

Research Article

Nomads: the Politically Marginalised Segment of Pakistani Society on the basis of Ethnic Prejudice

Muhammad Suliman^{1*}, Mussawar Shah², Asad Ullah³

¹MPhil Scholar, ²Professor, ³Assistant Professor, Department of Rural Sociology, The University of Agriculture, Peshawar, Khyber, Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan

*Corresponding author Email id: socialite12@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The study 'Nomads: The politically marginalise segment of Pakistani society on the basis of ethnic prejudice' was conducted in tehsil Dargai, district Malakand with the aim to find out the relative nature of social and political exclusion of nomadic communities, keeping in mind their conservative and ethnically vulnerable status in Pakistani society. The researchers aimed to elucidate nomadic groups' political exclusion, as a relative phenomenon in the study area with ethnic prejudice and conservatism. However, nomads are ethnic minority groups in the study area and their ethnic marginality was tested through participation, access to the basic amenities and resources of society in comparison to that of the settled community. A sample size of 123 respondents out of 180 was selected through random sampling procedure. It can be seen that majority of the respondents (78.4%) agreed that ethnic prejudice is a leading factor for their marginalisation within society. Likewise, (87.6%) of the respondents reported that they were considered outsiders and strangers everywhere by the settled population. This form of latent abstraction decreases their access to the basic services of society. The study found that almost (80.4%) of sampled groups did not have access to potable water, electricity, health, and employment opportunities in the targeted area.

The relationship was found highly significant i.e. ($P = 0.000$) between ethnic prejudice and political exclusion. Furthermore, ethnic prejudice was significantly ($P = 0.001$) contributing in the development of negative attitudes, beliefs, and judgments about nomads and their ways of life. Moreover, a significant ($P = 0.004$) relationship was also found between political exclusion and the way policies are devised in our country Pakistan.

Keywords: Nomads, Political exclusion, Social exclusion, Ethnicity, Prejudice, Conservatism Marginalisation.

INTRODUCTION

Since excluded groups are often a minority, and particularly a powerless minority. There is no incentive for political parties to take their interests into account, therefore, may be excluded from competing electorally by eligibility criteria that embody cultural or ethnic biases. In Cambodia, for instance, the requirement that candidates for commune council elections must read and write. So, in Khmer automatically excludes a large proportion of its tribal and indigenous population. The Political facets of social exclusion include the denial of political rights, restricted political membership, not have personal security and freedom of expression in society they live. International relationships dynamic patterns, political environment of the countries, strict rules about import-export, static boundaries full of threats, as well as migration along with national and international borders significantly affect their life (Tomei, 2005; Hickey and Bracking, 2005).

Ethnic multiplicity is a problematic, an enriching and progressively important facet of modern societies. Irish society considers itself ethnically more homogeneous, while history shows that nomads have been present since twelfth century and remained minority in this country. Numerous initiatives have been taken for the inclusion of various ethnic groups and settled population, but traditional inequalities and hostile relations between these groups restrain its goals (Kenny and McNeela, 2005). The application of race towards ethnically marginalised groups is now abstract, less frequently spoken and widely seen as unacceptable. However, within nomads is still common, as well as seen justified. They are ignored in services provisions, employment, education, political, potable water, suitable accommodation, etc. However, nomadic groups have experienced such antagonism for centuries, and are still continued in the present day which is very much shameful, for those who claimed emerging economic boom, modernity and the philosophy of equity and equality. Numerous inequalities nomads facing now a days are relative to their ethnic background on nomadic lifestyle. For instance, the issues in relation to gender, disability, age, religion and sexual orientations are mingled with other wider inequalities they face in their daily life (Cemlyn *et al.*, 2009).

All minorities, such as ethnic groups have been found as subjects of exclusion through low level of involvement in labour market, obstacles in political participation, harsh ownership rules and regulations, as well as lack of access in availing public services and amenities of life. Political exclusion of ethnic minorities in most cases are reinforced by numerous factors. For instance, indigenous people in Peru have lack of access to education, poorer land, worse sanitary conditions and health services. They also have highly limited political power, and are not able to use the political system for the improvement of marginalised communities or groups in society. In Vietnam, other ethnic minorities make up around 10% of the population and usually live in remote, unplanned tough mountainous areas

with huge obstacles in accessing the services and infrastructure of society. These groups are nomadic or semi-nomadic in their ways of life. While in India, ethnic groups are homogeneous, and are or were isolated from the rest of society, not only on the basis of their ways of life, but also on their accommodation in remote areas, and nomadism was highly contributed. The notions of citizenship and ethnicity, responsible for the state formation in Africa, the colonial state explicitly were formed on the basis of ethno-territorial communities. Ethno-territorial forms of belonging have provided the basis for inclusion and exclusion in the contemporary African state, in many ways that have shaped access to critical resources such as land. This has been called for civil conflict, and processes of chronic impoverishment (Kabeer, 1994; Mamdani, 1996; Figueroa and Barrón, 2005; Gradstein and Schiff, 2006).

Political exclusion tends to embody and reflect unequal power relations particularly on part of those who are excluded. That being so, it might seem unexperienced simply to list policies which would correct it, hence, it is not lack of knowledge but the political situations fundamentally responsible for non-inclusive policies and participation. External pressure, aid policy, the development of norms of inclusion, support for international human rights, may play some role in gaining support for inclusive policies. But what really needed is a change in the underlying power situations of the state, which means supporting the empowerment of those who are excluded. Numerous studies revealed that nomads fear of prejudice or hostility from healthcare officials has huge impact on accessing or utilising services. However, experiencing discrimination and racism contributes to their sense of devalued identity as well as feeling of shame and humiliation; thus leads to their social exclusion. Despite, the greater amount of health services availability, they shown less access than other members of the population (Henriques, 2001; Stewart and Wang, 2003; Honer, 2004; Thomason, 2006; Van Cleemput *et al.* 2007; Greenfields, 2008).

Legally nomads do not have place for housing or accommodation, which reflects their exclusion in this regard. The Political aspects of social exclusion include the denial of political rights, restricted political membership, not having personal security and freedom of expression in the society they live. Elaborated that members of all ethnic groups are at increased risk of homelessness, poor quality or inappropriate accommodation, forced movement, inevitably exacerbates existing health conditions as well as leading to new problems. Higher infection rates have been reported, linked to poor sanitation and poor access to clean water, particularly on roadside sites (and specifically not linked to a lack of knowledge or cleanliness). Globally nomadic groups are found alienated, marginalised, as well as considered now a days as threat to the current orders and pattern. They are lacking legal documents; thus are easily entrapped by modern rules of the

states. Nomads are marginalised citizens, because they do not possess any kind of material assets, like land for permanent residence, and do not have access to information, have outdated skills, being uneducated and having lack of dignity (Neligan, 1993; Berland, 2003; Dutt, 2004; Niner, 2004; Hickey and Bracking, 2005; Netto, 2006; Dyer, 2006).

METHODOLOGY

The interview schedule was used as a tool of data collection in this study, due to illiterate respondents. Before going to the field, the interview schedule was tested and addition and deletion were made accordingly. The study is about political exclusion of nomads, with relation to their ethnic prejudice. Therefore, the researcher has opted chungarr or churigar nomads as a respondent for the study concerned because of feasibility and accessibility. The universe of the study was tehsil Dargai (district Malakand). Tehsil Dargai consists of 11 union councils. Degraft-Johnson (1979) mentioned numerous approaches, addressing the issues of sampling nomadic populations. The researcher has opted camp approach for sampling in this study, among his approaches. In this approach a sample of nomads were selected randomly from the list of camps through the proportionate allocation method. A pilot study was conducted with the aim to know that how many households are currently abided in the targeted union councils. During the pilot survey 90 household (tents) were found in the targeted union councils. Therefore, the researchers have selected two respondents from each tent residing within the study area. By this technique the total population of the respondents reached up to 180. Then, selection of appropriate sample size procedures mentioned in the book of Sekaran was adopted. Among the total 180 population, a sample of 123 was selected for this study. Through proportional allocation method, the sample was selected randomly while applying lottery procedure.

Proportional allocation formula is mentioned below:

$$n_1 = n.N_1/N,$$

n_1 = Sample size required from strata,

n = Total sample size,

N = Total population,

N_1 = Population of each strata.

The Collected data was analysed through SPSS, and results were interpreted into frequency and percentages. Moreover, the effects of independent variable on the dependent variable were found using a chi-square test.

The following formula of a chi-square was adopted:

$$\chi^2 = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^c \frac{(O_{ij} - e_{ij})^2}{e_{ij}}$$

where

χ^2 = Chi-square for two categorical variables,

$\sum_{i=1}^r$ = Total of i th row,

$\sum_{j=1}^c$ = Total of j th Column,

O_{ij} = Observed frequencies in i th row and j th column

e_{ij} = expect frequencies corresponding to i th row and j th column

Whenever the frequencies in the cells were less than 5 Fisher Exact Test was used instead of simple Chi-square, by taking the procedures of Baily (1982).

In addition, it is requisite that the sample size must be objectively huge such that no expected frequency is less than 5, for r and $c > 2$, or < 10 if $r = c = 2$. However, this hypothesis was violated several times in the data and therefore, Fisher Exact Test (also known as Exact Chi-square Test) was used instead of simple chi- square. The relationship developed by Fisher is given in equation below;

$$\text{Fisher Exact Test Probability} = \frac{(a+b)! (c+d)! (a+c)! (b+d)!}{N! a! b! c! d!}$$

Where a , b , c and d were the observed numbers in four cells of contingency table and “ n ” the total number of observations.

CONCEPTUAL FRAME WORK Independent variable	Dependent variable
Ethnic prejudice(negative attitudes, beliefs, judgments about category of people)	Political exclusion

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

The univariate analysis of the dependent variable ‘political exclusion’ and an independent variable ‘ethnic prejudice; has been explained. While bivariate analysis of the dependent and independent variable with its cross tabulation has been elucidated by the application of the chi-square test (χ^2) with the aim to find out the association of both the categorical variables.

ETHNIC PREJUDICE AND POLITICAL EXCLUSION

Social and political exclusion is associated with ethnicity. In literature, ethnic harmony refers to the reciprocal relationship between permanent residents and nomads who are mostly considered wanderers; thus have no share in the state's amenities. There is complex relationship between ethnicity and social exclusion. In this regard, few statements were carefully developed for assessment of that relationship. Respondent's attitudes are mentioned in Table 1.

It can be seen that majority of the respondents i.e., 78.4% agreed that ethnic prejudice is a leading factor for their marginalisation and political exclusion. We have no share in politics nor have a single representative in state politics. Supporting this view, Aronson (2008) studies have found that people have a tendency to become more prejudiced when they move to areas where people are very prejudiced and less prejudiced when they move to locations where people are

Table 1: Perception of the sample respondents about ethnicity based discrimination

S. no.	Statements	Agree	Disagree	Donot know
1	Nomads have been denied in matter of citizenship rights	94 (96.9%)	1 (1.0%)	2 (2.1%)
2	Being member of a different ethnic group, you face resistance in accessing the basic needs of community like water, electricity, and gas	76 (78.4%)	18 (18.6%)	3 (3.1%)
3	The settled population considering you alien or strangers	85 (87.6%)	11 (11.3%)	1 (1.0%)
4	Nomads lack freedom of expression or voice in state machinery	92 (94.8%)	4 (4.1%)	1 (1.0%)
5	Stereotype perception of the settled population further deepens your marginality	72 (74.2%)	19 (19.6%)	6 (6.2%)
6	The prejudice you face on part of settled population and state officials create hurdles in accessing health care, educational and employment sectors	78 (80.4%)	18 (18.6%)	1 (1.0%)
7	Such a massive hatred attitudes and perceptions on large level halt your capabilities development	80 (82.5%)	12 (12.4%)	5 (5.2%)
8	Vast discrimination against minority groups resist the development of potentialities and capabilities which are necessary for uplift in society	87 (89.7%)	8 (8.2%)	2 (2.1%)
9	You have no rights of land and vote within state policies	93 (95.9%)	2 (2.1%)	2 (2.1%)

less prejudiced. Citizenship, a basic right of every one within the country of birth, while in this study the majority of the respondents 96.9% agreed that they have been denied in citizenship rights. Few respondents shared during interview with the researchers, that, when we apply for national identity card, the officials of the current accommodation refer us for the other office and vice versa. Percy-Smith (2000) in his study revealed that vulnerable groups lack access to political rights, occupational rights, educational rights, right to safe drinking water and suitable accommodation. Likewise, 87.6% of the respondent among the total reported that the settled population consider us outsiders or aliens and do not trust for anything until we left for other place. Stereotype or labelling perception means calling with the word chungar, churigar, etc. also deepens their marginality and this statement was favoured by majority of the respondents i.e., 74.2%. Similarly, 80.4% of the respondents agreed that attitudes full of prejudice and partiality from the side of settled community and state officials do not allow us to avail the services prevalent in the area. They claim that when we approach the villagers for drinking water, charity, and food they are taunting and mocking us. State officials also warned us, when we demarcated camps on government sites; even we assured them with temporary stay or accommodation. While the other 18.6% respondents disagreed with and claimed that, we did not face such kind of resistance anywhere. Besides, 82.5% of the respondents claimed that other people residing near hate us and our ways of life. Women among participants said that the village women do not like us to sit near them at their homes and hate us for our odd smell. They share with the researchers that we have a problem with our ways of life on daily basis; we do not have access to water for bath, if so then the appropriate space for bath is not available in our tent. We want to change this type of life and settle down like other people in dignity, whereas, 12.4% and 5.2% of them remained disagreed and uncertain, respectively. Besides, 89.7% of the respondents agreed with the researchers that due to vast discrimination prevalent in our society resist us to develop our potentialities. We are extremely eager to educate our children, while the teachers do not allow us to admit them in government schools, because they say you will leave this place soon and we are not able to manage this with issuing certificates to the child admitted for two, three or even for a month. Therefore, the government should demarcate specific areas to us and also construct schools for our children within that area for the sake of our development and uplifting in society, while the other 8.2% of the respondents disagreed with the statement. Freedom of expression was preferred by 94.8% of the respondents. The respondents said that till now no one has come and asked us. No politician visits us at our camps and did not ask about our problems. We also have a right, to have an elected representative in state political machinery for unveiling the issues we facing on daily life. Only 4 (4.1%) respondents were disagree with the statement and 1 (1.0%) remained uncertain. In addition, 95.9% of the respondents agreed with the researcher that

the policies designed on large level are exclusive in nature for nomads, because they do not include specific quotas for them in any sector of society. The provision of jobs needed high level of qualification, while nomads, almost all are uneducated and unskilled.

ASSOCIATION BETWEEN ETHNIC PREJUDICE AND POLITICAL EXCLUSION

Social exclusion is prevalent in Pakistani society in a multi-dimensional form. Nomads, the vulnerable group in this regard was considered to be politically excluded in this study on the basis of numerous structural and social factors.

Political exclusion was tested via chi-square statistics to find out the relationship with other categorical variable ethnic prejudice. Therefore, it can be seen from Table 2 that ethnicity factor was found highly associative with social exclusion i.e. ($P = 0.000$). Their ethnic marginality was measured on the basis of access and participation. They were compared with the settled population in the study area on the basis of income, educational background, access to the basic resources of society i.e., potable water, electricity and gas. Therefore, it was found that almost all of them were lacking access to the aforementioned resources, though were prevalent and reachable. Susan Olzak's (1992) in his theory (*Ethnic competition theory*), explains that ethnic prejudice and conflict increases when two or more ethnic groups find themselves competing for jobs, housing, and other goals. On the other hand, the nomads are considered strangers everywhere when they approach the settled population and was also found highly significant ($P = 0.000$) in relationship with political exclusion. The results of Mamdani (1996) are in line with the results claimed that in South African state ethnicity provides the basis for inclusion and exclusion. Furthermore, a significant ($P = 0.001$) relationship was found with the negative attitudes and perceptions of the people about nomads and their ways of life. Similarly, significant ($P = 0.000$) relationship was found between prejudice against nomads from settled population and state officials. This kind of negative attitudes and designing policies which are mostly exclusive resist these marginalised groups to avail the necessary resources and amenities of life. Therefore, it is obvious from the fact that the social exclusion of nomads are relational not structural in Pakistani society. Similarly, the idea that large scale structurally devised hatred attitudes resist them to develop productive capabilities also remained non-significant ($P = 0.677$) with social exclusion. Discrimination was found significant ($P = 0.002$) with political exclusion and this idea is buttressed by the results of Mohmand (2007) in which he quoted some factors of deprivation like: income, employment, health and disability, education, training and skills, housing, and geographic access to services. Moreover, a significant ($P = 0.004$) relationship was found between social exclusion and the way policies are devised

Table 2: Ethnic prejudice and political exclusion

S. No.	Attributes	Responses	Political exclusion		Total	Statistic/ chi-square
			Agree	Disagree		
1	Nomads have been denied in matter of citizenship rights	Agree	92(94.8%)	2(2.1%)	94(96.9%)	$\chi^2 = 34.844^a$
		Disagree	0(0.0%)	1(1.0%)	1(1.0%)	
		Do not know	1(1.0%)	1(1.0%)	2(2.1%)	$P = 0.000$
2	Being member of a different ethnic group, you face resistance in accessing the basic needs of community like water, electricity, and gas	Agree	74(76.3%)	2(2.1%)	76(78.4%)	$\chi^2 = 23.717^a$
		Disagree	16(16.5%)	2(2.1%)	18(18.6%)	
		Do not know	3(3.1%)	0(0.0%)	3(3.1%)	$P = 0.000$
3	The settled population considering you alien or strangers	Agree	82(84.5%)	3(3.1%)	85(87.6%)	$\chi^2 = 23.799^a$
		Disagree	11(11.3%)	0(0.0%)	11(11.3%)	
		Do not know	0(0.0%)	1(1.0%)	1(1.0%)	$P = 0.000$
4	Nomads lack freedom of expression or voice in state machinery	Agree	90(92.8%)	2(2.1%)	92(94.8%)	$\chi^2 = 28.544^a$
		Disagree	3(3.1%)	1(1.0%)	4(4.1%)	
		Do not know	0(0.0%)	1(1.0%)	1(1.0%)	$P = .000$
5	Stereotype perception of the community further deepens your sense of marginality	Agree	70(72.2%)	2(2.1%)	72(74.2%)	$\chi^2 = 14.095^a$
		Disagree	19(19.6%)	0(0.0%)	19(19.6%)	
		Do not know	4(4.1%)	2(2.1%)	6(6.2%)	$P = 0.001$
6	The prejudice you face on part of settled population and state officials create hurdles in accessing health care, educational and employment sectors	Agree	75(77.3%)	3(3.1%)	78(80.4%)	
		Disagree	17(17.5%)	1(1.0%)	18(18.6%)	$\chi^2 = 23.595^a$
		Do not know	1(1.0%)	0(0.0%)	1(1.0%)	$P = 0.000$
7	Such a massive hatred attitudes and perceptions on large level halt your capabilities development	Agree	77(79.4%)	3(3.1%)	80(82.5%)	$\chi^2 = .781^a$
		Disagree	11(11.3%)	1(1.0%)	12(12.4%)	
		Do not know	5(5.2%)	0(0.0%)	5(5.2%)	$P = 0.677$
8	Vast discrimination against minority groups resist the development of potentialities and capabilities which are necessary for uplift in society	Agree	85(87.6%)	2(2.1%)	87(89.7%)	
		Disagree	7(7.2%)	1(1.0%)	8(8.2%)	$\chi^2 = 12.799^a$
		Do not know	1(1.0%)	1(1.0%)	2(2.1%)	$P = 0.002$
9	No one allow you to have rights of land and vote	Agree	90(92.8%)	3(3.1%)	93(95.9%)	$\chi^2 = 10.922^a$
		Disagree	2(2.1%)	0(0.0%)	2(2.1%)	
		Do not know	1(1.0%)	1(1.0%)	2(2.1%)	$P = 0.004$

in our country. The results of Krätli (2001) are in line here, because he found that in Iran and Mongolia developmental projects are designed without the proper planning and assessment of nomadic people needs.

The results revealed that, they face huge discrimination on the basis of their ethnic marginality. Moreover, social exclusion is not a causative factor linked with some aspects but it is relational in nature and is manifested via other conditions prevalent in society. They are excluded because of their ethnic marginality, lack of education, political immobility, as well as low participation in political processes because of their distinct mobile ways of life in Pakistani society.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The study found nomadic groups more prone to political exclusion within the study area. Their political exclusion was found relative in nature with negative attitudes, and exclusive policies of the state. Ethnicity was measured on the basis of ethnic groups' living standards, occupation and income level. They experienced lack of employment opportunities, low political participation, and high level of illiteracy. They were also predominantly found within geographically remote and semi-arid areas within the study area. Nomads are considering wandering groups, thus lacking rights to land, suitable accommodation, potable water, electricity, gas, health care, housing, and security. The entire aforementioned are considered basic rights for each settled member of the society, but are not applicable to these vulnerable groups was a major theme of this paper.

RECOMMENDATIONS

- The race equality duty similarly requires public sector organisations and services to monitor the impact of the policies with the aim to identify how these policies affect racial groups, the extent of satisfaction of all groups with the way they are treated, whether the provision of services is effective for all communities, and whether the design of services is suitable to meet different needs.
- To strengthen the legal framework, i.e., judiciary, legislative, as well as law enforcement wings, with the aim to fight against massive discrimination based on race, ethnicity, religion, biradri, caste, etc.
- Policies should ensure protection and safeguard of ethnic minority groups within society, irrespective of their ethnic background.
- Recommendations included the provision of ethnic monitoring of Gypsies and Travelers' by public bodies and a refocus upon the evidence on inequalities experienced by members of these communities.

- Racism in the wider community needs to be addressed in order that each sector can operate within a safe community context and provide equal share for Gypsies and Travelers (nomads).

REFERENCES

- Aronson E, 2008. *The social animal*, 10th ed. New York, NY: Worth
- Baily KD, 1982. *Methods of Social Research* (2nd Ed.). New York: Macmillan Publishing Co., Inc. P. 408
- Berland, 2003. Servicing the ordinary folk: peripatetic peoples and their niche in southwest Asia. In: Rao A and Casimir Meds. *Nomadism in South Asia*. New Delhi: Oxford University Press.
- Cemlyn S, Greenfields M, Burnett S, Matthews Z, and Whitwell C, 2009. Inequalities experienced by Gypsy and Traveler communities: a review, p. 361.
- DeGraft-Johnson KT, 1979. Question/answer, survey statistician, NR. i, *International Association of Survey Statisticians*, pp. 22–23.
- Dutt B, 2004. Livelihood strategies of a nomadic hunting community of Eastern Rajasthan, *Nomadic Peoples*, Vol. 8, No. 2.
- Dyer C, ed., 2006. *The Education of Nomadic Peoples Current Issues Future Perspectives*, New York, Oxford: Berghahn Books.
- Gradstein Mand Schiff M, 2006. The political economy of social exclusion, with implications for immigration policy. *Journal of Population Economics*, Vol. 19, pp. 327–344. Available at: <http://doi.org/10.1007/s00148-005-0016-0>.
- Greenfields M, 2008. A good job for a traveller?' Exploring Gypsies and Travellers' perceptions of health and social care careers. High Wycombe: Buckinghamshire New University / Aim Higher South East.
- Henriques J, 2001. Hard travelling. *Community Practitioner*, Vol. 74, No. 9, pp. 330–332.
- Hickey S and Bracking S, 2005. Exploring the politics of chronic poverty: from representation to a politics of justice? *World Development*, Vol. 33, No. 6, pp. 851–865.
- Honer D and Hoppie P, 2004. The enigma of the Gypsy patient. *RN*, Vol. 67, No. 8, pp. 33–36. Available at: <http://rn.modernmedicine.com/rnweb/article/articleDetail.jsp?id = 114152>.
- Kabeer N, 1994. Social exclusion: concepts, findings and implications for the MDGs, pp. 1–33.
- Kenny M and McNeela E, 2005. Assimilation policies and outcomes: travelers' experience. *Work*, pp. 1–68.
- Krätli S, 2001. Education Provision to Nomadic Pastoralists: A Literature Review, IDS Working Paper 126
- Mamdani M, 1996. *Citizen and Subject*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Neligan D, 1993. Report of specialist health visitor for travelling families May 1990–November 1992. Bristol: United Bristol Healthcare NHS Trust.
- Netto G, 2006. Vulnerability to homelessness, use of services and homelessness prevention in black and minority ethnic communities. *Housing Studies*, Vol. 21, No. 4, pp. 581–601.
- Niner P, 2004. Accommodating nomadism? An examination of accommodation options for gypsies and travellers in England. *Housing Studies*, Vol. 19, No. 2, pp. 141–59.

- Olzak S, 1992. *The dynamics of ethnic competition and conflict*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press
- Percy SJ, ed. 2000. Policy responses to social exclusion: towards inclusion? Open University Press. Available: www.mla.gov.uk/documents/socialinc05.doc
- Rajesh T, 2004. *A Participatory Research on Meaning and Expression of Rights and Citizenship among Nomadic Communities in Rajasthan*. New Delhi: PRIA.
- Stewart F and Wang M, 2003. Do PRSPs Empower Poor Countries and Disempower the World Bank, or is it the other way round? Queen Elizabeth House Working Papers, no. 1 08. Oxford: Queen Elizabeth House Department of International Development, University of Oxford. Available online at <http://www.qeh.ox.ac.uk/pdf/qehwp/qehwps108.pdf> (last accessed 23 April 2006).
- Thomason C, 2006. Here to stay: An exploratory study into the needs and preferences of Gypsy/Traveller communities in Cheshire, Halton and Warrington. Chester: Cheshire, Halton and Warrington Race Equality Council.
- Tomei M, 2005. Indigenous and Tribal Peoples: An Ethnic Audit of Selected Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers, Geneva: ILO.
- Van Cleemput P *et al.*, 2007. Health-related beliefs and experiences of Gypsies and Travellers: a qualitative study. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, Vol. 61, pp. 205–210.