



A Comparative Analysis of Gypsies' Access to Employment Opportunities and Health Services in Pakistan and Turkey

Muhammad Suliman*

Reşat Açıkgöz**

* PhD Scholar

Selcuk University

Department of Sociology

suliman8237@gmail.com

Malakand Dargai,

PAKİSTAN

** Prof. Dr.

Selcuk University

Department of Sociology

acikgozresat@yandex.com

Konya / TÜRKİYE

Abstract

Gypsies are an important ethnic group both in Pakistan and Turkey. They are in a more disadvantaged position as compared to other segments of society in areas such as housing, work, health, and education. In this study, employment opportunities and access to health services of gypsies living in Pakistan and Turkey are explored. The researchers delimited the study only to areas of employment and health sectors in both countries, with the aim to comparatively analyze the situation of Gypsies' access to these services. In the study, qualitative research design and in-depth interview technique were used to collect data from respondents. The interviews were conducted with a total of 14 people (7 participants from Pakistan and 7 from Turkey respectively) including both male and female. According to the findings of the study, Gypsies both in Pakistan and Turkey are mostly excluded from employment opportunities and are pushed to work in informal sectors. Their access to health services is also very limited due to their housing conditions and active lifestyle. However, it has been observed that the conditions of Gypsies in Turkey were found better than the Pakistani ones in terms of employment opportunities and access to health services.

Keywords: Gypsies, employment, health, Pakistan, Turkey.

Received:

27.06.2021

Accepted:

20.07.2022

Field Editor:

Yurdağül Kılınç

Pakistan ve Türkiye'deki Çingenerin İstihdam Olanakları ve Sağlık Hizmetlerine Erişimi Üzerine Karşılaştırmalı Bir Analiz

Öz

Çingenerler hem Pakistan hem de Türkiye'de önemli bir etnik gruptur; barınma, çalışma, sağlık ve eğitim gibi alanlarda toplumun diğer kesimlerine göre daha dezavantajlı bir konumda bulunurlar. Bu çalışmada, Pakistan ve Türkiye'de yaşayan Çingenerlerin istihdam olanakları ve sağlık hizmetlerine erişimleri incelenmektedir. Araştırmacılar, istihdam ve sağlık hizmetleri alanlarıyla sınırlı kalmak kaydıyla her iki ülkedeki Çingenerlerin durumunu istihdam ve sağlık hizmetlerine erişim fırsatları bağlamında karşılaştırmayı amaçlamaktadırlar. Çalışmada, araştırma yöntemi olarak nitel araştırma, araştırma tekniği olarak da derinlemesine görüşme tekniği kullanılmıştır. Görüşmeler, erkek ve kadın katılımcılardan toplam 14 kişi (Pakistan ve Türkiye'de 7'şer kişi) üzerinden gerçekleştirilmiştir. Çalışmanın bulgularına göre hem Pakistan hem de Türkiye'de Çingenerler, çoğu durumda istihdam fırsatlarının dışında kalmakta ve enformel sektördeki işlerde çalışmaya itilmektedirler. Barınma koşulları ve hareketli yaşam biçimlerinden dolayı sağlık hizmetlerine erişimleri de oldukça sınırlıdır. Ancak hem istihdam olanakları hem de sağlık hizmetlerine erişimle ilgili olarak Türkiye'deki Çingenerlerin Pakistan'daki Çingenerlere oranla daha avantajlı bir konumda oldukları görülmüştür.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Çingenerler, istihdam, sağlık, Pakistan, Türkiye.

INTRODUCTION

Mobility has become a central theme of discussions in recent years. Gypsies and nomads incorporate the advantages of mobility. In the past, they were able to exploit more natural resources for the survival of their members. The international bordering system and strict rules and regulations particularly during Cold wars affected their life. Gypsies and nomads of the Pamirian Mountains are affected due to the changing geo-political environments of the countries (Crang, 2002; Crowe, 1999; Durst, 2011; Kreutzmann, 2003). International policies applied at local level in practice has drastically exacerbated the lives of nomads and excluded some of them from the mainstream of social system. They are living in every country of Europe and are being the object of misrepresentation, marginalization, victims of racism, and are socially and economically disadvantaged groups and a forced population for continuous migration. Throughout Europe anti-Gypsy sentiments are present in anti-communist countries such as Romania, in social democracies such as Finland, Britain and France. They are always shown at lower esteem as compared to other ethnic groups in these countries. Through the 2003 Anti-Social Behavior Act in Britain, the state has restricted the mobility of the Gypsies and travelers which cause a chaos and exclusion (Bancroft, 2005; Drakakis-Smith, 2007; Kabachnik & Ryder, 2013). The health status of Slovakian Gypsies is worse than majority population (Bartosovic, 2016).

In Netherland and Scotland Gypsies were seen as aliens and stateless, stigmatized, ethnically marginal and anti-social people. As a result, they are forced to stop their mobile ways of life and stay in fixed housing. Their marginality has been legalized and legitimized ideologically by laws and reproduced in policy documents of the country (Shubin & Swanson, 2010; Lucassen, 1991; Weckman, 1998). Social justice, marginalization and stigmatization of Roma communities are key areas of interests to be addressed. Tackling these areas can help break the cycles of poverty, exclusion, and discrimination (McGary, 2010). Recently, policies in England have been reviewed to accommodate nomadism. The policies encounter some issues in the shape of preferences of the Gypsies in continuation of traditional ways of life. They are excluded from the basic needs and rights available for other groups in society like education, accommodation, income, health, familial support, political and community participation. High rate of mortality, low immunization, high rate of infectious disease and high accidental injuries were found among Gypsies' (David, 2012; Imre, 2005; Partington, 1999; Brown, 2010; Cemlyn & Clark, 2005; Millan & Smith, 2019; Myers, 2014; Van Cleemput, 2010; Lloyd & Stead, 2001; Niner, 2004). Similarly, Gypsies of Portugal are victims of capitalist system. The systematic policy and pattern of employment exclude Gypsies and other ethnic groups. They do not have access to good health services as compared to other English-speaking countries (Casa-Nova, 2007; Marcu & Chrysochoou, 2005; Francis, 2013).

About the origin of Gypsies, the Council of Europe (2011; 2012), traces Roma, Sinti, and Kale ancestors from northern India. Similarly, the two prominent German Scholars Jakob Rüdiger and Heinrich Grellman, did extensive research of the Roma language and concluded that Roma had come from India and spread to other countries of the World. Grellmann pointed out that the history of these groups can be found out through their language. He based his notion of the Gypsy's Indian heritage on the basis of two factors: first, a comparative language studies of Romani language and Hindustani languages of Gypsies, and second, the study of popular travellers' journals which informed him about the Pariahs caste, colour, morals, and customs similarities. His ethnographic study on Gypsies was the first and foremost collection of existing texts and was not based on his own observations. There might be different names in different places for these groups, but Grellmann gathered them all under the label of 'Gypsies' (Lucassen et al., 2015, p. 20). Rüdiger through comparative studies of Hindustani and Gypsies languages link the origin of Gypsies with East India (Rüdiger, 1996). Miklosich and Pott

identified the homeland of the Roma/Gypsy as the Punjab, which lies in the north of Pakistan and India (Vašečka et al., 2003).

Ian Hancock is the first Gypsy scholar awarded doctorate degree and the author of more than three hundred books (Hancock, 1987; Pearson, 1988). Numerous, gypsy groups enlisted by Hancock (2010), in his book "The Danger! Educated Gypsy" show drastic similarities based on their behaviours not solely on their ethnicity. The two well-known scholars Wim Willems and Leo Luccassen used the terms Carvan dwellers and Gypsies broadly to include other itinerant groups living the same life. According to them, the carvan dwellers are indigenous Dutch groups, while the Gypsies came from abroad (Lucassen et al., 2015, p. 94). According to Kenrick (2007), the nomadic artisan clans living in Pakistan does not show any direct commercial or family links with the European Gypsies, but possibly may share a common ancestry with the European Romanies. There is total eight Paryatan communities living in Pakistan having different occupations and labour market participation. Among them the first one is Jogi communities. They are living mainly in tents and are snake charmers. The second is kanjar communities and are famous for the terra-cotta toys production. They are nomadic entertainers and are renowned for their singing and dancing. The Mirasi is another peripatetic group in nature and best known for their singers and dancers. Qalandar is the fourth peripatetic group. Like the other groups they are also living in tents and are known for their circus acts. They are also famous for animal training, being jugglers, acrobats, and magicians. The Chungar are best known for their special artistic skills, basket and broom making. The Chriga are famous for bangles and jewellery. The Kowli are groups of peddlers, and the Tinkers are tent dwellers. The last group is the Lohars, mainly involved in smithing business. Paryatan communities in Pakistan tend to be excluded from the government institutions and class interactions which on one side provide them flexibility in their economic activities, while on the other side restrict their access to the basic resources available to the settled population. Another well-known scholar Joseph. C. Berland preferred to use the specialized term Peripatetics for nomadic communities' activities in Pakistan (Berland, 1983). He conducted field work with the Qalandars, a spatially mobile nomadic artisans and entertainer community in Pakistan. They prefer to live in tents and are the basic social and economic unit among Peripatetic communities (Berland, 2021). Berland sketched the native model for Peripatetic strategies of nomadic population in Pakistan. According to his model, *KHANABADOSH* is a broader category classified further into *Chaupani* (Pastoralists, herders, Baluch, Gujjars), *Paryatan* (Peripatetics) and *Qafila* (transporters, Caravanners, Kuchis). The term *KHANABADOSH*, while covering all spatially mobile groups, depending on the context of usage may be limited to Paryatan groups exclusively. Paryatan or Peripatetics are further classified into Jogi (snake handlers, potion makers and peddlers), Kanjar (terracotta toys makers, musicians, dancers, and prostitutes), Mirasi (bards, impersonators, dancers, and genealogists), Qalandars (animal trainers, jugglers, acrobats, magicians, and impersonators), Chungar (basket and broom makers, garbage collectors, plastics, and bottles collectors), Churigar (jewelry, bangles and peddlers), Kowli (tinkers, peddlers), and Lohars (smiths). The Paryatan are organized hierarchically on the basis of Qom closest in meaning to tribe or nation in English. Two or more tents travelling together constitute a Dehra (Berland, 1983, 1986).

Pakistani society is multi-ethnic in nature and ethnicity is considered to be the most important dimension of social exclusion (Gazdar, Masood, & Naqvi, 2013). The major ethnic groups are Punjabis, Pashtuns, Sindhis, Baluchis, Muhajirs and other small ethnic groups (A. Hussain, 1979). Gypsies in Pakistani society are the most unrecognized population in social, political, legal, and economic spheres. They are poor, landless, marginal, isolated, socially, and politically excluded from the mainstream society. They do not have access to clean drinking water, water for bathing, access to health and economic opportunities. They are mostly found in marginal and sparsely populated areas lacking the basic needs of life (Spooner, 1984; Suliman, Shah, Ullah, & Jamal, 2016a; Suliman, Shah, & Ullah, 2017).

According to GODH, a non-governmental organization based in Lahore, there are approximately 10 million Gypsy people living in Pakistan. They are living in both urban and rural areas of Sindh, Punjab, and Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. They occupy vacant plots along roads, rivers, canals, and railway lines. Gypsies' children have no or lack of access to education at all. They are facing high level of exclusion due to bullying and racial harassment at schools. They are not able to maintain their education due to frequent eviction by state officials, police, and other landowners (Partington, 1999; Suliman, Shah, & Ullah, 2016b). Nomads are lacking basic needs like health, water for drinking and bathing, food, and suitable accommodation. Their ethnic marginality is trapping them within the larger society (Lucassen, Willems, & Cottaar, 2015). Gypsies in Pakistan, England and African Caribbean are lacking health services as compared to other ethnic groups. The Pakistani and Bangladeshi Gypsies and Travelers communities' adults reported that their health status is not good on Likert scales (Lasker et al., 2019; Peters et al., 2009). The Pakistani model of diversity management as per the vision of Quaid-e-Azam Muhammad Ali Jinnah democratization, egalitarian version of Islam, the implementation of strict rules of law and the need of special protective measures for the disadvantaged groups, minorities, and women reflects a cohesive society based on equal rights for all irrespective of their religion, creed, tribe, culture, language, ethnicity, and race (Syed, 2008).

Turkish society is also a hub of various ethnic groups and sub-cultures. Gypsies are among one of them, and are more prone to social exclusion, discrimination, and disadvantages (Kılıçoğlu & Kılıçoğlu, 2018). Approximately, thousand years ago they spread to different countries of the World from India. Professor Ian Hancock mentioned that the original speakers of Dom, Lom and Rom branches of Gypsy left India as one population, separating only once they had passed through Persia (Hancock, 2010). Three main Gypsies groups are found in Turkey (Dom, Lom and Rom). The social exclusion and stereotyping of these communities caused serious damage to their Self-respect. This damage further aggravates and leads to a series of other consequences such as permanency of Gypsy segregation and mistreatment (Firat & Açıkgöz, 2020; Karlıdağ & Marsh, 2008; Yıldız, 2007). Gypsies living in Western Anatolia and Thrace are called Rom, those in the East and Southeast Anatolia are called Dom, and the Black Sea and Eastern Anatolia's regional groups are named as Lom (Önen, 2013). Similarly, Roma is visible in Thrace and in some Aegean locations, Doms in Mesopotamia, Loms in Northern Turkey, Abdals in Central Anatolia, and Tahtacis in rural areas of the Mediterranean and Aegean regions. The Turkish word "*Çingene*" is a pejorative exonym used to denominate the local peripatetic groups such as Loms, Doms, Roma, and Abdals (Akkaya & Yılgür, 2019; Yılgür, 2017). Gypsies in Turkey are known to have a history dating back to the Seljuk period. They were living thousands of years ago in India, crossed Iran, Turkey, Armenia and finally reached out to Europe (Kenrick, 2004). During the period of Ottoman Empire, they adopted forging and music as a profession. Additionally, they worked as craftsmen like tinsmiths, blacksmith, swords makers, jewelers, knife makers, shoemakers, groomers, searers and butchers (Kolukırık, 2009, pp. 11-13; Özateşler, 2014; Soulis, 1961; Marushiakova and Popov 2006, as cited in Yılgür, 2015, p. 174). The traditional occupation of these peripatetic groups was primarily basket-making. They quit their traditional occupations in the 1960s and adopted flower selling due to the decline of demand in their traditional craft (Yılgür 2012, as cited in Yılgür 2015, p.172). Turkish Gypsies possess different nomenclatures in literature. In Turkish language, there are many words used for Gypsies. Some of them are "*Çingene*", "*Köptü*", "*Pouá*", "*Karaçö*", and "*Roman*" etc. (Yıldız, 2007). Yılgür (2018) prefer to use the terms Peripatetic and '*zanaat göçbeleri*' for Turkish Gypsies. He also claims that the use of these terms will enrich the Turkish literature regarding Gypsies.

Continuous migration and encounters with different cultures have given them various names. Moreover, the stereotypes and negative meanings of these names, all over the world, show quite similarity. In this respect, the Gypsies are constantly being looked with curiosity and suspicion because of their history, languages, religions, professions, different life-styles, and physical characteristics. They

are despised, exposed to prejudices, and labelled as thieves, and beggars. As a result of this stigmatization, the Gypsy's image is constructed in a negative way (İlhan & Fırat, 2017, p. 265; Uştuk & Tunç Cox, 2020). This situation affects the relations of the Gypsies with the dominant society and increases their social distances. Gypsies, who cannot internalize the parameters such as tradition, culture, norm, and social values of dominant society, are facing multidimensional problems. Gypsies in Turkey are living in unfavorable conditions. They are vulnerable to extreme unemployment and exacerbated accommodations. They are often found as unemployed, illiterate, poor and lacking health facilities. They are stigmatized and socially excluded minorities in Turkish society (Karlıdağ & Marsh, 2008; Marsch, 2008, p. 21; Özateşler, 2014; Uştuk & Tunç Cox, 2020). The study of Akkan et al., (2017) reveal the multidimensional aspects of Roma social exclusion in Turkey. They are portraying and link the social exclusion of Gypsies with the space or stigmatized neighborhood. They used the term "spatial stigmatization" for showing the relations between space and social exclusion. Those who residing in these space boundaries are stigmatized regardless of their ethnic differentiation. Another research conducted by Akkaya and Yılgür (2019) about stigmatization of Gypsies in Turkey is worth noting. They introduced a new term for handling the stigmatization of Gypsies in urban territories: locally confined territorial stigmatization. They conducted their study in two urban stigmatized quarters of Istanbul: Nişantaşı Teneke and Rumelikavağı kaydadere. The stigmatized Gypsies have very limited social space due to restricted opportunities for self-development and self-determination in every aspect of social life. Due to stigmatization, they also suffer various forms of discrimination particularly in health, settlement, employment, politics, and education. The stigmatized one are often restricted from full participation and does not enjoy civil, political, and social rights like other citizens. Therefore, Gypsies hide their identity especially when they apply for employment in formal sectors (Aksu, 2006, as cited in Akkaya & Yılgür, 2019). Gypsies in Turkey are more hesitant to expose their identity due to fear of being harassed and targeted by nationalists in the public sphere (Karlıdağ & Marsh, 2008, p. 148).

The aim of this study is to find out the socio-economic conditions, and the exclusionary processes of Gypsies living in Pakistan and Turkey, particularly the health and employment/labour market exclusion. We conducted this study in Pakistan, being a developing country and Turkey as a developed country to compare the livelihood, work, and access to health services of Gypsies in both the societies. It is worth noting that, there is a plethora of literature available on Gypsies' social exclusion, predominantly in Europe. But there is lack of a comparative study on the status of Gypsies living in developing countries. Therefore, this study will provide a contemporary source of literature for future research studies upon Gypsies' social exclusion and marginalization.

Methodology

Keeping in mind the migratory life-styles and hesitant to the external intrusion of participants, qualitative research design seemed to be the best suited one for the study. Detailed in-depth interviews were conducted in both countries in their tents/households. Due to the heterogeneity of the migratory populations, a primary challenge researcher usually facing is recruitment of participants (Condon et al., 2019). Sample design and sampling methodology are important steps to produce reliable data. Owing to the lack of accurate and reliable census data on Gypsy/Roma ethnicity, it is not possible to design a representative survey of Gypsy/Roma population. Some country specific surveys tried to solve these barriers by mapping information collected from stakeholders. But most cross-country comparative research, chooses a non-representative sampling approach, because the analysis of data respects the research design and does not speak about Roma/Gypsy in general (Messing, 2014).

In this study we adopted the camp approach suggested by Kalsbeek and Cross (1982) for sampling nomadic populations. In the camp/tent approach a cluster of camps are selected from the existing camps/tents, and each camp represents a cluster of Gypsies. One tent was considered single

household and two respondents were selected from one household/tent for interview irrespective of their genders. Prior to the actual study, we collected geographic information from municipal administrations and local schools about their encampment locations. The respondent's identification in Roma/Gypsy population is a difficult process (Messing, 2014). Our participants of this study were Chungar Paryatan (Peripatetic) artisan group of Gypsies mentioned by Berland (1983, 1986) in his studies and Dom group from Turkey. We started the interviews and continued until recurrence of the repeated themes and theoretical saturation point in the study. Finally, we stopped the interviews on total 14 respondents (i.e., 7 from Pakistan and 7 from Turkey). Seven respondents within the age range 18-60 from Peshawar Changar Bazar and Malakand district Sakhakot bazar in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan were interviewed. The majority dwellers in Khyber Pakhtunkhwa are Pakhtuns or Pashtuns. The culture of this area is totally different from those of other provinces. The outsiders, in this case Gypsies/Khanabadosh communities, are easily distinguishable due to their different ethnic background, language, dialects, culture, customs and norms. Therefore, the researchers opt this province among other provinces for this study as a universe. The interviews lasted for 1 hour approximately and were tape recorded with the aim to note the minute themes. Keeping in view the Purdah restrictions in Pakistan, two master level female students from sociology department were hired for data collection from female respondents in Malakand. At first, the participants were reluctant for interviews, especially in Malakand but through the explanation of objectives, ensured confidentiality and consent form read loudly in their native languages (Pashtu and Urdu), they then willingly participated in the study. The willing 7 participants were interviewed (i.e., five males and 2 females from Pakistan). The female respondents from Malakand were separately interviewed by female interviewers. The female interviewers were trained before going into the field for data collection. The male participants were interviewed by the researchers themselves in both the countries. Interviews in Pakistan were conducted by the corresponding author. While interviewees from Turkey were interviewed by a coauthor.

In Turkish language the term *Çingene* is used to refer Gypsy as a singular and *Çingeneler* stand for the plural word "Gypsies". The participants, Dom group of Gypsies are found in the Eastern and Southeastern Anatolian Regions of Turkey, especially in cities such as Diyarbakır, Van, Mardin, Adıyaman, Malatya and Elazığ. The interviews in the Turkey part of this study were conducted with the Gypsies living in Elâzığ, called '*Elekçi*'. Gypsies in Turkey are concentrated in the Elâzığ and Malatya regions and generally reside in single-story slum-style houses on the outskirts of the city. In-depth interviews were conducted with Doms (a group of Gypsies) living in poor slums of Elazığ city. Four men and three women participants were interviewed in Turkish Language. The interviews were conducted in participants' houses and lasted for an average of 45 minutes. The collected data were carefully reviewed, coded, and themes were drawn from the responses. Finally, cross comparative analysis was performed to reach the conclusion of the study. The study is delimited to Dom group of Gypsies in Turkey and Chungar/Changaryan an endogamous group in Pakistan. The result of the study is not generalizable to other nomadic groups and are limited to the subjects studied only.

Findings

The issue of Gypsies' employment

According to Arayıcı (2008) Turkish Gypsies are the forgotten group in Turkish society. They are deprived in socio-cultural, economic, and educational context in Turkish society and there is a dire need of policy making for acknowledging their Gypsy identity rather than the policies of assimilation and amalgamation. A similar situation is seen in the relationship between ethnic identity and working conditions. A young male Gypsy expresses these conditions below:

No one is easy to work with the Doms (a Gypsy group in Turkey), those who see us from ten kilometers understand that we are Dom (male, age 22, Turkey).

According to findings of the study of Önen (2013), Doms living in Diyarbakır hide their identity even though working on low paid/scale in industry or other sectors. Moreover, if exposed they will get fired from the work. They are dark-skinned Gypsies and are reluctant to expose their identity due to prejudice and discriminatory treatment by the general masses. This identity is transformed into an intermediary status and object of ignoring, excluding, blaming, and dragging down by the other people. It is not only individuals and identities rather spaces and lifestyles are also leading to marginalization:

Almost this entire neighborhood is excluded by non-Gypsies, I mean the settled population. Our application for a job will not be entertained if the employers find out our ethnicity, being Gypsy (female, age 39, Turkey).

Gypsies are also aware of the negative perception and attitudes of the settled population towards them. From the interviews, the perception of a Gypsy, who is considering himself at the bottom of society leads to their social deprivation and exclusion. These findings are also confirmed by Marsch (2008, p. 93), that in Tekirdağ province the application of a young girl for a store saleswoman was not entertained because she was from Gypsy community. Similarly, the Zorlu Linen factory board has a clear-cut decision regarding the recruitment of Roma/Gypsy personnel in the factory.

Sir, we are the lowest layer of this society, no other human category is there below us. Look at those who are doing the worst jobs, for example: Mixing garbage, doing scrap work, begging, collection of bottles and other stuffs from garbage, and manual scavengers, almost all are Gypsies (female, age 34, Turkey).

Society on the one hand ignores them, discriminates and pushes them to deprivation and marginalization. While on the other side, society also needs them to make their ordinary works done, to collect their garbage, and to make them work in dangerous jobs. Their professions are unprofitable and are unable to fulfil their daily basic needs. They are lacking suitable accommodation, food, and health care (Casa-Nova, 2007, p. 110; Ciaian & Kanacs, 2018; Phillips, 2019). The older generation is aware of this situation:

My boy got into work at the tea store. I said, go into an insured job, life does not go on with temporary jobs. We were crushed and forced to crawled. I said, do not go the same way (male, age 60, Turkey).

Jobs that are relatively less permanent, such as a tea stove, seasonal agricultural jobs, fortune telling, basket and flowers selling are low paid and does not fulfil the basic daily needs. These jobs, however, often lack safety such as social insurance and social security (Vorvolakos et al., 2012). One respondent argued that:

By the time I was newly married, my first child had died, and likewise my brother' child had died too. We decided to join hands and get into an insured job to prepare a good future for our children. We did not find it for 20 years, they (society) do not provide us jobs, as if it is written on our forehead that we are Dom (male, age 45, Turkey).

In the struggle to get inclusion in society and the quest for a secure life for the next generation, again the Gypsy's identity has been despised and has been plugged into the hidden barriers. Looking at the relationship between Gypsy occupations and the labor market, it is seen that Gypsies are again in a disadvantaged position. They are unable to perform their own old occupations and unable to find secure jobs in the labor market. Moreover, they are excluded from the labor market and forced to do marginal jobs. Day-to-day, temporary, hazardous, and filthy jobs have become the core jobs of Gypsies. Absence of secure jobs and labor exploitation is expressed in the following words:

Almost all our young people do not work in an insured business. They work daily to feed themselves and their families. We call on young people to find insured jobs or work there. However, they cannot find. We cannot blame them. It is very rare in this city that Doms (Gypsies' group) work, they are also cheap employees (male, age 56, Turkey).

The study of B. Akkan, Deniz, and Ertan (2017) reveal the multidimensional exclusion of Gypsies with the manifestation of stigmatized spaces in Turkey. They argue that the dwellers, irrespective of their ethnic identity living in neighborhood of the most spatially stigmatized areas are prone to poverty and severe form of social exclusion. The study of Kolukırık and Toktaş (2007) also found that Gypsies in Turkey are typically low skilled, low paid employees and tend to be poor. High rate of unemployment among Roma/Gypsy youths push them towards criminal and militant activities throughout the country. Özateşler (2017) opined that the Urban Transformation Project launched in Sulukule Istanbul Turkey also targeted the Gypsies. Their houses were demolished, and they were forcefully exiled from their places. As a result, hundreds of families got homeless (Kurban, 2007), having no access to potable water with extremely poor life conditions. They are the invisible minorities in Turkey having no access to basic needs and services (Göncüoğlu & Yavuztürk, 2009; Şimsek, Kenan, & Galip, 2020).

In Pakistan, the Gypsies known as *Khanabadosh* community as well, lives in slums, on roadsides and on vacant plots. The local community call them Changaryan (Ali & Taieb, 2021). They are lacking basic facilities such as sanitation, electricity, gas, and potable water. They are usually involved in running small grocery shops, day laboring, and less productive traditional professions like drum beating at mellas/bazars for some meager benefits. Being nomadic in nature they lack permanent addresses and national identity cards as a necessary document to avail numerous government services. One of the interviewees shared his views with the researchers below:

All day I am roaming all the main chowks/streets of the Peshawar city. No work for Gypsies here. Then I collect some torn paper pieces, plastics, and bottles from dust bins. The prices of all these items are very low....and everything got expensive. So, I hardly can manage to buy some food for my family (male, age 36, Pakistan).

According to Berland and Berland (1982), the Qalandar Gypsy males train animals preferably bears but some other small animals too like goats, macaques, and dogs for routine entertainment. Male members are expected to stay at home and take care of the infants and perform household chores as well. The women on the other hand largely engage in begging and selling of toys, clothes, bedsheets, and other household utensils to the settled population. Another study conducted in Lahore city by Javed (2017) revealed the involvement of Gypsy communities in labour markets. They collect garbage and recycle material for selling in the near markets. Some members were also seen in the construction areas on daily wage basis. The female of the community was found as housemaids in near residential areas of Johar town Lahore (Javed, 2017).

My family condition is very bad. I hardly manage to fulfil my family expenses. Sometimes, generous people on the way give us some money or offer us food as a charity. We are extremely poor people of this society. We are facing shortage of space, have leaky tents during rain and are without electricity. At night during rain, we sleep in markets, mosques and cars or buses' parks. Early in the morning we get back to our tents because the owners of the shops will beat, bullying us or will call the police (male, age 48, Pakistan).

Gypsies/Khanabadosh communities in Pakistan can hardly get involved in the formal employment sectors due to lack of higher education. Finding jobs without required qualification and necessary documents are not possible in Pakistan (Suliman et al., 2017). Those who overcome the tremendous familial barriers and get education or skills can avail employment opportunities. One example is the first Gypsy/Khanabadosh woman Nazo in Pakistan, who earned three master's degrees (in English language, history, and education) and is teaching English in a government school in Gujar Khan, Punjab province. Khanabadosh community in Pakistan do not send their children to schools. They prefer to send them out for begging, garbage collection and laboring (Mehmood, 2020). Siddique, Ahmad, and Chaudhary (2017, p. 53) also found that nomadic communities are not happy with their

current sources of income in Kasur district Pakistan. Their self-imposed isolation is also contributing to their marginalization from employment and education (Ciaian & Kancs, 2016).

All day long me and my husband are selling balloons and bangles. We visit different sites each day and earn money for food. One balloon price is ten Pakistani rupees and the whole set of bangles ranges 50-90 rupees. We hardly manage to earn thousand rupees and spend almost all of them buying food items for our family (female, age 33, Pakistan).

From the above discussion we may conclude that Gypsies in both the countries show similarities in terms of exclusion from labor market, appropriate accommodation, and essential services. Majority of the Gypsy/Khanabadosh communities are involved in the same professions as begging, paper/plastics collection, balloons selling, selling of plastic utensils and street vending (Happy, 2021). They cannot find jobs in formal sectors due to illiteracy, lack of skills, and trainings. However, Gypsies/Çingeneler in Turkish society have more opportunities for work compared to the Pakistani community. Ethnic prejudice in finding jobs reported in Turkish society. However, the Pakistani respondents did not report any kind of racist abuse or comments during interviews.

Access to health services and Gypsies

In general Roma (Gypsies) in Turkey are facing the problems of integration and social harmony in many respects. They are facing problems like social exclusion, lack of security, labor market exclusion, cultural discrimination, lack of professional skills and poverty. Moreover, participants also have been forced to be challenged at the point of cultural harmony, do not have income-generating occupations, are discriminated, and insulted because of their cultural identities and life-styles. They have the lack of opportunities to build a safe future for their families and children. Cultural or ethnic identity and social exclusion is understood to be a form of relationship having a profound impression on the social memory of the Gypsy (Marcu & Chrysochoou, 2005; Marsch, 2008; Zeman, Depken, & Senchina, 2003). A participant stated this situation as follows:

A black stain on our forehead, as if it were written on our forehead. We have managed so far but we do not know what our children will do (male, age 50, Turkey).

The participant described destiny as a glue to their forehead like an unseen black stain that marks criminals; however, it was seen as a wound and is unclear how this deep wound will affect their future generations. The young generation does not know how to behave, how to react, and what kind of paths to choose. It seems that the bad luck of their ancestors follows them and persists on them like a nightmare. Desperation, disbelief, and uncertainty seem to be the fate of the young generation. Infant mortality and child deaths are high among nomads and Gypsies (Omar, 1992). They are less conscious about their health rights and needs (Hajioff & McKee, 2000). The health status and access to health services of Turkish Gypsies are not very different from the other poor and disadvantaged groups (Rizzi, 2020). They neglect many health problems and try to solve them in the household or in social environment. Only in serious cases they call for medical services. Their priority is to fulfil their daily basic needs. As one participant stated:

We are trying to fill our stomachs. We do not care much if the children are sick. They will get better anyway. How will you go to the hospital... having no money? (male, age 39, Turkey).

As per the results of Benjamin Lê et al. (2013) Gypsies have lower self-reported health issues and have higher mortality risk compared to non-Roma population. Their children are at high-risk health factors including environmental risks, low birth weight, and lower vaccination coverage. Moreover, Roma people have lack of access to health services (Ekmekçi, 2016), due to high illiteracy and lack of awareness about health privileges in Turkey (B. E. Akkan, Deniz, & Ertan, 2011). Despite their worse

health problems and illness, Gypsies and Travelers access less than the general population and other groups (Johnson, 1984; Parry et al., 2007; Placa & Smith, 2016; David Smith & Ruston, 2013).

This is clear from the statements of the respondents that Gypsies in Turkey are very conscious about their ethnic identity. They are reluctant to expose their ethnic identity due to the fear of stereotypes and prejudices from the majority population. According to Marsch (2008) in many ways they are experiencing discrimination on the basis of their ethnic identity. The “green card” system that allows the poor ethnic groups to have access to health care system in Turkey, is hardly accessible to Gypsies. There are many instances of misbehavior and refusal to treat Gypsies’ patients by doctors. The most common health issue among them is respiratory disease. Gypsy women have also negative attitudes towards family planning program and are mostly not benefiting from these (Avci, Cavusoglu, Aydin, & Altay, 2018). They have a high level of anxiety and poor mental health compared to the general population (Öcek, Çiçeklioğlu, Yücel, & Özdemir, 2014).

Pakistani government unfortunately does not pay much attention to spending on health and education (Choudhry & Bokhary, 2013). Nomads are considered to be the most vulnerable ethnic group in Pakistani society. They do not have access to clean drinking water, health, accommodation, and social security (Suliman et al., 2016a). One of the interviewees expressed in the following way:

Whenever we visit government hospitals or private clinics, the doctors and staff consider us strangers and do not feel comfortable to deal with us. My sister was ill seriously, and we prefer to treat her at home with natural/herbal medicines rather than going to hospital, due to the fear of mistreatment and prejudice (female, age 23, Pakistan).

The respondent’s statements explain the negative perception of the medical staff in specific. Those was contributing largely to their social isolation. On large scale they are stigmatized, marginalized, and do not have support even from their closest friends and tribe. They are feeling nervous in interaction with the service providers. One interviewee explained this situation in the following way:

We usually prefer to treat our patients at home.... you know the biggest issue is exposing identity....to be Gypsy or Roma here. You will see abrupt changes in the attitudes and dealings of doctors/staffs.... though not all but many (female, age 27, Pakistan).

According to Francis, (2013) health staff members had a limited knowledge about language, culture, health needs and communal life-styles. There is a dire need of Gypsies engagement with health professionals to minimize the health inequalities and ensure Gypsies and travelers inclusion in the mainstream health care system.

People are not feeling compatible with us during social interaction. They consider us outsiders and poor hygienic persons with bad smells (male, age 41, Pakistan).

The feeling of dissatisfaction from interviewee’s life-style and accommodation was obvious. He was not happy the way he lives. Gypsy communities in Pakistani society do not have proper place to live. They usually prefer to stay at canal sides, government places, non-irrigated or uncultivated lands. The government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan has recently launched a big scheme of universal health insurance. Every household will receive free health facilities free of cost, either in government or private hospitals of the province (Ayub et al., 2018; Cheema et al., 2020; R. Hussain & Arif, 2021; Khan, Ayub, Khan, Khan, & Jamil, 2018). Comprehensive survey-based research is needed to evaluate the status of Gypsies as a beneficiary group of the *Sehat Sahulat Program* in Pakistan. However, the respondents of this study did not know about such scheme and were not facilitating from the scheme. As per the views of the respondent:

I do not know about such scheme. These are for the rich and settled population. We are constantly changing our places for livelihood and food. I do not know how to apply, where to apply, get registration, and avail these opportunities (female, age 30, Pakistan).

Gypsies are facing difficulties in accessing land, health care, and education (Myers & Bhopal, 2009), and best sanitation facilities in Pakistan. They are reported to be the poorest group in accessing health services (Gavrielides, Topa, & Major, 2012). They are constantly moving and is, therefore, difficult to meet their needs of vaccination and health issues.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study not only reflect the general conditions of Gypsies in Pakistan and Turkey but also tackle their access to employment and health care services in the study regions. The findings revealed that Gypsies are in more disadvantaged position as compared to other social or ethnic groups both in Pakistani and Turkish society. They show similarities and dissimilarities in terms of employment status, working conditions and health care availability. Moreover, they are facing exclusion from labor market and employment. In both the countries, (fully in Pakistan and partially in Turkey) they remain outside the formal employment sector. Therefore, they tend to work in informal sectors like scrap, paper collection, porter, and begging. Their lack of education and qualification, ethnic identities and life-style also significantly push them towards informal sectors. Gypsies in Pakistan are mostly residing in tents in rural areas and are constantly changing their abodes. On the other hand, Turkish Gypsies are living in shanty-style single-story buildings in cities. Those who are living in rural areas continue their life in tents and frequently change their abode for livelihood.

Looking at the employment status of Gypsies in terms of gender and age, it is seen that both male and female members as well as child and adult members are in the labor market in both the countries. Child and adult male members are at the forefront in jobs such as junkyard and street sales, while child and adult female/male members are in the foreground in jobs such as begging and collecting paper. A fact that was not mentioned in the interviews is that women tend to focus more on areas such as begging due to the decrease in male employment areas in the cities. It was observed that female interviewees in Elâzığ Turkey expressed begging with the less pejorative concept of 'gathering'.

The similarity in benefiting from or accessing health services is that Gypsies in both the countries benefit very little from health services. This is especially true for Gypsies who live in tents or hut-style houses in rural areas and on the outskirts of cities. This is accompanied by unawareness about health. Health problems in these places are often seen as minor or treated with traditional family methods. Since access to health services brings with it a financial burden, the rate of applying to health institutions are extremely low. Constant mobility is also a reason of low access to health care services available.

When it comes to the point of differences, it is seen that the Gypsies in Pakistan and Turkey differ from each other in some ways. In terms of working areas and employment opportunities, although Gypsies in both countries concentrate on jobs in the informal sector, it has been found that Gypsies in Turkey have a wider working area and they use the informal sector intensively. In addition, it has been observed that Gypsies in Turkey find employment in the formal sectors as well, albeit limited, and thus have more chances for social and spatial advancement. Unlike the Pakistani Gypsies, Turkish Gypsies can find opportunities to work in fields such as construction and agriculture. Since this situation requires a network of relations and interaction with other people, it may contribute to the integration of Gypsies into society or the expansion of the practice of including Gypsies in the mainstream society. The fact worth noting is that Gypsies in Pakistan both lack citizenship status and stay out of construction and agriculture sectors which makes it more difficult for them to integrate into the mainstream society.

The status of health services exhibits a different picture. Turkish Gypsies are up to some extent covered by health insurance and thus are benefiting from free checkup, surgery, tests, free medicine, and other facilities in the government hospitals. In contrast, Gypsies in Pakistan are not included in any health insurance system; therefore, they are in a state of fundamental health insecurity. They try to solve basic health problems in ways they know in their social environment. Another important difference in the use of health services relates to the housing and residence status of Gypsies. Because most Gypsies in Turkey are residing in a settled life. Thus, their access to health care is relatively easier than others. In Pakistan, however, most Gypsies lifestyle is nomadic in nature, therefore they do not have access to health care and emergency services easily. Although this disadvantageous situation of Gypsies in Pakistan has been known for many years, neither governments nor civil society have been able to come up with solutions to this problem.

Looking at the broad picture of Gypsies' social deprivation from both employment and health services, the researchers are concluding with the similarities of discrimination, stereotyping, stigmatization, vulnerability and social exclusion within Pakistani and Turkish society. Both the societies are hostile to them and are lacking practical steps and policies for their amelioration and development. Their children are out of schools, lacking access to basic daily life needs, hygienic environment, and suitable accommodation with satisfying facilities. Their living standards and daily life routines were found worse in Pakistan as compared to these in Turkey. Finally, though they are living in two different geographies and two different cultural environments, even then they are suffering from several similar problems in terms of work, employment opportunities and use of health services. Moreover, their life-style and organization of societies in which they are living also contribute to their marginalization and exclusion.

It is seen that the living conditions of the Gypsies, especially the employment and health are worse than the other settled groups of society. In this respect, it is possible to say that Gypsies experience multiple disadvantages. Gypsies' recovery from these disadvantages and their equal participation in social life like other social segments depend on research that will objectively reveal their socio-economic and cultural status. In this context, it is very important to investigate the living conditions of Gypsy groups in different geographies through comparative studies. Investigation of the exclusion practices in labor market, education, health, social and cultural roots will help both to understand social prejudices against them and develop inclusive policies. Therefore, it is of great importance to examine the socio-cultural characteristics of both Gypsies in a society and different Gypsy groups in different societies, both with each other and with other social segments. There is a need of recognition in planning of housing schemes and other governmental policies for the progressive development of the Gypsies. They should also have access to appropriate health and employment schemes available for all members of the society irrespective of their ethnic or cultural background.

Article Information

Ethics Committee Approval:	This study received ethical approval from Selcuk University ethical committee with the approval number 2021/30 and dated 03/06/2021.
Informed Consent:	Prior to interview the respondents' consent was obtained through consent form by researchers.
Financial Support:	The study does not have any financial source/funding.
Conflict of Interest:	The authors declare no conflict of interest.
Copyrights:	No forbidden/copyrighted materials have been used in this study. In case of paraphrasing the sources were properly cited keeping in view the ethical principles of publication.

Ethical Statement: It is declared that scientific and ethical principles have been followed while carrying out and writing this study and that all the sources used have been properly cited. (Muhammad Suliman, Reşat Açıkgöz)

Telif Hakkı&Lisans/Copyright&License: Authors publishing with the journal retain the copyright to their work licensed under the CC BY-NC 4.0.

Cited as: Suliman, M. & Açıkgöz, R. (2022). A Comparative Analysis of Gypsies' Access to Employment Opportunities and Health Services in Pakistan and Turkey. *Selçuk Üniversitesi Edebiyat Fakültesi Dergisi*, (48), 277-294. DOI: 10.21497/sefad.1218484

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Akkan, B. E., Deniz, M. B., & Ertan, M. (2011). *Sosyal dışlanmanın roman halleri*. Istanbul: Boğaziçi Üniversitesi Sosyal Politika Formu.
- Akkan, B., Deniz, M. B., & Ertan, M. (2017). The Romanization of poverty: Spatial stigmatization of Roma neighborhoods in Turkey. *Romani Studies*, 27(1), 73-94. <https://doi.org/10.3828/rs.2017.4>
- Akkaya, Ö., & Yilgür, E. (2019). Locally Confined Territorial Stigmatization. The Case of "Gypsy" Stigma. *Idealkent*, 10(26), 214-25.
- Ali, L., & Taieb, M. (2021). Patterns and cultural traditions of marriage among Khanabadosh of Mardan. *The Journal of Humanities & Social Sciences, Faculty of Arts and Humanities, University of Peshawar*, 29(2), 16-30.
- Arayıcı, A. (2008). Gypsies: the forgotten people of Turkey. *International Social Science Journal*, 59(193), 527-538. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-2451.2009.01683.x>
- Avcı, I. A., Cavusoglu, F., Aydın, M., & Altay, B. (2018). Attitude and practice of family planning methods among Roma women living in northern Turkey. *International journal of nursing sciences*, 5(1), 33-38. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijnss.2018.01.002>
- Ayub, A., Khan, R. S., Khan, S. A., Hussain, H., Tabassum, A., Shehzad, J. A., & Shah, S. S. (2018). Progress of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa (Pakistan) towards universal health coverage. *Journal of Ayub Medical College, Abbottabad: JAMC*, 30(3), 482-485. <https://jamc.ayubmed.edu.pk/jamc/index.php/jamc/issue/view/97>
- Bancroft, A. (2017). Roma and Gypsy-Travellers in Europe: Modernity, Race, Space and Exclusion. <https://doi.org/10.31235/osf.io/csqh8>
- Bartosovic I. (2016). Some aspects of health status of the Gypsy population in Slovakia. *Bratislavske lekarske listy*, 117(1), 26-30. https://doi:10.4149/BLL_2016_006
- Berland, J. C. (1983). *Peripatetic strategies in South Asia: Skills as capital among nomadic artisans and entertainers* (13). (Commission on Nomadic Peoples, Issue. Nomadic Peoples.
- Berland, J. C. (1986). *Pārytān: "Native" Models of Peripatetic Strategies in Pakistan* (21/22). Commission on Nomadic Peoples.
- Berland, J. C. (2021). Territorial activities among peripatetic peoples in Pakistan. In *Mobility and Territoriality*. Routledge. <https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781003135135-18/territorial-activities-among-peripatetic-peoples-pakistan-joseph-berland>
- Berland, J. C., & Berland, J. (1982). *No five fingers are alike: Cognitive amplifiers in social context*. Harvard University Press.
- Brown, P. (2010). Review: social exclusion of Gypsies and Travellers: Health impact. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 15(4), 329-329. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987110363236>
- Casa-Nova, M. J. (2007). Gypsies, ethnicity, and the labour market: An introduction. *Romani Studies*, 17(1), 103-123. <https://doi.org/10.3828/rs.2007.4>

- Cemlyn, S., & Clark, C. (2005). The social exclusion of Gypsy and traveller children. In G. Preston (Ed.), *At Greatest Risk: the Children Most Likely to be Poor* (pp. 150-165). Child Poverty Action Group.
- Cheema, A. R., Zaidi, S., Najmi, R., Khan, F. A., Kori, S. A., & Shah, N. A. (2020). Availability Does Not Mean Utilisation: Analysis of a large Micro Health Insurance Programme in Pakistan. *Global Journal of Health Science*, 12(10), 1-14. <https://doi.org/10.5539/gjhs.v12n10p14>
- Choudhry, F. R., & Bokharey, I. Z. (2013). Perception of mental health in Pakistani nomads: An interpretative phenomenological analysis. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being*, 8(1), 1-10. <https://doi.org/10.3402/qhw.v8i0.22469>
- Ciaian, P. (2016). *Causes of the Social and Economic Marginalisation: The Role of Social Mobility Barriers for Roma* (No. EERI RP 2016/03): Economics and Econometrics Research Institute (EERI), Brussels. https://econpapers.repec.org/paper/eeirpaper/eeri_5frp_5f2016_5f03.htm
- Ciaian, P., & Kanacs, d. A. (2018). Marginalisation of Roma: Root Causes and Possible Policy Actions. *European Review*, 27, 115 - 130. <https://doi:10.1017/S106279871800056X>
- Condon, L., Bedford, H., Ireland, L., Kerr, S., Mytton, J., Richardson, Z., & Jackson, C. (2019). Engaging Gypsy, Roma, and Traveller communities in research: maximizing opportunities and overcoming challenges. *Qualitative Health Research*, 29(9), 1324-1333. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1049732318813558>
- Cook, B., Wayne, G. F., Valentine, A., Lessios, A., & Yeh, E. (2013). Revisiting the evidence on health and health care disparities among the Roma: a systematic review 2003–2012. *International journal of public health*, 58(6), 885-911. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00038-013-0518-6>
- Council of Europe (2011) *Defending Roma human rights in Europe*, Brussels: Council of Europe.
- Council of Europe (2012) *Council of Europe strategy for the rights of the child (2012-2015)* CM (2011)171 final, Strasbourg, Council of Europe
- Crang, M. (2002). Between places: producing hubs, flows, and networks. *Environment and Planning*, 34(4), 569-574. <https://doi.org/10.1068/a34154>
- Crowe, D. M. (1999). The Gypsies of Romania since 1990. *Nationalities Papers*, 27(1), 57-67. <https://doi.org/10.1080/009059999109181>
- David, S., Margaret, G. (2012). Housed Gypsies and travellers in the UK: work, exclusion and adaptation. *Race & Class*, 53(3), 48-64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0306396811425985>
- Drakakis, S. A. (2007). Nomadism a moving myth? Policies of exclusion and the Gypsy/Traveller response. *Mobilities*, 2(3), 463-487. <https://doi:10.1080/17450100701597467>
- Durst, J. (2011). What makes us Gypsies, who knows? Ethnicity and reproduction. In M. S. a. M. ROVID (Ed.), *Multi-disciplinary approaches to Romany studies* (pp. 13-34). Hungary: CEU Summer University.
- Ekmekçi, P. E. (2016). Health and Roma people in Turkey. *Balkan Medical Journal*, 33(4), 377-382. <https://doi:10.5152/balkanmedj.2016.151385>
- Fırat, M., & Açıkgöz, R. (2020). Elazığ'da yaşayan çingenelerin değişen/dönüşen meslekleri üzerine nitel bir araştırma. *Journal of Economy Culture and Society*(Özel Sayı 1/Supplement 1), 229-248.
- Francis, G. (2013). Developing the cultural competence of health professionals working with Gypsy Travellers. *Journal of Psychological Issues in Organizational Culture*, 3(1), 64-77. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jpoc.21074>
- Gavrielides, T., Topa, S., & Major, A. (2012). Universal human rights? Looking at multi-cultural Britain and Canada for Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Criminology Volume*, 4(2), 45-62.
- Gazdar, H., Masood, S. Q., & Naqvi, H. (2013). Bottom Up or Top Down? Exclusion and Citizenship in Pakistan, Karachi: Collective for Social Science Research. <http://www.researchcollective.org/>

- Göncüoğlu, S. F., & Yavuztürk, Ş. P. (2009). Sulukule ve çingeneleri. *Güzel Sanatlar Enstitüsü Dergisi* (23), 107-134. <https://dergipark.org.tr/en/pub/ataunigsed/issue/2579/33178>
- Hajioff, S., & McKee, M. (2000). The health of the Roma people: a review of the published literature. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 54(11), 864-869. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jech.54.11.864>
- Hancock, I. (2010). *Danger! Educated Gypsy: Selected Essays*. Univ of Hertfordshire Press.
- Hancock, I. (2010). Mind the doors! The contribution of linguistics. In *All Change: Romani Studies through Romani Eyes*. University of Hertfordshire Press
- Hancock, I. F. (1987). *The pariah syndrome: An account of Gypsy slavery and persecution*. Karoma Pub.
- Happy, S. (2021). *Khanabadosh! Faqeer life in pakistan | Pakistani Gypsy | Khana Badosh Ramzan Special*. Retrieved from <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=IAmhb5eUys8>
- Hussain, A. (1979) *Elite politics in an ideological state: the case of Pakistan*. Folkestone: Dowson & Sons.
- Hussain, R., & Arif, S. (2021). Universal health coverage and COVID-19: recent developments and implications. *Journal of Pharmaceutical Policy and Practice*, 14(1), 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40545-021-00306-x>
- İlhan, S., & Fırat, M. (2017). Bir inşa süreci olarak çingenelik: Kuramsal bir çözümleme. *Fırat Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 27(2), 265-276. <https://doi.org/10.18069/firatsbed.346534>
- Imre, A. (2005). *Whiteness in post-socialist Eastern Europe: The time of the Gypsies, the end of race* (Vol. 10): State University of New York Press Albany.
- Javed, K. (2017). To reveal the emotional value of Khanabadosh and spirit of huts. *International Journal of Scientific & Engineering Research*, 8(10), 618-622.
- Johnson, M. (1984). Ethnic minorities and health. *Journal of the Royal College of Physicians of London*, 18(4), 228-230.
- Kabachnik, P., & Ryder, A. (2013). Nomadism and the 2003 anti-social behaviour act: constraining Gypsy and Traveller mobilities in Britain. *Romani Studies*, 23(1), 83-106. <https://www.muse.jhu.edu/article/509384>.
- Kalsbeek, W. D., & Cross, A. (1982). Problems in sampling nomadic population. Proceedings of the American Statistical Association, Survey Research Methods Section.
- Karlıdağ, Melike, & Marsh, Adrian. (2008). A study of research literature regarding Turkish Gypsies and the question of Gypsy Identity. In E. Uzpeder, S. Danova/Roussinova, S. Özçelik, & S. Gökçen (Eds.), *We are Here! Discriminatory exclusion and struggle for rights of Roma in Turkey* (pp. 143-156). Istanbul: Mart Matbaacılık. <https://www.ceeol.com/search/article-detail?id=200104>
- Kenrick, D. (2004). *Gypsies: from the Ganges to the Thames* (Vol. 3): Univ of Hertfordshire Press.
- Kenrick, D. (2007). *Historical dictionary of the Gypsies (Romanies)*. Scarecrow Press.
- Khan, S. A., Ayub, A., Khan, K. A., Khan, R. S., & Jamil, A. (2018). Political Architecture and Legal Framework Related to Social Health Protection Schemes in Pakistan: Qualitative Inquiry of Policy Makers' Viewpoint. *Journal of Ayub Medical College, Abbottabad: JAMC*, 30(3), 389-396. <https://europepmc.org/article/med/30465372>
- Kılıçoğlu, G., & Kılıçoğlu, D. Y. (2018). The Romany States of Education in Turkey: A Qualitative Study. *The Urban Review*, 50(3), 402-429. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11256-017-0439-4>
- Kolukırık, S. (2009). *Dünden bugüne çingeneler*. Istanbul: Ozan Yayıncılık.
- Kolukırık, S., & Toktaş, Ş. (2007). Turkey's Roma: Political participation and organization. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 43(5), 761-777. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00263200701422675>

- Kreutzmann, H. (2003). Ethnic minorities and marginality in the Pamirian Knot: survival of Wakhi and Kirghiz in a harsh environment and global contexts. *Geographical Journal*, 169(3), 215-235. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-4959.00086>
- Kurban, D. (2007). *A quest for equality: Minorities in Turkey*. UK: Minority Rights Group International London.
- Lasker, M. S., Dio, L. M., Chowdhury, M. H., Hossain, M. S., Islam, M. N., & Chowdhury, M. J. (2019). Lifestyle of the Nomadic River Gypsies and their threat Narrative: A Tale of two villages in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Environmental Sciences & Natural Resources*, 17(5), 154-161.
- Lasker, M. S., Dio, L. M., Chowdhury, M. H., Hossain, M. S., Islam, M. N., & Chowdhury, M. J. (2019). Lifestyle of the Nomadic River Gypsies and their threat Narrative: A Tale of two villages in Bangladesh. *International Journal of Environmental Sciences & Natural Resources*, 17(5), 154-161.
- Lloyd, G., & Stead, J. (2001). The boys and girls not calling me names and the teachers to believe me. Name calling and the experiences of Travellers in school. *Children & Society*, 15(5), 361-374. <https://doi.org/10.1002/chi.671>
- Lucassen, L. (1991). The power of definition. Stigmatisation, minoritisation and ethnicity illustrated by the history of gypsies in the Netherlands. *Netherlands Journal of Social Sciences*, 27, 80-91.
- Lucassen, L., Willems, W., & Cottaar, A.-M. (2015). *Gypsies and other itinerant groups: A socio-historical approach*. Springer.
- Marcu, A., & Chrysochoou, X. (2005). Exclusion of Ethnic Groups from the Realm of Humanity: Prejudice against the Gypsies in Britain and in Romania. *Psicologia Politica*, 30, 41-56.
- Marsch, A. (2008). Ethnicity and identity: who are the Gypsies? *European Roma Rights Center Country Reports Series* (17), 21-30.
- McGarry, A. (2010). *Who speaks for Roma?: Political representation of a transnational minority community*. The Continuum International Publishing Group Inc.
- Mehmood, A. (2020). Education Took Her from Darkness to Light: Pakistan 'gypsy' woman overcomes tremendous barriers to earn three master's degrees. *The Media Line*.
- Messing, V. (2014). Methodological puzzles of surveying Roma/Gypsy populations. *Ethnicities*, 14(6), 811-829. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1468796814542180>
- Millan, M., & Smith, D. (2019). A Comparative Sociology of Gypsy Traveller Health in the UK. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 16(3), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16030379>
- Myers, M. (2014). *Narratives of Gypsy Identity and the Crossing of Boundaries* (PhD thesis). The Open University. <https://doi.org/10.21954/ou.ro.0000eeff>
- Myers, M., & Bhopal, K. (2009). Gypsy, Roma and Traveler Children in Schools: Understandings of community and safety. *British Journal of Educational Studies*, 57(4), 417-434. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8527.2009.00442.x>
- Niner, P. (2004). Accommodating Nomadism? An Examination of Accommodation Options for Gypsies and Travellers in England. *Housing Studies*, 19(2), 141-159. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0267303032000168568>
- Öcek, Z. A., Çiçeklioğlu, M., Yücel, U., & Özdemir, R. (2014). Family medicine model in Turkey: a qualitative assessment from the perspectives of primary care workers. *BMC family practice*, 15(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2296-15-38>
- Omar, M. A. (1992). *Health care for nomads too, please*. Paper presented at the World health forum 1992; 13 (4): 307-310.

- Önen, S. (2013). Citizenship Rights of Gypsies in Turkey: Roma and Dom Communities. *Middle Eastern Studies*, 49, 608-622. <https://doi:10.1080/00263206.2013.798310>
- Özateşler, G. (2014). Gypsies under Surveillance. In *Gypsy Stigma and Exclusion in Turkey, 1970* (pp. 25-50): Springer.
- Özateşler, G. (2017). Multidimensionality of exclusionary violence: A case of anti-Gypsy violence in Turkey. *Ethnicities*, 17(6), 792-815. <https://doi:10.1177/1468796813518206>
- Parry, G., Van Cleemput, P., Peters, J., Walters, S., Thomas, K., & Cooper, C. (2007). Health status of Gypsies and Travellers in England. *Journal of Epidemiology & Community Health*, 61(3), 198-204. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jech.2006.045997>
- Partington, M. (1999). Current developments. *The Journal of Social Welfare & Family Law*, 21(3), 279-284.
- Pearson, R. (1988). Ian Hancock, The Pariah Syndrome: An Account of Gypsy Slavery and Persecution. Ann Arbor, MI: Karoma Publishers, 1987. xii, 180 pp. *Nationalities Papers*, 16(2), 332-334.
- Peters, J., Parry, G. D., Van Cleemput, P., Moore, J., Cooper, C. L., & Walters, S. J. (2009). Health and use of health services: a comparison between Gypsies and Travellers and other ethnic groups. *Ethnicity & health*, 14(4), 359-377. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13557850802699130>
- Phillips, C. (2019). The trouble with culture: A speculative account of the role of gypsy/traveller cultures in 'doorstep fraud.' *Theoretical Criminology*, 23(3), 333-354. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1362480617733725>
- Placa, V. L., & Smith, D. M. (2016). The Health and Wellbeing of Gypsies and Travellers in Settled Housing: A Narrative Review of the Evidence and Policy. *International journal of social science studies*, 4, 87-96. <http://dx.doi.org/10.11114/ijsss.v4i9.1812>
- Rüdiger, J.c.c. (1996). *On the Indic Language and Origin of the Gypsies* (K.B. Manuel Priego Thimmel, & Annette Monreal, Trans.). University of Manchester.
- Shubin, S., & Swanson, K. (2010). "I'm an imaginary figure": Unravelling the mobility and marginalisation of Scottish Gypsy Travellers. *Geoforum*, 41(6), 919-929. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2010.06.006>
- Siddique, A., Ahmad, S., & Chaudhary, A. H. (2017). Exploring nomadic parents' attitudes towards education of children in district Kasur. *Journal of Secondary Education and Research*, 1(1), 45-55. <http://pu.edu.pk/home/journal/46/contactus.html>
- Şimsek, S., Kenan, U., & Galip, Ö. (2020). Türkiye'de romanların yaşadıkları problemlere romanlar, yerel idareciler ve yöneticiler perspektifinden bir bakış. *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi* (50), 164-185. <https://doi.org/10.48070/erusosbilder.705640>
- Smith, D., & Ruston, A. (2013). 'If you feel that nobody wants you, you'll withdraw into your own': Gypsies/Travellers, networks and healthcare utilisation. *Sociology of Health & Illness*, 35(8), 1196-1210. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9566.12029>
- Soulis, G. C. (1961). The Gypsies in the Byzantine Empire and the Balkans in the Late Middle Ages. *Dumbarton Oaks Papers*, 15, 141-165. <https://doi:10.2307/1291178>
- Spooner, B. (1984). Nomads in a Wider Society. *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, 8 (1), Retrieved from https://repository.upenn.edu/anthro_papers/70
- Suliman, M., Shah, M., & Ullah, A. (2016b). Nomads: The Politically Marginalised Segment of Pakistani Society on the basis of Ethnic Prejudice. *Journal of Exclusion Studies*, 6(1), 18-29. 10.5958/2231-4555.2016.00002.4

- Suliman, M., Shah, M., & Ullah, I. (2017). Addressing the issue of nomadic communities' children educational exclusion through mobile tent schools in Malakand, Pakistan. *Imperial journal of interdisciplinary research (IJIR)*, 3(3), 540-546. <http://www.onlinejournal.in>
- Suliman, M., Shah, M., Ullah, A., & Jamal, H. (2016a). Ethnicity based Social Exclusion of Nomads in Khyber District Malakand, Pakhtunkhwa-Pakistan. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 3(1), 11-19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.29333/ejecs/41>
- Syed, J. (2008). Pakistani model of diversity management: Rediscovering Jinnah's vision. *International Journal of Sociology and Social Policy*, 28(3/4), 100-113. <https://doi:10.1108/01443330810862179>
- Ugur Rizzi, C. (2020). Antiziganism as a Barrier for the Roma to Access Policies: The Case of Romani Access to Education in Turkey. *Ethnopolitics*, 1-12. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449057.2020.1839220>
- Uştuk, O., & Tunç Cox, A. (2020). Roma people of Turkey re-write their cinematographic images. *Ethnicities*, 20(3), 501-519. <https://doi:10.1177/1468796819890463>
- Van Cleemput, P. (2010). Social exclusion of Gypsies and Travellers: Health impact. *Journal of Research in Nursing*, 15(4), 315-327. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987110363235>
- Vašečka, M., Jurásková, M., & Nicholson, T. (2003). *Čačipen pal o Roma. A global report on Roma in Slovakia*. Institute for Public Affairs.
- Vorvolakos, T., Samakouri, M., Tripsianis, G., Tsatalmpasidou, E., Arvaniti, A., Terzoudi, A., & Livaditis, M. (2012). Sociodemographic and clinical characteristics of Roma and non-Roma psychiatric outpatients in Greece. *Ethnicity & health*, 17(1-2), 161-169. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13557858.2012.654767>
- Weckman, S. (1998). Researching Finnish gypsies: Advice from a gypsy. *Gypsies: An Interdisciplinary Reader*, New York: Garland.
- Yıldız, H. (2007). Türkçede Çingener için kullanılan kelimeler ve bunların etimolojileri. *Dil Araştırmaları*, 1(1), 61-82.
- Yılıgür, E. (2015). Ethnicity, class and politicisation: Immigrant Roma tobacco workers in Turkey. *Romani Studies*, 25(2), 167-196.
- Yılıgür, E. (2017). Türkiye'de peripatetik topluluklar: Jenerik terimler ve öz-etnik kategorizasyon biçimleri. *Nişantaşı Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*. 5(1), 1- 25.
- Yılıgür, E. (2018). Balkanlar, Anadolu ve Mezopotamya'da zanaat göçebeleri. *KA Dergi*, 3(8), 22-35.
- Zeman, C. L., Depken, D. E., & Senchina, D. S. (2003). Roma health issues: a review of the literature and discussion. *Ethnicity & health*, 8(3), 223-249. <https://doi:10.1080/1355785032000136434>