2008: 69).

In this sense, Gypsies and Travellers are not alone in developing alternative values and beliefs pertaining to crime.

A clear example of the multiplicity of value systems is provided by Wardak (2000) who offers an insight into how different groups are able to develop alternative moral codes. His ethnographic study of young Asian males illustrated the range of conflicting values they held, within their culture, across generations and in schools. More importantly however, is Wardak's acceptance that even within a small ethnic community opposing moral values existed. One such example offered by Wardak (2000) can be seen in the mode of dress between 'newer' and more established communities. The less established groups were more comfortable wearing traditional clothing, whereas younger and more established groups were more reluctant to do so. This notion is certainly not new: as Chin (1996) found, members of ethnic minority groups have conflicting needs which are impacted upon by variables such as age, gender and socio-economic status. Whilst the work of Wardak (2000) and Chin (1996) provide an important contemporary account of how a group may define deviance and how this may differ from the wider society, it focuses on specific ethnic groups, namely young Asian males and Chinese communities. Nevertheless, the dichotomy experienced by these groups could have resonance with this current research.

Bourgois (1999) offers a slightly different perspective than that provided by Wardak (2000) and Chin (1996) arguing that many excluded groups develop an intricate system of values, beliefs and symbols that have developed as a result of exclusion from the mainstream society. The young people in Bourgois's study are able to resist the main culture with which they have an ambivalent relationship. In contrast Aboriginal populations in Australia do not just have an ambivalent relationship with the state. Their attitudes are more deep-rooted, to some extent rejecting the assimilation, cultural genocide and dispossession forced on them from colonial rule (Blagg 2008: 70).

Rites And Rituals

Thus far, this chapter has focused on conflicting values. Previous research has highlighted that Gypsies and Travellers, in line with other marginal communities, have developed an alternative set of values to those held by the dominant society (see Greenfields 2006b, Levison and Sparks 2006, Clement and Morris 2001, Bancroft 2000, Lomax *et al.* 2000, Dawson 2000, Campbell 1995, Gmelch 1986 and Okely 1983). It has even been suggested that Gypsy and Traveller communities are 'lawless' and 'scum', yet evidence would suggest that Gypsies and Travellers adhere to a strict moral code, which is underpinned by the rites and rituals performed by their communities (Okely 1983 and Bonos 1942). An evaluation and the pertinence of previous work in this field will now be assessed.

Through her extensive research on Gypsy and Traveller communities, Okely (1983) offers one of the most influential contemporary accounts into the social world of Gypsies and Travellers. While it must be noted, Okely's work is somewhat dated, it does present a useful comparison with this current research. Previously in this chapter, it has been discussed how Okely (1983) successfully and powerfully argues that Gypsies and Travellers have developed a bricolage set of beliefs. In addition to this, Okely (1983) is able to demonstrate how Gypsy and Traveller communities abide by a strict moral code. The importance of the moral code held by Gypsies and Travellers is of great significance, in that it takes precedence over the norms and laws held by the wider society.

Weyrauch and Bell (2001) who have written prolifically on the experiences of Gypsies and Travellers in America, discuss the importance of sexual taboos within Gypsy and Traveller culture. They argue that women have a central role in ensuring that such codes are adhered to. This impacts on the way women dress and interact with others. Dress codes have been cited as an important feature in studies of other ethnic minority groups. For example, Wardak alludes to the importance of how females dress not only in terms of cultural identity but also in imposing a notion of moral decency and eliminating sexual provocation. In contrast, however, members of the Pakistani community who were British born

found the wearing of traditional dress as a form of '*self-inflicted exclusion*' which incited racial hatred (Wardak 2000: 136).

The Role Of Pollution And The Creation Of Symbolic Boundaries

Okely (1983) illustrates the importance of pollution and the symbolism it implies amongst Gypsies and Travellers. Before looking at how pollution is used among Gypsies and Travellers and the way it informs aspects of the moral code held by communities, the concept of pollution needs wider exploration.

The work by the anthropologist Mary Douglas (1966) is a good starting point as she was able to recognise the symbolic element of pollution as a taboo function. Within societies taboos perform the function of protection, and the need to avoid taboos becomes all encompassing. In order for a taboo to exist there needs to be a general consensus among members of a community on deviant and accepted behaviour. As Douglas notes:

Taboo is a spontaneous coding practice which sets up a vocabulary of spatial limits and physical and verbal signals to hedge around vulnerable relations. It threatens specific dangers if the code is not respected (Douglas 1966: xiii).

Dirt signifies one of these dangers that need to be avoided. Communities through varying rituals of purity and impurity create symbolic patterns and construct meanings of the accepted behaviour. Thus, pollution is a symbol of social order and solidarity.

For Gypsies and Travellers pollution is of great significance, the community is able to distinguish between two forms of dirt, *chikli* meaning dirt that is harmless, and *mochadi*³ used to describe something that has become ritually polluted (Okely 1983: 81). The body is an important symbol and site of pollution among Gypsies and Travellers who distinguish between the inner and outer body. The inner body represents the ethnic identity of the Gypsy and Traveller that embodies the private social world of their culture, which needs to be protected from the public world.

³ Marrie Mae is also used to describe this form of pollution and has the same meaning as *mochadi* but used by different groups of Gypsies' and Travellers' than the ones studied by Okely

The outer body is the public self, the side they present to the Gorger social world (Okely 1983). The Gorger world is deemed polluted by Gypsies and Travellers and as such, Gorgers themselves are viewed as *mochadi*. Gypsy and Traveller communities must avoid contamination at all costs, which has consequences for the ways in which Gypsies and Travellers interact with Gorger people. While Okely (1983) provides a rich and vivid account on the role of *mochadi* within Gypsy and Traveller communities, she does not imply any significance of this in relation to the moral codes adopted by Gypsies and Travellers and the importance of this in terms of how they are perceived by the Gorger community and the attitudes towards crime and deviance. Yet, it is possible that *mochadi* or *marriemae* play a crucial role in these perceptions and attitudes. Recognising this constraint this research attempts to explore the role of pollution in more depth. This will help in understanding the social world of Gypsies and Travellers and how their moral codes are constructed.

Regardless of such omissions, Okely (1983) is however, able to demonstrate the importance of pollution in the construction of symbolic boundaries and the demarcation between Gypsy and Traveller communities, and the wider society. The concept of symbolic boundaries has also been discussed by Cohen (1985) who offers an interesting discussion of how communities are formed through the symbolic constructions of values, moral codes and norms which enable a community to develop a sense of identity and belonging for group members. This boundary:

encapsulates the identity of the community, the individual within that community and the exigencies of social interaction (Cohen 1985: 24).

The rituals and symbols adopted by communities provide them with the tools to map their social world, so what may seem as indecipherable to an outsider functions as a means of expressing social boundaries to members of a group (Cohen 1985). Thus through the use of pollution members of Gypsy and Traveller communities are able to separate themselves from the Gorger social world, and as such symbolize their ethnic boundary, and reinforce the moral codes accepted by Gypsies and Travellers.

Theoretical Explanations

So far, this chapter has concentrated on the attitudes towards crime held by Gypsies and Travellers, and how at times these may differ from the attitudes assumed by the wider society. Previous literature has highlighted the dichotomy experienced by Gypsies and Travellers. On the one hand it would appear that they are lawless, but as a community, Gypsies and Travellers abide by a strict moral code. In doing so, however, they are able to reject those values deemed as irrelevant to their community (Okely 1983). Moreover, these values are underpinned by the rites and rituals performed by members of Gypsy and Traveller communities (Weyrauch and Bell 2001, Cohen 1985, Okely 1983 and Douglas 1966). The aim of the remaining section of this chapter is to try and understand these attitudes through a broader theoretical framework. A good starting point for this is the work of Sykes and Matza (1957) and their concept of techniques of neutralisation.

Techniques Of Neutralisation

Techniques of neutralisation as offered by Sykes and Matza (1957) originally stemmed from the work of Sutherland (1937) and his Differential Association theory that suggests crime is learnt through the interactions of an individual with a deviant group and / or deviant individuals. These interactions provide them with techniques of crime, alongside a rationale or motive for doing so. Sykes and Matza (1957) were able to expand upon this, explaining how individuals are able to rationalize and justify their criminal acts. According to Sykes and Matza (1957) there are five different techniques used to neutralise deviant and criminal behaviour and they advanced these techniques to explain juvenile crime. However, these techniques have also been used to explain crime among a variety of groups and are no longer solely an explanation of juvenile delinquency (see Piquero *et al.* 2005, Copes 2003, Eliason and Dodder 1999, Dodder and Hughes 1993 and Ball 1966).

Before setting out the five techniques presented by Sykes and Matza (1957) it is useful to return once again to the work of Dawson (2000) and the typology of crimes frequently linked to Gypsies and Travellers that he presents. Previously in this chapter, it was noted that many of the crimes outlined by Dawson (2000) were cited as harmless or insignificant by Gypsies and Travellers. The notion of harm has been acknowledged by previous writers (see Weyrauch and Bell 2001 and Acton *et al.* 1997). Both Acton *et al.* (1997) and Weyrauch and Bell (2001) argue that Gypsies and Travellers are able to view many crimes as 'harmless'. Nevertheless, the notion of harm as an explanation of attitudes to crime among Gypsies and Travellers remains neglected. Let us now look at the different techniques offered by Sykes and Matza (1957) in order to better illustrate how this may prove useful in this current research.

The first of the techniques outlined by Sykes and Matza (1957) is concerned with the rationale of denying responsibility, and hence implying that the criminal's actions are beyond the control of the individual. Piquero *et al.* (2005) found that many corporate criminals accepted to diminish their own responsibility for their actions by apportioning blame on their work environment and culture. Many of the crimes referred to in Dawson's (2000) work would appear to suggest that the denial of responsibility was prevalent in the attitudes of Gypsies' and Travellers' toward certain crimes. For example, Dawson is able to show how poaching was seen as 'natural' by Gypsies and Travellers, and how the conning of, and theft from, the elderly was seen as the fault of society. Indeed, it is suggested by Dawson that Gypsies and Travellers blamed society for allowing the elderly to be left to fend for themselves, arguing that if families took greater responsibility this would not occur. Hence, it is possible that Gypsies and Travellers are able to neutralise some criminal acts through this process.

The second technique is the ability to deny any injury. Here, according to Sykes and Matza (1957) the delinquent is able to distinguish between criminal acts that may hurt someone and those acts which they perceive as not hurting anyone, for example poaching. Referring back to Dawson (2000) he illustrates how shoplifting, social security fraud and the theft of caravans were all seen as harmless by the Gypsies and Travellers that took part in his survey.

Denial of a victim is the third technique outlined by Sykes and Matza (1957). Here the victim becomes the 'wrongdoer'. If we take Gypsies' and Travellers' attitudes to antique theft, then according to Dawson this is justified them, suggesting that people should not be so greedy and have so many expensive items. Therefore it is likely that in doing so Gypsies and Travellers are able to adopt this third technique as provided by Sykes and Matza (1957).

Condemnation of the condemners is the fourth method of neutralisation discussed by Sykes and Matza (1957). Here individuals rationalise their behaviour by focusing their attention on those who disapprove of their actions. Finally, Sykes and Matza (1957) offer the technique of appealing to higher loyalties. Here the individual's actions are justified by the belief they are aiding their community, group or family. If we return to the work of Gmelch (1986) as outlined above, it was suggested that Gypsies and Travellers are strongly constrained by the obligation to provide for their family '*by whatever means possible*', even if that means they have to break the law in doing so (Gmelch 1986: 311). Okely (2005) is also able to recognise the importance of the family among Gypsies and Travellers, stating that their family loyalty is paramount and takes precedence over all other interactions. As such, it is possible that Gypsies and Travellers are able to adopt this technique in order to justify their actions.

The 'Established' And The 'Outsider'

Despite negative images of Gypsies and Travellers found in all echelons of society (see Richardson 2006) research would suggest that Gypsies and Travellers are fiercely proud of their cultural heritage (Clark 2006, Okely 2005, Bancroft 2005, Weyrauch 2001, Acton *et al.* 1997 and Okely 1983). For example, when a members of Gypsy and Traveller communities come into conflict with the Gorgor community, Gypsies' and Travellers' first loyalty is that to their community (see Okely 2005). Likewise, Bonos (1942) suggests that the first loyalty for a Gypsy and Traveller is toward their kin, and a close second to this is their loyalty to their community. Gronfors (1986) recognised the importance of identity among

Finnish Gypsies and Travellers who were able to see themselves as being separate from the mainstream Finnish society. This is again reiterated by Bancroft (2005) who claims that Gypsies and Travellers have been able to maintain a powerful group identity that has allowed the community to resist the many attempts of assimilation forced onto them throughout history.

Evidence would therefore suggest that Gypsies and Travellers have a clearly defined sense of identity that enables them to distinguish and separate themselves from the Gorgor social world. There are many and varied definitions of identity (Brewer 2001). Nevertheless, for the purpose of this research, the social construction of identity will be referred to, explaining how this is ascribed to individuals both internally and externally.

This idea of belonging and identity is of course not unique to Gypsies and Travellers. Many early anthropologists who examined the social worlds of small-scale communities and tribes discussed the notion of group identity and its importance in terms of the social solidarity and social order of these communities (see Malinowski 1961, Leach 1954 and Bohannan 1957). One such example is provided by Leach (1954) whose anthropological study of the Kachin tribes of Burma, illustrates how this tribal community were identifiable by their language which reinforced their sense of group identity. Indeed, the tribe had no word for 'I' but instead always referred to themselves as 'we,' thus suggesting a strong group identity (Leach 1954: 73). This is further reinforced by Howell's (1954) study of the Nuer tribal community, found in the Sudan, where the prevailing sense of loyalty was toward tribal members, thus allowing social harmony to be maintained, and members to develop a sense of social solidarity (see Bohannan 1957, Gluckman 1955 and Leach 1954).

Like many groups, Gypsies and Travellers it would appear, have a clear sense, and are committed to, their Gypsy and Traveller status. Yet, it would also seem that identities in Gypsy and Traveller communities are fluid. Not only are Gypsies and Travellers aware of the differing cultural status held by opposing Gypsy and Traveller communities, but the world outside of the community fails to recognise their ethnic status, seeing them as drop-outs from the dominant culture (Okely

1983). Paradoxically, society distinguishes between what they perceive as the 'real' Gypsies and Travellers and those who join-up to the nomadic lifestyle as some form of escapism.

The idea of the 'real' Gypsy has many repercussions, Vanderbeck (2003) notes:

there is a strong tendency for Travellers (particularly Irish Travellers) who do not conform to images of the "real Romani" to be viewed as illegitimate and deviant... (Vanderbeck 2003: 365).

Presenting an example provided by Jack Straw, the then Home Secretary, Vanderbeck (2003) emphasizes this notion, whereby Straw differentiated between '*real Romany Gypsies*', and those who '*masquerade*' as this group in order to pursue illegal behaviour. Importantly, research would suggest that for those members of Gypsy and Traveller communities labelled as the 'real' Gypsies and Travellers, their position in society, while remaining in the fringes (see Clark 2006, Greenfields 2006b, Hawes and Perez 1996, Sibley 1995 and Kenrick and Bakewell 1995) are more accepted in the Gorgers society than other Gypsy and Traveller communities (Vanderbeck 2003, Halfacree 1996 and Sibley 1995).

Vanderbeck (2003) equates the 'newer' Travellers' identity to that of the underclass, in which young people, and here young Traveller people are included, have become depicted as the '*dangerous youth*'. Thus, they become stigmatised and labelled as undesirables in all levels of society (Vanderbeck 2003: 376). The idea of the demarcation of groups between the older 'established' communities and 'newer' groups has been previously accounted for by Elias and Scotson (1965). These two writers illustrated how the influx of newcomers into a community, can lead the lesser established groups to be labelled and blamed for all the wrong doing in the neighbourhood.

Before detailing the work of Elias and Scotson (1965) it is useful to look at how similar identities have been discovered among other groups. Examples of 'insider' and 'outsider' group identity, were identified by Raybeck (1988) in which he provides evidence of dichotomous group relations among small-scale communities. Whereas Turnbull (1974) claimed the BaMbuti tribe of Africa viewed outsiders as a negative influence, distinguishing between insiders and

outsiders they were able to reaffirm their own cultural values (Turnbull 1974: 223). More recently Evans (2001) alluded to the notion of insider and outsiders among a virtual community. Differentiation between members of a virtual community (insiders) and non-members (outsiders) allowed the community to maintain social boundaries

Elias and Scotson (1965) developed the idea of the 'established' and 'outsider' groups in order to understand conflict in a working class community in England. The community had experienced an influx of new arrivals settling into the community, at the same time there was an increase in the level of crime in the area. The established families who lived in the community for many generations purported the blame for this increase on the newcomers. While both the new and established groups were similar in terms of their positioning in the socio-economic hierarchy, Elias and Scotson (1965) were able to illustrate how the power differentials between these groups meant that those families who were well established in the community considered themselves to be superior, declining any contact with newcomers. In turn, the newcomers, lacking any real sense of social cohesion, readily accepted their position and the labels attached to them by the more established members of their community.

The discourse within the media, policy-makers, politicians and society at large, certainly would appear to distinguish between what they see as the 'real' Gypsies and Travellers, who while still remaining separate from society, experience a more accepted and privileged position than those they envisage as 'newer' members of Gypsy and Traveller communities (Vanderbeck 2003). Hence, Elias and Scotson's (1965) positioning on social identity, in particular the means available to those deemed more powerful because of their established status could offer a useful theoretical framework for this current research. It could help our understanding of how society perceives and labels what they see as the 'real' and 'new' members of Gypsy and Traveller communities and the consequence of these labels.

Interestingly, Elias and Scotson (1965) were able to determine that:

Established groups with greater power at their disposal tend to experience their outsider groups not only as unruly breakers of laws and norms... but also as not particularly clean (Elias and Scotson 1965: XXVII).

In order to account for this power differential and the representation of dirt used to consolidate such differences, Elias and Scotson (1965) present a useful example of the Japanese Burakumin. The Burakumin, a minority group have often been defined as '*Eta*', meaning filthy or dirty, by the more established groups. As such Japanese society at large, is able to reinforce the outsider status of the Burakumins (Elias and Scotson 1965: XXVII). As outlined earlier in this chapter, a similar status and image of Gypsy and Traveller communities is evidenced in much of the literature concerning these communities which highlights how Gypsies and Travellers, despite endorsing a strict code on pollution are commonly seen as dirty (Okely 1983).

The work of Elias and Scotson (1965) has proved useful in emphasizing the disparities in power experienced by a variety of groups in society. This notion is accounted for by Hughes (2007) who draws our attention to the '*Othering*' of asylum seekers and new immigrants. Hughes (2007) points out how these marginalised groups become demonised by the established populations, including older immigrant groups who regard such newcomers as 'bogus' and a threat to society (Hughes 2007: 146). In a similar vein, Bauman (2001) ascribes the status of outsider to refugees fleeing their homeland in order to escape war and famine. Established groups view such newcomers as a threat to their social security, reminding them of the precariousness of society and how all too easily they too could be forced out of their country.

The above stress the usefulness of the established and outsider group dichotomy in understanding the power dynamics between varying social groups, and social settings. They are able to illustrate how those who threaten the social order of society are labelled and stigmatized through a variety of means. As such, the model of power configurations developed by Elias and Scotson (1965) could provide a useful theoretical basis for understanding the social positioning of

Gypsies and Travellers, whereby they are considered 'lawless' and a threat to the moral fabric of society (See Weyrauch and Bell 2001 and Weyrauch 1997b). However, there is currently very little understanding of how Gypsies and Travellers deal with members of their own community who deviate from the moral codes. It is possible that the work of Elias and Scotson (1965) could shed some light on power dynamics within Gypsy and Traveller communities; between those who conform to the moral codes and those who deviate. Indeed, as Becker (1963) acknowledges, through the process of labelling those who transgress the moral values of a group are defined as outsiders, and as a consequence their ability to interact with the wider society becomes restricted. Hence, the theoretical framework of Elias and Scotson (1965) may also prove useful in understanding how Gypsy and Traveller communities deal with those members who deviate from the moral code. This will be explored more thoroughly in subsequent chapters.

Conclusion

This chapter has located the theoretical positioning of Gypsies' and Travellers' attitudes to crime and deviance. Understanding these attitudes are socially constructed under the premise of 'harm' or 'harmless' we are able to understand the rationale that individuals adopt to account for criminal acts. It would be naïve to suggest that society is founded upon a value consensus, instead the position here is that values are tied-up with power differentials. Those groups that fail to abide by the values professed by dominant groups are perceived as 'lawless'. In spite of this, many groups adhere to a strict moral code, albeit one that conflicts with the values of the dominate society. This leaves many groups in a precarious position, excluded from many aspects of social life. Having outlined how values can conflict, I adopted Sykes and Matza's (1957) processes of neutralisation to understand how attitudes are constructed. Finally, the notion of identity was referred to, illustrating once again the power differentials between varying groups to render others as outsiders. Power, in this sense was understood through Elias and Scotson's (1965) stance, thus locating power among the established groups. The ability of the established groups to stigmatise newcomers reinforces positions of power, helping to maintain inequalities.

The following chapter will expand upon the literature discussed so far. It pays particular attention to theoretical and empirical understandings of informal community justice. It is concerned with the varying methods used within communities to tackle deviant transgressions. The chapter will also delve into the relationship between the police and Gypsies and Travellers, in order to shed some light onto the recourse of community members with official agents of social control.

Chapter Three:

Informal Community Justice

Introduction

Chapter two summarised findings from previous literature about the attitudes that Gypsies and Travellers hold towards crime, which suggest that these at times conflict significantly with the attitudes professed by the wider society. Despite such conflicts, it is clear that far from being lawless and deliberately flaunting the laws and norms of society, Gypsies and Travellers ascribe to a strict moral code, that is underpinned by the rites and rituals performed by members of the community. However, there are occasions when some members of Gypsy and Traveller communities deviate from the norms laid forth by Gypsies and Travellers. The purpose of this chapter will be to explore the varying methods used by Gypsy and Traveller communities when managing transgressions from the moral codes established among Gypsies and Travellers. This will be undertaken within the context of a review of literature on how various communities have dealt with transgressions among their members. Here, the second of the research questions set out in the introduction will be the focus of review. Accordingly the chapter seeks to address; *How are deviant and criminal acts dealt with, or resolved by Gypsies and Travellers?*

The second part of this chapter will look at previous literature on how members of Gypsy and Traveller communities engage with those whose responsibility it is to police the behaviour of Gypsies and Travellers, thus introducing the third research question underpinning this current research. That is; *how and when do Gypsies and Travellers have recourse to formal agents of social control?*

The chapter will begin with a discussion focusing on literature concerning the notion of 'governance from below' (Stenson 2005) and how communities have developed alternative sites of governance as a substitute for the governance offered by the state. This section will look at the assorted means by which governance from below has been administered within communities. I then go on to discuss theoretical explanations that could provide a useful framework, for understanding the purpose of the informal community justice systems implemented in Gypsy and Traveller communities. This will be achieved by looking at restorative justice, in particular the positioning of Braithwaite (1989) and the principles of reintegrative shame.

The chapter will proceed by looking at the relationship experienced by Gypsies and Travellers with official agents of social control. This will provide some insight into how and when Gypsies and Travellers interact with those responsible for the 'policing' of their communities. The notion of democratic accountability of the police will be explored and assessed in order to see to what extent this influences relationships between these two groups.

In addition to looking at how deviance is constructed by Gypsies and Travellers this research aims to look at how this community resolves transgressions from normative behaviour. Previous research has shown the reluctance of this community to seek assistance from official institutions when deviant acts occur (see Mason *et al.* 2009, James 2007 and Foley 2006). There is some evidence to suggest that Gypsies and Travellers adopt similar strategies to small-scale and tribal communities when members deviate (see Okely 2005, Evans 2001, Weyrauch 2001, Caffery and Mundy 1997, Malinowski 1961, Bohannan 1957, Frankenberg 1957 and Leach 1954).

Governance From 'Below'

Criminology has traditionally been interested in the constitutional and institutional sites of governance (Jones 2007). Nonetheless, there has in recent years been a growing interest in different sites of crime control and prevention, with a recognition that governance is no longer the exclusive responsibility of the

state. Governance is conducted from varying sites and at differing levels within, and between nation states (Edwards and Hughes 2005). Alongside this, many groups within a nation state actively resist state governance in favour of less formal locally administered justice, and as such, communities have developed their own agendas in the delivery of justice. Stenson (2005) argues that this form of justice can be understood through the notion of '*governance from below*' which he refers to as '*folk bio-politics*' (Stenson 2005). Many communities are thus able to develop informal systems of community justice based upon '*folk modes*' of expertise, indeed, they are better able to understand the needs of their community. Referring to oral traditions enables them to provide justice with little recourse to official agents of social control.

Sites of '*bio-politics*' are vast and numerous. Taking Northern Ireland as a case in point, Brewer *et al.* (1998) illustrate the varying sites of bio-politics in Belfast. Localities of crime control extend beyond the policing roles of paramilitaries, to extended family networks, neighbourhoods and the legitimate authority provided to community representatives (Brewer *et al.* 1998: 570). Stenson (2005) asserts that youth organisations, resident associations, criminal and ethnic communities, as well as paramilitary groups have developed different sites in which governance from below has been operationalised with little or no recourse to state governance.

A clear understanding of the presence of '*bio-politics*' is illustrated by Blagg (2008) whose work on Aboriginal populations in Australia proffers an important insight into how this community have continued to employ customary laws to deal with disputes. What Blagg (2008) is able to effectively argue, is that Aboriginal populations have had colonial rule enforced onto them, with little, or no autonomy. Despite this, they have been able to continue their own practices of governance based on the oral traditions of their community.

The work of Blagg (2008) complements much of the work on Gypsies and Travellers (see James 2007, Okely 2005, Pizani-Williams 1998, Gronfors 1986 and Okely 1983) in so far as Gypsies and Travellers have been ruled by the dominant society whose laws impede the Gypsy and Traveller communities'

lifestyle. As a result, they have developed a bricolage identity in which laws that 'pathologise' many aspects of their traditional way of life are rejected by Gypsies and Travellers in favour of their own laws and customs (see Chapter two).

Community Justice

Evidence would suggest that many communities have adopted alternative means to ensure the delivery of justice replacing the forms of justice offered by the state (see Okely 2005, Weyrauch 2001, Caffery and Mundy 1997, Gronfors 1998, Gropper 1975, Gibbs 1963, Bohannan 1957, Coser 1956 and Leach 1954). Edwards and Hughes (2002) make reference to the growing number of acts of vigilantism in the UK over the last decade, citing examples of vigilante groups seeking justice against alleged sex offenders. They argue the reasons why such groups are thriving stems from:

the perceived failure of government strategies to control crime
(Edwards and Hughes 2002: 1).

Yet, it would appear the need for many groups to develop alternative forms of justice, is not a new phenomenon grown out of disillusionment with state governance, but has been a historical practice among groups from a diverse range of settings (Blagg 2008 and Walgrave 2008). Moreover, it would appear that these sites of informal governance are more complex than merely being actions of vigilantism, which would suggest that community justice is operated on an ad hoc basis, resulting from local moral panics. As such, it neglects the formal means that have long been established within communities to deal with transgressions.

If we turn to the work of many early and influential anthropological studies that focus on small-scale tribal communities, the complexity of informal community justice becomes more apparent. Pfohl (1981) asserts that in small-scale or 'stateless' societies '*rituals of primary ordering*' have been adopted, enabling such communities to prevent deviation from norms, thus securing a shared sense of belonging and identity (Pfohl 1981: 75). This sense of shared belonging suggests that within these small-scale communities the focus is on the reconciliation of the offender back into their social group (Raybeck 1988). There are varying means found in small-scale communities to deal with transgressions.

These differ in terms of formality, including moot courts, fighting and blood feuds, gossip and avoidance (see Raybeck 1988, Pfohl 1981, Gibbs 1963, Bohannan 1957, Coser 1956 and Leach 1954). Evidence would suggest that similar methods have been employed among Gypsy and Traveller communities (see Okely 2005, Weyrauch 2001, Caffery and Mundy 1997, Acton *et al.* 1997 Gronfors 1998, Gronfors 1986 and Gropper 1975). Let us now look at each of these methods in a bit more detail.

Community Courts

Anthropological studies have been influential in understanding the use of community courts employed by many small-scale communities (see Scott 1976, Gibbs 1963, Bohannan 1957, Coser 1956 and Leach 1954). Drawing on Gibbs' (1963) study on the Kpelle tribe found in Liberia, Scott (1976) provides a useful definition of community courts and their proceedings, which he sees as informal assemblies set up to resolve disputes. Referring to these courts as 'moots' Scott (1976) writes:

As a rule, the moot is convened as soon as the parties to the dispute can arrange to come together... a mediator is agreed by both parties... during these proceedings, the parties to the dispute are encouraged to express their complaints... no one may leave the moot feeling embittered... (Scott 1976: 610-611).

Thus, the purpose of the court is to seek an amicable resolution to a transgression (see Gibbs 1963, Coser 1956, Bohannan 1957 and Leach 1954). An important facet of the court is the restoration of the offender back into the community, with no feelings of hostility exhibited by the rest of the group (Scott 1976). This is an interesting component and one that will be returned to subsequently under the section on theoretical explanations.

What is clearly evident from previous anthropological research is that a court or moot has greater influence over community members than the prevailing legal system of the state in which the community live. Indeed, Bohannan (1957) claimed that members of the Tiv failed to recognise the official state court of Nigeria. Similarly, Leach (1954) noted that the Kachin did not take the sanctions of the state courts seriously. Offenders punished by the state legal system would

also be punished by their community on their return, thus demonstrating the importance of the community court system operated among the Tiv.

As previously noted, among tribal communities the moot has greater significance for its members than state sanctions (see Bohannan 1957 and Leach 1954). This is reiterated by Caffery and Mundy (1997) who state that Gypsies and Travellers manage conflict and transgressions without recourse to any formal systems of justice. A consequence of communities in dealing with conflict internally has meant that their behaviour is often perceived as deviant and criminal by the wider society in which they live, thus resulting in conflict between these two groups (Caffery and Mundy 1997).

The use of informal community courts is not exclusive to tribal communities, indeed, there is clear evidence of their existence amid Gypsy and Traveller communities. Amongst Gypsies and Travellers, these courts are referred to as Creese, sometimes spelt as Kris, and it would appear that this system has clear parallels to the ones outlined above (see Scott 1976, Gibbs 1963, Bohannan 1957, Coser 1956 and Leach 1954). Thus:

The Kris is basically a meeting of group members in which a specific conflict relating to inter-group relations, mainly between families, is discussed and some resolution of the dispute is reached (Caffery and Mundy 1997: 254).

This mediating system has been compared to the court system used by the wider society in which Gypsies and Travellers reside (Gropper 1975). The use of the Creese plays a vital role in allowing Gypsies and Travellers to seek resolutions within their communities and not rely on outsiders and the formal state system (Caffery and Mundy 1997). Under the Creese system, the whole community is involved in the decision making process and the conflict resolution, hence the responsibility for carrying out any sanctions is a group-wide role. The Creese is held usually by the male members of the community. The 'head' presides over the hearing but does not take responsibility for the overall decision (see Weyrauch 2001, Caffery and Mundy 1997, Weyrauch and Bell 1997 and Acton *et al.* 1997).

Blood Feuding

A more extreme informal means to tackle deviant behaviour is the use of violence or blood feuds among members of society (Okely 2005). Scott (1976) defined a blood feud as:

The blood feud is a tribal institute that can only occur when a breach of law is recognised by both parties, and it is conducted for the purpose of obtaining reparations for the deviant action (Scott 1976: 613).

Feuding and the violence that accompanies this has been well documented, for example, Lee (1979) cited evidence of feuding among the !Kung San of the Kalahari Desert, which resulted in the killing of a tribal member. According to Lee (1979) within a thirty year period, there had been twenty-two such deaths. Feuding and the ensuing violence has been a focal concern of many academics, politicians and outreach workers among Aboriginal communities in Australia. Here, it is recognised that violence is rooted in the traditional 'tribal law' operationalised by many Aboriginal communities (Blagg 2008). Blood feuds are a feature of many societies, for example among Eskimos it was an accepted sanction for murder cases (Weitekamp 1999) and also among the Nuer tribes of Sudan (Evans-Prichard 1945).

Scott (1979) looks at the way in which a blood feud is employed by tribal members, demonstrating how a blood feud within a tribe rarely leads to the death of a member and is resolved quickly and amicably. In contrast a feud between neighbouring tribes could be ongoing with both tribes seeking retribution. Scott (1979) suggests that tribes need to resolve deviance among their community harmoniously in order to generate a sense of solidarity.

Okely (2005) acknowledges the importance of blood feuds among Gypsies and Travellers. Okely (2005) provides a case study to demonstrate the process of a feud, which began with gossiping and avoidance and eventually resulted in an organised fight between the parties. Gronfors (1998) validates the finding of Okely (2005) that blood feuds are sought even when an incident had been resolved by the formal state institutes. Thus, according to Gronfors (1986) Gypsies and Travellers do not fully recognise the laws of the country in which

they live, moreover, sanctions within their community take precedence over official mechanisms.

Gossip And Labelling

Gossip often in conjunction with labelling strategies (to be discussed in the section) is another technique used by communities to informally resolve transgressions from the moral code (see Okely 2005, Selby 1974, Bohannan 1957 and Frankenberg 1957). If we refer back to chapter two, and the discussion on Elias and Scotson (1965) we can see how gossip is employed by established groups to label 'outsiders' as dirty. In this sense, gossip allows established members to undermine the behaviour of outsiders who are seen as transgressors of the norms of the community (Elias and Scotson 1965). Yet, it would appear that the role of gossip is far more multifaceted than Elias and Scotson would suggest. The anthropologist Gluckman (1955) offers a useful perspective into how gossip is fundamental in consolidating important values. He suggests it promotes social cohesion, with all members acting to evade becoming the person targeted and talked about. Moreover, Herskovits (1937) recognised the importance of gossip as an informal sanction, used among tribal communities.

An illustration of this can be seen in Selby's (1974) anthropology of the Zapotecs. Here, Zapotecs apply a system of gossip against wrongdoers, to whom the label of a 'witch' is applied. The label persists until the deviant behaviour is modified, in this sense Selby (1976) is able to demonstrate how gossip is not only used as a mechanism of community justice, but with group members fearing the label of a 'witch', it acts as a technique preventing further deviant transgressions.

A more recent example of the use of gossip and how it operates as an important social sanction is evidenced in the work of Evans (2001) who explored the use of informal sanctions in an on-line chat room. Gossip is practiced through the use of symbols, these are attached to those who deviate from the cultural values of the chat room, and remain until behaviour is rectified.

In terms of Gypsies and Travellers it has already been noted that these communities use language to mark others as ‘outsiders’ (see Okely 1983). Indeed, by employing the term *Gorger*, Gypsies and Travellers are able to distinguish between members and non-members. Language is also used within the community to mark out those who have broken the rules of this society. Gypsies and Travellers apply the term ‘*ladger*’ to those who transgress the moral boundaries held by members of the community. The term translates to ‘shame’, for anyone who this label is attached, they and the rest of the community are aware that they have brought shame onto the reputation of their family, and the community at large (Acton *et al.* 1997 and Bonos 1942). Hence, gossip affords Gypsies and Travellers the opportunity to “*pull someone into line*” (Okely 2005: 699). Stories are knowingly fabricated against any wrongdoer, rumours are then circulated from trailers, to camps, and to visitors, with children playing a crucial role passing on these rumours (Okely 2005). Rumours continue until the alleged wrongdoer confesses to their behaviour in a public challenge.

Avoidance

Another important sanction employed by many communities that is worth some attention here, is that of avoidance. There are two forms of avoidance; firstly, a sanction can be temporary, whereby transgressors are shunned by their community for a specific period of time. A harsher form of this sanction can see deviants permanently ostracised from their group (see Okely 2005, Evans 2001, Colson 1974, Bohannan 1957 and Leach 1954).

The work of Okely (2005) is pivotal in demonstrating how avoidance is employed among Gypsies and Travellers. Unlike the previous sanctions outlined above, a resolution in the system of avoidance can take a considerable amount of time, and can on occasion remain unresolved. According to Okely (2005) the strategy of avoidance can take a number of forms, and more importantly, this mechanism has an important role in resolving conflict. On a basic level avoidance can take the role of non-speaking relationships. Usually this form of avoidance will be between members of different family units, and requires that the whole of the family do not speak to anyone with whom they are in conflict. As such, a ‘*stand-*

off' could last for many months , years, or permanently with individuals risking losing face if they speak first (Okely 2005: 698). In more extreme cases a family may be required to leave the campsite either temporarily or permanently. In such cases, the conflict is never fully resolved as family members avoid attending any event which may involve the family with whom they are in conflict. Hence, the informality of the system of avoidance suggests that the sanction will continue until the deviant individual(s) amend their behaviour, however, any form of apology would require an omission of guilt and can have serious repercussions on an individual's reputation. The consequence of this may be that members of certain Gypsy and Traveller communities will avoid certain families stemming from disputes that may have occurred a number of generations previous. It is therefore, no surprise that the first greeting any newcomer experiences when they pull onto a campsite for the first time, is, '*who are you?*' , the purpose of this is to establish if each family is able to talk to each other without contravening a dispute (Okely 2005, 1984).

The mechanism of avoidance is certainly not unique to Gypsies and Travellers. For example, Leach (1954) found that the Kachin adopt a similar strategy whereby an individual who had transgressed the norms of their culture would be avoided until their behaviour was amended. The Tonga's, a tribal community based in Zambia apply the sanctions of ostracism for lesser deviations, whereas, more serious offences are met with the permanent exile of individual(s) (Colson 1974).

Technical advancements in the cyber world have led to an interesting development into how the sanction of avoidance can be deployed. An interesting account of avoidance is presented by Evans (2001) whereby members of an on-line chat room are provided with an 'ignore' button, enabling the community to actively avoid those deemed as deviant. This prevails until the offender(s) apologises for their behaviour.

Theoretical Explanations Of Informal Community Justice

So far, this chapter has outlined the different techniques used by communities to administer informal community justice, and has noted that courts, fighting and feuds, gossip and avoidance have all been used to varying degrees among different communities (see Okely 2005, Evans 2001, Acton *et al.* 1997 Scott 1976, Gibbs 1963, Bohannan 1957, Coser 1956, Leach 1954 and Bonos 1942). This section will now review theoretical explanations that account for how these methods have been used by communities, and the purpose behind their use.

A useful explanation is offered by Raybeck (1988) who supplies a constructive critique of anthropological studies of small-scale tribal communities, to illustrate how labelling theory could help to understand the use of informal community justice in tackling transgressions. It could be suggested that Raybeck is somewhat selective in the data he draws upon, and subjective in his interpretation of the studies he presents. He is nonetheless able to provide a clear case for his argument. Raybeck (1988) concedes that for small-scale units, deviance is tolerated as long as it does not threaten the fabric of the society. Yet labelling individuals as deviant and the employment of a sanction will be invoked, if the action threatens the welfare of the community. The process of labelling is critical in the deliverance of informal community justice, in both small-scale tribal communities and larger advanced industrial communities (Raybeck 1988).

Raybeck (1988) certainly advances upon previous literature pertaining to sanctions in small-scale societies, such as the arguments set forth by Scott (1976) who claimed that sanctions enhance social cohesion. Through the use of informal community sanctions, a small-scale community is able to unite against the offender thus increasing the level of social integration (Scott 1976). Nonetheless, both Raybeck (1988) and Scott (1976) fail to account for the use of shame and the role this plays within systems of informal justice, this is despite the fact that both writers allude to the use of shame in their work.

Shaming And 'Ladge'

Previously in this chapter, it was noted how the term ladge was used among Gypsies and Travellers through the process of gossiping. Yet the notion of shame among Gypsies and Travellers could have significant bearing in the theoretical positioning in this current research, in relation to the use of informal community sanctions adopted by Gypsy and Traveller communities. Past studies of Gypsy and Traveller communities have highlighted varying levels of shame expressed by Gypsies and Travellers who differentiate between 'ladge' (shame) and 'baro ladge' meaning great shame (Acton *et al.* 1997 and Bonos 1942). Acton *et al.* (1997) contest that shame is a vital tool used among Gypsies and Travellers to ensure that social cohesion and solidarity is maintained. Thus by becoming fully socialised to the norms adopted by Gypsy and Traveller communities, shame can be avoided. While Acton *et al.* (1997) proffer a useful understanding of the importance shame has on Gypsy and Traveller communities, they fail to fully explain the possible role of shame in terms of how justice is delivered among Gypsies and Travellers.

Thus, it could be argued that shame plays a pivotal role in the system of informal community justice adopted by Gypsies and Travellers. As such, this useful concept needs a fuller exploration, to see how the notion of shame may be used by Gypsies and Travellers. A valuable examination of the function of shame is propounded by Braithwaite (1989) it is to this that we now turn our attention. In doing so, we will consider the relevance of Braithwaite's work for this current research.

Braithwaite (2002 and 1989) has written extensively about the vital function that shame plays in society, advocating the notion that: Cultural commitments to shaming are the key to controlling all types of crime (Braithwaite 1989: 55).

The manner in which shame is practiced in society can vary between and among different cultures. In order to expound this, Braithwaite is able to present evidence on how different cultures have modified the use of shame. A case in point highlights how in the Roman Republic offenders were shamed by having their door burnt down and followed by people dressed as mourners, thus stressing their

disapproval of the wrongdoer's behaviour. Polite mocking is used in some Indian cultures, while alternative approaches can be seen in both China and Cuba who publically denounce any deviants (Braithwaite 1989: 58).

Braithwaite (1989) effectively differentiates between two forms of shame. First, shame that is reintegrative: here the effects of shaming are not long-lasting, and an individual who receives this form of shame is eventually rehabilitated with their community. Conversely, Braithwaite acknowledges a second form of shame that is disintegrative: here the effect of shame becomes more enduring. This oppressive form of shaming becomes stigmatizing, leading to the out-casting of the individual(s) (Braithwaite 1989). For societies that are able to adopt a system of reintegrative shaming, there is a greater sense of social cohesion and crime rates are lower. In contrast, societies that espouse disintegrative shaming appear to have higher crime rates. It is of little surprise therefore, that Braithwaite is a champion of reintegrative shaming, employed under the edifice of restorative justice. Restorative justice focuses:

on the evil of the deed, rather than on the offender as an evil person (Zhang 1995: 249).

Braithwaite (1989) sets out a model of restorative shame in which the individual is 'free' to make choices on their behaviour. As such shaming is a:

tool to allure... the citizen to attend to moral claims... to coax and caress compliance (Braithwaite 1989: 9)

Yet, the individual is still free to reject moral obligations, through the disapproval of society. The focus of the next session of this chapter will be on how reintegrative shaming fits into the framework of restorative justice and its possible relevance to this study.

Restorative Justice

Restorative justice has become a widely used concept within criminology, so much so that Braithwaite (2002) refers to this system of justice as a global social movement. The muddying of the concept of restorative justice is noted by Daley (2002) who suggests that many of the practices that allege to fit in with its ideologies are far from restorative, and some go so far as being disintegrative.

Nonetheless, a key feature of restorative justice is that it is more inclusive and participatory than traditional systems of justice (Dignan *et al.* 2007). Marshall (1996) provides possibly the most cited definition of restorative justice which is seen as:

a process whereby all parties with a stake in a particular offence come together to resolve collectively how to deal with the aftermath of the offence and its implications in the future (Marshall 1996: 37).

Accordingly, Marshall (1996) proffers a number of key principles that represent restorative justice. These include: the acceptance of and need for personal involvement, that is, by those harmed and the offender(s); the problem should be seen in a social context; punishment should be forward looking and preventative; and finally practices should be flexible (Marshall 1996: 28). Walgrave (2008) is critical of the definition outlined by Marshall for being somewhat too narrow and rigid. Taking such criticisms, the system that Marshall defines seems to have some resonance with the system of community justice employed by Gypsies and Travellers. We will return to this subsequently, but first let us see how restorative justice has been, and is used, in different societies.

The development of restorative justice has often been credited to the work of Braithwaite (see Blagg 2008); nonetheless, as Walgrave (2008) concedes the principles of this form of justice can be traced back to many primitive societies. Turnbull's (1974) anthropology of the BaMbuti pygmy tribe, living in the rain forests of north-eastern Zaire, would certainly appear to validate this claim. Here, justice is dispensed quickly and informally. So, for example, violations of incest taboos would be dealt with by the offender being forced to leave the camp for a day, on their return the offender may be ridiculed for a day or two, but would be re-accepted back into the tribe and no further comments would be made about his actions. What we can see from Turnbull's study is a system of justice which dispenses reintegrative shaming that allows for the successful repatriation of the offender back into the tribal community.

The use of restorative justice has been well documented among many indigenous populations, such as Navajo peacemaker circles, in which all parties meet with a peacemaker who allows both groups to come to an amicable resolution (Coker

2006). Similarly, the use of family conferencing in New Zealand has its roots in restorative justice (Van Ness *et al.* 2001). Aboriginal ceremonies based on traditional tribal law focus upon the notion of cosmology, yet within this system there may be fighting, physical payback, cursing and sorcery. Regardless, offenders are shamed, but are also reunited with their community once the punishment has been dealt (Blagg 2008). Despite not fitting in with the stereotype of restorative justice which is often described as a soft option, Blagg (2008) argues that the system of justice maintained by Aboriginal communities does indeed fit with an agenda of restorative justice, and that those who fail to acknowledge this are looking at justice through a western lens. There appear to be some clear comparisons between the systems outlined here and the system developed by Gypsy and Traveller communities. Consequently, restorative justice could offer a useful theoretical framework for this current research, and the reasons why it may prove fruitful will now be discussed.

Returning briefly to the different mechanisms of informal community justice as practised amongst Gypsies and Travellers it would appear that the purpose of these systems would be to reintegrate the offender back into the community. Drawing upon the example of the Creese, all parties are actively involved in the decision making process with regard to the form of punishment dispensed. Alongside this, once the punishment has been commissioned, and the offender has recompensed for their actions, the incident is concluded with the offender rejoining the community (see Weyrauch 2001). Additionally, under a system of gossip, it has been shown that rumours persist up until the offender makes a public challenge. Once this has happened the rumours are stopped and the offender is united back with the community (Okely 2005). While fighting and feuding may not traditionally be seen as a form of restorative justice, if one is able to adopt Blagg's (2008) stance, whereby such attitudes are based on viewing and defining such systems through a western lens, the actions taken by social actors from these groups are based on the notion of restorative justice. As such, it would be culturally biased, not to recognise these modes of justice in terms of customary law and more importantly, systems of informal community justice operating under the premise of restorative justice. With this in mind, it is possible that ideologies and principles of restorative justice might help to explain the system of

fighting and feuding seen in Gypsy and Traveller communities (Okely 2005, Acton *et al.* 1997 and Gronfors 1986).

Democratic Accountability And ‘Policing’

At the beginning of this chapter, it was noted how communities have developed a system of governance from ‘below’ (Stenson 2005). One reason for the development of this stemmed from the sense of mistrust experienced by many communities toward the police (see Cole and Wardak 2006, Sharpe and Atherton 2007 and Newburn *et al.* 2004). In-line with other excluded and marginalised communities, Gypsies and Travellers fail to recognise the democratic accountability of the policing of their community (Mason *et al.* 2009). It is this notion that the remainder of this chapter will concentrate on. Before examining the notion of democratic accountability a discussion will be provided that focuses on some of the possible reasons for this sense of lack of legitimacy, but first an understanding of how the concept of ‘policing’ will be used in this research needs to be accounted for.

Policing

Over recent years, there has been a move towards a more holistic approach to policing, one that acknowledges the different agents involved in the policing of society (Jones 2003, Crawford 1997 and Mclaughlin 1994). Joined-up practices are not unique to the police, indeed, since the election of a New Labour Government in 1997, many of the policies adopted by this Government have been influenced by the philosophies of the third way (Atkinson and Flint 2004). The third way can be seen as a compromise between the New Right ideologies of the Conservative Government and those of Old Labour (Cook 2006). New Labour under the leadership of Tony Blair advocated the development of policies which were not influenced by prevailing political ideologies, favouring instead a ‘common sense’ approach (Barton and Johns 2005). During their first term in Government, New Labour faced a number of social problems which were not being resolved with current social policies (Cook 2006). Therefore in order to

tackle these issues the Government aimed to develop a holistic and 'joined-up Government' (JUG) approach to social policies (Clark 2002).

Traditionally definitions of the 'police' focused on the issues of law enforcement and peace keeping (Jones 2003). This definition has been criticised for being rather narrow, failing to account for the changing nature of policing in modern society (Crawford 1997). It is no longer the sole responsibility of the police to enforce the law and maintain the peace (Crawford 1996). Increasingly, duties that have traditionally been associated with the police have become more and more diffused, with different bodies taking accountability for these roles. Broader definitions of the police recognise the diffused concept of the police, taking into account the diverse activities that come under the remit of crime control and crime prevention (Jones 2003). It is this broader definition of the police that will be adopted in this research.

Police Actions

Having set out the position of the police and the way in which this concept is to be used within this research, this section will now explore some of the police activities, particularly toward some of the more vulnerable groups in society. Sharpe and Atherton (2007) surveyed the attitudes of young people toward the police and found that young black males were the least likely to have any confidence in the police. This, in part, was due to the negative behaviours of the police towards this group. Alongside this, misconduct of the police fuelled such attitudes. Stop and search measures used by the police are often cited as a critical cause for their lack of legitimacy in the eyes of many marginalised communities (Mason *et al.* 2009). In particular, evidence has consistently indicated that young black males have a far higher chance of being stopped and searched by the police than their white counterparts. Spencer and Hough (2000) found that such over policing was a clear cause for the negative attitudes to the police experienced by young black males. Much of the attention on the problematic relationship between varying groups in society and the police has focused on the actions outside of the police station. Newburn *et al.* (2004) change this tide with their

useful and important work on strip searches conducted by officers. Black arrestees were significantly more likely to be strip searched than any other ethnic minority group. This had serious implications on how the police were viewed by these groups, and could go some way to explain mistrust felt by many groups.

In a similar vein, the lesbian, gay and bisexual (LGB) communities, have little confidence in to the police, for slightly different reasons than the ones outlined above. For instance Moran (2007) discussed how the mistrust of the LGB community towards the police had its roots in the way in which these communities were treated by the police as both offenders and victims of crime. Many treatments were deemed to be unfair and unjust; this had serious consequences for the community in accessing justice (Mason *et al.* 2009).

In terms of Gypsy and Traveller communities the relationship experienced between them and the police has been historically problematic (Foley 2005). Indeed, when the police have dealings with Gypsy and Traveller communities, these tend to be confrontational rather than consultative. This is particularly the case of dealing with unauthorised encampments (James 2007 and Metropolitan Police 2006). This is somewhat further problematised by the fact the police are seen as enforcers of the settled communities laws, without paying due respect to the traditions of the cultural needs of Gypsies and Travellers (Metropolitan Police 2006). Pizani-Williams (1998) referred to policing practices in relation to Gypsy and Traveller communities as '*intensive and provocative*' (Pizani-Williams 1998: 19). Some of the methods employed by the police included, the parking of police vehicles at the entrance of sites thus blocking access to residents, night tours using high powered torches to look inside trailers, and the confiscation of lawfully owned items. It would seem that very little has changed since the time that Pizani-Williams's (1998) was writing. Indeed James (2007) found practices such as blocking site entrances, whole site raids, blocking mobile signals and stringent stop and search measures. The result of the intensive measures outlined here means that Gypsies and Travellers are reluctant to access the police as victims of crime (Mason *et al.* 2009).

Policing Legitimacy

Having established how the notion of the police will be defined within this research, this chapter now goes on to explore issues of policing legitimacy and how these may prove pertinent in this current research, in particular, in understanding the attitudes of Gypsies and Travellers towards the police and their dealings with them. The multi-agency approach to policing that this research will draw upon, has its roots in inner-city troubles that occurred during the 1980s in a number of sites throughout the UK (McLaughlin 1994). The causes of these riots were cited as the unfair policing experienced by communities in the UK, particularly among the black ethnic population (Scarman 1986). Thus, the actions of the police were seen as the sparks that fuelled inner-city riots (Benyon 1984). As such, it was proclaimed that the police were policing communities without the consent of large sections of society (McLaughlin 1994). Recognising the problems of policing without consent, the then political establishment accepted that changes were needed in the way the British society is policed. Crucially, the police needed to build bridges between themselves and the communities they were tasked to police (Crawford 1996).

The issue of policing without lawful consent, evidenced in many inner-cities meant that many members of society failed to accord any sense of legitimacy to the policing of their communities (Crawford 1996 and McLaughlin 1994). Coicaud (2002) proffers a useful explanation of police legitimacy, that is, “*the recognition of the right to govern*” (Coicaud 2002: 10). Thus it was conceded that the relationship between the police and those institutions that are charged with delivering justice needed to become far more democratically accountable (Jones *et al.* 1994). In order to realise a more democratic accountable system of policing, Jones *et al.* (1994) argued that policing should be based on a number of prerequisites. According to Jones *et al.* this should include: equity of service distribution; service delivery should be fair, effective, efficient and responsive, there should be an even distribution of power; information should be both accurate and readily available; any redress should be effective in dealing with the unlawful and unreasonable behaviour of officers; and participation and dialogue should exist with all social groups.

Throughout this chapter evidence has been provided showing how Gypsy and Traveller communities have adopted their own system of justice. Alongside this it has explained how police practices have often been intensive, which has resulted in Gypsies and Travellers becoming more and more excluded from society (see Mason *et al.* 2009 and James 2007). It is, therefore possible that the reasons for establishing their own informal system of community justice, with little recourse to official agents of social control, could stem partly from the lack of legitimacy and the lack of trust by the police in the eyes of Gypsies and Travellers.

The practices of the police highlighted by Pizani-Williams (1998) and James (2006) suggest that there is little democratic accountability experienced in the policing of Gypsy and Traveller communities. If we return briefly to Jones *et al.*'s (1994) criteria for democratic policing then it would appear that these police practices fail to abide by these principles, and as such, the policing of Gypsy and Traveller communities could be without the consent of many members of this community. Hence, police legitimacy could be useful in understanding the relationship that Gypsies and Travellers have with the police and other official agents of social control.

Conclusion

Governance from 'below' enables marginalised groups to reclaim power in decision making processes pertaining to justice. Through the use of folk modes of expertise, members are able to understand the specific needs of their community, enabling them to develop appropriate sanctions for wrongdoers. As such, many communities have little recourse to official agents of social control. There are however varying modes of justice delivered informally among community members. Despite this, the overarching principles of informal community justice are the 'swift' and 'visible' delivery of justice, with shame being at the heart of all forms of justice. Through this, communities are able to deliver justice that is underpinned by the ideology of restorative justice. The need for groups to operate a system of informal community justice can be seen partly as a result of the contentious relationship between themselves and the police.

Having outlined previous empirical and the theoretical positions that may be helpful in addressing the research questions set out in the beginning of this thesis, in the next chapter I will discuss the methodology adopted to answer these questions.

Chapter Four:

Methodology

Introduction

This chapter will outline the methods used to address the research questions as set out in the introduction to this thesis. In doing so, I draw attention to the ethnographic methods adopted throughout this research. I will explain why this approach was used and the benefits I gained in obtaining a rich source of data through these means. The chapter provides a detailed account of the range of methods used, including semi-structured interviews, life-stories, visual methods and participant observation. The intention here will be to offer the reader a comprehensive description of each of the methods used within this research, drawing attention to the many advantages, and indeed, the limitations of each approach. However, before this can be achieved it is important to explain how access was obtained. Hence, the chapter begins with an account of how I managed to gain and sustain access into what is often described as a 'hard-to-reach' group (see Foley 2009, Levison and Sparks 2002 and Lomax *et al.* 2000). In this section, I will also explain how 'gatekeepers' were selected and the importance of their role in the data collection stage of this research. I highlight the need within this research to constantly renegotiate access and the consequence of this. I will follow this with an account of my role in this research, and how this affected my rapport with Gypsies and Travellers and the data collection process. The chapter will then move on to explore a range of ethical issues and the potential these have to impede my research. An account into the varying ways in which each of these problems was redressed will be provided. The chapter will conclude with an explanation of the data analysis process, one that was guided by a grounded theory approach (Glaser and Strauss 1967). This provided a flexible, yet systematic approach to the data analysis that was reinforced through the use of a specialist assistive software programme, ATLAS.ti.

Having set out the intentions of this chapter, it is important at this stage to give a brief justification for the methodological approach adopted for this study, and how this impacted on this research. As we can discern from the research questions outlined in the introduction of this thesis, the focus of this research was to develop a greater understanding of Gypsies' and Travellers' experience of crime, deviance and justice (both formal and informal). The research was therefore carefully designed to ensure the methods used would allow for a rich source of qualitative data that at the same time took into account the specific needs and vulnerabilities of the Gypsy and Traveller communities (see Weckman 1998). As we can see above, a multi-methods strategy was adopted, incorporating a range of qualitative methods such as interviews, participant observations, visual methods and life-stories. The advantage of using a mixed method approach has been well documented. For example, as Bryman (2006) concedes it allows for a robust research design and fruitful data. Hence, ethnography was the preferred approach for this research as it would generate a greater understanding of the social world of Gypsies and Travellers and their experiences of crime and justice more fully than a quantitative approach.

Ethnographic Methods

The purpose of this brief introduction is to provide the reader with an insight in the use of ethnographic methods in criminology. I will explore the different types of methods used by ethnographers and explain why these are deemed useful by its advocates. I will then look at how ethnography has been successfully used in criminology, particularly amongst those who have researched crime, deviance and justice (see Williams 2006, Hobbs 2001, Maguire 2000 and Becker 1963). I will show that even the most successful ethnographic research is not without its problems. This is a lesson I learnt all too quickly and will discuss later in this chapter (see Access and The Researcher's Role and Ethics). It is not the aim here to offer a detailed account of the methods used, as this will be discussed subsequently in the section 'Methods'.

The development of ethnography is most often associated with the University of Chicago during the 1920s and 1930s (see Hobbs 2001, Silverman 2001 and

Bottoms 2000). Through the creation of a mixed methods approach, combining participant observations, interviews, life-histories and personal documents among others, the school was able to develop an innovative approach to study a range of social worlds and their actors (see Rock, 2001, Deegan 2001 and Maguire 2000). Thus the aim of the Chicago School, was to develop a greater understanding of the social worlds of different groups in society. Through the empirical study of these groups they employed a range of methods to create '*thick descriptions*' of the everyday life of the subject (Rock 2001). One area in which ethnographic research has been of particular importance is the study of deviance. For example, Liebow (1967) Whyte (1943) and Thrasher (1927) all conducted ethnographic research detailing the social worlds of different 'deviant' groups providing insightful empirical accounts of the behaviour of their subjects.

As noted above, ethnography is concerned with understanding the social world of actors, indeed, the term means to write about the culture and lives of different social actors. Commonly, ethnographic research is conducted in '*natural settings*'. That is, the place and space occupied by the social actors on which the study is based upon. Typically, this procedure is referred to as '*fieldwork*'. A useful description of this is offered by Atkinson *et al.* (2003):

Ethnographic fieldwork is founded on a commitment to understand everyday life in a given social world through a sustained engagement with that world. It is predicated on the recognition that local social organisation and the conduct of everyday are complex, in that they are enacted through multiple modes of social action and representation (Atkinson *et al.* 2003: 31).

Throughout this research I followed the principles of ethnographic research as closely as possible. In order to achieve this, semi-structured interviews were carried out with Gypsies and Travellers. These interviews took place in a range of 'natural settings' such as on campsites, horse fairs and places visited by the community as well as a project centre aimed at the community. Alongside this, participant observations were carried out at events attended by Gypsies and Travellers and on campsites. The purpose of these two methods was to gain a greater understanding of how crime and deviance is perceived by Gypsies and Travellers and the systems of justice they employ. In conjunction with the data

collated from Gypsies and Travellers I also gathered data from those who have knowledge of the Gypsy and Traveller communities. These included, Gypsy and Traveller police liaison officers, members of Gypsy and Traveller groups, and Local Authority employees working either on campsites, as wardens or as policy makers. Data from these individuals was obtained from semi-structured interviews which took place in their place of work and phone contact.

Ethnographic research has certainly proved useful in providing detailed descriptions of how different actors interpret and view their social worlds (Rock 2001). In spite of this, this mode of research is not without its problems. One problem that has faced a number of ethnographic researchers is concerned with becoming involved in deviant behaviour. This is well documented by Patrick (1973) whose informative work provides an interesting account of the violent activities in which he participated when researching gangs. Whereas, Sanchez-Jankowski (1991) had to endure physical attacks as part of an initiation ceremony in his research on gang activity. However, as Hammersley and Atkinson (1995) note a more common problem linked to ethnographic research is the notion of '*going native*' (Hammersley and Atkinson 1995: 110). This problem certainly transpired in Harper's (1982) ethnographic study of the homeless in which he greatly underestimated the potential of doing so, so much so, that he found himself desiring the social world of his participants to the detriment of his research.

Access

The issue of access is at the forefront of any social science research (see Bryman 2004). As Noaks and Wincup (2004) rightly argue the negotiation of access must be given considerable thought during the planning stage of any research. The importance of this is particularly great when researching 'hard-to-reach' and vulnerable groups in society (see Emmel *et al.* 2007 and Wardak 2000). For this reason, an account of how access was established in this research is provided at the opening section of this chapter. Here, I will provide an account on how access was both achieved and maintained in this research. I also draw attention to specific problems in gaining access to both a vulnerable and 'hard-to-reach' group

and the different methods I used to combat these. I also discuss the role of gatekeepers and the invaluable impact they had in gaining access. The precarious nature of my access will be alluded to, and the constant need to renegotiate entry into Gypsy and Traveller communities will be highlighted. Lastly, I will detail some very important environmental factors that greatly affected access and the data collection process of this research and how these were overcome.

Gaining access into Gypsy and Traveller communities can be a lengthy and problematic process (see Levison and Sparks 2004 and Lomax *et al.* 2000). Indeed, Gypsy and Traveller sites are usually found on the periphery of town and cities (see Sibley 1981). According to Barnes and Morris (2007) encampments in the main have limited access, with public transport being very poor or non-existent; this is exacerbated by the refusal of many taxi firms to go on to sites. Moreover, evidence has shown that Gypsy and Traveller communities remain socially excluded in contemporary British society (see James 2007, Foley 2006, Bancroft 2005 and Hester 2004). As an excluded group, Gypsies and Travellers experience high levels of victimization and are marginalized through social policies (James 2007, 2006, Richardson 2006 and Bancroft 2005). Consequently, Gypsies and Travellers are an extremely 'hard-to-reach' group who are sceptical of outsiders (Weckman 1998). Hence gaining access into this community can be extremely difficult, nonetheless Weckman (1998) who is herself a Finnish Gypsy, offers the would be researcher guidelines for researching Gypsies and Travellers. Some of the tips provided by Weckman (1998) are commonsensical, yet she reminds us of the many concerns we all too often forget. Weckman (1998) rightly remind us that we are novices in Gypsy culture and not experts, and to '*come down from our pedestals*' so that we can reach members of the community. Accordingly, we need to use the expertise of their culture that Gypsies and Travellers can offer us, but to do so, correctly by not judging and seeing the social world of this community through a western lens. Finally, and most importantly Weckman attests to never betray the trust given to you, the researcher (Weckman 1998: 7-8).

Bearing these points in mind, I sought access into Gypsy and Traveller communities three years prior to conducting this current research. This access was

achieved by volunteering at a community project aimed at Gypsies and Travellers. Initially, I worked as a volunteer on a youth participation project, the purpose of which was to enable younger members of the community (aged five to sixteen) to engage in the wider society and celebrate their cultural heritage. Having worked on this particular project for two years, I was then invited to help out on a project working with adult females in passing their driving theory test. This eventually developed into an open access class aimed at both males and females assisting them with internet access, developing their curriculum vitae's and any other computer related issues. Finally I was invited to become a member of the management committee for the project.

My role as a volunteer working with both adults and younger members of the community in South Wales allowed me to develop a rapport and learn about important cultural traditions. More importantly, this allowed me to gain contact with Gypsies and Travellers who would later act as my gatekeepers. Volunteering has been used very effectively to gain access by a number of ethnographic researchers. For example, Cohen (1973) in his classical study of Mods and Rockers worked as a volunteer throughout his research so that access could be achieved.

Additional contacts with Gypsies and Travellers was established through attendance at events such as conferences aimed at the community. During such events I was able to establish a rapport with members of the wider Gypsy and Traveller community, and not just those based in Wales. Thus, these individuals became gatekeepers to their local Gypsy and Traveller community. Furthermore, by using a snowball sampling method each participant also acted as my gatekeepers through the introduction of future participants.

Despite establishing individuals to act as gatekeepers, the issue of access was a constant source of concern in this research. Even when I thought access had been assured, maintaining this position often required a process of renegotiation. I have touched upon this issue in my previous research on a Gypsy and Traveller community and it still remains relevant in this present research. For example, on one occasion, contact had been established with a Gypsy and Traveller family and

an interview was scheduled. Yet on the day of the interview I arrived only to find that the family had gone away travelling and would not be back for several weeks. On a different occasion I had travelled some distance in order to interview a husband and wife, albeit separately. However, when I arrived at an unfamiliar site I was not able to find the plot where the family I was meeting lived. However, I saw two women and asked if they could point me in the right direction, but because I was a stranger to them I was told that no family with that name lived on site. Eventually I found the correct plot and it was explained to me that as Gypsies and Travellers are very wary of outsiders they would never tell a Gorgor the whereabouts of a community member if they do not recognise them. These incidents are only two of many examples showing how access was a constant process of renegotiation and why maintaining and sustaining access were a continual source of worry during all stages of this research.

Another impact on access, which I had not envisioned at the outset of this research relates to environmental factors, which had a detrimental effect on the data collection of this research. Indeed, from the beginning of this research I had planned to attend a number of animal shows that are attended by Gypsies and Travellers. During these shows I aimed to establish further links with other Gypsies and Travellers and conduct observations and interviews. However, two incidents prevented this from happening in the first year of the research. Firstly, the weather was for this time of year unusually wet. It had rained heavily for many weeks, as a consequence a lot of the community who would normally attend these shows had decided against going this particular year. In the case of one event a field that is set aside for Gypsies and Travellers had been rendered 'dangerous' because of the heavy rain, which meant that those who had turned up to the event did not stay. Not long after this, it was announced that foot and mouth had returned to the UK resulting in a ban in movement of livestock (Department for Environmental Food and Rural Affairs 2007). As a consequence many animal shows were cancelled. These two incidents had serious implications on this research in terms of access. However, these incidents allowed me to re-evaluate the data collection process of this research and as a result I forged links with community members whom I met at conferences and whose input into this research was invaluable. If I had adhered to my original plan I would not have

made some of these contacts, so in hindsight these incidents came to benefit my research. Moreover, I did manage to attend many of these events the following year, and so was able to consolidate the data collection process through these means.

Previously, it was noted that my role as a volunteer helped in establishing members of Gypsy and Traveller communities to act as 'gatekeepers' in this research. This is worthy of a fuller explanation. Earlier research I conducted on a Gypsy and Traveller community that focussed on the victimisation experienced by Gypsies and Travellers, allowed me to use my role as a volunteer to employ younger members of the community as my research assistants. Here, six young people were employed to administer a victimisation survey to older members of the community. The young people were paid a set amount of ten pounds each, the experience proved very empowering for the young people involved, whilst also offering a rich source of data that I feel would not have been achieved through any other means (see Foley 2006). Although some of the older girls involved in this previous research had move on in their lives; getting married and moving to different sites, contact with the six remained. Hence, for this current research I was lucky enough to re-engage with these young people, and was able to employ two females to act my gatekeepers. 'Chantelle' and 'Shauna' worked alongside me organising and setting up times for interviews. Chantelle's mother offered the use of her trailer to conduct the interviews if needed, in return for a packet of cigarettes. It is important to note that neither Chantelle nor Shauna were present during any of the interviews, their role was to merely recruit participants while I was conducting interviews. In truth, I could have recruited Gypsies and Travellers without the assistance of Chantelle and Shauna. However, once they learned I would be researching the community for a second time they were very keen to be actively involved. As such, I felt that as I was 'taking' from the community it was important to give something back and so by employing both girls, who felt a great sense of achievement, went some way towards recompense. Moreover, despite acknowledging that I could have possibly recruited by myself, the work of Chantelle and Shauna was invaluable as they were able to access some members of the community who may have refused or been 'off-limits' to myself.

Before entering the research field I learnt the customs of Gypsy and Traveller communities to ensure that no offence would be caused by my actions during the data collection process (Okely 1983). Indeed, the idea of the impartial researcher was been widely discredited in social science research (Rapley 2001). As such, the way we, as researchers conduct ourselves can have significant bearing in achieving access as well as the data collection process. It is to this that we now turn our attention.

An Impartial Bystander: My Role In This Research

As social scientists we are observers aiming to understand the social worlds of those we research (see Rock 2001). As such, the role of the researcher can have negative repercussions on the data collection process. This is eloquently argued by Rapley (2001) who disputes the notion of the '*impartial researcher*'. This was clearly evident in this present research. Indeed, Gypsies and Travellers have a term Gorger which is widely used within the community to describe those who do not belong to their culture and ethnicity (see Foley 2009 and Okely 2005). This term was used consistently throughout my interviews and observations with Gypsies and Travellers, thus reinforcing my outsider status. Hence it is worthy to note the consequences of my role and status and the effect this had throughout all stages of this research. Indeed, as Reiner (2000) notes, the relationship forged by the researcher and the researched requires reflexivity in terms of the participant's perceptions of the researcher and how this leads to a divergence in data.

I have already alluded to the notion of my Gorger status. This certainly had repercussions on the research I conducted with Gypsies and Travellers. Okely (2005) provides an insightful account of her Gorger status in her research on this community. Here she recounts how she was excluded from a number of social events or was tolerated as an invited outsider. Similarly I describe a situation in the previous section of this chapter of how my non-Gypsy and Traveller status meant that community members were reluctant to provide information about the whereabouts of someone I had arranged to visit. Likewise, whenever I entered a campsite even when my identity was known I would be asked by everyone I encountered what I wanted and what I was doing on site.

As an ethnic minority group, Gypsies and Travellers have many customs which differ from those of the wider society (Okely 1983). The breaking of such values can lead to conflict. In order to ensure that I did not offend any members of the community I was mindful of Gypsies' and Travellers' customs and made sure that I abided by their values. Having volunteered with Gypsies and Travellers prior to this research, I had gained an insight into the codes of behaviour that were expected of me as a guest in their community. This meant that I followed certain rules such as always accepting an invite into a trailer or cups of tea. When inside a trailer making sure I did not put my bags on chairs and tables and cups of tea on the floor. Not following these rules would have caused great offence and created problems in terms of pollution and would have affected the data collected.

Merely understanding Gypsies and Travellers cultural traditions does not mean that my role in this research was established. Previously, I have discussed the consequences of researching vulnerable communities when they '*do things differently*' to the wider society (see Foley 2009). As social scientists our quest is to understand the social world of different actors and how meanings are understood by varying groups in society (Coffey and Atkinson 1996). In doing so, we are often driven by the notion of empowering the groups we study through policy formation. Nonetheless, how we represent data is of vital importance, indeed, this could unintentionally lead us to further disempower such vulnerable communities. The potential for this becomes further compounded when researching attitudes towards crime and deviance (see Foley 2009). Often data collected in research can conflict with the values held by the researcher, and this could have serious detriment.

What was evident throughout this research is that the members of Gypsy and Traveller communities wanted their stories heard and understood. In the course of this research the Gypsies and Travellers who participated consistently checked my understanding of what was being said and observed. To illustrate this point, we can draw upon two quotes from Tom and Connie, however, these are by no means isolated incidents and there are many similar examples one can refer to:

Anne, do you understanding what I am saying to you, this is a big thing like...

Tom (Interview)

...can you see how this works Anne, let me put it this way...

Connie (Interview)

Clearly, Tom and Connie and indeed all the respondents who took part in this research checked my comprehension of given situations in order to ensure their stories would be represented appropriately. Therefore, I feel an immense responsibility Gypsies and Travellers, in the words of Weckman (1998), not to betray them through my research. Yet, as I have noted, when actors have differing values to one's own, this can cause a dilemma for the researcher. In demonstrating how this may materialise and the possible repercussions this may have on research, an example of one case will be offered.

The case referred to here, occurred at a very early stage in of this research and led me to question the role of me, as a researcher in this project and the responsibilities it brought. The example is taken from fieldnotes:

Cassey asked if I would like to see a picture of her new dog, to which I answered yes. After showing the picture to me of a rather cute looking dog, Cassey informed me that the dog had been bred to fight. This is something I find truly abhorrent, although I did not say anything. I'm still not sure if I should have done so or not...

Anne (Fieldnotes).

This case highlighted to me the very different worlds that myself and Gypsies and Travellers inhabit. I realised that I was looking into the world of Gypsies and Travellers through my western eyes, and failing in my role as a researcher of these communities (Weckman 1998). If I wanted to gain a real understanding of Gypsy and Traveller communities, it was imperative that I stopped acting in this manner. Once I had realised this I was freer to ask questions of what I was observing and hearing, and in so doing, able to represent Gypsies and Travellers appropriately through this research.

Interestingly, during a recent paper I gave on this research, a member of the audience asked me what the role of the researcher is. Indeed should one make moral judgements of the social world of others, or, do we merely describe what we are seeing. Hammersley and Atkinson (2003) note:

...accounts are not simple representations of the world; they are part of the world they describe and are thus shaped by the contexts in which they occur (Hammersley and Atkinson 2003: 16).

This leads us to the question of how data should be represented and the responsibility this has in terms of the researcher's role. Referring to the example highlighted above, if I had difficulties hearing about dog fighting, then the chances are that others would too. The notion of Gypsies and Travellers as 'lawless' has previously been alluded to (see chapters one and two). With negative attitudes held by others towards Gypsies and Travellers, the way in which data is represented has the potential to reinforce these opinions. To appease this situation, I have ensured that the context in which data is set is clear to the reader, hence they become sensitised to the social world of Gypsies and Travellers. Rather than portraying Gypsy and Traveller communities as 'deviant', throughout this research I have explained how the community abide by a strict moral code, which may at times conflict with the values held by the Gorgier community and that they are far from 'lawless'. In doing so, I neither merely describe nor make moral judgements of the data, instead, I have attempted to gain a greater understanding of this community. Empirical data will be provided in subsequent chapters that address the research questions underpinning this research, offering evidence in support of the theoretical framework adopted in this research.

A final point relating to my role in this research which would be prudent to mention, refers to my gender and how this impacted on data collection. Rakhit (1998) recognises how her female status affected her research relationship and Phoenix (2001) attests commonalities and indeed differences between the researcher and the researched can encourage an open dialogue in which sensitive issues are disclosed. At the outset of my research I was aware of the implications of my female status in gaining and sustaining access into the Gypsy and Traveller

social world. Certainly, previous research I conducted on the policing and victimisation of Gypsies and Travellers (see Foley 2006 and 2005) highlighted the difficulties in recruiting male Gypsies and Travellers to participate. The reason for this in part stems from the distinct roles given to males and females in Gypsy and Traveller communities; men are expected to support their family financially and women take on childcare and household responsibilities (see Bhopal 2010, Greenfields 2006a and Okely 1983). As such, the men who work long hours supporting their family are often away from the site from dawn to dusk, and therefore participating in research would delve into the time they could be earning money. Secondly, despite the roles assigned to men and women, it is the Gypsy and Traveller women who are expected to deal with the Gorgers world, therefore women take responsibility in dealing with disputes and can be seen as a 'go-between' for male Gypsies, Travellers and Gorgers (see Okely 1983).

I was however able to recruit male Gypsies and Travellers to participate in this research. A more detailed account of my sample is proffered below, but suffice to say four males participated in interviews, two of whom also provided written accounts of their lives. Interestingly, it was an elder male who indicated that he would be willing to take part, he is well respected by many Gypsies and Travellers and once word had got out that he was involved in a research project others soon followed. Although only four males participated in this aspect of the research it is important to acknowledge that I also observed the community throughout the research process, this allowed me to gain a better understanding of the social world of male Gypsies and Travellers. While I am aware that male narratives maybe somewhat limited, there is one final point regarding gender which may go some way in justifying this discrepancy.

As I previously noted, commonalities and differences can allow for a rich source of data (see Phoenix 2001 and Rakhit 1998). For example, Bhopal (2010) was able to use her gender identity by relating to the experiences of female Gypsies and Travellers, in doing so she found an open dialogue in which taboos were readily discussed. Moreover, I indicated above that women are responsible for childcare. The demands of this role means that women are required to teach their children the appropriate behaviour expected of Gypsies and Travellers, as such

she teaches the moral code of her social world to the young (see Bhopal 2010, Greenfields 2006a and Okely 1983). Alongside this, Gypsies and Travellers cannot discuss certain issues in mixed company for example, sexual matters and pregnancy must never be discussed in mixed company, unless it is between a husband and wife (Greenfields 2006a and Okely 1983). In addition, a woman cannot let any males who are not directly related to her inside a trailer unless her husband is present. This is to ensure her reputation is maintained (see Okely 1983). This is clearly demonstrated in the following statement by Maisy:

if a woman's husband is out working and a man happened to call and visited you, you wouldn't call him in for a cup of tea because it isn't the done thing... so you would give that person if they were a true friend to the family and you've known them for ages, a cup of tea outside or you'd take a cup of tea, '*would you like tea?*' and they'd take it to the van and drink it in the van, they would know not to ask to come in and they wouldn't get offended that you hadn't asked, unless of course they were an uncle or a brother, and even a first cousin...

Maisy (Interview)

Therefore, had I been a male researcher working on this project, access to female Gypsies and Travellers would have been off limits unless her husband was present. This would have meant that the data I collected in this research would have potentially been very different. As a female researching Gypsies and Travellers I was able to discuss issues with females inside their trailer where they felt at ease. This is of particular importance when one considers the topics I aimed to explore; looking at moral codes and conflict resolution in Gypsy and Traveller communities. Being female not only meant I had access to female Gypsies and Travellers but I could draw upon their knowledge and experiences of informing the young of the codes of their communities. Hence, in-line with Bhopal (2010) who found that when she was working on a research project that included male researchers, Gypsy and Traveller women refused access to the men on the team, I as a female was able to elicit a rich source of data.

As I noted above commonalities and differences can be an important tool when research marginalised groups (see Bhopal 2010, Phoenix 2001 and Rakhit 1998). The common experience of being female meant that to Gypsy and Traveller women '*I posed no threat*' (see Bhopal 2010:191). As a woman I was able to

establish a rapport with female Gypsies and Travellers, who also understood our differences, I was a Gorgier from a very different social world. Nevertheless, by affording the women the opportunity to ask questions about my life and discussing our different social worlds, allowed for a more egalitarian research experience (Finch 1984 and Oakley 1981). This in turn meant that I was freer to delve into sensitive issues with female respondents. Therefore, while I acknowledge access to male Gypsies and Travellers was somewhat limited, this is in some way equalled out by the access I had with Gypsy and Traveller women.

Ethics

Social science research is increasingly governed by very rigorous ethical guidelines (Bryman 2006). Ethical codes need to be given consideration from the preliminary stage through to the dissemination of any research (Noaks and Wincup 2003). Therefore before commencing this research, ethical approval was sought from Cardiff University School of Social Science. In addition the ethical guidelines set out by the British Society of Criminology (BSC) were strictly adhered to. Ethical codes can:

...provide a framework of principles to assist the choices and decisions which have to be made. Fundamentally ethical dimensions are pertinent to how researchers conduct their work through all stages of the research process from planning to dissemination (Noaks and Wincup 2004: 38).

That said it is important to note that this research did raise a number of ethical problems that had to be addressed. One such problem stems from the level of literacy of many Gypsies and Travellers, a number of the respondents were unable to read and write. This created a cause for concern in terms of ethics in that I had to ensure that all participants were fully aware of the nature of this research and their role within it. More importantly, it is essential that respondents understood how this research would be used once it had been completed. In addressing this potential problem I produced a participation form, which explained succinctly the aims of this research and the expectations of participants (see appendix 1). To overcome literacy issues I read through the form with each participant and then offered them the opportunity to ask questions, or raise any issues. The problem of achieving informed consent from participants with low levels of education has

been raised by Emmel *et al.* (2006) who questioned how 'informed' is informed consent. By suggesting that as academics we all too often fail to provide 'real' information about the research and use a language that is ineffective as an explanation to lay people. Acknowledging this, I hoped that by reading through and discussing the research with participants this problem was ironed out in this research. Yet in spite of this, there were numerous occasions during my fieldwork which led me to question the level of informed consent as understood by the members of Gypsy and Traveller communities. For instance, one respondent seemed to think that a PhD. thesis was an actual book that would be published and readily available in bookshops. Although I informed her on many occasions that this was not the case, she would still ask when she could have a copy of the book and would I like some of her family photographs to put into the book. When such questions arose I went to great pains to explain the full nature and purpose of the research in terms that could be easily understood to someone that had no, or limited, formal education. As such, I was able to address this problem.

In accordance with ethical codes of conduct, confidentiality has been maintained throughout this research. All participants have been provided with a pseudonym and their real identity is known only to myself. The names I have given to respondents have been taken from either traditional 'Gypsy names' or nicknames commonly used by the Gypsies and Travellers. Any events that were discussed in an interview or observed in which the identity of people could be known have been omitted from the write up of this research. Moreover, in compliance with data protection legislation all the transcripts generated from this research were held in a secure place where access was limited to myself.

As Miller and Brewer (2003) concede; social science research can be harmful to its participants. The participants in this research were informed that they could opt out at any stage of the research. In addition if participants wanted to discuss something but felt uncomfortable with the information forming part of the research they were offered the chance to speak off the record. This information was excluded from the research. Additionally, all respondents were asked permission to record interviews, only a few objected to this (see discussion below). When interviews were recorded, participants were offered the opportunity

of having the Dictaphone turned off at any stage of the interview. There were a number of occasions when a respondent wanted to discuss something that was highly sensitive, they wanted the information to be used in the research as long as there was no possibility of it being linked to them. There are therefore, several occasions when a quote has been supplied but no name has been attached to the extract. This is so that I can be fully sure that the reader will not in any way be able to identify the person speaking.

Methods

Earlier in this chapter there was brief mention of the multi-method strategy adopted for this research, highlighting the varying modes used to collate data, and as such address the questions set out in this research. Each distinct method was carefully designed to allow for the richest source of data possible. The methods were selected to address specific research questions. Nevertheless, they were not stand alone means to gain data on a particular issue. All methods interplayed with each other and occurred concurrently, as opposed to separate blocks. Before detailing the methods used in this research, some account of the participants from both Gypsy and Traveller communities and key-stakeholders would be beneficial and so it is to this I now turn.

The Participants

In chapter one, I argued that the official definition of ‘Gypsies and Travellers’ was somewhat limited (see ODPM 2004) as it fails to recognise many groups who identify themselves as belonging to this ethnic group. Instead of this rigid definition I opted to use Clark’s (2006) typology of Gypsies and Travellers in the UK (see chapter one). Hence, according to Clark (2006) the term Gypsies and Travellers encompasses a number of groups that can be identified within this ethnic category, such as; Welsh Gypsies, English Gypsies, Irish Travellers, Rom, Fairground Travellers, Boat Dwellers and New Age Travellers. Crucially, Clark (2006) recognises the fluidity and heterogeneous state of Gypsies and Travellers identity. In ascertaining the ‘ethnic identity’ of Gypsy and Traveller respondents I asked each individual how they wished to be defined.

For this research, I interviewed fifteen Gypsies and Travellers this included eleven females and four males. Of the four males, two identified themselves as Rom Gypsies; one defined themselves as English Romany and the remainder as Welsh Romany. In terms of the females three defined themselves as English Romany, five as Welsh Romany and three identified themselves as Irish Travellers. The majority of Gypsy and Traveller participants (seven) lived in Wales, all of whom lived on one of several authorised campsites based in the south of the country. Each of these interviews took place on the site that they were resident, usually inside the trailer. The remaining participants lived on various sites in England, these interviews took place in their trailers and at fairs where I had prearranged to meet up with them. While I did not seek the ages of my participants it is worthy to note that most participants were aged over seventeen; four of whom were retired and four participants were under sixteen (between twelve and fifteen), all the young people were female.

In addition, I sought to interview key-stakeholders who work with Gypsy and Traveller communities. The rationale for these interviews was to provide data which may not have been obtained from Gypsies and Travellers and more importantly to corroborate the narratives offered by members of Gypsy and Traveller communities. A total of eleven interviews were conducted for this stage of the research, including: three Diversity Police Officers, four Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officers, two Gypsy and Traveller Policy Officers and two campsite wardens (both wardens are based on authorised council encampments in Wales).

Interviewing Gypsies And Travellers

In order to obtain data from Gypsies and Travellers a number of semi-structured interviews were conducted (Appendix 2 provides an interview schedule). The purpose of these interviews was three-fold, taking into account each research question. Interviews were designed so that attitudes towards crime and the moral codes adhered to by Gypsies and Travellers could be elicited. Here, questions relating to different acts of crime and deviance were asked. Visual aids, that is photographs of different types of crimes acted as a stimuli for these discussions.

The use of visual aids proved extremely beneficial in this research as is discussed in more depth in the sub-section of this chapter titled 'photograph facilitated interviews'. Suffice to say, the decision to include specific types of crimes in these images was influenced by the typology of crimes proffered by Dawson (2000) (see chapter two). The second objective for interviews with Gypsy and Traveller communities was to extract information pertaining to the systems of informal community justice as realised by this community. Hence the focus here was to seek answers to the second research question, *How are deviant and criminal acts dealt with, or resolved by Gypsies and Travellers?* Thirdly, the interviews sought answers to question number three; *How and when do Gypsies and Travellers have recourse to formal agents of social control?* Each respondent was interviewed on all three aspects of this research. The majority of interviews took place over a series of sittings, usually this was three sittings, with two respondents being interviewed on four separate occasions.

In total, fifteen Gypsies and Travellers was interviewed, which equates to forty-five interviews in total. Four of the respondents were male and the remaining eleven, female. Participants were aged thirteen upwards. The decision to interview younger Gypsies and Travellers was informed by my previous research experience with this community (see Foley 2006). As noted above, I had employed younger members of a Gypsy and Traveller community as research assistants. From this, it became evident that younger members of this community have important insights into their culture, which may at times conflict with older members, thus highlighting important changes and the fluidity of Gypsy and Traveller culture. Hence, I felt it was important to include their stories in this current research. The Gypsies and Travellers who participated in this research defined themselves as either Welsh Romany Gypsies, English Romany Gypsies, Irish Travellers or Rom Gypsies.

Interviews took place in a variety of settings ranging from trailers, animal shows, horses fairs, pubs and Gypsy and Traveller centres. Interviews varied greatly in length, with some lasting forty-five minutes while others went on as long as four hours. At the start of each interview I handed participants a copy of the research outline which explains the purpose of the research and the role expected from

them. As many members of Gypsy and Traveller communities have low literacy levels (see Levinson and Sparks 2000) I read through the form with each participant to ensure they fully understood the nature of the research. I then asked each participant if they had any questions regarding the research and their role within it. Finally I went through the consent form with each participant which they either then signed or gave verbal consent, which I recorded (see Appendix 3 for a copy of the consent form). Ideally I would have liked to record each interview, however, understanding the reluctance of this community to being researched, I gave each participant the option as to whether they wanted the interview to be recorded (see Lomax *et al.* 2000, Weckman 1998 and Okely 1983) Therefore out of the fifteen interviews conducted fourteen were recorded and one was not. Whilst this could be a disadvantage when collecting research, Maguire (2000) provides a persuasive argument for not always using recording devices. Here Maguire argues that using recording equipment could '*damage the trust*' built between interviewer and interviewee (Maguire 2000: 133). Instead he opted to record interviews by using speedwriting aiming to write down everything of importance that was said during the interview. On the occasions I was unable to record an interview I made very detailed notes of the conversation making sure that I captured everything that was said. If I missed some information I asked the participant to repeat their point. Although this rarely happened I was conscious that this could affect the 'naturalness' of the conversation. The rest of the interviews were recorded and later transcribed.

One important point prudent to mention, is the importance of language used during the interviews. Romany Gypsies use a language which is referred to as Romani, it is believed the roots of this language stem from Hindi, and is as such very different from English. Alongside this, members of the Irish Travelling community use an early form of Gaelic known as either Cant or Shanti (see Acton 2003). As a result of this throughout the interviews many members of these communities interchanged their language with English and the dialect from their culture. These words have been included in the glossary of terms. If I was unsure about a translation I would ask the meaning. It is important to note that during the transcribing stage I used the original language of the interviewee with footnotes to explain the meaning. One further point about language worthy of note is the

spelling of these words. Acton (2003) rightly alludes to the notion of the oral tradition held by Gypsy and Traveller communities. This tradition means that many of the moral tales told among Gypsies and Travellers are not written down, instead they have been passed down verbally through songs and folklore through the generations. A consequence of this is that the spellings of words can change between different members of the community. There are many different spellings of the same words used in different parts of the country and in books about Gypsies and Travellers. Words such as Gorger have also been spelt Gogier and in some literature, Creese becomes Kris (see Okely 2005). I have overcome this problem by using the spellings given by my respondents, it is their accounts of their social world and as such not for me to dictate how words should be spelt. Hence, words which may be familiar to the reader albeit with a different spelling may appear throughout the writing of this research.

The decision to use semi-structured interviews, and I use this term somewhat loosely, was informed by the objectives of the research. A more structured approach may have elicited similar information, and most certainly would have been far quicker. Yet, this approach would have stifled the 'flow' of the conversation and probably would not have allowed for such in-depth data that I was able to elude using semi-structured interviews. I wanted to develop a more collaborative understanding of the social world, a method highly recommended by Weckman (1998). With this in mind, I opted for an '*active interviewing*' method, the style of interview proposed by Holstein and Gubrium (1997, 1995). This method calls for the interviewer and the interviewee to work jointly contributing meanings to the spoken word, in doing so, we recognise that respondents are not mere '*vessels for answers*' (Holstein and Gubrium 1997: 114). Taking heed of this, I allowed respondents to take their time over the questions I posed to them. I did not interject when they strayed from the question, instead I indulged them, listening intently to the varied stories that were being offered. It was only when the respondent came to a natural break in their stories that I would again prompt them back to the question in hand. It is for these reasons I suggest I used semi-structured interviews loosely, I did have themes that I wanted to be discussed, yet, many of these were discussed in '*naturally occurring talk*' (Hammersley

1992). Hence, the types of questions I asked were open-ended and fairly general, to allow the interviewee to respond freely and at length about their social world.

Photograph Facilitated Interviews

A key aim of the interviews as I have outlined above was to understand Gypsy and Traveller communities' attitude towards crime. This stage of the interviews was aided by the use of photographic images. These images related to various forms of crimes, and were guided by the typology of crimes produced by Dawson (2000). At the outset, it was envisioned that these visual images could be used as a comparison between the attitudes between Gypsy and Traveller communities and the wider society. Yet when using these visual aids, participants began to discuss the images freely, without any prompt from myself. Therefore, it was felt that if I began to systematically ask the questions I pre-designed I would impede the flow of the naturally occurring conversation.

Visual Aids

P1 – *fighting*



P2 – *Shoplifting*



P3 - *Joyriding*



P4 – *Burglary*



P5 – *Theft from a Vehicle*



P6 – *Illicit Drugs*



P7 – *Vandalism*



P8 - *Anti-Social Behaviour*



As we can see, the visual images were based on photographs of crimes including fighting, shop-lifting, joyriding, burglary, theft from a car, illicit drugs, vandalism and anti-social behaviour. Therefore, I do not adhere to Dawson's (2000) typology strictly. I felt it was important to include other forms of crime neglected by Dawson, but are focal concerns in society according to the British Crime Survey (see Kershaw *et al.* 2008).

Interviews during this phase began with a very generic question, '*can you tell me what you can see?*' Thus, facilitating a wider discussion. There were many benefits yielded from elucidating information in this manner. Without a doubt, the images acted as an 'ice-breaker' allowing respondents to focus their attention away from the notion of being interviewed. They spent time viewing the images, arranging and re-arranging the images across the floor of the trailer, picking up one photograph and replacing it with another image. In this way they were scrutinising the images, looking at what was going on in the photographs, affording them the time to gather their thoughts.

Written Accounts

Designing this research, it was understood that Gypsies and Travellers have important stories concerning crime, deviance and justice. Plummer (2001) evokes an informative argument in the practical use of life stories in ethnographic research. Life stories offer the researcher moral constructions. Indeed, behaviours and moral codes that have significance in one's life are re-told through the narratives and tales we provide (Plummer 2001). With this in mind; Plummer (2001) contends that such stories are the 'cornerstone' of ethnographic research. In view of this, Plummer (2001) affirms:

To tell a story of a life may be one of the cores of culture, those fine webs of meaning that help organize our ways of life. These stories – or personal narratives – connect the inner world to the outer world... They make links across life phases and cohort generations, revealing historical shifts in a culture... they tell the concerns of their time and place... (Plummer 2001: 395).

Accordingly, life stories have been successfully used in a number of ethnographic research projects; from Thomas and Znaniecki's (1918) *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*, Liebow's (1967) classic *Tally's Corner*, Menchu's (1984) account of the everyday life of one respondent, to Mishler's (1986) narratives of artists. In terms of this current research, life trajectories, as lived by Gypsy and Traveller communities, resulted from the natural occurring talk during interviews. Alongside this, I was lucky enough to be afforded the opportunity to gain written stories of Gypsies and Travellers lives. This is not something that I had set out to achieve, mainly because of the many practical implications involved, such as the levels of literacy associated with Gypsies and Travellers. In spite of these difficulties, it was a female Gypsy and Traveller who initiated this mode of research. When arranging an interview with Connie, she suggested the possibility of writing up some personal accounts of her life as a Gypsy-Traveller, so that we could discuss these narratives during the interview. Connie also indicated that this may be something that others from the community would like to contribute towards. As a result, four Gypsies and Travellers provided their stories in the written form. These accounts were hand written, I typed them and later analysed each narrative. I received the accounts prior to interviews, and so they acted as a stimulus for conversations. It is important to point out, that although I typed up each narrative, I have not altered the words or spellings, thus remaining faithful to the original transcripts. The life stories and personal accounts, relay experiences of different aspects of the Gypsy and Traveller lifestyle and customs, varying from marriage, fighting, morals to travelling and the 'Creese'. To give a flavour of these accounts two extracts are included here:

When a Gypsy dies years ago the wagon, car or trailer was burnt. Keepsakes, jewellery etc would be given to relatives. Today this still happens but is rare to burn clothes but possessions are still burnt. Born again Christians will give these to charity shops. No one would ever eat meat when a **near** relative died. Today some might eat chicken or ham but will have no red meat. Its usual to **sit-up** all night and not sleep, keeping a watch over the coffin or cast.

Connie (Written Notes)

When I have a son of my own one day, will he ever feel the buzz of sitting next to his dad, trailer behind, wondering about where they're pulling and who is there? I can only hope so. Or will he be able to go anywhere in the country, to an old friend and be made welcome, like my father can, as I can or when he drives 50 or 100 miles away will he be lost and not know anyone, perhaps not but only time will tell.

Sonny (Written Notes)

As well as aiding interviews, these narratives formed an important part of the analysis of this research.

Observing Gypsy And Traveller Communities

Alongside interviews, this research also collated data from Gypsy and Traveller communities through the use of participant observations. These observations took place in a range of settings and places frequented by Gypsy and Traveller communities and included the following; boxing clubs, pubs, weddings, fairs, campsites, funerals and Gypsy and Traveller projects based in both England and Wales. As I have noted previously this process was ongoing throughout the data collection stage of this research and should not be seen as a 'distinct' phase of research. Indeed, an ethnographer is constantly observing whenever and wherever they are in the 'field'. This includes observing when conducting interviews. Through observations the ethnographer is able to gain a greater understanding of the social world of various actors and the meanings they attach to their actions (see Alder 1985). Thus, through observations, the researcher is able to consolidate the spoken word of interviews and also act as a facilitator, generating numerous questions to help us understand what we are seeing.

During each observation I made field-notes which were later developed into detailed accounts. I ensured that notes were written up straight after leaving the field. This allowed me to write up my observations whilst they were still fresh in my memory. The purpose of these observations was to gain a greater insight into the social world of Gypsies and Travellers, which would not have been achieved from interviews. For the duration of the participant observation stage of this

research, I aimed to 'hang out' with members of Gypsy and Traveller communities. The use of observations has been prevalent in the study of deviance and subcultures (see Hobbs 2001 and Punch 2003). Indeed as Alder (1985) observes:

Personal observations, interactions and experience is the only way to acquire accurate knowledge about deviant behaviour (Alder 1985: 11).

There are numerous examples of how observations have been used in the social sciences to advance our understanding of deviance and attitudes towards crime. In his seminal study Becker (1963) through the use of observations gained detailed knowledge into the social worlds of marijuana smokers. Whilst Thrasher's (1927) observations of Chicago gangs provides a rich source of data and has been greatly influential on both criminologist and ethnographic researchers. More recently Punch (2003) describes his observations in police settings in order to develop an understanding of policing practices.

In terms of Gypsies and Travellers, observations have been used successfully by researchers wishing to gain insights into the lifestyles of this community. One of the most influential of these is Okely's (1983) anthropological study of Gypsies and Travellers. In her study Okely was able to live amongst a Gypsy and Traveller community for twelve months, observing their behaviour. The result is one of the most rich and detailed accounts of the lives of Gypsies and Travellers to date. A more recent attempt at observing a Gypsy and Traveller community is provided by Levinson and Sparks (2001). However, they focus their observations solely on campsites and therefore lack the detail of Okely's earlier work. Practical and ethical reasons prevented me from living on site during my fieldwork. Whereas James (2006) proffers the reader a useful account of the policing of New Travellers gained from observations and interviews. I did attempt to spend as much time as possible with these communities over a five year period. My contact with Gypsies and Travellers began three years before the commencement of this current research. During this time, as noted above, I worked as a volunteer on a number of projects with a Gypsy and Traveller community. This was important for this current research in that members of this Gypsy and Traveller community were aware of me and the purpose of my research therefore my presence on site

and at events did not concern them in the way it may have done if I were a complete stranger. Moreover, this experience provided me with important information regarding the types of events and public venues that were attended by Gypsies and Travellers.

The first three times I went out to observe Gypsies and Travellers, I did not participate in the activities of the group. Instead, I observed the various interactions, noting down my observations. I felt this was important as I wanted to ease myself into their community, and more importantly, it afforded the members of the community to become used to my presence. Once my presence had become more established I began to participate more fully in the groups activities. I was honoured and indeed somewhat overwhelmed to be invited to personal events such as two weddings and a funeral. In some way this illustrated Gypsies and Travellers approval of me as an invited and accepted guest into their social world.

One important advantage in using participant observations relates to the issue of gender. I have previously reported the fact that the majority of the interviews I conducted with Gypsies and Travellers were with female members of the community. Whilst the women I interviewed were able to provide details of the life and issues of crime and justice experienced by the male Gypsies and Travellers, I was conscious that this research lacked a detailed male perspective, thus limiting the data collected. However, through the use of participant observation I was able to iron out this problem. Nevertheless, contact with male members of Gypsy and Traveller communities was not without its problems and I shall discuss these issues later in this chapter.

Field-Notes

Previously in this chapter, I acknowledged the researcher's role as an 'impartial bystander' and the varying roles of the researcher bestowed onto us. I highlighted the many difficulties associated with this endeavour, and how I avoided some common pitfalls. One problem that has been neglected thus far in this chapter, relates to what we do in the field. Do we set out as a '*Martian*' who according to Loftland and Loftland (1995) enters the field with '*fresh eyes*', looking as if

seeing for the first time? Or do we take on the role of the 'Convert' who immerses themselves into the activities of the group, so that we are at one with the group? Certainly, there were times in the field when things seemed alien, yet there were times when the strange becomes familiar to one's self. In seeking answers to this, I asked myself what it was I wanted to achieve from my observations. Comprehending that I was concerned to understand how Gypsies and Travellers make sense of their social world and the symbolic meanings they prescribe to their actions, focusing particularly on crime and justice, my role became more clearly defined. I did not see myself as either a convert or a Martian, but an amalgamation of the two. With this in mind, my field-notes were invaluable in the analysis of this research and the development of the theoretical framework used here. I include here some short extracts taken from my field-notes to provide some sense of my experiences:

... I was so amazed by the fair and the number of people that had turned up... a man was buying a horse from a dealer, I stood discreetly and watched the transaction, it was just as Maisy told me. The man took out his cash, it was such a huge wodge he could barely fit it into his large hands, he spat on the cash and shook hands; deal done...

I arrived onto the site, there was a bare-knuckle going on, my apprehension was superseded by excitement. It was an actual fight; I truly never thought I'd get to see one, they had not seen me coming on the site with the playbus... I didn't want to draw attention to myself, I knew if I did the fight would be stopped...

Interviewing Key-Stake Holders

The second set of data was obtained from members of the wider community who work with Gypsy and Traveller communities. A total of eleven interviews were conducted. This included Diversity Police Officers from three police forces based in England and Wales and Gypsy and four Traveller liaison officers also based in England and Wales. Interviews were also conducted with two council employees who worked as either campsite wardens or policy officers. This set of interviews aimed to both reinforce the findings obtained from Gypsy and Traveller communities and also gain an insight into the attitudes to crime and justice as

seen by Gypsies and Travellers which may not have been evident from the interviews and observations on this community. In addition, the interviews proffered an understanding of the relationships between the police and Gypsies and Travellers. Thus the use of triangulation made the data more robust than it otherwise would have been. The importance of triangulation in social science research has long been established (see Denzin 2000 and Bryman and Burgess 1999). Through triangulation social scientists are able to combine interviews and observations which both validate and compliment the strengths of each method and address any potential limitations in particular methods (Atkinson *et al.* 2003).

Data from the non-Gypsy and Traveller community was taken from semi-structured interviews. These interviews lasted for at least one hour and were conducted at the participants place of work and over the phone. In addition to this, correspondence through email was maintained throughout this research, the transcripts of which were transcribed and analysed with the permission of the author. All but one interview was recorded and later transcribed and analysed. The exception to this was at the request of the participant, however, they consented to note taking during the interview. Therefore, similarly to the interviews with Gypsies and Travellers which were not recorded, I wrote down everything that was said clarification was sought regarding the points that were missed.

As I mention above, interviews with non-Gypsies and Travellers were semi-structured (see appendix 4). This method was selected as I was aware that many of the participants from this stage of the research were extremely busy and therefore unable to offer unlimited time to be interviewed. Therefore I felt it would be better to have pre-prepared questions. However, the advantage of using a semi-structured approach as opposed to a structured interview is that it offered a certain amount of freedom, in that if interesting points were made I could deviate from the schedule and follow a different point of enquiry.

Data Analysis

This research generated qualitative data through the use of ethnographic methods. Analysis of this data was ongoing through all stages of this research. By adopting the principles of grounded theory as set out by Glaser and Strauss (1967) a flexible but systematic approach was adopted. The analysis of this data was reinforced by the use of CAQDAS (Computer Aided Qualitative Data Analysis Software) namely ATLAS.ti. Therefore, in this section I provide an overview of the analytical procedures and principles that were undertaken for this thesis.

The importance of qualitative data analysis is clearly emphasised by Noaks and Wincup (2006) who note that a flexible but open approach is required in the analysis of qualitative data. Analysis should be seen as an ongoing feature of qualitative data and not as an add on once the data has been collected (see Coffey and Atkinson 1996). This is particularly pertinent in ethnographic research where the analysis of data should underpin the research and aide the formation of all chapters (Rock 2001). With this in mind, analysis of this current research was based on the principles of grounded theory, which as Charmaz and Mitchell (2001) effectively argue, complements ethnographic research by allowing the researcher to move towards a development of theory. It is important when conducting ethnographic research that there are no preconceived ideas of where the research will fit in terms of theory (Hammersley and Atkinson 1995). Instead the ethnographic researcher should allow themes to emerge from the data.

Acknowledging these points, this research adopted Charmaz and Mitchell's (2001) analysis procedures which they developed from Glaser and Strauss's (1967) grounded theory. Hence data was transcribed immediately after it had been collected, it was then coded line-by-line to show actions and processes. The next stage was to compare codes with data in the memos used in the research. This allowed for significant codes to emerge from within the data that were then explored through further observations and interviews. This process was ongoing until all the data had been collected. Once all the data had been coded and analysed they were integrated into a theoretical framework. This then enabled me

to write a first draft of my literature review from which any gaps could be identified and concepts developed and refined.

The use of codes in data is fundamental as it allows the researcher to ask crucial questions of their data (see Charmaz and Mitchell 2001 and Coffey and Atkinson 1996). Through the use of codes in the data analysis process of this research I was able to discover meanings in the data which were then checked with all subsequent data collected. In terms of ethnographic research this is hugely beneficial as it allows the researcher to interact with both participants and their data. The process begins with an initial coding and then codes are developed from everything that is seen in the data. Whereas some writers advocate the importance of planning codes before the analysis begins (see Miles and Huberman 1994) I chose not to apply this method. Instead I opted to allow the codes to emerge directly from the data.

This research generated a rich source of data and therefore I took the decision to use a CAQDAS package ATLAS:ti. Acknowledging the many strengths and limitations of employing such packages to analysis data I opted to use ATLAS:ti to help reinforce my coding and thus make the analysis more robust. This package has been designed specifically to use with qualitative data with the purpose of assisting with the coding and retrieving of the data. In all truthfulness, I was highly sceptical of the value of using CAQDAS packages for the analysing of data. However, what ATLAS:ti allowed was the careful management of the data. My concern, perhaps naively, was that I felt the use of this package would prevent me from remaining part of the data, and that I would lose control over it, but in reality the opposite was true.

Conclusion

At the heart of this research are three distinct research questions, focusing upon crime, deviance and justice as experienced by Gypsies and Travellers (see Introduction). This chapter has outlined the methods used to ensure that each question could be answered effectively. I have discussed the benefits of

employing an ethnographic approach and explained why this mode of research was judged the most efficient in achieving this goal. Alongside this, the chapter provided an account of the problems encountered during my time in the field; most notably it discussed issues of access, and the role of the researcher. In addition, I drew attention to the varying ethical considerations that this research brought to light and how these were conquered.

By offering a detailed description of the methodological approach, this chapter provides a solid foundation for subsequent chapters. Before going on to say a little bit more about the following chapters, I return briefly to the analytical methods used in this research. Undoubtedly, a wealth of data was amassed through my fieldwork, and I have taken great pains to ensure that the social world of Gypsies and Travellers is represented truthfully. This has meant I transcribed *'spoken action and recorded movements in accordance to best practice'* (Atkinson 2008: 10). A systematic, albeit flexible approach to data analysis was employed throughout this research. As we have previously discerned, data analysis was an ongoing process through all stages of this research. From this approach a theoretical framework was achieved. This framework is informed by the research questions on which this research is based. With this in mind, the research adopts a theoretical framework that explains the attitudes of Gypsy and Traveller communities towards crime built around the notion of harm. The work of Sykes and Matza (1957) proved useful in showing how attitudes are constructed through a process of neutralisation. In understanding the informal systems of justice practised by Gypsy and Traveller communities, the principles of restorative justice are applied, demonstrating the importance of shame within this system. Finally, in exploring the dealings that Gypsy and Traveller communities have with official agents of social control, we turn to issues around policing accountability and legitimacy to explain the reluctance of this community in seeking their assistance.

In the following four chapters, I present the empirical findings emerging from my data analysis. This begins with chapter five, in which I describe the research setting, looking at the moral codes important to Gypsy and Traveller

communities. Here we see how some of the values held by Gypsies and Travellers are at odds with the values professed by the wider British society.

Chapter 5

Moral Codes

Introduction

This chapter sets the scene by introducing the reader to the social world of Gypsies and Travellers. The journey begins with a discussion on the moral codes held by Gypsies and Travellers. It discusses the notion of value consensus both within Gypsy and Traveller communities and in the Gorgers society. Here the notion of bricolage, pollution and symbolic boundaries, concepts I have already identified as having significant bearing in this research, will be discussed. These themes will underpin future chapters and appear throughout the discussion. In this chapter I will outline the key findings of this data in relation to Gypsies and Travellers' moral codes. In doing so, the first of my research questions will be addressed. That is: *Do Gypsies and Travellers have a common set of shared values?* Contained within this question are the following sub-questions that this chapter will engage with. *Are these attitudes underpinned by a Gypsy and Traveller moral code?* and *do the values shared by Gypsies and Travellers conflict with those of the wider community?*

The chapter begins with a discussion on value consensus and conflicting values. Evidence will be presented that highlights how at times the moral code adopted by Gypsy and Traveller communities conflicts with the values professed by the wider society. While this suggests that Gypsy and Traveller communities are 'lawless' (see Weyrauch 2001 and Gmelch 1986) the evidence I present here indicates that Gypsies and Travellers adhere to a strict moral code. This code is evident in the rites and rituals performed by Gypsy and Traveller communities. Moreover, in line with Okely's (1983) position I will show how the community has been forced to adopt a bricolage attitude. The chapter then goes on to discuss the concept of symbolic boundaries, demonstrating how Gypsy and

Traveller communities have been able to create a demarcation between themselves and the wider British society. This enables the community to develop a sense of belonging as well as, a socially constructed identity of a Gypsy and Traveller. In understanding how Gypsies and Travellers are able to create a symbolic boundary the notion of pollution will be explained, in doing so I illustrate how this is used by Gypsy and Traveller communities. The chapter draws to an end with an analysis of the concept of 'Othering' showing how Gypsies and Travellers construct an identity of those who deviate from the moral code. Here, I draw upon the work of Elias and Scotson (1965) showing how Gypsy and Traveller communities distinguish between the 'true' and 'real' Gypsies and Travellers who abide by the codes adopted by this community, and the 'newer' Gypsies and Travellers who deviate from the code.

It is generally assumed that Gypsies and Travellers profess to a different set of moral codes than the mainstream society (see Vanderbeck 2003, Weyrauch 2001 and Dawson 2000). As chapter two outlined, in contemporary British society there are many groups who abide by often conflicting values to those held by the wider society (see Blagg 2008, Wardak 2000, Bourgois 1999, Chin 1996 and Hall and Jefferson 1976). Yet, as Sellin (1938) rightly attests laws reflect the values of the dominant group in society. This means that many groups are forced to live outside of the law (see Blagg 2008 and Okely 1983).

Value Consensus And Conflicting Values

Few social scientists would now subscribe to the picture of society as a harmonious whole, underpinned by a single set of shared values. A discussion of the culturally diverse nature of society was provided in chapter two. Here evidence was drawn upon, which showed that many different groups in society have generally differing definitions of what constitutes 'normal' and 'deviant' behaviour (see Blagg 2008, Wardak 2000, Bourgois 1999, Chin 1996 and Hall *et al.* 1978).

Many anthropologists have drawn attention to the issue of conflicting values. For example, Turnbull's (1974) study of the BaMbuti found conflicting values between different tribal groups within a region of Zaire. Whereas, Scott (1976) found that within tribal groups conformity to the tribal unit was evident. Nevertheless, between tribal groups there was generally animosity as conflicting values became evident.

Early anthropological studies of Gypsies and Travellers reinforce the notion of conflicting values. For instance, Bonos (1942) noted disputes between Gypsies and members of the society in which they reside. In America, for example, Bonos found that Gypsies and Travellers had managed to maintain their culture and norms even though they clashed with those held by the local community and led to a range of social conflicts. Similarly, Okely (1983) argued that the state has constitutently attempted to control Gypsies and Travellers as they continually clash with the prevailing social order. As such, Okely refers to Gypsies and Travellers as a '*bricoleur*' community, in that they select some values from the wider society to which they will conform and systematically reject other values. One of the most discordant values that Gypsies and Travellers reject is that of sedentarism. This reinforces Okely's concept of a bricoleur community and the conflicting values between Gypsies and Travellers and the wider society. The notion of bricolage will be given greater attention later in this chapter, but first let us now explore how the values of the Gypsy and Traveller conflict with the values of the wider society. This will begin with an exploration of the nomadic tradition of Gypsy and Traveller communities.

A Nomadic Tradition

Nomadism is a fundamental part of the lifestyle of Gypsies and Travellers. Yet this has led to contentions between this community and the values of the wider society. Throughout history a range of legislation has been introduced to curtail the nomadic lifestyle of Gypsies and Travellers, the most recent being the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act (1994). Regardless, Gypsies and Travellers attempt to maintain this lifestyle and in doing so, their values conflict with the values of the wider society.

Nomadism is an issue that featured heavily in the interviews with Gypsies and Travellers and those who work with this community. On the one side, Gypsies and Travellers discussed the importance of travelling in their culture and how they felt this was being hindered through legislation, a sensitive issue in their community. Alongside this is the concern from the wider society who see illegal encampments and the problems associated with this. Some of these problems include, increased crime, fly-tipping and waste disposal, which are often perceived as a problem of the 'nuisance Gypsies' (see Vanderbeck 2003). Generally, society becomes aware of Gypsies and Travellers when they set up illegal encampments. Hence, it is this that informs society's opinions of Gypsy and Traveller communities and in doing so highlights the conflicting values between Gypsies and Travellers and the wider British society. This is illustrated in the following quote, in which a policy officer refers to tensions between Gypsies and Travellers and the local community. Here the local community is affected by the illegal encampment set up by a Gypsy and Traveller community:

We have had complaints from the public when they first arrive...depending on the size of the encampment we can get a pretty big mess when they leave...

Pete: Policy Officer (Interview)

Counter to this, Gypsies and Travellers discuss the importance of Travelling. This is seen as a fundamental aspect of their lifestyle and the bond that they feel toward other Gypsies and Travellers. It is for this reason they do not want to give up this facet of their lifestyle. Nevertheless, in the following quote Tom is fully aware of the public resistance towards Gypsies and Travellers nomadic lifestyle and counters this with the cultural and economic needs of this community:

...but through the rules and that and I don't think that the Government likes to have a lot of people, like hundreds of trailers at one time 'cos they are frightened of what's going to happen... and that's all we do is go down and a load of Travellers goes down to enjoy their selves, some look forward to the actual racing to bet on the horses and that, the teenagers like the fairground and meet other teenagers and like the men like to find a young woman for courting 'n that and some people just like to go there and have a look around and see old friends that they haven't seen 'cos they live in different parts of the country. And some people has got businesses 'n that...

Tom (Interview)

Likewise, Sonny in his extracts from both interviews and his written notes expresses the value of the nomadic life:

...I mean even if some Gypsies aren't related to you, you still have a certain bond from sharing the same sort of nomadic life...

Sonny (Interview)

I love the freedom of travelling around, when it's time to pack up, getting excited thinking about where I was going...this is one of the many reasons I wouldn't change my way of life for all the tea in China...

Sonny (Written Notes)

Hence, as the above quotes infer, Gypsies and Travellers are indeed part of a bricoleur community, accepting some values from the wider society and as the example of nomadism suggests rejecting other values in order to maintain their lifestyle. It is for this reason that Gypsies and Travellers appear to have conflicting values to those of the wider society. We will return to the concept of bricolage later in this chapter, but first let us look and the moral codes practised by Gypsy and Traveller communities.

Moral Codes

By drawing upon a specific example of nomadism we are able to understand how the values and cultural lifestyle of Gypsy and Traveller communities is seen at odds with the values professed by the wider society. Such conflicting values have led many in society to label Gypsies and Travellers as 'lawless' and a 'nuisance' (see Cemlyn and Clark 2005, Vanderbeck 2003, MacLaughlin 1999, Mayall 1992 and Gmelch 1986). Nevertheless, Gypsies and Travellers follow a strict moral code within their community (see Clark 2006, Greenfields 2006a, Acton *et al.* 1997, Okely 1983 and Bonos 1942). The next section of this chapter will look at the moral codes as obeyed by Gypsies and Travellers. This section will then go onto show how moral codes are used by Gypsy and Traveller communities to create a '*symbolic boundary*' between themselves and the wider society. In doing so, Gypsies and Travellers are able to maintain their culture, often through adverse conditions (see Sibley 1981).

The moral code adopted by Gypsy and Traveller communities governs the behaviour of members of the community, particularly the behaviour between males and females. Indeed, as Connie suggests:

A women or man never speaks about private parts of the body or a woman's health issues in mixed company. If a doctor or nurse does this, then everyone accept the husband or mother or sister will leave the room. This is a great **taboo**⁴ among Gypsy people and Travellers...

Connie (Written Notes)

This leads to many rules being implemented and observed. The following statements by both Maisy and Tom reinforce this notion. Here, Maisy is referring to an incident when her daughter was younger and which led her to remove all her children from education, whereas Tom is talking about the need within his culture to safeguard his daughters from being subjected to sexual education and the need to provide his sons with the skills to earn a living at a young age:

she's older now, she's ten, but she was very young at the time, and she's always been taught not to get undressed in front of boys and they had to get undressed in the classroom in their knickers 'n that and she wouldn't do it right, and they made her and she wouldn't do it 'n she cried... so I went up and tried to explain to the teacher... and I said *'no she's not doing it and I won't allow her to do it'* and the teacher said *'well everybody else is doing the exercises in their knickers'* and we said 'well she's not allowed to do it

Maisy (Interview).

they should respect it, it's not like it's a one off but like a race of people believe in it, like right if the daughters are going to school 'till a certain age, then you don't want her going onto the next stage, you take her out.... and like for my son then, you see, you pull 'em out of school and the father learns him the rest and its your culture to do that.

Tom (Interview).

These statements allude not only to the conflicting values between Gypsies and Travellers and the wider society. They show the dilemma within this community to either follow the laws of society or to conform to the norms of their culture. Hence, both Tom and Maisy and their children may appear deviant by non-Gypsies and Travellers, but had they failed to act in the way they did and in observing the rules governing behaviour in their community they could risk their

⁴ Respondents emphasis

reputation in Gypsy and Traveller communities. The consequences of which could be far more reaching. The penalties for failing to adhere to the moral code will be discussed in more detail later in this chapter.

Gypsies and Travellers have a somewhat contentious relationship with the authorities, and whilst this will be explored more fully in chapter eight, this relationship has an important role in the moral codes. Indeed, one crucial element of the moral code is not to inform on anyone to the police. The repercussions for doing so can lead to people being ostracised from the community. This can be seen in the following statements by Connie, who is discussing a serious incident that occurred on site and was asked if she had reported it:

if anyone gave someone away to the police or the authorities, whether it was true or false, no one would talk to or stop with or marry into that family...

Connie (Interview)

This is reiterated by both Maisy and Billy:

... It wouldn't have happened because it was a socially unacceptable thing, something that brought great shame....

Maisy (Interview)

... It is unacceptable to squeal to the police...

Billy (Interview)

The Gypsy and Traveller moral code also featured in interviews with key stake holders, who worked alongside this community. However, in these interviews there is a distinction between those who follow the code and those who do not. This can be seen in the following statement by a council officer working with the community:

...you usually find that the ones who are higher in the hierarchy are the older ones who are the old school and you do expect them to have sort of code or whatever, and then you find the ones that just do not want to listen to anybody...

Paul: Policy Officer (Interview)

Gypsies and Travellers are often labelled as deviant, according to Richardson (2006) the discourse in the media, the police and by politicians acts to socially construct them as such. Yet, whilst Gypsies and Travellers may at times appear to

be deviant, within their community they are abiding by a strict moral code. Following the moral code of their community is paramount to Gypsies and Travellers, as this enables members to gain a good reputation and status within their culture (see Weyrauch 2001). Indeed, without a good reputation an individual will find it difficult to get stopping places on sites, employment and marriage for themselves and their families. This is illustrated by the following quote from Tom, who is referring to an incident which meant that the perpetrator was ostracised by other members of his Gypsy and Travelling community. Tom notes:

...he is blackball... they would definitely not marry his children, say he had sons right, and if he was to go and ask for a daughter-in-law, his doors are closed because of what he's done

Tom (Interview)

Likewise Connie also refers to the importance of the moral code within her Gypsy and Traveller community and how it can impact on both the individual and family units' lifestyle:

...once you've lost your respect well you've lost your stopping places, you've lost your children marrying into good families, you don't get invited anywhere and you know you can get down the fact that taken to its worse form you are not welcome in the churches you know so its very important

Connie (Interview)

As both Tom and Connie are suggesting here, if someone gains a poor reputation that shame not only reflects on the individual but will also have bearing on their family. Once a reputation has been lost the person will be seen as a '*Gorger*' a Gypsy term for a non-Traveller and it is hard for them to be accepted in Gypsy and Traveller circles. It is for this reason that Gypsies and Travellers abide by a strict moral code. In chapter seven, the mechanisms of informal community justice will be discussed, here it will be shown that the technique of avoidance is an important tool in the system employed by Gypsy and Traveller communities. Avoidance and banishment allows Gypsies and Travellers to deal with those who fail to abide by the moral codes of their community. What we can see here is that the consequences of avoidance plays an important role on the moral code of Gypsy and Traveller communities.

Bricolage

This chapter has thus far focused on the moral code of Gypsy and Traveller communities. Evidence has shown how many of the values held by Gypsies and Travellers can at times conflict with those of the wider society. This has been illustrated through examples of nomadism and attitudes towards education. Abiding by the values of their culture leaves Gypsy and Traveller communities in a somewhat precarious position. If they fail to conform to the values of their community, Gypsies and Travellers run the risk of not being able to participate fully in their social world as a Gypsy and Traveller. In order to appease this dilemma Okely (1983) put forward the argument that the community have adopted a bricolage attitude in their value system. Bricolage as we discerned in chapter two, refers to the '*cutting and mixing*' of values from different cultures, time and space (see Hebdige 1979). If we refer back to the quotes proffered by Tom and Maisy previously in this chapter, in which they discussed the education of their children, it is clear that their attitudes conflict with the values of the wider society. They allowed their children to be educated for a short period of time, however as soon as the values of the education system conflict with the values of their culture they removed their children from formal education. Thus rejecting educational values and indeed legislation, so that they could maintain their reputation as a '*decent*' Gypsy and Traveller, in this way they are able to adopt a bricolage attitude. This is further illustrated in the following statement by Connie. Here Connie recognises that her values as a Gypsy and Traveller conflict with the values of the wider society. Importantly she also understands that by acting in accordance to these values she and her community may be seen as a '*nuisance*'. Nevertheless, Connie is able to justify this arguing that she also abides by many of the rules of her society:

There is no recognition, amongst the Gorgers. I'm not saying all of them because people like yourself means things are changing, but they will not recognise that we have customs, right or wrong customs, we have ways whether they're a nuisance or not they deserve to one, be acknowledged, two recognised, three respected and we need to be allowed to upkeep those, in the same way we respect they way Gorgers do things and go along with many of their rules.

Connie (Interview).



In this sense the Gypsies and Travellers are a bricolage community (Okely 1983). Bricolage will be discussed in subsequent chapters, for instance in chapter seven where the forms of community justice adopted by Gypsy and Traveller communities, bricolage will be referred to showing how the community is able to discount justice systems that are not pertinent to the Gypsy and Traveller lifestyle.

Symbolic Boundaries

The issue of symbolic boundaries and their importance to a community is addressed by the work of Anthony Cohen (1985). Here Cohen looks at communities as symbolic constructions, in which a system of values, moral codes and norms provide a sense of belonging within a bounded whole to their members. As such the boundary signifies the beginning and end of the community. Cohen argues that the symbolism in a community may be explicit in that they can mark certain events such as life and death and the pure and the polluted. Thus according to Cohen, the community is where one learns how to be social in that this is where individuals acquire their culture. Hence within a community principles are established whereby anyone contravening these will be perceived as an '*outsider*'.

Many of the actions of Gypsies and Travellers on first inspection could portray them as both outsiders and deviant. However, as previously mentioned Gypsies and Travellers abide by a strict moral code. This may at times conflict with the values of the wider society, through the use of rites and rituals they are symbolising a boundary between themselves and the rest of society.

Rites And Rituals

Rites and rituals are one way in which communities are able to create a symbolic boundary (Cohen 1985). Turning to the example of fighting we can see how Gypsies and Travellers construct a symbolic boundary between their community and the wider society. Fighting is an important aspect of the Gypsy and Traveller lifestyle. Fighting within this community is a way of not only settling scores but

allows members to achieve a high status within their community, as Sonny argues:

Fights between Gypsies can be brutal and long, they are always private, no outsiders...they are known as the King of the Gypsies. They didn't wear crowns or live in castles they were modern day gladiators...men like this are respected...they have standing in the community...

Sonny (Written Notes).

Nevertheless, fighting amongst Gypsies and Travellers has resulted in a problematic relationship between their community and the wider society. So much so, that many pubs and restaurants have introduced no Gypsies and Traveller signs, thus barring this community from entering their establishment (see Foley 2006, Bancroft 2005, and Lomax *et al.* 2000). But as you can see from Connie's statement, there are a number of important elements to the fighting which forms part of the rites and rituals adopted by this community. Moreover, by following these rituals Gypsy and Traveller communities are setting themselves apart from 'Others', in doing so they are creating a symbolic boundary:

...it would be settled by a fight, this would be done with referees and they would go in a field away from the women and children, they would strip to the waist ... tie a silk hanky around their waist and they would be very fair ...

Connie (Interview).

From Connie's statement it is clear there are a number of important rituals involved in the fighting system of her Gypsy and Traveller community. Firstly, the men separate themselves from the women and children. They then strip to the waist, placing a silk hanky around them. These important rituals play an important role in the fighting ceremony. It allows the Gypsies and Travellers to distinguish themselves from other social groups and as such has an important meaning in their social world. Tom is also able to recognise the importance of the tying of the scarf, an aspect of the fighting ritual. In the next quote, Tom talks of the practicalities of this ritual, alongside this, he is able to acknowledge that failing to do so could have consequences for the individual:

What you have to understand right is that they 'ave to obviously remove it from 'round their neck, you know it's a thing that you could grab right so its something I can't grab so if you tied it around your waist they wouldn't be able to do anything like that. And also the scarves are expensive, so you could keep it safe, see what I mean. If someone went 'n 'ad a fight and they didn't tie the scarf, well they'd know they weren't behaving right, see what I'm saying

Tom (Interview)

Adherence to the rites and rituals is paramount as it is embedded within the moral code endorsed by Gypsy and Traveller communities. Failure to do so will render an individual and their family unit polluted, which will have repercussions on all aspects of their life. In the following statement Tom is referring to the notion of someone becoming marrie-mae (polluted) and how this impacts on their family. We will return to the concept of pollution shortly, however as we will see this plays an important role in the rituals practiced by Gypsy and Traveller communities. Hence, an individual becomes marrie-mae because they failed to observe the rites and rituals of the community. In this instance Tom is talking about an individual who failed to pay a fine for a previous offence, which has ended up in a 'Creese', a Gypsy court:

...what you see is Anne it's like driving through a traffic light or speeding and police hold you up and you have to pay a fine because you've done wrong and the bigger the crime the more that is involved, some people realise that they're wrong and they put money in their pocket to pay and if they haven't got enough money on them well then they give their word that they'll pay it or if they are a bit short on money they will say we'll look I'll give you so much and if I could pay you the rest in a months' time, that's the way it works. But sometimes people try to get away by paying a little bit and trying 'n knock them for the rest but they can have a second creese and say that man hasn't paid me 'n then you know what I said about the marrie-mae they could say that some people are not paying the money or just paying a little bit, he then sorts it out from the people you know the old saying 'bad news travels fast' then if that person wasn't to pay they could say well that person now we class him as marrie-mae...his doors are closed because of what he's done. So really and truthfully anyone with any sense would just grin and bare it, cough up and pay for it. Well what it is some people, it has been known for some people not to pay but my outlook on that is that they haven't thought about their daughters, sons and what he is thinking about is his money.

Tom (Interview).

Therefore by not paying due attention to the rites and rituals in Gypsy and Traveller communities can have many repercussions. Most notably, the risk of being excluded from their community and their reputation will be questioned. In another example, Tom is again discussing the creese and the rituals that it entails, here he shows the important role that women play within this court system. Tom notes:

Now funnily enough a few years back I went a Creese and a woman butted in right 'n the man before the court, this is just another story that I 'ave to explain, so what happened was this woman, she was a married woman right and the headman would say; *'would you tell your wife to be quiet or to step to one side so that this can be sorted'* he would give her one warning, maybe two the third one 'ed walk out right. He wouldn't say the woman 'imself *'go and sit down and behave yourself'* right...

Tom (Interview).

In the incident that Tom is relaying the creese had to be abandoned because the wife of the defendant failed to comply by the rituals of the court and resulted in both her and her husband losing their case. This meant that they not only had to pay a large fine but meant that the husband would not be called upon to give evidence in any future cases. Moreover, if in the future he was injured by the actions of another Gypsy or Traveller he would have great difficulty in calling a creese. In this sense he and his family have become polluted through their failure to abide by the rules of the creese.

In the above extracts offered by Tom the concept of pollution is discussed. Pollution is called either *mochadi* or *marrie-mae* among Gypsies and Travellers and is a way for the community to reinforce their symbolic boundary. *Mochadi* and *marrie-mae* enable Gypsies and Travellers to separate themselves from non-Gypsies and Travellers, by achieving this they are creating an ethnic boundary between their community and the wider society (see Okely 1983). This allows Gypsies and Travellers to remain separate, yet at the same time they can maintain contact with the wider community. In this sense pollution underlines the interaction between Gypsies and Travellers:

Nurses have come down and broken all the taboos you know with midwives they'd say '*well if you're going to let them in they're gonna mochadi everything you've got*' (laughs) you won't have a clean thing. And if something got mochadi, dirty meaning you would've to throw it away, that's why we don't like using them...

Maisy (Interview).

Maisy is articulating the importance of protecting her and her family from pollution. The threat of pollution governs her interactions with the Gorger society. In order to prevent the risk of pollution she and other members of her community limit their contact with the wider society, in this case nurses. Through such actions Gypsies and Travellers establish a symbolic between their community and the wider society. Pollution and its role in Gypsy and Traveller communities have been discussed previously (see Okely 1983). It is to this we now turn our attention in order to better understand the moral code Gypsies and Travellers.

Mochadi And Marrie-Mae

The role of the moral codes adopted by Gypsy and Traveller communities play an important function to its members. Indeed, the codes are underpinned by the rites and rituals performed by this community. Mary Douglas (1966) referred to the functions of rites and rituals, noting that they are not merely part of the institution but are compounded by its beliefs and practices. Within any society, according to Douglas, is the need for some form of social control, therefore a society which does not have the formal machinery to deal with transgressions will adapt and develop other means. These may take the form of witch-craft, superstition or vengeance. This allows the members of a given society to conform. Douglas argues that, as a community reaches a cultural homogeneity it begins to signpost moments of choice with dangers. One way in which a society can achieve this is through the notion of pollution. According to Douglas, the rules on pollution within a society can help consolidate and buttress the moral rules. Moreover, the rules on pollution have the useful function of assembling moral disapproval for any infringements.

Okely (1983) provides a useful and detailed account regarding the rules of pollution and how these are observed within Gypsy and Traveller communities.

In chapter two we discussed the notion of pollution which as Okely claims, allows Gypsies and Travellers to distinguish between the inside and outside of the body. The dichotomy between the inside and outside has an important feature in terms of the relationship between Gorgers and Gypsies and Travellers. Indeed, Okely describes the outside of the body as a symbolism of the public self, it is this that Gypsies and Travellers show to the rest of society. Whereas the inside of the body must remain free from pollution as it is to be pure and protected from the outside world. Hence, the notion of pollution has significant bearing on the rites and rituals and the moral codes accepted by Gypsy and Traveller communities.

Pollution is known as either '*mochadi*' or '*marrie-mae*' depending on the ethnicity of the Gypsy and Traveller and means '*ritually unclean and polluted*'. Whilst the words may be different and indeed, some of the rites and rituals may vary, both *mochadi* and *marrie-mae* play a pivotal role in governing the behaviour of Gypsies and Travellers. For example, Sonny is talking about the importance of being clean, '*culchen*' and how people are judged if they are not and the shame that this brings:

...it really, really is important, like if you go somewhere 'n you didn't know people 'n start chit-chatting, people will be friendly 'n say '*come in, have a cup of tea, have a sandwich*', but it would go down as a mental note that these people aren't very clean. You'd say like these are not so much our type of people, but like that they should keep the place clean and it would be unsaid, you wouldn't have to, a look can pretty much say it all, and they could consider that a great shame...

Sonny (Interview).

The notion of pollution is underpinned by many rites and rituals, the purpose of which is to prevent contamination either for the individual or those around them.

This is attested by both Tom and Maisy:

...a married woman must not step over dishes, cutlery etc or walk past in front of men, she must walk around them or excuse herself if she has to pass, this is all to do with *marrie-mae*, which is full of red tape

Tom (Written Notes)

...there would be a separate bowl for hands and face and one **just** for cups and dishes. Tea towels must also be washed separately and **not** in a washing machine. In a house a new sink must be fitted or at least a clean washing bowl...you **never** use the toilet in the trailer, you **must** go outside...

Connie (Written Notes)

Identity And 'Othering'

Chapter two outlined the importance of social identity. Therefore drawing on the work of Jenkins (1996), Brewer (2001) and Duveen (2001) identity is referred to as a social construct ascribed to an individual. The importance of the Gypsy and Traveller identity was addressed in chapter two (Clark 2006, Greenfields 2006a, Okely 2005, Bancroft 2005, Weyrauch 2001, Acton *et al.* 1997 and Okely 1983). It was noted that for a Gypsy and Traveller their firstly loyalty was to their kin. This is closely followed by a loyalty to their Gypsy and Traveller community, particularly during times on conflict with the Gorgers community (see Okely 2005, Bancroft 2005, Gronfors 1986 and Bonos 1942). Indeed Gypsies and Travellers are fiercely protective and proud of their ethnic identity (see Clark 2006, Greenfields 2006a, 2006b, Bancroft 2005, Acton *et al.* 1996 and Okely 1983).

Consistent with previous research, the cultural identity of Gypsies and Travellers featured in many of the interviews conducted with community members. This is illustrated in the following quote by Timmy, in which he is talking about the immense pride he has in his heritage:

...umm, yeah I suppose the heritage makes you quite proud because it such an old thing, I can trace my Gypsy heritage in this country going back over two hundred years... it is who I am and I am proud of that...

Timmy (Interview)

Connie is also able to recognise the importance of her Gypsy identity and how this leads to a sense of belonging and respect amongst other Gypsies and Travellers:

...if you go to an old fashioned Gypsy family they'll be as friendly as anything even like say if someone came along, we've had it happen before and you won't know them but they'll say or you do such and such 'cos they know of you through someone else and people are sat down and made to feel at home as an old family friend and it is that sort of comradidity⁵ which is passed throughout the old fashioned sort of Gypsies

Connie (Interview)

Interestingly, Gypsies and Travellers make a distinction between the Gypsies and Travellers who accept and abide by the shared values of their community and those who transgress the codes. The members of Gypsy and Traveller communities are consistently referred to as the 'others', the rougher or newer types of Gypsies and Travellers. In doing so, they are able to create a social identity on this group; one which is shaped by 'stigma'. Goffman (1963) referred to this as an attribute that is deeply discrediting. In chapter two the concept of the 'established' and 'outsider' group identity was discussed, in doing so I drew on the work of Elias and Scotson (1965) to illustrate power differentials in a community. Accordingly, the established group are able to separate themselves from newcomers to their community. Newcomers are labelled 'outsiders' and as such blamed for any wrong-doing in their community. If we refer back to Connie's statement above, she is able to identify herself as an 'old fashioned Gypsy'. Again, if we look at the quote below, Connie once more defines herself as the 'old fashioned Gypsy and Traveller', yet she also refers to the 'new Gypsies'. It is the newer Gypsies that Connie associates with crime in her community. Likewise Maisy also distinguishes between the new and older type of Gypsy, with the former group seen to be responsible for crime in her Gypsy and Traveller community:

I mean as we said before with the new Travellers well there is no respect

Connie (Interview)

⁵ Connie's expression

Maisy: Some do commit crimes obviously but not so much.... it's a different type of crime. It's like (Name)⁶ he asked us about distraction burglaries and things like that, and they're all like the newer Travellers, you know they might have been Travellers for the last twenty or forty years but, they're not off the old stock.

Anne: So do you mean the New Age Travellers?

Masiy: No, No, No, they are Travellers but when and where they come from I don't really know, but, well we do we don't really don't want to go too deep into it. They just do things you don't do, most old fashioned Travellers and Gypsies wouldn't behave in that way, but the modern ones

In this sense, both Connie and Maisy separate themselves away from those who commit crime or break the moral codes. Moreover, the actions that 'old fashioned' Gypsies and Travellers bestow on the 'new', 'rough' or 'modern' Gypsies reiterates their negative social identity (see Elias and Scotson 1965). It is these actions that that can be seen to be stigmatising. For example, in following quote Connie is taking about her communities' avoidance of certain families who fail to adhere to the moral codes held by the majority of the Gypsy and Traveller community:

...but the other Travellers and I don't like calling the ummm the rough Travellers 'cos in a way they're not but the other Travellers, you know the more mainstream Travellers... they don't respect the ole ways and so there are certain weddings you don't go to, funerals you don't go to and Travellers who you 'ope don't turn up at 'ours
Connie (Interview)

Similarly Mary also separates her identity from the those who fail to conform to the values and norms of her community. Crucially, Mary discusses the impact of failing to conform and the consequences on the individual in that people will not want to marry into their family. Hence, these individuals become stigmatised by their actions:

...know about fighting 'n that even the young boy's the one's that 'at do take drugs 'n things, the wildless ones, they are more wildless up the country, you know the new ones... 'n people would say don't marry them they are bad, 'n you hope that your girls don't get involved with 'em...

Mary (Interview).

⁶ The name has been deleted to protect the identity of the individual that Connie is discussing.

Conclusion

This chapter has illustrated that Gypsies and Travellers have a strict moral code. This code governs the actions of Gypsy and Traveller communities, which may at times render the community as 'lawless' for failing to abide by the prevailing norms of society. Yet, what is clear from the evidence that has been presented, Gypsies and Travellers adherence to the moral codes of their community have been forced to assume a bricolage perspective. As such, they are able to adapt the values from their community to fit their lifestyle and cultural needs, while at the same reject values that neglect and recognise these needs. This has meant they may appear 'lawless' by others in society who fail to understand the moral code of Gypsy and Traveller communities.

Gypsies' and Travellers' moral code can be understood through many of the rites and rituals practiced by this community. The practice of these rites and rituals allows Gypsy and Traveller communities to construct a symbolic boundary between their world and the Gorgor social world. Pollution plays a pivotal role in the creation of this symbolic boundary, regulating the interactions of Gypsies and Travellers and the wider society. Finally, Gypsies and Travellers are able to acknowledge that not all members will conform to these values. Recognising this, Gypsies and Travellers are able to distinguish between what they see as the 'newer' members who deviate from the code and the more established groups who conform to the values of their Gypsy and Traveller community. The work of Elias and Scotson (1965) provides a useful theoretical framework in understanding the power differentials between these two groups of Gypsies and Travellers.

The next chapter, which looks specifically at Gypsies' and Travellers' attitudes to crime, will further develop many of the theoretical and conceptual themes discussed here

Chapter 6

Gypsies' and Travellers' Attitudes Towards Crime and Deviance.

Introduction

This chapter will focus on Gypsies' and Travellers' attitudes towards crime and deviance. In the previous chapter, attention was drawn to the moral codes adopted by Gypsies and Travellers. Here, the notion of 'bricolage' was highlighted; Gypsies and Travellers select some values from the wider society and systematically reject those which they see as not being in tune with Gypsies' and Travellers' culture and values. Developing on from this, this chapter will now go on to explore Gypsies' and Travellers' attitudes to specific crimes, together with the views of those held by outsiders who work with these communities. The discussion will cover both crimes committed within Gypsy and Traveller communities and those committed by Gypsies and Travellers against outsiders. In addition, the seriousness of different crimes as seen by members of Gypsy and Traveller communities will be explored. Hence, this chapter will address the first of the research questions set out in the introduction of this thesis. However, whereas chapter five focussed on the sub-questions pertaining to moral codes and shared values, this chapter will concentrate on the following sub-question; *what attitudes do Gypsies and Travellers have towards crime and deviance?*

In order to discuss the attitudes that Gypsies and Travellers have towards different types of crime, it is necessary to begin by referring back to the process of 'neutralisation' proposed by Sykes and Matza (1957). As chapter two explained, techniques of neutralisation allow the individual to evade responsibility for any wrongdoing. Accordingly, delinquents are able to neutralise their deviant act by temporarily suspending their commitment to societal norms and values. In doing so, Sykes and Matza (1957) argued that the deviant uses five techniques which

effectively free the individual from both shame and guilt and thus provide them with the necessary freedom to violate both the norms and laws of their society. The variables to which Sykes and Matza refer to include; the deviant's denial of any responsibility for injury and victims(s); condemnation of the condemners and an appeal to higher loyalties. Sykes and Matza maintained that those who deviate do not reject the values held by the dominant culture, but through the process of neutralisation are able justify their actions. It is here that the notion of bricolage becomes important, in that Gypsies and Travellers accept some values held by society but at the same time maintain the values of their culture. This may lead to society's image of Gypsies and Travellers as being one of a deviant group as the values of their community clash with the values of the wider society (see chapter five).

In addressing the above question, this chapter will draw on data taken from field-notes and semi-structured interviews with members of Gypsy and Traveller communities and those who work alongside Gypsies and Travellers. A detailed account of the methodology used to gather data for this research is provided in chapter four. Nevertheless, it is important here to give some description of the methods that had most bearing on this part of the research. Indeed, as previously stated a number of visual cues were given to each respondent (see chapter four). The visual cues were taken from the internet and were based on Dawson's (2000) typology of crimes commonly associated with Gypsies and Travellers (see chapter two). As discussed in chapter four, participants from Gypsy and Traveller communities were asked to discuss each image and state which crimes they felt to be more serious than others and those which they felt were less serious. It is important here to note that there was no control group of non-Gypsies and Travellers of similar social characteristics included in this research for the reasons outlined in the chapter four. As a consequence, it is not possible to draw direct comparisons between the attitudes held by Gypsies and Travellers and those of the wider society.

The chapter will begin by examining Gypsies' and Travellers' attitudes towards crime committed outside of Gypsy and Traveller communities, before going on to discuss crime from within. The previous chapter referred to the notion of

'Othering', whereby, Gypsies and Travellers describe members of their community who fail to conform to the norms and values professed by Gypsies and Travellers as '*not true Travellers*' or the '*rougher Gypsies*' (see Elias and Scotson 1965). By adopting this approach Gypsies and Travellers are able to distinguish between those who conform to the values held by the majority of their community and those who reject such values. This concept will be explored again here in terms of their attitudes to crime.

Before sharing empirical data, it is pertinent to point out that whilst the attitudes of Gypsies and Travellers will be discussed, which potentially could show these communities as being 'lawless', this is indeed not the case and subsequent chapters will explain the measures used by these communities to deal with those who may transgress moral boundaries. Moreover, as previously discussed no control group was included in this study, therefore, it may well be that these attitudes are also quite common elsewhere in society, especially among younger people.

Crime committed by members of the Gypsy and Traveller communities has been frequently highlighted, discussed and documented in both academic publications and the mass media (see chapter one). For instance, Weyrauch (2001) alludes to the '*lawlessness*' of these communities, who are not averse to stealing from others. In terms of the mass media there have been a number of headlines referring to crime committed by Gypsies and Travellers. Indeed, in the introduction of this thesis, attention was drawn to headlines in The Daily Mail referring to Gypsies and Travellers as '*pickpockets*'. The common image of Gypsies and Travellers among the general public was discussed in chapter two. Here it was shown that Gypsies and Travellers are generally represented as a 'lawless' group in society. According to Acton (1994) there have been several moral panics pertaining to Gypsies and Travellers. This is clearly illustrated by The Sun's '*Stamp on a camp*' campaign. The chapter will now explore the attitudes to crime expressed by Gypsy and Traveller communities, thereby asking to what extent such perceptions of Gypsies' and Travellers' are realistic.

Outsider Crime

Stealing

In chapter two, it was shown that many writers have alluded to Gypsies' and Travellers' 'propensity' toward certain forms of crime. For example, Weyrauch (2001) referred to the thefts committed by members of Gypsy and Traveller communities, stating that Gypsies and Travellers have 'no morals' in regard to stealing as long as it is not against a member of their own community or that the victim is not harmed in any way. Likewise, Dawson (2000) discussed stealing as a crime commonly linked to Gypsies and Travellers. Similarly to Weyrauch, Dawson is also able refer to the notion of harm as a justification for this offence. Although this research cannot determine the extent of crime committed by Gypsies and Travellers, it does provide support to previous research in terms of the community's attitudes toward specific offences. Before discussing the data it is important to reacquaint ourselves with the sample used for this research. As stated in chapter three, the majority of respondents were female (eleven) and three were male. The ages of these respondents ranged from early teens to over sixty.

Shoplifting was seen by all the members of Gypsy and Traveller communities who were interviewed during this research as '*harmless*':

Shoplifting, that's not so bad, everyone does that at some time...
Tall-Girl (Interview).

...everyone does a bit of thieving now and then... it is really not like a crime... all the young one's have done it at some point, its what they do...

Mary (Interview).

I don't know anyone who hasn't nicked from a shop at sometime, I don't see anything wrong with that 'cos the shops have enough money
Sister (Interview)

In rejecting any notion of harm, it is probable that Gypsies and Travellers are conforming to Sykes and Matza's techniques of neutralisation. If we firstly take the statement provided by Tall-Girl, whilst she does not admit to having ever shoplifted, she is clearly in denial of any injury that may result from this type of offence. In her eyes shoplifting is an offence that everyone commits at some

point, as such she sees no harm in this. Again, Sister denies any harm in the actions of shoplifters. Indeed, according to Sister, shoplifting is not seen as wrong as the victim can afford the loss. In this sense she is also in denial of a victim and any injury that may result from this type of theft.

Gypsies' and Travellers' denial of either a victim or any form of injury resulting from a theft was further reinforced by those interviewed who work alongside this community. In the following comment by Steve it is possible to see how Gypsies and Travellers rationalise their offending actions and in doing so they develop techniques of neutralisation. As Steve notes crimes can only be justified as long as they see no victim. However, when a victim is evident then that offence is vilified by the community:

...they will tell you themselves, they will tell you they would never affect the person but they will affect a business...one Traveller I talk to well, he says if he could get his hands on someone who mugged an old lady, he would probably kill them and anyone else on the site would do the same, but whereas they don't like that sort of crime, they won't target a single person, but they will go for a business. They believe that the business can claim it back on their insurance and it's not affecting anyone

Steve Police Officer: Interview

Likewise, we can also see in the following statement by Rob, a police officer the process of neutralisation. In this statement, Rob is referring to a spate of thefts that had occurred from a local business near a Gypsy and Traveller encampment. The business is a fair sized organisation, which employs many local people. As a result of a number of thefts from the property, the managers decided to talk to an elder from a Gypsy and Traveller community, as Rob notes:

...Yes so they went and spoke to Paddy⁷, you know he was well respected by everyone and had a lot of weight with the Gypsies but also he was respected by people who are not from that community. You know they told him how disruptive the thefts were and that they were costing the business money. Paddy said to leave it with him and he would have a word with some of the younger people on the site. And fair enough the thefts did stop for a while. I don't know what he said to them but it certainly did work for a while...

Rob Police Officer: Interview

⁷ This is a pseudonym

The situation that Rob is referring to provides an interesting insight into the attitudes of Gypsies and Travellers towards crime and deviance, but it is also interesting in terms of resolutions to crime and deviance committed by members of this community, we will return to this in subsequent chapters. However, the circumstances that Rob is describing could also be linked to Sykes and Matza's techniques of neutralisation. Clearly, the theft from the local business had no consequences and was seen as '*fair game*' by many Gypsies and Travellers. Yet, the thefts stopped almost immediately after the managers' chat with Paddy. It is possible that by speaking to Paddy the thefts suddenly became linked to both a victim (the business) and injury (loss of earnings).

Interestingly, all the Gypsies and Travellers interviewed as part of this research claimed that burglary was unacceptable. So whilst some forms of theft are considered 'harmless' and as Mary said, '*it's not like a crime*' other forms of theft are seen differently. This was clearly evident in the responses given by Gypsies and Travellers to the visual images. Whereas shoplifting was ranked very low in terms of seriousness by respondents, the same could not be said for burglary, which was ranked in the top three of serious offences by all the respondents. Therefore, whilst some members of Gypsy and Traveller communities are not averse to stealing if the harm is invisible or seen to be trivial, if any harm is associated with the act then attitudes towards the crime changes and it is seen as morally wrong. This is highlighted in the following statement by Timmy:

Timmy: ...that one (photograph of a burglary) is really bad... I'd put that up high...

Anne: why do you think that is worse than the shoplifting?

Timmy: 'Cos no one gets hurt there the shops can afford it right, but I wouldn't like that one (points to image of burglary) being done to me, so that's worse.

Here Timmy is distinguishing between two types of theft. On the one hand, he discusses shoplifting, a crime in which he can see no victim. Yet on the other hand with burglary there is a victim and by positioning himself as such, Timmy is able to see the injury that this would cause. Similarly, for Tall-Girl burglary was

considered a very serious crime, one in which she could see a level of injury and in doing so deems this as wrong:

Err... I don't like that, someone gets hurt here I'd hate that if that happened to us...people who do that is wrong...

Tall-Girl (Interview)

Another important dimension that needs consideration is the importance of the sanctity of the home and how this may impact on the attitudes that Gypsies and Travellers have toward burglary. For the majority of Gypsies and Travellers the home is a trailer, in which many activities are banned so as to avoid the risk of pollution (Okely 1983). This can be seen in the statement from Connie who is discussing the trailer and the importance within her community to keep it clean and pollution free:

Travellers do not wash or use the toilet in the trailer, they are always very careful with what bowls to use you **cannot** mix the different bowls, and cats and dogs should **never** be allowed inside the trailer

Connie (Written Notes)

It is clear from Connie's statement that the trailer is an important sanctuary for Gypsies and Travellers. Indeed, it is a place where they can generally be free from outside pollution. This was certainly evident in my observations as the following diary entry demonstrates. The extract is describing my observations of being inside a trailer for the very first time:

I was extremely nervous about entering the trailer, but Gitana was insistent that I came in for a coffee and chat and I knew the importance of accepting this offer. On entering the trailer I asked if I should take my shoes off as it had been muddy outside. Out of what could only be politeness, Gitana said it was up to me, but one look around told me that I was really expected to take them off and duly complied. Gitana told me to go and sit over on one of the sofas, which I did. What really struck me was the cleanliness and pride she had taken with the inside of the trailer. I had heard and read about the cleanliness but was not prepared for how clean they actually are, nothing was out of place, no dust was to be seen, it was almost as if no one had ever lived inside there...

(Field-Notes).

This seems to embody the importance that Gypsies and Travellers place on their living quarters. Thus, it may be possible that the abhorrence that Gypsies and Travellers feel towards burglary and why they see it as more serious than other

types of theft could be partly in response to the contamination of what they feel is a pure environment. Yet, stealing was certainly an issue during my observations with Gypsy and Traveller communities. This is illustrated in the following extract taken from field-notes. It refers to a day when a group of young Gypsies and Travellers were taken horse riding as part of a youth project:

... Keith had been following in his car and called me as he had taken a wrong turning... after hanging-up I was distracted by someone needing help filling out their consent form, I then went to pick up my phone and it had gone and when someone in the group called, the line was dead, the phone had been switched off...it was clear that my phone had been stolen by one of the young people from the Gypsy and Traveller community... one of the young people (Elvis) said if I was insured then it wouldn't really matter as I could get a new phone from my mobile company but I said I was more concerned about losing all my numbers and that I needed the phone to be in contact with a sick relative. To which he replied if anyone of the boys has your phone, I'll have it returned by the time we get back to the site...

(Field-Notes).

True to his word, my phone was returned by the end of the day, Elvis placed it next to my bag on the floor of the mini-bus. This incident reinforces Weyrauch's notion of stealing among members of Gypsy and Traveller communities. Indeed, the stealing of the phone was not an issue for Elvis, it only became one when he realised that I would not be able to contact my sick relative. Therefore, the theft of the phone suddenly had consequences with which Elvis could associate some form of harm. Indeed, Elvis was able to perceive me as a victim, as the theft of my phone did not result in a simple case of claiming for a new phone through my insurance. As a consequence, Elvis was able to see both the injury and victim in the actions of one of the members of this group.

As noted in chapter two; the paramount obligation that Gypsies and Travellers hold is the assistance offered to a member of their community in times of need (Okely 2005). Alongside this 'Gypsy solidarity' (Okely 2005:704) means that as a community, Gypsies and Travellers have a heightened sense of moral obligation towards other community members. Moreover the notion of pollution further reinforces this sense of group solidarity (see chapter five). It is therefore possible in the situation described above, the young Gypsies and Travellers perceived me

as an insider, albeit temporarily. Indeed, the young people were in an unfamiliar environment, the staff at the centre were seen as strangers and strict disciplinarians as they had to ensure the health and safety of the young people participating in the centre's activities. In contrast to this I had been part of an enjoyable experience for the young people. Indeed, the horse riding was part of a treat offered to young Gypsies and Travellers for their good behaviour in recent weeks. Hence, I was seen as a buffer between their Gypsy and Traveller community and the outside world. In such circumstances it became more difficult for the members of this Gypsy and Traveller community to vindicate the theft of my phone.

Many early anthropologists discussed the notion of insider and outsider status among tribal communities. For example Leach's (1957) study of the Kachin tribe reported how tribes often conflict with neighbouring communities, yet, when these tribes are threatened by others they will unite, albeit temporarily to stave off the opposition. In terms of Gypsies and Travellers this notion was clearly highlighted by Okely (2005), whereby members of the community accepted her as an insider but she was expected to offer some service, such as protection and buffer to the outside world.

This idea is further illustrated in the following extract, taken from field-notes. The notes are based on a conversation which took place between a local businessman who ran a small garage close to a Gypsy and Traveller encampment and myself:

As we were going onto the site, the car had been playing up so we stopped close to the site at a small garage, the owner of which was known to me. We started chatting and I explained that I was going onto the site, it turned out that the owner of the garage had a lot of dealings with a Gypsy and Traveller community. The owner stated that a lot of the older men come to him when they have problems with any of their vehicles. Interestingly, he claimed that the men from the site treated him in much regard, and would always follow a transaction in true gypsy fashion (spitting on the last note as it is being handed over). The owner mentioned that on a few occasions some of the younger members of the community had stolen some equipment while the garage was shut. When asked how he dealt with that. The owner replied that he would speak to one of the older men from the site and the goods would always be returned to him...

(Field-Notes).

Here the owner of the garage is able to offer an important service to members of this Gypsy and Traveller community. In this sense he is a 'go-between' to members of the Gypsy and Traveller community and the wider local community. By providing Gypsies and Travellers with a useful service they see him as an insider, this is demonstrated through the spitting on money, a Gypsy ritual when finalising an important transaction. The insider status that is bestowed onto the garage owner means that stealing from him is off bounds (Weyrauch 2001).

Illicit Drug Use

There are some offences that are not condoned at all by members of Gypsy and Traveller communities. The most notable of these are the sexual abuse of children and young people and illicit drug use. According to the British Crime Survey (2008) nearly thirty-six per cent of all adults in the UK had tried some form of illicit drug at least once. Moreover, whilst evidence suggests a downward trend in illicit drug use in the UK between 2007 and 2008, the use of drugs has undergone a process of 'normalisation' (Parker *et al.* 2002). Accordingly, for young people there is an acceptance of drug use, even by those individuals who have never used them. Yet, counter to this, for Gypsies and Travellers the use of illicit drugs is considered a very serious crime. In terms of this research evidence from both Gypsies and Travellers and those who work with this community would suggest that drug use is still considered a very serious offence. So much so, it has often been cited by members of the community for not wanting to send their children to high school, for fear that they will be exposed to this offence. This is illustrated in the following quote by Gitana, a mother. Here Gitana was talking about the conflict she was having with her daughter who wanted to go onto high school and the concerns she has that her daughter will be exposed to illicit drugs:

She wants to go to the high school but she'll see and hear things she's not allowed to see... they all take drugs 'n stuff in those schools don't they?

Gitana (Interview)

In this case Gitana did allow her daughter to go to school but she discussed her reservations about this decision on numerous occasions. Gitana's decision was informed by her perception of her daughter, who she see saw as being intelligent and thus did not want to 'hold her daughter back'. However, Gitana's behaviour

is very unusual within Gypsy and Traveller communities as the following extract illustrates:

I have to say that drug use is not an issue amongst Gypsies and Travellers, it is something that they simply do not do and I have to say that it is a reason that they do not want to send their children to school... they are one of the only communities that I know that have no acceptance of drugs...

Louis: Community Worker (Interview)

Nevertheless, it would appear that illicit drug use has found its way into Gypsy and Traveller communities. As Connie notes:

Drugs knows no boundaries, you find them in the royal family and sadly these days you can find them amongst younger Gypsies and Travellers... they get everywhere and we are no exception these days...

Connie (Interview)

Likewise Mary highlights:

Gypsies you won't find doing drugs, they are just not accepted, but some Gypsies down the country do 'em, but no one 'round here does

Mary (Interview)

It is evident from the statements by Mary and Connie that drugs are seeping into Gypsy and Traveller communities. Nevertheless, the majority of Gypsies and Travellers appear to profess to the same moral code regarding drugs, indeed as Connie states, families do not condone this behaviour and will act swiftly to remove anyone participating in this illegal activity:

...well if they're found their parents find out, they would probably get a good hiding and they would pull off (leave the site)

Connie (Interview).

What we can discern from Connie's statement is that parents will act swiftly in removing their child away from illicit drug use. Evidently, Gypsy and Traveller communities are able to deal with transgressions of the moral codes pertaining to illicit drugs. We will return to this important aspect in the next chapter where mechanisms of informal community justice will be given greater attention. Needless to say, by moving their child away from the dangers of illicit drugs Gypsy and Traveller communities are able to recognise the harm associated with this activity. As such they fail to neutralise this behaviour, rebuking both the activity and those who participate in illicit drug use.

While illicit drug use is generally not condoned by Gypsies and Travellers, the same cannot be said for under age smoking and drinking. Only one respondent rated illicit drug use as a less serious crime:

This one is not so bad (points at image of illicit drugs), yeah that one goes down lower...

Tall-Girl (Interview).

However, when questioned further it transpired that Tall-Girl thought illicit drug use meant the use of alcohol and smoking, which she found acceptable. The acceptance of these two activities featured prominently in my observations, particularly among younger people. On many occasions I was asked by some of the younger people to verify their age with shopkeepers so that they could buy cigarettes. When I questioned the young people on their smoking and drinking they replied that it was acceptable and that elder people on site were aware that they did it and that was fine as long as it was not in front of them:

Anne: So what would your family say if they knew that you smoked?

Shannon: they know, but you just don't do it front of 'em

Anne: What about drink, last week you were telling me about getting wasted at the weekend?

Bridie: Teresa got us the drinks, we gave her the money and she went to the shop for us...

Shannon: yeah, anyway everyone smokes and has a drink, there's nothing wrong in it.

Organised Crime

Organised and serious crime can often be problematic to define, and some conceptual clarity is required (Levi 2007). For the purpose of this research the crime described in this section is deemed to be organised and serious as in concordance with the UK Serious Organised Crime Agency, it encompasses a range of criminal activities such as; counterfeiting, the use of fire arms and organised vehicle theft (See Levi 2007).

Previous research on Gypsies and Travellers has provided an insight into the function of serious crime within this community (see, Okely 2005, Dawson 2000 and Bonos 1942). A full discussion of this is offered in chapter two, for example Okely presents evidence of extreme physical violence and the eventual death of a member of the community, and likewise, Gronfors (1986) talks of blood feuding among Gypsies and Travellers. Certainly, it would appear that forms of serious and organised crime are often associated with Gypsies and Travellers. For instance, Dawson (2000) refers to crimes such as, antique theft and scams, major crimes and IRA connections and theft of caravans. It was not the intention of this research to explore involvement in criminal activity among Gypsies and Travellers. Nonetheless, evidence presented here suggests that serious and organised crime is evident in the community. There are two aspects to the organised crime experienced by members of Gypsy and Traveller communities. These relate to organised crime by members of Gypsy and Traveller communities toward outsiders and crime by members of the community towards other Gypsies and Travellers.

Serious and organised crime by members of Gypsy and Traveller communities against outsiders featured in many of the interviews with those who work with Gypsies and Travellers. In the following extract Steve, a police officer, articulates the type of serious and organised crime apparent in Gypsy and Traveller communities. The crime described by Steve is perceived as serious and organised as it involves a number of networks, hence it has a range of 'criminal actors', these networks according to Steve were not only UK wide but operate throughout Europe:

There are four main categories to their offending which I have to say is highly organised... Their offending is circular in that as soon as we manage to stop one ring they will move onto the next type of crime. The first type is house clearance and refuse collecting which results in illegal dumping. They also deal with stolen scrap metal and the most recent type they have been doing is stealing plant equipment, like diggers and JCB's and there is also theft of diesel engines. So yes it is highly organised and crosses international borders

Steve: Police Officer (Interview)

Likewise, Nick, also a police officer, refers to the theft of expensive plant equipment:

...there is a small criminal element that is operating on the site and last week alone we know that ten thousand pounds of stolen plant equipment passed through the site and annually there is an estimated one million pound of stolen property shifting through the site...

Nick: Police Officer (Interview)

Organised crime is an issue here... we had a particular issue about mail, mail was delivered to the site and whoever the officer who was on duty at the time was charged with allocating the mail out but he found four different plot numbers who would have a number of different names and we know full well who the occupant of each plot is and so we challenged it and said right, you have your mail 'Mr Jones', however, 'Mrs Evans', Mrs Johnson' and 'Mrs Patrick' you cannot have that letter and there was uproar because they are up to something...

Dave: Council Liaison Officer (Interview)

Here Dave, a council liaison officer is articulating an organised crime conducted within Gypsy and Traveller communities against outsiders. In all three extracts above it possible that no victim is evident and as such Gypsies and Travellers are able to justify their actions (See Sykes and Matza 1957).

Importantly, when organised crime was discussed during interviews, it was always acknowledged that it was only a very small minority of Gypsies and Travellers that was involved in such acts. It has been previously noted in chapter two of this thesis, how marginalised groups are often criminalised. For example, Hughes (2007) refers to the '*unholy trinity*' between immigration, asylum-seekers and terrorism. Hence, within popular discourse marginalised groups are demonised and depicted as a threat (Hughes 2007). Similarly, Chin (1996) discusses the imagery of the Chinese community as one involved in gangland activities. Nevertheless, as Chin concedes, it is only a small minority from the Chinese community who are involved in gangland crimes. Such findings are also consistent with this current research. Indeed, those who work with Gypsy and Traveller communities were at pains to point out that only a very small minority of Gypsies and Travellers that are involved in this type of crime. Moreover, because the crime may be highly visible and the only contact outsiders may have

with the community is when they are the victim of crime, it is this image of Gypsies and Travellers that they encounter as the following extracts highlight:

There is only a small group involved in the crime , there are four main members who do the majority of the crime but unfortunately that small minority seems to tarnish the reputation of all the Gypsies living on the site

Sharon: Police Officer (Interview)

It is only a very small element of the group who are committing the offence... The problem is that Gypsies are invisible and are only a few in number but their criminal behaviour is very visible and that's what the public see and that's where they get their perception of being criminal...

Mike: Police Officer (Interview)

Crime From Within

Stealing

So far, this chapter has only concentrated on attitudes towards crime targeted outside of Gypsy and Traveller communities and has not looked at crime from within. In recognising this disparity, attention will be given to this important aspect later in the chapter in relation to serious organised crime. However, it is prudent to recognise the attitudes that Gypsies and Travellers have in regard to theft by members of Gypsy and Traveller communities toward other Gypsies and Travellers. At the outset of this chapter, it was noted by Weyrauch (2001) that Gypsies and Travellers have no qualms in regard to stealing as long as the victim is not a member of their community. Contrary to this Okely (2005) provides some evidence of Gypsies and Travellers stealing from inside their community. Here Okely refers to how Gypsies and Travellers steal from others as a means of revenge for some misdemeanour. In such cases the victim of the theft would know the identity of the thief and the reason for the offence. In this sense, the thefts are used as some form of punishment and while this may indeed be the case, no evidence from this current research was found to support this claim. However, stealing between and by members of Gypsy and Traveller communities did feature in this research. In the following passage Maisy talks about crime from within Gypsy and Traveller communities by its own members, she accepts that burglary does take place within her community:

...nobody would want to be stopped beside you, 'cos you'd be thinking are they going to stop there, are they going to rob me, and you wouldn't want your children marrying among them. So it is not accepted, but it does go on...

Maisy (Interview)

Here Maisy acknowledges that some members of her community will commit crimes of theft against other members. Interestingly however, Maisy is able to separate the Gypsies and Travellers who steal from others, indeed in her words she portrays them as '*not true Gypsies*', whereas throughout the interview she consistently describes herself and other Gypsies who abide by the norms and values of her community as the '*true Gypsies*' and '*the traditional Gypsies*'. Hence, Maisy creates a sense of '*Othering*' (see chapter five) and in doing so she is labelling those who transgress the morals of her community as '*outsiders*' (Becker 1963 and Elias and Scotson 1965). Constructing an individual's identity in such a way was certainly not unique to Maisy as the following extract from Connie demonstrates:

Crimes were never committed by your proper Gypsies in the past, I mean a true Gypsy would never want to harm anyone, but you know you get these rougher types and they cause problems and these bad crimes cannot be allowed to go on, but like I said your traditional type of Gypsy will never do anything like that but I don't like staying on camps with this newer type 'cos you don't know if your things will be safe...

Connie (Interview).

Again Connie is able to distinguish between those who abide by the morals and norms of the culture and those who do not. In doing so Connie, like Maisy labels those who deviate as outsiders.

Sexual Abuse

In terms of sexual abuse, this is also completely unacceptable within Gypsy and Traveller communities. Indeed, as Okely (1983) acknowledges, sexual relations between family members is strictly forbidden. The following extracts from both Connie and Keith reinforce this notion:

there is a very big rule amongst Gypsies and Travellers and Romichiles is that you do not right, mess with children or if someone ever raped you in anyway they would never be allowed on any Gypsy campsite again I mean it is very rare...But what it is, if someone went to court a British court and did ten years for that, they would still never, never ever be accepted by Gypsies again

Connie (Interview)

...yeah, there was a case years ago where a man had raped some young girl, and he now lives on his own, no one from the community will ever talk to him not even his own family

Keith: Community Worker (Interview)

For members of Gypsy and Traveller communities to transgress the rules relating to illicit drug use and sexual abuse will lead to great shame or '*ladge*' for both the individual, and depending on the incident, also their family. Ladge has an important role for Gypsies and Travellers. The notion of ladge has been discussed by previous writers, indeed, both Bonos (1942) and Acton *et al.* (1997) refer to the importance of this in terms of punishment. In the following chapter, the use of informal justice and its role in Gypsy and Traveller communities will be discussed and the notion of shame will be explored more fully. However, shame also plays an important role in the attitudes of the Gypsy and Traveller communities towards crime. It is in this context that shame is discussed here. Indeed, as Bonos explains, Gypsies and Travellers '*have a deep sense of shame*' (Bonos 1942: 263) particularly in regard to sexual relationships. According to Bonos, failure to abide by the codes on sexual relationships has meant parents have been forbidden to speak to their child and for some members of the community to commit suicide. The extracts from both Connie and Keith seem to validate the work of Bonos whereby they discuss cases in which the guilty party has been ostracised from their community, often permanently. In this sense, the shame that these individuals have received could be said to be disintegrative (see Braithwaite 1989). Indeed, there is no attempt to reconcile the offender with their community. In this sense, according to Braithwaite (1989) the offenders' master status is that of a deviant. Conversely, whilst illicit drug use brings shame onto the individual this form of shame appears to be more reintegrative. This is highlighted in the following quote by Maisy, here she is talking about the use of drugs by some of the younger Gypsies and Travellers:

Maisy: And there're girls in our community, to me, which seem, and this is horrific are taking drugs and they're taking drugs with boys and like there's two or three boys and then it is a sort of free for all.

Anne: What would happen if their families found out?

Maisy: Well they don't know about it, but if they do find out about it I suppose But today with drugs you'd move away from bad company if it was possible...

Here, Maisy discusses the shame that drug use can bring, by moving away from what is termed 'bad company' the individual and the family are being shamed (Braithwaite 1989). However, as Maisy notes later in the interview the effects of this shame are not long term and gradually the offender will be reintegrated back into the community.

Domestic Violence

One interesting aspect in the Gypsies' and Travellers' attitudes towards crime and deviance, which needs to be explored here, relates to the issue of domestic violence. It is notoriously difficult to get any accurate data on this type of violent crime (Levi *et al.* 2007) Nevertheless, according to the BCS roughly five per cent of women in the UK experienced some form of domestic violence in the previous year. It is not possible to gauge the extent of domestic violence that takes place within Gypsy and Traveller communities. This is in part due to the problems of gaining accurate data on this offence generally, yet this is further compounded within Gypsy and Traveller communities as a result of the way in which women are regarded. As previously mentioned (see chapter two and five) the reputation of Gypsy women is paramount, she must constantly take measures to ensure that this is maintained (Okely 1983). A tarnished reputation not only impacts on the woman but it will also affect her husband's work opportunities and standing in the community and her offspring's chances of marrying into a 'decent' family (Bonos 1942). However, the issue of domestic violence, featured very strongly in interviews with those who worked with Gypsy and Traveller communities:

I have to say the women have a hard time...the men go off and have a drink, sometimes too much, they can get into fights and the woman are often on the receiving end when they get back home... it's difficult to know the full extent of the domestic violence as the women will not complain about it...

Ashley: Community Worker (Interview)

The main reason we get a call out is usually for a domestic...I am sure a lot more of it goes on that we are aware of. They'll only call us out if it is getting really bad, usually you'll find that another women and not the victim will call but like I said that is only when it is getting really bad

Nick: Community Police Officer (Interview)

The issue of domestic violence among Gypsies and Travellers has been such a matter of concern that an issue of the Travellers' Times, an information magazine aimed at Gypsy and Traveller communities and community workers was dedicated to this topic (Travellers Times 2007). Despite this, only one of my respondents talked about her experiences of domestic violence. Here Dotty and I were having a conversation about relationships. Dotty always wanted to have a gossip and chat with me so it was not unusual to be talking about my relationship with her. The conversation turned onto Dotty's former marriage and she began to explain why she had left her husband:

... I'm a bit bold for a Gypsy me, I mean leaving my husband 'n that. Thing is Anne, my husband wasn't good, I had to get a court order on him he stalked me 'n that but I had to leave he was very violent I mean he used to beat me with pool cues 'n things, it got really bad...it went on for years got scars 'n all but you know having the boys 'n they we small I left 'cos of the boys really...

Dotty (Interview)

well it takes two, so therefore you are very careful some woman if they've got jealous husbands, they wouldn't tell their husbands in case he was nasty to them or even hit her... I've never had that problem so I don't really know, he's never hurt me like that, but he's had plenty of bad temper tantrums but you know apart from the fact that they'd be very jealous or suspicious even so nine out of ten woman wouldn't tell their husbands in case it got them into trouble...

Connie (Interview)

Again, Connie alludes to the notion of domestic violence, here she illustrates how women are forced to be mindful of their actions, in order to avoid '*getting into trouble*' with their husbands.

Serious Violent Crime

At the beginning of this chapter attention was drawn to the work of Weyrauch (2001) who had noted that Gypsies and Travellers have no strong values against stealing as long as the victim is not a member of a Gypsy and Traveller community or that no harm was inflicted. Whereas, evidence is found to support this in terms of the attitudes members of the Gypsy and Travellers have towards specific crimes this is not always reflected in the actions of a small group within Gypsy and Traveller communities. This is illustrated in the following statement from an interview; here the respondent is referring to a series of serious incidents that have occurred over the last couple of years. The offenders are members of a Gypsy and Traveller community and the victims are also Gypsies and Travellers. As a consequence of the highly sensitive nature of this extract, no name has been attached to the quote so that the identity remains completely hidden:

Yes people (Gypsies and Travellers) go on site we've missed it, thank god, they don't do it on this site... and they're going and holding people up and demanding, demanding them to get out of their trailers you know just taking their trailers off of 'em 'n everything in it as it stands. Right, just demanding and they have weapons with 'em, guns, and there has been quite a lot of it over the last couple of say five years but gradually getting worse over the last two years and then its petered out and there's been a lot of it in⁸ going demanding, demanding well depending on what money they think people's got, they may want two thousand pound, they may want ten thousand pound, 'n people say they don't keep that money with them so for example those that live in 'n house say they don't keep that type of money on them and they threaten 'em saying that they will demolish 'alf the house...

Anonymous

Likewise the following comment also highlights the problem of organised crime within and by members of Gypsy and Traveller communities. In this statement the respondent is discussing how crime has changed in Gypsy and Traveller

⁸ Names places

communities and appears to corroborate the previous extract. Again no name has been attached to this quote for the reasons outlined above:

it didn't years ago it was never heard of for people to steal off of each other and maybe you would get the odd person like a daughter-in-law married in or a son-in-law and now you get with all the new people they've started like umm... going on the camps and holding people up with guns.

Anonymous

The crimes described anonymously present an interesting dimension to the attitudes that Gypsies and Travellers hold toward crime. Thus far, this chapter has referred to the techniques of neutralisation in order to explain the attitudes that Gypsies and Travellers hold towards crime and deviance. Yet the two quotes outlined above have a very obvious victim, moreover, it is someone from within their community, hence the injury from these types of crime are very apparent. Therefore, whilst we may argue that the majority of Gypsies and Travellers profess a shared value consensus, this is certainly not the case for all members of Gypsy and Traveller communities.

Conclusion

Central to this chapter were the questions, *do Gypsies and Travellers have a shared set of values* and *what are this communities' attitudes towards crime and deviance*. Drawing on Sykes and Matza's techniques of neutralisation, it was shown that generally Gypsies and Travellers tend to justify unlawful actions through the denial of any injury or victim(s). However, as soon as a victim becomes apparent or an injury becomes visible the crime is perceived to be more serious. Compounding these attitudes are the important rituals encompassing the day-to-day activities of Gypsies and Travellers. In this sense, injury takes on the form of pollution, and if the environment becomes contaminated the sense of injury is more strongly felt.

It is important to reiterate here that no control group of non-Gypsies and Travellers participated in this research. As such it is not possible to compare the attitudes of Gypsies and Travellers to those of the wider society. Thus it is

possible that other members in society profess to the same, if not more extreme attitudes.

In general the majority of Gypsies and Travellers are bounded by the same set of values. Yet, evidence here suggests that not all members of Gypsy and Traveller communities adhere to a shared moral code. Those who do not obey the Gypsies and Travellers' moral code are deemed as 'others'. The process of 'othering' allows those Gypsies and Travellers who profess to norms and values to separate themselves from those who do not. This practice enables the '*true*' and '*traditional*' Gypsies and Travellers to label the 'others' as deviant, the '*rough 'n ready*' Gypsies and Travellers. A number of techniques provided by the community allow Gypsies and Travellers to deal with those who have been labelled deviant. It is probable that the crimes uncovered by and against Gypsy and Traveller communities may not show the full extent of such incidents. The reasons for this could be two-fold. On the one hand, Gypsies and Travellers may fear reprisals for discussing incidents within their community with outsiders. Alongside this is the possibility that Gypsies and Travellers invest too much in maintaining the 'myth of value consensus' to trust such important information with an outsider. Accepting the idea of the value consensus myth, subsequent chapters will go onto to explore the ways in which Gypsies and Travellers deal with those who fail to abide by the moral codes espoused by their community.

Chapter Seven:

Gypsy Justice

Introduction

The previous chapter outlined Gypsies' and Travellers' attitudes towards crime. It was shown that not all members of the community profess to a shared moral code. Drawing on data collected from field-notes, interviews and written notes from community members and those who work with Gypsies and Travellers, this chapter will now go on to explore the methods used by Gypsy and Traveller communities to deal with those who transgress the moral boundaries. In doing so, this chapter will address the second research question underpinning this thesis; *how are deviant and criminal acts dealt with or resolved by Gypsies and Travellers?* Contained within this question are two sub-questions, *what customs and rules do Gypsies and Travellers adopt in responding to deviance?* And, *when and how are these methods of social control used by Gypsies and Travellers?*

The idea of communities developing their own system of justice has a long history. In chapter three, attention was given to the work of many early anthropologists who acknowledged the importance of informal systems of justice adopted by tribal communities (see Bohannan 1957, Leach 1954 and Evans-Pritchard 1945). For example, Bohannan (1957) recognised the importance of informal justice among the Tiv, a tribal community living in the Sudan. Transgressions from the social norms were dealt by the Tiv community, who failed to recognise the legitimacy of the British based Government of the time. More recently, Blagg (2008) provides a detailed and ambitious insight into the informal community justice adopted by the Aboriginal populations of Australia. Alongside this, evidence has consistently shown that Gypsies and Travellers have developed their own informal system of justice to deal with any transgressions from the moral codes professed by this community (see Okely 2005, Weyrauch 2001 and Acton *et al.* 1997). The methods adopted by Gypsies and Travellers, in

accordance to restorative justice are somewhat diverse and can range from fighting, gossip and avoidance to a community court or *Creese* (Acton *et al.* 1997 and Okely 2005).

Chapter three identified the importance of Braithwaite's (1989) work on restorative justice and its potential in understanding Gypsies' and Travellers' mechanisms of informal justice. Drawing on Braithwaite's work, this chapter will show how the practice of informal justice enables Gypsies and Travellers to deal with deviant and criminal transgressions swiftly. I argue, through the use of reacceptance ceremonies, those who break the moral code are reintegrated back into the community. In addition gestures of reacceptance, an important component in restorative justice, will be explored. Nevertheless, some offences within Gypsy and Traveller communities are seen to be so serious that the only sanction available is a '*banishment order*' (Gronfors 1986). Through this, disintegrative shaming is visible and presents a contrast to the reacceptance ceremonies, for the crimes committed have resulted in degradation ceremonies.

Following a discussion of the various mechanisms of informal community justice used by Gypsies and Travellers, the chapter discusses specifically the *Creese*, fighting, gossip and avoidance and examines the use of shame as a social control mechanism in Gypsy and Traveller communities. Showing how shame or '*ladge*' can be either reintegrative or disintegrative depending on the offence, it will draw on Garfinkel's (1956) conceptualisation of degradation ceremonies.

Before I can outline the different mechanisms of informal community justice employed by members of Gypsy and Traveller communities, it is appropriate to acknowledge that the methods discussed throughout this chapter are used internally by Gypsies and Travellers. Indeed, the focus of this research was to explore resolutions to transgressions of the professed moral code within, and by the Gypsy and Traveller communities. Consequently, it is not possible to comment on the methods used by Gypsies and Travellers to deal with crimes against outsiders. At this stage, it is also pertinent to point out that Gypsies and Travellers do at times have recourse to the formal justice system, and this facet of

the system of justice adopted by this community will be considered in the following chapter (see chapter eight).

Types And Use Of Informal Community Justice

In order to deal with transgressions from their moral boundaries Gypsies and Travellers have developed a range of informal community sanctions. These range between formal and informal forms of community justice, such as community courts, known as a Creese, fighting, and the use of gossip and avoidance (see Weyrauch 2001, Acton *et al.* 1997, Weyrauch and Bell 1997, Weyrauch 1997a, 1997b and Gronfors 1977). Nevertheless, whilst the use of community justice may differ, the consequences of each approach remain the same and are merely '*polarised variations of a common structure*' (Acton *et al.* 1997: 238). Hence, these variations in community justice are simply alternative means of expressing the cultural heritage of Gypsies and Travellers that enable the community to develop a symbolic boundary between themselves and the wider British society (Cohen 1985).

As discussed previously (see chapters two, five and six) individuals construct meaning through the co-construction of symbolic boundaries, thus allowing them to develop a sense of community (Cohen, 1985). Symbolic boundaries can be found in the practices and rites of a community. Crucially, while these rites and rituals take on different forms, and meanings change over time and place, the purpose of such practices remains constant. That is, enabling individuals to develop a boundary between their community and 'others' (see Cohen 1985). Indeed, as we can discern from chapter five, Gypsies and Travellers adopt a bricolage attitude. This allows the community through their rites and rituals separate themselves from the wider society. In the following section I will describe in turn each method of informal justice used by members of Gypsy and Traveller communities. In doing so, I will recognise the different mechanisms used by these communities, showing how each of these different methods, allow Gypsies and Travellers to express their cultural identity. This allows Gypsies and Travellers to construct a symbolic boundary between their community and the

wider society (see Acton *et al.* 1997). The section will begin by looking at the use of Gypsy courts.

Creese

Gypsy courts are commonly known as a Creese or Kris (see Okely 2005, Weyrauch 2001, Acton *et al.* 1997 and Weyrauch and Bell 1997). Gypsies and Travellers have an oral tradition and the language adopted by members of the community will reflect their cultural heritage (Kenrick 2004). Hence, depending on their origin, Gypsies' and Travellers' words can mean the same but have many different spellings. For the purpose of this thesis, I have used Creese, as this is how my respondents referred to the term. However, it is important to note that other publications use Kris (see Okely 2005, Weyrauch 2001 and Acton *et al.* 1997).

A Creese is a tribunal system, generally held by Rom Gypsies (see Weyrauch and Bell 1997). Creese's are relatively uncommon in the UK and are more likely to be found in America, Canada and some parts of Europe where there is a higher population of Rom (see Weyrauch and Bell 2001 and Acton *et al.* 1997). That is not to say that the tribunal system operated by Rom Gypsies does not occur in the UK. Indeed, with approximately five thousand Rom residing in Britain (Clark 2006) the Creese remains an integral part of their system of justice. For this research, two male Rom Gypsies participated in interviews, one of which, Tom also provided notes on the Creese. Alongside this, there were contributions from Tom's wife, who is not a Rom but through her marriage was able to provide an insight into the Creese and how this contrasted with her own system of justice.

The purpose of a Creese is to preside over disputes between individuals and groups. An elder male from the community deemed impartial by both parties' leads the proceedings (see Weyrauch 2001). The role of the elder is not to deliver a punishment or a verdict. This is reached by consensus between all those in attendance (Acton *et al.* 1997). The elder simply acts as a mediator, ensuring all parties are able to discuss the problem and an appropriate resolution is approved.

This is illustrated by the following quote, here Tom is discussing the procedures of a Creese. As Tom notes:

Whenever there is a disagreement or a problem between two or more people or two or more families, and after trying they can't sort out the problem or come to an agreement, then one or two of the parties will go to an older and wiser member of the Rom community, and ask if they can have a Creese. This is, these days set up by phoning other members in the Rom families and asking if they'd be willing to attend a Creese... Creeses are a way of settling honour and respect... Creeses are usually held about 11.00 in the morning, either at someone's house or if there are a lot of people a hall would be hired. Coffee and tea are given as refreshments, but in the last 50 years **no** alcohol is involved... when after hours of discussion a decision is reached and an apology is asked for, and usually a fine is given. The fine is paid to the elder member of the court, who then passes this on to the wronged party. If all the money is not available it is usual to give half of it and a date set for the rest...

Tom (Written Notes).

Likewise, Billy also discusses the role of the Creese:

We have the Creese right, if someone gets something that they brought, right, and it doesn't work or they owe money, right, and the one who decides on the Creese, well he is someone who comes in 'n show respect and he's very knowledgeable 'n fair, right. When they have the Creese they would say, 'we would like this man to come' and most of 'em would say yes right. But sometimes you could get a person that's old but not very wise 'n it could be a young person, and what they do is they seek out a person, the first speaker, and what happens they gather in a house or if it's a big party they hire out a hall, we meet at the hall 'n gather the people 'n you don't have a prosecutor or defence right. What happens is they get the person that is in the wrong, they tell his side of the story to the company that is there, and it's not just the 'ead man that is knowledgeable there is other people there to make the story...

Billy (Interview).

Through their descriptions of the Creese both Tom and Billy recognise the rituals underpinning this tribunal system. When discussing the Creese for example, Tom and Billy consistently referred to the bureaucracy involved within this system of justice. For example, below, Billy is referring to the rules of the Creese and the consequences for the individual and their family if these are not observed. Billy is conveying a situation where the accused failed to observe the rules and rituals of the court by disregarding their fine:

...so therefore right, sometimes it depends on the matter, it depends on how big a thing it is right, if it's a trivial thing a lot of people will say, if there is another court case or something like that don't call that person he's not responsible so what they do is sort of like a black sheep. But it's a real big thing right, a real big thing to get out of and he does it thinking he would dis the person right, then he's in deep trouble right, 'cos there goes another story Anne, do you follow what I'm saying. It's not just a cut case like that 'es not paying attention to the court but like that's another story to go in to...

Billy (Interview).

Billy is able to articulate the importance of the Creese and the rules and regulations that this system embodies. In doing so, Billy draws my attention to Cohen's (1985) notion of symbolic boundaries. Indeed, as mentioned above, Billy and Tom were able to verbalise the bureaucracy ingrained in the Creese. Billy refers to the '*rigmarole*' of the Creese and Tom alludes to the '*red-tape*'. The bureaucracy of the Creese serves to allow Gypsies and Travellers to mark the boundaries between their community and the wider society. As Cohen argues, boundaries encapsulate the identity of its community members. The symbolism that members attach to the meanings of rites and rituals of their community, no matter how routine they may appear, enables its members to label those who transgress such norms as 'outsiders' (see Elias and Scotson 1965). In the situation that Billy is describing above, the individual before the court (Creese) has failed to observe its rules. Therefore, the individual has become a '*black sheep*' who is seen as irresponsible and untrustworthy. In this sense, the Creese plays an important role among the Rom as it allows them to separate themselves from not only 'other' Gypsies but also more importantly the wider society.

Another dimension to the Creese that needs to be explored here, relates to the role of age and gender. In terms of gender, it was acknowledged that women play a pivotal role in ensuring the family unit remains free from contamination through '*mochadi*' or '*marrie-mae*'. Yet, through the Creese women play a minor role. It is not possible for women to bring a case directly to the Creese, if they are in dispute or have been wronged, it is the responsibility of the male members of her family to request this. Moreover, it has only been in recent years that women have been allowed to attend a Creese. Nevertheless, as chapter five has shown,

women are meant to be silent observers in the Creese. This was demonstrated by Tom in which he discusses the consequences of a women '*butting in*' during the Creese (see chapter five). In this situation the husband was asked to warn his wife.

Fighting

While the Creese is a relatively uncommon form of justice in the UK among Gypsies and Travellers (see Weyrauch and Bell 2001) fighting is a far more frequent event (see Okely 2005 and Acton *et al.* 1997). In chapter three, attention was drawn to the use of fighting and feuds between both tribal communities (see Bohannan 1957, Leach 1954 and Evans-Pritchard 1945) and among Gypsies and Travellers (see Okely 2005, Weyrauch 2001 and Acton *et al.* 1997).

In chapter five, it was acknowledged that Gypsies and Travellers hold a different attitude toward fighting in comparison to the wider society. Fighting represents an important sanction among Gypsies and Travellers, it is a system that is used when an individual or group have deviated from the moral codes of their community (Acton *et al.* 1997). For Gypsies and Travellers the fighting system is equally as important as the penal system to the wider society. As chapter eight will highlight, the fighting system has more legitimacy among Gypsies and Travellers and as such takes precedence over the formal Criminal Justice System (Acton *et al.* 1997). For Gypsies and Travellers the ability to defend one's honour and that of their kin is incredibly important, and the failure to do so is considered shameful. All the participants in this research discussed the importance of fighting in their culture. For example, the following quote is taken from notes written by Sonny. Here he is talking of the respect and honour that good fighters are given within Gypsy and Traveller communities:

wherever he went people would know that he was the fighter on top, ready to take a challenge, day or night. Men like this are respected in their day, the same as a judge or a doctor or a high-class gentleman. They had standing in their community...

Sonny (Written Notes).

Sonny emphasises the importance of fighting in his community. In doing so, he articulates the respect that he and other Gypsies and Travellers accord to those

seen as great fighters. However, Sonny also acknowledges the intensity and brutality involved in some fights. Yet, as Acton *et al.* (1997) recognised, the system of fighting employed by Gypsies and Travellers does not result in a continuous cycle of violence. In the following statement, Maisy expresses the rules that are observed during a fight:

if someone did try to interfere then that would be another thing that has to be sorted and it would be discussed and probably another fight between those people would happen and it would be immensely fair

Maisy (Interview).

According to Maisy, the fights are not only fair but strict rules are adhered to. Thus, through their understanding of the rules and the moral code professed by Gypsies and Travellers, a continuous cycle of violence is avoided (see Acton *et al.* 1997). In her statement above, Maisy alludes to a number of important elements to the fighting system adopted by Gypsies and Travellers. For example, Maisy refers to the stripping to the waist and the placing of a silk hanky (see chapter five). Alongside this, she discusses the importance of distancing the fight from the women and children and the issue of interfering during the fight by observers. By following these rituals, Gypsy and Traveller communities are able to set themselves apart from the wider society. Therefore, similarly to the Creese system outlined above, the fighting system allows Gypsies and Travellers to create a symbolic boundary, separating their community from the rest of the UK. Gitana reiterates this in the following statement:

...it's done with a Gypsy knot you know it's kind of a square knot they would always wear one of these, me dad used to wear one. And yeah they would tie it round their waist when they were going to fight and ummm its mainly I suppose for practical reasons and I suppose it was just a Gypsy thing... the real Gypsies right always wear them they'll tie a scarf ...and also the silk scarf has great significance you know...

Gitana (Interview).

Crucially however, not all Gypsies and Travellers abide by the rules and regulations of the fighting system. This is demonstrated in the following quote by Connie, in which she is discussing how some Gypsy and Traveller communities have developed a more informal system of fighting:

...if there was a dispute or a quarrel it depends on the individuals but you know you get the rougher lot... get a rougher free for all, you know things got changed... you know those old families umm, I guess they were more civilised, they would discuss things and were fair, you know they were a lot less rough and more educated, more sort of in the ways of the community and their way of dealing with things. But the other Travellers and I don't like calling them the rough Travellers, but then they would deal with things differently... it tends to be that they use knives and even guns these days...

Connie (Interview).

Likewise, Maisy also acknowledges that for some Gypsy and Traveller communities a different system of fighting exists:

Unfortunately, weapons are involved with some families, even knives and guns. Out of fears sake these people are now avoided by most...

Maisy (Written Notes)

Unlike the system describe above by Maisy and Sonny, the situation that Maisy is describing here, and Connie acknowledges above, is less regulated and as such, it could lead to a succession of fights. In order to prevent an escalation of violence some Gypsy and Traveller families are avoided.

Gossip And Avoidance

An additional strategy used by communities as a means of informal resolutions to deviant transactions, is that of gossip and avoidance. As chapter three noted, the function of avoidance as a means of informal justice has one of the greatest impacts on a community (see Bohannan 1957 and Leach 1954). According to Okely (2005) the strategy of avoidance can take a number of forms. On a basic level it can take the form of non-speaking relationships, yet conflicts can last for months, years or permanently through to the more formal use of a '*banishment orders*' (Gronfors 1986). In this sense, it differs from the mechanisms of informal sanctions previously discussed in this chapter. Indeed, within the tribunal and fighting systems, as long as both parties have given due attention to the rules and regulations, a truce is generally declared and the matter is resolved. Yet, with gossip and avoidance, disputes can be ongoing, resulting in the type of feuds outlined above. As Sonny notes:

...someone gets hurt then they go back for revenge and a feud starts. That goes on not just for years but generations. Someone might hurt someone else because his father was hurt years ago by the others family and it carries on...

Sonny (Written Notes)

The situation described by Sonny highlights the ongoing nature of a feud. Connie also acknowledges the length of feuds and the importance of avoiding members of a family who are in dispute:

...there are certain weddings and funerals you don't go to, you could be really tight with the family but you know that some families might turn up 'n there could be trouble... you know going back 'ears someone said some 'ut to someone 'n you know you have to stay out of that families way...

Connie (Interview).

The notion of avoidance was a significant feature during my observations with Gypsies and Travellers, as the following demonstrates:

Whenever a member from the community meets another member for the first time, the first question they will ask is; 'whose family do you belong to?' I asked several of the women today why they asked that. The reason they gave me, was so that they could see if it was a family that they needed to avoid because of some ongoing dispute...

(Field-Notes).

And:

I noticed I hadn't seen Mary and her children for a couple of weeks and asked Angie if they had gone away. I was somewhat surprised by Angie's reaction as she went a bit sheepish. After a long pause, Angie mentioned that Mary had 'pulled off' camp, it transpired that she had got into some sort of trouble with another family and had to move away for a while...

(Field-Notes).

Gossip is another strategy used by members of communities to informally resolve deviant behaviour. The Zapotecs, for example, used gossip against community members who transgressed the moral boundaries of their tribe (Selby 1974). In doing so the Zapotecs force individuals to conform, with those failing to do so being excluded from the tribe. The use of gossip was also evident in Okely's (2005) study on Gypsies and Travellers. She refers to stories being deliberately fabricated in order to ensure individuals conform to the community's moral

codes. Evidence from this current research reinforces the use of gossip as a mechanism of social control. As the following demonstrate:

...it is a very close knit community amongst Gypsies and Travellers right, and once you've had this shame brought on you by anything then it's gossiped about and then you lose your respect...

Dotty (Interview).

And:

...especially cos the women and the men talk like you know like nobody's business, but in such a close knit community it could be anything. You know with these jungle drums (points to mobile phone) these days, you can get on this and you know they were the greatest thing invented for Travellers, because in the past it was letters and you lost touch and call 'em, these are fantastic for us, but they are also a bad thing for exaggeration and lies, and bad news travels fast (laughs) you know really fast...

Connie (Interview).

Gossip is an important form of community justice in that it allows communities to promote social cohesion (Gluckman 1963). Hence, gossip reinforces community values, whereby members avoid becoming a victim of gossip and the shame that this brings on an individual and their family (Braithwaite 1989).

Restorative Justice

Having outlined the range of conflict resolutions adopted by Gypsy and Traveller communities, the remainder of this chapter will focus on the notion of restorative justice (Braithwaite 1989). It has been previously argued that while Gypsies and Travellers have developed a number of mechanisms to tackle transgressions from the norm, these different methods perform the same function. That is, enabling the community to develop a cultural identity, thus creating a symbolic boundary between Gypsies and Travellers and the wider society. This is achieved through the rites and rituals entrenched within the mechanisms of conflict resolution. Alongside this, the rites and rituals embedded within the systems of informal community justice enable the offender(s) reparation back into the community. This concept will now be explored more fully with a focus on how restorative justice allows the community to deal with transgressions of the norms through the '*swift and visible dispensation of justice*' (McEvoy and Mika 2002: 536). In order

to achieve this, communities employ a form of reintegrative shaming, embodied through the use of a minor admonishment and reacceptance ceremonies. These rebukes are swiftly followed by '*gestures of reacceptance*' (Braithwaite 1989: 55). However, some deviant acts render the individual as an 'outcast': in this situation the offender(s) are not reintegrated back into their community. This is perceived as essential for the long term social cohesion of the community (Gronfors 1986).

While Braithwaite (1989) is acknowledged for developing the concept of restorative justice in its current form (Botchkovar and Tittle 2005) the principles of restorative justice can be traced back to primitive tribal communities (Walgrave 2008). The expulsion of individuals or ongoing conflicts were potentially highly damaging to small-scale tribal communities. Hence as Walgrave (2008) argues, tribes attempted to find constructive means to tackle internal conflicts, the purpose of which was the avoidance of exclusion as much as possible.

In order to explore more fully the notion of restorative justice and how this fits within the informal system of community justice developed by the Gypsies and Travellers, this chapter will look at shame and reacceptance ceremonies in turn. Beginning with shame, this section will consider both reintegrative shame and disintegrative shame. It will then go on to discuss the importance of reacceptance ceremonies, the purpose of which is to help rehabilitate the offender back into the community. Finally, the notion of reacceptance will be examined to show how through the use of gestures, offenders then become accepted by other members of the community, thus restoring the individual into '*law abiding citizens*' (Braithwaite 1989: 56).

Shame

Shame is a powerful instrument used within communities to entice conformity of its members to the prevailing moral code (Braithwaite 1989). By distinguishing between two forms of shame, '*ladge*' meaning shame and great shame '*baro ladge*' (Bonos 1942: 257) Gypsy and Traveller communities stress the

importance of this concept. Hence, shame is embodied in the processes of community justice developed by Gypsies and Travellers. In this sense, shame offers the community greater benefits than the established criminal justice system (Braithwaite 1989).

The notion of how shame influences the actions of Gypsies and Travellers was evident from the observations and interviews conducted as part of this research. Indeed, the Gypsies and Travellers who participated in this research discussed the importance of not bringing shame on themselves or their family. As the following comments illustrate:

...now err shame like I was saying to you Anne, say if some of the daughter-in-laws would be of a different culture to our breed, but they'd still speak the same sort of language but 'ave different customs, so what would happen is the father would go and talk to the son and like; 'tell your wife that she mustn't do that 'cos other peoples come into the home and what she's doing is bringing shame on us...

Tom (Interview).

And:

Respect is a big thing, you know how it is once that's gone you've lost everything who is going to want to marry your kids?

Dotty (Interview).

Clearly, shame plays an important role in Gypsy and Traveller communities. Through the failure of a daughter-in-law to abide by the morals professed by his culture, Tom recognises the shame that such actions can bring to his family and the importance of acting swiftly to curtail such behaviour. Similarly, Dotty alludes to the consequences that shame can bring to a family. Moreover, Dotty and Tom understand the importance of avoiding shame.

The function of shame among Gypsies and Travellers is two-fold. Firstly, shame plays a reintegrative role, reuniting the offender and their family with their Gypsy and Traveller community. In contrast, shame is also disintegrative, whereby some acts are seen to be so iniquitous that the group is unable to rehabilitate the offender or their family back into the community. The following demonstrates how the role of shame can be reintegrative:

...maybe you had a fight with the brother and beat the brother really badly like and it maybe it's the brothers fault like, you know he was a bit of a Jack the lad then still they wouldn't speak for say six months, a year whatever like...

Connie (Interview).

...after I left to live with Jimmy, mum didn't know I even had a boyfriend, but that's our way we leave during the night... mum didn't talk to me for a bit and I stayed away for a couple of weeks but now we talk and she accepted Jimmy into the family like...

Bridie (Interview).

Bridie and Connie are both referring to a situation whereby the individual has transgressed the norms of their community, but after an appropriate period, were reunited with their group. By eloping with her boyfriend, Bridie is shamed by her family who shunned her for several weeks, nevertheless in due course she became reintegrated with her family and community. Likewise, in the situation that Connie is describing, the individual who become an outcast is eventually accepted back into the community. In both situations, shame is used as a tool to show disapproval of inappropriate behaviour. In doing so, the guilty individuals are eventually restored back into their community. However, not all shame is reintegrative.

The existence of disintegrative shame among Gypsies and Travellers is articulated by Gronfors when he suggests:

the continued use of authorised force in certain disputes is functional for the entire society, in that it separates the most serious offences and the most important norms from those of lesser importance (Gronfors 1986:116).

While Gronfors does not recognise disintegrative shame, by inferring that some acts are so serious that they require continued surveillance, he alludes to this notion. One offence that is considered so serious that the offender and their family are permanently excluded from Gypsy and Traveller communities is incest (see chapter five). Children or '*chavies*' are highly valued and protected among Gypsies and Travellers (See Okely 1983). As Sonny acknowledges:

Generally it's still the same as what it was in the old days concerning children, they're very protective of 'em, put them first basically in a lot of ways...

Sonny (Interview).

Yet, as Connie refers to in her notes, incest and the sexual abuse of children does occur. In her notes, Connie is able to emphasise the seriousness of this act and the consequences it incurs. As Connie writes:

Incest and being bad to children in anyway, beating or giving them away, or molesting or rape of any kind. Then a man would be **excluded** from society for **life!** No matter who he was and great **shame** would come on the **whole** family.

Connie (Written Notes).

Likewise, as Maisy states:

Going back to the regulations it never was acceptable to rape a child that's one thing that has never changed not now or ever. Amongst the Gypsies and Travellers Irish Travellers, not even the modern Travellers its not acceptable among the Rom and children of Travellers and the show people if anyone did anything wrong to a child right, today right 'n they hurts a child right today they wouldn't be allowed in the community no one would go with their daughters, no one would marry 'em would go to their weddings, or funerals and no one would speak to them and that would be them finished, sent to Coventry for good.

Maisy (Interview).

Therefore, incest and sexual abuse are extreme examples of a crime or act that renders the offender an outcast and indeed most communities do not accept this form of crime, as demonstrated by the recent moral panic generated by the 'News of the World', that involved the naming and shaming of known paedophiles (see Hughes 2007). Yet, there are lesser offences that lead to disintegrative shame. For instance, below Tom is discussing an incident that had happened when his female cousin began a relationship with a non-Gypsy and Traveller, a Gorger. The consequences of her actions meant that she was ostracised permanently from the community:

There was a cousin right and I think it was about thirty or forty years ago that the last time I've seen her... she went out with a Gorger fella and she was never heard of again, she would of known that she wouldn't be accepted she would be cut off, cut off from everybody cos you see you know you might know the language and you might know the culture but it still shows, so do you know what I'm saying to ya?

Tom (Interview).

Another important dimension of disintegrative shame links to the issue of becoming a police informer. Firstly, Connie is discussing a situation in which the child of a police informer married. As Connie notes, no matter how much time had lapsed the informer would never be welcome back into the community. The son of an informer would be met with great suspicion and would have to prove himself before they would be accepted by a future family's in laws:

...but not if they'd been squealed on to the police even if it had been fifty years before you wouldn't bind the family together but the boys father or the girls father who ever had done the police informer you'd never ever come back into that family and the boy would be accepted with great suspicion and very unpopular amongst the other Travellers you see

Connie (Interview).

Evidently, informing on a community member generally is not condoned among Gypsies and Travellers. Billy further acknowledges this in the following statement:

...but if I wasn't a nice person and I go to weddings or things like that and I start problems and squealing about people and afterwards been a real, a real nark to everybody, well then you get a name for what you are. So they say well I don't want my daughter in their home and 'ave him for a father in law, do you follow what I mean?

Billy (Interview).

While the restoration of an individual as a full member of their Gypsy and Traveller community is usually possible, what we see above, is that some acts are deemed too serious to accept the individual and reintegrate them with Gypsy and Traveller communities. As Gronfors (1986) noted, it is crucial that Gypsies and Travellers have the means to deal with acts that could potentially threaten the stability of the group. Yet for some acts, the only sanction available is a 'banishment order' (see Gronfors 1986). It is possible that both sexual abuse and informing to the police and female relationships with non-Gypsy and Traveller men fall under this category, as these acts are likely to threaten the social cohesion and solidarity of the community. Therefore, Gypsy and Traveller communities need to show their disapproval by preventing such offender(s) reintegration back into the community. This technique also acts as a threat,

warning future offenders of the risks of their potential actions. Therefore, the type of shaming described above by Billy, Tom, Connie and Maisy has a stigmatizing element. As Braithwaite (1989) acknowledges this form of shaming becomes the offenders '*master status*' (Braithwaite 1993: 1). By creating an outcast of the individual, their primary status becomes that of an offender and the bonds with their community and more the links with the victim are severed. The above statements from Billy, Tom, Connie and Maisy reinforce this notion.

Reacceptance Ceremonies And Degradation Ceremonies

An important distinction between shame that is reintegrative and that which is disintegrative, is that the former requires a community expression of disapproval which may take the form of a reacceptance ceremony and closely followed by gestures of reacceptance. Yet, stigmatizing shame that is disintegrative, divides the community by creating a class of outcast, which is what we see from the statements above. As noted in chapter three, reacceptance and degradation ceremonies are an important element in the process of restorative justice (See Braithwaite 1989). It is this aspect to which I now turn attention.

Participants in accordance with socially approved sanctions (See Garfinkel 1956) often decide the trajectory for the correction of a deviant or criminal act. In chapter three, it was argued that embedded within all societies are the conditions for inducing shame on its members. Accordingly, Garfinkel (1956) argues that degradation status is a universal feature in all societies. Braithwaite develops the concept outlined by Garfinkel (1956) referring to the notion of reintegrative ceremonies. Braithwaite argues that for individuals to be reaccepted into their community after a transgression from the moral codes, ceremonies need to acknowledge a deviant act and if an appropriate apology is provided the individual is rehabilitated. This process manages shame through the principles of restorative justice. Braithwaite turns to Japan, a country that historically has employed the principles of restorative justice and holds ceremonies of reacceptance. Interestingly, Braithwaite claims that communities successful in developing reintegrative shame have a lower rate of offending.

Ceremonies of reacceptance are an important feature in tribal communities. This is illustrated in the work of many early anthropologists. Bohannon (1957) touches upon this notion in his research on the *Tiv*, who adopted an independent court system for tribal members. Entrenched within these courts are ceremonies of forgiveness. In this sense, it could be argued that the *Tiv* employ the values of restorative justice. Likewise, Leach (1954) cites evidence among the '*Kachin*' of a court proceedings, the purpose of which is the restoration of the offender into the community. Hence, the *Tiv* and *Kachin* successfully observe the ideology underlying restorative justice.

The mechanisms of informal community justice adopted Gypsies and Travellers outlined at the outset of this chapter form an important part in the ceremonies of reacceptance advanced by Braithwaite (1989). This is clearly observed through the *Creese* and system of fighting used by the Rom Gypsy and Traveller community. While the practices of gossip and avoidance allow the development of reacceptance ceremonies, the reintegration of the offender is less apparent. Moreover, for some offences reintegration back into the Gypsy and Traveller community is not possible and instead of reacceptance ceremonies what we see are ceremonies of degradation, the purpose of which is to warn other Gypsies and Travellers not to commit similar offences.

Previously this chapter considered the tribunal (*Creese*) and fighting system adopted by Gypsies and Traveller. Returning briefly to these mechanisms of informal community justice we can see how these provide Gypsies and Travellers with the means to reaccept those who have transgressed the professed moral codes through ceremonies of reacceptance.

At the beginning of this chapter, a description of the *Creese* was provided by Billy and Tom. The *Creese* is an important ritual among Gypsies and Travellers seeking a resolution to a transgression of the norms. Underpinning this tribunal system it was argued, are a number of rites and rituals, which provide a symbolic boundary between the community and the wider society. Additionally, the *Creese* forms part of a reacceptance ceremony between the offender and the Gypsy and Traveller community. This is illustrated in the following remark by Tom. In the

case that Tom is referring to, the guilty party is aware of his offence and attends the Creese in the acknowledgement that he will be issued with a fine:

...if there's two sensible people right 'n the man knows he's in the wrong what happens is urrr the person from the innocent party calls the Creese the guilty one, well he goes to the bank with a pocket fulla money cos he knows he gotta cough up right?

Tom (Interview).

What Tom is verbalising in this statement is the purpose of the Creese, that is to enable the guilty party's rehabilitation in the community. Through this it is argued, the Creese functions as a reacceptance ceremony. As Tom notes, the guilty person attends the Creese with money, knowing he will have to '*cough up*'. Accepting this situation the guilty party could pay his victim without attending the Creese. Therefore, the Creese plays an important role, that is, the public shaming and reintegration of the offender. It is in this way the Creese is a ceremony of reacceptance. This is further exemplified in the following quote from Billy.

...I'll tell you one thing about the Creese that will be interesting for you. I went to one... but you also 'ear about it there was a large sum of money exchanged, someone said something they shouldn't 'ave... and umm it got back to someone, you know he'd been flirting with someone he shouldn't have been and so what they did the girl's father took him to court (Creese) and the man had to pay money to father and what he did was burn it...

Billy (Interview).

Again Billy alludes to the Creese as a ceremony of reacceptance. Here the victim's family publicly burn the money given by the offender. Burning the money has great significance. It expresses to those in attendance at the Creese that the money is inconsequential and that a public apology from the offender is more important. By burning the money, the victim's family are reintegrating the offender back into the community.

In addition, reacceptance ceremonies are evident in the fighting system adopted by Gypsies and Travellers. This is clearly demonstrated in the following quote by Timmy. Timmy is describing a situation whereby a fight had been organised by two families. The fight was a result of one family offending a member from the

other family. The two families placed a lot of stake money on the fight and in addition Gypsies and Travellers from around the UK travelled to watch the fight. Moreover, both men were talented and respected fighters. Yet as Timmy asserts:

...the fight had been set up 'n all, the families had put up a lot of money, we're taking serious money...anyway the one that was in the wrong well he took one punch...waved his 'ands 'n said 'that's it, he's the better man'... What it was, he knew he was in the wrong 'n had to take his knock for it...

Timmy (Interview).

It is clear from Timmy's statement that the man who conceded the fight was from the guilty family. By forfeiting the fight he accepts his guilt and provides the victim's family with an apology. It is important to note that conceding the fight meant that he would lose the considerable amount of money that his family placed on the fight. Similar to the situation that is outlined above by Billy, the money is insignificant, what is important in both these situations is the public apology the fight provides. Hence, fighting, like the Creese, performs the function of a reacceptance ceremony. In both situations the mechanisms of informal justice used by Gypsies and Travellers acts as ceremonies of reacceptance.

In this chapter, it has been previously acknowledged that for some offences the reintegration of the offender is not possible. As noted by Gronfors (1986) previously, Gypsies and Travellers cannot afford the instability and impact on the social cohesion of the community that certain offences bring. It was recognised that sexual abuse, informing to the police and women marrying or having relationships with Gorgers men are some such offences. The consequence of such actions is the removal of the offender(s) from the community. Through this process Gypsies and Travellers use shaming that is disintegrative (see Braithwaite 1989). Notable in this form of shaming is the absence of reacceptance ceremonies, instead ceremonies of degradation are apparent. The ceremony of degradation is acted out through the process of avoidance and taken to its more extreme '*banishment orders*'. This is evident in the following account from Connie. Here she is referring to an incident in which a member of her community was accused of sexual abuse. As Connie explains:

...what i'm telling you happen a long time ago 'n the man went to prison, but even so he would never be accepted back 'n the same goes for children, they would never be trusted or accepted. It's a very rare thing, Gypsies and Travellers do not do that... his family were turned away from the site, you know asked to leave 'n when they left they knew that they could never pull up there again... no one spoke to 'em it was something that they knew...

Connie (Interview).

Evidently, the family that Connie refers to are permanently excluded from the Gypsy and Traveller community. This way a 'banishment order' is given. Moreover, the refusal to speak to the offender's family performs the function of a degradation ceremony. Thus making it apparent to the family that they are not welcome on the site and the only course of action available to them is to leave.

Gestures Of Reacceptance

An integral part of restorative justice are gestures of reacceptance, acts which swiftly follow reacceptance ceremonies (see Braithwaite 1989). Gestures of reacceptance can take many forms and can include simple actions such as nod or a wink (Braithwaite 1989). Signals of this kind were evident in this research on Gypsies and Travellers. Earlier in this chapter under the sub-heading Shame, Bridie discussed a situation in which she eloped with her boyfriend. In order to show her disapproval Bridie's mother avoids her and her new husband. Eventually accepting them both, Bridie's mother uses a number of gestures of reacceptance:

...at first mum would smile at me like, if she saw me 'round, to show she was ok I suppose... after a bit she invited me 'n Jimmy 'round for tea...

Bridie (Interview)

Here we see Bridie's mother gesturing her reacceptance of both her, and her 'husband' into the community. This is demonstrated through the gestures of smiling and eventually inviting them back into the family home. Through this, Bridie's mother employs the principles of restorative justice.

Conclusion

This chapter has outlined the mechanisms of informal community justice as used by Gypsies and Travellers. While the techniques used by Gypsies and Travellers are somewhat diverse the outcome remains the same. That is, they enable Gypsies and Travellers to create a symbolic boundary between themselves and the wider society. Moreover, the system of community justice used by Gypsy and Traveller communities are underpinned by the principles of restorative justice advanced by Braithwaite (1989). Through reintegrative shaming, Gypsies and Travellers are able to successfully rehabilitate the offender(s) who are eventually reaccepted into the community. The process of rehabilitation of offenders among Gypsies and Travellers can be observed through the employment of reacceptance ceremonies that are quickly followed by gestures of reacceptance. Importantly, it has been argued that some offences can potentially breach the social cohesion of Gypsy and Traveller communities. In such circumstances restorative justice is not available. In order for the community to maintain its social order offences such as sexual abuse, police informing and female relationships with non-Gypsies and Travellers, the community adopts shaming that is disintegrative, banishing the offender permanently or semi-permanently from the community.

The chapter began by outlining the tribunal system of the Creese. In doing so, it was argued that the Creese, underlined by a number of important rites and rituals enables Gypsies and Travellers to create a symbolic boundary between themselves and the wider British society. Similarly it was shown how the Gypsies and Travellers adopt a system of fighting, again a number of important rites and rituals are observed here, enabling the community to reinforce a symbolic boundary between Gypsies and Travellers and the Gorgor community. These mechanisms of informal justice emphasize the use of restorative justice among Gypsies and Travellers. Alongside this, it was shown how the use of avoidance and gossip are employed by Gypsy and Traveller communities, the purpose of which is to demonstrate disapproval to a given offence. The fear of avoidance and becoming the victim of a gossip campaign acts as a mechanism of social control, thus preventing members of the community breaching the Gypsy and Traveller moral code.

Hence, it is argued that the mechanisms of informal community justice used by the Gypsies and Travellers act as polarised variations of a common structure (see Acton *et al.* 1997). This is demonstrated through the use of restorative justice. As a marginalised community, Gypsies and Travellers cannot afford ongoing conflicts or exclusions which potentially threaten the social cohesion of their community (Walgrave 2008). Therefore, Gypsies and Travellers have developed a system of justice that is both swift and visible (McEvoy and Mika 2002). The public shaming of offenders is manifest through ceremonies of reacceptance, which the fight and Creese form part of. This is quickly followed by gestures of reacceptance. The function of this is the public restoration of the offender into the community.

Additionally, it has been acknowledged that Gypsies and Travellers also operate a system of disintegrative shaming. As previously outlined Gypsies and Travellers cannot resolve certain offences as these have too great an impact on their community. In such circumstances, the offender(s) are permanently removed from the community, through the process of degradation ceremonies. In doing so the community unite against the offender, the outcome of this is two-fold. Firstly, it allows Gypsies and Travellers to maintain its social order and more importantly it acts as a caution to the community, instilling a sense of fear. Through this, members of Gypsy and Traveller communities generally avoid actions that will result in them and their family becoming ostracised from other Gypsies and Travellers.

The focus of this chapter has been the use of informal community justice adopted by Gypsies and Travellers. In the next chapter empirical evidence will be presented on the relationship between the community and the police. The purpose of this will be to establish an understanding of the recourse that Gypsies and Travellers have to official agents of social control.

Chapter Eight: 'Policing', Legitimacy And Engagement With Gypsy And Traveller Communities.

Introduction

Traditionally the relationship between Gypsies and Travellers and formal agents of the criminal justice system has been somewhat conflictual (see James 2007, 2006, Foley 2005 Taggart 2000, Lomax *et al.* 2000 and Gronfors 1998). Comparable with other ethnic minority groups in the UK, the issue of stop and searches by the police is often cited as a contributory factor to this (see James 2007, Foley 2005, Bowling and Philips 2002, Taggart 2000, Lomax *et al.* 2000 and Holdaway 1996). In addition, the nomadic lifestyle of Gypsies and Travellers compounds an already difficult relationship as legislation consistently attempts to restrict this activity (see James 2007 Richardson 2006, Taggart 2000, Lomax *et al.* 2000 and Okely 1983). Furthermore, as the previous chapter highlighted Gypsies and Travellers deal with transgressions by group members within this community, and have very little recourse to the Criminal Justice System (see chapter seven). This chapter aims to explore the Gypsy and Traveller communities' response to official agents of social control. Thus, focusing on the third research question that this thesis is centred upon: *How and when do Gypsies and Travellers have recourse to formal agents of social control?*

Responding to the above research question, this chapter will draw on data obtained from fieldnotes, interviews with Gypsies and Travellers and those who

work with this community. A more comprehensive description of these methods is provided in chapter four

The chapter will begin by contextualising the relationship between Gypsies and Travellers and official agents of social control. Here, policies that affect Gypsies and Travellers will be explored, showing the bearing of these on the fragile relationship between these two groups. This will provide an important framework for the analysis of data discussed in this chapter. Thus, the intention here will be to highlight problems around the legitimacy of the police in the eyes of Gypsies and Traveller, and the extent to which these are underpinned by a discourse of racism (Coxhead 2007) compounding the tenuous relationship between these two groups. Drawing upon literature reviewed in chapter three, an analysis will then be provided on when and how Gypsies and Travellers have recourse to official agents of social control.

At the outset of this chapter, it is pertinent to refer back to chapter three, and the discussion that was provided on policing and legitimacy, explaining how these concepts will be used here. In chapter three, a detailed account of policing and legitimacy was offered (see Jones 2003, Crawford 1997 and McLaughlin 1994). Jones's (2003) broader definition of policing proved more useful than the traditional definition offered by criminologists that focused on law-enforcement and peace keeping (Jones 2003: 604). A more extensive definition of policing recognises the diversity in activities and range of individuals and organisations involved in crime prevention and control. As Crawford (1996) attests, crime control is no longer the exclusive duty of the professional police; increasingly the UK has seen a fragmentation and dispersion of policing throughout state institutions, private organisations and the public (Crawford 1996: 25). This diffused concept of policing is referred to by Shearing and Wood (2003) as the '*pluralisation of governance*' (Shearing and Wood 2003: 403). It is this more holistic model of policing that will be drawn upon throughout this current chapter. Indeed, such a model will take into account the range of agencies involved in the 'policing' of Gypsies and Travellers. These include; the police, fire and health services, social services and Gypsy and Traveller policy officers (see Coxhead 2007, James 2006 and Richardson 2006). As James (2007) demonstrates,

increasingly a multitude of agencies both public and private are called upon to engage with Gypsies and Travellers, albeit more often than not through the use of enforcement practices.

As noted in chapter three, the need for a more holistic model of policing that encompasses a multi-agency approach, stemmed from concerns relating to the inner-city riots that took place in many cities of the UK (McLaughlin 1994). These riots forced the political establishment to recognise that the police were working without the consent of large sections of the population (McLaughlin 1994: 1). This led to a recognition that the police needed to rebuild the relationships between themselves and the communities in which they serve (Crawford 1996). Policing without consent raises the important issue of police legitimacy that is '*the recognition of the right to govern*' (Coicaud 2002: 10).

There has been a growing body of research developed over the last decade in criminology regarding the importance of the role of police legitimacy (Tankebe 2008). As Jones (2003) points out, this depends to a large extent on the democratic practices and police accountability to democratic institutions (Jones 2003: 606). The need for greater democracy within the police had previously been explored by Jones *et al.* (1994) who argued that an effective framework of police governance, has a number of prerequisites. these include: equity of service distribution; service delivery should be fair, effective and efficient; responsiveness; the even distribution of power; information should be accurate and readily available; redress should be effective in dealing with the unlawful and unreasonable behaviour of police officers and participation or appropriate dialogue should exist with all social groups. The democratic criteria offered by Jones *et al.* (1994) provide us with a useful measure with which to explore issues of legitimacy in relation to the policing of Gypsies and Travellers.

The notion of police legitimacy was explored to some extent in the work of early anthropologists and the study of tribal and primitive societies in relation to colonial Government. For example, Bohannan's (1957) study of the Tiv community found that the community paid little regard to the prevailing social order. As Bohannan (1957) recounts, the Tiv were bemused and non-cooperative

with government's attempts to bring its members to justice. In this regard, it could be argued that the Tiv did not recognise the legitimacy of the state criminal justice system. Moreover, there is much evidence to suggest that Gypsies and Travellers fail to acknowledge the legitimacy of the policing of their community.

As noted in the previous chapter, Gronfors (1997) argued that Gypsies and Travellers seek community resolutions even after the matter has been dealt with by formal institutions. This led him to conclude that Gypsies and Travellers fail to recognise the laws of the land in which they reside. More recently, James (2007) notes:

Gypsies and Travellers tend to distrust formal agencies and the police in particular, and are loath to engage with them (James 2007: 383).

Alongside this, Coxhead (2007) provides evidence of police racism toward Gypsies and Travellers, in which a language of hatred was evidenced by police diversity trainers. Indeed, he goes as far to claim that the policing of Gypsy and Traveller communities represents the '*last bastion of racism*' (Coxhead 2007: 26).

The chapter will begin by outlining the relationship between Gypsies and Travellers and the agents whose role it is to police this community. As noted earlier, a broad definition of 'policing' will be adopted. The chapter will then go on to explore how and when Gypsies and Travellers resort to official agents of social control.

The Relationship Between Gypsies And Travellers And Official Agents Of Social Control

It is not the intention of this research to provide an in depth exploration of the relationship between Gypsies and Travellers and official agents of control. Yet to omit this here would be an oversight, for it has considerable bearing on the communities' recourse to such agents particularly on occasions when a crime has been committed. As will be demonstrated in this chapter, the relationship between members of Gypsy and Traveller communities and the 'police' is often perceived

by Gypsies and Travellers as lacking legitimacy. However, there are pockets of good practice between Gypsies and Travellers and the official agencies of social control (James 2007, Coxhead 2004) where a dialogue between the community and the police is open. In these circumstances there is greater legitimacy in the policing of Gypsies and Travellers and problems with the local community and agents of social control may be greatly reduced (Greenfields 2006a, 2006b).

Poor Relations

Previous research has highlighted the problematic relationship between Gypsies and Travellers and the police. For instance, there is considerable mistrust between these groups, which historically has led to an adversarial relationship. On the one side, the police view Gypsies and Travellers as criminal and on the other the community perceive police behaviour as being excessive toward them (Kenrick and Bakewell 1995). Likewise, James (2007) concedes that the relationship between these groups has traditionally been poor, with the use of enforcement on Gypsies and Travellers going '*beyond normative limits*' (James 2007). In addition, Richardson (2006) claims that legislation intended for Gypsies and Travellers is far-reaching, while Bancroft (2000) even suggests that the British legal system has pathologised many aspects of the Gypsies' and Travellers' life. The consequence of this is that Gypsies and Travellers are overly policed, thus having repercussions on the relationship between these two groups.

The problematic relationship between the policing of Gypsies and Travellers and the community was certainly evident in my research. Previous research that I had conducted on the policing of the Gypsies and Travellers showed a very strained relationship between these two groups (Foley 2005). One reason for this fragile relationship was the over policing of the community with police officers going en-masse onto Gypsy and Traveller encampments. This issue had not been resolved in this current research as the following quote from a neighbourhood police officer, who covers a local authorised Gypsy and Traveller site emphasized:

We tend to go on the camp en-masse, partly to show our presence and also to show that we won't be intimidated by them...

Rob : Police Office (Interview).

This sense of over policing featured in a number of interviews with Gypsies and Travellers. The over policing of their community left many Gypsies and Travellers feeling aggrieved and exacerbates an already fragile relationship, as the next quote by Tall-Girl demonstrates. The situation that Tall-Girl is describing had taken place the previous evening, and her anger is strongly felt in the narrative she provides:

The police people was watching us, with cameras ‘n that ‘n that’s illegal... they were all in here with camera things ‘n video recording everyone ‘n it wasn’t everyone that had been doing anything wrong, there were van loads of ‘em. And then, when the people was saying don’t get me on that ‘n they said ‘if you touch that camera it’ll be the last camera you ever touch’. But we had no choice we all had to be filmed, every plot on ‘ere was filmed. When I asked the policeman ‘why are you doing this?’ ‘n they said they’re after stolen property, they said we’re recovering stolen property cos somebody obviously robbed something ‘n put it on the site ‘n they said if someone had done it then we must all be involved... they was coming onto people’s plots ‘n I said ‘you wouldn’t like it if we came on your property cos someone had left something that was stolen there’. But we wouldn’t have stolen anything that’s what the man said to me and I said ‘well I wouldn’t go in your houses without letting you know first so why are you doing it to us.

Tall-Girl (Interview)

What we can see from Tall-Girl’s statement, is the lack of legitimacy she sees in the policing of her community. It is evident from Tall-Girl’s experience and the experiences of others from her community that policing was conducted without the consent of those who were being served by the police. There was no open dialogue between Gypsies and Travellers and those policing their community. If we refer back to Jones’s *et al.* (1994) criteria of democratic policing, which in turn should inform police legitimacy, it is clear that many of the processes that help to ensure police legitimacy and democracy were absent in the scenario outlined by Tall-Girl. Tall-Girl and many other members of her community failed to recognise the authority of the police for a number of vital reasons. For instance, they had no understanding of the police presence as the reason had not been verbalised to the community. The service delivery appeared heavy-handed to members of this Gypsy and Traveller community, and in this regard; they felt a sense of inequality and unjustified targeting. Furthermore, the pattern of

enforcement evidently is different to forms of enforcement experienced by other communities.

The notion of heavy-handed policing of Gypsies and Travellers evident in this current research is consistent with previous findings, as noted above. For example, James (2007) found that disruptive actions such as police helicopters circling above encampments were fairly common, thus going 'beyond normative limits' proportionate to any harm that the crimes from the community may cause. Likewise, Richardson (2006) discusses the surveillance of the Gypsy and Traveller communities. Relating surveillance of Gypsies and Travellers to '*direct democracy*', Richardson (2006) argues that the level of scrutiny experienced by this community is a tool used by the majority to overtly control and police this marginalised group. In doing so the liberties of Gypsies and Travellers are endangered.

Evidence from this research shows that the overt surveillance of Gypsy and Traveller communities had serious repercussions for one council worker, as the following statement demonstrates. Here, members of a Gypsy and Traveller community had attacked a council worker whose role it is to monitor unauthorised sites. As part of this remit he was required to take photographs of all the vehicles parked on the site. Below Paul is responding to a question that I had posed to him during the course of my interview:

Anne: How do the Gypsies and Travellers respond to you when you go onto the sites?

Paul: It varies, some of them I wont say are glad to see me but know that they can expect to see me, other ones like the one I had then in January, I got assaulted, they didn't like the fact that I was taking pictures, they don't like to, if we say be identified and all I was doing was taking pictures of number plates, not the people. They didn't take it too kindly but that is generally the case anyway they don't want to see us... now I do tend now to take a police officer with me purely to make sure that I am protected and they can log it as well then.

Paul: Policy Officer (Interview)

Clearly, the story that Paul is relaying above affected his working relationship with members of this Gypsy and Traveller community. For Paul, he was merely going about his duty, yet the community that he was charged with 'policing'

could not see the legitimacy of his actions and acted accordingly. While it would appear that the situation outlined above may be rare, it does nevertheless, reiterate the precarious relationship between these two groups. Additionally, my previous research highlighted only one such instance of an individual working for an agency of social control being hurt by Gypsies and Travellers. On that occasion, a Gypsy-Traveller caught a police officer accidentally during a fight with another Gypsy-Traveller (Foley 2005). This hinders the Gypsy and Traveller communities' engagement with community initiatives and representation within policing forums (James 2007). Yet, as Jones *et al.* (1994) correctly acknowledged it is this form of engagement that may enhance the legitimacy of the policing of this community.

Alongside the overt surveillance of Gypsy and Traveller communities, the attitudes of the police toward this community is another important factor affecting legitimacy in the policing of Gypsies and Travellers. As noted above, Coxhead (2007) has drawn attention to the prejudicial attitudes of the police toward Gypsies and Travellers. He notes, Gypsies and Travellers are viewed as '*less than equals*' and as such a socially stigmatized group. This he argues, is demonstrated through an imbalance of power with those entrusted to police Gypsies and Travellers (Coxhead 2007: 27). Likewise, previous research conducted by myself on the policing of Gypsies and Travellers highlighted such attitudes, as one police respondent commented:

It's like this really, we call them GTB's... you know... Gypsy thieving bastards... (Foley 2005).

This comment emphasises the adversarial relationship between Gypsies and Travellers and the police. According to Coxhead, such attitudes prevent a positive dialogue between Gypsies and Travellers and the police; as such, the legitimacy of policing Gypsy and Traveller communities is further obstructed. In this research, there was no evidence of the overt racism outlined by Coxhead (2007) and Foley (2005) above. Nonetheless many of the Gypsy and Traveller respondents in this research discussed unfair practices in the policing of their community. Maisy illustrates this in the following statement, where she is describing a conversation she had with a police Gypsy and Traveller liaison officer in which they were discussing an incident that had recently taken place:

...there was this fella who took this job... he was like about in his forty's he was doing a tree job and went cold calling and the police picked him up took 'im back to the people's house and said 'is it true you got three hundred pound for this job' and he goes 'yes' 'and umm 'are you satisfied?' and he goes 'yes' 'did you want the seven day cooling off period?' and he says 'no'. They then told 'im he was a Gypsy and he lost the job, they then took 'im down the police station and kept 'im there all day. Now I think that's harassment personally for who you are..., he said they weren't targeting the Gypsies but I do think it is I didn't like the way he laughed, he laughed, he thought it was funny and that really annoyed us...

Maisy (Interview)

Maisy highlights the negative discourse between the police and her community, the consequence of which means that she fails to recognise the legitimacy of their actions. As Maisy discusses, the harassment by the police officer in the above scenario denotes a discourse of Gypsies and Travellers as deviant (see Richardson 2006). While this may not be as stark as the comment referred to above representing Gypsies and Travellers as thieves, the impact remains the same, thus 'pathologising' the community (Bancroft 2000). The outcome of such destructive actions leads to a reluctance by Gypsies and Travellers to interact with the police as both victims and offenders of crime (Coxhead 2007).

Another important dimension in the policing of Gypsies and Travellers that affects legitimacy relates to social policies. Greenfields (2006b) provides a useful account of how policies aimed at Gypsies and Travellers are laden with problems, which she describes as being based on '*inherently discriminatory regimes*' (2006c: 133). Richardson (2006) summarized some of the key legislation that has had most bearing on Gypsies and Travellers lifestyle in recent years, including the Anti-Social Behaviour Act (2003) the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act (2004) and the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act (1994). These policies problematize the policing of Gypsies and Travellers, requiring a multi-agency strategy to tackle issues arising from legislation, which is more often than not achieved through enforcement rather than community engagement (James 2007). This is evidenced in this current research, in which an eviction notice was served on an illegal encampment:

...it's very labour intensive and takes up a lot of officers time... in regard to one encampment they were taken to court, the high court so that we could move them on, they weren't too happy about it, but then again we are only doing our job...

Paul: Policy Officer (Interview)

However, the legislation intended for Gypsy and Traveller communities and the multi-agency policing required to uphold policies impacts greatly on Gypsies' and Travellers' nomadic lifestyle. This is illustrated in the following comment by Tom. Here, Tom was addressing my question regarding the difficulties in the relationship between his community and those whose role it is to police them:

I think that what has had a lot to do with that is Anne, is you know because they look to places to stop and the camps are full or there is not enough camps and they are up and down different places and they're getting harassed by the police or the council 'n things like that and the council pushes them on and if they buy a piece of land and that... so it's very aggravating and very upsetting and you get bad tempered because the moment that you try to camp you get in trouble. So they tries to do their own bits of places to make a home for themselves and then they say to them, well that's green belt or whatever belt they want to call it. So what happens is they've spent a lot of money on something, I'm not saying they done it the right way, by the way they done things, but sometimes you see when they try and do it the right way it's just closed of. So I should think that's got a big thing to do with it... You're on the road and you can't look for work cos you're travelling from one camp to another and sometimes you know weeks could roll by and when a person is upset for a couple of days they can't then be expected to go the next day and earn your living...

Tom (Interview)

Tom is articulating his frustration that he and members of his community experience from the insufficient number of legal encampments that force Gypsies and Travellers to set-up illegal sites, albeit temporarily. Tom's statement highlights the conflicting values between Gypsies and Travellers and the police. On the one hand the police are tasked to stop illegal encampments, yet for Gypsies and Travellers their nomadic status is important for cultural and economic reasons. The sense of frustration is felt on both sides as Paul's earlier account demonstrates. Therefore, in the Gypsy and Traveller community's quest for nomadism they are drawn into conflict with those who govern this behaviour. In this regard, legislation compounds Tom's and his community's perception of a lack of legitimacy in the policing of Gypsies and Travellers. However, as

evidenced in chapter five, travelling is very important to Gypsies and Travellers for a variety of reasons. This is further illustrated by Tom who in chapter five discussed the importance of travelling and this is reiterated here:

The country is changing and they try and stop certain things like horse fairs and that... We used to look forward to the Doncaster race, Cambridge, the Epson races, we used to pay, it was only a small fee and pull-on on Epson Downs the weather was beautiful and there would be a load of Travellers and they would have a week of enjoying themselves... But through the rules and that and I don't think that the Government likes to have a lot of people, like hundreds of trailers at one time cos they are frightened of what's going to happen... All we do is go down, and a load of Travellers goes down to enjoy themselves, some look forward to the actual racing to bet on the horses and that, the teenagers like the fairground and meet other teenagers... and some people has got businesses and that... But now Anne it is just a shame because we miss it like you know, I miss it I'd love to be off now that the weather is like this...

Tom (Interview).

Good Relations

Thus far, this chapter has concentrated on the poor relationship between Gypsies and Travellers and agents of social control. However, there are many good examples of policing of Gypsies and Travellers (Coxhead 2007, James 2007), the existence of which has led to increased police legitimacy in some parts of the country. We will now turn our attention to these good practices.

James (2006) alludes to some good practices in terms of the policing of Gypsies and Travellers. Indeed some police authorities appear to be coincidentally more tolerant of Gypsies and Travellers than others. Such variations in police practices have consequences for the nomadic behaviour of this community, as they avoid areas where the police show less tolerance towards them (James 2006). An area of good practice is seen in the work of the Metropolitan police force (2006) that has developed a role of Gypsy Traveller Liaison Officer (GTLO) who is responsible for developing intelligence led community policing. In the past the role of these officers has been questioned, Taggart (2000) was critical of the lack of

consistency of these roles between police forces (also see Richardson 2006). This current research, also uncovered some good practices in terms of the policing of Gypsies and Travellers, as the following statement by Richard illustrates:

...when I took on the job at this station, I went down to the (site)⁹ and to be honest with you, was horrified by what I saw there... the community are tax payers and forced to live in appalling conditions, the like of which would not be acceptable by others if it was any other community... I made it my personal responsibility to introduce myself to everyone on the site, and I told them truthfully that I would watch their criminal behaviour, but also that I wanted to know and deal with other issues... that they were to come to me if they ever needed the help of the police

Richard: Police Officer (Interview).

What we can see from the above statement by Richard is a clear example of a police officer attempting to open a dialogue with the Gypsy and Traveller community, as Richard went on to say:

I have made it my point, that whenever I go on site to investigate and alleged crime that I tell the residents the purpose of my presence, no I wont say they are happy to see me but, I'd like to think they know I am being fair, and I would say that some, not all relations have improved, but this is an ongoing process, it only takes on officer to say or do something and the tide is quickly changed...

Richard: Police Officer (Interview)

Therefore, by explaining his presence on the site, Richard is able to realise a better working relationship between himself and Gypsies and Travellers. In a similar vein, police officer Brian refers to his own good practices in dealing with the Gypsy and Traveller community. Brian is a local GTLO, who reports:

when I'm on duty I often make the case to pop onto the site, the same way I would with any other community I'm charged with policing... I'll go and show my face and say hello, I am quite friendly with a good couple on the site and some housed Gypsies, they know they can expect to see from time to time and it has made a difference when we have to go and recover some stolen item off the site

Brian GTLO (Interview).

⁹ The name of the site has been omitted by the researcher.

Again as Brian notes:

the Gypsy community are no different from any other community that I deal with, yes there is the odd bit of crime, but you tell me any other community that does not have any crime, there is no more or no less going on there than anywhere else, there is a good many places that give me trouble than the sites ever do

Brian GTLO (Interview).

Another example of good practice relates to a specific case, where there had been some trouble with two groups of young people fighting. The groups involved in the fighting were Gypsies and Travellers and local young people. Steve retells his actions in dealing with this incident as follows:

...there had been some problems between some of the youths from the site and local youths, they'd been fighting and generally causing a nuisance, I got all the parties together, with their parents and tried to get to the bottom of it... the upshot was that the Gypsy and Traveller parents were pleased that their children were being treated the same as the local ones, they could see this and were receptive of the solutions...

Steve: Police Officer (Interview).

As we can see from the above examples, there is indeed some evidence of good practice in the policing of Gypsies and Travellers. Such practices attempt to be more democratic and less excessive than the examples discussed previously. This appears to be validated by community workers and policy officers working in the same district, as the following accounts demonstrate:

when an illegal encampment is set up, I go on the site with the police, our aim is to see how long they are planning to stay for... generally those on the site are just passing through on their way to a fair or have come down for a funeral or wedding... you know in this case there is no point going into legal action, they'll be gone before anything is done and we work with the police to ensure their safety needs are met... it creates a better working environment

Paul: Policy Officer (Interview)

A recent report published by The Equality and Human Rights Commission (2009) claimed that Fenland District Council, which had traditionally experienced a problematic relationship with Gypsies and Travellers, agents of social control and the local community, has implemented a number of initiatives resulting in a dramatic decrease in hostilities. Positive engagement between official agents of social control and the Gypsy and Traveller community in the Fenland district and

the development of an authorised site has led to a greater autonomy among Gypsies and Travellers in the policing of their community. The wish for a similar dialogue as seen in the good practice of the Fenland District council was expressed in this current research:

You know they use money over here to set up transits sites, but I know what's it is for, it's to stop us travelling. But that is our birth right to travel. And they get outsider contractors to build the sites they don't ask us what and how we want them and we could build the site a lot cheaper and better than the contractors. So pockets are being lined to deal with the Gypsy problem but why don't they let us go and decide how it should be spent, why don't they take our advice onboard... if they stopped 'n listened to us, it would be better for everyone cos we'd feel we belonged and there wouldn't be 'alf as much trouble...

Connie (Interview).

Gypsies' And Travellers' Engagement With The 'Police'

Having discussed the relationship between Gypsies and Travellers and official agents of social control, the remainder of this chapter will explore how and when Gypsies and Travellers engage with these groups' particularly in cases of crime and deviance. Firstly, a discussion on the engagement of these institutions from within the Gypsy and Traveller community will be provided. The chapter will then go on to explore how the police engage with Gypsies and Travellers

Engagement From 'Within'

In chapter seven, it was shown that Gypsies and Travellers have developed their own system of informal community justice. The methods used varied from the more formal measures including a community court, known as a Creese, and bare-knuckle fighting, to less informal means such as avoidance and gossip. These methods are underpinned by principles of restorative justice, allowing the offender(s) reintegration into Gypsy and Traveller communities. As such, the Gypsies and Travellers have little recourse to official agents of social control. Moreover, as highlighted thus far, Gypsies and Travellers fail to recognise the legitimacy of the policing of their community by 'outsiders'. This in part is due

to the fragile relationship experienced between these two groups. Regardless, on occasion Gypsies and Travellers communities have cause to engage with those employed in the policing their community.

The Gypsy and Traveller communities' engagement with official agents of social control is two-fold. As evidence from this research will show, it is rare for the community to involve the police in internal matters. Nonetheless, in some circumstances a member of the community will seek the assistance of the police. For instance, Gypsies and Travellers will have recourse to the police when a situation is getting out of control and they are no longer able to deal with the matter internally (Foley 2005). Secondly, Gypsies and Travellers occasionally defer to the police when there is an ongoing feud. Here, information about offences are 'leaked' to the police. It is to these two situations that we now turn our attention.

Past research on the policing of Gypsy and Traveller communities established that Gypsies and Travellers seldom seek assistance from the police (James 2007 and Foley 2005). Indeed, it is only when a situation has become unmanageable and a resolution cannot be sought internally that external help is required by the community. The following statement attests this assumption; taken from previous research it illustrates Gypsy and Traveller Communities reliance on the police when they are unable to deal with a problem:

To be honest we rarely get called out, they tend to sort things out themselves so it's very rare... if we do get a call it is really unusual and so you think it must be bad and it tends to be because it is really getting out of hand and they have no choice but to resort to us.

Police Officer (Foley 2005).

This is further evidenced in this current research as the following remark by Pete a neighbourhood police officer emphasizes:

I've been called out and got there once or twice someone has turned round 'n said so and so were fighting but by the time we've got there it has been sorted out... They have never wanted to press charges they just want us to stop the fighting, usually I guess it's because they haven't been able to manage to do it themselves and it was getting out of control...

Nick: Police Officer (Interview).

What we can see from the situation described by Nick and the officer in the previous citation is that Gypsies and Travellers use the police when a problem has got out of control. Once the matter has been resolved they do not want any further assistance from the police. This is substantiated by data collected from Gypsies and Travellers:

I know people and their own family that has had to call the police because of violence...

Connie (Interview)

Gypsies and Travellers were very critical of the responsiveness of the police when they have required their assistance. This was a significant feature in interviews with members of the Gypsy and Traveller community as the following statements verify:

umm by the time they've (the police) got there forty or fifty minutes later you could all be dead, so you know they think 'oh well it's only a Gypsy' and they think well that lot sort it out among themselves anyway.

Connie (Interview).

And:

...but you see the police response is so slow

Tom (Interview)

Likewise:

...going back a few years ago, say sixteen years ago, someone had a disagreement with my husband and umm anyway I heard that they had a weapon... and umm anyway someone else rang the police, I didn't but there was gun there so it's a good job they did or we would all be dead and about an hour later, they rang about four times, the guy rang four times, and when they did come well obviously it was all over and done with and the people had gone thank goodness, so you know you get that kinda of reaction

Maisy (Interview).

People have been shot, you know the same as I do people have been shot, there's been a lot of shootings, people have been run over right, people who have been killed, I know personally people who this happened to, you know a lot of people from quieter families who have got mixed up with other families and the police deliberately and you get its only, its only a Gypsy feud let them sort it out by themselves

Maggie (Interview).

It is clear from the above statements that Gypsies and Travellers are dissatisfied with the reaction that they receive from the police. James (2007) notes that Gypsy and Traveller communities are over policed in terms of criminalisation, as evidenced thus far in this chapter. However, as victims of crime Gypsies and Travellers are under policed. This has been demonstrated here, and is reflected in earlier research (see James 2007, Coxhead 2007, Foley 2006 and Richardson 2006). The under-policing of Gypsy and Traveller communities heightens the lack of legitimacy they feel in relation to the policing of their community. As Billy notes:

A lot of them (police) will say that's the Gypsies for you let them sort it out for themselves, but that's not the law is it? The law is there for everyone that is why you have the police to protect you...

Billy (Interview).

In chapter seven, a discussion was provided on Gypsies and Travellers reluctance to inform give information to the police about crimes committed by members of that community. The consequence of such actions would lead to a banishment order for the informer and their family, thus stigmatizing the individual through disintegrative shame (see chapter seven). Interestingly, fear of disintegrative shame or indeed lack of police legitimacy are not the only factors prohibiting Gypsies and Travellers from corresponding with the police. One important factor apparent in this research relates to the notion of fear and intimidation experienced by Gypsies and Travellers from other members of their community. Gypsies and Travellers cited this as an adequate reason for not requesting police assistance. In chapter five, evidence of serious and violent crime by members of Gypsy and Traveller communities toward other Gypsies and Travellers was documented. It was revealed that some Gypsies and Travellers had held other members of their community at gunpoint, demanding that trailers and money be handed over. The following statement relates to such incidents. Here the respondent was addressing a question regarding whether or not Gypsies and Travellers reported the incident to the police. Again, at the request of the respondent no name has been attached to the statement to ensure that the statement is not traced back to any individual:

Well no what happens is they're too frightened to in case they get shot at or stabbed...there is no time and if somebody did it they would be too frightened now I've heard other people say I'd of gone and dialled 999 right and then other people have said that they've been too frightened to that you don't suppose you know what you do unless you were in that position ...

Anonymous (Interview).

As noted previously, the second dimension of the Gypsy and Traveller communities' engagement with the police relates to feuds. This contradicts with evidence presented in chapter seven, which suggested that the community reject Gypsies and Travellers who inform on members of the community to the police. Here, it will be shown that informing to the police is occasionally accepted during a struggle for power. Generally, it is the Gypsies and Travellers who are higher in the group hierarchy that have recourse to such actions, and is a way of establishing their authority (see Elias and Scotson 1965). This is clearly evident from the following statement from Steve:

Steve: about a year ago we starting to get from what I'd say are normally more the instigators, they had issues with other Travellers that had come down from England and they were infiltrating the site. Now we were getting information saying these people have come down and they've stolen property and it's in so and so spot and it would be recovered. Quite often I'd say between to seventy to eighty per cent of the information was good.

Anne: Sorry do you mean stolen property from within the community or outsiders?

Steve: From other Gypsies so obviously there was wrangle going off from within, and quite often this information was good, generally the goods were recovered we're talking motor vehicles and diggers. But it was clear why this was happening cos one party wanted the other ones to leave, but like I said, the ones giving the information from my experience they're the ones that see's themselves as the bosses on the site. So this is why they thought they'll give a bit of information to the police 'n they might get the others arrested 'n that will get rid of 'em

Steve: Police Officer (Interview)

This situation is also reiterated by Gypsies and Travellers. In the following notes written by Connie, she demonstrates, that for certain groups in Gypsy and Traveller community it is perfectly acceptable to inform the police of the actions of other members of the community. Similarly to Steve's account provided above,

it is a way of determining and reinforcing power among individual members of Gypsy and Traveller communities:

In the old days it was unacceptable to squeal to the police. Today and in the last 50 or 60 years Wrom quite often get each other locked-up and waste police time just to prove a thing and that they have the power. This came from the USA and then Canada as many Wrom had local sheriffs in their back pockets and it was their town and other Wrom wishing to come there to work would have to ask their permission... This customs differs so much from British Gypsies. The Wrom like to involve the police, British Gypsies and Travellers do **not** if at all possible it would have to be a very serious matter indeed to do that

Connie (Written Notes).

In chapters five and six the notion of 'bricolage' was discussed, in which Gypsies and Travellers systematically accept some values from the wider British society yet at the same time reject those values which they perceive as being irrelevant to their community (see Okely 1983). This was particularly evident in the analysis of Gypsy and Traveller communities' moral codes. For example, in chapter five a discussion was provided on the nomadic lifestyle of Gypsies and Travellers, which conflicts with the sedentary lifestyle of the majority of the population in the UK (James 2007). Therefore Gypsy and Traveller communities are often labelled as deviant (Richardson 2006) while policies consistently attempt to prohibit the nomadic lifestyle professed by Gypsies and Travellers (James 2007, Greenfields 2006c and Okely 1983). Nevertheless, Gypsies and Travellers adhere to a strict moral code which is underpinned by the notion of pollution, '*mochadi*' or '*marrie-mae*'. The prevention of pollution requires Gypsies and Travellers to systematically reject many of the values professed by the wider British society, but where possible they retain those values that are deemed significant to their community. The concept of bricolage also proves useful in explaining the Gypsy and Traveller Communities' engagement with official agents of social control.

Throughout this chapter, the reluctance of Gypsies and Travellers to engage with official agents of social control has been established. The notion of legitimacy is significant in understanding the reluctance of Gypsies and Travellers to engage with institutions whose role it is to police Gypsy and Traveller communities. Yet, as noted by Connie and Pete, Gypsies and Travellers are willing to interact with

the police as a way of confirming their authority to other members of their community. It is through this, the concept of bricolage becomes important in explaining the engagement of Gypsies and Travellers with the police. On the one side Gypsy and Traveller communities systematically reject the policing of their community, yet are willing to work with the police when it aids the community in dealing with transgressors of the norms adhered to by Gypsies and Travellers thus maintaining their authority. It is in this sense that bricolage is used here, as it highlights the dichotomy in the relationship between Gypsies and Travellers and the police. As noted by Connie and Steve, it is acceptable for Gypsies and Travellers to cooperate with the police when it is beneficial in sustaining the communities' norms. For example, Pete discusses how the police were used in dealing with a conflict between two groups of Gypsies and Travellers. Providing the police information relating to stolen property enabled the community to deal with those who disrupted the site, and in doing so the social order of the community was maintained.

Conclusion

This chapter has focused on the engagement of Gypsies and Travellers with official agents of social control. It has demonstrated the reluctance of Gypsies and Travellers to interact with the police. By highlighting the conflictual relationship between Gypsies and Travellers and the police, underpinned by a discourse of misunderstanding evidence shows that Gypsy and Traveller communities fail to recognise the legitimacy of the police. This not only undermines relationships and contacts between these two groups but more importantly, creates an environment in which a greater understanding of Gypsies and Travellers becomes very difficult to achieve. Importantly, social policies further compound an already fragile situation whereby legislation requires the 'police' to enforce policies which are seen by Gypsy and Traveller communities to impede their nomadic lifestyle and thus further marginalise an already socially excluded community (Greenfields 2006b).

Nonetheless, Gypsies and Travellers do engage with the police. There are two aspects to this engagement. Firstly Gypsies and Travellers seek assistance from

the police when an internal dispute has spiralled out of control and they no longer have the means to resolve the problem internally. In such circumstances, the Gypsies and Travellers require the police to bring an end to the problem, with no further action from the community. However, on occasion fear and intimidation prevents some members of the community from seeking the assistance of the police. The second form of engagement between the police and the Gypsy and Traveller communities centres on the leaking of information. Here, it has been shown that Gypsies and Travellers resort to the police during times of conflict as a means of (re)-establishing the authority of one group over other groups of Gypsies and Travellers.

Chapter Nine:

Discussion

Introduction

The previous four chapters have presented the main findings from the empirical research. The aim of this chapter is to provide a discussion of these findings. This refers back to previous literature reviewed in chapters two and three. Showing how the present findings fit with ongoing debates. The chapter will also revisit the theoretical framework underpinning the research.

It will be remembered that the three main research questions were set out in chapter one, as follows:

1. *Do Gypsies and Travellers have a common set of shared values?*
2. *How are deviant and criminal acts dealt with, or resolved by Gypsies and Travellers?*
3. *How and when Gypsies and Travellers have recourse to formal agents of social control?*

Discussions of the research findings will focus on each of these questions in turn. The chapter begins with a discussion of the concept of moral codes among Gypsies and Travellers, explaining how and when their values might conflict with the values shared by wider society. This includes considerations of the concept of 'harm' and how this influences Gypsies' and Travellers' attitudes toward crime and deviance. The chapter then goes on to tackle the second research question outlined above, and will focus on the informal systems of community justice adopted by Gypsies and Travellers. Here, I highlight the importance of 'governance from below', showing how justice is not conducted simply through the state but from within and by community members. This section also examines the role that shame plays in the delivery of justice among Gypsies and Travellers,

and will argue that through the application of reintegrative shaming, members of Gypsy and Traveller communities adhere to the underlying principals of restorative justice (see Braithwaite 1989). The chapter then goes on to discuss issues of legitimacy and accountability in the policing of Gypsy and Traveller communities, and how this affects the relationship between the two groups generally, and more specifically, the recourse that Gypsies and Travellers have to official agents of social control.

Thus the theoretical framework I have adopted is as follows. Firstly in understanding the attitudes of Gypsies and Travellers towards crime, the work of Sykes and Matza (1957) is employed to explain how these are shaped through notions of harm. Secondly, Elias and Scotson's (1965) understanding of power differentials is drawn upon. This will allow for a clearer understanding of how Gypsies and Travellers are able to construct an identity of 'outsiders' for those in the community who fail to abide by their moral codes. Thirdly, I draw on the work of Braithwaite (1989) and his theoretical positioning of restorative justice, to explain how informal community justice is operationalised in Gypsy and Traveller communities. Lastly, the relationship between Gypsy and Traveller communities are discussed in the framework of concepts of democratic police accountability, showing how this impacts on the recourse that the community makes to official agents of social control.

A Typology Of Gypsies And Travellers

In chapter one, a typology of Gypsies and Travellers was proffered (see Clark 2006, Murdoch, and Johnson 2004). Here, it was recognised that the term 'Gypsies and Travellers' is a somewhat broad term used to include, Welsh Gypsies, English Gypsies, Irish Travellers, Scottish Gypsies and Travellers, Rom Gypsies, Fairground Travellers, Circus Travellers, Boat Dwellers and New Age Travellers. It is important at this point to acknowledge that for this research I focused on Welsh Gypsies, English Gypsies, Irish Travellers and Rom Gypsies, as this has particular significance for the empirical data discussed thus far. Indeed, it is not possible to state that the findings discussed have resonance with all groups who fall under the umbrella term of Gypsies and Travellers. Other groups

of Gypsies and Travellers that have not been included within this research, do of course have varying alternative cultures to those that have been described here. Certainly, chapters five through to eight have shown that Irish Travellers, Welsh Gypsies, English Gypsies and the Rom community have developed and customised different aspects of Gypsy and Traveller culture. Yet, what has also been clear is that while customs may vary, the outcome remains the same, that is, the maintenance of their community. In recognition of this, the chapter will discuss how Gypsies and Travellers makes sense of their social world, focusing on the research questions outlined above, and how the findings of this research fits within a broader theoretical framework.

In addition to the theoretical framework, the chapter will discuss a number of conceptual themes that have significant bearing on this research. These include bricolage, pollution and symbolic boundaries. These are, however, not stand-alone themes, indeed, these concepts are embedded in all areas of this research and as such have resonance in each of the different sub-sections of the chapter.

Bricolage Communities

A review of literature in chapter two highlighted the fact that Gypsies and Travellers have been forced to adapt and assimilate themselves into the dominant British society (Okely 1983). Nevertheless, through the incorporation of rites and rituals Gypsies and Travellers are able to systematically amass some values from the dominant society, while rejecting other values, and maintaining values from their cultural heritage. In this way, Okely (1983) argues that Gypsies and Travellers, in line with other oppressed groups, become a bricolage community (Okely 1983:77). In chapter two, a discussion of bricoluers was provided through a review of previous literature. Here it was shown that Levi-Strauss (1966) first developed the concept to demonstrate how primitive people were able to draw upon a range of raw materials from their environment to enable them to construct myths. Bricolage can be seen as, '*cutting, pasting and incorporating of various culture forms*' (Kelly 1992: 1,402).

In correspondence with previous writers, in particular Okely's (1983) positioning, this research has employed the concept of bricolage to explain the process by which Gypsies and Travellers have had to adapt to their environment, principally, in a climate in which aspects of their social world have been pathologised through the enforcement of social policies aimed at curbing their nomadic lifestyle (Bancroft 2000). Hence, Gypsies and Travellers create a tapestry in which, some facets from the dominant British society are drawn upon while at the same time, certain features are rejected and parts of their cultural values are added.

The Role Of Pollution

Another important concept that has been discussed throughout this research, is the idea of pollution. As noted in chapter five, pollution is referred to Gypsies and Travellers as either *mochadi* or *marrie-mae*. As evidenced in this research, this is an important tool adopted by Gypsy and Traveller communities, underpinning many of their customs and the governance of behaviour. Referring briefly back to chapter two, the role of pollution is significant among Gypsies and Travellers as it enables the community to create a demarcation between themselves and the wider society (Okely 1983). As we saw in chapter two, Douglas (1966) provided a useful insight into how pollution is used by groups. It was argued that dirt becomes a taboo used by communities to protect their social world, thus reducing the chance of social disorder (Douglas 1966: xi). Early anthropologists dismissed taboos as being illogical and unfamiliar, whereas Douglas was able to see pollution as;

...a bridge between our own contemporary culture and those other cultures where behaviour that blurs the great classifications of the universe is tabooed. We denounce it by calling it dirty and dangerous; they taboo it (Douglas 1966: xi).

In this sense, dirt comes to represent social disorder and the need to protect society from such mayhem, necessities that individuals coerce others from transgressing. Communities therefore, develop a moral code, underpinned by notions of pollution. What is evident from data presented in previous chapters is that Gypsies and Travellers have developed a moral code based on the principles of pollution; this in turn regulates their behaviour (see chapter five). Importantly, *mochadi* and *marrie-mae* allows Gypsies and Travellers to express and reinforce the cultural boundary

between themselves and the wider society. In this way, Gypsies and Travellers are able to maintain their cultural heritage, even though they are often subjected to oppressive policies and enforcement (James 2007, 2006, Richardson 2006 and Bancroft 2000). Pollution not only regulates the behaviour of Gypsies and Travellers from within their community, but, enables the community to separate themselves from the wider society. This leads on to the concept of symbolic boundaries (Cohen 1985) and it is to this I now turn to.

Symbolic Boundaries

Conforming to practises based on mochadi and marrie-mae, Gypsies and Travellers create a symbolic boundary between their community and the wider society (Okely 1983). In chapter two symbolic boundaries were discussed, drawing upon Cohen's (1985) important work in this field. There it was argued that a community is not constructed through locality but rather through a sense of belonging (Cohen 1985: 15). Members of a community construct the idea of boundaries through their everyday interactions. These boundaries are constructed through symbols formed by the practices of the members of a community. Such symbols can be found in the rites and rituals performed by the community (Cohen 1985: 23). In doing so, the community is able to unite against 'outsiders', as they create a symbolic boundary between their social world and the social world of 'others'. This research argues that symbolic boundaries are pivotal in Gypsy and Traveller communities, allowing Gypsies and Travellers to maintain their culture without interference from the Gorgor society. This can be evidenced through the moral codes adopted by the community, as well as the systems of community justice used to deal with those who transgress their value system.

Do Gypsies And Travellers Have A Common Set Of Shared Values?

As outlined in chapter two, early research into Gypsies and Travellers and their lifestyles led theorists to regard the community as outsiders, who had become so as a consequence of '*cultural disintegration*' (Okely 1983: 28). Such cultural

isolation was believed to be born from the need of Gypsies and Travellers to preserve their cultural identity from the outside world (Trigg 1967). Yet, as Okely rightly argues, this notion greatly plays down the fact that isolation was, and is, more often imposed onto Gypsies and Travellers. This is evidenced through social policies and excessive policing of Gypsy and Traveller communities (James 2006, Richardson 2006 and Bancroft 2000). This leads to a somewhat complex position for Gypsies and Travellers in society. On the one hand they attempt to retain independence while never really being free from the dominant society; yet on the other hand they appear to defy many of norms and values professed by the wider British society; they resist sedentarism and are often described as 'lawless' (Weyrauch 2001 and Okely 1983). Nevertheless, as this research has shown Gypsies and Travellers, far from being 'lawless' abide by a strict moral code, which at times conflicts with the values professed by the wider society. Consequently Gypsies and Travellers are often portrayed as deviant (Mason *et al.* 2009). The moral codes adopted by Gypsies and Travellers and how these may at times conflict with the values professed by the wider society will now be discussed.

Conflicting Values

The idea of ethnic minority groups striving to maintain their cultural heritage is certainly not new. Indeed, as discussed in chapter two Wardak (2000) provides an interesting insight into how young Pakistani males in Edinburgh experience a conflict between the values of their parent's culture and those professed by their host culture. Through his ethnographic study, Wardak (2000) is able to demonstrate the tensions experienced by the young Pakistani population who are able to gradually adapt to new values, nonetheless, he notes;

...exclusionary practices and discrimination against Edinburgh's Pakistani population have not only slowed down their integration, but have created a need for them to strengthen and even revive their traditional cultural institutions (Wardak 2000: 253).

In this sense, Wardak's argument is in line with Okely's positioning on Gypsies and Travellers. Certainly, Wardak (2000) is able to recognise the paradoxical relationship experienced by the young Pakistani population, and while he does not refer to this, such actions force their community to adopt a bricolage approach

to British culture. Crucially, Wardak's (2000) focus was on young peoples' attitudes within a specific Pakistani community. In terms of my research, no comparison of age was provided, hence, it is possible that different generations of Gypsies and Travellers possess alternative values. Regardless of such differences, Wardak (2000) provides a useful comparison with this current research. Likewise, Blagg (2008) also alludes to the notion of bricolage in his influential and enlightening work on Australia's Aboriginal population. He argues that Aborigines, on the one hand desire much from the mainstream, however, they seek these desires in combination with a range of traditional demands from their Aboriginal culture.

Corresponding to the work of Wardak (2000) and Blagg (2008) what is evident is that Gypsies and Travellers possess some values that conflict with the values held by the wider society. Examples of these conflicting values can be seen in chapter five, the most divisive being the Gypsies' and Travellers' rejection of a sedentary lifestyle in favour of nomadism (Okely 1983). A nomadic lifestyle is important to Gypsies and Travellers; it is a means of maintaining contact with family and friends, developing new relationships and developing business networks, as well as conducting business. More importantly by travelling, Gypsies and Travellers are able to establish their cultural identity. Nonetheless, mainstream society views such behaviour with disdain, perceiving illegal encampments as part of the 'Gypsy problem'. Consequently, a range of legislation has been implemented in an attempt to curb the nomadic traditions of Gypsy and Traveller communities, most notable in recent years being the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act (1994). The implementation of such polices has meant that it has become increasingly difficult for Gypsies and Travellers to maintain a nomadic lifestyle (see chapter two). Indeed as James (2007) notes:

Perhaps the most over-arching limit placed on Gypsies' and Travellers' lives in the 20th century in England and Wales was the Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994 (CJPOA) that made it an offence for anyone to stop on any land that they did not own, or have planning permission to reside on (James 2007: 369).

Many early anthropologists argued that Gypsies and Travellers have different values from those held by the wider society (see Trigg 1976 and Bonos 1942).

However, my research suggests such arguments were somewhat simplistic and that Gypsies' and Travellers' value systems are far more complex than merely being different. If we take Gypsies' and Travellers' attitudes toward education as an example, the complexity of the Gypsies' and Travellers' values becomes more apparent.

As noted in chapter five, Gypsies and Travellers hold different values about education than those held by the wider society. At first glance, Gypsies' and Travellers' reluctance to allow their children to attend full-time education could appear both unlawful and deviant. Nevertheless, when the reasons behind this decision are unravelled, it is evident that Gypsies' and Travellers' moral values collide with those held by the wider society. As we are able to discern from chapter five, there are a number of reasons for Gypsies and Travellers not wanting their children to remain in education. Such reasons include the teaching of sexual education, illicit drug use and the importance of learning and working within the family unit. Hence, Gypsies and Travellers appear deviant to members of the wider society, which fail to recognise the moral code adopted by their community. Nevertheless, for Gypsies and Travellers to deviate from this moral code would have significant consequences for a family unit. The ramifications for a family that fails to abide by the moral code of their community are varied and can include: problems in the labour market, avoidance of the family (including unwillingness to marry into the family) and being unwelcome on sites (see chapter five).

Evidently, the values shared among Gypsies and Travellers, conflict with the norms and values generally shared by the wider society. The consequences of such conflict of values are of great significance for many marginalised and socially excluded communities (Arsovska and Verduyn 2008). Indeed, as Sellin (1938) concedes, laws reflect the values of the dominant groups in society. Clearly, society fails to recognise the legitimacy of moral codes that are deemed different or clash with those of the dominant group (see Arsovska and Verduyn 2008, Young 1999 and Sellin 1938). This is certainly apparent within this research, whereby society fails to recognise the moral codes of Gypsies and Travellers.

As discussed in chapter two, Elias and Scotson (1965) argue that through the creation of power and status, an established community is able to stigmatize newcomers, who they see as being deviant and the cause of crime problems within their area. In doing so, established groups are able to achieve a sense of cohesion. Thus by asserting their superior status, they not only maintain their authority but are able to keep ‘outsiders’ in their place. In terms of Gypsies and Travellers, they are clearly depicted as ‘lawless’ outsiders, and have often been blamed for crimes and disruption of the communities in which they live (see Vanderbeck 2003). Such imagery persists, in spite of Gypsies and Travellers abiding by a strict moral code, as this research highlights.

Harm And Techniques Of Neutralisation: Understanding Attitudes To Crime

Having outlined the moral code adopted by Gypsy and Traveller communities and how at times this conflicts with the values professed by the wider society, the focus now shifts to Gypsies’ and Travellers’ attitudes towards crime. I begin by referring back to the types of crimes commonly associated with Gypsies and Travellers (Dawson 2000). It is important to reiterate that no control group of similar characteristics were studied as part of this current research. Moreover, it is not the purpose of this research to examine the types of crime committed by Gypsies and Travellers. Rather, the intention of this research was to develop an understanding of Gypsies’ and Travellers’ attitudes towards crime, in doing so, it is argued that Gypsies and Travellers adopt techniques of neutralisation to rationalize these attitudes (Sykes and Matza 1957).

As noted previously, Gypsies and Travellers are often depicted as ‘lawless’ despite abiding to a strict moral code. There are a number of crimes associated with Gypsies and Travellers. Interestingly, Dawson first produced a list of crimes linked to Gypsies and Travellers during the 1960s and reproduced the data for a report in 2000. While many are critical of Dawson for using out-dated data (see Richardson 2006) his findings do have some resonance with this current research. It is important to note however, that Dawson (2000) was concerned with crimes

commonly associated with Gypsy and Traveller communities, whereas, this research as noted above, focuses on the attitudes of Gypsies and Travellers. The types of crimes listed by Dawson included: poaching, bare knuckle fighting, shoplifting, defrauding the elderly, thefts from the elderly, tarmac scams, antique scams, antique theft, social security fraud, vehicle crime, caravan theft, IRA connections and major crime. This research was unable to explore all the types of crime Dawson outlines. For instance, it did not explore the attitudes toward poaching, defrauding and stealing from the elderly, antique theft and scams and IRA connections. The reason for not doing so was addressed in chapter four. The issue of bare knuckle fighting was explored, but as this is part of the informal justice system used by Gypsies and Travellers and it will not be discussed here, but considered later.

In seeking a fuller understanding of Gypsy and Travellers attitudes toward crime, the research distinguished between 'outsider' crime and crime from 'within'. Here, this research develops on from Dawson (2000) who only looked at crime linked to Gypsies and Travellers against outsiders, thus failing to look at crimes between Gypsies and Travellers. This important omission could have significant implications for his findings. Indeed, as this research has acknowledged, crime against outsiders is measured by the level of harm that the offence may cause, a concept that Dawson neglects to recognise. Yet, the notion of harm is integral in the Gypsy and Traveller communities' attitudes toward crime, it is to this that I now turn attention.

In Chapter six, I discussed the perceived '*lawlessness*' of Gypsies and Travellers. It highlighted the attitudes of society and the stereotyped view of Gypsies and Travellers as criminogenic. For example, a recent BBC documentary '*The Gypsy Child Thieves*' (BBC 2009) was referred to, in which as the title suggests, and as was depicted throughout the programme, Gypsies and Travellers educate their children in the art of stealing and pick-pocketing. Such imagery results in moral panics and a negative discourse regarding Gypsies and Travellers, (see Bancroft 2005 and Acton 1994). However, as this research has shown, Gypsies and Travellers have a strict moral code toward crime, in that they distinguish between crime that harms and crime that they rightly or wrongly feel does not cause harm.

Moreover, far from being lawless, the majority of Gypsies and Travellers are able to separate themselves from those who do commit offences that they perceive as harmful. It has been argued that in so doing they apply techniques of neutralisation in their attitudes toward crime (Sykes and Matza 1957).

A detailed discussion of Sykes and Matza's (1957) techniques of neutralisation was provided in chapter two and is again revisited in chapter six, where it was noted that the theory was initially developed to understand juvenile delinquency. Sykes and Matza (1957) recognised that young offenders were able to distinguish between appropriate and inappropriate targets of crime. Through this it is argued they developed techniques of neutralisation. The authors describe five techniques by which the young offenders were able to justify crime, thus allowing the individual to maintain both their self image and their bonds with society. In this way, then, they were able to violate the norms of society, while at the same time remaining to these norms partially committed (Ball 1966). With this in mind Dodder and Hughes (1993) suggest that neutralisation is a process by which individuals

do not reject prevailing moral principles but accept them while simultaneously finding excuses or temporary justifications for behaviour which run counter to those values (Dodder and Hughes 1993: 65)

Accepting such a definition of the neutralisation process, here we can see a clear overlap with the concept of bricolage, and how this fits into the theoretical framework of this research. This will be discussed more fully later in this section, where the interconnection between these two theories will be given more attention, but for now, the techniques of neutralisation and the importance they have in understanding Gypsies' and Travellers' attitudes toward crime needs exploring more fully.

While neutralisation theory is somewhat dated, and focused primarily on young people, it has seen a resurgence of interest in recent years, in which it has been applied to different groups of offenders. For example, Elisaon and Dodder (1999) provide an interesting account of poachers and how they are able to adapt these techniques to justify their criminal behaviour. Again, Piquero *et al.* (2005) apply

neutralisation theory in the decision making process of corporate criminals. Much of the empirical evidence supporting, and indeed disputing, the theory of neutralisation have focused on criminal acts that have already taken place, (see Piquero *et al.* 2005, Copes 2003 and Eliason and Dodder 1999). In contrast, this research is not concerned with actual criminal acts. The purpose of this research was to understand the attitudes of Gypsies and Travellers towards crime. Nevertheless, these attitudes have resonance with previous work relating to techniques of neutralisation. While the analytical framework adopted by Piquero *et al.* (2005) could be questioned, they are able to demonstrate that many corporate criminals are able to justify their actions by denying both injury and responsibility. The theory of neutralisation has also been adapted by other writers. For example in chapter two it was noted that other variables have been added in the justification of crime: Minor (1981) provides the '*defence of necessity*' and Coleman (1994) suggest, '*the denial of necessity of the law*' and '*everybody else is doing it*'. However, it is argued here that these additional variables were already accounted for in Sykes and Matza's (1957) original theory. Here, it is worthwhile reminding ourselves of the five elements of neutralisation that Sykes and Matza (1957) identified: the denial of responsibility, the denial of injury, the denial of the victim, the condemnation of the condemners; and an appeal to higher loyalties. Each of these has been discussed in detail previously (see chapter two) and they will not be repeated here. I will instead focus on the two elements that have most relevance for this research, those being denial of injury and denial of a victim.

The attitudes toward stealing held by many Gypsies and Travellers presents a clear insight as to how the idea of harm is associated with crime and as such techniques of neutralisation. It was noted earlier that Dawson (2000) claimed that Gypsies and Travellers justify stealing from the elderly and defrauding the elderly as almost fair game, suggesting it is society's fault for not looking after the elderly properly. In many ways, what is being suggested here by Dawson is a form of denial of responsibility: if society took adequate care of the elderly such crimes would not exist. Yet, this research found no evidence of Gypsies and Travellers supporting crime against the elderly. In fact, quite the opposite was apparent. Throughout my observations, and interviews with Gypsies and

Travellers, the idea of harming the elderly in anyway was completely abhorrent. The words of Bridget sum up the feelings held by all those from Gypsy and Traveller communities who participated in this research:

...peoples that 'arm the elderly that's just wrong, they'd have no business here (on-site) for certain, people who does that sort of thing... well it is so wrong, nothing is too good for 'em...

Bridget (Interview).

In other words, far from denying responsibility, Gypsies and Travellers found such offences completely unjustifiable. They related them to both injury and the impacts on victims, and therefore represented them as strictly off limits. In the same way, illicit drug use, burglary and sexual abuse, where a clear victim and injury can be discerned are disapproved of. If a Gypsy and Traveller committed any of these offences, the community would act swiftly to deal with the transgression (see chapter seven and discussion below).

In contrast, if no victim or injury is apparent, the attitude towards crimes changes. In line with previous literature, denial of a victim or injury is influential in how attitudes toward crime are formed. For example, Piquero *et al.* (2005) found that corporate criminals disregarded injury as an over-exaggeration of the government and therefore, becomes significant in how this type of crime is perceived. Similarly, as shown in chapter six, shoplifting and stealing from corporations was generally seen as harmless by Gypsies and Travellers, who believed that businesses could afford to lose some items as they would be covered by insurance or they saw no real victim in such crimes. Hence, they are able to justify their attitudes to these forms of stealing. Similar results can be found among car thieves who see no victim, believing the car will be covered by insurance (Copes 2003).

Interestingly, neutralisation is by no means a rejection of society's norms, but as Eliason and Dodder (1999) suggests:

neutralization... does not involve a total rejection of the dominant cultural values of the society in which they live but instead involves the acceptance of those values while at the same time making exceptions to the values that excuse their misbehaviour (Eliason and Dodder 1999: 235).

Evidently, this research supports Eliason and Dodder's (1999) understanding of neutralisation. It is clear that Gypsies and Travellers accept many of the moral values professed by the wider society, and yet are able to make exceptions in relation to other values, reflecting their different attitudes to crimes that they deem justifiable. It is argued here that the process of neutralisation runs parallel with the notion of bricolage. As a marginalised community (see Richardson 2006, Morris 1999, Kenrick and Bakewell 1995 and Sibley 1981) Gypsies and Travellers have been able to adapt values from their culture and the society in which they reside, at the same rejecting other values. This allows them to neutralise their attitudes toward certain crimes.

The 'Outsiders'

Having outlined the attitudes of the Gypsies and Travellers towards crime, this section will now go on to explore their attitudes towards those who fail to abide by the community's moral codes. As we have previously seen (see chapters two, five and six) some Gypsies and Travellers do not always comply with the moral codes held by the majority in their community (Okely 2005, Acton *et al.* 1996, Gronfors 1986 and Bonos 1942). It was not the intention of this research to explore in detail the crimes committed by and between members of Gypsy and Traveller communities. Nevertheless, what is apparent from this research is that in line with all other communities in society, there are some Gypsies and Travellers that do commit crimes, some of which, it was noted, fell within the categories of serious and organised crimes (see chapter six). As such, the findings from this research are consistent with previous research focusing on Gypsies and Travellers (Okely 2005, Acton *et al.* 1996, Gronfors 1986 and Bonos 1942). However, what is evident here is that those within Gypsy and Traveller communities who comply with the moral values are able to separate themselves from those who deviate through the process of '*Othering*'.

It is clear from this, and previous research, that Gypsies and Travellers are fiercely proud and protective of their cultural identity (see Greenfields 2006a, Bancroft 2005, Acton *et al.* 1996 and Okely 1983). Therefore, they need to distinguish between those who comply, and those who deviate from the moral

codes. As seen in chapters five and six, transgressors are labelled as the 'newer' or 'rougher' Gypsies and Travellers, and the conformers view themselves as the 'true' Gypsies and Travellers. In understanding this pattern, the work of Elias and Scotson (1965) was drawn upon to explain how members of one group are able to use power to stigmatize members of a similar group. Established groups it was argued had a common set of shared values and the arrival of newcomers was seen as a threat against their way of life. Thus newer groups are blamed for any wrongdoing in their community. More recent studies such as that by Evans (2001) are able to demonstrate this process. Looking at a virtual community, it was shown how established groups labelled newcomers as 'mugs' who lacked the power to challenge the authority of the long-serving members. While Evans (2001) adopted social disorganisation theory to explain this behaviour, there is clear evidence of the established group stigmatizing newcomers, through the power they have acquired. Bauman (2001); whose interesting study of refugees highlights the process of negotiating the power balance between groups, provides a clearer contemporary example of Elias and Scotson's (1965) theory. Indeed, refugees are stigmatized by the already established groups who see the newcomers as a threat to their security and social order.

For this research I have adopted the notion of 'Othering' to emphasize the stigmatizing process used by the established group over newcomers in Gypsy and Traveller communities. It is the newcomers to Gypsy and Traveller communities that are blamed for transgressions of the moral code and in the words of Maggie:

...tarnishing us all with the same brush...

Maggie (Interview)

Hence, it is important for the established groups to distinguish between themselves and those who break the moral codes. Many of the Gypsies and Travellers who participated in this research had lived on the same sites for many generations, in some cases as many as four generations. As such, they had developed contacts in the outside world, and many were well respected both within their community and outside.

Interestingly, Elias and Scotson (1965) and Bauman (2001) allude to the role of gossip in the power dynamics between the established and outsiders, the purpose

of which is to maintain social hierarchies. Certainly, gossip among Gypsies and Travellers provides an important means of maintaining social order (Okely 2005). This research argues that the role of gossip is two-fold. First, it allows members of the Gypsy and Traveller group to distinguish between the 'newer' Gypsies and Travellers and the 'established' groups of Gypsies and Travellers. This is evident in the following statement by Mary:

...them (newer Travellers) they're dirty, they cause all the problems
'round 'ere they don't know the ways and yeah they're dirty like,
they're mochadi

Mary (Interview).

Here, Mary is not only able to distinguish herself from what she sees as the newer Gypsies and Travellers, but through the use of gossip she pronounces them as being unclean and as such, polluted. Again, we see how pollution is used in the demarcation of the symbolic boundaries adopted by Gypsies and Travellers. Interestingly, here pollution is used to separate the established group from the newer arrivals to Gypsy and Traveller communities. This is not unusual between groups, as it reinforces social hierarchies, with established groups perceiving outsiders as not only unruly, but also unclean (Elias and Scotson 1965: VII). The second function of gossip among Gypsies and Travellers, forms part of their informal community justice system. I will discuss this in more depth shortly (see discussion below) by looking at how the governance of Gypsy and Traveller communities, described by Stenson (2005) as 'governance from below' is underpinned by the rhetoric of restorative justice (Braithwaite 1989). But before this, let us address the question posed at the introduction of this section of the chapter, namely, *do Gypsies and Travellers have a common set of shared values?*

In answer to this question, I argue that the Gypsies and Travellers abide by a moral code. This code is embodied in the rites and rituals performed by Gypsies and Travellers and allows the community to construct a symbolic boundary between themselves and the wider society. The moral code adopted by the community at times conflicts with the codes shared by the wider society. In order to satisfy the demands of their culture that are discordant with the latter, the Gypsies and Travellers establish a '*bricolage*' approach.

In terms of attitudes toward crime, Gypsies and Travellers distinguish between crimes that they consider to be harmful and harmless. This is best understood through Sykes and Matza's (1957) framework of neutralisation, in which individuals justify certain forms of crime by claiming that no injury or victim has resulted from their actions.

Finally, within Gypsy and Traveller communities, distinctions are made between those who are held to conform to the codes and those that are held to deviate. Applying Elias and Scotson's (1965) theory of power differentials, it is argued that Gypsies and Travellers differentiate between 'established' and 'newer' members of their community. It is the newer stigmatized members, who lack the power of the established group, who are blamed for violations of the moral code.

How Are Deviant And Criminal Acts Dealt With, Or Resolved By Gypsies And Travellers?

The concept of governance, traditionally referring to the constitutional and institutional development of police policies and practices, has evolved with recognition of the increasing number of sites in which crime control is operated (Jones 2007: 842) and the differing ways in which crime has come to be controlled in an era of globalisation. The state is no longer singularly responsible for the governance of crime, and as Edwards and Hughes (2005) acknowledge, there are many different levels of governance within a nation state (see chapter three). In chapter three, it was also noted that many groups within society actively resist state power, by setting out their own programme of governance, enabling them to maintain solidarity among group members. Stenson (2005) refers to this form of governance as '*folk bio-politics*' that is 'governance from below' (Stenson 2005: 267).

As argued in chapter three, the erosion of state governance in favour of governance from below, or within communities, is certainly not a new phenomenon. For example, over the years many tribal communities have refused to conform to nation states' modes of governance, instead opting to seek

resolutions to deviant and criminal transgressions within the community and without recourse to the state (see Bohannan 1957, Leach 1954 and Evans-Pritchard 1949). Indeed, many early anthropologists emphasised the importance of systems of informal community justice adopted by many tribal communities. For example Marchetti and Daly (2004) write:

Indigenous participation in sentencing procedures has been occurring informally in remote communities for sometime... (Marchetti and Daly 2004: 1).

This current research examined the systems of informal community justice practised by Gypsies and Travellers. It recognises the opposition that Gypsies and Travellers feel toward state forms of governance and power in relation to crime and crime control. It is argued here, that Gypsies and Travellers have opted out of the state sites of governance in preference for the '*folk bio-politics*' of governance from below (Stenson 2005). Importantly, members of Gypsy and Traveller communities are able to relate to '*folk modes*' of expertise to deliver governance in particular geographical and ethnic locations. Stenson (2005) developed the notion of folk modes in recognition that many groups in society are organised through an oral discourse, which enables them to gather collectively to govern populations within their realm. As noted previously, there are many sites of folk bio-politics in society. For instance in chapter three it was argued that youth organisations, resident associations, aboriginal populations, ethnic, criminal and paramilitary organisations have developed alternative sites to state governance (see Blagg 2008, Stenson 2005 and Brewer *et al.* 1998). However, it is argued here that the resistance to state governance among Gypsies and Travellers is in part historical (Acton *et al.* 1997) but has also developed out of necessity. As previous research has shown and is corroborated here, the policing of Gypsies and Travellers can be somewhat over zealous, yet as victims of crime Gypsy and Traveller communities are often ignored by the official criminal justice system (Foley 2006 and Foley 2005). Here, similarities with Native American populations, Aboriginal and other marginalised groups are evident (see Blagg 2008 and Gross 2001).

Modes Of Informal Community Justice

In the administration of governance from below, members of Gypsies and Travellers have developed a number of ways to ensure that through informal systems of justice, resolutions to criminal and deviant transgressions can be sought. In previous chapters (see chapter three and seven) it has been noted that Gypsies and Travellers have a variety of means available to them to ensure that justice is delivered. These include community courts (Creese), fighting, gossip and avoidance. The different mechanisms of informal community justice have been well documented by previous researchers (see Okely 2005, Weyrauch 2001, Acton *et al.* 1997 and Gronfors 1977) and evidence in this research helps verify the use of alternative modes of justice among Gypsies and Travellers. It also supports Acton *et al.*'s (1997) argument that, while the techniques of informal community justice may differ between different groups of Gypsies and Travellers, the outcome remains the same: that is, the construction of a symbolic boundary between members of Gypsy and Traveller communities and the wider society. The purpose of this separation is to allow Gypsy and Traveller communities to maintain their social order and solidarity, particularly at a time when policies, the state and the media fail to recognise the needs and lifestyle of Gypsies and Travellers, resulting in further isolation of an already marginalised community (see Richardson 2006 and Bancroft 2005).

Forms Of Informal Community Justice: Restorative Justice

Restorative justice practices and policies, as outlined in chapter three, have increased significantly both in the UK and elsewhere (see Blagg 2008, Marchetti and Daly 2004 and Gross 2001). So much so, Braithwaite (1996) refers to restorative justice as a '*global social movement*' (Braithwaite 1996: 56). However, many of the practices and policies claiming to be restorative justice differ immensely in terms of outcomes and objectives (Walgarve 2008 and Pratt 2006). Morris (2001) goes as far as to suggest that many forms of restorative justice fall under the remit of vigilantism: they tend to be repressive, retributive, hierarchical and patriarchal, thus contradicting the underlying principles of

restorative justice, and therefore should not be classified as such (Morris 2002: 609). The community justice systems employed by Gypsies and Travellers could certainly be argued to be patriarchal, indeed, evidence presented in chapter seven highlighted the limited role that women, have particularly within the Creese and fighting where they are often excluded from the proceedings. Yet women play a significant role in terms of contaminating others through *mochadi* and *marrie-mae*. It is argued here, that justice among Gypsies and Travellers can be explained through the principles of restorative justice. Arguing against Morris's (2002) stance, it is contended that, while inequities may exist within this system, underpinning the Gypsies' and Travellers' informal community justice is the notion of repairing the harm that an offence may have caused to the victim and the community (Walgrave 2008).

In this regard, there are clear parallels between the system of community justice employed by Gypsies and Travellers and indigenous populations such as Aboriginal, native Americans, Inuit, Maori and pre-colonial inhabitants of the South Pacific Islands (Blagg 2008, Weitekamp 1999 and Consedine 1995) as well as groups in conflict (McEvoy and Mika 2002). For instance, Blagg (2008) observes that traditional forms of Aboriginal justice, while fitting within the principles of restorative justice, can be retributive; shouting, hitting, fighting and physical punishments may occur, as well as, cursing and sorcery (Blagg 2007: 83). These are clearly not the images one equates with restorative justice, yet the purpose of such events is to allow the successful reintegration of the offender into their community, while at the same time allowing for the harm caused by their actions to be repaired. It is in this sense that restorative justice has been applied in the analysis of this research. As Walgrave (2008) contends, restorative justice is by no means a soft option in itself, it necessitates the process of apology, which entails humiliation and degradation for the offender(s) (Walgrave 2008: 46).

Drawing upon Braithwaite's (1989) notion of restorative justice, this research has shown how Gypsies and Travellers place a high level of importance on shame (*ladge*). As noted previously (see chapters three and seven) shame can be either stigmatizing or reintegrative, with the latter being the most effective form (Braithwaite 1989). Reintegrative shame allows an offender who is able to

recognise the harm they have caused to their victim(s), to re-enter their community. This research has shown that Gypsies and Travellers have been able to successfully apply reintegrative shaming in their system of informal community justice. The process of rehabilitation of offenders among Gypsies and Travellers can be observed through the employment of reacceptance ceremonies that are quickly followed by gestures of reacceptance (see chapter seven). Yet, it is argued, the severity of some offences within Gypsy and Traveller communities, is such that the only course of action available is the permanent removal of the offender(s). Here, shame becomes disintegrative: this not only allows Gypsies and Travellers to unite against the offender and thus maintain the social order of the community, but also acts as a deterrent for future offences.

In response to how deviant and criminal acts are resolved by Gypsies and Travellers, I have referred to Stenson's (2005) perspective of 'governance from below' to account for the folk bio-politics employed by Gypsy and Traveller communities, thus recognising the varying measures available to groups in society to tackle social harms. For Gypsies and Travellers such measures can include a creese, fighting, gossip and avoidance. These vary in their level of formality. Nevertheless, the purpose of the system remains the same; the successful reintegration of the offender back into their community. Hence, resolutions in Gypsy and Traveller communities embody the principles of restorative justice espoused by Braithwaite (1989).

How And When Do Gypsies And Travellers Have Recourse To Formal Agents Of Social Control?

A recent report by the Ministry of Justice conceded that a lack of knowledge exists among professionals working with minority groups concerning access to justice and 'justiciable' problems (Mason *et al.* 2009). It recognised that many disadvantaged groups have little recourse to the criminal justice system, and that the needs of many marginalised communities, including black ethnic minority groups, Gypsies and Travellers, asylum seekers and the Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual communities, remain unmet by the criminal justice system, as both

victims and perpetrators of crime. While each of these groups can be said to fit into wider socially excluded communities, the Social Exclusion Unit (SEU) have focused much of their attention on the BME's, and failed thus far to recognise the divergent needs of other groups (Mason *et al.* 2009). A consequence of this has been that agents of social control have little understanding of the specific needs of these groups, and that many practices and policies aimed at marginalised communities can be discriminating (see Mason *et al.* 2009, Foley 2006, James 2006, Richardson 2006 and Bancroft 2005). As a result, members of the socially excluded groups outlined above often fail to accept the legitimacy of official agents of social control (Mason *et al.* 2009 and Foley 2006).

Mason *et al.* (2009) emphasise the need for more research pertaining to access to justice for vulnerable groups in the UK. This research goes some way to redress the lack of empirical evidence relating to the recourse of Gypsies and Travellers to official agents of social control.

The Relationship Between The 'Police' And Gypsies And Travellers

This research has focused on the 'policing' of Gypsies and Travellers in its broadest sense. As such, it does not concentrate solely on the police but has incorporated other agents that have a responsibility in the social control of Gypsies and Travellers (see Jones 2003). Hence, the analysis has included the police, policy officers, Gypsy and Traveller liaison groups, and site wardens (see chapters four and eight). In order to better understand the recourse that members of Gypsy and Traveller communities have to these official agents of social control, the analysis began by exploring relationships between Gypsies and Travellers and those responsible for the 'policing' of this community. This led to a distinction between 'good' and 'poor' relationships and a discussion of their consequences in terms of the recourse that Gypsies and Travellers have to services from these authorities. If we begin by looking at the 'poor' relationships between them, this becomes clearer.

The relationship between the police and Gypsies and Travellers historically has been somewhat contentious (James 2007 and 2006, Foley 2005, Taggart 2000, Lomax *et al.* 2000 and Kenrick and Bakewell 1995). The cause of this divisive relationship can be understood by the over zealous policing of the community, whereby the law has traditionally been enforced through stringent tactics (see James 2007 and 2006, Foley 2005 and Lomax *et al.* 2000). Such policing has been described as '*beyond normative measures*' (see James 2006 and Maguire 2000). Corresponding with previous research focusing on the policing of the Gypsies and Travellers, evidence presented here is able to highlight heavy handed policing of this community as a key factor in the problematic relationships it has with external authorities (see chapter eight).

Problems arising from unhelpful Government policies, particularly in relation to illegal encampments, and misunderstandings about the lifestyle and cultural needs of Gypsies and Travellers, have hindered the already fragile relationship the police and this community. Likewise, the lack of understanding and dialogue between these groups has meant that Gypsies and Travellers are disinclined to engage and work with those responsible for the policing of the community.

Nevertheless, there are many examples of good practice between Gypsies and Travellers and the police (James 2006 and Coxhead 2007). For instance a recent consultation between the Metropolitan Police and Gypsy and Traveller groups, led to recognition by the police authority that the police were perceived by the Gypsies and Travellers to be enforcers of the settled community's law against their rights and responsibilities, and subsequently the development of a more coherent role for Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officers. This new role is to be based on community and intelligence needs (Metropolitan Police 2006: 6). John Coxhead (2007), a long serving police Gypsy and Traveller Liaison Officer, is well respected by the community he serves, and provides one of the best examples of the good working relationships between these two groups. As a result of the relationship he has been able to develop with Gypsy and Traveller communities, Coxhead (2007) discovered more willingness among Gypsies and Travellers to actively engage with the police.

This research did uncover some good relations between Gypsy and Traveller communities and the 'police', and where such relationships did exist there was certainly a greater capacity for more positive engagement between the Gypsies and Travellers and agents of social control.

Recourse To Official Agents Of Social Control

In chapter eight it was noted that Gypsies and Travellers rarely involve the police with internal conflicts (see Foley 2006 and James 2006). This stems in part from the poor relationships between these two groups. Nevertheless, evidence in this research has illustrated that Gypsies and Travellers on occasion will engage with the police in certain circumstances.

There are two main situations in which this happens. Firstly Gypsies and Travellers will have recourse to the police if an internal conflict is '*getting out of control*'. In this situation, Gypsies and Travellers seek assistance from the police to resolve the problem. In this sense, engagement with the police is a last resort, used to stop a hostile situation. Once this is achieved, the matter returns to a status of an internal affair. The second form of engagement with the police, is a means for Gypsies and Travellers to solve ongoing conflicts. This situation sees members of the 'established' community inform on other Gypsies and Travellers, feeding the police information about the criminal activity of newer members. The purpose of this is to allow the established group to consolidate their status in the social hierarchy of their community. They will continue to inform the police about the lesser established group, until the newer members either acknowledge defeat and leave the campsite, or conform to the demands of the established group.

In summary, evidence presented here has demonstrated how the notion of legitimacy plays a vital part in Gypsies and Travellers engagement with the 'police'. A lack of recognition of the legitimacy of the policing of their community means that Gypsies and Travellers are hesitant to involve them in internal matters. Indeed, the type of relationship between these two groups has a significant bearing on whether or not Gypsies and Travellers will engage with the

police. Hence, where there is a problematic relationship, the police lack legitimacy in the eyes of Gypsies and Travellers, and the latter are generally reluctant to engage with them. Counter to this, when the relationship between these two groups is more open, the community are better able to recognise the legitimacy of the police, and more inclined to seek recourse with them.

However, even where relationships are poor and police legitimacy is low, the community will in certain circumstances seek police assistance in particular when a conflict has spiralled out of control and they lack the means to deal with it internally. Recourse to the police can also be used as a means of maintaining power differentials, in particular through informing on, and in some cases to remove rivals from the camp.

Conclusion

Drawing upon previous literature, as set out in chapters two and three, this chapter has discussed the empirical findings outlined in chapters five through to eight. In doing so, each of the research questions underpinning this study has been addressed in turn. The chapter began outlining the theoretical position adopted throughout this research. It examined the key conceptual themes that have been central to this research, including the concepts of bricolage, pollution and symbolic boundaries. The first section of the chapter, addressed the first main research question. Focusing on the attitudes of Gypsies and Travellers toward crime, it concluded that Gypsies and Travellers abide by a strict moral code, although many of the values held by this community conflicting with the values professed by the wider society. It also argued that these attitudes toward crime can be understood in terms of the community adopting techniques of 'neutralisation' (Sykes and Matza 1957). Moreover, when Gypsies and Travellers transgress the moral codes they are distinguished and separated from those who abide by the rules through the process of 'othering'. Here, there are parallels with Elias and Scotson's (1965) work on established and outsider groups.

The chapter then went on to address the second of the research questions, *How are deviant and criminal acts dealt with, or resolved Gypsies and Travellers?* Here it was shown that Gypsies and Travellers have a number of mechanisms available to them to informally deal with those who transgress the moral boundaries. Understanding the need for 'governance from below' (Stenson 2005) it was argued that Gypsies and Travellers deliver an informal system of justice, based substantially on the principles of restorative justice (Braithwaite 1998).

Finally, the chapter addressed the third and final research question; *How and when do Gypsies and Travellers have recourse to formal agents of social control?* It was noted that in general, Gypsies and Travellers fail to recognise legitimacy of formal agents of social control. This stems partly from the unhelpful practices that have traditionally been adopted in 'policing' of Gypsy and Traveller communities. However, as recognised here, there are many pockets of good practice between agents of social control and Gypsies and Travellers. Where such practices exist, Gypsies and Travellers are able to have a greater understanding of the legitimacy of the police and therefore more frequent and less hostile with them. Moreover, there are certain circumstances (mainly arises in which disputes get out of control, as well as rivalry between established and newer members of the community) in which even those communities that have very poor relationships with the police will call them in order to resolve problems, in a highly instrumental fashion.

The concluding chapter of this thesis will explore the impact of the findings of this research on both social policy and future research.

Chapter Ten:

Conclusion

Introduction

The purpose of this thesis has been to develop a greater understanding of Gypsies and Travellers experiences of crime and justice. At the heart of this research are three key questions that I identified as being important to the understanding of how crime and justice are perceived and practised amongst Gypsies and Travellers. In short these covered whether Gypsies and Travellers have a common set of shared values, how they resolve transgressions within their community, and their relationship with and recourse to official agents of social control. To this end, I adopted an ethnographic approach, as it was felt that this would provide a rich source of data from which a theoretical framework could be established. In the previous chapter I presented a detailed account of the theory I have adopted to enable a greater understanding of the social world of Gypsies and Travellers and their views on crime and justice. The aim of this concluding chapter will be to draw all the previous chapters together. I briefly outline the findings of this research and discuss the potential impact of these in terms of policies and the direction of future research.

The research was carefully designed to ensure the methods used would allow for a rich source of qualitative data that at the same time took into account the specific needs and vulnerabilities of Gypsy and Traveller communities (Weckman 1998). The research methods used included: semi-structured interviews, participant observation, visual methods and analysis of life events written by Gypsies and Travellers. Ethnography was the preferred approach as it would allow for a greater understanding of a vulnerable group's experiences (Hobbs 2001). A total of fifteen in-depth interviews were conducted with Gypsies and Travellers. These were complemented by a further eleven interviews with stakeholders working for and with Gypsies and Travellers.

Crime, Justice And Policing Of Gypsies And Travellers

The original intention of this research was to understand the different mechanisms of informal community justice practised by Gypsies and Travellers. However, it soon became apparent that in order to achieve this it was important to research the attitudes of Gypsies and Travellers, as well as the recourse they have to official agents of social control. Indeed, these different aspects are very much intertwined, and inform how justice is delivered in Gypsy and Traveller communities. This research has drawn upon the notion of community and identity as experienced by the Gypsies and Travellers, and how the values of this community conflict with values professed by the wider society. The notion of harm was discussed, illustrating how this informs attitudes toward crime. I also recognised a system of informal community justice adopted by Gypsies and Travellers that is underpinned by the principles of restorative justice. Finally, the concept of policing accountability and legitimacy was noted, showing how this impacts on the Gypsy and Traveller communities' recourse to official agents of social control.

This research also explored the social construction of identity among Gypsies and Travellers through the rites and rituals they perform. These rituals are underpinned by the notion of pollution, distinguishing between the inner and outer body (Okely 1983). The dichotomy between the inside and outside plays an important part in the relationship between Gypsies and Travellers. The notion of pollution governs the behaviour of Gypsies and Travellers, for whom the aim of preventing contamination has high importance. In order to achieve this, they have developed a strict moral code. Through these mechanisms (rites and rituals, and the operation of a strict moral code) Gypsies and Travellers are able to separate themselves from non-Gypsies and Travellers, allowing the creation of a symbolic boundary (Cohen 1985).

While Gypsies and Travellers adhere to a strict moral code this at times conflicts with the values professed by the wider British society. This has led to a common image of Gypsies and Travellers as being 'lawless' (Weyrauch 2001). This is particularly evident in the nomadic lifestyle of Gypsies and Travellers and has led to conflicts with local communities and a plethora of legislation aimed at curbing this tradition. Another important example of how the values held by Gypsies and Travellers conflict with the values of the wider society can be seen in the reluctance of many Gypsy and Traveller communities to allow their children to attend fulltime education. This reluctance stems from a fear that their children will learn values and engage in activities that conflict with the codes of Gypsy and Traveller communities such as a liberal attitude to sex and the use of illicit drugs. This creates a problem for Gypsies and Travellers: their actions may appear deviant to non-Gypsies and Travellers, yet by failing to abide by the moral code of their community they risk losing their reputation and more importantly being labelled as 'marrie-mae' (polluted). The research therefore argues that Gypsies and Travellers are a 'bricolage' community, systematically accepting some values from the wider British society yet at the same time rejecting those values which they perceive as challenging to the culture and practices of their community (see Okely 1983).

The research further explored the attitudes of Gypsies and Travellers towards crime. As noted above, Gypsies and Travellers have been labelled as 'lawless' by others. Yet my thesis highlights that this is indeed not the case, as the community have a sophisticated system to deal with those who commit offences. It is important to note that there was no control group of non-Gypsies and Travellers of similar social characteristics included in this research. As a consequence, it is not possible to draw direct comparisons between the attitudes held by Gypsies and Travellers and those of the wider society. However, my research demonstrates that Gypsies' and Travellers' attitudes towards crime are influenced by notions of harm, as they define actions as criminal only when injury and or a victim is evident (Sykes and Matza 1957), adapting 'techniques of neutralisation' in relation to other illegal activities.

Evidence has shown that Gypsies and Travellers make use of their own system of justice to deal with transgressions of the moral adhered to by this community. The methods adopted by Gypsies and Travellers are somewhat diverse and can range from fighting, gossip and avoidance to a community court known as a 'Creese'. Drawing on Braithwaite's (1989) notion of restorative justice, my doctoral research demonstrates how through the use of 'ladge' (shame), together with reacceptance ceremonies those who transgress the moral codes can become reintegrated back into the community. Yet, the severity of some offences within Gypsy and Traveller communities is such that the only course of action available is the permanent removal of the offender(s) and a banishment order is issued. Here, shame becomes disintegrative such actions not only allow Gypsies and Travellers to unite against the offender and thus maintain the social order of the community, but also act as a deterrent for future offences.

Gypsies and Travellers have very limited recourse to official agents of social justice. This is, in part, due the reluctance of Gypsies and Travellers to recognise the legitimacy of the policing of their community. Here policing is used in its broadest sense (Crawford 1997). My thesis demonstrates that while there are some positive practices in the policing of Gypsy and Traveller communities, generally policing of Gypsies and Travellers is through enforcement which goes beyond normative limits (James 2007). Yet, greater understanding of the needs of Gypsies and Travellers through an open and positive dialogue may go some way in redressing this issue. Evidence has been presented which illustrates that a positive engagement with Gypsies and Travellers can create a greater sense of legitimacy. This in turn allows Gypsies and Travellers to seek recourse to police in times of need.

Policy Implications And Directions For Future Research

At the outset of this thesis it was recognised that Gypsies and Travellers have been either neglected in social policies or, when they have been included, have been affected negatively (see chapter one). As the Commission for Racial Equality testifies:

The services Gypsies and Travellers receive from their local authority are manifestly less favourable than those the wider public enjoy (CRE 2006: 18)

Disconcertingly, only four per cent of social service departments have policies aimed specifically at working with Gypsy and Traveller communities (see Cemyln 2008). This is in spite of the fact that Gypsies and Travellers are a 'high need' group requiring specialist care (see Hester 2004: 39). As a result Gypsies and Travellers have become a neglected and socially excluded community found on the margins of society, with little access to public services (see Mason and Broughton 2007). Hence, the image of Gypsies and Travellers as a socially excluded community is apparent; this is further compounded when one acknowledges the negative treatment the community has experienced as a result of legislation.

In chapter two, an account of the varying legislation that has impacted on the lifestyle of Gypsies and Travellers was outlined. It was argued that policies have pathologised many aspects of the Gypsy and Traveller social world, failing to acknowledge the cultural needs of the community (see Richardson 2006 and Bancroft 2005). It was also argued that policies reflect the values of the dominant group in society (Sellin 1938). This has meant that Gypsies and Travellers have been both persuaded and coerced into adopting a sedentary lifestyle through policies that have attempted to assimilate their community with the wider society (see Hester 2004). Through their resistance to legislation Gypsies and Travellers are viewed as 'deviant' by many in society (see Vanderbeck 2005). Regardless, the policies implemented by the New Labour Government since their election in 1997 have aimed to tackle social exclusion; this was embodied in the rhetoric of the Third Way (Atkinson and Flint 2004).

New Labour under the leadership of Tony Blair advocated a new policy approach that, in theory at least that would not be influenced by prevailing ideologies. Instead, his Government favoured a 'common sense' positioning to address a range of social problems experienced by the most vulnerable and isolated groups in the UK (Cook 2006). Social exclusion was judged to be key in dealing with inequalities and social injustice by supporters of the Third Way and New Labour

(Giddens 1998). In dealing with this issue, New Labour attempted to develop a holistic and 'joined-up Government' (JUG) embodied by more evidence based policy. This would enable the Government to explore policies around the notion of 'what works', which would be achieved through consultation with public bodies and members of local communities (Cook 2006). Many have been critical of the policies adopted by New Labour for failing to effectively tackle social exclusion, arguing that their policies have in practice led to the further isolation of vulnerable communities (see Cook 2006, Atkinson and Flint 2004, Clark 2002 and Stenson 2001).

Atkinson and Flint (2002) claim that policies such as the Crime and Disorder Act 1998, have been burdensome for many of the communities the legislation attempted to engage. Moreover, Cook (2006) attests that under many New Labour initiatives the socially disadvantaged are denied basic human rights and more importantly lack the power that would enable them to become socially included. This leads to many in society becoming '*unequal citizens*' (Cook 2006: 8).

What is evident from this research and previous literature on Gypsies and Travellers is that policies have had little impact in the direction of enabling the community to gain a status of social inclusion (see Cemyln 2008, Mason and Broughton 2007, Southern and James 2006, CRE, 2006, Bancroft 2005 and Hester 2004). For example, The Criminal Justice and Public Order Act 1994, which gave greater powers to the police in evicting Gypsies and Travellers from unauthorised sites (see James 2006) has had a number of repercussions on the lifestyle of Gypsy and Traveller communities. Legislation that impacts on the social world of Gypsies and Travellers is complex, meaning local authorities use their discretion in how and when policies are employed (see Mason *et al.* 2009). Yet, as is clear from this research, when barriers between the 'police' and the Gypsies and Travellers are broken down, their access to justice is enhanced and their sense of inclusion is recognised (see Mason *et al.* 2009 and James, 2007 and 2006). In-line with the philosophy of the Third Way this research has shown that when Gypsies and Travellers have an open and positive dialogue with policy makers the community has a greater sense of empowerment.

One of the most illuminating narratives stemming from this research was the desire for Gypsies and Travellers to have a voice in the decision making process on policies that will impact on their community. In chapter eight, it was shown how many in the community wanted to take a more active role in the management of the social world of Gypsies and Travellers. In the words of Tom:

who knows better than what is best for us, than us but no one ever asks, they should cos it would save a hell of a lot of bother

Tom (Interview)

Despite the willingness of Gypsies and Travellers to engage with official agents, in practice this has not been fully achieved. Coxhead (2007) argued that in the main police diversity officers had limited contact with Gypsies and Travellers. As such, they had no real understanding of the needs of the community and their cultural heritage. Breaking down these barriers, Coxhead (2007) argues would go some way in addressing the inequalities that Gypsies and Travellers experience in accessing justice. Certainly, if we take Tom's remarks, Gypsies and Travellers are able to vocalise their needs: they do not want to be a burden on the state but neglecting to listen to their voices not only compounds their sense of isolation, it reinforces negative images of the mainstream community.

The thesis addresses a gap in the social sciences namely the limited body of research pertaining to Gypsies and Travellers notions of crime and deviance and the employment of justice within this community (Mason *et al.* 2009). This is particularly pertinent as Gypsies and Travellers nomadic status not only conflicts with values professed by the wider British society but legislation has served to pathologise aspects of the lifestyle of this vulnerable community (Bancroft 2000). I have examined in some depth the attitudes of Gypsies and Travellers toward crime and deviance as well as how justice is administered within this community. Alongside this, aspects of the policing of Gypsies and Travellers have also been examined in order to illustrate the nature and extent of access to formal justice engaged in Gypsy and Traveller communities.

It is widely recognised that there are simply not enough stopping grounds for Gypsies and Travellers to temporarily pull up at. This notion frustrated all those

who participate in this current research, both Gypsies and Travellers and those who work with this community.

Finally, while my research focused on Gypsies and Travellers, the results of my doctoral research have wider applicability to other socially excluded groups. Indeed, a central argument of this thesis relates to the development of informal community justice, based on 'governance from below' (Stenson 2005) as communities fail to recognise the legitimacy of the police. These findings need further exploration with other socially excluded and as such, vulnerable communities.

Bibliography

Acton, T. (2003) The Gypsies in B. Lalor (Ed.) *The Encyclopaedia of Ireland* Dublin: Gill and Macmillan.

Acton, T. and Mundy, G. (1997) *Romani Culture and Gypsy Identity*, Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.

Acton, T., Caffery, S. and Mundy, G. (1997) Theorizing Gypsy Law, in *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, 45(2) pp. 237 – 250.

Acton, T. A (1994) Modernisation, Moral Panics And The Gypsies, in *Sociology Review*, 4(1) pp. 24 -28.

Alder, P. (1985) *Wheeling and Dealing: An Ethnography of an Upper-Level Drug Dealing and Smuggling Community*, Washington DC: Columbia University Press.

Arsovska, J. and Verduyn, P. (2008) Globalization, Conduct Norms and ‘Culture Conflict’ in *The British Journal of Criminology*, 48(2) pp. 226- 246.

Atkinson, P. (2008) Qualitative Research and Its Capacities, in *Qualitative Research*, Issue 9: September 2008.

Atkinson, P., Coffey, A. and Delamont, S. (2003) *Key Themes in Qualitative Research: Continuities and Change*, Oxford: Altamira Press.

Atkinson, R. and Flint, J. (2004) Order Born Out of Chaos? The Capacity for Informal Social Control in Disempowered and ‘Disorganised Neighbourhoods, in *Policy and Politics*, 32(3) pp. 333 -350.

Bhopal, K. (2010) Gender, Identity and Experience: Researching Marginalised Groups, in *Women’s Studies Internal Forum*, 33 pp. 188 -195.

Ball, R. A. (1966) An Empirical Exploration of Neutralization Theory, in *Criminologica*, 4 pp. 22 -33.

Bancroft, A. (2005) *Roma and Gypsy-Travellers in Europe: Modernity, Race, Space and Exclusion*, Aldershot: Burlington VT.

Bancroft, A. (2000) ‘No Interest in Land’: Legal and Spatial Enclosure of Gypsy-Travellers in Britain, in *Space and Polity*, 4(1) pp. 41 – 56.

Barnes, M. and Morris, K. (2007) Strategies for the Prevention of Social Exclusion: An Analysis of the Children’s Fund, in *The Journal of Social Policy*, 37(2) pp. 251 – 270.

Barton, A. and Johns, N. (2003) Pragmatism and the Third Way: An Open Door for New Racism, in *Social Policy and Society*, 4(3) pp. 283- 291.

- Bauman, Z. (2001) *Community*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Becker, H. S. (1963) *Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance*, London: The Free Press.
- Benyon, J. (1984) *Scarman and After: Essays Reflecting On Lord Scarman Reports, The Riots and their Aftermath*, Oxford: Pergamon.
- Blagg, H. (2008) *Crime, Aboriginality and the Decolonisation of Justice*, Sydney: Hawkins Press.
- Blagg, H. (2005) A New Way of Doing Justice Business? Community Justice Mechanisms and Sustainable Governance in Western Australia, *Background Paper No. 8*, Law Reform Commission of Western Australia: Perth.
- Bohannon, P. (1957) *Justice and Judgement Among The Tiv*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Bonos, A. H. (1942) Roumany Rye of Philadelphia, in *American Anthropologist*, 44 (2) pp. 257 - 274.
- Botchkovar, E. V. and Tittle, C. R. (2005) Crime, Shame and Reintegration in Russia, in *Theoretical Criminology* 9(4) pp. 401 – 442.
- Bottoms, T. (2000) In Search of Causes and Explanations of Crime, in R. D. King and E. Wincup (eds.) *Doing Research on Crime and Justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bourgois, P. (1999) *In Search of Respect: Selling Crack in El Barrio*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bowling, B. and Phillips, C. (2002) *Racism, Crime and Justice*, London: Longman.
- Braithwaite, J. (1989) *Crime, Shame and Reintegration*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Brewer, J. D., Lockhart, B. and Rodgers, P. (1998) Informal Social Control and Crime Management In Belfast, in *The British Journal of Sociology*, 49(4) pp. 570 – 585.
- Brewer, M. B. (2001) Social Identities and Social Representations: A Question of Priority, in K. Deaux and G. Philogene (eds.) *Representations of the Social*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Buerger, D. E. (1994) A Tale of Two Targets: Limitations of Community Anticrime Actions, in *Crime and Delinquency*, 40(3) pp.411 – 431.
- Bryman, A. (2006) Integrating Quantitative and Qualitative Research: How is it Done? in *Qualitative Review*, 6(1) pp. 97-113.

- Bryman, A. and Burgess. R. G. (1999) *Qualitative Research*, London: Sage.
- Caffery, S. and Mundy, G. (1997) Informal Systems of Justice: The Formation of Law within Gypsy Communities, in *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, 45(2) pp. 251-267.
- Campbell. S. M. (1995) *Gypsies: Criminalisation of a Way of Life*, Criminal Law Review: January 1995.
- Cemlyn, S. (2008) Human Rights and Gypsies and Travellers: An Exploration of the Application of a Human Rights Perspective to Social Work with a Minority Community in Britain, in *The British Journal of Social Work*, 38 pp. 153 – 173.
- Cemlyn, S. And Clark. C. (2005) The Social Exclusion of Gypsy and Traveller Children, in G. Preston (eds.) *At Great Risk: The Children Most Likely To Be Poor*, London: Child Poverty Action Group.
- Cemlyn, S. and Briskman, L. (2002) Social (dys)Welfare Within a Hostile State, in *Social Work and Education*, 21(1) pp. 49 – 69.
- Cemlyn, S. (2000) From Neglect to Partnership?: Challenges for Social Services in Promoting the Welfare of Traveller Children, in *Child Abuse Review*, 9 pp. 349 - 363.
- Charmaz. K. and Mitchell, R. G. (2001) Grounded Theory in Ethnography in P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont and J. Loftland (eds.) *Handbook of Ethnography*, London: Sage.
- Chin, K. L. (1996) *Chinatown Gangs: Extortion, Enterprise and Ethnicity*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Clark, C. (2006) Who Are The Gypsies and Travellers of Britain? In C. Clark and M. Greenfields (eds.) *Here to Stay: The Gypsies and Travellers of Britain*, Hatfield: University of Herefordshire Press.
- Clark, T. (2002) New Labour's Big Idea: Joined-Up Government, in *Social Policy and Society* 11 (2) pp. 107-117.
- Clements, L. and Morris, R. (2001) *The Traveller Reform Bill: A Brief Guide*. Cardiff: Traveller Law Research Unit, Cardiff Law School.
- Coffey, A. and Atkinson, P. (1996) *Making Sense of Qualitative Data*, London: Sage.
- Cohen, A. P. (1985) *The Symbolic Construction of Community*, London: Tavistock Publications.
- Cohen, S. (1973) *Folk Devils and Moral Panics*, London: Paladin.

- Coicaud, J. M. (2002) *Legitimacy and Politics: A Contribution to the Study of Political Right and Political Responsibility*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Coker, D. (2006) Restorative Justice, Navajo Peacemaking and Domestic Violence, in *Theoretical Criminology*, 10(1) pp. 67 – 85.
- Cole, B. and Wardak, A. (2006) Black and Asian Men on Probation: Social Exclusion, Discrimination and Experiences of Criminal Justice, in S. Lewis, P. Raynor, D. Smith and A. Wardak (eds.) *Race and Probation*, Cullompton: Willan.
- Coleman, J. W. (1994) *The Criminal Elite: The Sociology of White Collar Crime*, New York: St Martin's Press.
- Colson, E. (1974) *Tradition and Contact: The Problem of Order*, Chicago: Aldine.
- Comaroff, J. (1985) *Body of Power, Spirit of Resistance: The Culture and History of a South African People*, London: The University of Chicago Press.
- Comte, A. (1998) *Early Political writings*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Consedine, J. (1995) *Restorative Justice: Healing the Effects of Crime*, Lyttleton, New Zealand: Ploughshares Publications.
- Cook, D. (2006) *Criminal and Social Justice*, London: Sage.
- Copes, H. (2003) Societal Attachments, Offending Frequency and Techniques of Neutralization, in *Deviant Behaviour*, 24 (2) pp. 101-127.
- Coser, L. (1956) *The Functions of Social Conflict*, New York: Free Press.
- Coxhead, J. (2007) *The Last Bastion of Racism: Gypsies, Travellers and Policing*, Stoke on Trent: Trentham Books.
- Coxhead, J. (2004) *Anti-Racism Training Strategies for the Police Service and Criminal Justice Sector: Gypsies and Travellers*, accessed via www.gypsyromatravellerleeds.co.uk Accessed March 2009.
- Crawford, A. (2002) *Crime and Insecurity: The Governance of Safety in Europe*, Devon: Willan Press.
- Crawford, A. (1997) *The Local Governance of Crime: Appeals to Community Partnership*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Crawford, A. (1996) The Spirit of the Community: Rights, Responsibilities and the Community Agenda, in *The Journal of Law and Society*, 23(2) pp. 247 – 262.

CRE (2006) *Common Ground: Equality, Good Race Relations and Sites For Gypsies and Irish Travellers*, Report of CRE Inquiry in England and Wales, London: CRE.

Daley, K. (2002) Restorative Justice – The Real Story, in *Punishment and Society* 4 pp. 55- 79.

Dawson, R. (2000) *Crime and Prejudice: Traditional Travellers*, Derbyshire: Robert Dawson.

Deegan, M. J. (2001) The Chicago School of Ethnography in P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont and J. Loftland (eds.) *Handbook of Ethnography*, London: Sage.

Denzin, N. K. (2000) The Practices and Politics of Interpretation, in N. K. Denzin and Y. S. Lincoln (eds.) *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Department of Rural Affairs (2007) *Foot and Mouth Outbreak 2007*, DEFRA available from www.defra.gov.uk accessed August 2007.

Dignan, J., Atkinson, A., Atkinson, H., Howes, M., Johnston, J., Robinson, G., Shapland, J. and Sorsby, A. (2007) Staging Restorative Justice, Encounters Against a Criminal Justice Backdrop, in *Criminology and Criminal Justice: A International Volume*, 7(1) pp. 5 – 32.

Dodder, R. A. and Hughes, S. P. (1993) Neutralization of Drinking Behaviour, in *Deviant Behaviour*, 14(1) pp. 65 – 79.

Douglas, M. (1966) *Purity and Danger*, London: Routledge.

Duffee, D. (1980) *Explaining Criminal Justice: Community Theory and Criminal Justice Reform*, Prospect Heights, Illinois: Waveland Press.

Dunning, E. and Waddington, I. (2003) Sports As a Drug and Drugs in Sport, in *International Review of Sociology of Sport*, 38(3) pp. 351 – 368.

Durkheim, E. (1984) *The Division of Labour in Society*, New York: MacMillan.

Duveen, G. (2001) Representations, Identities, Resistance, in K. Deaux and G. Philogene (eds.) *Representations of the Social*, Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Edwards, A. and Hughes, G. (2005) Comparing the Governance of Safety in Europe, in *Theoretical Criminology*, 9(3) pp. 345-363.

Edwards, A. and Hughes, G. (2002) Introduction: The Community Governance of Crime Control, in G. Hughes and A. Edwards (eds.) *Crime Control and the Community: The Politics of Public Safety*, Cullompton: Willan.

- Elias, N. and Scotson, J. L. (1965) *The Established and The Outsiders: A Sociological Enquiry into Community Problems*, London: Sage.
- Eliason, S. I. and Dodder, R. A. (1999) Techniques of Neutralisation Used By Deer Poachers in Western United States: A Research Note, in *Deviant Behaviour*, 20(3) pp. 233 – 252.
- Emmel, N., Hughes, K., Greenhalgh, J. and Sales, A. (2007) Accessing Socially Excluded People: Trust and the Gatekeeper in Researcher - Participant Relationships, in *Sociological Research Online*, 12(2).
- Evans, R. D. (2001) Examining the Informal Sanctioning of Deviance in a Chat Room Culture, in *Deviant Behaviour*, 22(3) pp. 195-209.
- Evans-Pritchard, E. E. (1945) The Sanusi of Cyrenaica, in *Africa: Journal of International African Institute* 15(2) pp. 61 – 79.
- Fernback, J. (2007) Beyond the Diluted Community Concept: A Symbolic Interactionist Perspective on Online Social Relations, in *New Media and Society* 9(1) pp. 46 – 69.
- Finch, J. (1984) 'It's Great to Have Someone to Talk to': The Ethics and Politics of Interviewing Women, in C. Bell. and H. Roberts., (eds.) *Social Researching: Politics, Problems, Practice*, London: Routledge.
- Foley, A. (2009) The Role of the Researcher: When Two Social Worlds Collide, in *Qualitative Research*, Issue 11, Winter 2009.
- Foley, A. (2006) '*Just Blame Us*': *The Victimization of Gypsies and Traveller Community Living in Wales*, MSc. Dissertation: Cardiff University.
- Foley, A. (2005) *Outside Of Society: The Policing of Gypsies and Travellers*, MSc. Dissertation: Cardiff University.
- Frankenberg, R. (1957) *Village on the Border: A Study of Religion, Politics and Football in a North Wales Community*, London: Cohen and West.
- Garfinkel, H. (1956) Conditions of Successful Degradation Ceremonies, in *The American Journal of Sociology*, 61(5) pp. 420 – 424.
- Gibbs, J. (1963) The Kpelle Moot: A Therapeutic Model for the Informal Settlement of Disputes, in *Africa: The Journal Of The International African Institute*, 33 (1) pp. 1 – 11.
- Giddens, A. (1998) *The Third Way: The Renewal of Social Democracy*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Gilroy. P. (1995) '*There Ain't No Black in the Union Jack*': *The Cultural Politics of Race and Nation*, London: Routledge.

Glaser, B.G. and Strauss, A.L. (1967) *The Discovery of Grounded Theory*, Chicago: Aldine.

Gluckman, M. (1963) Gossip and Scandal, in *Current Anthropology*, 4(3) pp. 307–315.

Gluckman, M. (1955) *Customs and Conflict in Africa*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Gmelch, S. B. (1986) Groups That Don't Want In: Gypsies and Other Artisan, Trader, and Entertainer Minorities, in *Annual Reviews Anthropology*, 15, pp. 307-330.

Goffman, E. (1963) *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity*, Harmondsworth, Penguin.

Greenfields, M. (2006a) Family, Community and Identity, in C. Clark and M. Greenfields (eds.) *Here to Stay: The Gypsies and Travellers of Britain*, Hatfield: University of Herefordshire Press.

Greenfields, M. (2006b) Stopping Places, in C. Clark and M. Greenfields (eds.) *Here to Stay: The Gypsies and Travellers of Britain*, Hatfield: University of Herefordshire Press.

Greenfields, M. (2006c) Gypsies and Travellers and Legal Matters, in C. Clark and M. Greenfields (eds.) *Here to Stay: The Gypsies and Travellers of Britain*, Hatfield: University of Herefordshire Press.

Gronfors, M. (1998) Police Perceptions Of Gypsies in Finland, in D. Tong (eds.) *Gypsies: An Interdisciplinary Reader*, New York: Garland.

Gronfors, M. (1986) Social Control and Law in the Finnish Gypsy Community: Blood Feuding as a System of Justice, in *Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, 24 pp. 101 – 126.

Gronfors, M. (1977) *Blood Feuding Among Finnish Gypsies*, Tutkimuksia Research Reports, Department of Sociology, University of Helsinki, No. 213.

Gropper, R. C. (1975) *Gypsies in the City: Culture Patterns and Survival*, Princeton: Darwin Press.

Gross, E. K. (2001) *Evaluation/Assessment of Navajo peacemaking*. NCRJRS N. 97-IJ-CX-0039 Doc Number: 187675

Halfacree, K. (1996) Out of Place in the Country and the “Rural Idyll”, in *Antipode*, 28(1). Pp. 42 – 72.

Hall, S., Critcher, C., Jefferson, T., Clake, J. and Roberts, B. (1978) *Policing the Crisis: Mugging, the State, and Law and Order*, Basingstoke: MacMillan.

- Hall, S. and Jefferson, T. (1976) *Resistance Through Rituals: Youth Subculture in Post War Britain*, London: Hutchinson for The Centre of Contemporary Culture Studies.
- Hammersley, M. and Atkinson, A (1995) *Ethnography: Principles and Practice* (2nd ed.) London: Routledge.
- Hammersley, M. (1992) *What's Wrong With Ethnography? Methodological Explorations*, London: Routledge.
- Hansard (2002) 15 July. Available online
at <http://www.publications.parliament.uk/pa/cm200102/cmhansrd/vo020115/halltext/20115h05.htm>
- Harper, D. A. (1982) *Good Company* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Hawes, D. and Perez, B. (1995) *The Gypsies and the State: The Ethnic Cleansing of British Society*, Bristol: Policy Press.
- Hebdige, D. (1979) *Subculture: The Meaning of Style*, London: Methuen.
- Herskovits, M. J. (1937) American Gods and Catholic Saints in New Negro Belief, in *American Anthropologist*, 39(4) pp. 635 – 643.
- Hester, R. (2004) 'Services Provided to Gypsy Traveller Children' A Review of Current Literature for the National Evaluation of the Children's Fund, NEFC, Birmingham, www.necf.org/thematic/core/documents/download.asp?id=42.
- Hobbs, D. (2001) Ethnography of Deviance, in P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont and J. Loftland (eds.) *Handbook of Ethnography*, London: Sage.
- Holdaway, S. (1996) *The Racilisation of British Policing*, Basingstoke: MacMillan.
- Holstein, J. A. and Gubrium, J (1997) Active Interviewing, in D. Silverman (eds.) *Qualitative Research: Theory Method and Practice*, London: Sage.
- Howell, P. P. (1954) *A Manual of Nuer Law*, London: Oxford University Press.
- Hughes, G. (2007) *The Politics of Crime and Community*, Basingstoke: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Hughes, G. and Edwards, A. (2002) *Crime Control and Community: The New Politics of Public Safety*, Cullompton: Willan.
- James, Z. (2007) Policing Marginal Spaces: Controlling Gypsies and Travellers, in *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 7(4) pp. 367 – 389.
- James, Z. (2006) Policing Space: Managing New Travellers in England, in *The British Journal of Criminology*, 46(3) pp. 470 – 485.

James, Z. (2005) Eliminating Communities? Exploring the Implications of Policing Methods Used to Manage New Travellers, in *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 33(3) pp. 159 – 186.

Jenkins, R. (1996) *Social Identity*, (3rd ed.) New York: Routledge.

Jones, T. (2007) The Governance of Security: Pluralization, Privatization, and Polarization in Crime Control, in M. Maguire, R. Morgan and R. Reiner (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (4th ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jones, T. (2003) The Governance and Accountability of Policing, in T. Newburn (ed.) *The Handbook of Policing*, Cullompton, Devon: Willan.

Jones, T., Newburn, T. and Smith, D. (1994) *Democracy and Policing*, London: PSI.

Kelly, R. D. G. (1992) Notes of Deconstructing ‘The Folk’ in *American Historical Review*, 97(5) pp. 1400- 1408.

Kenrick, D. (2004) *The Romani World: A Historical Dictionary of the Gypsies*, Hertfordshire: Hertfordshire University Press.

Kenrick, D. and Bakewell, S. (1995) *On the Verge: The Gypsies of England*, Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.

Kershaw, C., Nicholas, S. and Walker, A. (2008) *Crime in England and Wales 2007/08: Findings from the British Crime Survey and Police Recorded Crime*

Leach, E. R. (1954) *Political Systems of Highland Burma: A Study of Kachin Social Structure*, London: Bell and Sons.

Lee, R. (1997) The Rom-Valch Gypsies and the Kris-Romani, in *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, 45(2) pp. 345 - 392.

Lee, R. B. (1979) *The !Kung San: Men, Women and Work in a Foraging Society*, New York: Cambridge University Press.

Liebow, E. (1967) *Tally's Corner: A Study of Negro Street Men*, Boston: Little Brown.

Levi, M. (2007) Organised Crime and Terrorism, in M. Maguire, R. Morgan and R. Reiner (ed.) *The Oxford Handbook of Criminology* (4th ed.) Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Levi Strauss, C. (1966) *The Savage Mind*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Levisonson, M. P. and Sparks, A. C. (2006) Conflicting Values Systems: Gypsy Females and the Home-School Interface, in *Research Papers in Education*, 21(1) pp. 79-97.

- Lofland, J. and Lofland L.H. (1995) *Analysing Social Settings: A Guide to Qualitative Observation and Analysis*, London: Wadsworth.
- Lomax, D., Lancaster, S. and Gray, P. (2000) *Moving On: A Survey of Travellers Views*, Scottish Executive Central Research Unit (2000) from www.scottishexecutive2000.gov.uk
- MacLaughlin, J. (1999) European Gypsies and the Historical Geography of Loathing, in *Review: Fernand Braudel Centre for the Study of Economies, Historical Systems, and Civilizations*, 22 (1) pp. 31 – 59.
- McLaughlin, E. (1994) *Community, Policing and Accountability*, Aldershot: Avebury.
- Maguire, M. (2000) Researching ‘Street Criminals’ in the Field: A Neglected Art? in R. D. King and E. Wincup (eds.) *Doing Research on Crime and Justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Maguire, M. (2000) Policing by Risks and Targets: Some Dimensions and Implications of Intelligence-Led Crime Control, in *Policing and Society*, 9 pp. 315–36.
- Malinowski, B. (1966) *Crime and Customs in Savage Society*, London: Routledge.
- Malinowski, B. (1961) *Argonauts of the Western Pacific*, New York: Dutton.
- Marchetti, E. and Daley, K. (2004) Indigenous Courts and Justice Practices in Australia, in *Trends and Issues In Criminal Justice* (227) Australia Institute of Criminology, accessed via, www.aic.gov.au Accessed May 2009.
- Marshall, T. (1996) Criminal Mediation in Britain, in *The European Journal of Criminal Policy and Research*, 4(4) pp. 37 – 53.
- Mason, P., Hughes, N., Hek, R., Spalek, B. and Ward, N. (2009) *Access to Justice: A Review of Existing Evidence of Experience of Minority Groups Based on Ethnicity, Identity and Sexuality*, The Ministry of Justice Research Series 7/09.
- Mason, P. and Broughton, K. (2007) Gypsy/Traveller Children and Families: The Potential of Working Networks, in *Social Policy and Society*, 6(2) pp. 243 – 253.
- Mayall, D. (1992) The Making of Gypsy Identities C. 1500 – 1980, in *Immigrants and Minorities*, 11 pp. 21 – 41.
- McEvoy, K. and Mika, H (2002) Restorative Justice and the Critique of Informalism in Northern Ireland, in *The British Journal of Criminology*, 42(3) pp. 534 – 562.

McVeigh, R. (1997) *Theorising Sedentarism: The Roots of Anti-Nomadism*, in T. Acton (ed.) *Gypsy Politics and Traveller Identity*, Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press.

Menchu, R. (1984) *An Indian Woman In Guatemala*, New York: Verso.

Metropolitan Police (2006) *Impact Assessment for Gypsy & Traveller Policy*, accessed via http://www.met.police.uk/foi/pdfs/policies/gypsy_and_traveller_impact.pdf June 2007. Accessed March 2009.

Miles, M. B. and Huberman, A. M (1994) *Qualitative Data Analysis: An Expanded Source* (2nd ed.) Thousand Oaks, California: Sage.

Miller, R. L. and Brewer, J. D. (2003) *The A – Z of Sociological Research*, London: Sage.

Minor, M. M. (1981) *Techniques of Neutralization: Reconceptualization and Empirical Examination*, in *The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 18(2) pp. 295 – 318.

Mishler, E. (1986) *Research Interviewing: Context and Narratives*, Cambridge M.A.: Harvard University Press.

Moran, L. (2007) *An Interview With Les Moran*, (Centre for Law, Gender and Sexuality) accessed via <http://www.kent.ac.uk/clgs/documents/word-files/events/les-moran-interview-march-2007.doc> accessed March 2009.

Morris, R. (1999) *The Invisibility of Gypsies and Other Travellers*, in *The Journal of Social Welfare and Family Law*, 21(4) pp. 397-404.

Morris, R. (2001) *Gypsies and Travellers: New Policies, New Approaches*, in *Police Research and Management*, 5(1) pp. 41-9.

Morris, R. and Clements, L. (2002) *At What Cost? The Economics of Gypsy and Traveller Encampments*, Bristol: Polity Press.

Murdoch, A. and Johnson, C. (2004) *Introduction* London: Legal Action Press, pp. 1 -20.

Newburn, T., Shiner, M. and Hayman, S. (2004) *Race Crime and Justice? Strip Search Treatment of Suspects in Custody*, in *The British Journal of Criminology*, 44(5) pp. 677 – 694.

Ni Shuinear, S. (1997) *'Why do Gaujos Hate Gypsies So Much Anyway?'* A Case Study, in T. Acton (ed.) *Gypsy Politics and Traveller Identity*, Hatfield: University of Hertfordshire Press, pp. 26 – 53.

- Noaks, L. and Wincup, E. (2004) *Criminological Research: Understanding Qualitative Methods*, London: Sage Publications.
- Oakley, A. (1981) *Subject Women*, Oxford: Martin Robertson.
- ODPM (Office of the Deputy Prime Minister) (2004) *Guidance on Managing Unauthorised Camping*, London: ODPM.
- Okely, J. (1983) *The Traveller Gypsies*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Okely, J. (2005) Gypsy Justice Versus Gorgio Law: Interrelations of Difference, in *The Sociological Review*, 53(4), pp. 691- 709.
- Parker, H., Williams, L. and Aldridge, J. (2002) The Normalisation of 'Sensible' recreational Drug Use: Further Evidence, in *Sociology* 36(4) pp. 941 – 964.
- Parsons, T. (1968) *The Structure of Social Action*, New York: Free Press.
- Patrick, J. (1973) *Glasgow Gang Observed*, London: Eyre Methuen.
- Pfohl, S. (1981) Labelling Criminals, in L. Ross (eds.) *Law and Deviance*, Beverley Hills: Sage.
- Phoenix, A. (2001) Practising Feminist Research: The Intersection of Gender and 'Race' in the Research Process, in K.K. Bhavnani (ed.) *Feminism and Race*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Piquero, N. L., Tibbetts, S. G. and Blankenship, M. B. (2005) Examining the Role of Differential Association and Techniques of Neutralisation in Exploring Corporate Crime, in *Deviant Behaviour*, 26(2) pp. 159 – 188.
- Pizani Williams, L. (1998) *Gypsies and Travellers in the Criminal Justice System: The Forgotten Minority*, Cambridge: The Institute of Criminology, University of Cambridge.
- Plummer, K. (2001) *Documents of Life 2*, London: Sage.
- Pratt, I. (2006) The Dark Side of Paradise: Explaining New Zealand's History Of High Imprisonment, in *The British Journal of Criminology*, 46(4) pp. 541- 560.
- Punch, M. (2003) Rotton Orchards: 'Pestilence', Police Misconduct and System Failure, in *Policing and Society*, 13(2) pp. 171 – 196.
- Rakhit, A. (1998) Silenced Voices: Life History as an Approach to the Study of South Asian Women Teachers, in P. Connolly and B. Troyna (eds.) *Researching Racism in Education: Politics, Theory and Practice*, Buckingham: open University Press.

- Rapley, T. J. (2001) The Art(Fulness) of Open-Ended Interviewing: Some Considerations on Analysing Interviews, in *Qualitative Research*, 1(3) pp. 303-323.
- Raybeck, D. (1988) Anthropology and Labelling Theory: A Constructive Critique, in *Ethos*, 16(4), pp. 371 - 397.
- Redfield, R. (1967) Primitive Law, in P. Bohannan (ed.) *Law Warfare: Studies in the Anthropology of Conflict*, New York: The Natural History Press.
- Reiner, R. (2000) *Police Research*, in R. D. King and E. Wincup (eds.) *Doing Research on Crime and Justice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Richardson, J. (2006) Talking about Gypsies: The Notion of Discourse as Control, in *Housing Studies*, 21(1), pp. 77-96.
- Rock, P. (2001) Symbolic Interactionism and Ethnography, in P. Atkinson, A. Coffey, S. Delamont and J. Loftland (eds.) *Handbook of Ethnography*, London: Sage.
- Sanchez-Jankowski, M. (1991) *Islands in The Street: Gangs and American Urban Society*, Berkley: University of California Press.
- Scarman. Lord. (1981) *The Brixton Disorders 10 -12 April 198*, Cmnd: 8427
London: HMSO
- Seagrave, J. (1996) Defining Community Policing, in *The American Journal of Police*, XV (2) pp. 1 – 22.
- Scott, R. A. (1976) Deviance, Sanctions, and Social Integration in Small Scale Societies, in *Social Forces*, 54(3) pp. 604-620.
- Selby, H. A. (1974) *Zapotec Deviance*, Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Sellin, J. T. (1938) *Culture, Conflict and Crime: A Report of the Subcommittee on Delinquency and the Committee on Personality and Culture*: New York: Social Science Research Council.
- Sharp, D. and Atherton, S. (2007) To Serve and Protect? The Experiences of Policing in the Community of Young People From Black and Other Ethnic Miority Groups, in *The British Journal of Criminology*, 47(5) pp. 746 – 763.
- Shearing, C. (2001) Punishment and the Changing Face of the Governance, in *Punishment and Society*, 3(2), pp. 203-220.
- Shearing, C. and Wood, J. (2003) Nodal Governance, Democracy and the New 'Denizens', in *The Journal of Law and Society* 30(3) pp. 400-419.
- Sibley, D. (1995) *Geographies of Exclusion: Society and Difference in the West*, London: Routledge.

- Sibley, D. (1981) *Outsiders In Urban Society*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Silverman, D. (2001) *Interpreting Qualitative Data: Methods for Analyzing Talk, Text and Interaction* (2nd ed.) London: Sage.
- Southern, R. and James, Z. (2006) *The Devon-Wide Gypsy and Traveller Housing Needs Assessment*, Social Research and Regeneration Unit: University of Plymouth.
- Spencer, A. B. and Hough, M. (2000) *Policing Diversity: Lessons From Lambeth*, The Home Office: Policing and Reducing Crime Unit, Paper 121.
- Stenson, K. (2005) Sovereignty, Biopolitics and the Local Government of Crime in Britain, in *Theoretical Criminology*, 9(3) pp. 265- 287.
- Stenson, K. (2001) Community and Policing as Government Technical Approach, in *Economy and Society*, 22 (3) pp. 23-45
- Stonewall (2003) *Profiles of Prejudice: The Nature of Prejudice in England*, London: Stonewall/Citizenship 21 Project.
- Sutherland, E. H. (1937) *The Professional Thief: By A Professional Thief, Annotated and Interpreted*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Sykes, G. M. and Matza, D. (1957) Techniques of Neutralization: A Theory of Delinquency, in *American Sociological Review* 22(6) pp, 664 – 670.
- Taggart, I. (2000) *Gypsy and Travellers: A Police Strategy*, Home Office: Grampian Police, from www.homeoffice.gov.uk
- Tankebe, J. (2008) Police Effectiveness and Police Trustworthiness In Ghana: An Empirical Appraisal, in *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 8(2) pp. 185 – 202.
- Thrasher, F. (1927). *The Gang: A study of 1,313 Gangs in Chicago*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- The Equality and Human Rights Commission (2009) *Gypsies and Travellers: Simple Solutions for Living Together*, available from <http://issuu.com/equalityhumanrights/doc/simplesolutions?mode=page> accessed August 2009.
- Thomas, W. I., and Florian Znaniecki (1918). *The Polish Peasant in Europe and America*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Travellers Times (2007) Mary's Story, in *The Travellers Times*, Issue 32; Summer 2007.
- Trigg, E. B. (1967) *Magic and Religion Among The Gypsies Of Great Britain*, Unpublished D.Phil. thesis: Oxford University.

- Turnbull, C. M. (1974) *The Mountain People*, London : Pan Books.
- Turnbull, C. M. (1962) *The Forest People*, New York: Random House.
- Vanderbeck, R. (2005) Anti-Nomadism, Institutions and the Geographies of Childhood: Environment and Planning, in *Society and Space*, 23 pp. 71 – 94.
- Vanderbeck, R. (2003) Youth, Racism, and Place in the Tony Martin Affair, in *Antipode*, 35(3) pp. 363 – 384.
- Van-Ness, D., Morris, A. and Maxwell, G. (2001) Introducing Restorative Justice, in A. Morris and G. Maxwell (eds.) *Restorative Justice for Juveniles: Conferencing, Mediation and Circles*, Oxford: Hart Publishing.
- Walgrave, L. (2008) *Restorative Justice, Self-interest and Responsible Citizenship*, Cullompton: Willan Publishing.
- Wardak, A. (2000) *Social Control and Deviance: A South Asian Community in Scotland*, Adlershot: Ashgate.
- Weckman, S. (1998) Researching Finnish Gypsies: Advice From a Gypsy. In D. Tong (eds.) *Gypsies: An Interdisciplinary Reader*, New York: Garland.
- Weitekamp, E. G. M. (1999) The History of Restorative Justice, in G. Bazemore and L. Walgrave (eds.) *Restorative Juvenile Justice: Repairing the Harm of Youth Crime*, New York: Willow Tree Press.
- Weyrauch, W. O. (2001) *Gypsy Law: Romani Legal Traditions and Culture*. London: University of California Press.
- Weyrauch, W. O. (1997) Romaniya: An Introduction to Gypsy Law, in *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, 45 (2) pp. 224 -232.
- Weyrauch, W. O. (1997) Oral Legal Traditions of Gypsies and some American Equivalents, in *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, 45(2), pp. 407 - 442.
- Weyrauch, W.O. and Bell, M. A. (2001) ‘Autonomous Lawmaking’, in ed. W.O. Weyrauch (eds) *Gypsy Law: Romani Legal Traditions and Culture*, University of California Press, Berkeley CA.
- Whyte, W. F. (1943) *Street Corner Society: Structure of an Italian Slum*, Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Williams, M. (2006) *Virtually Criminal: Crime, Deviance and Regulation Online*, London: Routledge.

Willmott, P. (1987) Community and Social Structure, in *Policy Studies* 8 (1) pp. 52 – 63.

Young, J. (1999) *The Exclusive Society*, London: Sage.

Zhang, S. X. (1995) Measuring Shame in an Ethnic Context, in *The British Journal of Criminology*, 35(2) pp. 248 – 262.

Appendices

Appendix 1: Participation Form

Research on Crime Resolutions among Gypsy and Traveller Communities.

This is an invitation to all Gypsies and Travellers who wish to take part in research into how crime is dealt with by their community. This leaflet will provide you with information about this research and what your role will be.

Why is this research being done?

Criminology has always been interested in how different communities resolve crime. Yet to date there has been no research on the different ways Gypsy and Traveller communities in the UK deal with crime within their community. The purpose of this research is to look at how your community tackles crime. It is hoped that by doing this research policies can be adopted that will help your community resolve crime.

Who can take part?

Any member of the Gypsy and Traveller community who is willing to be interviewed and observed is welcome to take part. Your participation is completely voluntary.

What will I be asked to do?

If you chose to take part in this research, you will participate in a recorded one-to-one interview. The interview will take about 1 hour during which I will ask you a number of questions about your experiences of crime and how you deal with crime in your community. There are no right or wrong answers, I am interested in what you have to say.

I will also conduct a number of observations both on site and at fairs. I will write some notes about interesting things that I see during the observations.

How will the information you give be used?

Your interview will be recorded and written into what is called a transcript which will then be analysed. Once this has been completed it will form part of my PhD thesis.

Will the information be confidential?

Your name will not appear anywhere in the research. After you have been interviewed I will change your name, the name I give you will only be identifiable to myself and my supervisors. The same will happen with any notes I make on observations. Therefore the research will be completely anonymous and confidential. All the field-notes and transcriptions from interviews will be stored in a secure place and will not be permitted to anyone other than myself.

I should also let you know that if you tell me about a crime that has taken place or may take place I will have to talk about this with my supervisors. I may also have to inform the police. Therefore I will not be able to guarantee your confidentiality in such circumstances.

Can you change your mind about taking part?

If you agree to take part in this research but then change your mind that is ok. You can withdraw from this research at any stage and you will not be put under any pressure to continue.

If there is something that you would like to discuss but do not want recorded then you can ask the researcher to switch off the tape-recorder and this information will not be used in the research.

What happens once the interview and observations are completed?

After the interview you will be asked how you feel it went. If there is anything you discussed but feel uncomfortable about being included in the research, this information will not be used. The same will happen after the observations.

If you would like to know the final outcomes of this research, I would be happy to send you a summary of the findings. Please let me know if you want this at the end of the research so that I can take your contact details.

How can you contact me?

I am a research student at Cardiff University. My name is Anne Foley and you can contact me (contact details removed) I will be happy to answer any questions you may have about this project.

Thank you for your help and support in this project.

Appendix 2: Interview Schedule

Background

- Age
- Gender
- Ethnicity
- Residence

Lifestyle

- Work
- Education
- Travelling/ settled
- Family/ Children
- How long have you lived at your current location?
- How would describe your current accommodation?
- How would you describe your relationship with your neighbours?

Gorger

- Contacts – who, when
- Experiences
- Understanding of cultures
- Improvements

Visual images

- Can you tell me what you can see?
- What is happening?
- What do you think about that?
- Why do you think it is right/wrong?
- How would you feel if it happened to you?
- What would you do?

Moral Codes

- Customs
- Pollution
- Education
- Travelling
- Changes over time/ place
- Young people/ older generations

Justice

- When
- How
- What forms
- The consequences
- Resolutions
- Community impact

Policing

- Engagement with the police
- When and how often
- The relationship
- Improvements

Final

- Any other questions?
- Is there anything you would like to add
- Do you have any questions you would like to ask me

Appendix 3: Consent Form

| | Please initial |
|---|----------------|
| I confirm that I have read and understood the participation form for the above research. | |
| I confirm that I have had the opportunity to ask any questions about the research and my role in it. | |
| I understand that my role in the research is voluntary and that I am free to withdraw from the study at any time. | |
| I agree to take part in this study | |

(name of participant)

(date)

(signature)

(name of researcher)

(date)

(signature)

Appendix 3:

Interview Schedule for Non-Gypsies and Travellers.

1. Role

- How does this fit with the Gypsy and Traveller community
- How long
- What changes (if any)
- Policy issues
- Relations
- How does organisation work with Gypsies and Travellers
- What improvements if any

2. Crime and deviance

- Contact with the community in terms of crime and deviance
- Types of crime and deviance
- Who
- Impact with the wider community
- Disputes and problems within the community

3. Justice

- How are problems dealt with
- Insider/outsider
- Types of justice
- Who

4. Agency

- Involvement of agencies
- How
- When
- Gypsy and Traveller response
- Agency response

5. Future

6. Any other points

