Methodological Appendix

This book analyses primary data generated in three collective funded research projects and in a smaller follow-up study. Here, I outline the choices we made in designing and carrying out the research and that I later made in analysing the data. The initial section outlines the sequence of research projects, their aims and the rationales of our choices, while later sections look at specific aspects of sampling, interviewing and analysis.

Project Aims and Design

The research that generated the primary data used in this book began with a collective funded project, Changing Irish Identities (CII) 2003–2006, at the Geary Institute, University College Dublin.[1] It aimed to map the ways ordinary citizens in Northern Ireland and the Republic of Ireland understood their identity and relations with others in an age of rapid class, political-national, gender, religious and migratory change. We wanted to see (1) what fields of identity they themselves prioritized,

(2) how they understood them, (3) how this differed from different social positions and (4) how much this had changed from traditional Irish identities. We decided to focus on interviews with long-residents on the island, rather than with recent incomers, since our question was if and how the traditional identities had changed. Within this we wanted a broad sample which while not representative would meaningfully cover the widest possible range of perspectives.

The initial team of John Coakley, Alice Feldman, Tom Inglis and me, soon joined by Theresa O'Keefe, had extended weekly discussions about methodology. It was clear we could not go out and ask people about 'their identity', but equally clear that life history techniques (which we considered) would not serve the purpose of mapping responses to the major ongoing social changes, and that direct questions about politics (which we also considered) were likely to produce ideological and rote opinions rather than the personalized responses that we thought necessary. The developing interview schedule is discussed below. We agreed that each of us could publish on the interview data.

In 2004 I applied for further funding for a North-South project 'Intergenerational Transmission and Ethno-national identity in the Irish Border Area' (ITENIBA) (2004–2006). My partners were Orla Muldoon and Karen Trew, social psychologists then in Queens University Belfast.[2] Our aim was to investigate the mechanisms of transmission of ethno-national identity over three generations. Sampling was to be across the Irish border area (which for the purposes of funding included all of Northern Ireland). There were two parallel projects, an interview study led from Dublin and a social psychological study of school children and young adults led from Belfast.[3]

For the Geary strand of the project, we appointed two researchers, Dr. Nathalie Rougier, a social psychologist and Dr. Lorenzo Cañás Bottos, an anthropologist. Our aim was to investigate the mechanisms of transmission of ethno-national identity over three generations. Interviews were to be with members of three-generational families, with a specific sub-sample of mixed marriage families whom I interviewed. I met frequently with Orla and Karen to discuss how our two studies meshed, and Lorenzo, Nathalie and I—the Dublin-based team—had weekly meetings and more frequent conversations. The interview schedule was more limited

than the CII schedule, designed to generate episodic narratives around national and ethno-religious identity and division (see below). We agreed that after joint publications and after the research fellows were given time to publish on their own data,[4] I could publish a book on the basis of the interviews.

In 2006–2007, as part of a collective funded project led by Joseph Ruane which compared the position and perspective of Protestant minorities in the Gard, France, and Co Cork, Ireland,[5] Ruane and I decided to interview mixed married couples in the Gard. This gave a new comparison to my own mixed marriage interviews in Ireland. We interviewed about 30 respondents in the Gard, mostly mixed marriage couples whom we interviewed together, following a mixed interviewing schedule which met both of our interests and aims (see below). We also attended two group meetings, one of an extended family group, one of a mixed marriage network. We agreed that we could use the material for individual publications.

By 2010 I realized that I needed a follow-up study of identity change, after the economic bust in the South and with a new phase of devolution in the North. After failing to find a funding source for a large study, I undertook a limited follow-up project in 2014.[6] In the 2014 interviews, conducted by Dr. Susan McDermott, Oisin O'Malley-Daly and me, we used the ITENIBA interview schedule. I chose to focus on the Southern border area, in particular two of the local areas studied in the earlier period, with only limited interviews in the North, and to rely for study of the North on other research already published or otherwise available for use. It was agreed that the interviews could be used in my publications.

Altogether the series of projects generated about 270 interviews and other field notes. They form the primary data for this book.

Sites and Sampling

In the CII and ITENIBA interviewing projects, a major effort was made to balance the sample on religious, class, and gender lines, and (in the ITENIBA study) also on generational lines. In each project, we decided

to focus on ordinary citizens rather than political elites or activists. A few activists were interviewed—in the first project by design, in the second, by mistake. We focused attention on long-residents rather than recent incomers. Some English 'incomers' (all also residents for decades) were interviewed by mistake and turned out to give invaluable insights into national boundaries in Ireland. This is not a representative sample, but it is meaningful, showing a wide range of perspectives.

In the CII project, sampling was done in two sites, one on each side of the border. We spent time finding comparable sites, each medium sized towns, each with a mixed (Protestant-Catholic) population (see Fig. 1.1, Chap. 1, p. 6). The Southern site was near a centre for asylum seekers and we expected that migration would be a key theme for town residents. The Northern site was a mixed town within the Protestant dominated Eastern region of Northern Ireland. We later added a third site in a predominantly working class 'new-town' in the greater Dublin area. We rejected the idea of random sampling: it would not have worked in the North, where some trust is necessary before people talk, and we judged it was unlikely to work in the South. So as well as considerations of demographic and social comparability, an additional criterion of choice of research site was available avenues of entry.

CII sampling was snowball, from a number of separate starting points. This produced clusters of respondents: a number from a community centre for disabled people, a few from an amateur dramatic company, a cluster of Presbyterians in the South, some members of the travelling community in Ireland, working class women—and a few of their partners—from a Northern Ireland town, young upwardly mobile working class Dubliners. This allowed interviews to be contextualized in the context of neighbourhoods and common projects (cf Waters 1999, p. 348). Theresa O'Keefe lived for a period of months in the Northern town, and she also had close contacts in the Dublin research site. This increased the capacity to triangulate and to assess the interview narratives as evidence of credible overtime change.

In the ITENIBA project, we chose two pairs of sites: two medium sized towns on the East coast, one on each side of the Irish border, and two small towns and their hinterland, one on each side of the border farther to the West. Sampling was normally snowball from a number of different starting point with the intent of accessing three-generational families. The actual implementation of the plan necessitated some

changes. Cañás Bottos began his research in a small Southern border town, predominantly Catholic but with a Protestant minority presence. He lived in the town, conducting participant observation (Cañás Bottos 2015) in the course of which he generated over 30 open-ended interviews with a wide range of respondents. The matching cross-border Northern town did not prove open to research and so he completed the Northern half of his research in the North-West. Rougier undertook about 50 interviews in the Eastern border area, focusing on two large towns in that area. Her sampling was snowball and she gained a good spread of respondents on each side of the border. I undertook 14 interviews with mixed marriage respondents mostly in Belfast and Dublin.

Our initial plan of interviewing three-generational families proved too ambitious. In most of the families the youngest generation was too young (or had moved out of the neighbourhood) or the oldest too ill to be interviewed. But if we only interviewed a few three-generational families, we interviewed considerable numbers of respondents from two generations of the same family. Twenty-nine separate family circles were accessed, with between 2 and 7 individuals interviewed in each, representing well over half of the 110 respondents in this study. A subsample of 23 respondents in mixed marriage families was included, over-representing the (at most) 1 in 9 mixed marriages in the North, and the still fewer in the South.

In the ITENIBA and CII studies, Protestants were overrepresented in relation to their presence in the areas we studied, but remained a minority of the sample—a quarter of those interviewed overall, and a third in the North (see Table A.1 below). Other minorities were also interviewed in the South—for example travellers and English/Scottish incomers—such that a third of the Southern respondents were from non-majority groups. Females were slightly over-represented (61% of respondents). Class variation was achieved: about one fifth of respondents were working class (by occupation), and more were upwardly mobile from a working class background or lived in predominantly working class areas. Professional middle class respondents were over-represented—a full quarter of the respondents had some third level qualification, and there were 20 teachers and 20 students. We also had clusters of farmers, small business people, and lower-level service workers. About a quarter of respondents were over 65, over half between 25–65, and only an eighth in their teens and early twenties.[7]

Table A.1 Respondents

	Northern Ireland 2003–6	Republic of Ireland 2003–6	The Gard	Ireland North and South 2014	Total
Total respondents	75	147	33	22	277
Protestant	23	29	21	2	74
Catholic	48	118	10	19	198
Other	4	0	2	1	5
Male	33	55	16	10	114
Female	42	92	17	12	176
Working class	17	36	6	3	62
Professional middle class	22	41	12	12	87
Other (lower middle class, farmer, business)	26	70	15	7	118
Generation 1 (oldest)	18	44	4	5	71
Generation 2	46	86	29	12	173
Generation 3	11	7	0	5	23

In the Gard in 2007, we also worked with gate-keepers and snowball sampling. For example, my local family doctor in Nîmes volunteered that she was the daughter of a mixed marriage family, and we interviewed several couples from this extended network. A friend put us in touch with a Protestant bourgeois network that included a mixed marriage. Respondents in Ruane's wider study gave him contacts. I participated in 15 interviews and 2 focus group meetings with over 30 individuals of whom 24 were in mixed marriage families. Over half of these were Protestant.[8] Most were professionals, or big or small business, with one in six working class.

In the 2014 interviews, the main interviewers were originally from the localities where they were interviewing, and they used their own contacts as starting points in the quest to find respondents, with the aim of finding a generational, gender and class distribution and a range of different political views. The interviews took place mainly in the Southern border counties (17 out of 22 respondents), and respondents were mainly Catholics by background (19 out of 22 respondents). Half the respondents were female, a third were in their twenties or younger, and five were from mixed marriage families.[9]

The sampling strategy allowed very good access to particular clusters of respondents who proved to have distinctive trajectories of identity change: border dwellers; Northern Protestant working class women; middle aged middle class rural Southern Catholics; upwardly mobile working class young Dubliners; mixed marriage families and their wider networks; and extended family units. We were able to gain a close and in-depth look at variation within as well as between particular clusters of respondents. The interviews gave multi-perspectival visions of the same phenomena that permitted understanding of the dynamic local processes of identity construction and change (Waters 1999, p. 348). It allowed for a triangulation of interviews, participant observation, and other evidence. Thus, the interviews could be used not just as snapshots of discursive repertoires but also as credible evidence of overtime processes (Bray 2008).

Where possible, interviewing continued until saturation point, when the interviewers and the author agreed that they were getting repetition of very similar patterns. The one exception was in the CII Northern Ireland interviews when Theresa O'Keefe was told to leave the neighbourhood: since it was a paramilitary controlled area, she had no choice.

The sampling was not intended to be representative. However within each local area, the respondents were wide ranging and covered most categories within the area. They tended in both parts of the island to be in the religious-identifying majority rather than the no-religion minority, although many were non-practicing. In the North they did not usually present themselves as unionists or nationalists, but many had the clear constitutional preferences for union or Irish unity that were typical of their community. We did not interview a lot of respondents with extreme views—in the North some would likely have been unwilling to talk to us—but we did interview within the mainstream of each area, and included a significant range of disadvantaged and minority groups: people within a community centre for the disabled, Irish travellers. A clear preponderance of the respondents still held to group identity, even while many nudged it in more open directions.

In the Republic of Ireland we did not interview in the South, West, or Midlands. In Northern Ireland, we interviewed in mixed areas, not in highly segregated areas of Belfast. There were no interviews set in all Protestant

localities. Many committed unionists were interviewed in the project but proportionately fewer strong and exclusivist unionists than are present in the Northern Irish population. The least represented cluster in our sample is the male Protestant working class in Northern Ireland. In part this is because we did not interview in all-Protestant areas of Belfast, where large sections of the Protestant working class live. In part it is because working class men were less willing to talk to some of our interviewers than were working class women: so for example in the Northern town they did not agree to be interviewed by O'Keefe, although their partners, daughters and female neighbours were interviewed by her. However there are other studies of this group (McAuley 2016; Nolan et al. 2014; Smithey 2011). Conscious of the nature of our sample, I have wherever possible triangulated the interview findings with the survey data and with qualitative studies of religious evangelicals (Mitchell and Ganiel 2011), Protestants in divided Belfast and particularly working class male Protestants (Anderson 2011; McAuley 2016; Smithey 2011), besieged South Armagh Protestants (Donnan 2010; Simpson 2009), West Cork Protestants (Butler and Ruane 2009; Ruane and Butler 2007), youth (Anderson 2011; Jackson 2013; Leonard 2017; McLaughlin et al. 2006), political activists (Glendinning and Wilson 2013; Hoewer 2014; Nolan et al. 2014; Shirlow et al. 2012; Smithey 2017). I included up to date findings from the 2010s where our own data is limited (Jarman and Bell 2012; McGrattan and Meehan 2013; Nolan 2012, 2013, 2014; Tonge et al. 2014). Websites of the Institute for Conflict Research (http://conflictresearch.org.uk/), the Northern Ireland Community Relations Council (https://www.community-relations.org.uk/) and the Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister of Northern Ireland (https://www.executiveoffice-ni.gov.uk/publications) are very useful sources for uptodate information.

Interviews

Interviews were undertaken to access the meanings surrounding religious and national division and identity for the respondents, and to reveal the varying local and class manifestations of these divisions and identities (Lamont and Swidler 2014). They were designed to access assumptions

and pre-understandings, not simply beliefs, about religion and nationality.[10] Rather than ask respondents directly about 'their identity'—a question that would likely have produced ideological responses and self-legitimating accounts—we encouraged them to talk concretely about their experiences and to narrate important events in the past that related to nationality and/or religion. Their perceptions and intuitive judgments are shown in their stories and the way they tell them, what they take as unusual, how they describe the world and their own response to it. Very many respondents intuitively understood that telling us about significant, concrete, episodes from the past was going to reveal both their sense of social expectations and their personal understandings (Spradley 1979).

For the interviewer, the task was to encourage the respondent to participate in this project. As a highly personalized encounter, each of us had to communicate in our own way with the specific respondent, to find that part of ourselves that could speak to that respondent and elicit narratives, without in any way framing their response. We each had our own techniques. Lorenzo often got answers simply from a 'mmmm' and I sometimes found it helpful to begin questions and not quite finish them to let the respondents take off on a thought. As Nathalie, Lorenzo and I listened to each other's interviews and read the transcripts, we asked ourselves if we had succeeded in our aims, and similar processes of collective reflexion took place in the other projects.

Interviews at one point in time cannot prove change over time. They can show repertoires of distantiation from accepted dominant discourses. They can also be triangulated with other interviews with family, friends and neighbours, and with information and understanding gleaned from participant observation and wider social knowledge, in order to ensure credibility that narrated distantiation was in fact carried out—that the individual did move house to escape conflict, or did enter a mixed marriage, or did often question conventions. With this triangulation, interviews can serve also to reveal real-life processes up to the present (Bray 2008). They are used in this research both to show repertoires and—with other evidence—to infer that these repertoires constitute significant over-time identity change.

Interviews allow self-presentation in a non-judgmental context. They are more likely to reveal non-conventional views and individual identity

innovation than for example focus groups, where innovation may be silenced or reversed. They may also evoke self-legitimating narratives. We took steps to counter ideological self-legitimation by encouraging individuals to talk concretely about their experiences and narrate important events in the past. In analysis, I isolated self-legitimatory statements that stood out from the wider coherence of the interview and triangulated interviews with each other and with evidence of practice drawn from participant observation and other data. I focussed only on significant-major innovation, not the reports of minor change which are very frequent, usually show people in a good light, and are almost impossible to check. Moreover, the study was comparative, using the same methods in each site, to discover the relative prevalence of identity change.

Interviewers

There were 4 interviewers in the 2003–2006 projects, all of different degrees of 'outsiderness' in each jurisdiction. Cañás Bottos is Argentinian. In the early 2000s with his long dark hair, slight accent and bicycle he would not have been mistaken for a local in any part of the island. Rougier is French, well acquainted with the North (she completed her PhD there), but certainly not a part of it; she asked questions very directly and from an apolitical, outsider-academic standpoint. O'Keefe, from Newfoundland, has an 'Irish' name, a slight Canadian accent, and a clear radical and feminist style, and gained good access particularly to women from disadvantaged areas and minority backgrounds. I am from the North (liberal Presbyterian and unionist background, brought up in a small mixed town in the Western half of Northern Ireland), have worked in Dublin for over 30 years, and am in a mixed marriage in the South, and I interviewed many of the mixed marriage respondents. I did not find respondents mistrusting me because of my origins or residency: in neither part of Ireland did they seem to care, not infrequently mistaking my background despite my making it clear at the outset.[11]

In the joint interviews with mixed marriage respondents in France, Ruane and I were outsiders nationally and linguistically, but insiders in as much as we too were in a mixed marriage. The respondents frequently

turned the tables on us, asking us about our experiences in Ireland. The interviews often turned into dialogue, comparison and exploration of the meanings of difference.

In the later sets of interviews on the border area two of the interviewers would have been seen as insider/outsiders (they were from the local area but had left for some years). This allowed them ease of access when we had limited time and finance. In these interviews, respondents were keen to talk about changes in relationships in their local area and their own responses to this. This may have been a result of our introductions: we said we were conducting a follow-up interview study ten years after the initial one. It may have been because the interviewers had 'come back' after some years in Dublin. But the most plausible reason is the changes in the local area: respondents noted improved relations with the North and between republicans and others, and they were more relaxed in discussing these relations than respondents had been ten years earlier.

Interview Schedule

In the CII and ITENIBA projects, initial letters outlining the project and means to contact us were given to potential respondents.

CII Interviews began with an informal chat designed to put the respondent at ease and sometimes ended with a debriefing. These were later written up in short notes, where O'Keefe discussed the setting, the questions the respondent asked, the décor of their house, for example religious or national symbols, and her own responses.

In CII, the interview schedule was piloted and then perfected over time. Our final schedule began with an open-ended question—asking the respondent 'tell me about yourself'—and went on to ask them about each category that they mentioned (gender, class, locality, nationality, religion, race). If nationality and/or religion were not mentioned in the introduction, later this was probed in the interview. Questions for every field were intended to access boundaries, including 'what makes you x?', 'who else is x…? "is being x an important part of who you are?', and more generally 'is there a group of people that you feel like you belong to [don't belong to] or can [can't] identify with readily?' In addition, there were

particular questions for each field, for example, 'Do you like living in X-town? Are people here different from people in Dublin/Belfast? Are you an X-town person?'; 'Is being working class an important part of who you are?', 'People say Ireland used to be a classless society, do you agree? Has it changed?', and on occasion O'Keefe probed for experiences of class exclusion. On religion, questions included 'Would you consider yourself a religious person?' 'Were you baptized?' 'Do you go to church?' 'Why did you stop?' 'What other religions are you interested in?' On nationality, probes included 'What does being Irish mean?' 'What makes you personally Irish?' 'Do you remember the first time you realized you were Irish?' 'Are people in the North Irish?' 'Do you have to be born here to be Irish?' And sometimes there were questions about important events and processes: 'Did you watch the troubles in the North on television? How did that make you feel?' 'What about the Celtic Tiger, what is your experience of it?', 'Do you feel European?' and where there are children 'Are your children the same?'

Since the interview schedule potentially covered seven or eight fields, the emphasis in any particular interview depended on the respondent's interests. If the respondent was showing little interest in, for example, nationality, not all the questions were asked. And when the respondent showed a lot of interest in nationality, we felt it more important to generate episodic narratives around the concept of nationality than to ask a long list of questions about it.

Where many fields were covered, the interview experience was intense: when asked if he had anything to add, one respondent commented '*There's nothing really because you asked me everything.… I never got such a thorough going over in me life, I hope I was alright?*'.[12] Theresa responded '*You were very, very helpful*'.

In the ITENIBA interviews, as in the CII ones, the respondents were given a written document that outlined the broad character of the project and those accountable for it. The interview schedule itself was designed to produce episodic narratives around religion and nationality. When religious or national categories were mentioned, the interviewer asked what they meant to them, and if this had changed. If they were not mentioned, the issue was probed. Follow-up probes included whether their views were the same or different to those of their parents or their children. Other than

these general guidelines there were no defined questions, and the interviews were ethnographic in style, open-ended, with the aim of eliciting engagement from the respondent rather than answers to specific questions.

The interviewers used slightly different techniques in beginning the interviews: Cañás Bottos insisted on an open-ended beginning; Rougier insisted on giving some guidelines, asking respondents to introduce themselves while mentioning nationality, religion, 'that sort of thing'; I began asking the respondents to tell me a little about themselves. Long discussions between all three of us and close comparisons of our initial interviews were undertaken to ensure that the slightly varying techniques generated unforced discussions and narratives around religion and nationality, without any framing by the interviewer.

The interview schedule varied within projects as we refined our approach, it varied slightly between interviewers and it varied between projects. This means that different questions were asked in different projects and in different phases of each and similar questions were differently phrased. This is not unusual in narrative analysis which requires that interviewers follow respondents where they lead and thus uniformity in questions can never be guaranteed (Riessman 2008, pp. 23–24). Interviewers were careful not to introduce terms that would be important in the subsequent analysis: so for example, they never said 'we' to indicate that they shared membership of a broader group with the respondent, and while they might introduce the terms 'national' or 'religious' they did not introduce specific national or religious categories.

In the Gard, the interview schedule was a compromise between Ruane's ethnographic and historical interests and my own. I usually started by asking the respondents to introduce themselves, and when they mentioned religion I asked what it meant to them and if this had changed. He engaged them in discussion about their general sense of Protestantism/Catholicism, its historical and political resonances and about the forms of local community and the changing relationships, class and status of Protestants and Catholics in their locality. In the 2014 interviews, the ITENIBA schedule was followed.

Specific questions were sometimes asked only in one project or of some respondents but not of others. For example, O'Keefe asked three quarters of her Southern respondents if they thought of Ireland as 32 or 26

counties and why, with a follow-up on whether or not they include Northerners as Irish. In proportions similar to recent surveys, about half said 32 counties, a third 26 counties and the rest either pointed out the complexity of the question or did not wish to address it (Todd 2015). The answers informed and qualified what we already know from the surveys about Southern constitutional ambivalence and uncertainty. But this was background material for this book, not central to its analysis.

Sometimes specific questions—about ownership of industry in Nîmes or about watching the Northern violence on television—produced an episodic narrative that was directly relevant to the analysis of identity change or an extended discussion where I could later analyse the concepts used by the respondents. The questions that provoked such discussions ranged from the most general 'will you tell me a bit about yourself?' through the most non-descript 'uh-huh', to the most factual follow-up question 'and do you have a British passport?'. It is the narratives and extended discussions that form the basis of analysis in this book, and their structure and content (which I was later to analyse in terms of a typology of identity change) varied independently of the questions that provoked them.

Still the question remains: did the differences in technique and interview schedule affect the responses? It was because we thought that they might do so that we spent so long discussing the best techniques and questions. In thematic analysis, it is generally believed that the questions asked may steer the respondents' answers and emphases (see McCrone and Bechhofer 2015). I analysed all CII and ITENIBA interviews to see if the different schedules, and in particular the presence or absence of initial questions about nationality and religion, affected respondents' assignment of importance to these fields. I assessed respondents' sense of importance of nationality and/or religion both by their explicit statements and by the reflection and thought that they gave to them in discussion. The results are reported in Todd 2014 (see also Chap. 4, pp. 75–76). Whether or not the respondents volunteered their religious and/or national identity at the start of the interview, or whether they were asked about them then or later, was unrelated to the importance they assigned to nationality and/or religion. Almost all in the Republic of Ireland, whether or not they volunteered the categories, said that religion and nationality were important to them. In Northern Ireland, about a quarter of those who volunteered their

religious background did so saying that they preferred not to use these categories, while very many of those for whom religion and/or nationality were very important did not volunteer them. Nor was there a difference between the importance assigned to nationality and religion in these interviews and in those that began with more direct questions. Where the categories were no longer salient, our respondents felt quite able to tell us that we were asking questions irrelevant to them.

The French interviews differed from most of the others because, for the most part, two of us interviewed a mixed marriage couple. This certainly affected the interaction and style of the interviews, with the 'couple' interviews sometimes generating lively discussions that went on all evening. Did this affect the crucial elements of comparison in Chap. 7? In particular, did it affect the French respondents' description of identity processes as relatively smooth, compared to the descriptions of similar processes in Northern Ireland as crisis-ridden? In fact, similar descriptions of smooth processes of identity change were given in the individual 1–1 interviews that I conducted in France. Moreover the 'couple' interviews in the Republic of Ireland showed the same sort of processes of identity change as did the individual interviews. In the individual interviews, in Northern Ireland and elsewhere, respondents did not tell me secrets that they kept hidden from their spouse, but rather discussed their actions at and responses to very public events: a wedding, the birth of a child, baptism. In several interviews in Northern Ireland, a respondent repeated to me stories of distress that their spouse or parent had already told me.

More generally, in each of the interviews we were concerned to elicit what the respondent felt was important about group divisions, social relations and identity. In analysing this, I read and reread the interview as a totality, interpreting the specific parts within the context of the whole. This was what was compared in the narrative analysis of Chaps. 6 and 7.

Taping, Transcribing, Editing and Anonymizing

The interviews were taped with the permission of the respondents, transcribed and anonymized. We decided to keep only the very evident laughs, silences or sighs in the transcriptions, not every pause.

An initial code was given to each respondent in the ITENIBA project, for example NF2XTP02, to ensure easy identification of the interviewer (Nathalie), gender (F), generation (second or middle), locality (X-town), occupation (teacher), religion (Protestant) of the respondent, and the number of respondent with these general characteristics. I later generalized this to the other interviews. Those from the Changing Irish Identities project had previously been referred to as D12 or D30 to refer to the research site and the number of the interview. I added reference to the interviewer, gender, generation, occupational class and religion of the respondent so that D12 became TM1CCD12).

The quotations included in the text are chosen because of the clear way they express typical themes or modes of argumentation. I have attempted to disguise individual identity not simply by changing names, but also by telling only bits of their stories and changing non-essential details. For ease of presentation, small repetitions and hesitations are excised from the quotations in the text.

Reporting and Replication

My own analysis was carried out on word-documents and on spreadsheets.

There were multiple pages of word-documents. They included: notes on the make-up of the '220 respondents' in the 2003–2006 interviews, and the major themes in their transcripts; notes on 'Protestants in the South'; notes on 'who changes and by how much'; notes on exclusion narratives; notes on the mixed marriage respondents in each of the three sites; and notes on generational differences. For each measure in the text, I have several pages of notes.

These were then summarized on excel spreadsheets.

A first 'thematic' spreadsheet collated information about the respondent (sometimes short quotes) under the following headings:

Code: NF2NHC04;
 Special notes: pseudonym (Veronica), relation to other respondents (mother of John, NM3XXXX., wife of James, NM2XXXX.) In other cases, a mixed marriage, divorce, English or Scottish background, or being a child or parent of a mixed marriage partner was noted.
 Age: 53

    <u>Place</u>: born in Northern Ireland in town where she is presently living.
    <u>Class</u>: service worker.
    <u>Values emphasized</u>: moderation, getting along with people, not giving offence.
    <u>Epistemology/ontology</u>: n/a (no clear evidence in the interview). In other cases, the respondent might be on principle 'fallibilist' or have great certainty about their identity and values.
    <u>Religion</u>: practicing Catholic, it is important to her
    <u>Type of Change</u>: one incident discussed, but not followed through in practice. In other cases, the type of change, for example, privatization or transformation would be noted.
    <u>Family</u>: mentioned as moderates, against violence
    <u>Nationality:</u> Irish. Important to her.
    <u>Politics</u>: nationalist
    <u>Schooling</u>: sends child to local Catholic school
    <u>Slippage</u>: some slippage between nationality and religion
    <u>Self-introduction</u>: mentions her religion and nationality from the start

A second spreadsheet added a column for individual identity innovation. It was recorded as numerically (0–4) (correlated with Table 5.1, p. 106 where box A = 0, box B and D = 1, box E = 2, box F = 3, and box I = 4) or 'too little information'. In the neighbouring column brief notes were added. So for example Veronica was assessed as 0.5 with the note 'minor ideational and little practical change'.

A third spreadsheet outlined reports of exclusion, under the following categories

    <u>Experience of violence and overt intimidation</u>: 'Worried by violence in her neighbourhood during the troubles.'
    <u>Experience of exclusion</u>: 'Her desire not to give offence unreciprocated'
    <u>Framing of exclusion</u>: nationality.

A fourth spreadsheet counted the number of times the 'we' is used in the interview, the number of national 'we's, and the number of ambiguously national 'we's. For example, for Veronica 150 'we's, 0 national 'we's. An additional column allowed comments on the coding and reference to significant aspects of the interview, for example, how many ambiguous uses of the 'we', or why I coded in one way rather than another.

Analysis

The research teams began publication with thematic analysis. One of us tried coding electronically (via Atlas TI) but we found that it was not worthwhile; themes (nationalism/nationality) were too wide and drew in so much text that it was as easy and more reliable for me to read the whole interview and highlight relevant text manually. For the rest of the analysis I worked manually. The main effort went into the coding. Whenever possible, I had my own coding spot-checked by a colleague or research assistant.[13]

As my concepts developed, it became clear that the thematic approach with which we began was far from sufficient to explore processes and patterns of identity change. My analysis developed in seven phases, ordered here logically rather than chronologically. For each phase, a different method and wholly or partially different data set was relevant.

Phase 1: contextual analysis. This involves socio-political and structural analysis of changing boundaries and community identities, with coordination patterns assessed by aggregate practice (voting, housing, policy reports), and aggregate attitudes and opinions (surveys). This allows an assessment of the character of the boundaries in each part of the island, the temporality of their change over time, and the aggregate makeup of the population over time (those committed to change, those resisting, and the swayers) (Chap. 3). It permits an aggregate assessment of the extent to which individual identity innovation in the early 2000s was sustained and spread socially, or reversed or marginalized (Chap. 3; Chap. 9).

Phase 2: grounded theory. This phase of analysis was collective: Rougier, Canas Bottos, O'Keefe and I derived themes and interrelations from the interviews themselves, using techniques of grounded theory (Strauss and Corbin 1997).

Phase 3: theoretically focused analysis. Here I read the interviews to distinguish how the respondents characterized social expectations with respect to nationality and religion (the grammar of nationality). In particular I distinguished between reports of what '*they*' or '*we*' say about nationality and religion from what it means to '*me*', how '*I*' see it. I used the former, with other data, to inductively map social grammars of nationality where whole groups of respondents converged in the themes they emphasized and their ways of interrelating them.

In this process of analysis, pronouns were examined to see how the respondent defined nationality, whether as a self-project (what I believe in, where I am situated) or as a sense of belonging (we). All uses of 'we' were colour coded. Common usages included: Familial (family of origin and of marriage); Cohort (school friends, circle of friends); Locality (neighbourhood, town); Work (the firm or enterprise or sector); Religion (sometimes broadened from church to wider community who share religious socialization); Class (in particular working class); State-society (the situationally defined population who share the same laws, institutions, governing parties); Nation (the people—Irish, British or Northern Irish—said to share common cultural characteristics and/or stretching back historically). The following counts as a national 'we': 'We' (i.e. the British, Irish or Northern Irish) are/do/think/say xyz. The following does not: 'We' (indeterminately family, cohort, religious group, fellow citizens) are British (or Irish or Northern Irish).[14] Usage of the national 'we' was pervasive in the South and rare in the North (Chap. 4, pp. 83–84).

Phase 4: Contextualising the individual's position. Here I analysed the gaps and discrepancies between the individual's self-positioning and the wider social practices (Chap. 3) and grammar of nationality (Chap. 4). This involved contextualizing interviews in the wider discourse and practices, and contextualizing respondents' construction of the self in relation to their understanding of the community norms. This allowed me to define the extent to which the individual is embedded in the ethical life of the community, or distances him/herself from it. The latter is what I call individual identity innovation (III). I give examples of how III is identified below. As I discuss in Chap. 5, the extent of III varies very radically between North and South, and over time, and between mixed marriage families and the rest.

Phase 5: Interpretative narrative analysis of the logics of identity change.

Here I restricted analysis to those interviews showing identity innovation, and specifically to the approximately 100 interviews which provided episodic narratives of identity change. (A few of these—less than 10%—were in the end not categorized because they were insufficiently detailed or credible).

Riessman (2008, p. 11, 12) notes that narrative analysis preserves extended accounts as units, rather than fragmenting them into categories. This was my approach in Chap. 5 where I attempted to reconstruct

the ways individuals narrated self-change—the modes of argumentation, assumptions (fallibilism, certainty) values (e.g. autonomy), and tropes ('live and let live', 'the jury is still out', 'it's only a label'). Using examples and careful reading in the context of the interview as a whole, I reconstructed the logic of four empirical types of identity innovation—privatization, pluralization, universalistic reaffirmation, transformation—and showed also the ways more uncertain and minor routes of innovation proceeded (Chaps. 6 and 7). In these ways I followed Riessman (2008, p. 11) in showing '*how* and *why* incidents are storied, not simply the content to which language refers'.

In Chaps. 4 and 5, I looked more specifically at narratives of exclusion and of the triggers of innovation, seeing them not in the context of the interview as a whole, but as narratives to be compared across cases. Riessman argues (Riessman 2008, pp. 62–63) that this requires an assumption that the theme (in this case, exclusion) has a similar meaning 'across narratives and narrators'. This is what I argue in Chap. 4. In Chap. 5 I coded the narratives of the proximate causes of innovation thematically in terms of their emphasis on 'push' factors (bad experiences) or 'pull' factors (opportunities, hopes for the future). I subdivided 'bad experiences' into 'exclusion by out-group', 'exclusion by in-group' and 'normative dissonance' (Chap. 5).

Phase 6. Comparative 'experimental' analysis of how social context affects the process and sustenance of identity change.

Comparison of the impact of social structure on types of identity change is difficult, because differences across societies may be a result of sampling and individual psychological variation. In particular, it is tempting to return to a psychological-depth, 'hardened identity' perspective to explain the persistence of division in Northern Ireland more than in the other research sites. Thus I took very similar respondents in very different societies—63 respondents in mixed marriage families in Northern Ireland, the Irish state and the Gard in France—and compared the process and outcome of identity change in each society. This revealed the mechanisms by which cultural norms and social opportunities affect identity change even among individuals who share open and tolerant attitudes and interests in overcoming division.

Phase 7. Reconstruction of the (social) traps of change.

I elaborated and developed the typology of identity change, reconstructing its social and its normative logic. This allowed me to show how particular social structures give strong incentives for individuals to take paths of change almost guaranteed to fail (Chap. 8). This model is tested in Chap. 9, this time looking at contemporary processes of social mobilization in both Irish jurisdictions. These collective movements are good test cases for the model, for the data was collected by others, quite independently of my projects. I show that micro-processes and logics of identity change are key to understanding and explaining the makeup and outcome of the movements.

At each phase of analysis I went beyond the raw data, contextualizing, interpreting, inferring, reconstructing (cf Spradley 1979). The phases of analysis are in large part self-standing. The holistic developmental account of when and how people rethink identities and divisions and with what impact requires a synthesis of all the parts. Conceptually, key concepts are developed in early chapters and then used in subsequent ones: grammar of nationality; individual identity innovation; typology of identity change; traps of change. As in pragmatist philosophy of science (Bates et al. 1998), the ideal is to come to a reflective equilibrium between theory (the development of appropriate theoretical concepts and claims) and evidence (the interpreted transcripts and other data) such that the detailed account of changes and reversals in Ireland gives insight into the big questions about how and when micro-level processes can have macro-level impact.

Indicators of Individual Identity Innovation

Individual identity innovation is distantiation from the dominant practices and understandings of division. Innovation is coded as such when distantiation is consistent through the interview—not simply a matter of one statement—and when it is credible. Coding therefore involves contextual knowledge and careful reading of the interview as a whole.

The dominant practices and understandings of division on religious and national grounds were identified in Chaps. 3 and 4.[15] As discussed in Chap. 5 (pp. 102–103), innovation is assessed as minor, significant or

major on two axes: how people use the religious and national categories discursively ('ideational' change), and how they act with respect to them ('practical' change) (following Smithey (2011), pp. 140–141). Where there was no change on either axis they were coded 0, creeping up to 0.5 or 0.75 if there was minor change (Table 5.1, p. 106, box A). If there was significant change on one axis, they were coded 1 (Table 5.1, p. 106, box B and D), and if on both axes, 2 (Table 5.1, p. 106, box E). Where there was significant change on one axis and major on the other, they were coded 3 (Table 5.1, p. 106, box F and H), and if major change on both, they were coded 4 (Table 5.1, p. 106, box I).

It is relatively straight-forward to code practical identity innovation: significant innovation involves people intentionally and regularly involving themselves in boundary crossing behavior: for example sending their child to an integrated or 'out-group' school; being in a mixed marriage; moving house so their children could have mixed friends; in Northern Ireland a Protestant going to mass or a Catholic to a loyalist bonfire with friends. It includes regular engagement with 'the Other', in the sense of attempts to understand the real issues in dispute, differences and divisions. Major practical innovation involves taking a lead public role in these activities.

Ideational innovation is measured by the distantiation from existing social norms and conventions. This is trickier to code because social norms and conventions themselves change. Since Chaps. 4, 5, and 6 give most attention to those respondents who do change, in this Appendix I focus particularly on those who do not change, or change only in a minor way (Table 5.1, p. 106, box A), explaining how I make the cut-off between no-change and change.

Veronica, a Catholic woman in Northern Ireland, spoke of what—for her—was a big change: applying for a place for her son in a Protestant (state) school.[16] As she told the story, she mentioned that once he also gained a place in the Catholic system, she turned down the offer from the state school. In the context of her interview, it was clear that she still lived in a predominantly Catholic symbolic world: despite meeting Protestants in her job, she did not engage with them. Her application was a once-off event. It was subjectively (ideationally) important to her, but it followed emergent social norms and there was little practical change. I coded the extent of innovation as 0.5 to signify some ideational change and only

minor practical change. Had she been more critically reflective on her own tradition, or voiced more concern to increase the permeability of boundaries, or had she followed through practically I would have coded the innovation as 1, and if she had done both I would have coded it as 2. There were similar cases in the South.

Another respondent, Colm, began the interview saying that he had not changed at all.[17] He was emphasizing the continuity with his own father and family, whom he portrayed as like himself, open and permeable in their practices and boundaries. Yet as discussion developed, it was clear that he had made very major practical changes (mixed marriage, engagement with Protestant in-laws), which contrasted with his descriptions of the previous generation of his family, and it was clear too that he distanced himself from conventional understandings and boundaries. His interview shows significant-major innovation even though he emphasizes personal and familial diachronic continuity rather than change.

Others in Northern Ireland make significant change on some dimensions, and little or none on others. Anna (TF2SPA7) is discussed in Chap. 5. She states that she does not hold religion to be salient '*I have to say Protestant because that's the way I was born into and the way I was brought up, sort of thing, but given the preference I'd prefer not to be classed by or under a religion…*'. As the interview progresses, it is clear that this is a credible innovation that she carries with her through many judgements: '*I would sort of support the parties of being more middle of the road, trying to educate, to get communities together sort of thing.*' She presents herself as the middle ground nationally, differentiating herself as Northern Irish from the dominant British-Irish dichotomy. But a strong distinction from nationalists remains: '*I'm never going to affiliate myself to Southern Ireland … This is the country I was brought up in with a certain way of doing things…. Northern Irish identity is my way of establishing 'Excuse me, I don't want to be part of southern Ireland'.*' I judged that this respondent had distanced herself in a significant but not a major way from the dominant divisions some of which remain salient, although in a more restricted field than before. I coded the extent of innovation as 2.

In the South, Donncha (TM3SCT13, see Chap. 3) is very reflective even while he ends up in a traditional position. He does not believe in Catholic theology, but would want to baptize his children for social rather

than religious reasons. On the other hand he would be happy to marry a Protestant or bring his children up as Protestant. Being Irish is '*very important to me because it just helps me to figure out the world, to have a standpoint, to have a position in it and I just find the nationality itself very interesting culturally, historically.*' '*I fit into the category of what is generally defined as being an Irish person and I'm happy with that.*' He does not find it easy—or even possible—to connect to Northerners. '*People I have met from the North I didn't feel connected to in the same way that I would people from Galway, Kerry, Cork, the midlands so no I consider myself part of the 26 counties, part of the 32 counties but part of the 26 I just a little bit more so…*' He remains open, actively planning another trip North, and yet his openness is limited. He prefers not to think too much about the practices he feels at home in, in case it would change his feelings. I coded the extent of innovation as 0.5; despite significant openness his satisfaction with existing practices limits even his reflexion. His willingness to 'marry a Protestant' indeed begins to address one of the inherent divisions of the society, but it remains conditional, less strongly asserted than, for example, his atheism (intra-group change) and it is expressed only briefly. For the moment at least, reflexion has led him to minor rather than significant change.

Meanwhile, an older rural working class couple exemplifies that third of respondents in the South who problematize neither nationality nor religion (LM1SCC1/LF1WCC2). Their life story has to do with coping with hardship. When probed, the husband associates Irish with anti-British, but neither nationality nor religion are highlighted or commented upon. Like some other older respondents, for whom '*being Irish and being Catholic was always there*', these respondents are coded 0 for identity innovation.

For many respondents in the South, boundaries are not noticed and therefore not questioned. Many respondents criticized and distanced themselves from the once-hegemonic power of 'the church', without mentioning which church. If I had counted as innovation these critiques of the Catholic church by Southerners of Catholic background, there would have been much more identity innovation in the South. But I defined this as intra-group critique, thus not innovation with respect to national/religious divisions. Of course it may, or may not, impact on these in the future.

Quantitative Data

There are time-series survey data on Northern Ireland from 1989 (the Social Attitudes Surveys), and later, from 1998, the Northern Ireland Life and Times Surveys. Before this, three surveys are particularly important: those conducted by Rose (1971) in 1968; by Moxon-Browne (1983) in 1978, and by Smith and Chambers (1991) in 1986. In the South, studies by Davis and Sinnott (1979) in 1978, by MacGreil (1977, 1996) in Dublin in 1972–1973 and throughout the state in 1988–1989 are particularly useful, together with ESS and EVS surveys (discussed in the excellent volume by Fahey et al. 2005). The journal *Irish Political Studies* provides a collection of other surveys and opinion polls from 1986 to the present. Fahey et al.'s (2005) analysis of EVS surveys, Hayes and McAllister's (2013) analysis of the Northern Ireland Life and Times survey, and Garry's (2016) analysis of post-2011 Northern Ireland political attitudes are essential resources. Nolan's (2012–2014) *Peace Monitoring Reports* of Northern Ireland are particularly valuable contextualized benchmarks of the state of social relations in the fields of security, economy, community relations and politics.

Where relevant, I compare the interview findings with the survey evidence. However, the survey data is limited and particularly so on meanings. Often I have had to develop the argument solely with the qualitative data.

Notes

1. I acknowledge PRTLI3 (The Third Irish Government Programme For Research at Third Level Institutions), the then Director of Geary Institute Stephen Mennell, and the incoming Director, Colm Harmon, who provided encouragement and support over the next four years. The PIs of the CII project were John Coakley, Alice Feldman, Tom Inglis and me. We appointed a researcher—Dr. Theresa O'Keefe—to conduct interviews.
2. I acknowledge funding from EU Peace III project, via the Irish Higher Education Authority North South project, and the help of the Geary Institute and Colm Harmon its Director.

3. We had some joint publications (Muldoon et al. 2007; Todd et al. 2006a) and some separate (Stevenson and Muldoon 2010); the data from the two parts of the project were not pooled and this book uses only the data generated by the Dublin team.

4. Todd et al. (2006a, 2006b, 2008, 2009), Cañás Bottos and Rougier (2006), Cañás Bottos (2015).

5. 'Irish Protestants in the European Context', funded by an IRCHSS Government of Ireland Research Projects Grant in the Humanities and Social Sciences, 2005–2007.

6. I acknowledge funding from the Institute for British Irish Studies, UCD.

7. This is partially because we did not prioritize sampling in terms of age in the first study; and because in the second, our Northern partners were focusing on youth, whom they found somewhat more polarized than their elders (see McLaughlin et al. 2006).

8. The two individual interviews undertaken were with the Protestant partners in mixed marriages, and one of the focus groups was with an extended Protestant bourgeois family. One Protestant couple was interviewed in the mistaken view they were mixed. Two partners were from other backgrounds, for example one was Greek Orthodox by background married to a Protestant by background. In addition I had many informal discussions with people who had been in mixed marriages.

9. Note that generation 3, in Table A.1, stops in the early 20s.

10. The concern with pre-understandings is typical of the 'ethnographic interview', see Spradley 1979.

11. I took this as positive, they saw me as they wanted to see me, and thus my particular background did not affect their discourse.

12. TM3WCD38.

13. Many research assistants were involved, sometimes for only short periods before moving on to better jobs: Kayla Torre checked the analysis of 'we's. Oisin O'Malley Daly checked coding of exclusion. Thematic coding was discussed with all interviewers. Colleagues and PhD students, including Matthias Bähr, Jennifer Jackson and Melanie Höwer commented on my narrative analysis.

14. Northern Irish 'we's were judged national if the 'we' referred to a cultural/historical community, and/or if the respondent explicitly said that Northern Ireland was their 'nation' or 'country' or 'nationality'. They were judged non-national if the 'we' referred simply to a common situation (e.g. us in this jurisdiction) and/or when the respondent made clear

that their national identity was British or Irish rather than Northern Irish.

15. In Chap. 4 respondents' comments (on what 'people here' say, or what 'is done' here) helped clarify the specific understandings in their milieu.
16. NF2NHC04.
17. JM2PCB01.

References

Anderson, M. (2011). *Identity Change and Power Shift: The Case of Loyalism in Northern Ireland*. Unpublished thesis (Phd), University College Dublin.

Bates, R. H., Greif, A., Levi, M., Rosenthal, J.-L., & Weingast, B. R. (1998). *Analytic Narratives*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press.

Bray, Z. (2008). Ethnographic Approaches. In D. Della Porta & M. Keating (Eds.), *Approaches and Methodologies in the Social Sciences* (pp. 296–315). Cambridge: CUP.

Butler, D., & Ruane, J. (2009). Identity, Difference and Community in Southern Irish Protestantism: The Protestants of West Cork. *National Identities, 11*(1), 73–86.

Cañás Bottos, L. (2015). Assemblages of Sovereignty and Anti-sovereign Effects on the Irish Border. *Focaal: Journal of Global and Historical Anthropology, 71*, 86–99.

Cañás Bottos, L., & Rougier, N. (2006). Generations on the Border: Changes in Ethno-national Identity in the Irish Border Area. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics, 12*(3–4), 617–642.

Davis, E. E., & Sinnott, R. (1979). *Attitudes in the Republic of Ireland Relevant to the Northern Ireland Problem: Vol. 1 Descriptive Analysis and Some Comparisons with Attitudes in Northern Ireland and Great Britain*. Dublin: ESRI Report Series, 97, Paper No. 9.

Donnan, H. (2010). Cold War along the Emerald Curtain: Rural Boundaries in a Contested Border Zone. *Social Anthropology/Anthropologie Sociale, 18*(3), 253–266.

Fahey, T., Hayes, B., & Sinnott, R. (2005). *Conflict and Consensus: A Study of Values and Attitudes in the Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland*. Dublin: Institute of Public Administration.

Garry, J. (2016). *Consocation and Voting in Northern Ireland*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Glendinning, W., & Wilson, J. (2013). *Flagging It Up: A 'Rebuilding the Bridges Project' by the Parish of Errigal and Desertoghill*. Belfast: Community Relations Council.

Hayes, B. C., & McAllister, I. (2013). *Conflict to Peace: Politics and Society in Northern Ireland over Half a Century*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Hoewer, M. (2014). *Crossing Boundaries during Peace and Conflict: Transforming Identity in Chiapas and in Northern Ireland*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

Jackson, J. K. (2014). Negotiating National Identity in Northern Ireland and Quebec. Youth Perspectives. In J. K. Jackson & L. Molokotos-Liederman (Eds.), *Nationalism, Ethnicity and Boundaries. Conceptualizing and Understanding Identities Through Boundary Approaches.* London: Routledge

Jarman, N., & Bell, J. (2012). Routine Divisions: Segregation and Daily Life in Northern Ireland. In C. McGrattan & E. Meehan (Eds.), *Everyday Life after the Irish Conflict: The Impact of Devolution and Cross-Border Cooperation*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Lamont, M., & Swidler, A. (2014). Methodological Pluralism and the Possibilities and Limits of Interviewing. *Qualitative Sociology, 37*(2), 153–171.

Leonard, M. (2017). *Teens and Territory in Post-Conflict Belfast*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

MacGreil, M. (1977). *Prejudice and Tolerance in Ireland*. Dublin: College of Industrial Relations.

MacGreil, M. (1996). *Prejudice in Ireland Revisited*. Maynooth: Survey and Research Unit, St Patrick's College.

McAuley, J. (2016). *Very British Rebels? The Culture and Politics of Ulster Loyalism*. London: Bloomsbury.

McCrone, D., & Bechhofer, F. (2015). *Understanding National Identity*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

McGrattan, C., & Meehan, E. (Eds.). (2013). *Everyday Life after the Irish Conflict*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

McLaughlin, K., Trew, K., & Muldoon, O. T. (2006). Religion, Ethnicity and Group Identity: Irish Adolescents' Views. In J. Todd, L. Canas Botos, & N. Rougier (Eds.), *Political Transformation and National Identity Change: Comparative Perspectives* (pp. 285–303). London: Routledge.

Mitchell, C., & Ganiel, G. (2011). *Evangelical Journeys: Choice and Change in a Northern Irish Northern Irish Religious Sub-culture*. Dublin: University College Dublin Press.

Moxon Browne, E. (1983). *Nation, Class and Creed in Northern Ireland*. Aldershot: Gower.

Muldoon, O., Trew, K., Todd, J., Rougier, N., & McLaughlin, K. (2007). Religious and National Identity after the Belfast Good Friday Agreement. *Political Psychology, 28*(1), 89–103.

Nolan, P. (2012). *Peace Monitoring Report, 2012*. Belfast: Community Relations Council. Retrieved September 20, 2013 from http://www.community-relations.org.uk/fs/doc/NI%20Peace%20Monitoring%20Report%202013_Layout%201.pdf.

Nolan, P. (2013). *Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report. Number Two*. Belfast: Community Relations Council.

Nolan, P. (2014). *Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report. Number Three*. Belfast: Community Relations Council.

Nolan, P., Bryan, D., Dwyer, C., Hayward, K., Radford, K., & Shirlow, P. (2014). *The Flag Dispute: Anatomy of a Protest*. Queen's University Belfast Institute for the Study of Conflict Transformation and Social Justice. Retrieved September 30, 2017, from http://pure.qub.ac.uk/portal/files/13748797/The_Flag_Dispute_report_PRINTED.pdf.

Riessman, C. K. (2008). *Narrative Methods for the Human Sciences*. London: Sage.

Rose, R. (1971). *Governing without Consensus: An Irish Perspective*. London: Faber and Faber.

Ruane, J., & Butler, D. (2007). Southern Irish Protestants: A Case of De-ethnicisation? *Nations and Nationalism, 13*(40), 619–635.

Shirlow, P., Tonge, J., & McAuley, J. (2012). *Abandoning Historical Conflict: Former Political Prisoners and Reconciliation in Northern Ireland*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Simpson, K. (2009). *Unionist Voices and the Politics of Remembering the Past in Northern Ireland*. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Smith, D. J., & Chambers, G. (1991). *Inequality in Northern Ireland*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Smithey, L. (2011). *Unionists, Loyalists and Conflict Transformation in Northern Ireland*. Oxford: OUP.

Smithey, L. (2017). The Peace People in Northern Ireland: Principled and Revolutionary Nonviolence. In L. Bosi & G. de Fazio (Eds.), *The Troubles: Northern Ireland and Theories of Social Movements*. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.

Spradley, J. P. (1979). *The Ethnographic Interview*. Austin: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Stevenson, C., & Muldoon, O. T. (2010). Socio-political Context and Accounts of National Identity in Adolescence. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 49*, 583–599.

Strauss, A., & Corbin, J. (1997). *Grounded Theory in Practice*. London: Sage.

Todd, J. (2014). Social Structure and Religious Division: Comparing the Form of Religious Distinction in the Two Irish States. In J. Wolffe (Ed.), *Irish Religious Conflict in Comparative Perspective* (pp. 42–58). Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan.

Todd, J. (2015). Partitioned Identities? Everyday National Distinctions in Northern Ireland and the Irish State. *Nations and Nationalism, 21*(1), 21–42.

Todd, J., Muldoon, O., Trew, K., Cañás Bottos, L., Rougier, N., & McLaughlin, K. (2006a). The Moral Boundaries of the Nation: Nation, State and Boundaries in the Southern Irish Border Counties. *Ethnopolitics, 5*(4), 365–382.

Todd, J., O'Keefe, T., Rougier, N., & Cañás Bottos, L. (2006b). Fluid or Frozen: Choice and Change in Ethno-national Identification in Contemporary Northern Ireland. *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics, 12*(3–4), 323–346.

Todd, J., Cañás Bottos, L., & Rougier, N. (Eds.). (2008). *Political Transformation and National Identity Change: Comparative Perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Todd, J., O'Keefe, T., Rougier, N., & Canas Bottos, L. (2009). Protestant Minorities, Minority Protestants and the Remaking of Protestant Identity in Ireland. *National Identities, 11*(1), 1–8.

Tonge, J., Braniff, M., Hennessey, T., McAuley, J. W., & Whiting, S. A. (2014). *The Democratic Unionist Party: From Protest to Power*. Oxford: OUP.

Waters, M. C. (1999). *Black Identities: West Indian Immigrant Dreams and American Realities*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.

Index[1]

---

[1] Note: Page numbers followed by 'n' refer to notes.