A professional narrative of Roma mediation in Ilion (Greece)

MARIA FAKIOLA[1], EUGENIA ARVANITIS[2]

[1]Department of Intangible Cultural Heritage and Intercultural Issues,
Directorate of Modern Cultural Heritage
Hellenic Ministry of Culture
Greece
mfakiola@culture.gr

[2]Department of Educational Sciences
and Early Childhood Education
University of Patras, Patras
Greece
earvanitsi@upatras.gr

ABSTRACT
This paper adopts narrative inquiry and attempts to capture the meaningful story of a public administrator regarding the Intercultural Centre of Ilion (Hellenic Ministry of Culture) which operated between 1999 and 2008. This reflexive account highlights practices that helped and barriers that hindered its operation. It constitutes a professional recollection specifying three major dimensions: temporality, sociality, and place. The present narrative aims to steer public awareness on the Roma integration efforts in Greece. Lived experiences are utilized here to present the complexity of Roma integration and reflect on systemic failures.

KEYWORDS
Roma, Greece, integration, exclusion, mediation, narrative

RÉSUMÉ
Cet article adopte une enquête narrative et essaie de saisir l'histoire significative d'un administrateur public concernant le Centre Interculturel d'Ilion (Hellenic Ministry of Culture) qui a fonctionné entre 1999 et 2008. Ce compte réflexif met en lumière les pratiques qui ont aidé et les obstacles qui entravaient son fonctionnement. Elle constitue un souvenir professionnel précisant trois dimensions principales : la temporalité, la socialité et le lieu. Le récit présent a pour but d'orienter la sensibilisation du public sur les efforts d'intégration des Roms en Grèce. Expériences vécues sont utilisés ici pour présenter la complexité de l'intégration des Roms et de réfléchir sur les défaillances systémiques.

MOTS-CLÉS
Roms, Grèce, intégration, exclusion, médiation, narration

INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Roma is considered a pan-European ethnic group of about 10 to 12 million, even though this idea has been strongly criticized. Gypsies are not a homogenous group, but they characterized by great diversity (Okely, 1983, 1997; Lucassen, Willems & Cottar, 1998; Marushiakova &

Popov 2005a). Their characteristics vary not only between different nation-states, but also within the same nation state. There are often notable differences such as language, customs, social status, degree of integration and lifestyle (General Secretariat of Popular Education, 1996; Lucassen, Willems & Cottar, 1998; Kalantzis & Cope, 2016). Roma people experience continuous social exclusion and multiple stereotypes. Globalization, technology advances and international mobility have caused new means of exclusion whereas consequences of the economic crisis have effected more the vulnerable populations, causing them greater predicament. Currently, social exclusion is apparent in Greece both through the effects of the economic crisis as well as the strong presence of large number of refugees and migrants entering and living in the country for a prolonged time.

Moreover, there are different policies among nations considering Roma groups. The nation-state response to *others* is a critical point of identity construction and coexistence as states constitute one of the most powerful collectives. However, globalization has a strong influence on nation-state development as new forms of national or supranational organizations emerge. The national collectivity takes up new forms where coexistence and mutual acceptance is not for granted. Cultural differences and conflict are present and call for an immediate systemic or personal response. Mediation is a process that illuminates intercultural contact and aims at a reciprocal social inclusion referring to both the mainstream society as well as disadvantaged groups. The role of mediators is critical as they can act as *change agents* bridging different parties. For instance, they can harmonize emerging needs, transform existing administrative protocols into culturally sensitive and inclusive ones, and deliver a holistic approach to manage different needs (Arvanitis, 2014). Intercultural mediation is associated to the presence of migrants/refugees and/or distinct cultural communities or socially excluded groups. It is also associated with "exclusion and marginalization" and "the urgency to alleviate social fragmentation" (Arvanitis, 2014, p. 2).

In Greece, intermediation lies on the periphery of administrative response. Facilitation of integration or settlement needs are hindered by the difficulties faced by social institutions and professionals (e.g. scare resources), the lack of an ethical or legal framework and limited interventions. In spring 2014, the Task Force of the Open Coordination Method on the *role of public arts and cultural institutions in promoting diversity and intercultural dialogue* (European Union, 2014), drew up a report involving experts from all EU Member States. This report concluded that it is necessary for public institutions to adopt new ways of functioning to include the newly emerged multicultural reality and its various expressions. This recommendation is certainly an indication that it is impossible to ignore changeability of modern pluralistic societies. In this reality, the *other* is continuously present and claims equal participation in society, social recognition and visibility as well as basic civil rights in institutional frameworks. Modern states are challenged by global trends that require an urgent transformation of their institutions, structures and functions to ensure active participation of all their (non)citizens. However, institutional change is probably a much more complex issue than changing people. Institutions inherently bear the obligation of reproduction as well as represent the social consensus of repetition and a ritualistic process of protection from change. But, how can we achieve social change and adopt a more inclusive stance of *others*?

This paper attempts to capture the meaningful story of a public administrator regarding the Intercultural Centre of Ilion (Hellenic Ministry of Culture) which operated for a decade (1999-2008). The initial goal of this Centre was the social integration of young Roma into the Greek cultural life and the enhancement of their particular cultural characteristics. Intercultural mediation emerged as an important method to fulfill the Centre's scope. This reflexive account highlights practices that helped and barriers that hindered its operation. It constitutes a professional recollection specifying three major dimensions: *temporality, sociality, and place* (Connelly & Clandinin, 2006). The present narrative aims to steer public

awareness on the Roma integration efforts in Greece referring simultaneously to a particular period of time and a set of relations evolved in one location. Lived experiences are utilized here to present the complexity of Roma integration and reflect on systemic failures. This account could be useful for future interventions. Narrative inquiry has proven a useful approach as it "entails a view of the phenomenon" under investigation. It is "first and foremost a way of thinking about experience" (Connelly & Clandinin, 2006, p. 375) that follows a recursive and reflexive process from a lived story to research data.

THE GREEK CONTEXT: TEMPORAL REFLECTIONS

The Roma population in Greece (approximately 180.000-365.000) comprises of many heterogeneous groups with different level of integration (Ziomas, Bouzas & Spyropoulou, 2011). Most of them came to Greece around the 14th century and some came after Asia Minor catastrophe in 1922. There are Roma people in many areas (Crete, Corfu, Northern Greece), that once were smoothly integrated into daily life of the regions and today some of them are totally assimilated choosing to forgot their gypsy origins and identity (Athanasopoulou, 2014; Mavromatis, 2014). The Greek state response towards Roma populations have always been characterized by tolerance and ambiguity. By the middle of the last century, Roma groups were often harmoniously integrated to the local life as their occupations were vital to locals. No severe persecutions or oppression was observed, which allowed Roma groups in Greece to consider themselves as being a vital part of the Greek culture (Mitakidou, Tressou & Karagianni, 2015), distinguishing themselves from other European Gypsies who claim a minority status. Since the 1980s, the then General Secretariat for Popular Education (GSPE) has carried out some notable surveys and training programs for Greek Gypsies, which managed to give a realistic picture of their situation and the many stereotypes surrounding them. For example, widespread stereotypes were that *Roma do not want to stay in permanent housing* or that *they do not want to go to school* or that *they are parasite populations that live off the backs of the society* and *they do not want to change their way of life*.

The Greek systemic response toward Gypsies began to change in the 1990s when massive numbers of refugees and migrants from the former Soviet Union came to the country taking up jobs usually performed by Gypsies (mainly vendors). At that stage, Roma people felt threatened and multiplied their own efforts for a status change. So, in the 1990s there was an unprecedented momentum of institutional interest: i) the interest of the state (which in 1995 established a special office under the auspices of the Prime Minister, the so-called *Prime Minister's Quality of Life Office*), ii) the establishment of an inter-municipal network for the integration of the Greek Gypsies in the local communities (the Roma Network) and iii) the Pan-Hellenic Roma Federation, a nationwide initiative, in which, for the first time Roma communities in Greece elected their representatives to participate in mainstream decision-making bodies as well as cooperate with each other and with bureaucrats (Fakiola, 2010).

In addition, the emergence of young educated Gypsies in the the mid-1990s in various parts of the country has pushed the public administration and local governments to adopt a new approach. Both government entities and Gypsies themselves, saw the need for a partnership to achieve social inclusion. The Greek Ministry of the Interior, as well as the Roma Network (a network of municipalities, in which participated some gypsy representatives from the local government) supported innovative actions and promoted policies that had no precedent in the history of Gypsies in Greece. One of these was to elect representatives of various Roma associations in Greece (during 1996-1998). This was initially supported by the Municipality of Agia Varvara and later by the Ministry of the Interior (Fakiola, 2010). Furthermore, the Greek administration became more committed to Roma

social inclusion in the early 2000s, when a special Inter-ministerial Commission was set up. It was clear from the outset of this committee that only coordinated interventions would be successful instead of individual attempts. All these activities were also supported by some of Roma stakeholders and mediators who had already been involved in the various programs of the GSPE in previous decade.

One of the most important intervention was the mediation program carried out by GSPE in the Municipality of Agia Varvara (even since 1984), one of the most Roma populated municipalities in Attica. The Municipality was extremely interested in Roma social inclusion and implemented a GSPE six month mediation program with great impact on Roma and mainstream populations in the area. The GSPE personnel in this first mediation played a key role in securing at some extend collaboration among all interested parties. This was definitely an important beginning in shaping a framework of relationships beyond simple data collection or training delivery. At this juncture, systemic agents (social actors, Ministry departments, municipality authorities and institutions) and Roma communities were met in the arena of social politics attempting to communicate in a respectful manner and undertake common action. This was made possible not only through the new generation of Gypsy representatives, but also through the successful use of Roma first generation mediators, which in some cases were the same people. Roma mediators/representatives acted as liaison officers (between the official/systemic actors and the Roma community) deploying mainly a *liaison* type mediation (Cohen-Emerique, 2007).

In this context, mediators were facilitating communication between different parties, explaining needs and cultural differences and dealing with collisions and conflicts. After all, they were themselves a living example of a non-stereotypical presence; an educated new type of Roma becoming familiar with the ventures for an equitable civility and asking for new ways of inclusion. However, this period was characterized by great ambiguity, strong contradictions and different pursuits among Roma. Clientelist power relations could not be overcome overnight and as long as there were no tangible results, old practices gained ground (Fakiola, 2010). Likewise, state intervention was impossible to free itself from multiple stereotypes although there were specific objectives and methodologies in place. Finally, political willingness and commitment was greatly varied from hostility to inclusiveness.

THE ILION INTERCULTURAL CENTER: A RETROSPECTIVE ACCOUNT ON LOCALITY

Ilion is a municipality of 85.000 habitants in the western part of Attica. The Gypsies at the Municipality of Ilion (approximately 3000) live in residence houses and many of them work as musicians, while others in seasonal occupations, and many of them are unemployed. Their children attend mainstream education. This location was selected by the Ministry of Culture to develop a pilot intercultural project (March 1999 to June 2008). The area was selected after consulting the then General Secretariat of Popular Education, which had subsidized actions for Roma youth in the area, since the 1980s. During preliminary contacts the local Gypsy representatives were positive to such a development anticipating public funding in exchange of their support. However, when the program started the local Gypsy association saw the lack of a compensatory grant with suspicion and withdrawn its support. Clientelistic views prevented local Gypsy representatives from embarking in this intervention. In addition, the association considered that these actions would not be of particular importance to the group and that emphasis should be given on actions that would provide opportunities for professional mobility. The Centre's mission was not perceived as one that would offer professional benefits to participants.

The Intercultural Center of Ilion was a central administrative intervention (run by the Inter-ministerial Committee) and its operation was exclusively directed by the Ministry of Culture in cooperation with the Museum of Folk Art and the Museum of Greek Folk Musical Instruments. Its main objectives were the inclusion of the Greek Roma in the mainstream cultural life through their participation in cultural institutions and the enhancement of their cultural uniqueness. The Ministry employed a social anthropologist and a Gypsy secretary, along with some permanent public officers from the Intercultural Office to staff this Centre. The secretary, apart from her other activities at the Ministry, has undertaken (assisted by other ministerial personnel) the on-site coordination of the Center and communication with local children and parents. The role of the Gypsy secretary as a mediator was informal. The then Prime Minister's office had intervened to the Roma network of representative bodies and the Roma community asking them to recommend a member of their community for the job. Thus, a secondary school graduate with computer skills and English language command was selected.

In the absence of the local support, the Ministry turned to primary and secondary schools in the area. Local teachers, school directors and counselors were very supportive taking this program off the ground. However, this was not always the case, as sometimes changes in school staff meant change in attitude to the Centre. The Center started its operation with a significant number of 50-85 children (mainly Roma students together with some Greek and migrant children) attending its courses. The initial approach was to familiarize young Gypsies with cultural structures, but also to work with children from other groups. The Centre initially run two cultural labs: the Creative Expression Lab and the Music Lab. Five more were added later on. The Music Lab was considered the most suitable to attract children's interest, as at that period there were about 500 Gypsy musicians among the Roma community in Ilion and music was highly perceived in their culture. It should be noted that for this project there was not much experience in both Gypsy community and the Greek public administration. Only some of the teachers employed had experience of teaching vulnerable and excluded groups, although the Hellenic Ministry of Culture tried to hire qualified staff.

On the other hand, the Municipality had already developed various activities in the region, with many cultural events, but Roma participation was virtually non-existent. The Center's long-term goal was to eventually collaborate with the Municipality, as this would ensure sustainability and further engagement of the local Roma community. The Center during its 10-year operation implemented art workshops, educational programs, theatrical performances and guided tours in places of cultural interest (such as Museums, educational and cultural institutions, theaters, bookstores, etc.). At the same time, children presented their works in museums, cultural institutions and participated in educational programs and special events. Momentum was established through the joy and engagement of young participants.

THE ROMA MEDIATOR: THE INSIDER/OUTSIDER DICHOTOMY

The Gypsy employee initially worked on Ministry's various actions and particularly at the Intercultural Office. Later on, she worked exclusively at the Center. Her mediation capacity and activity was catalytic in the program, as it would be impossible to reach children without her help. The Ministry approached the local schools in collaboration with Center teachers. But the most important role in approaching Roma students and parents was - as it turned out - Vasiliki (the Gypsy colleague). Her presence and her approach were instrumental to build trust with children. Vasiliki processed enrollments, recorded participant activity and emerging needs. The relationship she developed with children and parents was established through intense phone calls and home visits if a problem arose. Familiarizing with students often

involved solving internal conflicts, both within the Center, and with other gypsy pupils, outside the Centre. Such incidents were faced by both Vasiliki and Centre teachers with much success.

Although Ministry personnel were contacting the Roma community, Vasiliki was the lynch pin of communication with parents and their children, at least at the initial stages before teachers can relate to their students in a more trustful manner. She was the key person to get permission from parents for children to participate in events and educational trips. Most parents watched their children's efforts with a steady support. However not all parents supported the program. Vasiliki's participation in the program included, apart from her administrative role, her special skills, such as her special interest in children, her lovable character, empathy and courtesy. Her appealing appearance was very much appreciated by children because beauty is highly valued in Roma culture. Also she acted as a positive role model as children were impressed by her leading skills and highly perceived status. Vasiliki was acted as an *insider* to the Roma community being able to culturally relate to the group and provide optimal solutions. At the same time, she operated as a bridge between systemic actors at the Ministry and the local community taking the role of an *outsider* to her community. In this role, she effortless tried to counteract existed stereotypes on both sides. Overall, Vasiliki constantly supervised the Center's operation, responded to needs and liaised with the Ministry. She collaborated with teachers for any changes to the program, but also with students as they cared for shaping and decorating their learning space. Vasiliki was a trustworthy *agent*, which her role never ceased to be important.

COLLABORATING WITH LOCAL COMMUNITY: AN AMBIGUOUS SOCIALITY

Approaching the Municipality was deemed critical for the Centre's future expansion and survival. All people involved in the program (public agents and teachers) attempted from time to time to establish relationships with the local authority, but it proved difficult for both sides. Initially there was some positive response and the Center participated in Municipality's various events, but this was the exception. On the other hand, the Ministry itself did not steadily and persistently pursuit a closer relationship with Municipal authorities. The Ministry's aim was for Municipality to undertake full responsibility of the Center. This never fulfilled due to the lack of funding by the Public Administration and the lack of tangible results. In addition, diverse voices and contradicting views of systemic actors gradually disrupted the cooperation between state and Roma representatives (2003-2008). In fact, Roma inclusion was rather a marginal issue in the mist of the growing economic crisis. By the end of 2010s bureaucrats invested little effort in the implementation of the Inter-ministerial Program and the program stalled (Fakiola, 2010).

During the Centre's operation, there were various grass roots collaborations with the Municipality, museums and cultural institutions through which the young pupils had the opportunity to create artistic works and present them in mainstream institutions. There were also several events in which children took part. These events, such as, musical concerts and art exhibitions, children designed calendars and cards attracted an impressive positive response from various audiences. However, Roma community desired for their children to have access to a wider professional network in the labor market attaining professional benefits. This outcome has not been fulfilled spreading suspicion and caution among the Roma community. For example, in 2002 the Pan-Hellenic Federation of Roma Organizations (which was inaugurated in 1998 and had its headquarters in Ilion), requested from the Ministry of Culture to establish a music academy in the region. This could enable young Roma (aged 12 to 18) to read and write music and acquire competitive skills for the labor

market. The Federation stated that disagreed with the local Roma union's demand for financial compensation to the children. The Federation argued that the local union could not understand the long-term benefits of such intervention being entrapped into a *clientelist* mindset. Indeed, the Roma local union did not perceived the added value of such efforts. In their stereotypical idea, the state and *Gadge* in general (the non Roma people as they called them) *only wanted to exploit Roma, get what they want and go*. However, the proposal was rejected casing fierce reaction by the Roma community, which openly accused the state administration for overt racism and attempt to further marginalize the group. In the same period the Directorate (Ministry of Culture) had requested from its supervised cultural institutions to design and implement a vocational training program for young Roma in cultural-related professions without any substantial response.

Despite problems, the Intercultural Center of Ilion was an innovative program as far as a public administration strategy is concerned. Initially all personnel worked with enthusiasm and many times administrators overstretched their abilities to contribute as the institutional framework was insufficient for such a venture. On the other hand, there was no adequate coordination and dialogue among different ministerial departments and other significant actors in the local community, so to understand Roma needs or to change problematic institutional frameworks. In addition, there was a lack of coordination at the top levels of hierarchy (ministries' representatives, mayors - including Prime Minister's consultants). Mediation in Ilion was a preliminary attempt to take action in response to pressing needs. Maintaining the balance between proximity and distance to mediation parties was intuitive as no operational or professional contact framework was in place.

Furthermore, emerging problems could not be sufficiently understood by the hierarchy or involved administrators and institutions, as some of them had no experience in delivering such programs, communicating with disadvantaged groups and dealing with stereotypes. For example, an important problem emerged by the nature of the programs, which were designed on the basis of the 'traditional' nature of the gypsy communities. The Gypsies themselves did not share this view and believed that the Greek state attempted to marginalize/stigmatize them even through integration processes. For example, Roma community requested to learn musical notes because they believed this would easier integrate them in modern life. However, there were many disagreements from systemic stakeholders as to whether this would have *a corrosive effect on the cultural particularities of the Gypsies* or not. But these perceived 'cultural *particularities*'[1] were in direct contradiction with Roma views. Finally, the notes were introduced into lessons, although for a long time the musical workshop was severely criticized from different sides and for exactly the opposite arguments. Obviously, a completely opposite interpretation of the "cultural peculiarity" has observed between the Gypsies themselves and the institutions involved.

Although Centre teachers' and mediator's tried their best, resolving everyday operational problems was rather restricted as many of these had to be tackled at political level. Little emphasis was given to ultimate objectives and sustainability of the program due to the lack of coordination and consensus among interested bodies. In addition, the Prime Minister's Office, which was responsible for coordination, often caused more problems than solved because its advisers were unable to perceive the problems on a realistic and practical basis. In fact, although the mediation worked successfully and enthusiastically at grass root level (among children, teachers and the mediator), it was unable to penetrate other levels of hierarchy (services and officials), the Municipality decision-making structure, as well as gatekeepers and representatives of the Roma community. Although some steps had been

---

1 The discussion of the 'gypsy identity' and its peculiarities, its marginal or exotic character and the accompanied stereotypes have been extensively discussed in bibliography (Lucassen, Willems & Cottar, 1998; Lemon, 2000; Gotovos, 2002, 2004; Daskalaki 2003; Marushiakova & Popov, 2005b; Fakiola 2010).

taken in this direction, the result was poor. What was often expressed by children (and by some teachers) is that *no one was interested in the Administrative hierarchy about what is going on there*. In one instance, when the Secretary-General came to the Center's Christmas event he was accepted with great enthusiasm and this gesture was very much appreciated by Roma.

Despite organizational problems, success was evident only through the positive response of general public, the participation of young pupils in various events as well as the artistic value of children works. Staff and teachers acted as mediators and brought the general public in touch with children's work and their achievements in various social contexts. Children themselves became mediators, as they changed positively their image by improving their self-esteem and projecting a very positive paradigm to the local community. It seems, however, that the power of existed stereotypes and their negative effect was underestimated. For example, getting local actors (and sometimes administrators, as well as some institutions) involved to such an innovative intervention was a vague goal instead of being the main strategy and a means of inclusion. Stereotyping and lack of consensus was evident in actors involved. Finally, little importance was given in disseminating outcomes to the wider community so to counteract existing stereotypes. Thus, mediation was caught up between the Centre's reality (objectives, problems and implementation) as well as demands of Public Administration, Ministerial hierarchy and Roma community.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

This narrative attended *temporality, sociality* and *place* in its effort to reflect on a mediation intervention on the Roma community in Ilion, Greece. Temporal transition in this narration highlighted the progression of sentiment and program delivery when dealing with disadvantaged groups. In addition, this narrative projected the complex relations between different stakeholders (systemic and community) involved in the operation of the Ilion Centre. It also, highlighted very different views among the same actors (e.g. within Roma community or the various administrative gatekeepers) underlying well rooted stereotypical representations on both sides. Personal and social conditions emerged as important factors of future sustainability. Firstly, stakeholders' "feelings, hopes, desires, aesthetic reactions and moral dispositions" (Connelly & Clandinin, 2006, p. 480) evolved from unwavering commitment to disinterest. Secondly, social conditions and particularly: political interest, lack of direct and effective communication among involved stakeholders, stereotypical views, rigid institutional framing and top down decision making became an ultimate barrier of implementing this mediation program. Social change and counteracting stereotypes required flexibility and mainly integrating differences and the views or 'disadvantaged', but hierarchical relationships governed by authority prevailed. No consensus among the various parties was achieved as many times it was difficult to reach agreement even in the definition of a problem or in the interpretation of the main scope.

The decade followed the Centre's cessation brought decisive realizations that can no longer be ignored. Professional qualifications of mediators cannot replace the necessity of forging a meaningful social awareness, coordination and persistence at different levels of decision making. Training and certified qualifications together with a professional code of practice are undoubtedly important steps in securing professional integrity and impartiality, but is not enough. The willingness to integrate the voices of various stakeholders at different levels is important. The top-down decision-making process cannot override local and community aspirations. Ethnocentric political, social and pedagogical choices are not viable. There is a need to take into consideration the *others'* perspective. But this is a difficult

process as it requires self-awareness and ability to transform established positions and practices. This transformation of parties refers to the fourth stage of mediation, in the Cohen-Emerique scheme (2007). Through this stage standards, structures and beliefs of both parties undergo a process of transformation in the context of mutual understanding, cooperation and trust (Arvanitis, 2014, p. 2). Reciprocity and respect are prerequisites. This process is not possible if different parties are focused on differences, instead of building common goals, values and vision that can overcome individual conflicts.

Overall, it became apparent that overall local Roma representatives adopted a marginal role in the Ilion mediation process, even if this was not the Greek state's intention. They were mere recipients of an intervention instead of being active producers of knowledge and *agents of change*. Hierarchical power relations as well as clientelist mentality remained unchanged restricting Roma participants of acquiring more agency in modifying existing relationships with policy making bodies. However, there were many instances that children and parental views were taken into consideration in important decisions about the Centre's operation. Reframing mutual social goals and equity processes towards an inclusive citizenry remained an equivocal challenge for all parties involved.

REFERENCES

Arvanitis, E. (2014). The intercultural mediation: a transformative journey of learning and reflexivity. In E. Arvanitis & A. Kameas (Eds), *Intercultural mediation in Europe: narratives of professional transformation* (pp. 1-16). USA: Common Ground.

Athanasopoulou, I. (2014). The 'Gypsy Feudo' in medieval Corfu. Paper presented at the "*Roma, historical routes and today's quests*", Byzantine and Christian Museum, Athens.

Cohen-Emerique. (2007). Intercultural mediators: bridges of identities. *InterCulture, 153*, 7-22.

Connelly, F. M., & Clandinin, D. J. (2006). Narrative inquiry. In J. Green, G. Camilli & P. Elmore (Eds), *Handbook of complementary methods in education research* (pp. 477-487). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Daskalaki, I. (2003). *Greek-Gypsy identity and the relationship between Greek-Gypsies and the state*. Retrieved from http://www.lse.ac.uk/collections/hellenicObservatory/pdf/ symposiumPapersonline/Daskalaki.pdf.

European Union (2014). *The role of public arts and cultural institutions in the promotion of cultural diversity and intercultural dialogue*. Brussels: European Union. Retrieved from http://www.europa-creativa.eu/Files/uploads/30-role_arts_diversity-dialogue_en.pdf.

Fakiola, M. (2010). Social relations and identities in the Roma community of St. Barbara. Ph.D. Dissertation, Department of Sociology, Panteion University of Social and Political Sciences, Greece (in Greek). Retrieved from http://thesis.ekt.gr/thesisBookReader/id/ 23005#page/ 1/mode/2up.

General Secretariat of Popular Education (1996). *Mapping the way the Gypsies are installed*. Athens: GSPE (in Greek).

Gotovos, A. (2002). Roma identity in the Greek society: Roma conflict definitions in Greece. In *Roma in Greece* (pp. 111-135). Athens: Hellenic Society of Ethnology (in Greek).

Gotovos, A. (2004). From the social margin to the Gypsy nation: critique of the political correctness. Paper presented at Scientific Symposium *Minorities in Greece*, Society for the Studies of Modern Greek Culture and General Education, Athens (in Greek).

Kalantzis, M., & Cope, B. (2016). Learner differences in theory and practice. *Open Review of Educational Research*, *3*(1), 85-132.

Lemon, A. (2000). *Between two fires*. London: Duke University Press.

Lucassen, L., Willems W., & Cottar, A. (1998). *Gypsies and other itinerant groups.* London: Palgrave Macmillan.

Marushiakova, E. & Popov, V. (2005a). The Roma - a nation without a state? Historical background and contemporary tendencies. In: W. Burszta, T. Kamusella, & S. Wojciechowski, (Eds), *Nationalismus across the Globe: an overview of the nationalism of state-endowed and stateless nations* (pp. 433-455). Poznan: School of Humanities and Journalism.

Marushiakova, E., & Popov, V. (2005b). The Roma between the Skylla of marginalization and the Charybdis of exotization. In *Social and cultural diversity in Central and Eastern Europe: old factors and new* (pp. 6-9). Prague: Multicultural Centre. Retrieved from http://www.mkc.cz/download/Bulletin%20Social%20and%20Cultural%20Diversity.pdf.

Mitakidou, S., Tressou, E., & Karagianni, P. (2015). Implementing culturally sensitive assessment tools for the inclusion of Roma children in mainstream schools. In S. Hood, R. Hopson & H. Frierson (Eds), *Continuing the journey to reposition culture and cultural context in evaluation theory and practice* (pp. 233-250). Charlotte, NC: Information Age Publishing.

Mavromatis, G. (2014). Archival testimonies for the presence of Gypsies in the Venetian-occupied Crete (14th-17th centuries). Paper presented at the "Roma, historical routes and today's quests", Byzantine and Christian Museum, Athens.

Okely, J. M. (1983). *The traveller-Gypsies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Okely, J. M. (1997). Some political consequences of theories of Gypsy ethnicity: the place of the intellectual. In A. James, J. Hocker & A. Dawson (Eds), *After writing culture* (pp. 125-134). London: Rutledge.

Ziomas, D., Bouzas, N., & Spyropoulou, N. (2011). *Promoting the social inclusion of Roma: a study of national policies-Greece*. Athens: Institute of Social Policy, National Centre for Social Research.