



**Maynooth  
University**

National University  
of Ireland Maynooth

## **Maynooth University Department of Law**

### **Declaration on Plagiarism**

I hereby certify that this material, which I now submit for assessment on the programme of study leading to the award of **MA in Criminology and Criminal Justice** is entirely my own work and has not been taken from the work of others save and to the extent that such work has been cited and acknowledged within the text of my work.

Student Name: ..... Agnel Nidhi Shiji .....

Student Number: ..... 17338653 .....

Date: ..... 25 August 2021 .....



*Capturing the Muslim experience with airport staff, security checkpoints and surveillance systems at Dublin airport.*

*Agnel Nidhi Shiji*

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

*MA in Criminology & Criminal Justice*

Maynooth University

Department of Law

## **Abstract**

Recent research has shown that the airport can be an unwelcoming and hostile place for Muslims (Blackwood et al., 2013; Bonino, 2015; Nagra & Maurutto, 2016; Selod, 2019). With the drastic increase in the implementation of security and surveillance measures at airports since the 9/11 attacks, studies have shown these measures can affect various populations differently (Blackwood et al., 2015; Nagra & Maurutto, 2016). While studies have examined the Muslim experience at airports in Scotland, Canada and America, no studies have investigated the Muslim experiences at Irish airports. To address the gap, this study set out to examine the encounters between Muslims (living in Ireland) and airport staff, security checkpoints and surveillance systems at Dublin airport. A digital self-completion survey provided quantitative data from 31 individuals. This survey asked participants to provide their views, opinions and encounters with security personnel, security checkpoints, monitoring technologies and profiling at Dublin airport. A thematic analysis was used to interpret the findings from the survey. The findings from this study show that participants generally reported having an overall positive experience at Dublin airport. However, some individuals recalled having a negative experience with additional screening procedures in particular at Dublin airport as participants described these practices as an embarrassing and uncomfortable experience. More than half of respondents (61.29%) also believed that profiling happens at airports. The impact of these results will be compared with existing current literature. This study highlights the importance of raising awareness to the issue in an Irish context as the Muslim community is growing in Ireland. The findings presented in this thesis will add to our understanding of the Muslim experience at airports in an Irish context. This study should, therefore, be of value to researchers wishing to gain further insight into the issue in Ireland.

## Table of Contents

<b>Chapter 1 – Introduction.....</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>Chapter 2 – Literature Review.....</b>	<b>10</b>
Introduction.....	10
The airport as a space of exception.....	11
Surveillance systems.....	12
Security checkpoints.....	14
Border security.....	14
Muslim Identity.....	17
Irish context.....	20
Conclusion.....	21
<b>Chapter 3 -Methods.....</b>	<b>23</b>
Introduction.....	23
Research Design.....	23
Ethical Issues.....	24
Participant eligibility.....	25
Sampling.....	25
Survey Questions.....	25
Demographic data of participants.....	27
Recommendations for future research.....	27
Thematic analysis.....	28
Conclusion.....	28
<b>Chapter 4 – Results.....</b>	<b>30</b>
Introduction.....	30
Demographic data.....	31
Theme 1 – A positive environment.....	31
Interactions with security personnel and staff at Dublin airport.....	33
Theme 2 – Discrimination.....	33
Theme 3 – Lack of respect.....	34
Interactions with security checkpoints and additional screening procedures.....	35

Theme 4 – Fear of Judgement.....	36
Theme 5 – Religious clothing seen as a ‘threat’.....	36
Theme 6 – ‘Othering’ experience.....	37
Experiences with surveillance systems at Dublin airport.....	38
Profiling at Dublin airport.....	39
Theme 7 – Profiling as a common occurrence.....	39
Suggestions for improvement.....	40
Theme 8 – Desire for equal treatment.....	40
Conclusion.....	41
<b>Chapter 5 – Discussion.....</b>	<b>42</b>
Introduction.....	42
Positive experiences.....	42
Profiling.....	44
Additional screening procedures.....	46
Surveillance systems can discriminate.....	49
Conclusion.....	51
<b>Chapter 6 – Conclusion.....</b>	<b>53</b>
<b>Bibliography.....</b>	<b>56</b>
<b>Appendix A – Survey.....</b>	<b>63</b>
<b>Appendix B – Quantitative Breakdown of Survey Results .....</b>	<b>68</b>

**Wordcount (excluding bibliography): 21,412**

## **Chapter 1 - Introduction**

By facilitating travel, tourism and trade, the airport has become a profitable and valuable resource for many nations in contemporary times (Smith, 2014). Security at the airport has drastically changed since the 9/11 terrorist attacks. In response to these attacks, several countries around the world enacted new laws and acts to increase and improve passenger safety at the airport. This has resulted in an exponential increase in the number of security and surveillance measures travellers are exposed to at the airport. Airports have become a space where surveillance is widespread and extensive (Adey, 2004). Passengers are expected to pass through several security checkpoints, screen their baggage and confirm their identity multiple times as they pass through the space. Airport staff, surveillance technologies and security systems at the airport are designed and trained to identify those that could pose a threat. Individuals are continuously monitored by authorities using closed-circuit television (CCTV) systems and biometric technologies at airports (Lyon, 2007; Salter, 2008; Magnet, 2011) and expected to go through security checkpoints where they pass metal detectors and baggage screening. These measures can create new forms of inequality where certain groups or population are subject to more intrusive forms of surveillance and monitoring (Haggerty & Erikson, 2006). This could potentially result in different cohorts of people being treated differently based on their race, ethnicity or religious identity at the airport. Browne (2012) explained that racial profiling can be used in surveillance systems to inform different institutions about who is let into the country and monitor those who are deemed as a threat. Similarly, Torres et al. (2015) explained that discrimination is especially visible in the realm of immigration as security agents can use surveillance measures to identify, monitor and target specific populations for intensive searches and questioning.

With an increase in the number of people passing through airports in recent years, there is a growing academic interest in capturing and portraying the interactions between certain populations with security and surveillance measures at the airport. Studies have noted that certain populations, especially Muslims, are more likely to be subject to be chosen for additional checks and surveillance at the airport (Bahdi, 2003; Bhandar, 2008). To investigate this issue, more research aims to capture the experience of Muslims at the airport (Blackwood et al., 2013; Bonino, 2015; Nagra & Maurutto, 2016; Selod, 2019). These studies strongly suggest that the airport can act as a hostile and intimidating space that can cause emotional and mental discomfort for Muslims. Discussions around profiling of the Muslim community at airports are still prominent and widespread today. For example, a hashtag known as

#flyingwhileMuslim was popularised on Twitter so Muslims have a platform to share their experiences of islamophobia and profiling at airports or on flights (Khalife, 2018). Encounters described with this hashtag vary but they have a common theme, that is, being profiled due to their religious identity. This finding was also consistent in this study as many of the participants who reported a negative experience believed it was due to their religious identity. For example, in 2016 a man was detained at the airport in Vienna for sending messages in Arabic on a flight to his wife and a women who was coming back from her honeymoon was questioned and detained by police for reading a book about Syria on an airline flight (Khaleeli, 2016). These stories are significant as these individuals believed they were treated in this harsh manner due to their religious identity. There are many other stories that are similar to these experiences where Muslims around the world recall being unfairly harassed, detained or questioned at airports due to their religious beliefs. It is important to acknowledge these experiences and be aware that an issue is present at airports. It is time to introduce initiatives to make the airport experience better for Muslims as probably hundreds of individuals are used to receiving this type of negative and discriminatory treatment.

Although, this issue has been investigated in Canada, America and Scotland, no study has examined the issue in an Irish context. As the population of Muslims is increasing in Ireland, it is important to better understand and resolve the problem and eliminate the discomfort that members of the Muslim community may be facing at the airport. Studies in other countries are showing that this is a widespread issue so it is vital to raise awareness by researching the topic in Ireland to see if an issue is present. If a problem is identified, it is necessary for relevant political agencies and stakeholders to enact legislation and introduce measures that ensure fair and equal treatment for all passengers. As this seems to be an issue that is prominent in other countries, this research wants to investigate whether members of the Muslim community in Ireland may be feeling the same level of discomfort and hostility at Dublin airport. As Ireland is becoming a more diverse and multicultural society, it is important to better understand and resolve the problems they may be facing.

The aim of this study was twofold. **(1)** To investigate whether encounters between Muslims living in Ireland and security personnel and staff, security checkpoints and surveillance systems at Dublin airport were positive or negative. These three categories were broken down in sections to determine whether it was a particular aspect of the airport experience that made it either a comfortable or intimidating environment for these participants.

(2) To ask if respondents believe that profiling happens at Dublin airport and whether certain groups/individuals are targeted unfavourably or treated differently at the airport.

To achieve the objectives mentioned above, the current study collected qualitative data in order to gain insights into the opinions, beliefs, ideas and experiences of Muslims (living in Ireland) on various aspects of Dublin airport. Responses for this study were collected through a self-administered digital Microsoft Forms survey. As the project aimed to collect data on user experience and keeping with Covid-19 precautions at the time of conducting this project, an online survey was the best option to use that reached a wide audience. The survey was disseminated through different social media platforms and sent to various relevant organisations such as the Islamic Cultural Centre in Ireland. It was also disseminated through snowball sampling and the use of personal networks. The survey asked participants to recall their experiences and emotions when encountering airport staff, security checkpoints, additional screening procedures and surveillance systems at Dublin airport. Respondents were also asked about their views on whether certain people or groups are more likely to be subject to more scrutiny at Dublin airport. To conclude the survey, participants were also asked to provide some recommendations on how they could improve their experience at the airport.

This study is structured using chapters. Each of these chapters will have a brief introduction and conclusion. Chapter 2 will examine existing literature on the airport acting as a space of hyper-surveillance and the importance of Muslim identity in this context. It will also discuss how the airport acts as a space of exception where sovereign authorities have the power to confront potential threats as “bare life”. Feldman (2007) claimed by identifying individuals by bare life, airport authorities are given the power to politically control the population. Additionally, this chapter will examine security checkpoints, surveillance systems and airport staff in more detail. Chapter 3 explores the methods of this study in comprehensive detail. This chapter will describe what approaches were taken to conduct the research and why these measures were adopted. Strengths and limitations of the methods will also be examined. Chapter 4 presents the results of the online survey. A complete breakdown of the findings can be found in this section. Chapter 5 offers a discussion that examines the findings and compares them with current existing literature. This chapter will highlight the significance of this study in Ireland. The findings presented in this study will add to our understanding of the experience of Muslims at the airport. Finally, chapter 6 will briefly conclude the major points and findings from the previous chapters.



It is anticipated this study will be of value for future researchers who wish to examine the topic in further detail as this research will begin to raise awareness of the topic in Ireland. Future investigations are essential to gain further insight of the issue and discover the extent of the problem in an Irish context.

## Chapter 2 – Literature Review

### Introduction

The airport has become an increasingly popular hub for transporting countless people and goods around the world (Smith, 2014). As more individuals travel through the airport, capturing passenger experiences with airport security and surveillance measures has been a major area of interest within the surveillance and racial studies field (Nagra & Maurutto, 2016; Marciano, 2018; Selod, 2019; Gidaris, 2020). Ongoing research indicates that individuals from religious and ethnic minorities are subject to increased inspection and discrimination by screening technologies and border security at airports (Bhandar, 2008; Blackwood et al., 2013; Nagra & Maurutto, 2016; Selod, 2019). The events of 9/11 significantly changed how countries respond to and prevent terrorism, and airports became a space of hyper-surveillance from various agencies. Governments have invested a lot of income, time and resources to increase and improve the quality of security checkpoints, security personnel and technology systems at airports (Gillen & Morrison, 2015). As a result, travellers are now subject to increased security and monitoring measures aimed at identifying individuals who could pose a threat to national security (Nagra & Maurutto, 2016). However, while these surveillance and security systems work to limit threats to national security, these systems can also have negative effects for individuals. Haggerty and Erickson (2006) discuss the negative consequences of using surveillance measures by stating these technologies have the potential to erode privacy rights and create new forms of inequality where certain groups can be targeted. It is important to see whether these security and surveillance technologies result in differential treatment of individuals at airports. With countries becoming more diverse, it is an issue that must be thoroughly investigated and researched. Data collection regarding passenger experiences with security measures and personnel at airports is essential for implementing security measures and procedures that are appropriate, fair and consistent.

To begin, a discussion on the unique nature of the airport will be provided. It is an environment where hyper-surveillance from various authority figures is considered normal and expected. To follow on, an analysis on surveillance systems and border security found at the airport will be examined. As this study aims to gather data on Muslim experience with security systems and airport staff at Dublin airport, it is important to assess this in more detail by examining existing literature. Muslim identity is also a key theme that will be discussed in this chapter as well as understanding the issue in an Irish context.

### **The airport as a space of exception**

Airports around the world serve as a major port of entry for millions of tourists, businesspeople and travellers (Carr et al., 2020). The airport is a unique space that is infused with power and control from various sources ranging from local, national and international law enforcement and security (Feldman, 2007). It is a space where multiple sources of information and technology are combined to monitor and inspect large groups of individuals at once (Adey, 2004). Unlike other borders, the airport's monitoring systems can be excessive and intrusive as travellers must undergo several security checks and measures. Individuals are also under constant surveillance and some passengers have to go through additional invasive security procedures such as opening baggage and body checks (Alards-Tomalín et al., 2014). Airport authorities have the power to use the data from surveillance systems to track individuals to control or regulate their behaviour and allow security to detain those who they deem as a threat. Security personnel and other figures of authority have the power to deny, detain or grant access to an individual. Feldman (2007: 333) has likened international airports terminals to a "territorial borderline" where entry into the state is strictly controlled and individuals are placed into various categories such as citizens, refugees, tourists, low risk individuals and those who pose a threat. The airport is a space of exception where sovereign authorities (security officers, police, customs personnel) have the power to confront potential threats as "bare life" (Feldman, 2007). 'Bare life', a term coined by Italian philosopher, Giorgio Agamben (2000) refers to the way in which a person is identified and treated by their basic biological characteristics rather than how the individual has lived their life. By reducing individuals to bare life, airport authorities are given the power to politically control the population (Feldman, 2007). The state of exception is when states suspend ordinary law for some or all of the population and give themselves the authority to do whatever they view as necessary to protect citizens, including taking away people's rights (Salter, 2008). The state of exception rarely impacts all individuals similarly. Exemptions are usually made to exclude or target certain populations. Nagra and Maurutto (2016) claim the airport is a space that legitimises taking people's rights away for the sake of protecting a country. At the airport, sovereign power and bare life combine in a way that operates outside normal law (Feldman, 2007). To reiterate, the airport incorporates mobility and freedom with control and surveillance all under one roof (Feldman, 2007).

Kellerman (2008) emphasised that airports are borders where authority and control can be clearly seen. Passengers are given precise instructions about the rules which they are expected to automatically obey. Kellerman (2008: 164) argues that prisons and military bases

are the only other places that would be “as authoritarian as airports”. Passengers and luggage must undergo various security points where they are screened by complex surveillance systems and trained staff for any potential threats (Babu et al., 2006). Most airports have several checkpoints where passengers are screened for different types of threats by various security figures. The airport is controlled and managed by numerous regional, national and international authoritative figures. Local authorities aim to serve, gather and guard passengers at airports while national authorities are in control of passport checks and inspection procedures (Kellerman, 2008). International authorities refer to the organisations in charge of airline services. On a passenger’s journey in or out of the country, multiple authorities monitor the individual. For example, a local employee will examine the passenger’s luggage while the national authorities will confirm passport details and conduct a series of security procedures. As a passenger enters the plane, an air hostess will once again verify passport and ticket details. At every stage of the process, the individual is under constant surveillance and control (Kellerman, 2008). Both Adey (2004) and Lyon (2008) claim these security practices at airports can be dehumanising as individuals are reduced to an object or a piece of information. These practices can be particularly harsh for individuals who are deemed a threat as they can be subject to additional and invasive security checks.

Travellers undergo several security measures at the airport as they must pass through various security checkpoints, be under constant surveillance and interact with multiple staff member to confirm their identity and purpose. It is important to look at these three aspects of the airport in more detail to understand the differences between them and how interactions with each of these measures can result in a negative experience. This study also wants to determine whether there is a specific aspect of the airport journey that makes it an uncomfortable experience for individuals.

### **Surveillance systems**

Passengers are continuously monitored by authorities using closed-circuit television (CCTV) systems, biometric technologies and risk profiling systems in airports (Lyon, 2007). Adey (2003) suggests that airports use surveillance systems because it helps to control and regulate mobility. Biometric technologies identify and monitor people by assessing biological information or behavioural traits (Magnet 2011). Biometric systems are frequently used for identification purposes. The most common systems found at airports are iris scanning,

fingerprint and facial recognition technologies (Marciano, 2018). Other biometric technologies include voice identification systems and retinal scans (Magnet, 2011).

Lyon (2007) stated that surveillance systems can increase social sorting and argues that social sorting is one of the main aims of these technologies. Modern surveillance and risk profiling systems are created to collect personal data on passengers then organise and categorize individuals according to different sets of criteria. This gives state institutions or law enforcement at airports the ability to determine which populations can be targeted for suspicious activity and helps determine which communities or groups are classified as “high-risk” or pose a threat (Lyon, 2007). Individuals who are classified as high risk by surveillance systems would be subject to increased monitoring and interrogation.

These surveillance systems are often classified as impartial and objective when they have the potential to exacerbate existing inequalities. Magnet and Rodgers (2012) argue the body imaging technologies used at airports have the potential to perpetuate existing inequalities despite the machines being marketed as neutral and fair and these technologies violate an individual’s privacy. It can be a degrading experience as body imaging technologies are able to make the body a “searchable database” (Magnet & Rodgers, 2012; 106). Unfortunately, only certain groups or individuals are subject to this intrusive form of interrogation. These technologies have the ability to single out women, ethnic minority groups and individuals who are transgender, overweight or have a disability (Magnet & Rodgers, 2012; Marciano, 2018). Therefore, individuals who have disabilities or injuries that causes them to not provide legible biometric information at airports can be refused access into the country. This highlights how biometric technologies can deprive individuals of their basic human right to mobility and freedom (Magnet & Rodgers, 2012).

Magnet (2011) argues that surveillance technologies especially biometric systems can use outdated or stereotypical characteristics to build databases that can encourage racial profiling. This means that these systems are developed with racial biases and narrow definitions meaning these technologies will always be capable of discriminate against those who do not fit these narrow descriptions. For example, biometric systems have failed to identify faces on darker skin tones and reported difficulties in detecting fingerprints on various races in the past (Magnet, 2011). These technologies use predictive data to categorize and prioritise certain communities and populations over others (Van der Ploeg, 2006). As Marciano (2018) states, this would cause people from minority groups to receive discrimination and prejudice from

airport staff and personnel. Negative experiences with surveillance and monitoring systems can cause individuals from ethnic or religious minority groups to question their sense of belonging within a country and bring out a variety of negative emotions (Nagra & Maurutto, 2016).

### **Security Checkpoints**

Knol et al. (2019) has stated that airport security checkpoints are the most important safety and security measure at airports as all passengers are expected to go through these checkpoints. Passengers are required to confirm their identity, pass through metal detectors and their luggage has to be screened for any dangerous substances or items at these checkpoints. From 2013, the Irish Aviation Authority has been assigned with the responsibility of monitoring and complying with the national and European Union rules on aviation security in Ireland (Department of Transport, 2019).

There are typically two types of security measures found at airports; standardized screening techniques and elevated risk screening (Alards-Tomalin et al., 2014). Standardized screening techniques refer to the procedures that all passengers must complete like metal detector scans and x-ray of luggage. Elevated risk screening refers to the more invasive surveillance procedures like body imaging technologies, pat-downs and strip searches. Only perceived “high risk” passengers are subjected to these additional screening measures, meaning that a small number of the population are picked out for these extra checks (Alards-Tomalin et al., 2014). Staff have the power and ability to target certain individuals for extra searches or questioning at these checkpoints. Additional screening measures can be seen as a humiliating and dehumanising experience for some individuals as the person can be treated as if they are a suspect (Magnet & Rodgers, 2011). Additional security measures can introduce anxieties around personal privacy and a perceived threat to dignity (Alards-Tomalin et al., 2014).

### **Border security**

Aside from surveillance systems, treatment from security personnel at the airport can also impact a passenger’s experience. There has been a lot of debate in recent times surrounding the treatment of ethnic minority groups by members of airport security. Members of security have a lot of freedom in the way they administer the rules (Kirschenbaum, 2015). Security personnel at airports act as petty sovereigns (Butler, 2006) which means that staff are given the power to make unilateral decisions without any legitimate authority. Security officers can use their powers of discretion to bend the rules when examining passengers who they deem a threat. Petty sovereigns are capable of using their managerial or authoritative status to interpret and

administer the rules their own way (Butler, 2006), this can be seen when staff use their power of discretion to identify which passenger require additional screening procedures and what those extra measures should be (Lum et al., 2015).

The use of profiling techniques has undoubtedly increased since the 9/11 attacks, the Madrid and London bombings in the early 2000's (EU Fundamental Rights Agency (EU FRA), 2010). This has resulted in airport authorities being given the power and discretion to use ethnic/racial profiling techniques to identify those that pose a threat, meaning that they can single out a specific cohort for increased screening procedures (Hasisi et al., 2020). Ethnic/Racial/ profiling refers to the practice where individuals are stopped, detained or questioned by authority figures because of their ethnicity, appearance or religion rather than on reasonable individual suspicion (Warren & Farrell, 2009; EU FRA, 2010). Kirschenbaum et al. (2012) noted there was a large degree of subjectivity in how airport security employees interpret and administer security measures and argued that the vast majority of security employees were willing to "bend or break the rules" under specific circumstances (Kirschenbaum et al., 2012: 379). Both Lum et al. (2015) and Hasisi et al. (2020) agree that the relationship between a passenger and airport security resembles one between an individual and a police officer as the security at airports are given powers of discretion.

Prior studies seem to indicate that particular ethnic groups are more wary of airport security than other groups (Gabbidon et al., 2009). An analysis from a Gallup poll found that African American participants assumed that racial profiling at airports was more common and were less likely to believe it was justified than individuals from the Hispanic or White groups (Gabbidon et al., 2009). The study also found that 60% of individuals believed that airport racial profiling was widespread. Racial profiling can be seen when members of law enforcement or police officers target people based on physical characteristics rather than evidence of suspicious behaviour. Negative experiences with authoritative figures can decrease the willingness of minority populations to ask for help from law enforcement, inform authorities about offences, increase the belief that the justice system is prejudiced and increase feelings of embarrassment (Keskinen et al., 2018). For example, a study conducted by Tyler et al. (2010) on American Muslims' willingness to engage with authorities on anti-terrorism measures found that a perceived lack of justice led to participants viewing law enforcement as illegitimate. This made members from Muslim communities less likely to voluntarily engage with authorities on counter-terrorism procedures.

Lum et al. (2015) examines procedural justice in an international airport in America. A survey was conducted on 505 passengers about their experiences with airport screening procedures and border security. Some important findings from the study included that non-whites were more likely to undergo extra screening procedures (16%), non-whites were more likely to have their luggage confiscated and less likely to be offered an explanation for additional searches (Lum et al., 2015). Non-whites were also more likely to feel uncomfortable or embarrassed than the white group when undergoing additional screening procedures. Similarly, Hasisi and Weisburd (2011) examine procedural justice at an Israeli airport. The study explores the experiences of Arab Israeli and Jewish Israeli passengers who passed through a security checkpoint in an Israeli airport. The political identity of Arab Muslims has resulted in the group being prone to increased security checks at airports and other borders in Israel (Hasisi & Weisburd, 2011). In their findings, the authors observed that Arab Israelis reported higher rates of perceived humiliation and intimidation from security officers than Jewish Israeli passengers (Hasisi & Weisburd, 2011). An increase in perceived humiliation and intimidation had a negative influence on the legitimacy of airport screening procedures and border security. Overall, trust in airport screening staff was high (75%) but Arab Israeli passengers exhibited lower levels of trust (64%) than the other cohort (85%). Hasisi et al. (2012) also found that over half of the Arab Israelis in the study were selected for extra checks, which involved opening baggage in public, while only 10% of Jewish Israelis were selected for the same process. This resulted in Arab Israelis who had their luggage opened reporting much greater dissatisfaction with airport security than Jewish Israelis. The Arab Israelis participants commented that members of security were hostile and intimidating during the process. Overall, it was an unwelcoming and daunting experience.

These findings imply that increased feelings of perceived humiliation and intimidation from security personnel can negatively affect a passenger's trust and overall safety at the airport (Hasisi & Weisburd, 2011; Alards-Tomalin et al., 2014). Hasisi et al. (2020) found that secondary screening procedures can create feelings of anger and distress for passengers if they believe they are being targeted unfairly. A positive experience can still occur even if an individual is incorrectly chosen for secondary screening when the passenger believes they are being treated with respect, fairly and the treatment they receive is consistent with other airline passengers (Lum et al., 2015). It is essential that passengers believe that security personnel do not show bias (Carr et al., 2020). Hasisi et al. (2020) noted that after their study in 2012, the Israel Airports Authority introduced measures to improve the quality of luggage checks for



passengers. This measure has greatly improved the airport security experience for Arab Israelis (Hasisi et al., 2020).

### **Muslim identity**

Many contemporary studies examine the Muslim experience with border security and screening procedures. Nagra (2011) defines ‘Muslim identity’ as a religious identity that is susceptible to the same inequality and discrimination that other ethnic minority groups experience. As mentioned previously, it has been widely acknowledged that in the post 9/11 era, surveillance, security measures at airports have become stricter. Introducing measures that kept passengers and borders safe from potential terrorist attacks was vital. Although the events of 9/11 had a huge impact on travel for all populations, specific groups have been affected more than others (Nagra & Maurutto, 2016). Lyon (2007) claims that 9/11 has caused an increase in the number of screening technologies implemented at airports to monitor and identify potential terrorists that pose a risk to the state. A dramatic increase in the implementation of identification technologies and risk profiling at airports in America and Canada post 9/11 has also been reported (Wilson, 2006). Blackwood et al. (2015: 150) noted that airports became a space where Muslims experience “hyper-surveillance” by security systems and security personnel.

Prior research has shown that there has been an increase in the number of individuals that associate Middle Eastern looking people and/or Muslims as a perceived threat or danger to society (Haque, 2010; Nagra, 2011; Gidaris, 2020). Negative stereotypes and beliefs about individuals from the Middle East or those who identify as Muslim could result in airport security deploying profiling techniques that are harmful and discriminatory. This increases feelings of mistrust for Muslims and individuals from the Middle East, which in turn, creates an unwelcoming and hostile environment for Muslim passengers (Khoshnevis, 2017). The 9/11 attacks were not a direct cause for increased intimidation but a catalyst for strengthening existing stereotypes and prejudices (Khater, 2012). Both Magnet (2011) and Wilson (2006) discuss how the increase in risk management techniques have resulted in the rise of ethnic and discriminatory profiling of Muslims and Arabs worldwide. This has led to Muslims being subject to increased harassment and intimidation at airports. This can be seen when Bahdi (2003) highlights how security personnel were encouraged to carry out intense searches on Muslims, and surveillance technologies, especially biometric technologies, encouraged the racial profiling of Muslims, individuals from Middle Eastern and Muslim majority countries at Canadian airports as it was under the façade of protecting the country.

Previous studies have examined the experience of Muslims or Arabs at Canadian (Nagra & Maurutto, 2016), American (Selod, 2019) and Scottish airports (Blackwood et al., 2013; Blackwood et al., 2015; Bonino, 2015). Participants in Selod's (2019) article described the airport as a place of multiple stops for Muslims as men and women frequently recalled stories of being stopped, questioned and checked. The airport became a space they associated with negative feelings such as fear, discrimination and prejudice. Selod (2019) claims these experiences confirm the notion that Muslim identity is seen as a threat to national security as these extra surveillance practices at the airport are driven by the participant's religious identity.

Nagra and Maurutto's (2016) ethnographic study investigates the experiences and encounters of 50 young Canadian Muslims at airports. Several participants in Nagra and Maurutto's (2016) study stated that their interactions at the airport left them upset as it made them question their sense of belonging within the country and changed their views on their citizenship and freedom. Participants recalled being frequently detained, questioned and harassed by security personnel. Individuals who reported going through additional screening procedures stated the process was intrusive, extensive and most were not given an adequate explanation for the additional screening procedures. 98% of participants believed that profiling of Muslims at airports was common. Numerous respondents reported feeling angry as their citizenship and identity was questioned. Another finding showed that 78% of participants recalled a story where a friend or family member has been racially profiled by security officers at airports (Nagra & Maurutto, 2016). This is alarming as it suggests this is a frequent occurrence. The majority of participants voiced their frustrations over their community being seen as constant threats. Gidaris (2020) states that in spite of having a legal citizenship status, Muslims continue to be seen as a danger by members of airport security and viewed as a threat by the monitoring technologies at the airport. Gidaris (2020) goes on to argue that airport security measures and surveillance technologies can exacerbate racial discrimination.

Blackwood et al. (2013) conducted semi-structured interviews with 23 Muslims and two focus groups including another 15 Muslims from three different Scottish cities to gather their experience with authority. The authors noted that various interactions with authority figures were mentioned but a significant number of participants recalled their experiences with security personnel at Scottish and British airports. A few of the respondents stated they only had issues with their religious identity at the airport. Overall, most participants viewed airports as problematic. The majority of participants associated the airport as a space where they felt embarrassment, intimidation, isolation and fear (Blackwood et al., 2013).

Bonino (2015) conducted interviews with 39 Muslim residents in Edinburgh. Similar to Blackwood et al. (2013), the participants in Bonino's (2015) study reported positive experiences with daily life in Scotland but the relationship between Muslims and airport security brought up discussions around inequality, discrimination, embarrassment and anger. All respondents that mentioned their airport experience believed the treatment they received by security personnel and staff was due to their religious identity or they fit into a Muslim stereotype (Blackwood et al., 2013). The authors noted there was a common tale that was widely shared and acknowledged by participants known as the 'Muslim airport story'. This tale gives individuals a "frame on how to interpret their personal encounters with authority figures" (Blackwood et al., 2013: 1097). It is extremely concerning that a tale like this is widely acknowledged among Muslim communities. Participants recalled feeling embarrassed, ashamed and disrespected as they are questioned in front of other passengers, getting asked irrelevant questions by security officers and a lack of respect is shown for their family members or friends who have to wait and worry. Several interviewees reported feeling a sense of belonging in Scotland but some claimed that they were made to feel as if they were an outcast and did not belong within the community (Blackwood et al., 2013). To be treated as an outsider when they are citizens made the interviewees feel excluded and increased feelings of loneliness. Authorities at the airport are frequently questioning or denying the participants' identity and do not recognise them as being a British or Scottish citizen (Blackwood et al., 2013). Participants from both studies revealed that security personnel acted in a hostile and disrespectful manner to them. Similarly, participants in Bonino's (2015) study recalled experiences of being treated as a suspect within their own country. Several respondents mentioned they have been frequently stopped and frisked by airport security officers. Both studies portray and emphasise the airport as a space that has deeply affected Muslims' sense of belonging and perceived equality within Scotland. A common theme that has been brought up in all the studies mentioned above is the association by Muslims that airports are a discriminatory space where they experience offensive and hostile treatment. Participants recall feelings of shame and losing their sense of belonging when airport security personnel question their citizenship and identity. Another common theme to arise is that controlling an individual's mobility can increase feelings of isolation and nervousness (Nagra & Maurutto, 2016). It is important to acknowledge the harmful emotional and mental conditions that arise from these negative encounters.

Profiling techniques in surveillance systems have also resulted in unfair discrimination and targeting of Muslims and individuals from the Middle East (Bahdi, 2003). Associating Muslims with notions such as terrorism and danger have caused the creation of regressive risk management techniques that are embedded into surveillance databases and used by border security officials (Nagra & Maurutto, 2020; Gidaris, 2020). Individuals deemed as high-risk are usually put on no-fly lists. The Canadian Passenger Protect Program, created in 2007, was introduced as a means to tackle airline terrorism (Privacy Commissioner Office of Canada, 2009). The program functioned by prohibiting known and “possible” terrorists from entering flights. Staff have to essentially guess who might be a danger by using personal and biometric data to determine the level of risk of a passenger (Gidaris, 2020). Similarly, Werbin (2009) claimed that no-fly lists in Canada exacerbated the profiling of different ethnic, religious and minority communities. It is evident to see these systems can result in the increased intimidation, harassment and interrogation of Muslims at airports. These systems are not as impartial or unbiased as companies declare they are.

It is clear to see that security measures found at airports are capable of strengthening discrimination. With the rise of surveillance technologies being introduced at airports, these technologies are capable of choosing who is allowed into a state and determining who does not belong (Ajana, 2012). Similarly, Murray (2007) claimed these systems are capable of granting and denying access and allowing or prohibiting mobility.

### **Irish Context**

Individuals from ethnic and racial minority groups account for more than 12% of the Irish population (CSO, 2016). The most recent census shows that Muslims represent over 1.3% of the Irish population with over 63,000 individuals (CSO, 2016). As the population of Muslims is growing within Ireland, it is vital that their opinions, views and challenges are understood and acknowledged by the state. In their annual report, the Irish Network Against Racism (INAR) found that almost a third (32%) of assaults and threats to kill or harm were against individuals who identified as Black-African, Black-Irish or Black-Other with 18% of these individuals being Muslim (Michael, 2021). Overall, research surrounding discriminatory profiling and racist incidents experienced by ethnic minority groups in Ireland is relatively small.

The Dublin Airport Authority (DAA) reported that over 35.5 million passengers used Irish airports in 2019 (DAA, 2020). 32.9 million of those passengers used Dublin airport. This

study focuses on Dublin airport as it is the largest and most frequently used airport in Ireland. Both Cork and Dublin airport are making strong efforts to implement positive strategies that benefit a wide range of groups. In 2019, Dublin airport introduced a sensory room for individuals who have autism, dementia and other cognitive impairments to provide a space where passengers can relax without feeling overwhelmed by their busy surroundings (DAA, 2020). Other than mentioning that all of the important customer service quality measures made by the Irish Commission for Aviation Regulations, such as friendliness of staff, were met, the annual reports offer no additional data on passenger experience with border security and surveillance systems.

This study acknowledges the current COVID-19 pandemic has had a very severe impact on global aviation. Airports around the world are cancelling services and introducing travel bans to ensure public safety, As a result, the number of passengers at Dublin and Cork airports have dramatically reduced (DAA, 2020). In their 2020 annual report, the DAA noted that the number of travellers at Dublin airport declined by 78%, meaning that under 7.4 million individuals passed through the airport (DAA, 2021). Although, the number of individuals travelling has reduced, collecting the Muslim passenger experience still remains vital. As mentioned before, negative experiences at the airport can cause an individual to question their sense of belonging within a country and begin to lose their trust and faith in the state (Nagra & Maurutto, 2016). Therefore, it is important to examine whether individuals who identify as Muslim feel as if they are being discriminated against by border security or the surveillance measures at Dublin airport. Numerous studies have been conducted on the issue in America, Canada and Scotland so it is essential to examine the topic in an Irish context. As Ireland is becoming a more diverse and multi-cultural society, it is essential to capture the experiences of individuals from various minority ethnic and religious groups as they travel through Dublin airport. As seen above, discriminatory profiling at airports can have extremely harmful and damaging emotional effects for Muslims so it is an issue that needs to be thoroughly researched.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, safety measures at airports have increased drastically as a result of the 9/11 attacks. Governments have invested a lot of time, money and resources to improve security checkpoints, technology systems and training for security personnel. Due to the excessive security procedures, The airport has now become a space of hyper-surveillance where passengers are constantly watched and monitored by various agencies of authority. It has

become a state of exception where human rights are not met due to protecting a nation. The state of exception does not treat everyone equally. Therefore, specific populations can be targeted and deemed as a threat. Security personnel also have a large degree of discretion when applying the rules so some employees might misuse that power by constantly profiling a specific population for extra security checks. Surveillance and monitoring systems also have the power to discriminate despite it being known as objective and impartial. As Khater (2012) noted the 9/11 attacks acted as a catalyst to strength existing stereotypes about Muslims and Arabs which could result in them experiencing more intrusive forms of security and surveillance at the airport. Existing literature has shown that the airport as an hostile and intimidating space for Muslims (Bonino, 2015; Nagra & Maurutto 2016.) Therefore, it is important to examine the issue in an Irish context to determine whether a problem does exist.

## **Chapter 3 – Methods**

### **Introduction**

The objective of this study is to gather data on the experience of Muslims with surveillance security systems and security personnel at Dublin airport. This section aims to provide a comprehensive explanation of the methods used to collect the data and the methodology behind it. This section provides an overview of the research procedures, methods of analysis, ethical concerns, the inclusion criteria for survey participants and a breakdown of the survey questions. It will also review the strengths and limitations of the methods that were used in this study. As mentioned before, the two key research questions this study intends to examine are: **(1)** Examining whether interactions between Muslims and airport security personnel and staff, surveillance systems and security checkpoints were positive or negative **(2)** Questioning whether respondents believe profiling occurs at Dublin airport.

### **Research Design**

The current study uses qualitative analysis in order to gain insights into the opinions and experiences of Muslims in Ireland on various aspects of Dublin airport. The purpose of qualitative research is to obtain an in-depth understanding of human behaviour (Miller & Brewer, 2003). A qualitative approach aims to understand and present the experiences, feelings, beliefs and opinions of individuals or specific cohorts on different topics or particular situations (Elliott et al., 1999). Prior studies that collected data on the experience of Muslims with surveillance systems and border security at airports mainly used interviews and focus groups to gather and analyse qualitative data (Nagra & Maurutto, 2016; Blackwood et al., 2013). However, responses in this study were collected through a self-administered digital survey. One of the advantages of using a survey was that participants had an opportunity to complete it at their own pace (Andres, 2012). Bryman (2015) notes that a major benefit of online surveys for respondents is the ability for individuals to complete the survey in their own time while in a setting of their choice. This could result in the data being more genuine, thoughtful and insightful as respondents have a chance to reflect before writing down their answers (Bryman, 2015). As this study focuses on a topic that can be quite sensitive, the online survey provided a platform where participants had the opportunity to voice their opinions, ideas and attitudes without being confronted by an interviewer (Andres, 2012; Dillman et al., 2014). In accordance with Covid-19 guidelines, a survey was also the best option to reach a wide

audience while maintaining social distancing practices. Digital surveys can also be created with minimal costs and it can be completed within a short period of time (Nayak & Narayan, 2019).

However, there are certain drawbacks associated with the use of surveys. For example, some participants might not finish the survey, few candidates might not have an good understanding of how to use a digital platform, respondents also have the option to not answer all the questions and the researcher cannot probe for additional answers (Bryman, 2015; Cohen et al., 2018; Nayak & Narayan, 2019). Despite these setbacks, disseminating an online survey was the best option to gather a wide variety of participants in accordance with current Covid-19 protocols while keeping costs minimal. The survey was made using Microsoft Forms. This platform was used as it offered a simple breakdown of numerical data on the results page in the form of pie charts and Microsoft Forms has an option to transfer data to Microsoft Excel which allowed for quicker interpretation and analysis of the findings. The survey was open for three weeks to accommodate the needs of the participants, allow for flexibility and provide time for individuals to send the survey link to other potential candidates.

### **Ethical Issues**

It is crucial that participants have enough knowledge and information about the study to understand what the research is about and the potential harms and benefits of being involved. Therefore, informed consent is essential. Denzin and Lincoln (2011) states that “informed consent” is the basis of ethical research. To ensure this was achieved, a comprehensive information sheet was provided to respondents before starting the survey. This contained in-depth information on the purpose of the study, how confidentiality will be maintained and the possible risks involved with the research. As privacy, anonymity and confidentiality are important ethical considerations in digital surveys, all participants were guaranteed anonymity as all survey responses were anonymous (Cohen et al., 2018; Nayak & Narayan, 2019). Confidentiality was maintained by not disclosing any data gathered in the research process to other individuals and parties. Ethical approval for the survey was obtained from the Department of Law ethics committee at Maynooth University. As members of ethnic and religious minority groups can be described as vulnerable because they are often over studied and questioned in research and the questions in the survey touch on sensitive topics that may cause emotional discomfort to participants, contact information to support services were provided to respondents before and after completion of the survey. For example, respondents were given



contact information to Samaritan, an organisation that provides emotional support to individuals in emotional distress before and after they completed the survey.

### **Participant eligibility**

Eligibility criteria required individuals to self-identify as a Muslim, be over the age of 18 and respondents must be a resident of Ireland. Participants also had to travel through Dublin airport at least once.

### **Sampling**

Respondents were recruited using a variety of strategies such as snowball sampling, use of personal networks, social media and asking various relevant organisations around the country to disseminate the survey to potential candidates. Organisations included the Islamic Cultural Centre Ireland (ICCI), Muslim Association of Ireland, Muslim Sisters of Eire and the Islamic Foundation of Ireland. The ICCI is one of the main organisations that provides religious, family and information services to the Muslim Community living in Ireland and they promote the positive integration of Muslims into Ireland's diverse and multicultural society. An email was also sent to the Muslim student society at University College of Dublin and Technological University Dublin to contact as many individuals as possible. The survey was also distributed through two different social media platforms, Facebook and Instagram. Snowball sampling is a non-probability sampling technique. It refers to the practice where additional candidates are identified by previous participants (Saunders & Lewis, 2012). Snowball sampling is typically used when it is difficult to access or identify members of a certain group or population (Saunders & Lewis, 2012). Participants who completed the survey were encouraged to send the survey to potential candidates. However, sampling bias is an issue that can arise from using this technique. Participants tend to share or nominate individuals that they know personally so there is a possibility that future potential candidates share the same opinions and attitudes as the initial participant. This could result in a biased response.

### **Survey Questions**

The questions were presented in a clear and concise manner so respondents would find it easier to understand what was being asked. The survey incorporated a mixture of open and closed-ended questions to gather data. Closed-ended questions were used to gather demographic data of the participants. This included questioning their age, gender, occupation and how often respondents would pass through Dublin airport in a year. Several of the questions were open-

ended to ensure that participants had the opportunity to express their thoughts. As the aim of this research was to capture the Muslim experience at Dublin airport, participants were asked to give their opinion, views and experiences on four different categories. Keeping in mind that Covid-19 had affected travel for many, the questions were phrased to ask participants what their experience on average was like at Dublin airport. To begin, **(1)** questions on participant interactions with security personnel and staff were asked. This section required individuals to rate the courtesy and professionalism of the security personnel and staff they typically encountered at Dublin airport on a 5-point Likert scale which ranged from very courteous and professional to very discourteous and unprofessional. Following on, participants were questioned about their **(2)** interactions with security checkpoints and additional screening procedures at Dublin airport. Participants were asked about their perception on the level of security and their emotions as they pass through security checkpoints in this section. It was important to add questions on whether participants or someone they knew went through additional security checks as explained in the previous section, certain individuals are more likely to be chosen for these extra invasive security practices. It was essential to see whether participants in this study were chosen for elevated checks, what procedures were done and how these elevated checks made them feel if they were selected for one. Participants were also asked to recall their **(3)** experiences with surveillance and biometric systems. These interactions with airport staff and security, security checkpoints, additional screening procedures and surveillance systems could be positive or negative. Participants also had the opportunity to describe as many encounters as they liked. These three categories were broken down in sections to determine whether it was a particular aspect of the airport experience that made it either a comfortable or intimidating environment for these participants. If the questions were more general, it would have been hard to distinguish what aspect of the airport journey makes the participants feel uncomfortable.

Respondents were also asked about their view on **(4)** profiling at the airport. This category asked individuals to provide their opinion and beliefs on whether profiling of passengers happens at Dublin airport and whether certain people or groups are more likely to be subject to more scrutiny by security personnel and staff, be chosen for additional security checks or subject to more surveillance. It was important to ask participants on their views on profiling at the airport as previous studies have shown that individuals believe that profiling was a common occurrence at airports (Blackwood et al., 2013; Nagra & Maurutto, 2016; Perry & Hasisi, 2020) To conclude, participants were given an option to suggest some recommendations that would

improve their experience at Dublin airport. Every category asked participants to give descriptions of their experiences and interactions as well as asking what emotions they felt at the encounter. A Likert scale was used to gather general information on passenger experiences, attitudes and overall satisfaction with security and surveillance systems at the airport. Participants had to indicate their level of agreement by choosing an option they most identified within a five-point scale. The five-point scale ranged from very positive, positive, average, negative and very negative.

### **Demographic data of participants**

In total, there were 31 participants who took part in the survey. Of this, 17 identified as female while 14 were male. All participants were over the age of 18. All respondents were between 18 to 70 years of age. The vast majority of participants (77.4%) were Irish citizens. As for country of origin, 29.03% of individuals were from Pakistan, 29.03% were from India and 19.35% from Ireland. Other answers included countries such as Somalia, Nigeria, Sudan, Albania, Algeria, Iraq and Morocco.

### **Recommendations for future research**

To improve this study, future research should conduct this study by increasing the age range of the individuals being surveyed. This would result in a more varied response which would be more representative of the experiences of Muslims living in Ireland. As Omair (2014) notes, an unrepresentative sample would cause the data to be biased and this will not change if the researcher just increases the sample size. Lenth's (2001) stated that the sample size of a study must be relative to the goals of the study. If a study were to be conducted that attempts to determine the opinions and experiences of Muslims living in Ireland on their airport experiences, it is necessary to have a bigger sample size. The findings would be more representative of the opinions and beliefs that the wider Muslim population in Ireland hold. A small sample size would not produce enough data that would be significant enough to make a meaningful contribution to this research field so it is an important factor to be aware of (Lenth, 2001).

Future research should also conduct this study with other data collection methods such as interviews. Interviews would allow for researchers to ask for additional information as the interview is taking place and participants might be more willing to open up in a conversational setting (Cohen et al., 2018). In addition to that, researchers have the ability to take note of

verbal and non-verbal cues in a face-to-face setting and interviews typically have a better response rate than surveys and questionnaires (Saunders & Lewis, 2012).

Future research is also needed to assess if there are any long-term emotional or mental health problems that can arise from negative encounters. Questioning the potential long-term effects of negative experiences at the airport for Muslims living in Ireland was an important category that should have been added into the survey questions. It would have been also interesting to see whether participants changed their behaviour after their interactions at Dublin airport. Further studies, which take these variables into account, will need to be undertaken.

### **Thematic analysis**

Upon completion of the survey, numerical data was analysed through Microsoft Excel. A thematic analysis will be used to inspect and interpret the data collected. Thematic analysis is a method used for identifying, analysing, and deducing patterns of meaning from a qualitative dataset (Clarke & Braun, 2017). There are several advantages in using a thematic approach. For example, it is extremely flexible as it works with a wide range of research questions, it can be used with datasets of any size and academics can interpret meaning from the data in various methods (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Although there are several advantages of using a thematic analysis to interpret qualitative data, it is important to acknowledge the disadvantages of using this method. Nowell et al. (2017) suggest that the flexibility that a thematic analysis provides can lead to inconsistency when forming potential themes. Nowell et al. (2017) stated that there are six criteria that make a trustworthy thematic analysis. Categories include credibility, audit trails, dependability and confirmability. There are a total of six steps to follow when conducting a thematic analysis. Coding is a crucial part of a thematic analysis. Coding refers to the systematic way of organising the data into meaningful sections (Braun & Clarke, 2006). These meaningful pieces of data are known as codes. If similar codes arise, this is turned into potential themes. A theme would be categorised by a certain phrase or words that explain the data after it has been analysed (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Every theme is analysed to gain a deeper understanding of respondents' perceptions and rationales.

### **Conclusion**

The aim of this research was to gather qualitative data on the experiences of Muslims (living in Ireland) with airport staff, security checkpoints and surveillance systems at Dublin airport. Keeping in line with Covid-19 protocols, the data collection method for this study involved participants partaking in an online self-completion survey. An online survey has many

advantages as it is easy to develop, cost-effective and participants can complete the survey in their free time. A digital survey can also reach a wide audience. Although there are disadvantages with using this method. For example, the researcher is unable to probe for more answers and participants have the option to skip questions. The survey was disseminated through a variety of different ways such as distributing it on social media platforms, the use of snowball sampling, personal networks and emailing relevant organisations the survey link. The survey asked individuals for their experiences and views on airport staff, security checkpoints, surveillance systems and profiling at Dublin airport. A thematic analysis will be used to examine the qualitative data. This chapter also provided recommendations for future research.

## Chapter 4 – Results

### Introduction

The main objectives of this study were twofold: To investigate whether encounters between Muslims living in Ireland and security personnel and staff, security checkpoints and surveillance systems at Dublin airport were positive or negative and questioning whether respondents believe they or certain groups/individuals are targeted unfavourably or treated differently at the airport. Throughout this chapter, the findings gathered from the online survey will be presented. A thematic analysis was used to interpret data from answers to questions that had open-ended answers. As seen in the previous chapter, the methods section provided a comprehensive breakdown on the structure and formatting of the online survey. Participants were asked to give their opinion, views and experiences on four different categories: **(1)** interactions with security personnel and staff, **(2)** interactions with security checkpoints and additional screening procedures, **(3)** experience with surveillance systems. Respondents were also asked questions about **(4)** profiling. This category asked individuals to provide their opinion and beliefs on whether profiling of passengers happens at Dublin airport and whether certain people or groups are more likely to be subject to more scrutiny by security personnel and staff, be chosen for additional security checks or subject to more surveillance. Every category asked participants to give descriptions of their experiences and interactions as well as asking what emotions they felt at the encounter. Participants were to elaborate on their stories and write as many stories they felt comfortable sharing. It is important to note that as the survey went on, responses for the questions decreased. To start, the demographic data will first be presented. This is followed by the positive themes that were noted across all four categories. A breakdown of the negative themes that were apparent in each of the four categories can be seen next. To conclude, suggestions for improving the airport space will be provided.

Eight broad themes emerged after conducting a thematic analysis. Common themes that arose when examining the results were a positive environment, discrimination, lack of respect, fear of judgement, religious clothing seen as a ‘threat’, an ‘othering’ experience, the belief that profiling is a common occurrence and equal treatment for all. It is important to note that with the small sample size of this survey, it cannot be said that these responses are a true representation of how the wider Muslim population living in Ireland would describe their experiences at Dublin airport. These answers are not generalisable to the beliefs, views or opinions of the wider Muslim community in Ireland.

## **Demographic data**

As stated in the methodology section, 31 individuals participated in the study. 14 of those self-identified as male while the remaining 17 self-identified as female. The majority of the sample population were between the ages of 21 to 30 (35.48%), 22.58% of participants in the study were between the ages of 18 to 20, 22.58% were between 41 to 50 years of age and 12.9% of respondents were between 31 and 40 years of age. The remaining 6.46% of respondents were over the age of 51. The youngest participant was 18 years old while the oldest was 70 years old. The participants in this study came from various professional backgrounds. Answers included doctor, teacher, sales assistant, midwife, IT staff and nurse. Most participants (77.42%) were Irish citizens. The country of origin for participants varied with more than half of respondents stating Pakistan or India while others listed Iraq, Somalia, Algeria and Morocco.

51.61% of participants (16 out of 31) stated they wore some form of religious clothing. When asked what type of religious clothing the participants wore, the most common answers were a hijab (29%) and an abaya (9.68%). Other forms of clothing included burka, headscarf, cap and salwar kameez. An abaya is a long robe that is typically worn by women, it covers the individual's whole body except their face and hair whereas a burka covers an individual's entire body including their head and face. A hijab is a traditional religious headscarf worn by Muslim women. A cap (also known as a kufi or taqiyah) is another traditional piece of religious clothing usually worn by Muslim men. 38.71% of the sample (12 respondents) stated they pass through Dublin airport once in an average year. Likewise, another 12 participants stated they would go through Dublin airport two to three times in an average year. Almost three quarters (73.33%) (22 out of 30 participants that answered) of the sample group specified that family visits were their main reason for travelling through Dublin airport while 5 participants (16.67%) chose tourism and holiday as their reason.

### ***Theme 1: A positive environment***

Participants generally reported having a good experience at the Irish airport. 30 participants out of 31 answered this question. 22 out of the 30 individuals (73.33%) claimed they had either a very positive or positive experience on average at the airport. Only one member in the sample population claimed they had a bad experience on average. The remaining 7 individuals described their experience as neutral.

When participants were asked to recall their experiences with security personnel and staff at Dublin airport, over half the sample (58%) described their overall experience as very

positive or positive. 7 participants recalled positive encounters with staff and security at Dublin airport. Participants acknowledged that in general, the staff were very helpful, friendly, polite and understanding. For instance, respondent 3 described how the staff at Dublin airport are generally supportive and friendly: *“Efficient and very good staff. Kind and polite way of dealing with customers”*. Participant 14 shared this notion by claiming that *“In general, people are very helpful and friendly.”* One individual remembered an encounter where they were late to their gate and the staff were very co-operative and patient when helping them. For example, participant 23 said: *“When I was delayed in arriving the airport, they were so good. Supported and send me to the nearest gate easily.”* When asked what emotions respondents felt when encountering airport staff, positive responses included comfortable, at ease. relaxed and happy.

Almost two-thirds of participants (64.52%) reported having a very positive or positive experience with security checkpoints at Dublin airport. Two participants mentioned how simple the process at security checkpoints can be with the staff being supportive and encouraging. Participant 3 said *“The security check was very clear and as normal compared with other passengers. It was not biased.”* Respondent 24 noted that the security experience at Dublin airport has usually been good: *“In general my experience in security in Ireland has been good.”* Participant 21 also remarked that they felt *“safe, secure and respected”* at security checkpoints.

20 individuals out of 31 (64.52%) described their experience with surveillance systems and biometric systems at Dublin airport as either very positive or positive. Unlike the other categories, response were significantly neutral or positive. Only 12 out of the 31 respondents provided an answer when asked for further information. 9 participants wrote their experience with surveillance systems were positive but did not go into detail about how or why this is. Answers were vague and very few participants went into detail about their experience with surveillance and biometric systems. A few answers included: *“Always been ok”* (participant 1), *“Nothing special”* (participant 4), *“Very positive”* (respondent 23) and *“I haven't had any issues with this as of yet”* (participant 2). 2 participants implied they feel more secure and relaxed with surveillance systems monitoring them. Examples of this viewpoint can be seen when respondent 2 wrote: *“More comfortable; knowing that surveillance systems do not necessarily discriminate compared to some security staff”* and respondent 24 said: *“I mean I just ignore them cause the cameras are looking at everyone else like it just happened that I was passing by. So it doesn't bother me”*. This suggests that participants feel more comfortable and safer with surveillance systems. The belief that monitoring systems cannot discriminate makes



a few participants feel safer with CCTV cameras monitoring them rather than security personnel and staff. This issue will be discussed in more detail in the discussion section.

### **1. Interactions with Security Personnel and Staff at Dublin airport**

58% described their overall encounters with security personnel and staff as very positive or positive. Although, four individuals (12.9%) reported having bad encounters on average with border security and airport employees at Dublin airport. The remaining sample population (29%) described their interactions as neutral. When asked to rate the courtesy and professionalism of airport security and staff they typically encounter at Dublin airport, responses were once again mostly positive. More than two-thirds (67.74%) of the sample (21 participants) stated that staff and security were either somewhat courteous/professional and very courteous/professional. However, 6 participants reported that staff they encountered at Dublin airport were somewhat discourteous/unprofessional.

The participants were then asked what emotions or how they felt when approaching and interacting with security personnel and staff at Dublin airport. 21 individuals out of 31 provided an answer to these questions. Responses were varied with many having positive and negative encounters. Out of 21 responses, 10 were generally negative and quite pessimistic. When analysing and examining the negative participant responses, there were several recurring themes. These consisted of discrimination and a lack of respect.

#### ***Theme 2: Discrimination***

When asked about their experiences with security and staff at Dublin airport, several participants recounted negative interactions. Respondents mentioned feeling nervous and scared to meet staff or security in fears that they might show discrimination or prejudice to them or their loved ones because of their religious beliefs. Participant 9 wrote they were *“concerned for my family in case they get stopped because of being Muslim”*. Participant 5 shared similar worries by stating they *“feel bit scared as I am a Muslim man”*. Another common issue that arose from the results is a worry that participants would be treated differently based on their appearance. This sentiment can be seen when respondent 28 claimed they *“anticipate a search based on how I look”*. Individuals remembered instances where they believed they were selected for searches based on unnecessary reasons and are often not given an explanation as to why they have been stopped. Participant 14 shared: *“I have been stopped unnecessarily...I feel like the only person that is being asked in the area”*, respondent 1 shared how they would *“often get “randomly selected” for drug tests and extra questioning for no*

*valid reason*”, participant 27 noted that *“most times when I travel, I would be randomly selected for a search”*. The individual felt uncomfortable when this occurs because other passengers might start to form negative biases or prejudices: *“a Muslim being searched or checked...implies that this person is someone to worry about”* (participant 27). This statement suggests that this individual is also worried about how fellow passengers perceive them as well as airport security and staff.

Similar to Blackwood et al (2013) findings, participant 2 stated they would feel uneasy and embarrassed to be treated as an outsider and repeatedly questioned on their Irish citizenship: *“Nervousness: If I were...questioned about my Irish citizenship”*. Participant 14 went on to recall an incident where they believed they were singled out by a staff member at arrivals: *“I even had a staff woman watch me...run after me frantically...ask where I was flying into Dublin from”*. The individual went on to ask the staff employee why she was being singled out from all the other passengers but got a rude and impolite response: *“She then rudely asked me, “Do you have a problem with me asking you that question? at the time, I felt that was unnecessarily aggressive”*.

Responses showed clear strong negative emotions and feelings by some participants towards airport staff and security. Consistent with previous relevant literature, this research found that participants recounted feelings of nervousness, fear, frustration and anxiety. When asked what emotions they experience when approaching and meeting airport employees and staff at Dublin airport, responses included nervousness, frustration, concern, fear and judgement. These replies indicate that some participants in this study view the airport as a discriminatory space as they believe they are frequently stopped or questioned when there is no valid reason for it. It is also concerning that the responses were so negative as it suggests that this could be a deeper issue than expected.

### ***Theme 3: Lack of respect***

Another common theme from some of the negative responses was the lack of respect, understanding or sympathy the staff and security personnel had when dealing with the participants. Respondent 24 noted in one encounter with family, staff members were unsupportive and quite rude: *“the staff at the airport... were really unhelpful and not polite”*. A number of respondents were particularly critical of the behaviour and treatment they received from security and staff. These respondents voiced similar concerns to the first participant over the lack of respect and understanding they received from security and staff at Dublin airport.

Other responses to this question included: *“a lady spoke rudely to me”* (participant 25), *“no sympathy from the security personnel”* (participant 6), *“they don’t respect at all”* (participant 17). The comments above illustrate that a few of the participants have strong negative memories of security and staff at Dublin airport.

Quite a few of the individuals surveyed wrote about the embarrassment they feel when they are selected for random searches or asked to remove religious clothing. Respondent 28 wrote they had to remove their religious clothing which was an embarrassing experience: *“asked to remove my scarf and my hair was checked, very embarrassing and unnecessary”*. Participant 17 stated that better understanding or awareness of their culture and beliefs should be brought in by requesting that only female staff members should be allowed to check Muslim women: *“should be female staffs to check females”*. Participant 28 went on to recall an incident where staff were extremely rude to them and their children which resulted in the individual stating that airport staff have no respect and showed a lack of understanding and sympathy: *“One year I had my baby in a sling and was travelling alone... lady was extremely rude to me...children’s soft toys taken resulting in...me very stressed... also asked to remove my scarf and my hair was checked”*. Respondent 24 described how they get unnecessary glances from security personnel at times: *“I get looks by some of the security staff”*. These responses suggest that treatment from security personnel at the airport can severely impact a passenger’s experience at the airport.

## **2. Interaction with Security Checkpoints & Additional Screening Procedures**

Almost two-thirds of participants (64.52%) reported having a very positive or positive experience with security checkpoints at Dublin airport. However, 3 participants (9.68%) described their interactions with checkpoints as very negative or negative. The remaining population sample stated their encounters have been neutral. Similar to the participant experiences with security and staff, responses were varied.

The majority of the sample population (77%) believed their treatment they received at security checkpoints at Dublin airport was similar to the treatment that other passengers received. When asked for more detail on their experiences and emotions with security checkpoints, 17 participants provided a response. When asked to explain their encounters and feelings at security checkpoints in more detail, almost half of the responses were negative. There was one main recurring theme throughout the negative responses which was fear of judgement and religious clothing being seen as a threat.

#### ***Theme 4: Fear of Judgement***

Several participants suggested they were felt anxiety, dread, apprehension and tension when approaching the security checkpoints. Fear of judgment was a frequent issue that participants brought up in their answers. Examples of this can be seen when respondents said they feel anxious, scared, nervous, frustrated or stressed when they pass through security checkpoints at Dublin airport. These answers strongly suggest that some participants are nervous to go through security checkpoints due to fears and worries over being judged for their religion or appearance. An example of this can be found when a participant 5 said they were scared to go through security checkpoints because of their religious identity: *“Afraid as I am Muslim”*. Some respondents mentioned they have been frequently stopped and frisked at security checkpoints at Dublin airport. A few participants also stated they expect extra searches, unnecessary questioning and increased glances at security checkpoints due to their religious beliefs: This view can be seen when respondents say they: *“anticipate search”* (participant 28), *“often get asked more questions than others”* (participant 1), *“get checked a little more than others”* (participant 9) and *“I get looks from most of them”* (participant 24). This suggests that security checkpoints can be a hostile and unwelcoming environment for some Muslims at Dublin airport. Similar to Blackwood et al. (2013) findings, participants from this study revealed that security checkpoints can be a hostile and unwelcoming space for some Muslims as they are often selected for unnecessary checks.

#### ***Theme 5: Religious clothing seen as a threat***

Another topic that a few participants brought up when discussing their experiences at security checkpoints was the idea that if an individual dresses in a manner that is socially acceptable or meets typical societal standards, there is a lower chance or expectation that they would get picked out for searches, questioning and interrogations. An example of this can be seen when participant 2 said the following: *“As I dress in a way that is more “acceptable”, I feel like my experience has not been as negative as other Muslims”*. The individual went on to detail a prior encounter at the airport where they saw fellow Muslim women wearing abayas being patted down at the security checkpoints and they believed they were selected for this extra search because of their attire. *“I witnessed a fellow Muslim women wearing the abaya patted down by female staff...I felt they were selected because of their religious clothing and I still do believe that to this day”*. For some of the participants, being asked to remove religious attire can be a humiliating and unnecessary experience. For example, a participant stated that they feel

“*nervousness if I were told to remove my hijab*” (participant 2), “*asked to remove my headscarf: very embarrassing*” (participant 28). These answers suggest that it can be an uncomfortable situation for many Muslim women. It also implies that this participant has the perception that dressing in religious attire will garner more unwanted attention and glances at security checkpoints. In the profiling section below, many participants shared the belief that wearing religious attire would cause the individual to be more scrutinized at the airport. Participant 2 from the story above revealed this incident occurred over 6 years ago but it is clear to see it has deeply affected the individual and created a negative perception of security checkpoints at the airport. As noted in Nagra and Maurutto’s (2016) study, a negative encounter at the airport can leave a long-lasting negative impression of the airport for many Muslims. The participants suggest that religious forms of clothing can be intimidating or seen as a threat at the airport. This topic will be reviewed in more detail in the following chapter.

### ***Theme 6: ‘Othering’ experience***

Along with questions about participant experiences with security checkpoints, respondents were also asked if they or someone they knew had encounters with additional screening procedures at the airport. Out of 30 participants that answered, 20 individuals (66.6%) have gone through or know someone who has gone through additional screening procedures (such as opening of luggage, interrogation, full body searches). This is quite alarming as it suggests that this is a frequent occurrence. Participants mentioned a wide range of additional procedures that were done to them or someone they knew. Answers included: “*Drug tests, additional questions*” (participant 1), “*checked luggage by opening it*” (participant 2), “*rechecking passport*” (participant 3) and “*extra screening of luggage*” (participant 23). A few individuals implied that they were not given an adequate reason as to why these additional checks were being made. Examples of this can be seen when participants wrote the following: “*they gave an explanation that didn’t make sense*” (participant 27) and “*it has always just been called a ‘random selection’*” (participant 1).

Two individuals recalled experiences at security checkpoints where they or someone they knew were taken to a secluded space then searched or asked to remove their religious clothing. One was a personal encounter and the second individual described what happened to their mother. Below are recounts of both stories: “*I was taken to a private room and asked to remove my outer clothing such as hijab and abaya. And in several occasions I have been full*

*body frisked and my hand luggage searched*" (participant 27) and *"My mother had to go into a private room and a lady searched her completely"* (participant 24).

Most participants expressed negative emotions and feelings when asked how these additional procedures make them or the person they knew feel. Respondents suggested that additional screening procedures that are invasive and unnecessary can make them feel uncomfortable and scared. Respondent 14 said that extra security checks make them question their belonging in the country and citizenship. This can be seen when the participant writes: *"I felt suspected and it was a very 'othering' experience. Especially being an Irish citizen with an Irish passport"*. These are rather troubling findings as it suggests that this participant believes that they are being treated as a criminal and in a hostile manner due to their religious beliefs. To be seen as a suspect in a country they view as home is an embarrassing experience for one of the participants. This finding is consistent with that of Blackwood et al. (2013) article where several participants recalled feeling ashamed that their citizenship was questioned. Additional screening checks are an unnecessary and intimidating experience for some of the respondents.

Several participants acknowledged that additional screening checks can result in a damaging and harmful mindset which creates negative unwanted emotions. When asked to describe their feelings about these procedures in detail, responses were overwhelmingly negative with 11 out of 15 responses writing down bad feelings. This can be seen when participants wrote that encounters with additional screening procedures made them feel singled out, nervous, worried, discriminated against, judged and labelled. These strong emotions indicate this can be quite a traumatising and damaging experience that can deeply affect an individual's perception of the airport.

### **3. Experience with surveillance systems at Dublin airport**

Out of 31 participants, 20 individuals (64.52%) described their experience with surveillance systems at Dublin airport as either very positive or positive. 8 respondents (25.81%) viewed it as neutral while the remaining 3 regarded it as negative (9.68%).

In the survey, surveillance systems referred to CCTV and biometric systems. Unfortunately, none of the participants mentioned referenced biometric technologies in their responses. This might suggest that respondents are not familiar with biometric monitoring systems or assume that CCTVs and biometric technologies are similar devices.

Although 3 individuals described their experience as negative, they did not give an explanation as to why they wrote this answer down. Similarly, participant 5 said they felt scared in the presence of surveillance technologies while respondent 10 stated they felt uneasy and anxious in front of these systems but both did not give a reason as to why they believed this.

#### **4. Profiling at Dublin airport**

Out of 31 respondents, 19 participants (61.29%) believed that profiling of travellers happens at Dublin airport. This is quite a worrying finding as more than half of the total sample group assume that people from different ethnic, religious or cultural communities will face some sort of discrimination at the airport. This result suggests that participants in this study generally believe that certain people or groups are more likely to be subject to more scrutiny by security personnel and staff, be chosen for additional security checks or subject to more surveillance at Dublin airport. When analysing the responses, a common theme that was brought up several times was the idea that profiling is a common practice at airports.

##### ***Theme 7: Profiling as a common occurrence***

When respondents were asked to describe their opinion in more detail, several individuals believed that members of the Muslim community especially those who wear religious clothing face more discrimination and bias at security checkpoints at the hands of airport security and staff. Some examples include: *“It is a common thing in the Muslim community to know that when you go to the airport you are going to get extra tests, extra questioning, extra screening etc. This is because it always happens. I do believe they chose certain people”* (participant 1) and *“Yes, I see evidently that Muslims are constantly chosen for additional security checks”* (participant 27), *“Yes, I think wearing Muslim clothing or Pakistanis male person have to go to sometimes more security”* (participant 19).

Participant 14 wrote that *“Young men with beards and people in traditional clothing”* can experience more discrimination at the airport. Another participant suggested that Muslim people are treated in a harsher manner at airports because officials feel intimidated by them. This opinion can be seen when the individual says the following: *“Yes, I feel like people of my religion (Islam) are treated way more unfairly than any other religion. Maybe cos of the way we look, because of our attire or simply because they feel threatened”* (participant 30).

Other participants brought up the issue that individuals from different ethnic groups and people of colour are also more likely to be singled out and stopped at airports. Examples

include: *“Yes, I feel like hijabs and the other ethnic people are checked more thoroughly because of the way the world is now days”* (respondent 7), *“Muslims or people of colour seemed to be stopped More and they call it 'random checks”* (participant 9) and *“Yes, people from minorities or certain ethnicities may definitely be stereotyped against. This isn't the case from all security personnel, but someone of colour or who stands out due to their clothing, may be stopped”* (participant 10).

It is a worrying result to find. It is clear to say that most participants do believe that certain communities receive harsher treatment than other groups. Participant 2 stated that it would be foolish to assume that individuals from various backgrounds get treated equally. They explained that they *“would be naive to not think that certain group of people would be subjected to more scrutiny by security staff”*.

## **5. Suggestions for improvement**

To conclude the survey, participants were asked to provide recommendations that would improve their experience with security personnel, security checkpoints and surveillance systems at Dublin airport. The majority of respondents stated they were happy with the present system but there were a few that demanded for positive change. When analysing the responses, the common theme was a desire for equal treatment.

### ***Theme 8: Desire for equal treatment***

Receiving equal treatment at security checkpoints from airport security and staff to people from various backgrounds was repeatedly mentioned. A positive, friendly and helpful staff network is crucial to better the airport experience for participants. Equal, unbiased and fair treatment would be the ideal solution for many participants. Some examples of this can be seen when participants mentioned the following: *“To not be randomly selected every time just because of how I look. Or not to be treated like I don't understand what they're saying even though English is the only language I speak”* (participant 1), *“Don't single out people who don't share the same culture”* (participant 30) and *“equal treatment should happen instead religious or cultural criteria”* (participant 19). Participant 27 was also vocal about this issue by stating that their airport experience would improve if they received the same treatment as fellow passengers: *“I believe that if they checked me the same way they checked everyone else I would feel better about my overall travel experience”*. This issue will be examined in more detail in the discussion section.



## **Conclusion**

This chapter presented the findings of the online survey. A thematic analysis was used to interpret the data. Participants were asked to give their opinion, views and experiences on four different categories: interactions with security personnel and staff, interactions with security checkpoints and additional screening procedures, experiences with surveillance systems and profiling. Eight broad themes emerged, these included a positive environment, discrimination, lack of respect, fear of judgement, religious clothing seen as a ‘threat’, an ‘othering’ experience, the belief that profiling is a common occurrence and equal treatment for all. Each of these themes were explored in detail throughout this chapter. One of the major results to emerge from the survey was that most participants (22 out of 30- only 30 people answered this question) recalled having a positive experience on average at Dublin airport. Participants recalled having positive and negative experiences with security personnel and security systems. 11 participants associated additional screening procedures with negative emotions such as fear, judgment and embarrassment. Encounters with surveillance systems were mainly positive but very little information was provided by participants as to why it was positive. 61.29% of respondents believed that profiling of travellers happens at Dublin airport. When asked how participant experiences at Dublin airport can be improved, a few participants expressed the desire to receive treatment that is equal to fellow travellers. These findings will be discussed in more detail in the following chapter.

## **Chapter 5- Discussion**

### **Introduction**

The aim of this study was to gather data on the experiences of Muslims living in Ireland with security and staff, security systems and surveillance systems at Dublin airport as existing literature has shown it can be a hostile and intimidating place for members of the Muslim community (Blackwood et al., 2013; Nagra & Maurutto, 2016; Gidaris, 2020). Where the previous section presented the survey results, this chapter will examine the results in further detail and further ground them in existing literature. Four prominent themes arose when examining the results of the survey. To begin, one of the primary findings to emerge in this study was that most participants generally reported having a positive experience on average at Dublin airport. Following on, a discussion on profiling at the airport will be examined as 19 out of 31 participants believed that profiling of travellers happens at Dublin airport. Most of the participants had the belief that Muslims, wearing religious clothing and people of colour were more are more likely to be subject to more scrutiny by security personnel and staff and additional security checks. This brought up the idea that any evidence of visible Muslim identity (through clothing, name or appearance) at the airport was a sign that the individual would experience harsher treatment at the airport. Another major finding from the data was the feeling among many participants that additional screening procedures are an intrusive, embarrassing and common occurrence. A few participants expected to be stopped, questioned or harassed by airport security due to their religious identity. An interesting comment that was brought up by a few participants was that they feel more comfortable in the presence of surveillance systems monitoring them as they had the belief these systems do not necessarily discriminate the same way employees would. To conclude, this chapter will analyse and examine this statement in more detail as previous research has shown that surveillance and biometric technologies do have the ability to discriminate (Lyon, 2006; Lyon, 2007; Bacchini & Lorusso, 2019; Gidaris, 2020).

### **Positive Experiences**

The primary finding to emerge from the data is that most participants stated they generally had a positive experience at Dublin airport. Over 70% of the sample population claimed on average they had either a very positive or positive experience at Dublin airport (22 out of 30 participants – only 30 people answered this question). This contrasts with the responses from Nagra and Maurutto's (2016) and Blackwood et al. (2013) studies as their participants described their

experience on average as predominantly negative. Although participants in this study had a diverse range of attitudes towards airport staff, security checkpoints and surveillance systems, on average participants associated Dublin airport with positive and good experiences. When describing their encounters with employees, security checkpoints and surveillance systems, participants remembered optimistic stories.

Positive experiences were common among the participants in this study. For example, when participants were asked to recall their experiences with security personnel and staff at Dublin airport, over half the sample (58.06%) (18 out of 31 participants) described their overall experience as either very positive or positive. 7 participants went on to elaborate why they believed this. For example, participant 8 went on to recall an incident where they were lost upon arriving to Dublin airport. The staff pulled them away for additional checks but the individual went on to describe the staff as helpful and respectful: *“On my first visit to Ireland, after baggage collection, I was searching for exit door. I felt panicked not finding the exit and the security officials called me up asking me to put the bags on for security check. They made me open it and checked few goods I brought from India. Once they felt everything is perfect, they let me go with all due respect. Staffs in Dublin airport has always been so helpful and well behaved.”* Participant 23 also commented on the kind nature of the staff at Dublin airport: *“When I was delayed in arriving the airport, they were so good. Supported and send me to the nearest gate easily”*. Similarly, participant 21 agreed that the staff have been respectful of them and their feelings by not asking the individual to remove their religious clothing: *“Airport staff never asked me take off my head cover and sometimes if I wore some kind of body wraps, they understand I don't want an exposure”* and *“I know they respect my feelings”*. These answers suggest that staff and security in Dublin airport are generally very helpful, mindful, aware and respect other cultures. 21 out of 31 respondents (67.74%) also stated that employees at Dublin airport were courteous and professional.

Even if participants were asked to go through additional screening procedures, a few described these interactions as positive when the staff and security were respectful and kind in this study. Lum et al. (2015) noted that claimed a positive occurrence can still happen even if an individual was mistakenly chosen for secondary screening procedures if they believe they are being treated politely and the treatment they receive is consistent with fellow passengers. This can be seen when one of the participants recalled going through additional procedures such as opening luggage or being questioned but described their interaction as positive because the staff were helpful and informative throughout the entire process. For example, participant

8 noted that although they were selected for additional screening procedures, they felt secure and at ease: *“I was so comfortable, never made me feel that I have done something illegal”*. This suggests that it is vital for passengers to feel respected and equal by staff and security to make their journey across the airport space more comfortable and enjoyable. Other respondents commented that the staff were mindful, polite and friendly. Participant 21 remarked that they felt *“safe, secure and respected”* at security checkpoints. These experiences show that the airport can be a welcoming and comfortable space for individuals if they feel like they are treated with respect and kindness.

### **Profiling**

Similar to Nagra and Maurutto’s (2016) findings, several individuals in this study believed that any evidence of Muslim identity, through their appearance, clothing would result in increased searches, questioning and harassment at the airport. Likewise, participants in Blackwood et al. (2013) believed the harsh treatment and discrimination they faced at Scottish airport was due to their Muslim identity. Interestingly, none of the participants in this study brought up the fact they experience discrimination because of their name whereas some individuals in Nagra and Maurutto’s (2016) did.

Respondents in this study believed that Muslim women wearing religious clothing or men with beards were more likely to receive harsher treatment. For example, participant 30 believed that Muslims are treated differently because of the clothing they may wear or because they feel scared. Respondent 30 wrote down the following: *“Yes, I feel like people of my religion (Islam) are treated way more unfairly than any other religion. Maybe because of the way we look, because of our attire or simply because they feel threatened.”*. A small number of participants also stated that Muslim men were more likely to be selected for additional procedures at security checkpoints. For example, participant 14 stated that *“Young men with beards and people in traditional clothing”* have an increased chance of being stopped at the airport. Another example of this can be seen when participant 5 claimed they felt afraid to pass through security checkpoints at Dublin airport because of their gender and religious beliefs: *“Feel a bit scared as I am a Muslim man”*. These answers seem to be consistent with participants in Nagra and Maurutto’s (2016) article as they suggested that evidence of anything that signals their religious identity seemed like a red flag to authority figures at airports.

Over half of participants (51.61%) in this study reported wearing some form of religious clothing. Answers varied from headscarf, burka and abaya. A few participants believed that

Muslim women who dress in religious traditional clothing such as a hijab or jilbab (a long and loose-fitting coat or outer garment) are more likely to experience extra scrutiny and checks by airport staff at security checkpoints. Participant 2 stated the following: *“I am convinced that if I were to wear an abaya or jilbab or burka, I’d more than likely be selected for a ‘random check’”*. Participant 11 also voiced similar concerns by stating that people who wear hijabs are more likely to be subject to more scrutiny by airport staff and more likely to be chosen for additional checks: *“I feel like hijabs... are checked more thoroughly because of the way the world is nowadays”*. Another example of this can be seen when participant 19 said the following: *“I think wearing Muslim clothing or Pakistanis male person have to go to sometimes more security”*. Overall, these results seem to be consistent with findings from Nagra and Maurutto (2016) article. Participants in their study also believed that any confirmation of their religious identity through their appearance, gender and clothing made the individuals more likely to face extra questioning, surveillance and checks.

61.29% of the sample population (19 individuals) who answered this survey believed that profiling of travellers happens at Dublin airport whereas 98% of the Canadian-Muslims (49 individuals out of 50) who were interviewed in Nagra and Maurutto’s (2016) study believed that profiling of Muslims is widespread at airports. Although, the figures are not as high when compared to Nagra and Maurutto’s study, it is still a worrying result. These findings suggest that Muslims in different communities expect to be discriminated against at the airport solely due to their religious beliefs. Several respondents claimed that it is common knowledge in the Muslim community to know that when individuals go to the airport, they are going to be asked extra questions or put through additional security checks. For instance, participant 1 said *“It is a common thing in the Muslim community to know that when you go to the airport you are going to get extra tests, extra questioning, extra screening etc. This is because it always happens. I do believe they chose certain people”* (participant 1). Participant 27 also believed that Muslims are more likely to be chosen for elevated risk measures: *“Yes, I see evidently that Muslims are constantly chosen for additional security checks”*. Many of the participants shared the belief that Muslims, other ethnic groups and people of colour are more likely to be stopped, searched, detained or questioned at the airport. For example, respondent 7 remarked: *“Yes I feel like hijabs and other ethnic people are checked more thoroughly because of the way the world is now days”*, participant 9 claimed that *“Muslims or people of colour seemed to be stopped More and they call it ‘random checks’”* and respondent 10 shared a similar opinion: *“People from minorities or certain ethnicities may definitely be stereotyped against. This isn’t*

*the case from all security personnel, but someone of colour or who stands out due to their clothing, may be stopped more due to personnel being more sensitive towards these people travelling.”*

Harmful stereotypes and biases about Muslims can also cause individuals from the Muslim community to experience discriminatory treatment at the airport (Gidaris, 2020). It is very harmful when people share dangerous, harmful and inaccurate information or stereotypes about certain communities. For example, in 2020, Ryanair chief executive Michael O’Leary was criticised for his comments claiming that terrorists are usually Muslim men (Wilson & McGarry, 2020). Spreading inaccurate and false information can be very damaging and harmful to the Muslim community. These lies could influence individuals into believing that this community deserves to be treated as a suspect. It is also important to note that profiling can be done by anyone at the airport not just staff and security. Fellow passengers can also believe harmful stereotypes. For example, one of the participants in the survey stated they feel embarrassed and angry when they are selected for extra searches in front of fellow passengers as it encourages the idea that Muslims need to be checked and implies this person is someone to be concerned about: *“a Muslim being searched or checked...implies that this person is someone to worry about”* (participant 27). Again, this practice could cause individuals to believe that this community should be treated differently. It is important to change people’s mindset if they believe these negative stereotypes.

Unsurprisingly, when respondents were asked what could be done to improve their relationship with security personnel and staff, security checkpoints and surveillance systems at Dublin airport, the majority of individuals expressed their desire to receive treatment that is fair, equal and consistent to that of fellow passengers. This can be seen when participant 19 commented that *“equal treatment should happen instead of religious or cultural criteria”* and participant 28 said *“Treat everyone equally”*. Other participants also stated their travel experience would be more positive if airport personnel at security checkpoints did not single out individuals based on their religious identity or appearance.

### **Additional screening procedures**

As highlighted in the literature review, individuals from different religious and ethnic minorities are often subjected to increased inspection and discrimination by screening technologies and border security at airports (Magnet & Rodgers, 2011). The airport can act as a space that legitimises and promotes discrimination or bias under the façade of national

security and protecting the state (Gidaris, 2020). This idea is consistent with those of Nagra and Maurutto (2016) and Blackwood et al. (2013) who noted that the airport can act as a “state of exception” where individuals human rights can be ignored in order to protect a country.

From analysing participants encounters, it is clear to see that there were aspects about Dublin airport that made it a hostile and unwelcoming space for some of the respondents in this study, particularly extra security procedures although other participants did recall negative experiences with security personnel and staff and security checkpoints at Dublin airport. Similar to the findings of Blackwood et al. (2013), this study found that several participants associated the airport as a space where they felt embarrassment, intimidation, judgement and fear. 11 out of 15 participants wrote down negative feelings when describing their experiences with additional screening procedures.

As Blackwood (2019) highlighted, a ‘Muslim airport story’ is common among these communities. Several Muslims associate the airport as a space where they required to stop multiple times because of their identity (Blackwood, 2019). This sentiment can be seen in this study when participants stated they expect to be stopped and questioned whenever they pass through Dublin airport. For example, participant 1 recalled they “*often get asked more questions than other people*” and stated they were “*prepared that its going to take longer than normal*” and participant 27 stated “*most times I travel, I would be randomly selected for a search*”. It is disappointing to realise that some of the respondents just expect to be stopped and questioned at the airport because of their religious identity or appearance. These answers suggests that some individuals are almost used to receiving this type of negative treatment.

Several studies have shown the airport can act as a space where different ethnic and religious groups, especially Muslims, can be placed under extensive surveillance and go through additional screening checks (Nagra & Maurutto, 2016; Blackwood, 2015). It is a space that can fill the individual with dread, anxiety and fear. These emotions were also frequently brought up in the survey. Bad experiences at the airport brought up a wide range of negative emotions in participants. Feelings of frustration, anger and humiliation were repeatedly mentioned. Many of the respondents recalled stories or moments when airport staff and security behaved with them in an impolite or rude manner. Some participants were particularly critical of the lack of respect and understanding that was shown to them by airport staff and security. For example, respondent 24 noted in one encounter with family, staff members were unsupportive and quite rude: “*the staff at the airport... were really unhelpful and not polite*”.

Similarly, interviewees from Bonino (2015) and Blackwood et al. (2013) revealed they had negative encounters with airport staff by claiming they acted in a hostile and intimidating way.

When asked if participants or someone they knew were ever selected for additional screening procedures, two-thirds of the sample group (20 out of 30 participants- only 30 individuals answered) answered yes. A common view amongst participants was that additional screening procedures are an uncomfortable and embarrassing practice. These results seem to be consistent with those of Blackwood et al. (2013) and Nagra and Maurutto (2016) as participants claimed additional checks can feel like a violation of privacy. It can be a dehumanising or degrading experience for the individual. Examples of this can be seen in this study when participants mentioned they felt nervous, attacked, uncomfortable, suspected, embarrassed, labelled and judged when they or someone they knew was selected for extra screening procedures. Hasisi et al. (2020) found that secondary screening procedures can create feelings of anger and distress for passengers if they believe they are being targeted unfairly.

A common theme between this participants in this study and Nagra and Maurutto's (2016) was that respondents in both studies stated that extra inspections were always called "random" by staff. Airport authorities and staff never provided a valid reason for these additional checks. These random checks made respondents in this study feel like they were being discriminated against as they feel like they were specifically chosen. Participant 28 revealed they felt they extremely embarrassed and angry when they were chosen for additional screening procedures as they believed there was no valid reason for it: "*extremely embarrassing and angry as there was no need at all*". Participant 1 voiced a similar opinion by writing the following: "*Often get "randomly selected" for drug tests and extra questioning for no valid reason*". Respondents from Nagra and Maurutto's (2016) study also felt as if they were being targeted and when they went to confront the airport staff about this unfair treatment, they received the same reply as the participants in this study, insisting it was simply a "random check". This suggests this problem is a widespread and common issue that Muslims around the world may experience when travelling through airports. Kirschenbaum (2015) noted that security officers have a lot of freedom in the way their administer the rules, therefore they can use their powers of discretion to bend the rules when examining passengers who they deem a threat. This can result in airport security and staff treating individuals they view as dangerous or potentially threatening to extra screening procedures such as baggage checks, pat-downs etc. Lum et al (2015) further explained that even though all passengers have to be screened, discretion can be used by security officers to identify which passenger requires additional



checks and what those extra measures should be. This could result in some officers targeting specific populations for increased searches and security measures.

Unlike the findings from Bonino (2015) and Nagra and Maurutto (2016) articles, very few participants emphasised their experience at the airport affected their sense of belonging in the country, their idea of citizenship or questioned their identity as a result of negative encounters. Nagra and Maurutto's (2016) article focuses heavily on how extensive surveillance and intrusive screening procedures deeply impacted their respondents' sense of identity and belonging in Canada. The airport became a daunting environment where they expect to receive harsher treatment due to their religious beliefs. Likewise, interviewees from Blackwood et al. (2013) study spoke of their treatment at Scottish airports as a violation of their rights, an insult to their citizenship and felt their sense of belonging in the UK decreased as a result. A negative experience can have a lasting harmful impact on an individual's emotional, mental and physical health. This sentiment was rarely brought up in the survey by respondents apart from two individuals. One participant briefly mentioned they would feel nervous and anxious if their Irish citizenship was questioned and only one participant revealed how or if their experience at Dublin airport affected their sense of belonging in Ireland. Participant 14 reported that being selected for additional security checks feels like an 'othering' experience and they are made to feel like a suspect in a country they view as home: *"I felt suspected and it was a very 'othering' experience. Especially being an Irish citizen with an Irish passport."* It can be especially insulting when the individual is an Irish citizen but are made to feel as if they are not. It was surprising to see that not many individuals in this study brought up this topic as it was a prominent theme in other relevant existing literature (Blackwood et al., 2013; Bonino, 2015; Nagra & Maurutto, 2016). This does not mean that all Muslims living in Ireland believe that negative encounters do not affect their sense of belonging within the country. The survey did have a small sample size and there was no specific question that asked for participant's opinions and views on the topic.

### **Surveillance systems can discriminate**

The final topic engaged with is the ability of surveillance systems to discriminate. Participants were questioned about their feelings and experiences with surveillance systems and biometric technologies. Unfortunately, no one in the sample group discussed their interactions with biometric systems. A possible explanation for this might be that participants are not familiar with these biometric systems of technology or have no opinion of them. Overall, 28 out of 31

participants described their experience as either neutral, positive or extremely positive while the remaining 3 were particularly critical about their experience stating it as negative. 20 out of 31 participants (64.52%) in this study claimed to have either positive or very positive experiences with surveillance measures whereas interviewees from Nagra & Maurutto (2016) article claimed that their Muslim identity makes them feel as if they under increased surveillance which makes them feel uncomfortable and increases their fear of the airport.

Sadly, only a very small number of the participants provided an explanation as to why they described their experience with surveillance systems as positive while none of the respondents explained why they were negative. An interesting comment that one of participants brought up was they felt more relaxed in the presence of surveillance technologies than airport staff and security because they believed that surveillance systems are not capable of discrimination: *“More comfortable; knowing that surveillance systems do not necessarily discriminate compared to some security staff”* (participant 2). Another participant remarked that the cameras are watching everyone so they do not feel necessarily singled out: *“I mean I just ignore them cause the cameras are looking at everyone else like it just happened that I was passing by. So it doesn't bother me”* (respondent 24). There are several possible explanations for this result. One reason why participant answers were mainly positive might be due to the fact that individuals in this study are not aware of the discriminatory and targeting power that surveillance and biometric systems can have. These answers above show there is a lack of awareness about the negative aspects of surveillance systems.

It is interesting that a few of the participants had this opinion as Lyons (2007) has shown that monitoring technologies such as CCTV cameras are capable of discriminating between various populations. These systems have the potential to increase social sorting through measures such as profiling. Profiling in this context can be seen when airport authorities use various technologies such as CCTV's cameras to specifically target individuals who appear to be or identify as a Muslim or an Arab (Abu-Laban, 2012). Gidaris (2020) also states that surveillance and biometric systems are created with racial biases, meaning these technologies will always be capable of targeting and excluding those that do not fit into a certain category. Surveillance measures can be used to control, monitor and target specific populations especially in the field of immigration (Torres et al., 2015). As various monitoring technologies are becoming more widespread and common in different environments, it is necessary to inform and alert individuals about the downsides and problems associated with these devices as it is not as impartial or objective as participants believe it to be.

Overall, it would have been beneficial to see if the other participants also shared the belief of the other 2 participants. It would indicate that the general public may not be aware of the discriminatory effect of monitoring systems.

## **Conclusion**

From the discussion above, it is clear to see that four themes arose when examining the findings of the survey in greater detail. The main finding was that most participants had an overall positive experience on average at Dublin airport. Participants frequently remarked on the kindness and helpfulness of the employees. They were generally satisfied with the treatment they received and a number of participants believed they were not treated differently to other passengers.

Another major finding was that two-thirds of the sample group also believed that profiling of specific individuals and groups was common at Dublin airport. There was a general consensus among the participants that people of colour and those that appear to be Muslims are often selected for additional security checks. A few respondents had a strong belief that individuals who dress in traditional forms of religious clothing as the hijab or individuals who strongly appear to be Muslim were more likely to get selected for extra checks than a Muslim who would dress more in a Western conforming style.

Despite many participants claiming they had a good experience at Dublin airport, several respondents did note that the airport can also act as an unwelcoming and hostile place, particularly in relation to additional screening checks. Feelings of anger, nervousness, frustration, embarrassment and judgement were common throughout the responses. These results are also consistent with those of Blackwood et al. (2013) Bonino (2015) and Nagra and Maurutto (2016) where participants stated the airport was an intimidating and anxiety-inducing space. A number of respondents expect to be repeatedly stopped, questioned and checked. As Blackwood (2019) states, the airport is a place of multiple stops for Muslims. There is a common notion among the Muslim community that the airport process is going to be longer for them.

An interesting topic that was raised by a few members of the sample group was the belief that surveillance systems do not discriminate as they are claimed to be objective, impartial and fair. However, studies have shown that surveillance and biometric systems have the ability to perpetuate existing inequalities. The systems of technology are capable of targeting certain specific populations by subjecting them to increased surveillance.

To conclude, it is important to re-iterate that these results are not generalisable to the wider Muslim community in Ireland. These results are not a true representation of how the whole Muslim community living in Ireland would feel about their experiences at Dublin airport. However, this study does highlight an issue that needs to be further explored and researched in Ireland. With the number of Muslims in Ireland rising, it is essential to determine the extent of the problem and develop effective strategies that help reduce and eliminate the discomfort felt by the community when they travel through the airport.

## Chapter 6 – Conclusion

This study set out to gain a better understanding between the experience of Muslims (living in Ireland) at the airport as previous research has demonstrated that the airport can act as a hostile and intimidating place for Muslims (Blackwood et al., 2013; Bonino, 2015; Nagra & Maurutto, 2016; Selod, 2019). Since the 9/11 attacks, safety measures at airports have exponentially increased. Passengers are now under constant surveillance and have to undergo several security checks (Martin, 2010). As a result, the airport has become a unique space that is infused with power and control from various sources ranging from local, national and international authority figures (Feldman, 2007). This increase in surveillance technologies, security checkpoints and security at the airport can result in certain disadvantages. For example, Haggerty and Erikson (2006) noted surveillance systems can introduce new forms of inequality where specific populations can be subject to more intrusive forms of monitoring. Airport staff and security also have a large degree of subjectivity in how they interpret and administer security protocols which could result in certain populations being subject to more scrutiny by airport staff if they are seen as a threat (Kirschenbaum et al., 2012). Khater (2012) highlighted that the 9/11 attacks acted as a catalyst for strengthening existing stereotypes and prejudices about Muslims and Arabs. As a result, the airport has become a space that some Muslims associate with fear, humiliation and embarrassment (Blackwood et al., 2013; Nagra & Maurutto, 2016). Individuals are often left questioning their citizenship and sense of belonging in the country as a result of these negative experiences (Blackwood et al., 2015). Muslims expect to be treated differently and more harshly due to their religious identity (Nagra & Maurutto, 2016; Selod, 2019). Individuals recalled being frequently detained, questioned and harassed by security personnel (Blackwood et al., 2013; Bonino, 2015; Nagra & Maurutto, 2016).

To investigate this issue in an Irish context, the objectives of this study were twofold. **(1)** To examine whether interactions between Muslims (living in Ireland) with airport staff, security checkpoints and surveillance systems were positive or negative. **(2)** To ask respondents whether they believed that profiling of travellers happens at Dublin airport. To examine the issue, participants were asked to complete an online Microsoft Forms survey. 31 participants were recruited through a variety of measures such as snowball sampling, use of personal connections, distributing the survey on social media and to multiple relevant organisations such as the Islamic Cultural Centre in Ireland. A thematic analysis was used to analyse and interpret the results of the survey. Eight broad themes emerged from analysing the data, these included a positive environment, discrimination, lack of respect, fear of judgement, religious clothing

seen as a 'threat', an 'othering' experience, the belief that profiling is a common occurrence and equal treatment for all.

Upon further inspection, four prominent themes arose in the discussion section. The main finding in this study was that most of the participants recalled having a very positive or positive experience on average at Dublin airport (22 out of 30 participants – only 30 people answered this question). Another major finding from this study was that 19 out of 31 respondents believed that profiling of travellers happens at Dublin airport. Many of the participants had the perception that evidence of Muslim identity through appearance or clothing would make them more likely to be chosen for additional checks at the airport. Additional screening procedures were a daunting and humiliating experience for some participants. 11 out of 15 participants wrote down negative feelings when describing their experiences with additional security measures. Feelings of embarrassment, fear and anger were among the common answers. This finding adds to the growing body of research that indicates additional screening measures such as extra questioning, luggage checks and pat downs at the airport can be a daunting and embarrassing procedure for Muslims (Bonino, 2015; Nagra & Maurutto, 2016). 20 out of 31 participants recalled having a very positive or positive experience with surveillance systems at Dublin airport. However, very few respondents actually provided further information on why they chose this answer.

These results are relevant to both practitioners and policymakers as they can introduce measures and services that minimise and eliminate the discomfort felt by some Muslims as they make their journey across the airport. When participants were asked to provide some recommendations on how they could improve their experience with staff and security personnel, security checkpoints and surveillance systems at Dublin airport, several participants wished to be treated fairly and receive equal treatment to other passengers. Muslims have a right to feel safe and respected at the airport. Therefore, it is important for political actors and relevant organisations to begin taking steps that ensure these recommendations are fulfilled. Prior to this investigation, there was no data that recorded the experience of Muslims (living in Ireland) at Dublin airport. Therefore, this study should help to establish a basis for future research in this field and be useful for researchers who wish to further engage with the topic in an Irish context. As Ireland is becoming a more diverse and multicultural society, it is important to conduct research on issues that different communities may experience. As this problem has been well documented in other countries, it is vital to bring awareness to the topic in an Irish context.

It is important to acknowledge that the present study was subject to several potential methodological weaknesses. To begin, this research is limited by the relatively small sample. Therefore, findings of this study cannot be applicable to the wider Muslim community in Ireland. Future research in the area should conduct the study with a larger sample size. Another limitation of this study was that data was collected through a self-administered online survey. An interview setting would have been more beneficial to collect data as the researcher could probe the participant for additional information. The individual would also form a rapport with the interviewer which could result in the person becoming more comfortable and willing to share their experiences at the airport (Cohen et al., 2018). In regard to the actual survey, it would have benefited from being shorter. As there were 30 questions in total, the number of responses reduced as the participants completed their way down the questions. This resulted in only a small number of participants answering questions about their relationship and experience with surveillance systems at Dublin airport. Future studies should also include questions asking participants whether their encounters at the airport had any long-term emotional, mental or physical impact on them. This would have shown if negative or positive experiences at the airport had any severe effect or impact on the individual.

## Bibliography

- Abu-Laban, Y. (2012) The politics of surveillance. In: Ball, K., Haggerty, K. and Lyon, D. (2012) *Routledge Handbook of Surveillance Studies*. Routledge. Taylor & Francis Group. 420-427.
- Adey, P. (2003) Secured and Sorted Mobilities: Examples from the Airport. *Surveillance & Society*, 1(4).
- Adey, P. (2004) Surveillance at the airport: surveilling mobility/mobilising surveillance. *Environment and Planning A*, 36(8), 1365-1380.
- Agamben, G. (2000). Means without end: Notes on politics (Vol. 20). University of Minnesota Press.
- Ajana, B. (2012) Biometric citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 16(7), 851-870. Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group.
- Alards-Tomalín, D., Ansons, T., Reich, T., Sakamoto, Y., Davie, R., Leboe-McGowan, J. and Leboe-McGowan, L. (2014) Airport security measures and their influence on enplanement intentions: Responses from leisure travellers attending a Canadian University. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 7, 60-68.
- Amoore, L. (2006) Biometric borders: Governing mobilities in the war on terror. *Political geography*, 25(3), 336-351.
- Andres, L. (2012). Designing and doing survey research. SAGE Publications.
- Babu, V. L. L., Batta, R. and Lin, L. (2006) Passenger grouping under constant threat probability in an airport security system. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 168(2), 633-644.
- Bacchini, F. and Lorusso, L. (2019) Race, again: how face recognition technology reinforces racial discrimination. *Journal of Information, Communication and Ethics in Society*.
- Bahdi, R. (2003) No exit: Racial profiling and Canada's war against terrorism. *Osgoode Hall LJ*, 41, 293.
- Bhandar, D. (2008) Resistance, detainment, asylum: The onto-political limits of border crossing in North America. *War, Citizenship, Territory*. New York: Routledge, 281-302.
- Blackwood, L. (2015) Policing airport spaces: The Muslim experience of scrutiny. *Policing: a journal of policy and practice*, 9(3), 255-264.



- Blackwood, L. (2019) Flying while Muslim: should we be concerned about Islamophobia at the airport? In: Zemin, I. and Awan, I. (2019) *The Routledge international handbook of Islamophobia*. Routledge: Taylor & Francis Group. Ch. 27.
- Blackwood, L., Hopkins, N. and Reicher, S. (2015) 'Flying while Muslim': citizenship and misrecognition in the airport. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 3(2), 148-170.
- Blackwood, L., Hopkins, N., & Reicher, S. (2013) I know who I am, but who do they think I am? Muslim perspectives on encounters with airport authorities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 36(6), 1090-1108.
- Bonino, S. (2015) Visible Muslimness in Scotland: between discrimination and integration. *Patterns of Prejudice*, 49(4), 367-391.
- Braun, V. and Clarke, V. (2006) Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3 (2). pp. 77-101. Doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa
- Browne, S. (2012) Race and surveillance In: Ball, K., Haggerty, K. and Lyon, D. (2012) *Routledge handbook of surveillance studies*. Routledge. Taylor & Francis Group. 72-81.
- Bryman, A. (2015) *Social research methods*. Oxford University Press, Incorporated.
- Butler, J. (2006) *Precarious life: The powers of mourning and violence*. Verso.
- Carr, A., Biswas, T. and Wheeler, J. V. (2020) Airport operations and security screening: An examination of social justice. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 85, 101814.
- Clarke, V. and Braun, V. (2017) Thematic analysis. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 12(3), 297-298. doi:10.1080/17439760.2016.1262613
- Cohen, L., Manion, L. and Morrison, K. (2018) *Research methods in education* (8th ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315456539>
- Denzin, N. K. and Lincoln, Y. S. (2011) *The sage handbook of qualitative research* (4th ed.). Sage. Thousand Oaks.
- Department of Transport (2019) *Aviation Security* [online] Available at: <https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/26c8e5-aviation-security/?referrer=/aviation/aviationservices/aviationsecurity/> (accessed 22 July 2021)
- Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D. and Christian, L. M. (2014). *Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method*. John Wiley & Sons, Incorporated.

- Dublin Airport Authority (2020) *Annual Report and Financial Statements 2019*. Dublin airport, Dublin. Available at: [https://fr.zone-secure.net/5521/daa\\_annual\\_report\\_2019/#page=1](https://fr.zone-secure.net/5521/daa_annual_report_2019/#page=1) (accessed 24 March 2021).
- Dublin Airport Authority (2021) *Annual Report and financial Statements 2020*. Dublin airport, Dublin. Available at: <https://d110e1o1ol6ak2.cloudfront.net/> (accessed 12 August 2021).
- Elliott, R., Fischer, C. T. and Rennie, D. L. (1999). Evolving guidelines for publication of qualitative research studies in psychology and related fields. *British journal of clinical psychology*, 38(3), 215-229.
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (EU FRA) (2010) 'Understanding and Preventing Discriminatory Ethnic Profiling: A Guide.' *Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union*. Available at: [https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra\\_uploads/1133-Guide-ethnic-profiling\\_EN.pdf](https://fra.europa.eu/sites/default/files/fra_uploads/1133-Guide-ethnic-profiling_EN.pdf) (accessed 18 July 2021).
- Feldman, L. C. (2007) Terminal exceptions: law and sovereignty at the airport threshold. *Law, Culture and the Humanities*, 3(2), 320-344.
- Gabbidon, S. L., Penn, E. B., Jordan, K. L. and Higgins, G. E. (2009) The influence of race/ethnicity on the perceived prevalence and support for racial profiling at airports. *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 20(3), 344-358.
- Gidaris, C. (2020) The Carceral Airport: Managing Race as Risk through Biometric Systems and Technologies. *PUBLIC*, 30(60).
- Gillen, D. and Morrison, W. G. (2015) Aviation security: Costing, pricing, finance and performance. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 48, 1-12.
- Haggerty, K. D., and Erickson, R. V. (2006) 'The New Politics of Surveillance and Visibility', pp. 3-25 in Haggerty, K., and Erickson, R. (2006) (Eds) *The New Politics of Surveillance and Visibility*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Haque, E. (2010) Homegrown, Muslim and other: Tolerance, secularism and the limits of multiculturalism. *Social Identities*, 16(1), 79-101.
- Hasisi, B. and Weisburd, D. (2011) Going beyond Ascribed Identities: The Importance of Procedural Justice in Airport Security Screening in Israel. *Law & Society Review*, 45(4), 867-892.

- Hasisi, B., Margalioth, Y. and Orgad, L. (2012). Ethnic profiling in airport screening: lessons from Israel, 1968- 2010. *American Law and Economics Review*, 14, 517–560.
- Hasisi, B., Margalioth, Y., Jonathan-Zamir, T., Perry, G., Zamir, R. and Haviv, N. (2020) Mitigating the consequences of invasive security practices: A quasi-experiment in an international airport. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11292-020-09424-z>
- Kellerman, A. (2008) International Airports: Passengers in an Environment of ‘Authorities’, *Mobilities*, 3:1, 161-178, DOI: 10.1080/17450100701797406
- Keskinen, S., Aminkeng Atabong, A., Himanen, M., Kivijärvi, A. H., Osazee, U., Pöyhölä, N., and Rousku, V. (2018) *The Stopped-Ethnic profiling in Finland*. Swedish School of Social Science, University of Helsinki.
- Khaleeli, H. (2016) ‘The perils of ‘flying while Muslim’’ *The Guardian* [online] 8 August 2016. Available at: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/aug/08/the-perils-of-flying-while-muslim> (accessed 23 July 2021).
- Khalife, L. (2018) ‘Flying While Muslim’ is an actual thing and the reality is disturbing’ *StepFeed* [online] 17 February 2018. Available at: <https://stepfeed.com/flying-while-muslim-is-an-actual-thing-and-the-reality-is-disturbing-6490> (accessed 23 July 2021)
- Khater, A. F. (2012) " Flying While Arab": the Experiences of Arab Americans in the Wake of 9/11.
- Khoshnevis, H. (2017) Accountability in a state of liminality: Iranian students’ experiences in American airports. *Mobilities*, 12(3), 311-323.
- Kirschenbaum, A. A. (2015). The social foundations of airport security. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 48, 34-41.
- Kirschenbaum, A. A., Rapaport, C., Lubasz, S., Mariani, M., Van Gulijk, C. and Andriessen, H. (2012) Security profiling of airport employees: complying with the rules. *Journal of Airport Management*, 6(4), 373-380.
- Knol, A., Sharpanskykh, A. and Janssen, S. (2019) Analyzing airport security checkpoint performance using cognitive agent models. *Journal of Air Transport Management*, 75, 39-50.
- Lenth, R. V. (2001) Some practical guidelines for effective sample size determination. *The American Statistician*, 55(3), 187-193

- Lum, C., Crafton, P. Z., Parsons, R., Beech, D., Smarr, T. and Connors, M. (2015) Discretion and fairness in airport security screening. *Security Journal*, 28(4), 352-373.
- Lyon, D. (2006) Airport screening, surveillance, and social sorting: Canadian responses to 9/11 in context. *Canadian Journal of Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 48(3), 397-411.
- Lyon, D. (2007) Surveillance, security and social sorting: emerging research priorities. *International criminal justice review*, 17(3), 161-170.
- Lyon, D. (2008) Filtering flows, friends, and foes: Global surveillance. In: Salter, M. (2008) (ed.) *Politics at the Airport*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, pp. 29–49.
- Magnet, S. (2011) *When biometrics fail: Gender, race, and the technology of identity*. [e-book] Duke University Press. Available at: Maynooth University Library website.
- Magnet, S. and Rodgers, T. (2012) Stripping for the state: Whole body imaging technologies and the surveillance of othered bodies. *Feminist Media Studies*, 12(1), 101-118.
- Marciano, A. (2018) Reframing biometric surveillance: from a means of inspection to a form of control. *Ethics and Information Technology*, 21(2), 127-136.
- Martin, L. L. (2010). Bombs, bodies, and biopolitics: securitizing the subject at the airport security checkpoint. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 11(1), 17-34.
- Michael, L. (2021) Reports of racism in Ireland: Data from iReport.ie. - Annual Report 2020. Dublin: *Irish Network Against Racism*. Available at: [https://inar.ie/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/2020\\_iReport.pdf](https://inar.ie/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/2020_iReport.pdf) (accessed 23 March 2021).
- Miller, R. L. and Brewer, J. D. (2003) *The A-Z of social research: A dictionary of key social science research concepts*. SAGE Publications.
- Murray, H. (2007) Monstrous play in negative spaces: Illegible bodies and the cultural construction of biometric technology. *The Communication Review*, 10(4), 347-365
- Nagra, B. (2011) ‘Our Faith Was Also Hijacked by Those People’: Reclaiming Muslim Identity in Canada in a Post-9/11 Era. *Journal of ethnic and migration studies*, 37(3), 425-441.
- Nagra, B. and Maurutto, P. (2016) Crossing borders and managing racialized identities: Experiences of security and surveillance among young Canadian Muslims. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 41(2), 165-194.

- Nagra, B. and Maurutto, P. (2020) No-fly lists, national security and race: the experiences of Canadian Muslims. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 60(3), 600-619.
- Nayak, M. S. D. P. and Narayan, K. A. (2019) Strengths and weakness of online surveys. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 24(5), 31-38.
- Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E. and Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis: Striving to meet the trustworthiness criteria. *International journal of qualitative methods*, 16(1), 1609406917733847.
- Omair, A. (2014) Sample size estimation and sampling techniques for selecting a representative sample. *Journal of health specialties*, 2(4), 142
- Perry, G. and Hasisi, B. (2020) Closing the gap: promoting suspect communities' cooperation with airport security. *Terrorism and Political Violence*, 32(6), 1141-1160.
- Privacy Commissioner Office of Canada. (2009) Audit Report on the 'Passenger Protect Program Transport Canada'. Available at: [https://www.priv.gc.ca/media/1146/ar-vr\\_ppp\\_200910\\_e.pdf](https://www.priv.gc.ca/media/1146/ar-vr_ppp_200910_e.pdf) (accessed 04 July 2021).
- Salter, M. B. (2008) When the exception becomes the rule: borders, sovereignty, and citizenship. *Citizenship studies*, 12(4), 365-380.
- Saunders, M. and Lewis, P. (2012) *Doing research in business & management: An essential guide to planning your project*. Pearson Education Limited, Essex: England.
- Selod, S. (2019). Gendered racialization: Muslim American men and women's encounters with racialized surveillance. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 42(4), 552-569.
- Smith, C. D. M. (2014) The economic impact of commercial airports in 2013. *Airports Council International – North America*. Cincinnati, Ohio.
- Torres, C., Shahshahani, A. and Tavaras, T. (2015) Indiscriminate Power: Racial Profiling and Surveillance Since 9/11. *University of Pennsylvania Journal of Law and Social Change*, 18(4), 283-310
- Tyler, T. R., Schulhofer, S. and Huq, A. Z. (2010) Legitimacy and deterrence effects in counterterrorism policing: A study of Muslim Americans. *Law & society review*, 44(2), 365-402.

- Van der Ploeg, I. (2006) Borderline Identities: The Enrolment of Bodies in the Technological Reconstruction of Borders. In *Surveillance and Security* (pp. 189-206). Routledge.
- Warren, P. Y. and Farrell, A. (2009) The environmental context of racial profiling. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 623(1), 52-63.
- Werbin, K. C. (2009) Fear and No-fly Listing in Canada: The Biopolitics of the “War on Terror”. *Canadian Journal of Communication*, 34(4).
- Wilson, D. (2006) Biometrics, borders and the ideal suspect. In *Borders, mobility and technologies of control* (pp. 87-109). Springer, Dordrecht
- Wilson, J. and McGarry, P. (2020) ‘Ryanair’s Michael O’Leary under fire for comments on Muslim men’, *The Irish Times* [online] 22 February 2020. Available at: <https://www.irishtimes.com/news/ireland/irish-news/ryanair-s-michael-o-leary-under-fire-for-comments-on-muslim-men-1.4182161> (accessed 23 July 2021).

## **Appendix A: Survey Questions**

## Survey Questions

1. Do you wish to participate in this study?
  - Yes
  - No

## Demographic Information

2. What is your age?  
-----
3. What is your gender?  
-----
4. Do you wear any form of religious clothing?
  - Yes (please specify if comfortable)
  - No
  - Prefer not to say
5. What kind of religious clothing do you wear?  
-----
6. Are you an Irish citizen?
  - Yes
  - No
7. What is your country of origin?  
-----
8. What is your occupation?  
-----
9. How often would you pass through Dublin airport in an average year?
  - 1 time
  - 2 to 3 times
  - 4 to 5 times
  - More than 5 times
10. What is your main reason for travelling through Dublin airport?
  - Business
  - Tourism



- Family Visit
- Pilgrimage
- Other (please specify)

11. What is your main reason for travelling through Dublin airport?

-----

12. On average, I would describe my experience at Dublin airport as:

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very Negative

### **Experience with security personnel and staff at Dublin airport**

This refers to the security personnel and staff that patrol the terminal, the security officers present at security checkpoints and staff employees that monitor passports, luggage and boarding passes.

13. Overall, I would describe my experience with security personnel and staff at Dublin airport as:

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative

14. How would you rate the courtesy and professionalism of the security personnel and staff you typically encounter at Dublin airport?

- Very courteous/professional
- Somewhat courteous/professional
- Neutral
- Somewhat discourteous/unprofessional
- Very discourteous/unprofessional

15. Could you elaborate on some of your experiences with security personnel and staff at Dublin airport in more detail? You can tell as many stories as you like about your experiences.

-----

16. What emotions do you experience (or how do you feel) when approaching and meeting security personnel and staff at Dublin airport?

-----

## Experiences at security checkpoints

Security checkpoints at the airport include but are not limited to spaces where baggage screening occurs, passengers pass through metal detectors and a passenger's boarding ticket and passport are scanned and verified.

17. In general, I would describe my experience with the security checkpoints at Dublin airport as:

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative

18. In general, I would describe my treatment at security checkpoints in Dublin airport as different from the treatment of other passengers.

- Yes
- No

19. Could you elaborate on your experience at these security checkpoints in more detail? You can tell as many stories as you like about your experiences.

-----

20. What emotions do you experience (or how do you feel) when going through security check points?

## Experiences with additional screening procedures

Additional screening procedures refer to measures such as opening of baggage, full body searches and interrogations.

21. I have gone through or know someone who has gone through additional screening procedures (such as opening of luggage, interrogation, full body searches).

- Yes
- No

22. If you or someone you knew was selected for further screening, did security officials explain why you were selected for further screening?

-----

23. What additional procedures were done?

-----

24. When selected for additional screening procedures, how did this make you or the person you know feel?

-----

## **Experiences with surveillance systems at Dublin airport**

Surveillance systems refer to measures that are used to track, monitor or gather information about individuals e.g., CCTV cameras and biometric systems. Biometric systems are surveillance systems used for verification and identification purposes. Examples of biometric systems include iris, fingerprint or facial recognition scanning.

25. Overall, I would describe my experience with the surveillance systems at Dublin airport as:

- Very positive
- Positive
- Neutral
- Negative
- Very negative

26. Could you elaborate on your experience with surveillance systems at Dublin airport in more detail? You can tell as many stories as you like about your experiences.

-----

27. What emotions do you experience (or how do you feel) when passing through surveillance systems at Dublin airport?

-----

## **Concluding Questions**

28. Do you think certain people or groups are more likely to be subject to more scrutiny by security personnel and staff, be chosen for additional security checks or subject to more surveillance at Dublin airport? Please explain your answer.

-----

29. Do you believe that profiling of travellers happens at Dublin airport?

- Yes
- No

30. Overall, do you feel like there is anything that would improve your experience with security personnel, security checkpoints and surveillance systems at Dublin airport?

-----

31. Is there anything else related to the study or your experiences that you were not asked about and would like to add? Please elaborate here.

## **Appendix B: Quantitative Breakdown of Survey Results**

## Demographic Information of the participants

### Age

	Frequency	Percentage
Under 20	7	22.58%
21-30	11	35.48%
31-40	4	12.9%
41-50	7	22.58%
51-60	1	3.23%
61-70	1	3.23%
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Gender

	Frequency	Percentage
Male	14	45.16%
Female	17	54.84%
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Participants who wore religious clothing

	Frequency	Percentage
Yes	16	51.61%
No	15	48.39%
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>

### Irish citizenship

	Frequency	Percentage
Irish citizen	24	77.42%
Non-Irish citizen	7	22.58%
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Country of Origin**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Pakistan	9	29.03%
India	9	29.03%
Ireland	6	19.35%
Somalia	1	3.23%
Nigeria	1	3.23%
Sudan	1	3.23%
Albania	1	3.23%
Algeria	1	3.23%
Iraq	1	3.23%
Morocco	1	3.23%
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Results for Question 9: How often would you pass through Dublin airport in an average year?**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
1 time	12	38.71%
2 to 3 times	12	38.71%
4 to 5 times	4	12.9%
More than 5 times	3	9.68%
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Results for Question 10: What is your main reason for travelling?**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Business	0	0
Tourism	5	16.67%
Family Visit	22	73.33%
Pilgrimage	0	0
Other	3	10%
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>100%</b>
	(only 30 participants responded to this question)	

**Results for Question 12: On average, I would describe my experience at Dublin airport as:**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
--	------------------	-------------------

Very Positive	6	20%
Positive	16	53.33%
Neutral	7	23.33%
Negative	1	3.33%
Very Negative	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b> (only 30 people answered this question)	<b>100%</b>

**Experiences with security personnel and staff at Dublin airport**

**Results to Question 13: Overall, I would describe my experience with security personnel and staff at Dublin airport as:**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Very Positive	5	16.13%
Positive	13	41.94%
Neutral	9	29.03%
Negative	4	12.9%
Very Negative	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Results to Question 14: How would you rate the courtesy and professionalism of the security personnel and staff you typically encounter at Dublin airport?**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Very Courteous/Professional	6	19.35%
Somewhat Courteous/Professional	15	48.39%
Neutral	4	12.9%
Somewhat Discourteous/Unprofessional	6	19.35%
Very Discourteous/Unprofessional	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Experiences with security checkpoints and additional screening procedures at Dublin airport**

**Results to Questions 17: In general, I would describe my experience with the security checkpoints at Dublin airport as:**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Very Positive	6	19.35%
Positive	14	45.16%
Neutral	8	25.81%
Negative	2	6.45%
Very Negative	1	3.23%
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Results to Question 18: In general, I would describe my treatment at security checkpoints in Dublin airport as different from the treatment of other passengers.**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	9	29.03%
No	22	70.97%
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Results to Question 21: I have gone through or know someone who has gone through additional screening procedures (such as opening of luggage, interrogation, full body searches)**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	20	66.67%
No	10	33.33%
<b>Total</b>	<b>30</b> (only 30 people answered this question)	<b>100%</b>

**Experiences with surveillance systems at Dublin airport**

**Results to Question 25: Overall, I would describe my experience with the surveillance systems at Dublin airport as:**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Very Positive	7	22.58%
Positive	13	41.94%



Neutral	8	25.81%
Negative	3	9.68%
Very Negative	0	0
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>

**Concluding Questions**

**Results to Question 29: Do you believe that profiling of travellers happens at Dublin airport?**

	<b>Frequency</b>	<b>Percentage</b>
Yes	19	61.29%
No	12	38.71%
<b>Total</b>	<b>31</b>	<b>100%</b>