



University of Dundee

Territoriality and migration in a divided society

Stevenson, Clifford; Sagherian-Dickey, Thia

DOI:
[10.1037/qup0000072](https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000072)

Publication date:
2018

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Discovery Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):
Stevenson, C., & Sagherian-Dickey, T. (2018). Territoriality and migration in a divided society: Lay theories of citizenship and place in Northern Ireland. *Qualitative Psychology*, 5(1), 135-154.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/qup0000072>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Discovery Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

“©American Psychological Association, 2018. This paper is not the copy of record and may not exactly replicate the authoritative document published in the APA journal. The final article is available, upon publication, at: <https://doi.org/10.1037/qap0000072>”

POST PRINT VERSION

To cite print version:

Stevenson, C. & Sagherian-Dickey, T. (forthcoming) Territoriality and Migration in a Divided Society: Lay Theories of Citizenship and Place in Northern Ireland. *Qualitative Psychology*

Territoriality and Migration in a Divided Society: Lay Theories of Citizenship and Place in Northern Ireland.

Clifford Stevenson¹ and Thia Sagherian-Dickey²

¹Anglia Ruskin University

²Queen's University Belfast

*Requests for reprints should be addressed to Clifford Stevenson, Department of Psychology, Anglia Ruskin University, Cambridge, CB1 1PT, UK (e-mail: clifford.stevenson@anglia.ac.uk).

Territoriality and Migration in a Divided Society: Lay Theories of Citizenship and Place in Northern Ireland.

Abstract

The study of citizenship has increasingly focused on the ways in which spatialized understandings of the concept can be used to marginalise and exclude social groups: exclusive constructions of national boundaries, local neighbourhoods and public spaces can deny marginalised groups their social and political rights. Less attention has been paid to how constructions of place can accommodate different groups' rights and promote peaceful coexistence. This is particularly important in locations where migration disrupts existing understandings ('lay theories') of the relationship between residency, identity and collective rights. The present research examines how spatialized understandings of citizenship shape perceptions of intergroup mixing in previously segregated areas of a post-conflict society. Critical Discursive Social Psychological (CDSP) analysis of 30 interviews with long-term residents and recent migrants to increasingly mixed areas of Belfast shows that, while all participants acknowledged Northern Ireland's territorialisation, different lay theories of citizenship underpin the possibility and desirability of intergroup coexistence. Long-term residents drew upon understandings of the negative citizenry of the outgroup to argue against the possibility of peaceful coexistence within their locale, while recent incomers gave evidence of their own experiences of good citizenship within the shared spaces of neighbourhood to demonstrate that this could and should be achieved. The implications of lay theories of citizenship for the study of residential migration and mixing are discussed.

Keywords: citizenship; migration; contact; co-existence; critical discursive social psychology

The study of citizenship within social psychology has increasingly focused on how the ways this concept is constructed in various arenas of social interaction operate to marginalise or exclude social groups in different societal arenas (Haste, 2004; Stevenson, Dixon, Hopkins, & Luyt, 2015). Within this body of work, discursive analyses of political, legal and everyday talk has shown that the ways in which the boundaries and contents of citizenship are described can be flexibly used to deny rights and entitlements to those depicted as failing to qualify as citizens or as lacking the qualities of ‘good citizens’ (Barnes, Auburn, & Lea, 2004). Place has a central role in this process as groups are often denied rights on the basis of either being outside of a geographically-bounded polity or as failing to belong within it (Hopkins & Dixon, 2006; Phillips, 2015). Migrants and displaced groups are particularly vulnerable to this form of exclusion and, for these groups, borders and public spaces have often been the site of contestation (Donnan & Wilson, 2010; Lefebvre, 1991).

This body of literature has largely focused on exclusion and contest at the expense of the investigation of how groups can be accommodated through more inclusive understandings and practices of citizenship. A few studies have suggested that particular linguistic formulations of civic identity and multiculturalism lend themselves to accommodating differences within the public sphere (Hopkins, Reicher, & Kahani-Hopkins, 2003; Verkuyten, 2005). Moreover, particular discursive formulations of the public sphere in terms of places and spaces have been found to be especially effective in rhetorically accommodating and engaging disparate social groups (Abell, Condor, & Stevenson, 2006; Bowskill, Coyle & Lyons, 2007). However a systematic investigation of how these understandings of citizenship can accommodate difference and co-existence within specific real world contexts has yet to be undertaken.

The current paper applies the insights to a post-conflict divided society which remains geographically segregated, but in which issues of citizenship, belonging and coexistence have

come to the fore. The recent phase of the Northern Ireland conflict saw mass segregation of opposing communities and a division of the landscape into identity-based territories. The subsequent 'peace process' has given the society a degree of stability in which opposed communities can begin to rebuild their relationship with one another and the state and to find means of peaceful reintegration within shared residential areas. The present study takes as a case study the development of increasingly mixed areas in the regional capital of Belfast and examines to what degree residents' understandings of citizenship - in terms of right of residence as well as the entitlements and duties associated with community membership - reflect new patterns of coexistence.

The Social Psychology of Citizenship and Space

Recent reviews of the study of citizenship within social psychology (Condor, 2011; Stevenson et al., 2015) attest to the multiple and diverse academic and popular understandings of the term and point to the need to examine how these understandings emerge in specific contexts as well as how they are used in situated practice. One such body of research has adopted a discursive approach to the examination of how particular understandings of citizenship are used to exclude and deny rights to specific social groups. Emerging from the early constructionist work of Shotter (Shotter, 1993) on the micro-politics of citizenship in everyday interactions, this research has typically focused on how understandings of belonging within a polity can privilege the rights of some individuals or groups over others (Haste, 2004). Building upon critical approaches to citizenship in other disciplines (e.g., Isin & Neilsen, 2008; Kymlicka & Norman, 1994; Lister, 2003; Staeheli, 2011) discursive approaches in social psychology have notably focused on the role of citizenship in exclusionary talk and practices occurring in particular places: at the boundaries of nations; in controversies concerning social rights within and between local

neighbourhoods; in disputes over access to public spaces and the right to display group identities in public (Hopkins & Dixon, 2006).

Firstly, in terms of the boundaries of the nation, several authors have pointed out the ways in which discourses of citizenship serve to rhetorically undermine the rights of refugees, asylum seekers and migrants by undermining their eligibility or desirability as potential citizens. Taking the case of the UK, Andreouli and Howarth (2013) identified different rationales for exclusion among official and lay discourses of citizenship: official discourses focussed on the concept of 'earning citizenship' as well as rights of mobility across national boundaries, while lay discourses focussed on issues of similarity and difference between immigrants and host nationals. In each instance, the rights of skilled migrants from countries of greater cultural similarity were privileged over poorer, unskilled, 'less similar' immigrants. Likewise Gibson and Hamilton (2011) illustrated how lay understandings of citizenship were used to highlight how immigrant groups deviate from norms of cultural expression, civility and abiding by laws. In turn, these deviations were used to rhetorically undermine their rights and entitlements as members of the community. As Hopkins, Reicher and Harrison (2006) argue, migration across boundaries is shaped by understanding of the relationship between identity, place and entitlements and as Andreouli and Howarth (2013) point out, the inscription of official models of citizenship into policy can act to reify and perpetuate exclusive understandings of this relationship.

Secondly, at a local community level, marginal and vulnerable social groups are also systematically excluded in daily life on the basis of their quality as citizens. Barnes et al. (2004), in their analysis of letters to a town council concerning 'New Age' travellers' site, illustrated how depictions of the travellers as economically inactive were used to undermine their right to residence as well as their entitlements to local services and amenities. Their transitory lifestyle was also used to highlight their lack of belonging or commitment to the

local area and to argue for the denial of the access to amenities and entitlements afforded to other long-term residents. In effect these travellers were depicted as deficient or deviant citizens and as beyond the moral boundaries of the local community, a finding reproduced in the work of Tileaga on discursive constructions of the Roma in Romania (Tileaga, 2006). However even for settled communities, geographical location can be used to undermine rights and entitlements. As Stevenson, McNamara and Muldoon (2014) showed in their study of stigmatised residential communities, residents faced discrimination from outsiders and service-providers on the basis of having their address within areas reputed for criminality and welfare dependency.

A third arena in which constructions of place are used to undermine citizens' rights and entitlements is through denying rights to access public space. As Di Masso and others (2015; Di Masso & Dixon, 2015; Phillips, 2015) have highlighted, although public space in urban areas may appear to be neutral territory, it is intensely politicised and regulated. This is most evident when considering public street protests, but on an everyday level, groups who are deemed undesirable (in terms of age, social status, race or other determinable characteristic) are often prevented from accessing and making use of public areas while their older, more affluent counterparts enjoy full rights (Gray & Manning, 2014). Likewise, Dixon and colleagues analysed talk of public space among residents of a small UK town, finding that their talk systematically characterised undesirable groups (in this case street drinkers) as violating these norms of civility and threatening others by their very presence (McCauley, Dixon, & Levine, 2006). Insofar as public space constitutes an arena for group expression, it also constitutes a forum for social exclusion, a point clearly made in the body of work by Durrheim, Dixon and colleagues on the role of everyday justifications of the micro-segregation of public spaces in post-apartheid South Africa (e.g. Durrheim & Dixon, 2013). In effect, these studies illustrate the ability of constructions of place-based rights and

normative models of coexistence to enact and enforce social exclusion of marginalised groups.

Discursively Constructing an Inclusive Citizenship

While this body of research has delineated the various ways in which discourses of citizenship and space can marginalise and exclude social groups, less attention has been paid to how these discursive constructions can include and accommodate diversity. This is perhaps surprising given the challenges of diversity and social conflict currently facing most societies across the globe. In the extant psychological literature we can define three broad approaches to discursively accommodating difference: constructing unity; integrating difference; and accommodating diversity. Again, all contain implicit spatial dimensions, though this is most pronounced in the latter.

In terms of constructing unity, discursive researchers have emphasised the role of constructing inclusive identities in transcending differences among the polity. Discursive analyses of political articulations of Bulgarian national identity during the Second World War illustrate how constructing the Bulgarian Jewish population as part of the nation was used to resist Nazi attempts to extradite these citizens (Reicher et al., 2006). In relation to contemporary national identities, those constructed on the basis of civic understandings of society (i.e., based on understandings of rights as derived from participation) are typically considered as more inclusive than those based on ethnic (rights as derived from ancestry or birth) definitions (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001), though the ways in which civic identity is instituted and practiced may itself have exclusionary effects (Gray & Griffin, 2014).

In terms of accommodating diversity, discursive psychological research has focussed on how the language of multiculturalism can be used to advocate tolerance and inclusion of immigrant groups in everyday life (Andreouli & Howarth, 2013). For example, the work of

Verkuyten (2005, 2007) in the context of the Netherlands has done much to map out the content of arguments for and against multiculturalism. In terms of migrants, he identified that those constructed as not responsible for their own fate were more likely to be talked of in terms of integrationist rhetoric than those immigrants thought to be responsible for their own fate. These 'blameless' immigrants were more likely to be encouraged to maintain their own cultural identity within broader society. In terms of the content of arguments concerning coexistence, Verkuyten identified that discourses which supported multiculturalism focused on the internal benefits of learning and self-improvement, equality and increased tolerance and understanding, while those against this ideal centred on external threats of insecurity, instability and disunity. In other words, different lay theories of multiculturalism have different implications for coexistence.

Finally, some attention has been paid to the specific role of space and geography in accommodating difference. In their exploration of the conditions under which the nation was articulated as a physical space rather than a polity, Abell, Condor and Stevenson (2006) examined how English and Scots talked of the changing constitutional arrangement in the UK. For Scots in particular, England constitutes the traditional national 'other', such that articulating a commonality of national identity is difficult. Hence, for Scots wishing to advocate political union and the maintenance of the United Kingdom, an alternative discourse is required. One such formulation was geographic such that the United Kingdom could be described as 'this island' or 'these islands' to stress the logic and inevitability of political cohesion. Though neither formulation is technically correct, it affords the articulation of a common political unit while accommodating national differences. In a similar vein, Bowskill and colleagues (Bowskill, Lyons, & Coyle, 2007), in their analysis of the language of integration in the British media, demonstrated that geographical metaphors were often used to rhetorically advocate accommodation and pluralism, providing a metaphorical 'space' for

difference and supporting a 'landscape' of diversity within the polity. Metaphors of place would therefore appear to be especially suited to the accommodation of diversity.

These studies provide a starting point for the investigation of how understandings of citizenship and place can be articulated in a way that can accommodate diversity and difference. However, we can note in passing that these are much less well developed than the studies of exclusionary citizenship. In particular they have yet to examine the situated nature of the use of theories of citizenship in everyday life and in the places and boundaries where lay theories of citizenship have their effects in contemporary society. The current paper addresses these gaps through the examination of a divided, post-conflict society in which residents are now required to deal with emerging issues of rights and belonging in the everyday life of desegregated residential areas. It asks when and how lay theories of citizenship serve to reproduce or challenge patterns of exclusion and inclusion.

Case Study: Northern Ireland

While there are many historical, national, political, economic and cultural dimensions to the conflict in Northern Ireland, it is generally acknowledged that the situation is primarily an 'identity conflict' (Cairns, 1982; Hewstone et al., 2005; Schmid et al., 2009) which has become ingrained in the social structure of the region and the geographical dispersal of its inhabitants. The two main ethno-political groups are mutually defining, differing along axes of national identity (Irish/British), political affiliation (Nationalist/Unionist) as well as religious lines (Catholic/Protestant). Alongside these identity labels a complex system of intergroup differentiation has produced separate cultural, sporting, recreational and religious practices as well as a high degree of residential segregation. For 30 years from the late 1960s this ethno-political division was compounded by an armed conflict known as the 'Troubles' which claimed more than 3500 lives, injured over 10,000 more and resulted in the widespread

forced segregation of Catholics and Protestants into separate, ethnically homogenous areas. In 1998, after a series of peace talks and paramilitary ceasefires, a power-sharing agreement between both sides was agreed and the process of demilitarisation and desegregation began.

While this identity model of Northern Ireland's conflict has much explanatory value, it does tend to ignore the central role of citizenship in the conflict. Both of the competing identities are underpinned by contested understandings of the economic, civil and political rights of each group. Notably, the origins of the Troubles are popularly recognised to have emerged from the 'civil rights movement' in which social inequalities in housing and voting which disproportionately (but not exclusively) affected working class Catholics. The subsequent eruption of violence divided the population into Catholic Nationalists, who viewed themselves as fighting for their economic, civil and political rights against illegitimate oppression by the other, and Protestant Unionists who viewed themselves as 'loyal' British citizens against a disloyal, criminal opposition. Indeed much of the conflict can be seen as a struggle for the symbolic power to define the past and present in terms of the competing worldview of each group (Stevenson, Condor & Abell, 2007).

These competing lay understandings of citizenship are inextricably linked with the sectarian geography of the region. Following mass segregation, paramilitary elements within both groups struggled to control and defend their respective territories from attack. These areas also became political support bases for different political parties. In effect, many areas across Northern Ireland became 'single-identity' such that group members could be identified by area of residence and risked violence by transgressing group boundaries (Shirlow & Murtagh, 2010). At flashpoints between opposing residential communities, high barriers or 'peacewalls' operated to physically separate the sides and community amenities and resources needed to be duplicated for each side. In effect, community identity, space, belonging and social and political rights had become fused through conflict.

Following the end of the Troubles and the development of the powersharing arrangement in Northern Ireland, there has been a noted increase in residential desegregation, with an increase in the number of electoral wards designated as mixed. While the consequences of this mixing are poorly understood, the assumption that spontaneous organic contact will lead to better intergroup relations now informs the government's policy in this area (OFMDFM, 2013). However, survey research has found that instances of contact within real-life settings (and in particular within residential settings) have unpredictable effects on intergroup relations. For example, more positive attitudes were found for some residents of mixed areas of the capital city of Belfast while others reported higher levels of threat and political violence (Schmid, Hewstone, Hughes, Jenkins, & Cairns, 2010; Schmid, Tausch, Hewstone, Hughes, & Cairns, 2007).

Ethnographic studies indicate that this is attributable to the geographic variation in local demographic composition and intercommunity relations of local areas (Byrne, Hannon, & Bell, 2006). The consequences of contact encounters depends upon the history and composition of the residential contexts within which they occur and, while there is evidence of an overall increase in the level of intergroup contact among residents of mixed areas, this is often qualified by a level of strategic withdrawal at different times according to local political tensions (Hughes, Campbell, Hewstone, & Cairns, 2007). Furthermore, ethnographic research points to a fundamental difference largely overlooked by survey research: the experience of contact is qualitatively different for those who have lived in mixed areas for some time compared to those who have recently arrived (Byrne et al., 2006; Stevenson & Sagherian-Dickey, 2016). From this perspective it would seem imperative to examine how different groups understand the relationship between citizenship and place and how their models of coexistence afford or impede successful mixing.

Method

The research outlined above stresses the key importance of histories, identities and worldviews of residents in shaping their experiences of residential mixing and intergroup contact. Accordingly, in order to get an in-depth insight into the impact of increased mixing in residential areas of Belfast, we recruited participants from four residential districts that have shown demographic shifts towards mixing over the past 10 years at electoral ward level. The areas differ in terms of local history, but all were (in common with the overwhelming majority of new mixed areas of Belfast) previously predominantly Protestant single-identity areas which contained or adjoined separate and distinct Catholic neighbourhoods. Within each area we recruited two diverse samples of people: incomers and long-term residents.

The first sample had been resident for 10 years or less and had previously lived in other areas of Northern Ireland. Within these parameters the sample was diverse in terms of occupation (professional, manual, unemployed) and location of origin across Northern Ireland with even numbers of Catholic and Protestants. In terms of numbers of participants, we had 18 interviews in total with a total of 28 respondents (16 female and 12 male of whom 14 were Protestant and 14 Catholic). Participants' ages ranged from early 20s to late 60s. Most interviews were conducted with single individuals or couples of one religious background (13 interviews) but we also included a sample of mixed-marriage participants, recruited from across all areas (5 interviews).

The second sample was conducted with 12 long-term residents of these areas (5 female and 7 male; 6 Catholic and 6 Protestant). All interviewees were aged between 65 and 80 years of age and hence had lived through the periods of population mobility during the Troubles. All had lived within their communities for 20 or more years and again were diverse in terms of their current or previous occupations. While these two samples clearly conflate age with length of residence, this does reflect the general demographic profile of these newly

mixed areas: existing residents are typically older couples or singles and in-migrants are usually younger families or working singles (Byrne, Hannson, & Bell, 2006).

Both sets of interviewees were recruited through a number of avenues, including local community organisations, church groups as well as snowballing from existing participants. Interviews were conducted in participant's homes by student interviewers who previously came from outside of Belfast and had no discernible association or investment in the local areas. The interview schedule was semi-structured and the interviews were guided by the participants' accounts of their experiences. For incomers, topics included: their life in their previous community; their decision to move; the expectations of their new community; their experiences of moving; and their experiences of settling into their new area. For long-term residents, topics included: their experiences of community life before the Troubles; the community's experience of the armed conflict; change in community life and composition since the ceasefires; and current community relations. All interviews were transcribed verbatim, anonymised and systematically analysed by our research team.

Interviews were analysed using principles and tools derived from Critical Discursive Social Psychology (CDSP: Wetherell, 1998; Wetherell & Edley, 2001). This approach is explicitly constructionist in its assumptions and examines how the micro-processes of language-based interactions are shaped, and in turn shape, more macro-level understandings of social relations. Specifically, interactants draw upon a range of 'discourses' or coherent networks of representations of the social world in their daily interactions, some of which are cultural hegemonic or dominant. CDSP analyses how participants 'position' themselves in relation to these discourses (e.g., by endorsing, challenging or subverting them), in order to manage their interactive concerns, thereby either reproducing or transforming these discourses through their actions. A particular strength of the method is therefore its ability to capture participants' orientations to their broader national and political contexts through the

examination of their active adaptation and reworking of shared political contexts for their own purposes in interaction (e.g., Burns & Stevenson, 2013; NiMaolalaigh & Stevenson, 2014). For present purposes, where we aim to investigate how accounts of personal experiences are both shaped by the broader political context of Northern Ireland and serve to perpetuate or transform this context, this approach is apposite.

On this basis, across all interviews the sections of the transcripts pertaining to intergroup relations and coexistence were tagged for analysis. Within each extract the various ways in which participants claimed and asserted their own entitlements as community members and depicted the rights and obligations of others within their locale were identified. Particular attention was paid to the micro-features of linguistic usage such as the use of commonplaces, hesitations and reformulations, ‘troubled’ talk and the range of linguistic features known to mark prejudice management in conversation, so as to ground the interpretation of the extracts in the concerns evidently negotiated by participants. From this, the ‘dominant’ or hegemonic manner of describing social relations in local communities was identified along with the range of ways in which participants positioned themselves in relation to this dominant discourse. Explanations were developed for the recurring patterns of identity positions and, in line with best practice in qualitative analysis (Silverman, 2001), the data was searched for exceptions and these ‘deviant cases’ were used to develop the explanation. The resultant explanation revealed systematic differences in the ways that Catholics and Protestants within each sample articulated and positioned themselves in relation to the dominant discourse, as outlined below.

Analysis

Through the process of CDSP analysis, it became evident that all of our participants oriented to a particular discourse of ‘territorial identity’, as hegemonic as this was displayed as least

problematic way of characterising local areas. This was recognisably the set of arguments, commonplaces and other discursive features which centred on the assumption that Catholics and Protestants have opposed, antagonistic and incommensurable identities which cannot peacefully coexist in the same locale and so remain geographically segregated. Iconic areas such as Sandy Row or the Falls Road were treated unproblematically as single-identity in terms of their demographic composition and it was taken for granted that transgressing boundaries of these areas would result in conflict. In addition to its prevalence, this repertoire was dominant in that it was typically presented as self-evident, consensual and an essential aspect of everyday life in Northern Ireland. While the other discourses afforded a number of strategic 'subject positions' for the speaker, these were consistently presented as 'troubled' requiring additional evidence, corroboration or other forms of justification.

Against this repertoire, the various ways in which participants positioned themselves were determined and in particular, the ways in which alternative discourses of citizenship were used to support or undermine this dominant discourse were identified. These lay theories were identified across all interviews, though recognisably took different forms within the two samples of long-term (LR) and new (NR) residents and between the two religious groupings of Catholic and Protestant as outlined below.

Part One: Long-term Residents

In our analysis of long-term residents' interviews, all participants articulated a broadly similar account of the historical course and consequences of the conflict in Northern Ireland. While the reasons for the emergence of the conflict and the attribution of blame to its protagonists vary systematically between Catholic and Protestant interviewees, the sample evidenced a common assumption that the conflict emerged from a period of relatively peaceful coexistence and acted to segregate the two main groups into separate, distinct and

antagonistic camps. As a result the communities were reported to have physically moved apart for reasons of safety and security. Notably all articulated the belief that this need to remain separate persisted to the present day and that bringing Catholics and Protestants together was inherently problematic. In other words across this group, the dominant discourse of ‘territorialised identity’ was presented in a straightforward and unproblematic fashion.

Within the interviews, it was notable that understandings of citizenship were embedded in this dominant discourse. Citizenship, or lack of it, was used to account for the behaviour of each group during the conflict. Also, various understandings of the rights, entitlements and obligations of each group were used to explain the current political situation in Northern Ireland. Finally, citizenship was often used as the basis for explaining why groups would not be able to co-exist easily in close proximity. Again the manifestation of these lay theories differed systematically between Catholics and Protestants and so we present extracts from each group separately below.

1.1 Protestant Long-term Residents. In some Protestant accounts of the conflict, the time preceding the Troubles was one of harmony as well as peaceful coexistence. Catholics and Protestants got on well at local level, despite their religious differences, and the deterioration of positive relations was largely attributed to Catholic discontent. While the actions of different parties during the conflict were acknowledged, the main source of the disorder and subsequent segregation was often attributed to elements within the Catholic population. Likewise, in terms of current day prospects for coexistence in the local area, the source of the difficulty was again directly or indirectly attributed to Catholic incomers. The following extract from an elderly Protestant lady exemplifies this narrative:

Extract 1: Protestant Female (LR11)

M: Now we had Catholic friends and that but when the Troubles started they all sort of disappeared.

- I: And did they leave this area?
- M: Yeh
- I: When that happened and then obviously the ceasefire happened, they came back? Would you say it was starting to become a lot more mixed would you say?
- M: Yes
- I: And do you think the relationships have changed since they came back?
- M: Yeh they just keep themselves to themselves now, there's no talking or nothing, and then round this area here there's a lot of foreigners and they don't socialise at all
- ...
- I: Do you think, how does that make you feel that you would have before and now you don't?
- M: Well it makes you feel terrible, because we did always have a good laugh and all together, it was brilliant, we all played together, and worked together, we done everything together, now you're even scared to walk up the street.
- I: And why are you scared, if you don't mind me asking?
- M: Because at nights there, they're prowling the streets, they're snatching your handbag or beating you up and what not.

This extract has several noteworthy features that exemplify many of the interviews within the long-term residents' sample. Firstly, the core assumption underpinning this account is that the resident lives in an essentially Protestant area to which other groups have come and gone. Any potential role of the Protestant community in the departure of the Catholic residents is omitted. Leaving is presented as Catholic's own choice but also as due to unknown motivations ("they all sort of disappeared"). Indeed the warm relations between friends before the conflict presented near the end of the extract is contrasted to the returnees desire to keep to themselves. Relatedly, the behaviour of the returning Catholics is compared to those of unspecified 'foreigners' who fail to integrate into local society.

While this account primarily addresses the negative consequences of Catholics returning to these areas, it is also underpinned and justified by a lay model of citizenship. The outgroup is presented as having withdrawn from a situation of positive coexistence only to

return without resuming cordial relations. As well as placing the blame for this lack of reintegration at the feet of the returning outgroup, it also serves to rhetorically exclude this group by contrasting them with the long-term Protestant residents who by implication do participate. Much in the same way as exclusionary talk of 'New Age' travellers (Barnes et al., 2006), Roma (Tileaga, 2006) and immigrant groups (Gibson & Hamilton, 2011) serves to dissociate these groups from rights associated with belonging and participation, Catholics here depicted in ways that are antithetical to social and civic forms of citizenship. Indeed direct parallels are drawn between the returning Catholic group and unspecified 'foreigners' who are also presented as failing to participate in community life. This is supplemented by characterising the returning group as inherently predatory and criminal, again discrediting the group on the basis of lacking good citizenship qualities as well as rhetorically setting them against the Protestant neighbours.

Although the basis on which bringing groups together would cause conflict varied across interviews, a common assumption was that the political identities of Catholics and Protestants were simply incommensurate and so must remain in their own areas. On occasion this was framed in terms of persisting threats to physical safety of members of the other community, but on other occasions this could be presented as due to the content and manifestation of the outgroup's identity.

Extract 2: Protestant Male (LR12)

- I: But as in, mixing, as in both Protestant and Catholics the two communities bringing them together you don't think that will happen in this area?
- T: No, not in this area no,
- I: Do you think that's a good or a bad thing?
- T: It's a bad thing, but, why put, say you're from the Short Strand; you come in here and live, why put your life at risk coming into a Protestant area? ... They are putting their [Irish] Tricolours up. This is a British country so they shouldn't be up. See in America, it's a criminal offence to burn the American flag, it's an act of treason. But

they can burn Union Jacks in the streets and the police standing by and watch. This is a Protestant country, it should be all the Union flag. They say they don't want the Queen but they take the Queen's money. It's the Queen's head on a tenner, but it's all the same. No matter what it is or what they're doing. Fine then, just let us live in peace, let them stay where they are and we will stay on our way. In the town [have a] neutral area.

The respondent does acknowledge that, in principle, mixing would be a positive outcome for the local community. However the rest of the extract argues that this is simply impossible. Stated in bald sectarian terms, Catholics coming from an area (recognised to be staunchly Republican), would be at risk of physical attack from Protestant residents. Notably as with the previous extract, the agency of actors in the extract is carefully managed: the agency, and therefore the responsibility for safety, is attributed to the Catholics moving into the area rather than to the Protestant residents who would enact the violence. Violence is presented as a natural consequence of boundary transgression and the only possible conditions of mixing occur in non-identity related 'neutral' spaces.

The second noteworthy aspect of the extract is the basis on which this incommensurability is founded. The expression of Catholic identity - here characterised as the display of the Irish flag - is presented as inherently illegitimate and specifically as at odds with the requirements of citizenship within the UK. Drawing parallels with the US, the display of Irish national identity is presented as treasonous while the rejection of the authority of the UK monarch is contrasted with willingness to avail of social welfare ('take the Queen's money'). Once again, we see that the identity conflict discourse is underpinned by arguments concerning the absent or deviant citizenship of the outgroup. The contrast between their lack of national loyalty and their abuse of social rights is used to undermine their position as legitimate UK citizens. In turn, this characteristic is essentialised ("but it's all the same. No matter what it is or what they're doing") and the outgroup's persistent refusal to

recognise the legitimacy of the British state is presented as grounds for geographical separation of the groups into their respective areas.

Not all interviews with long-term Protestant residents of mixed areas were as negative or pessimistic about the prospect of improving intergroup relations at local community level. Some respondents did hold out hope for peaceful coexistence. However the basis on which this was done suggests that this could only be achieved if identities were abandoned - if identities persisted they would remain territorialised:

Extract 3: Protestant Male (LR3)

- I: And how did your own community, as things moved towards the ceasefires, how did it change? Were you all beginning to see the light at the end of the tunnel?
- J: Yes, I think people became a lot more relaxed, there was an initial sense of celebration and ‘this is a good thing let’s hope it lasts’ then there’s that sense of ‘God let’s hope it lasts, it could fall apart at any moment’ but the more it continued the more hopeful we became. I mean in terms of bring up our kids together as well and seeing the difference with them. You know my daughter is coming up and I don’t think she had a real sense of being a Catholic or Protestant, where we always, that was very much a part of our identity. And while you didn’t hate the other side, you knew who you were. I don’t know about kids growing up, apart maybe in specific areas...a lot of the kids today wouldn’t have a strong an identity with one side or the other and I think that was helping things.

Ostensibly, this account of improving community relations at local level runs contrary to the previous extracts. Certainly the report of improving intergroup relations and of the willingness of the local population to peacefully co-exist with members of the other communities is in stark contrast to the pessimistic accounts in the previous two extracts. However, the basis on which this optimism is based bears closer scrutiny. The participant makes several rhetorical moves which distance the increasingly positive intergroup relations from his own position. Firstly, improving intergroup attitudes are located within the children

rather than the adults of the community, notably a group outside of the arena of formal citizenship. Secondly, this ability to coexist is attributed to children's lack of identity rather than the development of effective strategies of accommodation and reconciliation. Thirdly, the 'specific areas' in which identities remain strong are posited as locations where intergroup relations will not improve in this way. This serves to align the speakers' position with the dominant discourse, while distancing himself from the potential construal of being prejudiced.

While this account does present a much more positive and hopeful image of improvements in intergroup relations, it is in fact based on the same assumptions that identities, where they are manifest, will remain segregated. While the participant cedes that relations may be better among children, this is because of their lack of identity rather than through the ability to accommodate different identities within the same territory.

1.2 Catholic Long-term Residents. As noted above, Catholic long-term residents used the same dominant discourse of 'territorialised identity' in their accounts of the conflict and of persisting division in present day society. However, their characterisation of the origins of the conflict and their account of the responsibility of the actors in the conflict differed systematically as did their characterisation of the attributes of each group.

Extract 4: Catholic Female LR5

I So around the time of early 1960's in the mixed areas seemed to get along, was the same seen in your local area?

P Well they wouldn't have been buzzin' buddies but the only trouble as I seen as the child in the market prior to all the 1969 was when Ian Paisley led a march through Cromac Square to remove a Tricolour out of a window of a electoral candidate on Davis street.

I And how was that felt within your local community?

P Well the police battle charged some local people and some were charged and put in jail and that didn't go down well at all.

I Yeah it didn't help with relations.

P By in large, working class Catholic and Protestants had a lot in common. Poverty, bad housing, lack of decent jobs but once the Civil Rights movement came along and demanded 'one man, one vote' I think they were a number of Protestants who would have support but then events happen that didn't help relations. But other events were for change but the reaction of the Unionist government was one of resistance to change

This account diverges in marked ways from that in extract 1. Implicit in this account is a model of citizenship quite different from that of Protestant participants: the focus is on the denial and suppression of economic and political rights as the core underlying cause of the conflict rather than the loyalty or disloyalty of the population. Furthermore, these injustices are presented as initially common to both Catholics and Protestants, with the problem of opposition to change attributed to the Unionist government.

This model of the illegitimate oppression of Catholic's rights is reflected in the key events presented in the extract as an instance of poor relations between communities. This is an account of Protestant aggression in the form of Ian Paisley (then a divisive political and religious figure) entering a known Republican area to remove a display of Irish national identity. Crucially, his actions are presented as an infringement of the territorial integrity of the Republican enclave and hence a violation of the community's right to self-determination and self-expression. Furthermore, the role of the police in upholding this illegitimate act and unfairly suppressing the rights of the community is presented as emblematic of state-sanctioned inequality and unfairness and Catholics' positions as victims.

As with Protestant long-term residents, Catholic participants were reticent about the prospects of harmonious coexistence at local community. In the extract below this is

presented within a temporal frame, such that at one stage mixing was possible, but that this situation has once more deteriorated.

Extract 5: Catholic Male (LR1)

- I: And moving on then to after the ceasefires and political agreements. How did things change? Were you beginning to get on better with the other side or not?
- C: Well you felt you wanted to talk and for both communities to come closer together. And I would say it did happen for a while. I remember after the Agreement going over to a shop in Sandy Row and feeling safe. But things have got worse since that. It has gone back. I wouldn't go to Sandy Row now.
- I: So you think then in more recent times that there has been a movement back to what it used to be?
- C: Yes.
- I: So would have noticed that with your local community? Do you think they are becoming more enclosed again then, moving back to what it used to be?
- C: No I don't see it in my own community. I think it is more the other community. I think they are lacking in confidence. They don't like how things are moving and so they are fighting against it.

Rather than the issue of whether his own community evidences good intergroup relations, the respondent (as in extracts 2 and 3) uses the example of a more exclusive outgroup community (Sandy Row) to make his case. While he concedes that there was a brief occasion on which mixing in that area was possible, this is presented as having passed with a resumption of the territorial exclusivity. When pressed, this regression is attributed to the resistance of elements of the Protestant community to the social changes brought about by power-sharing. As in extract 3, opposition to integration is attributed to outgroup communities, affording the alignment of the speaker's position with the dominant discourse, while avoiding accusations of ingroup prejudice.

Once again we can see that this explanation is couched in the understanding of an of territorialised identity in which the incompatibility of identities is engrained in the geography

of communities. Again, a lay theory of citizenship underpins the asymmetrical understanding of the openness of each community: the intolerance and exclusivity of the outgroup is presented as potentially infringing the right of the ingroup. Against the historical narrative of Catholic oppression, the Protestant outgroup is presented as opposed to political progress as it undermines its previously dominant position (“lacking in confidence”).

As in interviews with long-term Protestant residents, some Catholic interviewees did suggest conditions under which integration and coexistence would be possible. However, again, this was considered to only be possible if overt displays of the identity of the other community were hidden or abandoned.

Extract 6: Catholic Male (LR9)

I: If people were to move in [from a nearby Protestant area], and it was predominantly mixed, how do you think that would affect your relationships round this area with your neighbours and things like that?

W: It's hard to say, depends on what the attitude they come in with. If they come in with the attitude that 'Oh, we will do what we want, we will start putting flags up' - it would cause friction. But I mean other than that if they came in and they lived their lives normally like the rest of us, there would be no problem.

I: and do you say

W: I mean like, don't get me wrong like, we have a friend, our [son] is quite friendly with a girl who is Protestant. Were both quite friendly with her and get on well with her and her kids and whatever and there's no bother...

I: No bother with them at all.

W: So as long as people aren't throwing it up in your face, I mean, don't get me wrong, if people came in here and started putting up Union Jacks, I would have a Tricolour in the garden and I would just do the same.

I: and that's fair yeah. That's completely fair yeah.

W: You know what I mean but, you don't want to go that way.

I: No

W: You wouldn't want that because then, it does cause friction

The resident's account here ostensibly suggests the possibility of successful mixing within his area. However, as with the other long-term Catholic residents, the potential problem posed by mixing is framed in terms of inherent illegitimacy of the identity of the outgroup and their tendency to dominate the area they inhabit. This is presented as something that is not normal and that will inevitably lead to conflict.

The basis on which this argument rests deserves some attention. As we have seen in all cases above, the participant is keen to demonstrate that he himself is not sectarian, hence the invocation of a Protestant family friend and her children to demonstrate the possibility of interpersonal friendships with members of the other religion. However, this is rhetorically contrasted with the possibility of the display of political symbols which the respondent presents as necessitating resistance ("I would have a Tricolour in the garden") even though this is recognised to potentially form a site of conflict. In other words, the understanding of identities as inherently territorial, combined with the interpretation of flags as an assertion of territorial dominance to be resisted, results in a situation where displays of identity are impossible for fear of conflict.

Part Two: Incomers

The interviews with incomers to these increasingly mixed areas also showed high levels of sensitivity to the community composition and the history of intergroup relations within their new areas. Some had come from single-identity areas and thus moving to mixed locations was viewed as potentially dangerous, while others had family or friends within these destinations or were otherwise familiar with the areas. All reported some level of anxiety upon entering their new communities, though most reported entirely positive experiences of mixing with members of both religions within their new locale.

Across all interviews, incomers employed the same dominant discourse of identity territorialisation in their talk as did their long-term resident counterparts above. However, respondents positioned themselves relative to this dominant discourse in a more critical and nuanced way. As we shall see below, all used some variant of understandings of citizenship to argue that conflict was not inevitable or only occurred under specific circumstances. Some countered the expectation of identity conflict with the evidence of their own experience of harmonious relations. Others talked of ways of successfully managing their own displays of identity so as not to cause offense. Some others outlined a shared understanding within the local community of when identity displays were acceptable and when they were not. In other words, participants used a range of lay theories of citizenship to position themselves outside of the dominant discourse of inevitable identity-based territorialisation.

2.1 Protestant Incomers. For members of the Protestant community moving into mixed areas from single-identity areas, many reported apprehension and some expectation of trouble. In some regards this is a similar manifestation to the dominant discourse of identity territorialisation noted in the previous section. However, these respondents typically countered this discourse with the evidence of their own experiences. One of example of this is below:

Extract 7: Protestant Couple (NR5)

- I: Were you aware at all of the religious composition of this area?
- F: Yeah because that's what a lot of people seemed to have a problem with because it is mainly Protestants and then it does become a Catholic area. That's what they would be like, "They'd be always fighting or coming to the 12th July or the 11th night there's always fights", this is what we were being told at the time, but we've never had any problems at all.

Here the respondent articulates a version of the identity territorialism discourse, but works to qualify and undermine this in several important regards. Firstly, identity conflict is not

presented as a matter of fact or as engrained in the essential nature of communities, but is presented as a viewpoint which is attributed to ‘a lot of people’. Second, these people are not presented as sharing a well-informed opinion but as having a ‘problem’, which suggests their view is rooted in partiality rather than objectivity. Third, the unfounded certainty attributed to the view-holders (“there’d be always fighting... there’s always fights”) is contrasted to the certainty of her own experience (“never had any problems at all”). In other words, the participant is invoking an epistemological warrant - rooted in the evidence of her own experience - to characterise the discourse of inevitable identity conflict as ungrounded.

Other participants used the discourse of identity territorialisation in a rather different way, to present peaceful coexistence as the desirable and attainable goal of a mixed community. In the following extract, the participant is objecting to a display of political symbols in his local area. At first glance this bears some similarity to the anti-identity position of long-term residents. However, on closer inspection we can see that the resident is complaining about the identity displays of his *own* political grouping rather than that of the other group.

Extract 8: Protestant Couple (NR7)

F: We live in what is supposed to be a mixed area, a very mixed area, a mixed street, this happens every year and it’s one person in the street that puts the [Union] flags up and it drives me crazy. I mean, I come from the Protestant community that’s, you know, and I think it’s offensive, I think it makes the area, is it cheapen is the right word, or that it in some way it labels us all as intolerant. I think it’s aggressive, I think it’s offensive, I think it’s intimidating, I certainly wouldn’t want to be a home owner in this street who was trying to sell a property. They went up around mid-July again, as far as I know, there hasn’t been any consensus given within the 2 streets here.

Firstly the participant systematically emphasises the mixed nature of the area, upgrading a supposition (‘supposed to be a mixed area’), to a firmer assertion (‘a very mixed area’) to a concrete assertion based on his own experience of the immediate geographical location (‘a

mixed street’). Secondly, this mixing is contrasted to the exclusive nature of the display of political symbols and its impact on the image of the local community as intolerant.

Thirdly, the bases on which this argument is made bears some scrutiny. At several points, the speaker makes it clear that he understands the identity displays to have infringed upon the rights of others. As well as an isolated individual misrepresenting the views of the broader community, the particular effects of these displays upon other residents are described as ‘aggressive’, ‘offensive’ and ‘intimidating’. In other words, rather than a political display being assumed to occur as a direct result of the identity of the local territory as in extracts 1-6 above, it is presented as requiring the consent of the local population. The decision whether or not to display political symbols is being presented as legitimately made by all in the local community, including non-Protestant incomers, and this decision is considered to be something breached by an isolated individual.

In one sense this extract clearly evidences an individual systematically managing their own moral identity by distancing themselves from political displays which could be construed as sectarian. In another, it evidences a range of very different assumptions about citizenship, specifically concerning the contingent nature of rights to display ones identity within a locale along with the responsibility for the impact of this behaviour upon the variety of other residents living there. This type of argument was most clearly expressed in relation to paramilitary emblems:

Extract 9: Protestant Couple (NR2)

M: And where it sits, it’s on a main road and anybody driving past it you cannot miss it. I think it’s very intimidating, it has a very negative aspect because it’s, you can’t not see a balaclava gunman on it.

F: And I think for me, a lot of these paramilitary things are just a small group of people forcing what they want on other people because nobody, a lot of those people living in those streets probably don’t want that at the end of their street but they’re not going to

come up and tell them not to paint it or paint over it, you know. So, it's part of this sort of intimidatory feeling that they can do whatever they want, you know.

The couple are discussing a paramilitary mural representing the Protestant paramilitary 'Ulster Volunteer Force' on the border of their local area. In addition to attending to the reputational damage to their locale "it's on a main road and anybody driving past it you cannot miss it" their concern is that the divisive and exclusive representation is not reflective of the opinions of the local community. In this way, paramilitary symbols were represented as illegitimate, not simply because of the illegal organisations they endorse, but because of the violation of residents' rights, whereby the consent of the entire community should govern the display of their identity.

2.2 Catholic Incomers. As with Protestant incomers, Catholic in-migrants did not endorse the dominant discourse of identity territorialisation in a straightforward way. While all acknowledged the history of intercommunal conflict in their new areas, their depictions of intergroup relations were predicated on a similar set of arguments as those seen among Protestant incomers. The first set was based on personal experience. In the following extract we see a Catholic couple talking about school children in the public space of their local area (it is worth bearing in mind that these schoolchildren are all dressed in distinctive uniform and so their religious identities will be immediately recognisable to one another).

Extract 10: Catholic Couple (NR8)

F: And then sometimes the wee girls from [area 1] are on up the top of, they're Protestants, they would be Protestants across the street, a couple of streets down so they would walk down here. I mean, there would be nothing said, even [area 2] Catholic girls school is up through the park so they would come up this way.

I: But these are people that you wouldn't know, you wouldn't even know them by face?

M: No, they would walk. [area 2] is up that way that's for Catholics, you'll see the girls walking up and walking through the play park and going in and not a word will be said to them from the girls that are coming down to go to the [Protestant school].

F: Yeah, they would by pass on by one another and nothing would be said, you know.

From the perspective of the traditional contact literature in Northern Ireland, this account would not appear to constitute a positive instance of intergroup contact (e.g., Hewstone et al., 2008): the children are reported not to interact and so this contact would not even be considered a ‘superficial’ interaction. However for these participants, the lack of contact (“not a word would be said”) is being presented as a positive outcome. Their account is structured to emphasise the coming together of two distinct groups: the school children coming from geographically segregated locations (“they would walk down here”; “they would come up this way”) and as coming physically close enough to interact (“pass on by one another”). This is being relayed as first-hand visual evidence that Catholic and Protestant children *can* occupy the same public space without negative consequence. In other words, against the assumption that co-present displays of opposing identities will inevitably lead to conflict, this is being retold as evidence of peaceful coexistence in a shared space.

As such, displays of identity in themselves were not considered problematic. However, as with Protestant incomers, such identity displays which would disrupt this coexistence were criticised, including those of the ingroup.

Extract 11: Mixed Couple (NR15)

F: A girl I went to school with moved in and started to put holy statues out on the door and all of that and, well anyone we spoke to was horrified. I’m trying to think, S next door was absolutely disgusted, J and E, different people that we knew in the street were like, “We don’t want that because that’s advertising Catholicism when there’s Protestant kids walking up and down the street all the time and there’s no need for it, the kids don’t bother”. Like, there was never any abuse with the girls coming from the [Protestant School] to the [Catholic] kids in the street, so I think somebody spoke to her

Here we see these respondents contrasting the evidence of peaceful coexistence (again characterised by a lack of antagonism between school children) to the unilateral decision of one resident to display a partisan symbol. While this time the display is a religious rather than a political symbol, it is taken to be unrepresentative of the broader mixed community of residents and indeed to be offensive to their sensibilities. Notably, the offense is not presented as being on the basis of partisanship (none of the other residents are said to be offended on the basis of holding non-Catholic beliefs) but on the basis that it disrupts the neutrality of the space shared by residents: is potentially offensive to Protestant children, especially when they had previously evidenced tolerance towards their school counterparts.

Finally, some Catholic residents gave explicit accounts of their tolerance of potentially divisive displays of political identity within their new locales. Indeed they presented these occurrences as evidence of tolerance within their communities.

Extract 12: Catholic Couple (NR14)

I The fact that flags have gone up, it doesn't bother you anymore or would they not be up anymore?

M: It never bothered me much anyway, you would sort, you would have noticed it but, I mean, it wouldn't really bother me personally but I think it's just knowing your neighbours. I mean, as I say, M. and A. are next door and they would always have their flag up but because you know them and you know they're lovely people, heck as far as I'm concerned, if they want to put a hundred foot flag on top of their house, 'who cares?', you know?

F: Yes, I suppose it's not about the flag it's about what you think is behind it, really isn't it?

Here this Catholic couple have been reporting very high levels of integration within their new community including developing a range of close friends from the Protestant community. When the interviewer raises the display of Protestant political symbolism as a potential problem, their response is to explicitly deny this.

On a general level, the way in which this denial is managed works to present the couple as non-prejudiced, but again on closer scrutiny a lay theory of citizenship underpins the argument. First the husband acknowledges the display as significant within the local: to deny noticing the flags within the context of Northern Ireland would be unreasonable, as would an assertion that the symbols have no political import. However, he then diffuses the potentially sectarian interpretation of the display by shifting the argument to his own beliefs and perceptions “it wouldn’t really bother me personally” rather than framing it in intergroup identity-conflict terms.

The second strand of the argument also relates to this personalisation of the phenomenon, in that those displaying flags are presented in terms of their role as good neighbours and local friends rather than simply as members of the outgroup. This is particularly significant as the participants are presenting themselves as having both rights within the community as well as responsibilities towards their fellow residents. In particular the category of ‘neighbour’ is employed to make available associations of trust, reciprocity as well as friendship. Within this broader understanding of neighbourliness (as requiring cooperation, understanding and reciprocal tolerance) the act of flag flying is reconceptualised as something these residents are prepared to tolerate as a personal freedom of fellow neighbours. Furthermore, by giving an exaggerated example of the extent to which this would be tolerated (“a hundred foot flag”) the residents are presenting the flag-flying as a harmless foible rather than as an aggressive statement against their own religious and political grouping. In sum, by basing their arguments within the understanding of a shared neighbourhood of interdependent residents, the issue of flag flying becomes reconsidered as a harmless feature of the shared locale rather than a divisive issue.

Discussion

Across our dataset, it was evident that all participants oriented to a dominant discourse of intergroup dynamics in Northern Ireland as naturally based on identity territorialisation. While relationships between space, identity and belonging usually remain invisible (Hopkins & Dixon, 2006), within the context of Northern Ireland, the embeddedness of division in the fabric of everyday life means that our participants were all keenly aware of the significance of place for local identity politics. Whether Catholic or Protestant, long-term resident or incomer, all participants oriented to the assumption that Catholic and Protestant groups have traditionally been segregated into single identity areas and now face difficulties coexisting in shared residential space. However, within our sample, members of each subgroup positioned themselves relative to this dominant discourse and used a variety of lay theories of citizenship - constructions of group rights and responsibilities - to represent this issue.

Long-term residents *endorsed* this dominant worldview, deploying an oppositional model of competing group rights and using arguments about the lack of citizenship or the deviant citizenship of the outgroup to justify the claims that peaceful coexistence is impossible. For Protestants, citizenship was primarily a matter of civil obedience and loyalty to the state such that the impossibility of peaceful integration was attributed to the disloyalty and irresponsibility of Catholic community. For Catholics, citizenship was primarily a matter of minority group rights and of opposing the oppression of the outgroup, such that the barriers to integration were attributed to the aggressive nature of the Protestant identity. Even when espousing positive accounts of peaceful co-existence, both sets of long-term residents presented integration as contingent upon the absence or suppression of outgroup identities.

In contrast, incoming residents *challenged* the ineluctability of segregation, offering an alternative model of citizenship and coexistence and using the epistemological warrant of their own experiences to support this. The identity-position adopted by these residents was predicated upon an understanding of the rights of community membership as accompanied by

the duty to acknowledge and respect the feelings and opinions of their neighbours. This was constructed by both Catholic and Protestant incomers through an avowal of their willingness to regulate the display of their own group's identity and to criticise ingroup members who breached this expectation of intergroup civility. Likewise the interpretation of outgroup identity displays was constructed within this frame as something to be accommodated through consensus as to the appropriate norms of identity display. Significantly this was accompanied by a reconsideration of space as shared between neighbours and governed by consensualised norms of tolerance and reciprocity rather than belonging to any one group.

These findings contribute to the previous literature in three main ways. Firstly, it illustrates that in line with Barnes et al. (2004) and Gibson and Hamilton (2011), lay theories of place-based citizenship can be used to rhetorically exclude groups. Specifically, it highlights that understandings of the relationship between community identity and geographical territory can be articulated in order to deny rights of access to outsiders. In addition, it illustrates that in conflicts such as Northern Ireland, the models used to do this are derived from broader historical understandings or discourses of group rights and duties within the state. Accordingly, the models used by participants are recognisably structured by their group memberships: Catholic and Protestant participants articulated distinctive versions of place-based citizenship which were used to support their group's rights and entitlements and undermine that of the outgroup. Finally, it points to a new and distinctive discursive strategy in this context, whereby models of citizenship and place can be actively used to include and accommodate difference. While previous research has outlined content of discourses for and against multiculturalism (e.g., Verkuyten, 2005) and the spatial metaphors used to include or exclude social groups (Abell et al., 2007; Bowskill et al., 2007), the present research illustrates how incomers construct a model of rights and obligations to facilitate peaceful coexistence between groups through a construction of public space as consensually shared.

Secondly, while previous research has illustrated the relationship between institutional and lay theories of citizenship (Andreouli & Howarth, 2013), the present research suggests a further relationship between abstract lay understandings and those derived from the lived, spatialized experience of everyday citizenship. In effect, occupying a different position relative to one's locale makes relevant or 'affords' a series of place-based citizenship arguments. Being a long-term resident of a community affords rights associated with length of commitment to a community and fit with the identity of the locale. This in turn supports the community's entitlement to assert and enforce a territorial identity. Conversely, this territorial-based citizenship also implies a duty to protect one's area from the outgroup such that changes to the composition of the local population are construed as threats.

In contrast, moving between areas constitutes an 'identity transition' (Stevenson & Sagherian-Dickey, 2016) which necessitates a reconsideration of the relationship between identity and place. For new residents, length of residence and identity-congruence are not initially supportive of their community membership. Their community rights and obligations are therefore derived from engaging with their neighbours and their future commitment to the area. In a sense then, migration has occasioned a new way of formulating rights and duties which problematizes the dominant understanding of place-based entitlement. Moreover, the day-to-day experiences of incomers provide them with evidence against the ineluctability of the dominant discourse: their personal experience is that coexistence is possible and desirable. In this way, the experiences of daily life provide an epistemological warrant to underpin the emergence of new discourses of citizenship and place. While we acknowledge that in our study the age of participants was confounded with their length of residence, we suggest that these different types of spatialized experience of community have effectively shaped our participants' understandings of rights and belonging. Further research could explore how the different types of residence (temporary vs permanent; private vs publically

owned) in different locales (deprived vs affluent; urban vs rural) can afford or inhibit the emergence of new forms of place-based citizenship.

Thirdly, from a theoretical perspective, the findings also contribute to an emerging body of work attesting to the relationship between discourse and practice (Haste, 2004; Elcheroth, Doise, & Reicher, 2011) in which the routines and practices of everyday life give shape and substance to lay understandings of the social world. It develops this approach by indicating that the introduction of new practices and experiences (in this case occasioned by sharing common space) can provide substance to alternative ways of imagining social relations. In turn though, as Elcheroth and colleagues point out, this is only one part of a larger process required to challenge and change dominant discourses. Further research is required into how new lay theories of inclusive citizenship come to be shared among community members and adopted by their political leaders and inscribed into social policy. In doing so, social psychology can show how the language of citizenship can be used to transform the social landscape of groups living together in increasingly diverse communities.

References

- Abell, J., Condor, S., & Stevenson, C. (2006). "We are an island": Geographical imagery in accounts of citizenship, civil society, and national identity in Scotland and in England. *Political Psychology*, 27(2), 207-226. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2006.00003.x
- Andreouli, E. & Howarth, C. (2013). National identity, citizenship and immigration: Putting identity in context. *Journal for the Theory of Social Psychology*, vol.43(3), 361-382. doi:10.1111/j.1468-5914.2012.00501x
- Barnes, R., Auburn, T., & Lea, S. (2004). Citizenship in practice. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 43(2), 187-206. doi: 10.1348/0144666041501705

- Bowskill, M., Lyons, E. & Coyle, A. (2007). The rhetoric of acculturation: When integration means assimilation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, vol 46(4), 793-813. doi: 10.1348/014466607X182771
- Burns, M. & Stevenson, C. (2013). Deconstructing national leadership: Politicians' accounts of electoral success and failure in the Irish Lisbon Treaty referenda. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 52(1), 122-139. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02060.x
- Byrne, J., Hansson, U. & Bell, J. (2006). *Shared Living: mixed residential communities in Northern Ireland*. Institute for Conflict Research.
- Cairns, E. (1982). Intergroup conflict in Northern Ireland. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Social identity and intergroup relations* (pp. 277-297). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Di Masso, A. (2015). Micropolitics of public space: On the contested limits of citizenship as a locational practice. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 3, 63-83. doi:10.5964/jspp.v3i2.322
- Di Masso, A. & Dixon, J. (2015). More than words: Place, discourse and the struggle over public space in Barcelona. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 12, 45-60. doi:10.1080/14780887.2014.958387
- Dixon, J., Levine, M., & McAuley, R. (2006). Locating impropriety: street drinking, moral order, and the ideological dilemma of public space. *Political Psychology*, 27(2), 187-206.
- Donnan, H. & Wilson, T. M. (2010). *Borderlands: Ethnographic approaches to security, power, and identity*. New York: University Press of America.
- Durrheim, K. & Dixon, J. (2013). *Racial encounter: The social psychology of contact and desegregation*. London: Routledge.
- Elcheroth, G., Doise, W., & Reicher, S. (2011). On the knowledge of politics and the politics of knowledge: How a social representations approach helps us rethink the subject of

- political psychology. *Political Psychology*, 32(5), 729-758. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2011.00834.x
- Gibson, S. & Hamilton, L. (2011). The rhetorical construction of polity membership: Identity, culture and citizenship in young people's discussions of immigration in northern England. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 21(3), 228-242. doi: 10.1002/casp.1087.
- Gray, D. & Griffin, C. (2014). A journey to citizenship: Constructions of citizenship and identity in the British Citizenship Test. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 53 (2), 299–314. doi: 10.1111/bjso.12042.
- Gray, D. & Manning, R. (2014). "Oh my god, we're not doing nothing": Young people's experiences of spatial regulation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*. Advance online publication, 53 (4), 640–655. doi: 10.1111/bjso.12055.
- Haste, H. (2004). Constructing the citizen. *Political Psychology*, 25(3), 413-439. Doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00378.x
- Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., Voci, A., Paolini, S., McLernon, F., Crisp, R. J., ... & Craig, J. (2005). Intergroup contact in a divided society: challenging segregation in Northern Ireland NOVA. The University of Newcastle's Digital Repository.
- Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J. B., Cairns, E., Tausch, N., Hughes, J., Tam, T., ... & Pinder, C. (2008). Stepping stones to reconciliation in Northern Ireland: Intergroup contact, forgiveness and trust. In A. Nadler, T. Malloy, & J. Fisher (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup reconciliation* (pp.199-226). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hopkins, N. & Dixon, J. (2006). Space, place, and identity: Issues for political psychology. *Political Psychology*, 27(2), 173-185. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2006.00001.x.
- Hopkins, N., Reicher, S., & Harrison, K. (2006). Young people's deliberations on geographic mobility: Identity and cross-border relocation. *Political Psychology*, 227-245.

- Hughes, J., Campbell, A., Hewstone, M., & Cairns, E. (2007). Segregation in Northern Ireland: Implications for community relations policy. *Policy Studies*, 28(1), 33-53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0032309>.
- Hughes, J., Campbell, A., & Jenkins, R. (2011). Contact, trust and social capital in Northern Ireland: A qualitative study of three mixed communities. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 34(6), 967-985. doi: 10.1080/01419870.2010.526234.
- Isin, E. F., & Nielsen, G. M. (2008). Introduction: Acts of Citizenship. In E. F. Isin & G. M. Nielsen, (Ed.s), *Acts of citizenship* (pp 1-14). London: Zed Books Limited.
- Kymlicka, W. & Norman, W. (1994). Return of the citizen: A survey of recent work on citizenship theory. *Ethics*, 104, 352-381. doi: 10.1086/293605.
- Kvale, S. (2008). *Doing interviews*. London: Sage.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Lister, R. (2003). *Citizenship: feminist perspectives*. New York: NYU Press.
- McKeown, S. (2013). *Identity, Segregation and Peace-building in Northern Ireland: A Social Psychological Perspective*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- NiMaolalaigh, M. & Stevenson, C. (2014). National identity in a foreign context: Irish mothers accounting for their children's national identity in England. *Discourse and Society*, 25(2), 245-262. doi: 10.1177/0957926513516049
- Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister (2013). *Together Building a United Community*. Stormont, Belfast: OFMDFM.
- Phillips, D. (2015). Claiming spaces: British Muslim negotiations of urban citizenship in an era of new migration. *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers*, 40(1), 62-74. doi: 10.1111/tran.12054

- Reicher, S., Cassidy, C., Wolpert, I., Hopkins, N., & Levine, M. (2006). Saving Bulgaria's Jews: An analysis of social identity and the mobilisation of social solidarity. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 36(1), 49-72. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.291.
- Reicher, S. & Hopkins, N. (2000). *Self and nation*. Sage.
- Schmid, K., Hewstone, M., Hughes, J., Jenkins, R., & Cairns, E. (2010). Residential segregation and intergroup contact: Consequences for intergroup relations, social capital and social identity. In M. Wetherell (Ed.), *Theorizing identities and social action* (pp. 177 – 197). London: Palgrave MacMillan.
- Schmid, K., Hewstone, M., Tausch, N., Jenkins, R., Hughes, J., & Cairns, E. (2010). Identities, groups and communities: The case of Northern Ireland. In M. Wetherell & C. T. Mohanty (Eds.), *The sage handbook of identities* (pp. 455-475). London: Sage.
- Schmid, K., Tausch, N., Hewstone, M., Hughes, J., & Cairns, E. (2008). The effects of living in segregated vs. mixed areas in Northern Ireland: A simultaneous analysis of contact and threat effects in the context of micro-level neighbourhoods. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence*, 2(1), 56-71.
- Shirlow, P. & Murtagh, B. (2010). *Belfast: Segregation, violence and the city*. London: Pluto.
- Shotter, J. (1993). Psychology and citizenship: Identity and belonging. In B.S. Turner (Ed.), *Citizenship and social theory* (pp. 115-138). London: SAGE Publications.
- Silverman, D. (2001). *Interpreting qualitative data: Methods for analysing talk, text and interaction*. London: SAGE Publications.
- Staeheli, L.A. (2011) 'Political geography: where's citizenship?'. *Progress in human geography*, 35 (3), 393-400. doi: 10.1177/0309132510370671
- Stevenson, C., Condor, S., & Abell, J. (2007). The majority-minority conundrum in Northern Ireland: An Orange Order perspective. *Political Psychology*, 28 (1), 107-125. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2007.00554.x

- Stevenson, C., Hopkins, N., Luyt., R. & Dixon, J. (2015). The Social Psychology of Citizenship: Engagement with Citizenship Studies and Future Research. *Journal of Political and Social Psychology* (vol 3). doi:10.5964/jspp.v3i2.581
- Stevenson, C., McNamara, N., & Muldoon, O. (2014). Stigmatised identity and service usage in disadvantaged communities: Residents', community workers' and service providers' perspectives. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 24(6), 453-466. doi: 10.1002/casp.2184.
- Stevenson, C. & Sagherian-Dickey, T. (2016). Collectively Coping with Contact: The role of ingroup support in dealing with the challenges of intergroup mixing in residential contexts. *British Journal of Social Psychology*. [Early View] doi: 10.1111/bjso.12150
- Tileaga, C. (2006). Representing the 'other': A discursive analysis of prejudice and moral exclusion in talk about Romanies. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, vol 16(1), 19-41. doi: 10.1002/casp.846.
- Verkuyten, M. (2005). Immigration discourses and their impact on multiculturalism: A discursive and experimental study. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 44(2), 223-240.
- Verkuyten, M. (2007). Social psychology and multiculturalism. *Social and Personality Psychology*, vol 1(1), 280-297. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00011.x.
- Wetherell, M. (1998). Positioning and interpretive repertoires: Conversation analysis and post-structuralism in dialogue. *Discourse and Society*, vol 9(3), 387-412. doi: 10.1177/0957926598009003005.
- Wetherell, M. & Edley, N. (1999). Negotiating hegemonic masculinity: Imaginary positions and psycho-discursive practices. *Feminism & Psychology*, 9(3), 335-356. doi: 10.1177/0959353599009003012