The International Indigenous Policy Journal

Volume 7 | Issue 3 Article 6

July 2016

Indigenous Inclusion in Public Policy: A Comparison of Urban Aboriginal Peoples in Canada and Travellers in Ireland

Joanne M. Heritz
McMaster University, joheritz@gmail.com

Recommended Citation
Heritz, J. M. (2016). Indigenous Inclusion in Public Policy: A Comparison of Urban Aboriginal Peoples in Canada and Travellers in Ireland. *The International Indigenous Policy Journal*, 7(3).
DOI: https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2016.7.3.6

Indigenous Inclusion in Public Policy: A Comparison of Urban Aboriginal Peoples in Canada and Travellers in Ireland

Abstract
To what extent are voluntary organizations included in the policy processes that make decisions regarding the needs and interests of Indigenous groups? As politically underrepresented groups, both urban Aboriginal Peoples and Travellers rely on voluntary organizations to provide culturally appropriate programs and services and to advocate on their behalf. Applying a scalar analysis, this project isolated three key concepts that are critical to their inclusion in policy processes. First, is the incorporation of their issues and interests in cultural programs and services. Second, is group representation in policy processes. And third is their collaboration with government. On balance, it appears that urban Aboriginal Peoples in Canada have moved closer to inclusion in policy processes than Travellers.

Keywords
policy, representation, urban Aboriginal Peoples, Travellers

Acknowledgments
The author would like to thank Catherine Frost, Karen Bird, and Peter Graefe, and the journal's anonymous reviewers for their comments on this manuscript.

Creative Commons License

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Noncommercial-No Derivative Works 4.0 License.

Indigenous Inclusion in Public Policy: A Comparison of Urban Aboriginal Peoples in Canada and Travellers in Ireland

Does the inclusion of underrepresented Indigenous groups in policy processes facilitate outcomes that address their individual and community needs and interests? This question is based on the premise that choice—in terms of adhering to traditional or to mainstream lifeways, to varying degrees—is crucial to "build the case that a secure sense of personal and cultural continuity are necessary conditions for personal or cultural identity" (Chandler & Lalonde, 2009, p. 223). Securing cultural continuity is challenging for marginalized, politically underrepresented groups. Government agencies tend to rely on leaders of voluntary organizations to represent their Indigenous communities in decision-making processes. In turn, the voluntary sector adjusts the levers so that policy accommodates these groups by (a) articulating their specific issues and interests, and (b) designing programs and services that meet these criteria.

In other words, this article asks: In the process of providing programs and service delivery, how and to what extent is the voluntary sector included in policy processes whose decisions impact politically underrepresented Indigenous groups? It is only when members of these groups have their issues and interests addressed that they will secure a sense of personal and cultural continuity.

The study of public policy for Aboriginal Peoples in Canada and Travellers in Ireland (see for example Lewis & May, 2007) does not involve comparing the two groups that are indigenous to their respective countries; rather, it involves comparing the engagement of these Indigenous Peoples with their respective governments and with the efficacy of the voluntary sector in defining and achieving their policy needs. The comparison of two specific cases broadens our ability to consider certain phenomena in each instance, specifically, the accommodation of issues and interests of urban Aboriginal Peoples and Travellers and the availability of opportunities for these groups to secure cultural continuity.

The article commences with background context for urban Aboriginal Peoples in Canada and Travellers in Ireland, followed by a justification of the urban sites selected for the comparative analysis. It then tests Laforest's (2011) concept of scale to explain how opportunities available to Indigenous voluntary organizations to secure policy aligns with levels of interaction available, using the following systems:

a. The micro scale lays out the cultural component of programs and services provided by voluntary organizations.

b. The meso scale reports on the relationship between voluntary organizations and government and the inclusion or exclusion of these groups by government in policy processes.

c. And the macro scale reveals the extent to which broad state and societal forces impact on the capacity of voluntary organization to secure the needs and interests of both groups.

The discussion compares the opportunities and obstacles faced by both groups regarding their inclusion in policy processes. The conclusion recommends specific criteria necessary for the inclusion of groups in policy processes.

Urban Aboriginal Peoples and Travellers

Urban Aboriginal Peoples in Canada

The term urban Aboriginal Peoples refers to political and cultural entities of the original peoples of North America, which include First Nations, Inuit, and Métis peoples, who reside in urban centres (Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples [RCAP], 1996). In Canada, "Indian" is also a legal term to signify those people the government recognizes as having Indian status and are recognized under the Indian Act. The term "non-Status Indian" refers to people who lost their status, and who do not have the same rights under law as Status Indians (Warry, 2007, p. 9), and both of these groups may be included as urban Aboriginal Peoples. This article uses Andersen's (2013) definition of "urban Aboriginal—as a distinctive and equally legitimate form of Aboriginal identity" (p. 47) based their distinctive social context, which includes economic marginalization, growing professional and middle classes, racism and social exclusion, legal diversity, status blindness, urban Aboriginal institutions, distinctiveness of urban Aboriginal policy ethos, the character of informal networks, attachment to non-urban communities, struggles over the political representation of urban Aboriginal Peoples, and places of Aboriginal women in urban Aboriginal social relations.

Most major Canadian cities developed in locations used by Aboriginal Peoples as gathering places in the period before European settlement. Over time, these most of these people were systematically dislocated from urban centres and moved to reserves, most of which were located considerable distances from urban centres and original habitations. The Métis were dispossessed from their settlements near urban centres due to expropriation to accommodate spreading urban boundaries (Newhouse & Peters, 2003). Having been segregated from urban centres, the notion of an urban Aboriginal person became incompatible with images of Aboriginal Peoples. Those who returned to cities were often regarded as individuals "who had turned their backs on their culture" (Newhouse & Peters, 2003, p. 6) even though they were traveling within their traditional territories. In accordance with the Indian Act 1876, First Nations were sequestered on reserves, located far away from urban centres (Peters, 2001). In the present day, there is significant movement of Aboriginal Peoples between reserves and cities; therefore, the two populations are not completely disparate (Maxim, Keane, & White, 2003).

According to the Census (Statistics Canada, 2011a), over 1.4 million individuals, or 4.3 percent of Canada's population, identify as Aboriginal, more than half of whom live in an urban setting. The Aboriginal population is expanding more rapidly than the non-Aboriginal population. Between 2006 and 2011, the Aboriginal population grew by 20 percent compared to 6 percent for the non-Aboriginal population in Canada (Statistics Canada, 2011a). When compared to the non-Aboriginal population, Aboriginal Peoples are disproportionately poor. Aboriginal unemployment rates are more than double non-Aboriginal rates (Peters, 2011). Among those who are employed, Aboriginal Peoples have lower incomes than non-Aboriginal peoples and they have been declining relatively over time. Food insecurity is much higher among Aboriginal households (Harell, Soroks, & Ladner, 2014). Aboriginal Peoples fare lower on indicators for longevity and have higher rates of suicide (Kirmayer et al., 2007), addictions, and incarceration (Cardinal, 2006) than the general population. Aboriginal People elicit more negative stereotypes when compared to Whites or visible minorities: "Explicit racism stereotypes such as poor, ignorant, dirty, stupid, unfriendly are associated with Aboriginal peoples as a group, and the public often blames Aboriginal people for the problems they face" (Harell et al., 2014, p. 2586).

DOI: https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2016.7.3.6

The urban Aboriginal experience is as varied as the urban centres themselves, but they do share commonalities (Lawrence, 2004; Silver, 2006). First, status and benefits for First Nations people living on reserve are applicable to each reserve only and are not transferable to urban centres. Second, urban centres may present challenges in connecting to traditional sources of Aboriginal culture, including contact with the land, Elders, Aboriginal languages, and spiritual ceremonies (Peters, 2002). Third, although there are Aboriginal Peoples in the middle and professional classes, the fact remains that lower income groups include a disproportionately high number of Aboriginal Peoples (Parriag & Chaulk, 2013). And fourth, some regard input in policy processes as tokenistic rather than genuinely consultative (Nguyen, 2014).

Travellers in Ireland

The Government of Ireland defines Travellers as " . . . the community of people who are commonly called Travellers and who are identified (both by themselves and others) as people with a shared history, culture and traditions, including historically, a nomadic way of life on the island of Ireland" (Government of Ireland, 2002a, p. 7). As a group, Travellers were excluded from national stories of Irish history and culture. Even those that examine the role of ethnicity and social diversity in Ireland often fail to mention Travellers (Fanning, 2009, pp. 17-18). Struggles for independence from Great Britain led to the Easter Rising in 1916 and the acceptance of the Anglo-Irish Treaty in 1921, which established Ireland's Dominion status within the British Empire. The identification of Travellers provided a way to uphold Gaelic society and culture and downplay the role of the Anglo-Irish in Irish cultural development in newly independent Ireland. MacGréine was the first folklorist to collect information directly from "tinkers" and became the first to refer to them as "Travellers" and he credited them for the spread of folk tales as "important repositories of Irish tradition" (cited in Helleiner, 2003, p. 47-48). Although Travellers made gains in cultural notoriety, they were increasingly othered and separated from mainstream society over time.

There are approximately 30,000 Travellers in Ireland, slightly less than one percent of Ireland's population of almost five million (Central Statistics Office, 2012). The Traveller Health Study placed the Traveller population at closer to 40,000 (All Ireland Traveller Health Study [AITHS], 2010). Their culture, values, language, customs, family economy, oral traditions, and nomadism all separate them from mainstream society (Binchy, 1995; Ó Floinn, 1995). Travellers disproportionately rely on state resources due to their status as a vulnerable group. They rank high in terms of health risks including a suicide rate 3 times that of the national rate (Royall, 2010) and have lower average levels of educational attainment and employment ("Report of the Task Force," 1995). As Fay (2001) noted,

> [Travellers'] experience of low social status and exclusion . . . is mostly due to the widespread hostility of settled people towards them. This hostility is based on prejudice, which in turn gives rise to discrimination and affects Travellers in all aspects of their lives. (p. 99-100)

Travellers seek housing that accommodates their preference for either living on the road or living in close proximity to their extended families, or both (Kenny & Binchy, 2009). Living on the road has become increasingly difficult since the passing of the Trespass Law in 2002 (Government of Ireland, 2002b), which severely curtails parking on private and public property. Currently, 12 percent of Travellers live in caravans and mobile homes while the majority of Travellers reside in group or standard

housing schemes (Central Statistics Office, 2012). Standard housing (single family units in multiple storied buildings) is the accommodation most readily accessible to Travellers because it is available to the general public. However, standard housing runs counter to the preferences many Travellers have for living in group housing (Kenny & Binchy, 2009).

Method

Case selection involved choosing two types of urban centres within each country. One larger urban centre was chosen to provide access to government as a national or provincial capital and as access to the headquarters of voluntary sector organizations. A second satellite urban centre was chosen for three reasons. First, these urban centres have significant Indigenous populations. Second, a satellite location tests whether the balance of advocacy, service delivery, and specialization of services varies from one urban centre to another. And third, from a scalar perspective, a satellite location is helpful in assessing whether opportunities for action for voluntary organizations exist in policy processes or whether these opportunities are isolated by locale.

Toronto and Thunder Bay were the two urban centres selected as cases for urban Aboriginal Peoples in Canada for the following reasons: the province of Ontario (where Toronto and Thunder Bay are located) has the largest Aboriginal population (Statistics Canada, 2011b). Toronto and Thunder Bay are among the 10 major urban centres with the highest percentage of people identifying as Aboriginal (Vancouver, Edmonton, Calgary, Regina, Saskatoon, Winnipeg, Thunder Bay, Montreal, Toronto, Halifax, and Ottawa) (Environics Institute, 2010). Toronto, with an Aboriginal population of 36, 990,[1] is the capital of Ontario, and provides a concentration of contact nodes that include provincial ministries and provincial Aboriginal organizations. Thunder Bay, located 1,400 kilometers from Toronto in Ontario's more sparsely populated northern region, was selected as a satellite case because its Aboriginal identity population of 11,675 comprises almost 11 percent of Thunder Bay's overall population of 108,359 (Statistics Canada, 2011a).

Dublin and Galway were the two urban centres selected as cases for Travellers in Ireland. As the capital city of Ireland, Dublin (with a Traveller population of 5,935) provides a concentration of access to policy actors at both national and local levels of government and their respective departments. As an urban centre with a significant Traveller population, Dublin also provides access to local Traveller organizations. Galway, located 200 kilometres from Dublin, on the west coast of Ireland, has a Traveller population of 1,667 and the largest proportion of Travellers at 22 percent (Central Statistics Office, 2012).

Forty-nine confidential interviews were conducted in Canada (29) and Ireland (20) between September 2010 and June 2011. The interviewees consisted of voluntary organization representatives, government officials, and scholars whose mandates or research interests included urban Aboriginal Peoples and/or Travellers. Organizations contacted included national, provincial, and/or local organizations. Key organizations in areas of health, justice, housing (which included shelter for the homeless), and children's and family services were contacted. Participant selection focused mainly on education, health, and housing programs and services that aligned with the needs of marginalized members of

[1] Local agencies estimate the Aboriginal population to be 70,000 (McCaskill, FitzMaurice, & Cidro, 2011).

DOI: https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2016.7.3.6

communities in crises. Correctional services (even though members of these groups have higher incarceration rates) and employment services (despite high unemployment rates for members of both communities) were not as easily identified because organizations were not identifiable in all of the four urban centres or they were integrated into the mandates of other Indigenous organizations. The aim was to identify the points of negotiation for these groups when it came to impacting policy development in order to more fully understand the setting for advocacy activities in the two cases, including the role of advocacy groups, the voluntary sector, and systems of government representation. Qualitative methods, including data collected using open-ended questions in semi-structured interviews with key informants in Aboriginal and Traveller organizations and with government officials, were used to analyse program, service delivery, and advocacy activities of Aboriginal and Traveller organizations (see Appendix A). Participants were not selected from specific Indigenous communities. Rather, Indigenous identity was used as a variable to determine the extent to which Aboriginal Peoples or Travellers have input in policy processes. Participants were not compensated for the interview. They were recruited based on their employment in voluntary organizations and government, and were interviewed at their place of employment during working hours. These interviews provided information regarding the engagement of urban Aboriginal Peoples and Travellers in the very policy processes that define and work to achieve their needs. The information gathered from notes taken during interviews, from organizational documents, and from personal observations were thematically coded and analyzed using a scalar approach that examined the opportunities available to voluntary organizations to advocate for policy that aligns with the needs and interests of the underrepresented groups they represent. Rather than adhering to a method that isolated analysis of policy activities at each level of government, this constructivist approach defined the overall scope of the space in which voluntary organizations manoeuvre. While the scalar approach is useful in illuminating various policy processes within multi-governance frameworks, it is also flexible as an analytical tool that has been adapted for this comparison.

The theoretical framework for the analysis of minority group representation in policy processes is a model that assesses the various scales of social action. Understanding the importance of scale in politics is challenged by a pre-existing scalar vocabulary that spans from the smallest to the largest, namely local, regional, national, and transnational levels of government. For this analysis, scale should be considered as a dimension of social processes rather than as a fixed unit. Applying scale to social movements reveals that groups organize and mobilize at different geographical scales, therefore, they "actively make and remake the scales of collective action" (Masson, 2006, p. 4). Political opportunities create scales of action. Laforest (2011) used the concept of scale to recognize new governance relations that take place at different levels of analysis, ranging from the micro to the macro in processes that construct social relations. Due to varying governance relations for the voluntary sector, more emphasis is placed on scales of human life as the spatial construction of social groupings, such as gender, race, and voluntary associations (Laforest, 2011). A scalar approach is useful in a comparison of least similar cases to understand how and why one group experiences more successful inclusion in policy processes than the other.

The micro scale, the meso scale, and the macro scale are applied where policy for Indigenous groups takes place, and is used to evaluate the extent of their inclusion in these processes. The micro scale focuses on organizations and the processes that are unique to their organizational design. The meso scale locates the dynamics of organizational participation within the policy community (Laforest, 2011) by addressing relationships that shape and affect policy at the macro and micro levels (Evans, 2001).

The macro scale embodies the broader interaction between the state and the voluntary sector. Organizations that are representing themselves to the state devise strategies for issues that are important to them. This collective action influences the dynamics within the policy field from which emerges a distinct representation of the sector. These interactions and processes are unique to the policy issue, the actors, and the sector (Laforest, 2011).

There are additional aspects of interaction that contribute to scale that are not confined to the micro, meso, and macro structure, but may influence this model. First, the struggles that governance arrangements place on voluntary organizations are not isolated from each other. The governance process influences the structure for collaboration between the state and the voluntary sector. Actors make decisions regarding policy issues in relation to their unique experiences and also in relation to their locational understanding of governance processes within their policy field or their organization. Second, dynamics at one scale may influence political struggle at another, and even isolated events may have an impact on the capabilities of the voluntary sector. A third aspect to understanding scale is that place matters. This means that the nature of relationships and their outcomes have different results that are unique to each locale. Scales of action may diverge not only across policy fields, but also across geographic space, for example, from one city to another. Challenges at the meso scale may span across spatial scales to sub-state and local networks (Laforest, 2011).

Next, the findings of this research project reports on interviews with voluntary organizations and government officials to determine the extent to which voluntary organizations are included in policy processes, that is initially identifiable on micro, meso, and macro scales. However, additional aspects of interaction demonstrate how policy networks influenced by broad state and societal norms impact within and between these scales to highlight why and how urban Aboriginal Peoples are better represented in policy processes when compared to Travellers.

Findings

Voluntary Organizations and Operations

The micro scale focuses on the nature and range of the actual programs and services undertaken by voluntary organizations for urban Aboriginal Peoples and Travellers. When asked about types of programs and services they carried out, voluntary organizations reported significant efforts in the areas of housing, health, education, justice, family (which includes domestic violence and other services for women) and cultural awareness programs for urban Aboriginal Peoples in Canada and Travellers in Ireland.

Toronto and Thunder Bay provided similar programs to meet the needs of urban Aboriginal Peoples. A representative of an Aboriginal organization explained:

> Because we incorporate culture and spirituality a lot of Aboriginal people have moved forward in their lives. (Thunder Bay, Interview 7)

As much as organizations in these cities work independently, their leaders are involved in networking with other Aboriginal organizations and the Aboriginal community. Perhaps due to the smaller geographical area of Ireland as a whole and the distance (4 hour commute by train) between Dublin and

DOI: https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2016.7.3.6

Galway, there appeared to be more contact regarding the daily transactions of representatives of Irish national and local organizations. For example, staff from local Traveller organizations across Ireland are occasionally invited to national Traveller organizations in Dublin for the day to participate in a meeting or a special event.

Homelessness and access to suitable housing are major issues for both groups because their accommodation may be points of contestation for mainstream society. Some Aboriginal organizations assist clients in finding housing. A number of Aboriginal organizations in Toronto and Thunder Bay provide refuge from domestic violence for Aboriginal women and their children, and shelter for homeless Aboriginal men. Local Traveller organizations assist Travellers in finding housing, which may include accompanying them to city council (city hall) to complete the required paperwork to apply for group or standard housing.

Urban Aboriginal Peoples and Travellers experience shorter life expectancy, and a higher prevalence of disabilities and mental health related illnesses (Kirmayer et al., 2007; Royall, 2010). Aboriginal health programs incorporate Indigenous traditional practices that provide Aboriginal Peoples with choices regarding their health and healing. Aboriginal health incorporates a holistic approach (which includes mind, body, spirit, and emotion) to develop traditional programs and services dealing with all aspects of health issues, which may include healing circles, for example.

Traveller health programs are specifically designed to bridge access to mainstream health and addiction services rather than accommodate cultural difference. The Primary Health Care Workers program is designed to train and employ Travellers nationwide as health care workers to conduct diagnostic testing (such as diabetes assessments). Community health workers provide health information for Travellers and arrange for their medical appointments. An interviewee explained that not all Travellers have telephones and

> Traveller sites don't have postal delivery because of the fear [that letter carriers have] of going to halting[2] sites. (Dublin, Interview 14)

Education programs address low educational attainment and low literacy rates found in both groups. Education programs for urban Aboriginal Peoples in Thunder Bay collaborated with school boards to provide elementary school children with food security (lunch and snacks) and an afterschool program that could include mentorship, drumming, singing, and stories. The eight step Yellow Flag program has been instituted and monitored by a national Traveller organization to challenge racist attitudes by addressing issues of equality and diversity in elementary schools. Stay in school programs are also offered in response to the disproportionate dropout rate among Traveller youth. Traveller organizations offer education programs to adult Travellers that range from teaching literacy to assisting learners to access secondary school qualifications. Across Ireland, 36 centres for the education and training of Travellers operated in conjunction with the Department of Education. In keeping with the national policy of integrating Travellers into mainstream education, these adult training centres closed in 2012 and their responsibilities were integrated into the Department of Education. One interviewee explained:

[2] Halting sites are spaces allocated by local authorities for Travellers to park caravans (trailers), and graze horses.

> This has seen the erosion of . . . Traveller specific supports and services under the camouflage of integration and inclusion. (Dublin, Interview 10)

Marginalization encountered by both groups impedes their access to the justice system and is exacerbated by disproportionally higher incarceration rates compared to the general population (Cardinal, 2006; Royall, 2010). An Aboriginal legal organization in Toronto provides assistance to Aboriginal victims and offenders that include Gladue services (which provide judges with contextual information about the systemic discrimination of Aboriginal Peoples in Canada in order to better understand the background factors that affect an offender). In contrast to these established Aboriginal legal services, Travellers are not represented by any culturally specific legal services. Traveller organizations provide legal advocacy services wherein staff will write letters or accompany a Traveller to court to assist in explaining the proceedings.

Aboriginal organizations provide programs and services that help their clients cope with family crises, which have a greater gendered impact on women. Both Toronto and Thunder Bay have Aboriginal women's shelters to accommodate victims of domestic abuse and their children. Aboriginal organizations have also found that Aboriginal men are victimized by society, so their approach to domestic violence includes facilitating programs for men:

> We have to heal men. (Toronto, Interview 5)

Aboriginal children and their families are assisted by an Aboriginal organization that has authority over Aboriginal child protection in Toronto. Aboriginal women's and men's organizations provide a range of life skills programs and services for clients of all ages and all walks of life, including literacy and life skills, detoxification programs, applying for continuing education programs, and addressing residential school or adoption experiences. They also assist with court advocacy by accompanying clients to court to assist with the legal jargon or "just to be there" (Toronto, Interview 15).

Traveller organizations deal with domestic crises and design programs and services that encompass the family rather than separating service provision for women and men. In contrast to Aboriginal women's shelters in Canada, shelters specifically for Traveller women and their children seeking refuge from domestic violence do not exist in Ireland. Although there is a national Travellers women's organization, it is proportionately smaller in size than similar women's Aboriginal organizations in Canada. A representative of a Traveller organization explained the reluctance to talk about domestic violence:

> People are more clear on issues. Naming sexual violence. Two years ago you would never talk about it. This is a huge area of progress. (Dublin, Interview 12)

To overcome discrimination, stereotyping, and general misunderstandings regarding their culture, both urban Aboriginal and Traveller organizations are facilitating cultural awareness programs. Urban Aboriginal organizations participate in awareness programs with the Ontario Public Service, Toronto District School Board, Metro Children and Youth Services. National and local Traveller organizations provide Traveller cultural diversity training for Garda Síochána (national police), National Health Service (HSE), and universities.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2016.7.3.6

Voluntary Organizations and Government Dynamics

The meso scale locates the dynamics of voluntary organizations and analyzes how they represent Indigenous communities in policy processes that take place within and between multiple levels of government. Interviews with representatives of urban Aboriginal and Traveller organizations and government officials clarified,

a. The extent to which these communities are represented by voluntary organizations,

b. The individuals who represent voluntary organizations and government, and

c. The relationship of voluntary organization actors and government actors within governance structures mandated for these groups.

In both Toronto and Thunder Bay, there is cooperation between government and Aboriginal organizations to establish advisory bodies within municipal government. In Toronto within the Office of Equity, Diversity and Human Rights, the Aboriginal Advisory Committee was founded in 1999 to advise Toronto City Council on Aboriginal affairs in addition to acting as a liaison between the Aboriginal community and City Council. In 2008, the City of Thunder Bay created an Aboriginal liaison position within the Office of the City Clerk that facilitates the engagement of the City of Thunder Bay with the Aboriginal community in policy development and cultural planning development, and is in contact with Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) and provincial departments. As a government representative explained:

> Aboriginal people would have never gone to City Hall, but now they know about the Aboriginal Liaison as the person to go to. (Thunder Bay, Interview 4)

In contrast to the response by municipal government in Toronto and Thunder Bay to establish a liaison with Aboriginal communities, Traveller input is restricted to legislated participation in housing policy at the local level. The Local Traveller Accommodation Consultative Committee (LTACC) consists of elected local officials, city or county council staff from the Traveller Accommodation Unit, Traveller advocates, and Traveller representatives who meet quarterly at City Hall or County Hall. A Traveller member of a LTACC observed that their participation over time is decreasing because of councillors' lack of respect for Travellers. A representative of a Traveller organization noted that councillors make disparaging remarks against Travellers to raise their own profiles:

> The local Councillors have been overheard to say during meetings that Travellers live a dysfunctional way of life. (Galway, Interview 1)

The interviewee also observed that the meetings "can be fairly volatile" and do not follow the agenda (Galway, Interview 1). In one case, when a LTACC Traveller representative requested the key to access the community centre on his halting site because "no one has ever been inside" (Galway, Interview 1), he was instructed to bring plans of the proposed activities. When he asked to present his plans at the following meeting, the Traveller was informed that the meeting was over. A representative of a Traveller organization explained that the LTACC undermines Traveller participation because they feel Travellers lack the education to deal with councillors. Finally, Traveller needs and interests are not acknowledged

or implemented. A representative of an organization affiliated with Travellers observed that group-housing schemes for Travellers are poorly planned. For example, a housing scheme was inaccessible because it was built in a hollow. The representative went on to say that even though 70 percent of Travellers are in standard housing in Galway,

> There are some Travellers who would not choose standard housing because they say they get too claustrophobic. Explain that to an official here. (Galway, Interview 4)

Most of the representatives of voluntary organizations, government officials, and scholars in Canada identified as Aboriginal compared to Travellers in Ireland as shown in Table 1. Only one organization in Canada with a non-Aboriginal representative had a large Aboriginal client base, but was not considered an Aboriginal organization. In contrast to Canada, just fewer than half of the representatives interviewed from Traveller organizations in Dublin and Galway identified as Travellers.

Employment with Aboriginal organizations ranged from 2 to 22 years, in various leadership and staffing positions as shown in Table 2[3]. Government officials interviewed in Canada were employed with the public service for 3 to 10 years. As with the Canadian case, the majority of Traveller organization representatives have considerable years of service, ranging from 7 to 25 years. Government representatives—none of whom identified as a member of the Travelling community—have been affiliated with Traveller affairs less than 5 years.

Both groups require substantive representation by members of their community to best articulate and advocate for the interests of their community within and between policy networks. A major impediment to employment in voluntary organizations is that members of these groups may not have the educational qualifications for various positions. Urban Aboriginal Peoples in Canada have significantly higher representation by the Aboriginal community in voluntary organizations and government than Travellers. Aboriginal individuals, who have expertise and years of experience in representing their community, hold most of the leadership positions in Aboriginal organizations. Also, approximately half of the interviewees in government positions identified as Aboriginal.

[3] Scholars were consulted for their expertise, rather then their actual employment with voluntary organizations; therefore, they were excluded from Table Two.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2016.7.3.6

Table One. Identity of Interview Participants

	Canada		Ireland	
	Aboriginal	Non-Aboriginal	Traveller	Non-Traveller
Voluntary organizations	16	4	5	5
Government officials	5	1	0	8
Scholars	2	1	0	2
Total	23	6	5	15

Table 2. Years of Service among Interview Participants

	Canada		Ireland	
	Aboriginal	Non-Aboriginal	Traveller	Non-Traveller
Voluntary organizations	2 - 22	10 - 20	7 - 25	4 - 15
Government officials	3 - 10	3	0	3 - 5

In contrast, Travellers are underrepresented in voluntary organizations and government. Although one Traveller was identified in a national government bureaucratic position, as was one elected official at the local level, none of the government officials interviewed for this specific research project identified as a member of the Travelling community and these officials had less than 5 years experience in a department mandated specifically for Travellers, which implies higher staff turnover rates. Although Royall (2010) stated that by "the 1990s pro-Traveller organisations were run and staffed in the main by Travellers" (p. 162), this could not be verified in the present day. Rather, observations made while conducting interviews with Traveller organizations found a significant complement of their staff were non-Travellers. The only significant representation of Travellers in voluntary organizations was among those employed as primary health service providers. Travellers have yet to be appointed to chair government bodies that specifically address Traveller issues. Substantive Traveller representation in government bureaucracy would overcome a major hurdle in the historical othering[4] of Travellers from mainstream society. It would also facilitate inclusion of Travellers within various government departments and throughout policy networks that pertain to the affairs of the Traveller community.

[4] Othering refers to "the perception or representation of a person or group of people as fundamentally alien from another, frequently more powerful, group" (Oxford Dictionary, 2016).

State and Societal Settings

The macro scale determines the success of both groups in taking advantage of any opportunities to be included in policy processes. Recognition of these groups on this scale may indicate political incorporation into government institutions that locate processes of inclusion as well as exclusion. This is significant because most liberal democratic governments are dependent upon mainstream society for their mandate, and to this extent mainstream preference may dominate processes or create obstacles to impede the political incorporation of Indigenous groups in policy processes. Challenges to inclusion and exclusion also reveal the extent to which government shapes and reshapes policy through legislated structures and through conventional practices. Another significant aspect to inclusion on the macro scale is the extent to which policy processes that include voluntary sector representation facilitate linkages to government during times of increasing accountability and austerity. My initial presumption was that the inclusion of urban Aboriginal Peoples and Travellers in policy processes would be sufficient to achieve positive outcomes for each group. In reality, the *actual* outcomes of policy processes are the real test of success in addressing the individual and collective issues and interests for each group.

So far this analysis has reported on the micro scale that assessed program and service delivery of voluntary organizations and the meso scale that located the representation of members of Indigenous groups in policy processes. These findings now facilitate a deeper analysis of intra- and inter- group struggles over cultural identity on the macro scale and its focus on broad state and societal influences that impact on their capacity to secure favourable policy outcomes for their groups.

Negativity toward urban Aboriginal Peoples was not as evident during interviews in Toronto or Thunder Bay as they were with Travellers and representatives of Traveller organizations who reported that they face discrimination in all aspects of their lives. The following nuances of othering and microaggressions[5] were observed during interviews in Ireland. A representative of a church-based Traveller organization observed:

> People who arrive in the parish do not get the same welcome because they are Travellers. (Dublin, Interview 13)

Another representative of a Traveller organization reported:

> Travellers are required to sign an agreement with the local Gardaí [police] that they will not engage in anti-social behaviour with the settled community. (Dublin, Interview 14)

A government official explained that the standard handbook distributed to all renters living in social housing schemes was rewritten for Travellers:

> We dumbed it down. (Dublin, Interview 11)

And a representative of a Traveller organization reported that the lunch for the approximately 12 Traveller men, women, and children who participated in a local St Patrick's Day parade had to be held at

[5] Microaggressions refer to "a statement, action, or incident regarded as an instance of indirect, subtle, or unintentional discrimination against members of a marginalized group" (Oxford Dictionary, 2016).

DOI: https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2016.7.3.6

their Traveller office because the group "would be refused entry to any of the local pubs" (Galway, Interview 1).

In Canada, collaborative linkages have been established between the voluntary sector and government through the Urban Aboriginal Strategy (UAS) (INAC, 2014). What is significant about the UAS is that, while the federal government has devolved its responsibility to Aboriginal Peoples in urban centres, it now uses a collaborative approach to bring together urban Aboriginal organizations to recommend and develop pilot projects that would locate needs that currently are not being met. In Thunder Bay, for example, the UAS committee included over 25 representatives from Aboriginal organizations, Elders, youth and
ex officio members from the public and private sectors that are in direct contact with INAC.

The devolution of jurisdictional responsibility from national governments to provincial and/or local government creates multiple points of contact for voluntary organizations. Despite Aboriginal-specific government departments at the federal and provincial level, program and service delivery for urban Aboriginal Peoples is still associated with multiple federal and provincial government departments. A government representative observed that within the federal government there is an attitude that "[INAC] is First Nations only" (Toronto, Interview 19) and this attitude of exclusion of urban Aboriginal issues impacts on working across other federal departments. INAC's direct contact with the urban Aboriginal community is mainly through community work conducted through the UAS. At the provincial level, the Ministry of Aboriginal Affairs (MAA) does not have a specific mandate for program and service delivery for urban Aboriginal Peoples in Ontario. An interviewee explained:

> Most Aboriginal people in Ontario don't live on reserve . . . We need to address those who do not live on reserve. (Toronto, Interview 6)

However, the MAA collaborated with provincial-level friendship centres[6], as well as women's and Métis organizations to produce the five volume *Urban Aboriginal Task Force* and the Domestic Violence Action Plan for Ontario in 2005. Furthermore, in collaboration with Ontario's Ministries of Community and Social Services, Health and Long-Term Care, and Women's Issues and Children and Youth Services, the MAA produced the Aboriginal Healing and Wellness Strategy (AHWS) to reduce violence against Aboriginal women and children (AHWS, 2016). In actuality, although federal government responsibility for Aboriginal Peoples has in many cases been devolved to the provinces, Aboriginal organizations continue an intergovernmental collaboration with the federal UAS to coordinate programs and services. And policy networks have been established with Aboriginal organizations and various provincial government departments.

In Ireland, Equality Authority (EA) legislation was passed in 2002 to uphold equal status and protect against discrimination based on nine criteria (civil status, family status, age, disability, race, sexual orientation, religious belief, and membership in the Traveller Community) (EA, 2012). As previously noted, when equality legislation was put into place in 2002, Travellers brought the majority of

[6] Friendship centres are non-profit community centres that were established to assist Indigenous newcomers during their urban transitions through programs and services.

complaints. Under the EA, Travellers were able to file a complaint and be heard by the Equality Tribunal when they were asked to leave shops or pubs.

> In the early years there was a heavy focus on equal status and discrimination. Travellers filed complaints about pubs. (Dublin, Interview 5)

This procedure did not require a solicitor because they could make their own case to the tribunal or have an advocate speak on their behalf. In 2004, the vintners lobby was instrumental in launching an amendment to the Intoxicating Liquor Act where any complaints against vintners and publicans would be heard by the local district courts (where liquor licences are issued and renewed for pubs). Afterward, if a Traveller were asked to leave a pub, they could no longer file a complaint of discrimination with the Equality Authority at minimal cost, but would have to make their case before the district court and incur significant costs for legal representation.

> For Travellers to get their claims heard there is a high bar to overcome. There is a huge barrier for Travellers because they are seen negatively. (Dublin, Interview 5)

In contrast to Canada, the government in Ireland is composed of multiple departments that more narrowly address specific Traveller issues as legislated. At the national level, housing for Travellers is located within the national Department of the Environment, Community and Local Government in the Traveller Accommodation Unit (TAU), which is legislated to finance and administer local accommodation committees. The TAU operates as a board consisting of 12 members that include representatives from government and national Traveller organizations. Other obstacles to secure housing for Travellers are located in local government processes. A representative of a Traveller organization observed:

> Councillors who did nothing for Travellers got re-elected, while there were repercussions for those who advocated for Travellers. (Dublin, Interview 2)

Policy for Travellers is monitored at the European Union level by the Council of Europe's Committee of Ministers High Level Group on Traveller Issues as set out in the Framework Convention for the Protection of National Minorities (aka Framework Convention). The National Traveller Monitoring Advisory Committee (NTMAC) was established by the Irish government in 2007 in response to the EU's Framework Convention. The NTMAC is chaired by an appointee of the Irish government and is composed of representatives from government departments, national Traveller organizations, the Catholic Church, and individual Travellers. The NTMAC's mandate is to produce a biennial report on issues of ongoing concern for Travellers (Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform, 2009). Although this body has been in place since 2007, the NTMAC published its biennial report in 2009, and the Traveller organizations interviewed are representative members of the NTMAC, only one individual referred to participation in the NTMAC when asked about the level of government with which their organization has contact. Moreover, none of the representatives of Traveller organizations interviewed referred to the NTMAC or its reports. Although Traveller issues are of concern at the EU level, there appears to be limited engagement in the NTMAC by Traveller policy actors in Ireland. For example, regarding the 2004 revisions to complaint procedures for Travellers evicted from pubs, the NTMAC biennial report in 2009 broadly acknowledged these changes in discrimination complaint procedures for

DOI: https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2016.7.3.6

Travellers but responded only by indicating that it would continue to monitor the revised discrimination policy (Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform, 2009).

At the macro level there are broader commitments by government, and more extensive opportunities for action for urban Aboriginal voluntary organizations in Ontario. The following key factors have proven crucial for the recognition of urban Aboriginal Peoples as a sector. First, acknowledgement has been crucial for policies to move forward to accommodate the group. Second, significant numbers of voluntary organization staff and government representatives working in the area identify as members of Aboriginal communities. While working within policy networks and representation admittedly occur on the meso scale, without a prior commitment in principle by the state, these practices would not be possible at the macro level. Third, federal, provincial, and local levels of government are crucial to efforts to assist urban Aboriginal Peoples through the UAS. Although there are no specific branches within departments assigned to urban Aboriginal affairs in the federal INAC or Ontario's MAA, there are vertical and horizontal collaborations to coordinate programs and services. Although it cannot be directly attributed to the establishment of Aboriginal committees at the local level, we can pinpoint areas where collaboration and consultation between government and voluntary organizations are taking place.

In contrast, Travellers face significant struggles in securing commitments from government and in securing acknowledgment for their sector at the macro level. This is indicated by the following factors that contest opportunities for action for Travellers by the organizations that represent them. First, Travellers willingly report that they are intimidated by the settled community in policy development settings, which makes it difficult for Travellers to participate in housing policy proceedings. Second, the inaction by government to establish a national Traveller agency is instructive in assessing the extent to which Traveller organizations are struggling to make a major impact on the national agenda. Third, Traveller organizations are critical of the success of the vintners lobby in overturning Equality Authority procedures. Fourth, at the EU level, the Framework Convention on the Protection of National Minorities (aka Framework Convention) has proven weak in monitoring the affairs of the Traveller community. And fifth, the low profile of NTMAC activities among representatives of Traveller organizations interviewed indicates its minimal significance to Traveller representatives. The biennial reporting of the NTMAC to the Irish government also indicates that it is a weak monitoring instrument of government.

Discussion

A scalar approach facilitates an analysis that assesses the inclusion of both groups in policy processes. Scale is employed to identify three levels of action that locate the dynamics of opportunities in policy processes and are identified as micro, meso, and macro. At the micro level, the model examines the role and function of voluntary organizations that serve Indigenous groups, and can identify the structure and nature of the program and advocacy activities in which these organizations engage. The meso level locates the nexus of activity among representatives of voluntary organizations as actors in a policy field or policy community, and can reveal their inclusion in or exclusion from these processes, as well as the extent to which policy actors avail themselves of opportunities to take action. The macro level examines how broad state and societal forces not only impact the capacity of these organizations but also impinge on relationships at the meso and micro levels. Moreover, place matters—relationships and their outcomes are unique to each locale. It should be noted that while these scalar divisions start off being

relatively precise, the policy areas, issues, and events may overlap, or be reported as located in more than one of these divisions. This should not distort the overall analyses as the summaries of each scalar section.

On the micro scale, urban Aboriginal organizations are moving closer to political incorporation by introducing Aboriginal culture, healing, and capacity-building into their approaches to health services; using Gladue Reports in the justice system; asserting authority over the care of Aboriginal children in the child welfare system in Toronto; providing health services choices for traditional healing and wellness; providing shelter for Aboriginal women and their children experiencing domestic violence, and healing services for men. Traveller organizations, on the other hand, provide family counselling services, but do not provide shelters for Traveller women, even though domestic violence is prevalent in the Traveller community. Traveller health organizations are instrumental in bridging access for Travellers to national health services. However, these services align with policies to bring Travellers into mainstream health programs and services, rather than accommodating their cultural preferences. The cancellation of education programs for Travellers in order to align with integrationist policies also illustrates diminished consideration for the needs and interests of the Traveller community.

On the meso scale, organizations that represent urban Aboriginal Peoples are included in local government advisory committees that liaise with various municipal departments. The majority of voluntary organization and government representatives identify as Aboriginal and both groups have substantial experience in Aboriginal policy networks. In contrast, Travellers are underrepresented among voluntary organization representatives and are not represented in government departments. Non-Travellers assigned to Traveller policy have mandates of less than 5 years. Members of the Traveller community also have limited access to representation in housing advisory committees, where they are generally underrepresented. Travellers reported that official meetings often did not adhere to rules of order, or follow an agenda, which makes it difficult for Travellers to participate, especially given that they reported the settled community intimates them. Despite the consultation of Traveller organizations regarding education and housing, policy outcomes indicate they are ineffective in countering changes in education and housing policies that are moving toward the integration of Travellers into mainstream society.

On the macro scale, urban Aboriginal Peoples in Canada have encountered more success when it comes to establishing themselves as a policy sector compared to Travellers in Ireland, who are experiencing struggles in countering broad state and societal preferences that fail to commit to them either as a sector or as an ethnic minority. Travellers have minimal opportunities for action, and struggle to be recognized as a policy sector both on a national front and at the EU level. Societal othering of Travellers and feeling intimidated by the settled community are contributing factors that allow the government to resist new principles or changes to legislation that support Travellers. This in turn clarifies why Travellers lack voice to counter the cancellation of Traveller education programs or counter changes in procedures for filing complaints regarding equality legislation.

Conclusion

What has this comparison of the inclusion of urban Aboriginal Peoples and Travellers in policy processes taught us? The overarching lesson is that the inclusion of Indigenous groups in policy

processes does not adhere to a "one size fits all" pattern where positive outcomes for one group translates into success for the next. Since urban Aboriginal organizations have had more success comparatively achieving inclusion in policy processes, it is worthwhile to ask: What can Traveller organizations learn from urban Aboriginal organizations? Urban Aboriginal organizations are able to collaborate with government to achieve outcomes that assist their community. Travellers, on the other hand are struggling with inclusion in policy processes, which would require Travellers to counter state and societal attitudes against them in order to secure the right to participate in policy processes. As Travellers are now beginning to attain higher levels of education, this will qualify them to secure employment in Traveller organizations and in government to substantively represent and advocate for Travellers. Cultural awareness programs can also assist in breaking down barriers between mainstream and Indigenous communities by extending these programs to government officials and the broader public service. Regarding their organizational advocacy, another strategy for Traveller organizations to consider is affiliation with transnational Indigenous networks with success in countering societal biases and othering. Thus, Travellers may consider the potential of aligning with other Indigenous groups in addition to their affiliation with Roma[7].

One major prescription for Traveller success in advocating for their community is to implement guidelines of acceptable behaviour for government and the voluntary sector. "Standards of advocacy" would incorporate guidelines that would ensure their equal participation in policy processes that would include, but not be confined to zero tolerance of defamation of an individual or group by government officials; allowing all members of government sanctioned committees a voice in proceedings; and penalties for members who do not adhere to these guidelines. While the state eventually sets the rules and constraints for the engagement of groups in policy and in government, it is possible to create and implement a code of conduct that would grant equal access to all participants in these processes.

One potential critique of the success of urban Aboriginal organizations compared to Traveller organizations is that there are simply a larger number of urban Aboriginal Peoples than Travellers, which enables them to have more representation and therefore more services and better influence. Yet, the comparative success of urban Aboriginal organizations in policy processes is a fairly recent phenomenon—organizations for both groups shared comparable development since the middle of the twentieth century. Rather than a size argument, in comparing urban Aboriginal organizations to Traveller organizations, I would stress that Aboriginal representation in policy processes and their collaboration with government is the deciding factor in their relative success. Even if Traveller organizations grew in comparable size to urban Aboriginal organizations, mainstream preferences would likely prevail in Ireland, and Travellers would continue to be excluded from policy processes. Moreover, it must be remembered that both groups experience comparable levels of disadvantage. This indicates that despite the relative success of urban Aboriginal representation and collaboration with government compared to Travellers, there is still a lot of work to be done to increase the well-being of both groups, and to provide them with the authority to secure their cultural continuity.

[7] Many comparative studies of Indigenous Peoples overlook the inclusion of Irish Travellers because they are a small minority group, and there is a tendency in the EU to group them with the larger Roma communities across Europe, which fails to capture their Irish indigeneity.

In conclusion, the inclusion of Indigenous groups in policy processes is crucial for the acknowledgement of these groups, addressing needs and interests that may not align with those of mainstream society, and assisting them as communities in crises (Ladner, 2009; Royall, 2010). Systems of domination determine the manner in which society influences the state, and vice versa, to recognize these groups and allocate resources to assist them. These systems show strong tendencies towards aligning policy decisions with those of mainstream stakeholders. As a consequence, the marginalization of Indigenous groups is exacerbated. Allowing these groups to facilitate their cultural choices require the following: broad societal adoption and enforcement of non-discrimination practices to protect minority groups, substantive representation and standards of advocacy that uphold fair access to policy processes whose outcomes make decisions that facilitate the needs and interests of these groups, ongoing allocation of resources to assist them in building their communities in urban centres. The ability of the state to acknowledge and accomplish these challenges is a crucial test of accommodating Indigenous cultural continuity in liberal democracies.

DOI: https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2016.7.3.6

References

Aboriginal Healing and Wellness Strategy (AHWS). (2016). Retrieved from the Ministry of Community and Social Services, Government of Ontario website: www.mcss.gov.on.ca/en/mcss/programs/community/programsforaboriginalpeople.aspx

All Ireland Traveller Health Study [AITHS]. (2010). *Our Geels: Summary of findings*. Retrieved from http://health.gov.ie/wp-content/uploads/2014/03/AITHS2010_SUMMARY_LR_All.pdf

Andersen, C. (2013). Urban Aboriginality as a distinctive identity, in twelve parts. In E. Peters & C. Andersen (Eds.), *Indigenous in the city: Contemporary identities and cultural innovation* (pp. 46-68). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Binchy, A. (1995). Travellers language. In *A heritage ahead: Cultural action and Travellers* (pp. 87-93). Dublin: Pavee Point Publication.

Cardinal, N. (2006). The exclusive city: Identifying, measuring, and drawing attention to Aboriginal and Indigenous experiences in an urban context. *Cities, 23*, 217-228. doi:dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2006.03.005

Central Statistics Office. (2012). *This is Ireland: Highlights from Census 2011, Part 1.* Dublin: Stationery Office.

Chandler, M. J., & Lalonde, C. E., (2009). Cultural continuity as a moderator of suicide risk among Canada's First Nations. In L. J. Kirmayer & G. G. Valaskakis (Eds.), *Healing traditions: The mental health of Aboriginal Peoples in Canada* (pp. 221-248). Vancouver: UBC Press.

Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform. (2009). *National Travelling Monitoring and Advisory Committee: Report to Minister for Justice, Equality and Law Reform*. Retrieved from http://www.inis.gov.ie/en/JELR/NTMAC%20Report%20to%20Minister%20Final%0Version.pdf/Files/NTMAC%20Report%20to%20Minister%20Final%20Version.pdf

Environics Institute. (2010). *The Urban Aboriginal Peoples Study.* Toronto: Environics Institute. Retrieved from http://uaps.ca

Equality Authority. (2012). *Citizens information.* Retrieved form the Government of Ireland website: www.citizensinformation.ie/en/employment/equality_in_work/equality_authority.html

Evans, M. (2001). Understanding dialectics in policy network analysis. *Political Studies, 49*, 542-550. doi:dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.00326

Fanning, B. (2009). *New guests of the Irish nation*. Dublin: Irish Academic Press.

Fay, R. (2001). Health and racism: A Traveller perspective. In F. Farrell & P. Watt (Eds.), *Responding to racism in Ireland* (pp. 99-114). Dublin: Veritas.

Government of Ireland. (2002a). Equal Status Act. Retrieved from http://www.inis.gov.ie/en/JELR/EqualStatusActsConsldtd_00_04.pdf/Files/EqualStatusActsConsldtd_00_04.pdf

Government of Ireland. (2002b). Housing (Miscellaneous Provisions) Act, 2002. Retrieved from http://www.irishstatutebook.ie/eli/2002/act/9/enacted/en/html

Harell, A., Soroks, S., & Ladner, K. (2014). Public opinion, prejudice and the racialization of welfare in Canada. *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* 37(14), 2580-2597. doi:dx.doi.org/10.1080/01419870.2013.851396

Helleiner, J. (2003). *Irish Travellers: Racism and the politics of culture.* Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC). (2014). *Urban Aboriginal Strategy*. Retrieved from www.aadnc-aandc.gc.ca/eng/1389724611277/1389724670841

Kenny, M., & Binchy, A. (2009). Irish Travellers, identity and the education system. In P. A. Danaher, M. Kenny, & J. R. Leder (Eds.), *Traveller, nomadic and migrant education* (pp. 117-131). New York: Routledge.

Kirmayer, L., Brass, G., Holton, T., Paul, K., Simpson, C., & Tait, C. (2007). *Suicide among Aboriginal People in Canada.* Ottawa: Aboriginal Healing Foundation.

Ladner, K. (2009). *Understanding the impact of self-determination on communities in crisis. Journal of Aboriginal Health, 5*(2), 88-101.

Laforest, R. (2011). *Voluntary sector organizations and the state: Building new relations.* Vancouver: UBC Press.

Lawrence, B. (2004). *"Real" Indians and others: Mixed-blood Urban Native Peoples And Indigenous nationhood.* Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Lewis, H., & May, A. W. (2007). Sharing the story: Canadian First Nations and Traveller community development. *The International Journal of Diversity in Organisations, Communities & Nations, 7*(4), 59-68.

Masson, D. (2006, April). *Women's movements and transnationalization: Developing a scalar approach.* Paper presented at Transnationalization of Solidarities and Women Movements Workshop, Montreal.

Maxim, P. S., Keane, C. & White, J. (2003). Urban residential patterns of Aboriginal People in Canada. In D. Newhouse & E. Peters (Eds.), *Not strangers in these parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples* (pp. 79-91). Winnipeg: Policy Research Initiative.

McCaskill, D., FitzMaurice, K., & Cidro, J. (2011). *Toronto Aboriginal Research Project (TARP): Final report.* Toronto: Toronto Aboriginal Support Services Council (TASSC).

Newhouse, D. & Peters, E. (2003). *Not strangers in these parts: Urban Aboriginal Peoples*. Retrieved from

Nguyen, M. T. (2014). Consulting whom? Lessons from the Toronto Urban Aboriginal Strategy. *The International Indigenous Policy Journal, 5*(1), 1-29. doi:dx.doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2014.5.1.3

Ó Floinn, B. (1995). Irish Travellers and the oral tradition. In *A heritage ahead: Cultural action and Travellers* (pp. 63-83). Dublin: Pavee Point Publication.

Oxford Dictionary. (2016). Retrieved from www.oed.com

Parriag, A. & Chaulk, P. (2013). The Urban Aboriginal middle-income group in Canada: A demographic profile. *Aboriginal Policy Studies, 2*(2), 34-63. doi:dx.doi.org10.5663/aps.v2i2.19005

Peters, E. (2001). Developing federal policy for First Nations People in urban areas: 1945-1975. *The Canadian Journal of Native Studies, XXI*(1), 57-96.

Peters, E. (2002). Aboriginal People in urban areas. In C. Andrew, K. A. Graham, & S. D. Phillips (Eds.), *Urban affairs: Back on the policy agenda* (pp. 45-70). Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Peters, E. (2011). Aboriginal public policy in urban areas: An introduction. In E. Peters (Ed.), *Urban Aboriginal policy making in Canadian municipalities* (pp. 3-32). Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Report of the Task Force on the Travelling Community. (1995). Dublin: Stationery Office.

Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (RCAP). (1996). *Report of the Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples.* Ottawa: Canada Communication Group.

Royall, F. (2010). Organisation, mobilisation and marginalisation. In D. Chabanet & F. Royall (Eds.), *Mobilizing against marginalisation in Europe* (pp. 1-8). Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Silver, J. (2006). *In their own voices: Building urban Aboriginal communities.* Halifax: Fernwood Publishing.

Statistics Canada. (2011a). *2011 Census: Aboriginal population profile*. Ottawa, ON: Statistics Canada. Retrieved from http://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/dp-pd/aprof/index.cfm?Lang=E&fpv=10000E

Statistics Canada. (2011b). *Aboriginal Peoples in Canada: First Nations People, Métis and Inuit.* Retrieved from https://www12.statcan.gc.ca/nhs-enm/2011/as-sa/99-011-x/99-011-x2011001-eng.cfm

Warry, W. (2007). *Ending denial: Understanding Aboriginal issues*. Peterborough: Broadview Press.

Appendix A

Questions to Participants

Questions Related to Participation

- Do you consider yourself an Indigenous person?
- How long have you been affiliated with this organization/government position?

Third Sector Advocacy for Indigenous Organizations

- Does your organization produce (publish in print or on the Internet) policy documents for public awareness?
- Has your organization increased or decreased (in size, funding, and/or advocacy) over time?
- What progress has your organization made in accommodating the needs and interests of urban Aboriginal Peoples/Travellers?
- What would you consider the major achievements of your organization in regard to urban Aboriginal Peoples/Travellers?

Communication Between the Third Sector and Government

- Which level of government does your organization have contact with? (Which third sector organizations does your department have contact with?)
- Who are the third sector organizations that are included in the policy process?
- Has this changed over time?
- What are your achievements with government (third sector organizations)?
- What setbacks have you experienced with government (third sector organizations)?

Perceptions of Third Sector and Government Actors Regarding the Policy Process for Indigenous Groups

- What would you consider your major achievement in regard to urban Aboriginal Peoples/Travellers?
- What are the major obstacles that government faces in accommodating Aboriginal Peoples/Travellers?

DOI: https://doi.org/10.18584/iipj.2016.7.3.6

Possibilities and Obstacles for the Realization of Accommodation of Indigenous Groups

- Do policies for urban Aboriginal Peoples/Travellers facilitate or undermine self-determination/nomadism?
- To what extent are international actors involved in advocating for Indigenous minorities?

Political Inclusion

- Are urban Aboriginal Peoples/Travellers included in policy processes regarding their needs and interests?