

Competiție:

PN-II-ID-PCE-2011-3 – PROIECTE DE CERCETARE EXPLORATORIE

Cod depunere:

PN-II-ID-PCE-2011-3-0354

Titlu proiect engleză:

**The spatialization and racialization of social exclusion. The social and cultural formation of "Gypsy ghettos" in Romania in a European context.**

Titlu proiect română:

**Spațializarea și rasializarea excluziunii sociale. Constituirea socială și culturală a "ghetourilor țigănești" în România într-un context European.**

## **RAPORT NARATIV**

**Pentru anul 2011, cu începere din 05.10.2011**

În luna octombrie 2011 coordonatorul de proiect prof. univ. dr. Enikő Vincze (*principal investigator*) și personalul tehnic doamna Adriana Popescu-Țiganea au făcut demersurile în vederea semnării contractului PN-II-ID-PCE-2011-3-0354 cu instituția finanțatoare, precum și în vederea contractării personalului de proiect implicat în activitățile din anul 2011. Astfel, în acest an, pe lângă cele două persoane deja amintite, cu începere din noiembrie 2011 au fost angajate în proiect următorii experți:

*Senior researcher*, dr. Cătălin Berescu

*Senior researcher*, dr. Cristina Raț

*Senior researcher*, dr. László Fosztó

*Senior researcher*, dr. Michal Buchowski

*Senior researcher*, dr. Michael Stewart.

De la începutul lunii noiembrie 2011, Enikő Vincze și Adriana Popescu-Țiganea au început pregătirea primului workshop/ atelier de lucru al proiectului (vezi Anexa 1), cea dintâi din punct de vedere științific, iar cea din urmă din punct de vedere logistic. Mențiune: în afară de cei deja angajați în proiect, la atelierul de lucru au mai participat: Hajnalka Harbula, Iuliu Kozak, Camelia Moraru, Tibor Schneider. Drept rezultat, membrii echipei SPAREX au acceptat schema de lucru privind activitățile de proiect (Anexa 2).

ANEXA 1  
**WORKSHOP, 24-27.11.2011**  
**Agenda**

*24<sup>th</sup> of November, arrival of the participants*

**25<sup>th</sup> of November 2011 (FRIDAY)**

10.00-13.00 (with a coffee break)

Overall project presentation (Enikő Vincze)

Introducing the project team (self-presentations of the team members, in terms of their relationship with the project's issue and their expectation from this project; building a common framework for understanding the project aims and methodologies)

15.30-19.00 (with a coffee break)

Continuing the project team presentation

Discussion on WP3: documentary film (Michael Stewart)

Discussion on WP6: media and political discourse analysis (Michal Buchowski)

**26<sup>th</sup> of November 2011 (SATURDAY)**

10.30-13.30

Discussion on WP2: the multi-sited ethnography/ case studies (Cătălin Berescu, Enikő Vincze, László Fosztó)

16.00-19.00 (with a coffee break)

Discussion on WP4, WP7 and WP8: policy analysis (Cristina Raț, Cătălin Berescu)

WP10: Dissemination (Enikő Vincze)

Conclusions and home-works

*27<sup>th</sup> of November, Departure of participants*

## ANEXA 2

### WORKING PAPER ON PROJECT ACTIVITIES

#### PART I: OBJECTIVES, APPROACHES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

##### **Project objectives and relevance**

- Producing new knowledge (journal articles and joint volume) on/through the main concepts described below:
  - o Analytical potential of the term “Gypsy Ghetto”/ghettoization
  - o Spatial turn
  - o Multi-sited ethnography/ thick descriptions of multiple micro-spaces generated by a collaborative research team
  - o Participatory/ collaborative project
- Policy recommendations (policy paper addressing policy-makers on the base of multi-sited ethnography, public discourse and policy analysis)
- Making participatory/collaborative products
  - o The film addressing a broader public
  - o The film as a tool by which people living in segregated areas give voice to their experiences
  - o The film produced by “us” as strongly linked to the research, but as well as facilitating the participation of people in the process of film-making/choices on subjects, locations, editorial work

##### **Main concepts**

- Spatial turn/spatialization:
  - where things happen, is crucial for how and why they happen
  - social construction of space
  - spatial differentiations/territorial inclusion and exclusion
  - the impact of culturally defined space on embodied identities and social relations: space inscribed into bodies, and bodies inhabiting/humanizing spaces
  - power relationships and unequal positions regarding the location of people/groups in different spaces that are hierarchized and valued on a scale from center/superior/mainstream to periphery/inferior/
  - related terms: spatial exclusion, spatial justice, spatial practices, spatial behavior, spatial perception, spatial realities, spatial mobility, performativity of space, spatial location, being-in-the-world
- Segregation: isolation, marginality, lower quality of living conditions, cumulated disadvantages, lack of communication/participation/access to resources and services; voluntary or involuntary; proudly assumed or unwillingly endured; polluted areas/environmental racism

- Ghettoization: the spatialization and racialization of social exclusion in Romania in the context of EU:
  - deconstructing and reconstructing the controversial term of “Gypsy ghettos” by describing its meanings, variations and dynamics
  - describing different variations in which economic deprivation, racial stigmatization and spatial isolation intersect each other
  - life in ghettos viewed in the context of structural factors that created the ghetto
- Racialization/racial stigmatization and assumed ethnic identifications
- Economic deprivation, disadvantaged housing areas, in the case of which poor/or even better housing conditions are juxtaposed with spatial isolation (in several cases in polluted environments)
- Social exclusion = non-participation or non-belonging

### **Approaches**

- Spatial turn
- Processual and constructivist
- Contextual
- Comparative
- Multilayered
- Intersectional
- Structure and actor
- Integrative research composed of many parts and having many layers

### **Research questions**

- The social and cultural formation of urban “Gypsy ghettos” (actors, socio-economic-political forces and cultural meanings that create segregated spaces)
  - who/the actors: inhabitants of ghettos and actors from outside the “Gypsy ghettos” (at local, national, and European level)
  - under what conditions/the structural factors within and outside of ‘Gypsy ghettos’ that create and maintain segregated spaces
  - why/the structural and personal motivations of the formation and maintenance of “Gypsy ghettos”
  - how/the inside and outside practices of creating the “Gypsy ghettos”
- Narratives and practices of spatial exclusion that lead to the creation of “Gypsy ghettos”
  - Discursive/symbolic/cultural formation (how do we talk about spatial distinctions, and how are we doing/creating ghettos by talking about them; the power in the discourse/discursive power, and the power on the discourse/who defines, who has a dominant voice, who is voiceless, who negotiates from what position)
  - Economic/politic/social mechanisms (political decisions, urban planning, economic restructuring, the social landscape of the cities)
- Narratives on and practices of living in “Gypsy ghettos”

## PART II: MAIN QUESTIONS REGARDING METHODOLOGIES

- **Different layers of research from extensive to in-depth methodologies:**
  - landscaping through public discourse analysis in several EU countries (content and critical discourse analysis of different texts, such as media, policy, NGO + interviews in Romania) and on EU institutions
  - multi-sited ethnography in Romania.
  
- **Complementarity of multiple methods in the case of Romania:**
  - policy analysis (content analysis, critical discourse analysis and interviews: policy-makers and –implementers, decision-makers at national and local levels),
  - public discourse analysis (content analysis, critical discourse analysis and interviews: media and NGO at national and local levels)
  - multi-sited ethnography (participant observation and interviews in five cities: Cluj, Miercurea-Ciuc, Calarasi, Ploiesti, Tg.Mures)
  - participatory/collaborative film-making.

Observation: in Romania, policy analysis and public discourse analysis should be conducted as part of the planned multi-sited ethnography, but they also should be used separately in order to have a contribution to the description of the EU landscape of the discursive production of “Gypsy ghettos”

- **Mapping as method that crosses different aspects of the analysis:**
  - Mapping the sparex research fields (google maps)
  - Mapping the juxtaposition of poverty with ethnicity in cities where multi-sited ethnography will be conducted, by following the census tracks from 2002 and from 2011
  
- **Comparative and integrative analysis:**
  - What is comparable? Ethnographies? Public discourses?
  - How to compare?
  - Why to compare?
  - How to make use of the thick descriptions provided by each separate research component?
  - How to integrate the different parts?
  - How to produce analyzes that make use of the understanding of the different layers of the research?

## PART III: RESEARCH COMPONENTS/ WORK-PACKAGES

### **MULTI-SITED ETHNOGRAPHY (WP2)**

#### **Deliverables (other than preliminary and final reports)**

Each team member will have to produce:

- A journal article in English
- A study in the collective volume; English proofreading will be provided

These papers should be presented at international conferences

Each team member should participate on the 3 public conferences to be organized in Romania

#### **Research team:**

- Ethnographic research in the segregated housing areas from the five cities will be conducted by Eniko, Laci, Catalin, Camelia, Hajni, Adi and Anca
- Policy makers and –implementers will be interviewed by Cristina, and she is also going to make the document analysis
- Media and NGO people will be interviewed by the ethnography team, while texts will be analyzed by Gyuszi
- principles and rules of the collaborative research, or of the working of the ethnographic research team will be clearly defined in a self-reflexive way (division of labor, mutual visits to each other's sites, learning about each other's materials/transcribed interviews, photos, participatory observation notes and diaries, reflecting on each other's materials, permanent discussions/sharing fieldwork experiences and interpretative ideas as they occur) in order to consciously make use of the relationship between the team research and the multi-sited ethnography

#### **Research instruments (presented in the 2012 Research report):**

- individual interview guide for inhabitants of segregated housing areas
- individual interview guide for authorities, NGO and media people
- notes on participant observation
- diaries
- photos

### **Interviews and informal discussions with:**

- people from segregated housing areas
- media and NGO people (local, national, international to be met in Romania)
- authorities (local and national – as part of WP4, and completed with the European level as part of WP7)

Observation: recorded interviews will be transcribed

### **This ethnography is “multi-sited” in two senses:**

- Ethnographic research conducted by a research team in five cities as fieldwork sites
- Ethnographic research conducted in each city on different city sites:
  - ghettoized/segregated housing areas,
  - public authorities,
  - mass media,
  - NGOs,in order to identify different perspectives on segregation/ exclusion/ racialization/ ghettoization and to describe (power) relationships between different actors

**Issues and means to focus on within the segregated housing areas** by using ethnographic strategies of entering, hanging around, being there, participating on activities, taking up roles, exchanging ideas/beliefs/experiences, balancing between insider/outsider position etc:

- **Mappings:**
  - Mapping the fields of the sparex research (google maps)
  - Mental maps of people (if they agree drawing)
- Actors from the segregated spaces: women and men of different ages (informal interviews/discussions should be made in very wide circles, trying to reach every family at least for a conversation; persons will be chosen for semi-structured interviews after relationships are settled and the researcher has an overview on the area’s social networks and at least a sense of power relationships within
- Actors’ narratives to be registered as individual interviews and/or noted as informal discussions with individuals and/or with groups of people
- **Actors’ narratives** on (what people say, recorded by the means of semi-structured interviews and informal discussions):
  - Memories/histories of other housing locations and their move to this current location
  - Stories about the formation of this segregated space
  - Reflecting on the lived experiences of this space:
    - Naming spaces: official and informal names
    - Stories of legality/illegality (legal documents, property acts, personal IDs)

- Spaces for sleeping, cooking, playing, intimacy
  - Sharing spaces: women, men, children
  - Utilities and objects inside and outside
  - Spatial arrangements and gender roles: the home and the neighborhood
  - Spatial mobilities (where, why, when, how, who from the family) and distances to work/school/shopping/entertaining
  - Stories about visiting the city
  - Sense of justice/injustice regarding life in this segregated space
  - Explanations given to their own situation
  - Friends, relatives, informal and formal relationships/networks in this segregated area and in the city
  - Needs, options and expectancies
- **Actors' practices** (what people do, observed by the means of participant observation; how many visits at least?)
- How they spend their days at home?
  - How do they relate to each other with different occasions?
  - Who is doing what from the family within the homes?
  - Who is going where? (people might be joined in their daily travels from home to places outside the residential area, and back)
  - (Power) relations within this area, leadership
- **Photos to reflect on:**
- The vicinity from different angles, including natural and technical elements/ boundaries
  - The spatial arrangement of houses
  - The spatial arrangements of insides
  - Objects (that might have their stories narrated through the interviews)

## **FILM (WP3)**

**Team:** Michael, Tibi, Eniko, Catalin, Adrian

The film should contribute to fulfilling the aims of the whole research project by its specific means (reflecting on the causes, manifestations and consequences of socio-spatial segregation)

But the film should introduce a specific contribution as well: assuring the participatory/collaborative character of our research.

## **POLICY ANALYSIS (WP4 and WP7)**

- WP4 (Romanian policies) and WP7 (EU policies)
- Separate work-packages but should be also treated as linked, so developing ways in which the two sets of policies are interrelated (negotiated, contested, agreed etc.), ideas about how the two WPs might be integrated

### **WP4:**

- Theoretical and methodological frames:
  - o Anthropology of policy
  - o Mapping the issues to which policies should respond (but probably fail responding), by statistical data and maps (Norbert)
  - o Actors to be interviewed
    - At local level: administrative staff members from urban planning and social assistance, maybe also urban planners and local councilors involved into these issues (Cristina, Eniko)
    - At government: ministries (Eniko, Cristina)
    - Actors will be approached both as experts (their knowledge and understanding of laws and policies), and as actors (decisions-makers at national and local level)

### **WP7 (Eniko and Cristina):**

EU document analysis on Roma policies, social inclusion policies, and housing

Informal discussions, participation on meetings

## **PUBLIC DISCOURSE ANALYSIS (WP6)**

Public discourse analysis within the research project:

- o the extensive layer of our research on spatial segregation as exclusion of those who (should) not belong, (should) not participate, should be excluded spatially, whose otherness should be marked territorially
- o public discourse as:
  - object of analysis
  - contextual element

- part of multi-sited ethnography in the case of Romania (public discourse, including policy discourse conceived as one of the sites of our multi-sited ethnography)
  - the aim is to describe a general (national and transnational/European) landscape of the:
    - actors of this discursive world (who is talking? institutions, individuals?)
    - discursive construction of “Gypsy ghettos” understood as spatialized and racialized forms of social exclusion
    - ways in which the issue of spatially/territorially conceived distinctions among people are discursively produced/maintained/justified,
    - degree to which such distinctions become ethnicized/racialized,
    - way in which “Gypsiness” is one of the mostly used/abused markers of difference under the conditions of contemporary EU in order to point out the unwanted otherness
    - discourses by which these subjects are talked about (racist? nationalist? human rights? cultural rights? social rights? inclusion? exclusion? etc?)
  - through the contextual analysis of following types of texts in Romania (Gyuszi), Hungary (Hajni), Bulgaria (Cătălin), Poland and Slovakia (Michal), Italy and France (Giovanni), and EU documents (Eniko and Cristina)
    - Media texts (and images?) (critical discourse analysis) – in Romania this should cover the national, and as well as local media for the five localities where multi-sited ethnography is conducted, and in the case of latter content analysis should be combined with interviews conducted with media persons (Gyuszi and the ethnography team should make a division of labor)
    - Policy documents – in Romania and on EU institutions this type of documents is also analyzed as separate WPs (made by Cristina), as anthropology of policies (within which content analysis is combined with interviews conducted with policy-makers and policy-implementers); in other countries the analysis of policy documents is limited to content analysis
    - NGO documents – local, national and European/international (content analysis); in Romania, content analysis should be combined with interviews conducted with NGO people (Gyuszi and the ethnography team should make a division of labor)
  - identifying across countries:
    - research-specific issues: segregation, ghettoization, exclusion, housing (rights), homelessness,
    - big country-specific issues, through which our research-specific issues from above were transformed into public topics during the time-frame of our public discourse analysis research
      - Romania: extreme poverty, slums
      - Hungary: most disadvantaged regions
      - Poland: othering on the base of class; rich Roma
      - Italy: nomadism
      - Great Britain: lands for Travelers (but, to be changed to Slovakia)

- France: national security
  - Bulgaria: inter-ethnic conflicts; rich Roma
- discursive frames of talking about the issues from above/framing the issues
- classifications/distinctions between those who should, and those who should not belong
- labels used to name those who should not belong
- arguments for why they should not belong
- debates around segregation/ghettoization
- perspectives/positions of speakers
- national and transnational references
- methods (to be decided):
  - content analysis?
  - critical discourse analysis?
  - comparison?