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Abstract

The nation has often been viewed as a unifying force (Anderson, 1981); however, groups are rarely, if ever, completely united (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). The national group is no exception, yet the social identity literature has largely ignored intra- and subgroup variability within the same nation. In order to challenge this pervasive image of the nation, a mixed methods approach was applied to consider variations that exist within the same national category. The first phase qualitative investigation applied a discursive approach to examine how Irish Travellers and Irish students negotiated their national identity in interaction. The findings suggested that individuals within the same interactional context displayed and constructed their national identity in different ways. Importantly, these divergent displays may also have had interactive consequences, as they marked individuals as being inside or outside of the national category. Additionally, ‘banality’ (Billig, 1995) was identified as a discursive resource mobilised by individuals in interaction as a marker of their entitlement to exclude others from the national group.

The discursive findings informed the subsequent quantitative investigations; the first of which considered the effect of experimentally manipulated perceived prototypicality on evaluations of displays of Irishness. The findings indicated that participants displayed a degree of distance between themselves and the national group in their evaluations of displays. The second set of studies manipulated both participants' perceived prototypicality and that of a target group member. The effects of the manipulation on participants' assignment of national attributes and similarity judgements in both an intra- and intergroup comparative context were then considered. The findings indicated that prototypical and peripheral group members adjusted their distance to the national group, relative to other subgroups occupying different positions within the nation. The implications for discursive understandings of identity, the study of intra-national relations and policies of inclusion were then discussed.
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Introduction

There are often discrepancies between constructions of the nation by policy makers and government representatives, and national identity as enacted and experienced by individuals in everyday social interactions. Consider for example, Irish Travellers as an indigenous minority in Ireland. Irish Travellers are nomadic people, and maintain a separate language and set of traditions to members of the majority population.

However, in the UN Committee Report on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (CERD), the Irish government states that “…it should be noted that Irish Travellers do not [emphasis added] constitute a distinct group from the population as a whole in terms of race, colour, descent, and national or ethnic origin” (CERD, 2005, p. 82). Thus the Irish government does not recognise Irish Travellers as an ethnic group; rather, their legal status is that of a ‘social group’ within Ireland and not distinct from the national group as a whole.

On the other hand, the European Parliament (2005) enquiry on racism and xenophobia, found Irish Travellers to be among the most discriminated-against ethnic group in Ireland and yet their legal status remains insecure in the absence of widespread legal endorsement. Irish Travellers are, in effect, included within the nation in terms of public policy. However, in reality this group is considered distinct and on the ‘margins of Irish society’ (Department of Justice, Equality & Law, 2006). This indicates a discrepancy between the inclusion of Irish Travellers in public policy versus the social reality of their marginal status.

Indeed, this discrepancy is also evidenced in Irish Travellers’ accounts of their marginal minority position within Irish society. In contrast to the inclusive nature of public policy, Irish Travellers’ descriptions of their experiences of exclusion within the Irish nation: “Our way of life has been pushed to the edge of Irish life, people have
caused a lot of hardship for Irish Travellers by simply ignoring us, by doing nothing, by denying us our identity, and by giving us little or no space to be ourselves’ (Culture and Heritage Programme, 2007, p. 2). This quote encapsulates the widespread ostracism of Irish Travellers in Ireland, which has also been well documented in the media, and is consistent with the common perception among the Settled community that Irish Travellers are insular, anti-social or believed to be involved in mendicant behaviour.

The discrimination faced by Irish Travellers and the widespread denial of their identity as an ethnic minority, has been found to have a profound negative impact on their health and psychological well-being. For example, the suicide rate among Irish Travellers is now five times higher than the majority population (Hutten, 2008), with national newspapers speculating that increased ostracism and loss of identity are contributing factors in the marked increases in deaths by suicide within the Travelling community (Hutten, 2008; Hunt, 2011). In addition, the physical health of Irish Travellers is significantly poorer than that of the general population in Ireland. This is evidenced in a Census (2006) published in Ireland, which states that over half of Irish Travellers do not live past the age of 39 years. In addition, 32% of the deaths in the Irish Traveller community were of people under the age of 25, compared to only 2.6% of the entire population. In addition to other obvious correlates of reduced psychological and physical wellbeing, such as poverty and low levels of education, this indicates that there is a link between Irish Traveller status, impaired psychological well-being and physical health.

Despite the well-documented discrimination and ostracism of Irish Travellers, they have not being granted ethnic minority status. Furthermore the widespread denial of their ethnic minority identity has negatively impacted on their physical health and emotional well-being. Similar to policy makers, social psychologists have largely
viewed the national group as relatively homogenous, within the exception of ethnic minorities within the nation. However, social psychology research shows that individuals do make distinctions between members of the same groups (e.g., Jetten, Spears & Manstead, 1997) and similarly, the example of Irish Travellers suggests that these distinctions ensure that members of the national category are not all treated equally. In this thesis I will argue that social psychology has an important role to play in exploring the different understandings of national identity among members of the same nation and the possible consequentiality in terms of the reproduction of inequality and exclusion.

The discrepancy between policy related definitions of groups and every day understandings of the same groups can also be seen in the psychological study of national identity. The social psychology literature traditionally presupposed the existence of a homogeneous group and, in doing so, largely ignored intra- and subgroup variability. While the national category is said to encompass a group of people united through a real or imagined sense of shared origin and culture (Anderson, 1983), this doesn’t negate the fact that in reality, group members will occupy different perceived positions within the group, which is likely to influence subjective and objective experiences (Doosje, Ellemers & Spears, 1995; Jetten, Spears & Manstead, 1997). Indeed, individuals will vary in terms of their prototypicality, or how well they represent the group relative to other in-group members, and in turn, group members will respond to the social world in different ways, depending on their position within the group (Schmitt & Branscrombe, 2002). The national group can be no exception, yet the importance of group position has somewhat been over-shadowed by the totalising quality of the nation where group members are viewed as homogeneous, with a shared past and common destiny (Anderson, 1983). This chapter therefore proposes a revised
focus, and argues that subgroup members within the same nation actively construct and contest their position within the national category. In order to do this, it is necessary consider the national category in terms of the positions people occupy in the social world.

Along these lines, this thesis aims to challenge the homogenization of national identity in the social psychological literature by considering the intra- and subgroup variability that makes up the nation. This will allow for an understanding of national identity to emerge that is not simply bound up in ‘social identity’ and the uniformity of identity expression, but allows for the possibility that corollaries of national identity- ‘self’ ‘nation’ ‘group membership’ ‘social position’- can be used differently and strategically to negotiate and police category membership. Rather than approaching the subject with a mono-methodological lens, a mixed method approach is employed to challenge the pervasive image of national identity in the literature and reconstruct it from divergent methodological perspectives. As such, the active negotiation of the epistemological perimeters and core methodological assumptions will form the tapestry of this thesis.

This argument is outlined in more detail in the proceeding nine substantive chapters of the thesis, before presenting a final restatement in the form of a general discussion. Chapter one provides a general introduction to the subject of the thesis by considering the conceptualisations of national identity in the broader social sciences and social identity literature, which has collectively contributed to a pervasive image of national identity as a form of generic social identity, uniformly guiding members of the national community to act as a homogeneous national group. It is important to note that despite a good deal of theoretical speculation on this subject, comparatively, national identity in its own right has only rarely been the subject of empirical scrutiny. In this
review, I emphasise the potential importance of 'banal' (Billig, 1995) aspects of national representation and identity, and highlight the limitations in previous research. More specifically, it is noted that the qualitative study of national identity fails to consider the variability of identity expression among subgroups within the same nation.

Chapter Two will acknowledge the differences among group members in terms of their perceived social position and variations in identity expression. There is a tendency in the literature to emphasise the strategic and purposeful behaviours of particular group members and or subgroups, which may result in only a partial account of the ways in which individuals negotiate their position within the nation. The subgroup-superordinate literature will be reviewed which suggests the possibility that an individual’s inclusion within the superordinate nation could activate the intra- and intergroup differences between category members. Finally, there will be a discussion of ways in which the subsections of the literature review align. In doing so, a clear rationale for a mixed methods investigation of national identity will be provided.

Chapter Three outlines the details of the methodology used in the studies described in this thesis. A technical methodological section details the core assumptions underlying both qualitative and quantitative methodology. However, it is also noted that mixed methods approaches to research have been subject to a considerable amount of scrutiny concerning their place and appropriate use in social scientific research. This necessitates a detailed contribution to the debate concerning mixed methods, clearly outlining the epistemological parameters of this thesis. It is also argued that the criticisms often directed at multi-methods approaches can be viewed as equally applicable to mono-method research, though potentially unchecked and therefore more pervasive.
Chapter Four provides an overview of the method employed in the qualitative elements of this thesis. The chapter will outline the perceived advantages and disadvantages of photo elicitation employed in the qualitative elements of this thesis. In addition to providing an overview of the characteristics of the participants in the group interview study, this chapter will provide a rationale for the recruitment of research participants in line with the theoretical underpinnings of this thesis. This chapter will conclude with a review of the literature on photo elicitation. In doing so, an argument will be presented for an ethnomethodological approach to the understanding of participants’ use of photographic imagery in interview research.

Chapter Five explores the ways in which Irish Traveller and Irish student participants display and construct their national identity in talk. It was observed that both sets of participants within the same national context, orient to different norms of identity display in talk. Irish Traveller participants, who orient to their marginal minority status, proactively assert a claim to national identity and consider overt displays of Irishness to be indicative of being within the national category. Irish student participants on the other hand assert a banal sense of national identity and consider overt displays of Irishness to be indicative of being outside of the national category. It is suggested in this thesis that these different forms of identity display could have potential interactive consequences for group based entitlement within the broader nation.

Chapter Six explores the ways in which participants manage issues of entitlement and accountability in their talk of photographic representations of Irishness. Each set of participants orient to the photo elicitation task in different ways and in doing so, engage with pervasive dilemmas that they must manage and negotiate in talk. Irish Travellers, on the one hand, orient to the photo elicitation task as one affording the entitlement to comment on the content of Irishness. Irish students, on the other hand,
interpret the photo elicitation task as a challenge to account for the photographs of Irishness while simultaneously dealing with issues of accountability that could undermine their banal, taken for granted 'unnoticed' sense of national identity. The analysis shows how encouraging participants' talk of the task, provides an opportunity to examine how individuals swing between two sides of the dilemma to manage respectively, issues of entitlement and accountability in their talk of the task.

Chapter Seven begins with a discussion of the possibilities and pitfalls when drawing on the discursive findings to inform the development of the experimental studies in this thesis. This chapter goes on to describe a set of quantitative studies in which participants first complete measures of national identification and are then exposed to a stimulus designed to manipulate their perceived prototypicality within the nation. Finally, participants evaluate subtle and overt displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day. Participants’ strength of identification was found to be an important co- variate that impacted on their evaluations of displays of Irishness. I will suggest the possibility that participants can strategically distinguish between displays of Irishness in order to manage their reputation within the group.

Chapter Eight will provide a brief overview of the intra- and intergroup prototypicality literature and will focus particularly on the instrumental use of prototypicality judgements. It describes a set of quantitative experimental studies that manipulate participants’ perceived prototypicality in relation to the group and that of a target group member in both an intragroup and intergroup comparative context. The results suggest that participants alter aspects of the intragroup context, such as their proximity to the national group, when provided with prototypicality information concerning fellow co-nationals. I argue that these findings not only contribute to an understanding of national identity in terms of its component parts, but also suggest that
these parts (i.e. intragroup prototypicality) can be used to manage the reputation of the national group.

In Chapter Nine, I will summarise the main findings of this thesis, and acknowledge the limitations of the work. This provides an opportunity for further investigations into national identity, subgroup membership and engagement with wider theoretical and methodological debates in social psychological research. I will also discuss the theoretical and methodological contributions of this thesis, as well as the practical and policy implications for addressing issues of inclusion within the nation.

In concluding, I will demonstrate the contributions to knowledge in this thesis. Principally, I note the theoretical contribution to the discursive literature though the demonstration that individuals within the same nation construct versions of the national identity for different strategic purposes. Similarly, the experimental findings noted participants’ instrumental use of intragroup prototypicality judgements to manage their social position, relative to other group members and subgroups within the broader national category. Overall, I conclude that the findings suggest that the different ways in which participants manage their national identity could have consequences for the reproduction of inequality within the nation.
Chapter 1

National identity in social psychology

1.1. Introduction

This thesis addresses a gap in the social psychological literature on national identity which neglects to consider the possibility that members of the same national category can adopt different styles of identity displays in interaction. In doing so, this thesis challenges the assumption in the social psychological literature on national identity that members that individuals will act uniformly in terms of identity expression to perpetuate and consolidate their shared national identity. The nation has been conceptualized as a homogenising force, particularly in the social sciences, where members of the national community are depicted as united through a shared past and common destiny (Anderson, 1983). To provide a dramatic example of the totalising quality of the nation, W. B. Yeats wrote that the idea of the nation can only be sustained when there is a ‘‘model of it in the minds of the people wrought by an invisible hypnotist’’ (Yeats, 1939, p.78). While Yeats refers to the political and literary elites that construct versions of the nation, it is argued in this chapter that this reference to an invisible hypnotist can also reflect the depiction of the nation that exists in the broader social sciences and to a lesser extent, the social psychological literature that ‘hypnotically guides’ individuals to consider themselves part of a collective entity (Anderson, 1983).

In this chapter, I will outline the social identity approach to national identity, as a useful theoretical framework for understanding the group-level cognitive processes underpinning identification with the nation. In particular, however, I will draw attention to the research which considers the flexible and variable nature of individuals’ use of
national categories (e.g., Levine, 2004; Levine & Thompson, 2004; Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). Additionally, the discursive approach to national identity will be outlined and will focus particularly on the different strategies of accomplishing being a member of the national group in different national contexts. Overall, this chapter will highlight the need to consider individuals with the same national context and their use of identity management strategies to manage their national identity interactionally.

1.2. National identity in the social sciences

Researchers in the social sciences have focused their attention on the empirical investigation of the nation and have marked their own conceptual territory. What is more, this conceptual territory is vast and ramified, with no agreed theoretical language defining key concepts (notably ‘nationhood’, ‘statehood’, ‘nation-state’, ‘nationalism’, patriotism’, ‘national identity’ are used interchangeably), ultimately creating obstacles in systematic research (Smith, 2010; Gellner, 1983). However, the aim here is not to temporarily disentangle the theoretical language in the broader social sciences, as that would be beyond the scope of this thesis. Rather I aim to provide conceptual clarity on the definitions of nationalism and national identity that relate to the empirical concerns of the present thesis. This will include brief descriptions of civic, ethnic and psychological definitions of national identity and will conclude with an overview of the theory of Banal Nationalism (Billig, 1995).

National identity has at least three dimensions: (1) political or civic, (2) cultural or ethnic and (3) psychological, with some overlap between these dimensions (Smith, 2010). Civic national identity refers to the sense of entitlement to national belonging based on citizenship rights. While this has been considered an adequate claim to national identity, it has also been problematised in the literature. For example, Rocha
(2009) examined the construction of national identity and citizenship in the inhabitants of the border region of Costa Rica and Nicaragua. This study found evidence of bi-national currency, language and media which weaved together a bi-national way of life, independent of citizenship or political entity. This would suggest that straight-forward definitions of national identity, in terms of civic distinctions, could in reality, be more complex.

The second dimension refers to ethnic national identity which emphasises blood ties or hereditary connections to people. This definition of national identity is also problematic as it is less tangible than civic definitions. In other words, ethnic ties cannot be traced directly to kinship. Instead this link to a common ethnic group is presumed to be based on customs and traditions that in itself, is an abstract part of history. Similarly, Reicher and Hopkins (2001) noted that “both between nations and even within the same nation, ethnicity may just be one means of defining boundaries amongst many (p. 12). There are two noteworthy aspects of this quote. Firstly, there is an acknowledgement that distinctions are made - “even within nations” - however the authors do not elaborate further on this point. Second, it is noted that there are multiple definitions of national identity that can be used to construct the boundaries of the national category. Here it is argued that there is a possibility that individuals within nations can use these multiple definitions of national identity to construct different versions of the nation for different strategic purposes.

The third dimension refers to national identity as a psychological concept conceived in the imagination of those who consider themselves part of a common national community (Anderson, 1983). Communication on a wide scale has promoted this idea. For example, the invention of the first printing press in the 15th century fuelled the national imagination and, according to Anderson (1983), created a common national
language. Much later, broadcasting and national television aided the ideological connections between fellow nationals and the political establishment, projected through the lens of national identity (Kolar- Panov, 1997). Television created standardised images of citizenship, cultural structures, and representations of the nation for mass consumption. However, a preoccupation with the preconditions under which the national imagination can be harnessed may preclude consideration of the different ways in which members of the national community consume and understand mass images of national identity (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001, p. 15).

In addition to an understanding of national identity as mass-produced through print media, the reproduction of national identity through ritualized, taken-for-granted daily routines has been considered (e.g., Lofgen, 1989). The nation, according to Lofgen (1989) can therefore exist in the jokes that are shared, leisure activities and the ways members of the national community discuss themselves and others in national terms. Taken together therefore, it is argued that definitions of national identity in terms of ethnic, civic and psychological constructions are often problematic and more complex in reality. Alternatively, it is possible to understand national identity as reproduced and re-enacted in everyday social interaction (Foster, 2002; Edensor, 2002). Central to this understanding, Billig’s (1995) seminal work ‘Banal nationalism’ will now be outlined in terms of a theory of unnoticed everyday representations of national identity.

1.2.1. Banal nationalism. Billig (1995) draws attention to the everyday unnoticed representations of nationalism. Symbols, flags, national songs, money are the more obvious representations, yet turn of phrase, the weather, and domestic news are also representations of nationalism that are woven into the ‘banal backdrop’ to everyday life. These aspects of the banal backdrop often operate beyond the realm of conscious awareness but can be mobilised at any point to great effect. Banal Nationalism, as it
pertains to studies of national identity in social psychology, will be discussed in more
detail in section 1.7., this description will be elaborated upon briefly with illustrative
examples of ‘banal nationalism’ operating in everyday practices. Finally, these
examples will be grounded by a brief overview of the empirical investigation of banal
nationalism in the social sciences.

Banal nationalism is embedded and reproduced in everyday social practices
(Billig, 1995). Take for example the countless national flags that mark the homeland of
the United States. These are ‘unwaved’ flags that do not require saluting or demand
attention. These unnoticed representations of nationhood serve to “flag” nationalism
daily, while still remaining within the unconscious banal national backdrop to everyday
life (Billig, 1995, p.40). The taken-for-granted nature of nationalism is forged through
iterative practices. In other words, the fact that these flags are continually present and
routinely ignored insures that they are “mindlessly remembered” and reproduce a taken-
for-granted world of nations (Billig, 1995, p. 41). However, in a different context, the
same flag can change dramatically. The flag waved during a military parade is a
signifier of the nation-state, it emerges from the national unconsciousness and is
noticed. Therefore, the everyday unnoticed representations of nationalism insure that
nationalism is not forgotten but is mindlessly remembered and can be drawn upon to
evoke national sentiment and solidarity at particular moments of national significance.

Banal nationalism not only exists in everyday practices but is embedded in the
discourse of politicians, ordinary people and in the fabric of national newspapers. In
order to identify instances in discourse, it is necessary to become “linguistically
microscopic”, as the crucial words of banal nationalism are often the smallest (Billig,
1995, p. 94): ‘we’, ‘us’, ‘them’. These small words can work so discretely and
unobtrusively that they are often unnoticed by the speaker or writer (Billig, 1995). ‘We’
the nation implies ‘them’ and similarly, ‘this country’ implies ‘those countries’. These words are used routinely and unconsciously in everyday language and illustrate the widespread belief in the existence of the nation with clear boundaries between ‘us’ and ‘them’. These unnoticed, routine ways of talking are less controversial than overt patriotic sentiments but nonetheless subtly work to “seal the borders” of the imagined national space that ‘we’ occupy (p.109).

Studies in the social sciences have brought the unnoticed banal backdrop of the nation to the fore (Gill, 2005; Hearn, 2007; Jones & Merriman, 2006) by studying elements such as signposts in Wales (Jones & Merriman, 2009), cottages in rural Ireland (Cusack, 2001), licence plates in North America (Leib, 2011) and how they work to reproduce aspects of the nation that are generally unnoticed but contribute to the national consciousness. Another example is a study by Gray, Delany and Durrheim (2005) who conducted a discursive analysis of a group of South African participants who were contemplating. The analysis demonstrated that, contrary to Billig’s (1995) theory, reminders of nationalism are not necessarily taken-for-granted, commonsense categories. Rather, these participants demonstrate an awareness of the nation as imagined and constructed in everyday social interaction (Gray et al., 2005). This discursive investigation has been valuable in demonstrating that national identity is not a matter of banal unawareness but rather, participants actively engage with the banal nature of national identity in conversational interaction for particular rhetorical purposes.

However, as the authors highlight, South African participants’ accounts of national identity must be understood in relation to the contexts in which these accounts were produced. Participants’ choice to emigrate is an “unpatriotic act” (Gray et al., 2005, p.17) that they must attend to and manage in their talk. This ensures that
participants’ accounts of their national identity are a ‘hot’ topic and not a matter of banal unawareness. This point will be discussed in more detail in Section 1.7., however for present purposes it is worth acknowledging that discursive constructions of banal nationalism are of empirical interest and importantly, that subgroup members’ constructions and displays of national identity within the ‘banal backdrop to nationalism’, are currently unexplored.

In general, social psychology has largely remained on the periphery of the discussion of nationalism. This is largely due, in part, to the tendency of social psychological researchers to gloss over the nation in pursuit of more general intergroup phenomena (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001), which will be discussed in detail in the following section. Those researchers who do address national identity as a psychological phenomenon in its own right widely agree that national identity is notoriously difficult to define for empirical study (e.g., Barrett, 2000; Gibson, 2007; Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). To date, psychological studies of national identity have been derived from three major theoretical approaches: (1) social cognition, (2) the social identity approach and (3) the discursive approach. These will now be discussed in turn.

1.3. National identity in social psychology

It is important to examine how national identity is defined and operationalized in the social psychological literature. This discussion will be divided into two sections corresponding to the main approaches to the study of national identity in this thesis: the social identity approach and the discursive approach. Each of these subsections will be further sub-divided according to the key theoretical threads in the area. The overall aim is to provide an overview of these approaches to national identity in social psychology. In addition, findings from the social identity and discursive approaches will be used to
evidence participants’ flexible and strategic use of national identity. Firstly, however there will be a brief discussion of the social cognition approach and deviations from the theoretical focus of this thesis.

The social cognition approach typically operationalised national identity as an independent variable and therefore as a momentary experience or stable cognitive construct. Key studies in the area of social cognition have examined national identity indirectly as a means of predicting its effect on other psychological phenomenon such as out-group attitudes and intergroup comparison (e.g., Suleiman & Beit-Hallahmi, 1997). Many of the researchers in this area provide participants with the context in experimental manipulations, administer a survey that does not account for contextual variation or an implicit association test (IAT) designed to access unconscious thought processes (Sibley, Liu, & Sammyh, 2008; Sibley, Liu, & Khan, 2010; Devos & Ma, 2008). Therefore, researchers in the social cognition tradition typically treat national identity as relatively stable, invariant and enduring over time (Gibson, 2007).

The study of national identity in social cognition tradition has yielded interesting and significant findings. In particular, it is also worth noting at this point that there is a considerable amount of fruitful research on the quality (contrastive, assimilative) and direction (upwards, lateral, downwards) of social comparison (e.g., Mussweiler, Ruter, Epstude, 2004), although an extended discussion is beyond the scope of this thesis. For the purposes of clarity and brevity, the focus will be on the social identity approach as a way of explaining both the intra- and intergroup processes that occur during social interaction, central to the aims of this thesis.

The social cognition approach has also been criticised for being individualistic in nature (Widdicombe & Wooffitt, 1995) and for portraying asocial, decontextualised accounts of identity processes (Gibson, 2007). In response to these criticisms, social
cognition researchers have argued that cognition has a social origin. However, it is fundamentally concerned with the way in which individuals form cognitive representations and categorizations of the social world. Information processing occurs at the individual level and, regardless if the information is shared socially, it does not account for the categorization and cognitive representations that occur from social interaction. The core assumption of the social cognition approach therefore, deviates from the theoretical focus of this thesis which views national identity as malleable, open to strategic construction and negotiated in social context. The following two sections will deal with the social identity and discursive approach to national identity, which will be used as theoretical frameworks to answer questions put forward in this thesis from two epistemological perspectives.

1.4. Overview of social identity approach

This section will describe the social identity approach to national identity, highlighting the overall tendency to homogenize the nation by presupposing that individuals within the same nation will display their identity uniformly. However, the strengths of this approach will also be drawn upon in demonstrating the flexible use of national category to shape and define the characteristics of the group and dimensions of social comparison. The importance of these findings, in particular, will be discussed in relation to variations in national identification and possible implications in terms of how the nation is viewed and understood by group members.

1.4.1. Basic principles of the social identity approach. The Social Identity Theory (SIT) of intergroup relations (Tajfel, 1978) and the Self Categorization Theory (SCT) of group membership (Turner, Oakes, Reicher & Wetherell, 1987) have played a key role in the development of approaches to group processes in social psychology over
the past two decades. The social identity approach was developed to challenge the preoccupation with the individual in social psychology and to bring the study of social groups to the fore. There are a number of core assumptions, and they will be outlined in this section. These will be divided according to the early version of SIT (Tajfel; 1978: Tajfel & Turner: 1979) and the later refinements in terms of the cognitive underpinnings of self-categorization (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987).

The earliest version of social identity theory was principally concerned with the psychological motivations that lead individuals to endorse or disavow group membership. Turner (1987) later described this motivation in terms of ‘positive distinctiveness’ or the need to distinguish one’s group from relevant outgroups along valued dimensions of comparison. For example, group members can achieve positive distinctiveness by demonstrating that they are kinder and more generous than other groups. Therefore, positively valued groups will identity and act in the terms of the group, in order to achieve and maintain positive distinctiveness.

However, this process must be understood in the context of structural inequalities (Tajfel, 1978). Groups are not evaluated equally. Subordinate groups, for example, are devalued on the basis of their group membership. These groups can engage in collective action to achieve positive distinctiveness and challenge inequalities between groups. However, collective action is contingent upon two factors. The first is related to the permeability of group boundaries, or an individual’s ability to advance in the social hierarchy despite their negative social standing. Belief in the permeability of group boundaries will encourage strategies of individual mobility, while impermeable boundaries will encourage strategies of collective action (Ellemers, 1995; Wright, Taylor & Moghaddom 1990).
The second factor relates to the perceived security of intergroup relations and is contingent on two additional factors: the perceived fairness (legitimacy) and the stability of intergroup inequalities. If intergroup relations are perceived to be illegitimate and unstable, individuals are aware of cognitive alternatives to change the structural inequalities. They can act either individually or collectively to change the status quo (Tajfel, 1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

Individuals can engage in a number of different strategies in response to the perceived inequality between groups (Ellemers & Spears, 1995; Ellemers, Wilke & van Knippenberg, 1990). An individual can choose to dis-identify or leave the socially devalued group. Alternatively an individual can choose to remain within the group and engage in a process of ‘social creativity’ to redefine the shape and dimensions of the group (Tajfel, 1978). For example, group members may emphasise the variability within the group (we’re poor but we’re not all poor), they can make comparisons over time (we’re poor but better off than we used to be) or compare themselves to an alternative outgroup (we’re poor but not as poor as others) to buffer against their subordinate status (Haeger, Mummendey, Mielke, Blanz & Kanning, 1996). The process of social creativity will be discussed in more detail in sections 1.5. and 2.3.3.

However, for the present purpose, it is worth noting that subordinate groups act in a number of different ways to redefine the definitions of the group and challenge the perceived inequalities between groups.

SCT developed on Tajfel’s earlier work and concentrated on the cognitive underpinnings of social identity (Turner et al., 1987). The social identity approach is based on the assumption than an individual’s identity exists on a continuum from personal to social identity. Individuals belong to various different groups that become more or less salient in different contexts. For example, in a lecture hall an individual can
identify as a ‘student’. If their cohorts are predominately of one gender, an individual’s gender identity might become salient, at home their social identity might switch to ‘daughter’, ‘partner’, ‘parent’ and so on, dependent on contextual variations. Moreover, when social identities are more salient than personal identities, those who share the same social identity will behave in a group like fashion, adhering to group norms. Therefore, salient social identity is generally thought to usurp an individual’s personal identity (Hornsey & Jetten, 2004), so they are no longer behaving as individuals but, as socially defined group members.

In addition, SCT researchers emphasised the importance of an individual’s perceived similarity to the category prototype in the development of their social identity (Hogg, 1996; Hogg & Hains, 1996). The prototype can be an actual person that is considered the most typical group member or a fictional member that embodies the shared characteristics of the group. Group members are evaluated against the category prototype to determine the extent to which they are typical members of the category. Those who deviate from the category prototype are not considered representative group members and therefore, are perceived to be less deserving of group-based entitlements than other more typical members (Hogg, 1996). As such, categories consist of a fuzzy set of characteristics (Huddy, 2001) against which to evaluate and justify the differential treatment of group members.

The following section will deal more specifically with the social identity approach to the study of national identity, and in doing so it will make explicit the core assumptions that underlie this approach that might perpetuate the assumption in the literature that members of the national category will display uniformity in their expression of national identity.
1.5. The social identity approach to national identity

A considerable amount of the research in the social identity tradition reflected a general preoccupation with national and ethnic identities and an underlying tendency to depict the nation as a homogenizing force in the earlier work (Tajfel, 1960b, 1970). This is not surprising given that Tajfel's (1978) definition of social groups was based on Emerson’s (1960) definition that “the nation is a community of people who belong together in the double sense that they share deeply significant elements of common heritage and that they share a common destiny for the future (p. 95). However, what is surprising is that there is a considerable amount of difficulty in explaining national identity in social psychological terms (Billig, 1995).

This section will provide an overview of definitions and studies of national identity in the social identity tradition and will be conceptually organised according to three broad threads in this area. Firstly there will be a discussion of the early research in the SCT tradition. Second, there will be an overview of the research that elaborated on SIT and national identity by Brown and colleagues (e.g. Brown, 2000; Brown, Hinkle, Ely, Fox-Cardamone, Maras & Taylor, 1992; Hinkle & Brown, 1990). Thirdly, research on national identity and strength of identification will be discussed and will include a discussion of identity management strategies employed by group members to refine the shape and characteristics of the group.

1.5.1. National identity in the SCT tradition. The early work in the SCT tradition on national identity can be subdivided further into (1) studies that emphasise the context-contingency of national identity (e.g., Haslam & Oakes, 1995; Haslam et al., 1998) and (2) studies that manipulate the salience of national identity in order to investigate other related intergroup phenomenon. Examples are investigations of labour mobility (Reicher, Hopkins & Harrison, 2006), group-based guilt (Doosje,
Branscrombe, Spears & Manstead, 2006), outgroup helping and charitable intervention (Van Leeuwen, 2007; Levine & Thompson, 2004), and social stereotyping (Haslam, Turner, Oakes, Reynolds, Eggins, Nolan & Tweedie, 1998). The key distinction between the two categories is the operationalisation of national identity. The first set of studies emphasise context dependence, and typically measure national identity as a dependent variable. On the other hand, studies of the second type typically operationalise national identity as an independent variable that can be made more or less salient to assess the impact on other related variables. As such, these studies generally include a national identity salience manipulation and manipulation check. These two approaches to national identity in the SCT tradition will now be discussed.

1.5.2. National identity and context-dependency. As a theory of group membership, SCT is not explicitly concerned with the issue of national identity but rather seeks to explain national identity in terms of generic intergroup processes and general theories of psychological group membership. As such, national identity and national categories have not been studied in their own right in this tradition but have been used to demonstrate various theories and principals in the social identity approach (Haslam & Oakes, 1995; Haslam et al., 1998; Haslam, Turner, Oakes, McGarty, & Hayes, 1992; Hopkins & Murdoch, 1999; Hopkins, Regan, & Abell, 1997a). One such principle is that self-categorizations are inherently flexible, context-contingent and can vary according to the comparative social context (Turner, Oakes, Haslam & McGarty, 1994). The same is true for national categories, the meanings of which are likely to vary according to the context (Hogg, Turner & Davidson, 1990) and importantly, dependent on the category to which they are compared (Oakes, Haslam & Turner, 1994).

One such study that examined the principles of SCT, suggested that the descriptions of national character were context-dependent (Haslam et al., 1992). The
findings demonstrated the way in which Australian participants’ descriptions of
Americans during the Gulf War was affected by the frame of reference in which they
made these descriptions. In this study, the frame of reference for comparison was
manipulated by asking participants to use a list of adjectives to rate a selected country
(the United States) that was presented as part of a list of other countries. Results
indicated that national stereotyping was most negative when participants were presented
with a frame of reference that included Iraq, among other countries, effectively making
the conflict salient. As such, national categories were used in this instance to further
enhance the understanding of self-categorization principals by demonstrating the
context-contingency of national stereotypes.

These effects of context dependence have also been extended to the study of in-
group stereotyping (Hopkins & Murdoch, 1999). In one such study, participants were
asked to rate not only a national outgroup (Americans) but also their own national group
(British). The results again demonstrated the context contingency of national
stereotypes and additionally found that ‘ingroup identity varied as a function of the
identity’ here refers to participants’ ratings of lists of attributes according to how
applicable they are to their national group. As such, this study was not concerned with
‘identity’ as such but rather national self-stereotyping. Similar findings have been
reported in relation to ‘identity’ when participants were asked to rate (or provide
descriptions) of their own ingroup in comparison to relevant outgroups (Cinnirella,

In summary, early studies of national identity in the SCT tradition, which
investigate the content dependence of national categories, do not deal directly with
identification and therefore do not generally employ measures of national identification.
However, implicit in their findings is the assumption that if the national category is salient, an individual will automatically identify with the category and have an unproblematic unified understanding of the content and meaning of the category.

1.5.3. National identity and salience manipulations. In addition to emphasising the context dependence of national identity, a number of early SCT studies have operationalised national identity as an independent variable, manipulating national identity salience to investigate its effect on other variables of interest. National identity (and national categories) has been made salient as an identity threat manipulation to assess intergroup helping, such as willingness to aid victims of the tsunami disaster (van Leeuwen, 2007) or offer financial help after national disasters in Europe and South America (Levine & Thompson, 2004). These studies and others in this tradition have manipulated national identity salience through questionnaire items assessing ingroup identification (Doosje, Branscrombe, Spears & Manstead, 2006) and questionnaire cover sheets presenting national emblems and flags (Reicher, Hopkins & Harrison, 2006; Levine & Thompson, 2004).

For example, Reicher, Hopkins and Harrison (2006) manipulated national category salience with a questionnaire cover sheet outlining the border of Scotland and England on a map of Great Britain using their respective national flags. At the end of the questionnaire participants were asked about their (unspecified) nationality and to indicate their level of identification using items such as ‘this national identity is important to me’ (Reicher, Hopkins & Harrison, 2006, p. 254). The results indicated that, when national categories were made salient, high identifying Scottish nationals showed an increased preference for Scottish versus English towns.

The researchers, however, were only interested in Scottish people who clearly identified with the category, therefore disregarding participants who were either non-
Scots or identified below a cut-off criterion on the national identification measure. However, as the national identification measure was presented at the end of a questionnaire manipulating national category salience, it is possible that participants might have indicated increased identification scores that were not entirely indicative of their strength of identification, but rather more indicative of increased identity salience following the manipulation.

However, it is worth noting, in relation to the study by Reicher et al., (2006) and other similar studies, that while national identification was measured, it was not incorporated into the analysis or theoretical understanding, except to indicate a preference for including Scottish nationals who identify highly with the category. This gives no indication of the possible identification pathways and strategies of high versus low identifiers however, and though it alludes to possible variations within the national category, this was not explicitly addressed. The significance of this omission will be discussed later in section 1.5.6., in relation to studies of strength of national identification and identity management strategies. Taken together, SCT studies on national identity, as contextually variable, provide a compelling account of the importance of context for national identity processes.

1.5.4. National identity and levels of social comparisons. In addition to the SCT development of the social identity perspective, the original principles of SIT have been elaborated in different ways by Brown and his colleagues (e.g. Brown, 2000; Brown et al, 1992; Hinkle & Brown, 1990). According to the social identity perspective, identification with the national group occurs on valued dimensions of social comparison. Brown and colleagues expanded on this principle by suggesting that evaluations through social comparison are on different levels, such as comparisons with other nations (intergroup comparison), comparisons across time in terms of past or
future behaviour (temporal comparisons) or with reference to the prototypes that reflect ideals in society (abstract standards comparison). Brown and colleagues therefore argue that social groups (and by extension, the national group) might use various types of comparison that impact on the evaluation of their ingroup.

In addition to variations in ingroup evaluations, national categories can be used differentially by members of the national group, dependent on the levels of comparison. Mummendey, Klink & Brown (2001) examined central assumptions of SCT and proposed that the concept of ‘nationalism’ involved the positive evaluation of one’s own national group in comparison to other relevant outgroups and was therefore likely to lead to outgroup derogation. On the other hand, it was hypothesised that the concept of ‘patriotism’ was a positive ingroup evaluation associated with national attachment and independent of outgroup derogation. Participants were primed with intergroup, temporal or standard comparison orientation and completed measures of ingroup identification, ingroup evaluation and outgroup derogation. However, across the four studies, the national ingroup identification measure was modified three times due to reliability issues on scale items and the authors acknowledged that the pattern of correlations varied across the four studies. This could possibly indicate some difficulty in assessing national ingroup identification among German participants, particularly in light of research on the intertwined issues of patriotism, German national identity and social stigma (Dresler-Hawke & Liu, 2006).

However, Mummendey et al.’s (2001) study does provide some particularly interesting findings, from the perspective of this thesis, because of the use of national categories to examine the process of ingroup identification and outgroup derogation. Turnerian SCT findings were extended by, not only considering the context contingency of national identity but, also by highlighting how different aspects of national identity
(i.e. nationalism vs. patriotism) are can be used differentially by members of the national group depending on level of comparison made (i.e. intergroup, temporal, abstract). This serves to further highlight the flexibility in the use of national categories or the various meaning definitions assigned to labels of national identification such as nationalism or patriotism.

Research in this tradition demonstrates contextual flexibility in the use of national identity. However, the measures of national identification used in these studies do imply the acceptance of an underlying stability in the concept of national identity. This does not account for variability among group members. Recent research on the strength of national identification supports the importance of considering the variability among group members in terms of strength of national identification (e.g., Matera, Giannini, Blanco Abarca, & Smith, 2005; Feather, 1996)

1.5.6. National identity and strength of identification. Recently there has been a discussion of the role of strength of national identification in evaluations of national groups (Matera et al., 2005). For example, Feather (1996) investigated the possibility that participants would demonstrate favouritism toward the economic products and achievements of their own nation across the domains of economic development, cultural and technological achievements. Participants completed a national identification measure and were then asked about their endorsement of national products. The results indicated that high identifiers showed greater national favouritism, demonstrating the presence of individual differences in terms of strength of identification and evaluations of the national group.

Furthermore, it is important to look at the individual within the group and the role of identity management strategies in shaping the national category. National and ethnic groups have been called ‘ascribed social identities’, which reflects how the
identity is forced on the individual with little choice, often through early socialization (Tajfel & Johoda, 1966). This means that low status or ethnic minority groups within the nation may have adopted identity management or identity protecting strategies to redefine the aspects of their identity for which they are judged or the social comparative context to buffer against the effects of low status and inequality. Brown (2000) provides the example of the ‘black is beautiful movement’ where African Americans redefined the definitions of physical beauty as inclusive of African American stereotypical physical features to create a more positive social identity. This also suggests that groups might engage in recategorisation as an identity management strategy that reconstructs and redefines the relevant comparison dimensions of the group, splitting the group into subcategories so that one group might feel less inferior to the other (Blanz, Mummendey, Mielke & Klink, 1998).

As Brown (2000) points out, in his review of the achievements and future challenges in the social identity tradition, the role of group identification and identity management strategies have been under-researched and as I will argue in section 2.3.3., the way that groups and group members construct and negotiate the parameters of national identity is a key area for further research.

1.5.7. Summary of social identity approach to national identity. Social identity theory has provided a useful framework for understanding social identity processes. The social identity approach views all social groups as interchangeable. In order words, theoretical claims that hinge on the group as a unit of analysis can be translated to a whole host of groups to which the individual ascribes. This includes the nation, football team supporter, or university affiliation. This is despite the fact there are aspects of the national group that are quite unique, not least the well documented power of national identity over the individual. In fact, member of the national group, have on
some occasions, sacrificed their lives for the collective ideal of this unique social group. Therefore, I argue that this interchangability of group membership in the SCT tradition could also be problematic. In reality, social groups are qualitatively different and these differences can have implications for the understanding of group membership (Widdicombe & Wooffitt, 1995).

Moreover, Reicher and Hopkins (2001) have criticised the way in which SCT research typically operates to determine the context in experimental manipulations. Reicher and Hopkins argue that social context is a matter of debate and that one cannot assume everyone in a given context shares a common conception of national categories. Instead the authors advocated an approach that considers the way in which both context and categories are contested (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). Reicher and colleagues have adopted this approach for their own study of national categories and identity, acknowledging that stereotypes are linked to the way in which groups explain and justify their actions (Reicher, Hopkins, & Condor, 1997; Hopkins & Reicher, 1996, 1997).

This perspective has been applied to the study of the discourse of political elite, who evoke national stereotypes in order to construct versions of the nation that mobilise national communities (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). Reicher and colleagues have therefore demonstrated the importance of considering the strategic use of national categories to define the characteristics of the group and mobilise members of the nation.

Although there are some limitations, the SCT approach has been valuable in demonstrating the flexibility of national categories in more generic intergroup terms. For example, research in the SCT tradition has demonstrated that the category can change dependent on variations dimensions of social comparison (e.g. Brown, 2000; Brown et al, 1992; Hinkle & Brown, 1990) and variations in the comparative context.
(Reicher, Hopkins & Harrison, 2006; Levine, 2004; Levine & Thompson, 2004). Finally, studies of identification strength have acknowledged how variations in national identification might affect individuals’ evaluations of other national groups (Matera, Giannini, Blanco Abarca, & Smith, 2005). Relatedly, it has been argued that researchers should examine the identity management strategies of group members and the use of social creativity to redefine and reconstruct the characteristics of the group (Brown, 2000).

Taken together, this demonstrates the need to acknowledge variations within the national group. It is further argued that group members can use national categories flexibly and strategically as an identity management strategy to meet their individual or group based needs. It remains necessary to demonstrate that national identity can indeed be actively constructed by group members in different ways to meet their concerns. This is addressed in the following section.

1.6. The discursive approach to national identity

The discursive approach to the study of national identity has been particularly useful in identifying the different norms and concerns displayed by different national groups. For the purpose of clarity, I will refer to the ‘discursive approach’ while acknowledging that there are variations within this approach, which will be discussed in greater details in Chapter 3. Here, however, I will provide a brief overview. The discursive approach uses qualitative methodology to focus on the variability of language at a micro-level. This approach operates from the premise that psychological phenomenon are constructed and reconstructed though conversational interaction. More specifically, discursive researchers have paid much attention to the manner in which identities are actively and strategically constructed and managed in talk (Antaki &
The discursive approach, therefore argues that national identity is best understood as articulated and actively negotiated in everyday interaction.

Within the discursive approach there is a broader understanding of national identity in terms of content, formulated “as a hybrid collectivity of social and natural elements, of people, places, and things” (Condor, 2006, p. 676). These elements of national identity include geography (Abell, Condor, & Stevenson, 2006, Billig, 1995), military involvement (Gibson & Abell, 2004), history (Condor, 2006: Condor & Abell, 2006), the countryside (Wallwork & Dixon, 2004), the monarchy (e.g., Billig, 1992), and national commemorations (Stevenson & Abell, 2011). These different elements of national identity can be used to negotiate discursive concerns. For example, Gibson and Abell (2004) demonstrated in interviews with members of the British army that soldiers typically downplay the ‘national’ aspect of their military involvement to manage concerns of patriotic motivations. Similarly, English respondents distanced themselves from depictions of the Jubilee as a nationalistic event and instead evoked descriptions that were apolitical and inclusive (Stevenson & Abell, 2011). English respondents, in this particular national context, are concerned with rhetorically distancing themselves from explicit national sentiment to avoid the possibility of appearing prejudiced. In everyday interaction therefore, these aspects of national identity can be deployed as a discursive tool to negotiate local interactional concerns.

In addition, the content of national identity can be deployed differently by individuals in different national contexts. For example, English and Scottish respondents use ‘the Empire’ to work up particular accounts of national identity, the British state and contemporary domestic politics (Condor & Abell, 2006). In Scotland, respondents inferred the heroic character of Scottish involvement in ‘the Empire’. In
England, however the Empire tended to be framed as a moral lesson in history and articulated in conjunction with a banal acceptance of Britain as the natural order. Similarly, English and Scottish respondents use ‘island’ imagery differently to negotiate their discursive concerns in conversational interaction (Abell, Condor & Stevenson, 2006). Scottish nationals who normally distinguish themselves from the British but who also wish to maintain a union with Britain, evoke ‘these islands’ to establish geographical unity. Respondents in England, on the other hand, used ‘island’ imagery as a discursive resource to justify and mitigate a psychological distance from the continent of Europe. Therefore these studies demonstrate the way in which the nationals in different contexts can evoke the content of national identity to negotiate their discursive concerns in interaction.

1.7. Banal and proactive displays of national identity

In addition to the content of national identity, researchers in the discursive tradition have examined how individuals in different national contexts adopt different forms of identity display in interaction. In particular, Kiely and colleagues’ work is of interest (e.g. Bechhofer, McCrone, Kiely & Stewart, 1999; Kiely, Bechhofer & McCrone, 2005; Kiely, Bechhofer, Steward & McCrone, 2001). Although rooted in a sociological tradition of symbolic interaction, their work is relevant here, as it has explored the articulation and reception of national identity claims. Taking as a starting point individuals' own accounts of their national identity, they demonstrated that Scottish nationals resident in Scotland proactively claim national identity by asserting birth right, civic engagement and ancestral ties as characteristic features of Scottishness (Kiely et al., 2005). They also demonstrated the interactional nature of identity construction by illustrating how identity claims are received by national others who are
perceived to evaluate the legitimacy of the claim. Importantly, this also suggests that migrants produce claims to inclusion that reflect issues of entitlement in the Scottish nationals evaluating their claims. This indicates a bi-directional interactional process of identity construction in talk.

These claims, however, should be interpreted in the national context in which they were produced. Scottish nationals’ proactive claims occur within the broader identity politics of Scottish devolution and independence from the UK ensuring that national identity is not unproblematic, taken-for-granted or simply a matter of personal preference. Rather, for Scottish nationals, identity is a ‘hot’ topic and subject to the apparatus of state. Thus, Scottish nationals within this national context, proactively assert in their national identity in talk.

It is also worth noting that there is a general tendency in sociological work on national identity to emphasise the content of discourse, rather than its action orientation (Potter & Wetherell, 1987) or how discourse can be used strategically to achieve certain goals in talk (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998). The focus on the content, rather than the way in which language is used in discourse, reflects a lack of sensitivity to the ways in which participants orient to categories and how these categories are used to achieve particular types of goals in particular contexts. Relatedly, research by Kiely and colleagues do not consider the possibility that individuals can construct and display their national identity in different ways for different strategic purposes.

In contrast to studies involving Scottish nationals, Condor’s work (2000) indicates that it is normatively appropriate for English nationals to distance themselves from associations between Anglo-Britishness and racism and xenophobia. English respondents assert a taken-for-granted sense of national identity such that their interactive business is to disavow their identity in talk. According to Condor (1996),
when posed relatively straightforward questions requiring national self-definition, English respondents were hesitant and displayed their difficulty in formulating a response thereby providing answers which displayed uncertainty and ambivalence to the interviewer.

Condor (1996) identified various strategies among English respondents for overcoming conversational difficulty in national self-definition in talk. This includes drawing a distinction between objective knowledge of British nationality and subjective ‘feelings’ of national attachment. Participants disavowed the salience of their national identity, claiming ‘I don’t really think about being English’ (p. 46), deny any personal significance and stress that feelings of national identification were confined to particular contexts (i.e. abroad). Expressions of national pride, when they did occur, were qualified or constructed in association with prejudice and shame. Further research by Condor and colleagues demonstrated how, even in situations of heightened displays of national identity such as English football matches, English participants downplayed national sentiment and attachment (Abell, Condor, Lowe, Gibson & Stevenson, 2007; Stevenson & Abell, 2011).

Therefore, in the work of Condor and colleagues, English respondents’ constructions of national identity closely mirror the version of nationalism put forward by Billig (1995), in that participants typically treat national identity as assumed, taken-for-granted and part of the banal backdrop to everyday life (Condor & Abell, 2006; Condor, 2010). The English assertion of national unawareness in talk can be attributed to the security of the national category, as according to Condor (1996), Britain is generally unscathed by “occupation, defeat of war or internal occupation” (p. 57) and its occupants enjoy a national stability and lack of confrontation on issues of national identity. In contrast, Scotland, Wales and Northern Ireland, either in folk or living
memory, have stories of English invasion that have rendered their identities less secure and more to the fore of national consciousness.

### 1.7.1. Strategic display of banal nationalism

Discursive research has recently begun to look at how group members can construct identity differently according to their place within society. For example, Stevenson and Muldoon (2010) examined constructions of national identity among individuals living in different socio-political contexts and found that Irish Catholic adolescents living as a minority in Northern Ireland proactively assert their national identity, in effect claiming to be prototypically Irish. In contrast, their Republic of Ireland counterparts presented their own identity as natural, taken for granted and, in the words of Billig (1995), ‘banal’. This entitled them to distance themselves from proactive or excessive assertions of national sentiment and to define their own passive identity as more prototypically Irish.

However, the conversational display of national identity among individuals within the same nation has yet to be explored. The significance of conversational interaction of individuals within the same nation is apparent for a number of reasons. Moreover this focus distinguishes this thesis from other studies investigating related phenomenon and highlights an important theoretical and conceptual gap in the study of national identity that is worthy of further investigation.

Firstly, and perhaps most importantly, a number of studies have examined nationals in different national contexts and found that individuals orient to the conversational norms that govern identity displays in talk, and noted the proactive displays of some individuals (e.g., Kiely et al., 2005) in comparison with the ‘banal’ form of identity expression of others (e.g., Condor, 2000). However, without examining individuals within the same national context, it is unclear whether these forms of identity expression are a unique feature of the conversational landscape of ‘border
regions’ (Stevenson & Muldoon, 2010), the ‘identity politics’ of post-devolution national accounting (Condor & Abell, 2006), or a function of the relative position of members within the national group as I might contend. Importantly, the examination of subgroups within the same nation will shed light on the various forms of identity displays available within the same ‘banal backdrop to nationalism’ (Billig, 1995), and any strategic manipulation in talk will also become apparent.

1.8. The discursive approach and subgroup members

Although, displays of national identification within the same national context is currently unexplored, there is a considerable amount of discursive research that examines the ways in which ethnic minorities orient to their place within the host nation (e.g., McLeod & Yates, 2003; Merino & Tileaga, 2010; Verkuyten & deWolf, 2002; Verkuyten, 2003). Of particular relevance to the present thesis is research by Verkuyten and deWolf (2002) which demonstrated that ethnic minorities orient to their discursive position within the Dutch nation. The authors note that ethnic self-definitions are not merely a matter of description but are reflexively designed to manage issues of accountability in conversational interaction. For example, participants rhetorically distinguish between ‘being’ a member of a social group and an internalised ‘feeling’ of group membership to inoculates against counterclaims to inclusion within the nation (Verkuyten & deWolfe, 2002). Therefore, these findings suggest that minority individuals orient to their social position in talk and deploy discursive resources to manage this position interactionally.

In addition to the discursive examination of the minority group membership, research has also examined the discursive strategies deployed by majority group members in interaction (e.g., Rapley, 2001; Van Dijk, 1992; Wetherell & Potter, 1992).
These studies tend to claim that the discursive strategies used by majority group members function to sustain and legitimate their dominant position within society. However it can also be argued that the sole empirical focus on majority group members, against an implied background of discrimination, will implicitly reproduce and reinforce their dominant position in discourse.

However, relatively few discursive studies considered the comparative focus of minority and majority group members within the nation (e.g., Verkuyten, 2005). Research by Verkuyten (2005) examined the ways in which ethnic minorities and majority group members account for their position within Dutch society. The analytic focus is particular on the discursive strategies used to describe and explain discrimination. The analysis revealed that both minority and majority group members use similar discursive strategies when accounting for the existence of discrimination in Dutch society. For example, majority participants argue that ethnic minorities are oversensitive to racism to manage the responsibility and blameworthiness of discrimination in the Dutch context. However, ethnic minorities also argue that minorities are oversensitive and use this discursive strategy to justify their lower status position. Therefore the analysis revealed that the same discursive strategies can function in different ways, in different contexts.

It is also worth noting, at this point, that there are some difficulties inherent in the discussion of discursive approaches to minority and majority group relations. For example, the discursive studies described in this section discussed differences between minority and majority group members in terms of the discursive strategies employed to manage and negotiate their position in interaction. In the analysis, participants’ group membership is presented as pre-existing and self-evident, rather than evidenced and reproduced in talk. This is somewhat at odds with the discursive approach in which
groups exist only in so far as individuals themselves orient to their group membership in talk (Edwards, 2005).

However the discursive studies presented here do provide a number of interesting findings in terms of the ways in which individuals orient to the social position within the group and the discursive devices deployed to manage their identity concerns. These discursive studies do not, however, explicitly consider national identity. In fact, many of these studies on ethnicity do not consider discursive displays of national identity, either in common or official discourse, in any great detail. Rather they consider nationality as a background in which to highlight differences in private and public displays of ethnic identity. As such, this further highlights a gap in the discursive literature on national identity, which has neglected to consider the possibility that individuals within the same nation strategically deploy different rhetorical devices to manage their national identity in interaction.

1.9. Conclusion:

I have argued that researchers have agreed that the concept of national identity is notoriously difficult to define for empirical investigation. However, there is currently no theoretical consensus or continuity in defining and operationalising the nation. I have highlighted how relatively few studies have examined variations in group members in terms of strength of identification and the use of identity management strategies to redefine the dimensions of social comparison and characteristics of the group. The social identity approach has however demonstrated the flexible nature of national categories, which can vary dependent on the dimensions of social comparison, contextual variations and the rhetorical concerns of the speaker (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001).
Additionally, in the overview of the discursive approach to national identity, I noted that individuals in different national contexts will orient to the conversational norms that govern identity displays in talk and construct their national identity in different ways. I have also noted that ethnic minorities orient to their position within the nation and deploy rhetorical devices to manage their position interactionally. However, without examining the displays of national identity among members within the same nation, the assumption remain that all members of the national category will behave uniformly in terms of their identity expression. The question remains therefore; are there different ways of expressing national identity co-present in the same national context?

This can also be examined from an SCT perspective, which incorporates an understanding of the intra and intergroup variability that constitute the nation. More specifically, the following chapter will highlight differences among group members in their experiences and displays of identity-related behaviour. Overall, I will argue that these differences among members of the national group can have important implications for the social psychological understanding of national identity.
Chapter 2

Intra-and intergroup differences within the nation

2.1. Introduction

Although the social psychological study of national identity has tended to gloss over variations within the same national category, I know that group members’ perceived position within the group will vary and that this is likely to impact subjective and objective experiences (Jetten, 2006). In fact, individuals have remarkably different internal and external experiences relative to their position within the group (Tajfel, 1974). Marginal groups and those deprived of social belongingness are much more likely than others to experience psychological distress (Biggam & Power, 1997; Hobfoll, 1986) and somatic health problems (e.g., Orth-Gomer, Rosengren, & Wihelmsen, 1993), which are also likely to colour their view of the social world.

Along these lines, a considerable amount of literature in the SCT tradition has focused on the effects of perceived prototypicality on participants’ identity related behaviour (e.g., Jetten, 2006), the differences between minority and majority group members in the subjective importance and cognitive accessibility of their group membership (e.g., Simon & Hamilton, 1994) and the impact on subordinate identification on subgroup relations (e.g., Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999). I will argue that these differences among group members and subgroups within the superordinate category can be applied to the study of national identity. More specifically, by attending to the differences among group members within the national category, it will be possible to determine whether all members of the same nation behave uniformly in terms of their national identity related behaviour.
2.2. Perceived social position

In SCT tradition, Jetten and colleagues have paid particular attention to the affects of an individual’s perceived centrality within the group on their identity related behaviour (Jetten, 2006; Jetten et al., 2007; Jetten, Branscombe & Spears, 2002; Jetten, Branscombe, Spears & McKimme, 2003). Group members are evaluated according to the extent to which they represent the prototypical characteristics of the group. The prototypical position in the group is representative of the shared view of the group as a whole (Jetten et al., 1997). Peripheral group members, on the other hand, deviate from the shared characteristics of the group and are therefore not perceived to be accomplished group members (Jetten, 2006). These differences in perceived prototypicality have been found to affect self-esteem (Jetten et al., 2002) and therefore it has been argued that there is an intrinsic motivation to increase the centrality of social position (Jetten, Branscombe, & Spears, 2002). Moreover, the motivation to increase perceived prototypicality is likely to affect the way individuals behave as group members, and this will now be discussed.

High identifying peripheral members display their identity strategically, demonstrating their loyalty to the group by symbolically rejecting ‘bad’ group members who do not fit the category prototype, perhaps in a bid to alter their future position within the group (Jetten et al., 2002). Moreover in studies of intragroup interactions, peripheral negotiators are motivated to display to group members that they are in fact ‘one of us’, by behaving more competitively towards the outgroup. This is particularly true when they expect fellow group members to monitor their behaviour (Kleef, Steinel, Knippenberg, Hogg, & Svensson, 2007). Thus it would appear that peripheral group members employ strategic and overt behaviours, possibly aimed at altering their future
position within the group or increasing acceptance from their prototypical counterparts (Noel, Wann, & Branscombe, 1995).

There has been some dispute about the function or purpose of outgroup derogation among peripheral group members. Some researchers speculating that such behaviour reflects the inner identity conflict on behalf of peripheral minority members (e.g., Tajfel, 1978), while others consider outgroup derogation to be a public act aimed at increasing acceptance by ingroup members (Noel, Wann, & Branscombe, 1995). For example, Noel et al., (1995) examined the public private distinction by providing both core and peripheral group members with an opportunity to respond negatively to a relevant outgroup. Additionally, participants were lead to believe that their responses were either private or shared with fellow ingroup members. The study found that peripheral group members display their loyalty to the group by engaging in outgroup derogation, particularly when they believe that their responses are public and will be viewed by other ingroup members. Effectively, this brings the strategic element of displays of group loyalty to the fore. However, the function and purpose of strategic identity displays remains unclear, through it is assumed to increase acceptance by fellow ingroup members (Noel et al., 1995).

Prototypical group members on the other hand are considered to be more representative of the group and are therefore more likely to become leaders, embodying the prototype or cognitive representation of the group (Platow, Knippenberg, Haslam, Knippenberg, & Spears, 2006; Abrams & Hogg, 1990; Hogg & Van Knippenberg, 2003). Prototypical leaders are individuals with influence, consensual prestige (Duck & Fielding, 2003), power, and charisma (Platow et al., 2006). High identifying group members endorse the decisions made by the prototypical leader, regardless of the fairness of their ingroup allocations (van Dijke & De Cremer, 2010). This creates a
status differential between members who are ‘followers’ and those who are influential ‘leaders’. Prototypical group members have been shown to exercise the active elements of leadership, including the power to construct the shape and parameters of group identity (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001) and influence the social comparative context (Fielding & Hogg, 1997). Leaders might, for example, capitalise on the followers’ feelings of self-uncertainty within the group by creating an ingroup prototype that defines how the uncertain follower should think and behave in a given context (Hohman, Hogg, & Bligh, 2010).

The literature on intragroup position provides important findings which contribute to the study of national identity in this thesis. More specifically, researchers have noted differences among group members in perceived social position and how this is likely to impact on evaluations and displays of identity-related behaviour. In particular, I have noted how prototypical group members occupying a secure position within the group are more likely to become leaders, acquire power and consensual prestige. Peripheral group members are insecure followers and display their identity more strategically and overtly than prototypical members, particularly when evaluated by ingroup members. Their aim is to strategically altering their future position within the group. Therefore, rather than behaving as a unified group, the variations in the social position of group members affects their display of identity. The following section will further examine difference among group members in terms of their subgroup membership.

2.3. Minority and majority group membership

The study of minority and majority membership has largely remained distinct from the social psychological study of national identity, despite particularly noteworthy
findings on differences between subgroups in level of awareness (Simon, 1998) and perceived psychological importance of group membership (Simon & Hamilton, 1994). There has been a considerable amount of literature on minority identity in social psychology (e.g., Kinket & Verkuyten, 1999; Verkuyten & Nekuee, 1999; Verkuyten, deJong & Masson, 1993; Verkuyten, 2008), however an extended discussion on this topic is beyond the scope of this thesis. For present purposes, this discussion will focus on traditional experimental research in the SCT tradition on minority/majority relations.

Traditionally, in experimental research, minority and majority membership has been defined according to objective indicators, such as status differentials (Simon, 2009), numerical distinctiveness (Brown & Gartner, 2001; Sachdev & Bourhis, 2006) and ingroup attractiveness. Simon and colleagues’ work has been particularly useful as it highlights differences between subgroups in the cognitive accessibility and perceived psychological importance of their group membership. However, it will also be argued that this glossed over the importance of how participants define and use their own identity in favour of examining generic intergroup processes. The following is an overview of the experimental findings of Simon and colleagues, in terms of the differences in cognitive awareness of group membership between ‘mindful minorities’ and ‘mindless majorities’

2.3.1. ‘Mindful minority’. Tajfel (1978) had noted that minority group members are subjectively aware of their group membership and the psychological barriers separating them from others. Later, Simon and colleagues provided corroboratory evidence, that minority group members are more cognitively preoccupied with their group membership than majority group members. In other words, minority members are much more focused on their collective group identity, perhaps due to the fact that they are ‘small against a big background’ and are therefore more aware of
intergroup differences than majority members, who can afford to be ‘mindless’ in this respect (Lucken & Simon, 2005). As such, minority members are more likely to describe themselves in group terms and place greater subjective weight, or importance, on their subgroup membership than majority group members (Simon & Hamilton, 1994; Brewer & Weber, 1994).

Minority group members have therefore been viewed as more ‘mindful’ or cognitively preoccupied with their group membership. Additionally, Simon and Hamilton (1994) have indicated that minorities more readily incorporate characteristics of group membership into their collective self-definition, than do majority members. In this study, participants were asked to indicate their preference for an artist. Self-stereotyping was measured in terms of the endorsement of in-group attributes based on the personality dimensions of introversion-extraversion associated with their group’s painter preference. Findings indicated that minority members self-stereotype more strongly, in terms of the attributes associated with their group membership, than majority members. Brewer and Weber (1994) also found that minority members align their self-perception more strongly with the group and incorporate the associated attributes into their self-definition. Therefore, minority group members are not only more cognitively preoccupied with their group membership but are also more likely to incorporate group characteristics into their self-perception, than majority group members.

2.3.2. ‘Mindless majority’. The ‘mindless majority’, on the other hand are cognitively unaware of their group identity (Simon & Hamilton, 1994). However, this distinction might not be as straight-forward. Lucken & Simon (2005) suggest that minorities who are experimentally defined in numerical terms and confronted with power disadvantage show greater cognitive preoccupation with group membership than
majority members. However, Simon and Hamilton (1994) concludes that the ‘mindless’ majority and not the minority were sensitive to variations in ingroup power, effectively awakening their group membership from its dormant state. This effectively problematised the notion that majority group members are mindless or cognitively unaware of their group membership.

In addition, majority group members, according to Tajfel (1978), are often in positions of relative power and as such, can choose the identities they adopt rather than having identities imposed on them. Majority group members can, for example, exercise this freedom by denying their group membership and to choose instead to consider themselves in individualistic terms. Additionally, and unlike minority group members, they can do so without the fear of societal repercussions. Overall, these findings suggest that subgroup members operate on different levels of cognitive awareness, which determine how they behave as group members.

There are several possible explanations for differences in collective self – interpretation among majority and minority members. For example, the concept of outgroup homogeneity effect (e.g., Haslam & Oakes, 1995; Bartsch & Judd, 1993), states that when it comes to attitudes and values, people tend to see out-group members as more alike than in-group members and that they are thus more likely to be stereotyped. This theory has been used to explain why minority group members’ identities appear to be more salient than those of majority groups (Mullen, 1991; Simon & Brown, 1987; Haslam & Oakes, 1995: Simon & Pettigrew, 1990). There is a consensus among some theorists in the area of minority-majority relations that the group identity of minority members is more salient due to a heightened awareness of their distinctiveness in a given context. This is further exacerbated by the knowledge that this awareness is shared with only a small number of others (Lucken & Simon,
2005). It this thesis, it will be argued that it is this preoccupation in the SCT literature with generic intergroup processes that overshadows an understanding of different strategies employed by group members to shape the definitions of the group.

### 2.3.3. Psychological consequences and social creativity

There are clearly psychological consequences to minority group membership. Lucken and Simon (2004) found that minority members were more insecure and therefore displayed more signs of affective strain than their majority counterparts. The researchers concluded that a combination of the cognitive and affective consequences of minority membership might create a ‘psychological conflict situation’ (Lucken & Simon, 2005). In other words, minority group membership is more cognitively accessible, which pulls minority group members towards their in-group. At the same time, minority members experience more negative affective reactions to their membership, pushing them away from their ingroup and possibly resulting in internal conflict (Lucken & Simon, 2005). However, experimental studies have noted that negative affect, such as self-esteem deficits, in experimentally created minority groups are rare (Crocker & Major, 1989), leading to a revised focus on the possible use of psychological techniques to enhance the self-esteem of low status minorities (Branscombe, Schmitt, & Harvey, 1999).

In response to psychological conflict and threat, minority members might draw on a number of psychological mechanisms to safeguard against the negative consequences of minority membership. One strategy, which might be used to buffer against self-esteem defects associated with negative group membership, is the use of ‘individual mobility’ or dis-identifying from the group. This results when a individual creates physical or psychological distance between them and the group (Brown, 2000). This is seen as a viable method of protecting one’s self-esteem when group boundaries are perceived as permeable. Dis-identification, however, can have negative
consequences for the individual as there is a potential risk of not being accepted by the new group and simultaneously being isolated from the old group.

As I have argued earlier in section 2.3.1, group membership for minority group members, however negative, is of considerable psychological importance. Therefore, individuals from minority groups might opt for alternative routes to buffer self-esteem with less perceived risk of social isolation. A more viable option for those who highly identify with the category is the use of social creativity. As outlined in section 1.5.6., this involves the strategic use of components of identity to shape and redefine aspects of the category. This area is under-researched (Brown, 2000) and could provide important insight into how group members use identity management strategies and flexibly alter the definitions and perimeters of the group.

2.3.4. Summary of SCT approach to minority/majority identity. The literature on minority and majority relations has largely remained distinct from the study of national identity. This is despite the fact that the intergroup literature on minority/majority relations presents some particularly noteworthy findings on differences between subgroups in the cognitive accessibility (Simon, 1998) and perceived psychological importance of group membership (Simon & Hamilton, 1994). This can influence how individuals view themselves and others relative to the national group. The review here focused particularly on the psychological consequences of minority group membership in terms of possible self-esteem defects and referred again to the need to examine how identity management strategies can be used by group members to redefine and reconstruct the characteristics associated with the group.

2.3.5. Peripheral minorities and prototypical majorities. Although the minority and intragroup literature have developed in parallel, in reality there are minority group members that exist on the periphery of the national group and therefore,
at this point, it is worth drawing on the collective findings. The findings from the minority literature noted here have focused on the cognitive differences between minority and majority group members in terms of how cognitively assessable their group identity is and how readily they incorporate this identity into their cognitive framework. For example, minority members have demonstrated greater identity salience than the ‘mindless majority’ (Lucken & Simon, 2005; Simon & Hamilton, 1994). It has also been suggested that majority group members have the freedom to deny their group membership and are less likely to have their position contested by others. Low status minorities engage in social creativity to redefine and reconstruct the characteristics associated with the group (Brown, 2002).

Intragroup studies, on the other hand, provide information about the differences in identity related behaviour between group members and have noted some important distinctions. Prototypical group members exercise the active elements of leadership by dictating the shape and characteristics of the group, while their peripheral counterparts display their identity strategically and overtly in an attempt to negotiate their group position (Jetten, 2006). Taken together, it would appear that subgroups and group members will think and behave in different ways, in a manner dependent on their social position within the group. It is now necessary to consider the implications of the findings from the minority majority relations and intragroup prototypicality literature in terms of how differences in identity behaviour can possibly be exacerbated by inclusion within the superordinate category, such as the nation.

2.4. Subgroup-superordinate

The perceived inclusiveness of the superordinate national category acts as a catalyst, which activates elements of subgroup memberships by creating a threat to
group distinctiveness (Hornsey & Hogg, 2000). According to SIT, people are motivated to differentiate their ingroup from similar outgroups, along related dimensions of comparison, in order to maintain positive distinctiveness (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). When an overarching superordinate identity blurs group boundaries, a threat to group distinctiveness occurs. The Optimal Distinctiveness Theory (Brewer, 1991) includes the proposition that very large social groups, such as the nation, can appear over-inclusive, therefore failing to meet the group members’ need for distinctiveness. Consistent with this, an experimental study investigating the effects of superordinate group membership on group distinctiveness, found that membership of very large groups prompted individuals to identify more strongly with subgroups, perhaps providing a more viable avenue to meet their need for distinctiveness (Brewer, Manzi, & Shaw, 1993).

A number of theories have been developed to account for the consequences of inclusion into a superordinate category for subgroup members (e.g., Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Hewstone & Brown, 1986; Wenzel, Mummendey, & Waldzus, 2007). These have focused on changing the ways in which the individual categorizes information about in-groups and outgroups. Categorization processes are seen to be quite malleable and flexible in that group boundaries can be deconstructed and individuals either decategorized or recategorized with resultant reductions in intergroup bias (e.g., Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986). These two strategies are thought to work in different ways. Decategorisation degrades boundaries so that the psychological distance between self and former ingroup members is increased. Recategorisation decreases the psychological distance between the self and former outgroup members (Gaertner, Mann, Dovidio, Murrell, & Pomare, 1990). Furthermore, the Common Ingroup Identity Model (CIIM; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986) involves recategorising the group so that previous outgroup members can be induced to think of themselves in terms of one superordinate
identity. In contrast, the Intergroup Differentiation Model (IDM; Hewstone & Brown, 1986) considers how inclusion in a superordinate category can create a threat to group distinctiveness. This theory suggests that intergroup bias can only be reduced if subgroup distinctions are preserved and affirmed. The following section will examine in more detail the Ingroup Projection Model as an alternative theory of reconfiguring the group to decrease intergroup conflict and will consider some ways in which this model relates more broadly to the study of subgroups within the nation.

2.4.1. Ingroup Projection Model. The Ingroup Projection Model (IPM), states that when the superordinate category encapsulates two groups in competition over the category’s prototype, subgroup members will generalise or project their own group’s image onto the superordinate category (Wenzel, Mummendey, & Waldzus, 2007) and disagree with each others’ claim to relative prototypicality (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999; Finley & Wenzel, 2003; Waldzus, Mummendey, & Wenzel, 2005; Waldzus, Mummendey, Wenzel, & Weber, 2003. However, both groups share inclusion in the superordinate category and it is this normative force that renders the prototypical ingroup’s image more representative of the category. The outgroup image, by definition, is different from the ingroup and thus deviant from the category prototype. Consequently, the ingroup attributes become the normative frame of reference for evaluating the outgroup, highlighting the relative prototypicality of subgroup members. Paradoxically then (and in contrast to the more widely accepted maxim that re-categorisation leads to better intergroup relations), the imposition of a superordinate identification increases distinctiveness between groups by highlighting their relative prototypicality.

Following on from IPM and incorporating an intragroup perspective, it is possible therefore that when both groups are encapsulated within a common
superordinate category, their relatively prototypicality might be accentuated. This can potentially activate differences in their identity related behaviour among group members within the superordinate category. This may, in turn, have implications for the way in which subgroups within the nation perceive and evaluate the behaviour of other group members.

The progenitors of the IPM have acknowledged some limitations worth noting. In particular, Waldzus et al., (2003) pointed out that while the model focuses on the divergence of perspectives of minority and majority members on their relative prototypicality, this is largely a one-sided story, as minority perspectives remain under-examined. This is particularly significant in light of the findings in the minority literature which suggest that there are differences in the way in which majority and minority members attend to their group membership. This suggests that minority members are cognitively more aware of the group membership than majority members. Minority members are also much more likely to encounter resistance to their claims to prototypicality, in the face of social reality, than majority members.

In addition, while the model acknowledges the proactive role of group members in constructing their group as prototypical or otherwise, this aspect of the model requires further consideration. Recently however, researchers have begun to examine ingroup projection in instrumental terms by suggesting that projection may be a conscious and public act aimed at influencing social relations and achieving desired goals (Sindic & Reicher, 2008). The IPM asserts that group members will project their ingroup characteristics onto the superordinate category and tend to believe that their own subgroup is more prototypical of the superordinate category than other relevant outgroups. However, Sindic and Reicher (2008) suggest that the process of relative
ingroup projection is moderated by perceived group interest and by how members seek to strategically meet group goals.

Evidence has been found for the strategic use of group projection to meet desired goals. For example, Sindic & Reicher (2008) argue that, provided it aligns with group interests, it is possible for outgroup projection to occur, where subgroup members rate relevant outgroups as more prototypical of the superordinate category. Individuals may also choose to emphasise the prototypicality of their own group. This would serve the strategic goal of legitimizing intergroup status differences by identifying subgroups who deviate from the inclusive category and are thus less deserving of group entitlements. Therefore, it can be argued that the process of ingroup projection is not static and objective, but is influenced by the motivations of subgroup perceivers to actively influence the construction of their subgroup and meet their desired goals. When examining national identity from the perspective of subgroup perceivers, it is therefore proposed to address the limitations of IPM by examining the dynamic nature of identity construction in the interaction of peripheral minorities and prototypical majorities within the same nation.

2.4.2. Summary of subgroup/superordinate literature. In experimental studies, the inclusiveness, complexity and definability of the prototype is manipulated by the researcher to determine effects on ingroup projection and dual identity process. In real life however, different groups from different vantage positions, could have divergent perspectives of what constitutes the category prototype. In addition, when there is little contact between groups and they differ remarkably in terms of social leverage, this could reduce the likelihood that subgroups will have a shared understanding of the prototypical characteristics of the superordinate category. Group members may therefore project ingroup characteristics onto the superordinate category-
however their projection may be more a reflection of their differing social positions, rather than a consensual representation of the prototype. It is argued that their divergent understandings of the category prototype could have implications for intergroup relations within the broader category.

In support of this statement, it is necessary to refer to a number of findings in the minority majority literature: (1) Minority members are distinct from majority according to objective and subjective determinants of group membership, (2) minority members are more cognitively preoccupied with their minority identity as they are more aware of their differences than majority members, who can afford to be more mindless in that respect, (3) minority members are more likely to incorporate ingroup characteristics into their collective self-definition than majority members. It is therefore reasonable to presume that minority and majority members are likely to project different images of the ingroup prototype due to the divergent vantage points of ingroup and outgroup perceivers.

These gaps in the subgroup superordinate literature have implications for the overall understanding of national identity in the social psychological literature and again confirm the need to examine identity management strategies among subgroups within the nation.

2.5. Conclusion

To summarise then, Chapter one noted that there is a preoccupation in the broader social sciences with the roots and definitions of national identity and a presumption that individuals within the nation had a common conception of what constitutes the nation. In the social psychological literature, it is noted that there is a
general consensus among researchers that national identity is a notoriously difficult concept to even begin to define for empirical investigation (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). There is also an assumption that definitions of the nation are consensually accepted and subsequent identification with the national category equates to a uniformity of identity expression among its group members. The findings from the discursive literature indicate that subgroups in different national contexts construct their national identity in different ways and orient to the conversational norms that govern identity displays in talk. However, the display and construction of national identity among members of the same nation is currently unexplored.

Additionally, the intra- and intergroup relations literature suggests that groups and group members will think and behave in different ways, dependent on their position within the group relative to others. Moreover, it is noted in this thesis that these differences were likely to impact on their displays of identity related behaviour (e.g., Jetten, 2006). Researchers have highlighted the need to examine the identity management strategies used by group members to redefine the characteristics of the group (e.g., Brown, 2000). The findings from the subgroup-superordinate literature suggest that inclusion within a superordinate category can highlight the relative prototypicality of subgroup members (e.g., Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999), which could have implications for entitlement and inclusion within the nation. Taking together the findings confirm the importance of examining the intra- and intergroup variability within the nation.

However, there are a number of questions left unanswered. For instance, do individuals within the same nation display and construct their national identity in different ways? Can differences in perceived social position within the nation impact upon individuals’ evaluations of displays of national identity related behaviour? If so,
what are the potential consequences for divergent constructions, displays and evaluations of national identity among group members within the same national category? These and other questions begin to unpack the overall empirical question- do all members of the same national category have a shared perception and understanding of what constitutes the nation and act uniformly as group members in relation to national identity? It is argued in this thesis that a single epistemological framework would not adequately answer the empirical questions set out in this thesis and therefore an approach is required that incorporates both qualitative and quantitative research methods.

It would appear therefore that a mixed methods design is an appropriate tool to address these research questions. The first phase qualitative approach considers how nationals themselves accomplish and manage their national identity within a specific interactional context. This affords a consideration of the qualitatively different ways in which national identity can be constructed and displayed without assuming that identification with the national category automatically equates to a uniformity of identity expression, as is typically the assumption in the social identity approach to national identity. In order to further address the homogenization of national identity in the social psychological literature, it is necessary to examine how individuals within the same nation display and construct national identity in interaction. Importantly, the study of subgroups within the same nation will allow for the examination of the various forms of identity displays available within the ‘banal backdrop to nationalism’ (Billig, 1995), which will bring to light the intentional use and strategic manipulation of national categories in talk among group members. In addition, given the numerous constructions of national identity in the social psychological literature, it is perhaps
useful to take as a starting point the aspects of national identity that participants’
themselves make relevant in conversational interaction.

The second phase experimental investigations will afford an opportunity to use
the insights garnered from the discursive studies to develop specific, testable
hypotheses. The aim is to further explore the different ways in which those occupying
different positions within the national group understand and evaluate displays of
national identity. The quantitative elements of thesis will avail of the advantages of this
approach to generalise research findings, limit the influence of confounding variables
and to credibly access cause and effect relationships (Niaz, 2008; Doyle, Brady &
Byrne, 2009). Therefore, the use of a sequential mixed methods design is guided by the
research questions put forward in this thesis and offers an appropriate avenue to address
the theoretical gap in the literature.

Finally, a mixed-methods approach acknowledges the commonalities between
the qualitative and qualitative approaches to the study of national identity in terms of
their mutual theoretical concerns. In particular, it is argued that the theoretical concerns
underpinning the intra- and intergroup relations literature can speak to the overarching
concerns of this thesis and contribute to the discussion of national identity in social
psychology. This review focused particularly on the psychological consequences of
group membership and how identity management strategies can be used by group
members to redefine and reconstruct the characteristics associated with the group.
Overall, this thesis draws on both approaches to examine how individuals construct,
display and evaluate national identification and their position within the nation.
Chapter 3

Research methodology

3.1. Introduction

An overview of the social psychological literature on national identity revealed some empirical questions that require further consideration. More specifically, the question remains: do all members of the same national category act uniformly as group members in relation their national identity? I will argue that in order to adequately answer this question, a mixed methods approach would appear to be most useful. To this end, I will provide an introduction to the mixed methods approach, focusing particularly on key debates in the literature and epistemological stance. I will also provide a brief overview of the classification system for mixed methods research before focusing more specifically on the rationale for mixed methods in the present thesis. This will be followed by an argument for the use of discourse analysis (DA) and Discursive Psychology (DP) in the qualitative phases of this thesis. I will conclude with a brief discussion of issues of (in) compatibility between the discursive and experimental approach to social psychological research.

3.2. Rationale for mixed methods approach

Qualitative and quantitative methodology have traditionally remained separate and distinct traditions within the social and behavioural sciences (Bazely, 2007), though recently there has been a move towards a more integrated mixed-method approach to bridge the gap between paradigms (e.g., Boezeman & Ellemers, 2008; Doyle, Brady, & Byrne, 2009; Powell, Mihalas, Onwuegbuzie, Suldo, & Daley, 2008). There are a number of clear advantages and disadvantages to both the quantitative and qualitative
approaches, which make up mixed methods research. Strengths of quantitative research include the ability to conduct experiments and draw comparisons between groups, an important aspect of social psychological research. It also allows for the comparisons between variables of interest, the testing of research hypotheses and the generalisation of research findings (Doyle et al., 2009). One major limitation of quantitative research in psychology is that it is often decontextualised from a ‘real world’ context (Viruel-Fuentes, 2007). Qualitative research, on the other hand, offers a contextualised approach, generating rich accounts of human experience that cannot be captured in quantitative measurement scales. Some of the limitations of qualitative approaches to research are that it often lacks well-defined prescriptive procedures (Morse, 1994) and is limited in its ability to reliability integrate information across cases (Kilk & Miller, 1986) and to generalise research findings to wider populations (Niaz, 2008). Given the strengths and weaknesses of each approach, it would appear reasonable that researchers would combine approaches to strengthen the overall research process.

However, there has been a considerable amount of competition between qualitative and quantitative research paradigms, each emphasising the primacy of one approach over the other (e.g., Campbell & Stanley, 1963; Maxwell & Delaney, 2004). The positivist approach privileges objective observations and measurement over subjective states and constructed realities (Doyle et al., 2009). The qualitative tradition, on the other hand, emerged as an alternative approach that privileges instead the subjective process of induction as a means of investigating phenomena. These paradigm debates have led many to conclude both traditions are largely incompatible due to the differences in ontological and epistemological stance (Guba & Lincoln, 1988). However, others would argue that this competition between paradigms is not useful and
that researchers should focus instead on how each approach can be usefully combined (Stevenson, 2005).

A mixed methods approach combines both qualitative and quantitative dimensions and attempts to maximise the “complementary strengths” and minimise the weaknesses of each approach (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p.18). Despite numerous researchers advocating for the applicability and use of mixed methods in a wide range of psychological domains including health (Dures, Rumsey, Morris, & Gleeson, 2010), educational (Niaz, 2008), and counselling psychology (Hanson, Creswell, Clark, & Creswell, 2005; Tuicomepee & Romano, 2008), this remains a contentious ground (Onwuegbuzie & Leech, 2006). Some researchers continue to question whether methodological pluralism can reach the ‘gold standard’ as recommended by the National Research Council (NRC, 2000), while others assert that a mixed method approach yields “superior research”, as compared to the traditional mono-method approaches (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004, p. 14).

To address the criticisms of mixed-method research, Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, (2004) suggests that the emergence of a new mixed-method paradigm is possible if researchers from both traditions reach a consensus on some important philosophical points, namely that empirical evidence does not provide conclusive proof and that objective, value- free research is a myth. The pragmatic approach (James, 1904) moves away from paradigm debates and acknowledges that these can never be resolved as it is impossible to prove or disprove paradigms (Bazely, 2007). Instead, pragmatists argue that the benefit of conducting research to adequately answer research questions outweighs the importance of philosophical debates concerning its use (Miles & Huberman, 1999). As such, the pragmatist approach advocates eclecticism so that researchers are free to determine the research methods that offer the best chance at
answering the specific research questions. Therefore it would appear that pragmatism is the most appropriate epistemology for mixed methods and one that allows researchers to overcome the competing philosophies and paradigmatic debates that have separated research traditions (Johnson & Onwuegbuzie, 2004; Morgan, 2007).

In addition to establishing the philosophical underpinnings of mixed methods, researchers have developed a typology or classification system of types of mixed methods design (e.g., Greene & Caracelli, 1997; Teddlie & Tashakkorri, 2006; Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007). The selection of a type of mixed methods design involves three decisions, guided by the research question. The first decision involves whether data collection occurs sequentially with one type of data collected in the initial stages, followed by other type (sequential timing) or concurrently with both types of data being collected simultaneously. Second, a decision is made regarding the level of emphasis given to qualitative and quantitative data (equal or unequal weighting). Third, a decision is made whether the mixing of qualitative and quantitative methods occurs at the data analysis (full mixed design) or data interpretation stage (partial mixed design). The rationale of mixed methods research in this thesis was guided by philosophical debates and classification systems identified in this brief overview.

More specifically, the mixed methods research in this thesis will adopt a pragmatist stance incorporating both quantitative and qualitative methods to best answer the research questions identified in the literature review. The first phase qualitative study in this present thesis addressed the following broad research question on how subgroup members, who occupy different social positions within the nation, display and construct their national identity in talk. The second component of this work incorporates a reflexive account of the method by looking closely at participants’ engagement with a photo elicitation task and examining issues of entitlement and accountability in their
talk of representations of Irishness. This first phase of qualitative research then informed the development of a second phase of quantitative experimental investigation. These experiments involved manipulating participants’ perceived position within the group in order to assess the effect on their evaluations of displays of Irishness.

The present thesis therefore employs a partial mixed sequential equal status design (Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007) incorporating a qualitative and quantitative phase that occurs sequentially and is given equal weighting. Qualitative and quantitative data are analysed separately and mixing occurs at the qualitative data interpretation stage to inform the development of the second phase experimental investigations in this thesis (see also figure 3.1).

![Figure 3.1. Modified decision tree for mixed methods design (Creswell & Plano Clark, 2007).](image)

The rationale for adopting this particular mixed methods design was based on the research questions that emerge from the examination of the literature. More specifically, the findings in discursive literature suggest that group members in different national contexts display their national identity in different ways. However subgroup members’
display of national identity within same nation has yet to be explored, thereby perpetuating an assumption that members of the same national category will act uniformly in terms of identity expression. Therefore, it would seem reasonable to begin with a discursive analysis that challenges this assumption and addresses the gap in the discursive literature on national identity. I have also noted that there are a number of competing definitions of national identity in the social psychological literature and therefore it would be useful to begin with the participants’ own constructions of national identity in conversational interaction. Taken together, the first phase qualitative studies provides an opportunity to challenge the homogenous construction of the national group in the social psychological literature and to take as the foundation of this research the aspects of national identity deemed relevant by participants themselves in conversational interaction.

The interpretation of the discursive findings, along with an examination of the intra- and intergroup prototypically literature, will inform the development of experimental hypotheses in the second phase quantitative investigations. With the insights garnished from the discursive studies, it will then be possible to return to the literature and develop more specific experimental hypotheses that will further challenge the homogenous image of national identity in the social psychological literature. The use of qualitative research to develop quantitative hypotheses is a useful approach to address “complex and multi-faceted research problems” (Doyle et al., 2009, p. 175) and is therefore particularly apt for present purposes as national identity is notoriously difficult to define for empirical investigation (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). In addition, it is possible to avail of the advantages of quantitative research to access the associations between variables, to integrate information across observations and to generalise the research findings to wider populations (Doyle et al., 2009).
Overall therefore, this present thesis draws on the strength of both qualitative and quantitative methodology. It is hoped, that by examining the topic of national identity more broadly from what has been argued as divergent perspectives (Bazely, 2007), that their complimentary methodological strengths can provide new insight into this social psychological phenomenon that has often times eluded researchers in both traditions (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). However, in line with the pragmatist approach to mixed methods, I acknowledge the limitations of both qualitative and quantitative approaches and do not aim for conclusive, objective reflections on the social world. Instead I seek to look at the topic of national identity from two epistemological lenses in an attempt to address the research questions identified in the literature review.

The following section will describe in more detail the rationale for a qualitative approach to examining participants’ display of Irishness in talk, while the rationale for the quantitative methodology will be discussed in more detail in Chapter 7. I will return to the discussion of a mixed method design at the end of this chapter (see section 3.9) in order to address some critiques of this approach before offering some concluding comments.

3.3. Qualitative methods in psychology

There are a number of well-established approaches to qualitative research in psychology including, but are not limited to, Grounded Theory, Thematic Analysis, Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA), and Discourse and Conversation Analysis. A common element of qualitative approaches in psychology is their use of verbatim data generated by interviews to answer empirical questions, which is now also the most common form of systematic inquiry in the broader social sciences (Hugh-
Jones, 2010), although not without its own limitations (see section 4.1.). Rather than focus on the intricacies of each individual approach to qualitative research, this section will take interview data as a foundation to qualitative research in psychology, and in doing so will attempt to situate the conceptualization of interview data in this present research.

There are two distinct approaches to the understanding of interview data in psychology. The first approach involves the “excavation” of thoughts and beliefs that are believed to lay dormant in the participants mind and activated through probing by the interviewer in the interview context (Hugh-Jones, 2010, p. 82). Although there has been a move to acknowledge the more active role of the interviewer in recent years (Hall & Callery, 2001), this is secondary to the interviewer’s main role of eliciting the participants subjective understanding of the concepts under investigation. These basic assumptions underlie the approach of Grounded Theory and IPA to interview data, where the interviewer asks questions concerning the subjective states of the participants. The interview data is then analysed and coded into different levels of abstraction aimed at generating a theory from the data, as is the case in Grounded Theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967) or, in order to examine the meaning participants attribute to their individual experiences, using a method of IPA (Osborn & Smith, 2006). Both approaches view the variable and inconsistent nature of interview accounts as ‘noise’ that should be avoided and focus instead on obtaining the underlying meaning that is being expressed (Edwards, 2012).

Another approach to interview data is broadly social constructionist in nature and incorporates a theoretical position that questions taken-for-granted knowledge and aims instead to examine how individuals create versions of reality through talk and text (Hugh-Jones, 2010). This is the understanding that underlines the discursive approach
in psychology that examines how a participant’s thoughts, attitudes and beliefs can be talked about in different ways, dependent on the discursive concerns of the speaker. This is in contrast to phenomenological quantitative approaches that develop explanatory theories (Grounded Theory) or examine how individuals attribute meaning to their lived experience (IPA). The discursive approach is concerned with ‘thoughts’, ‘beliefs’, ‘meanings’ and ‘experiences’ only so far as individuals use these aspects of language to achieve particular rhetorical goals in conversational interaction. In contrast to other approaches to interview data, the discursive approach considers the ‘noise’ and variability in interviews to have a different kind of order and that these inconsistencies bring to light the functional use of language in order to achieve particular rhetorical goals in particular contexts (Edwards, 2012).

The qualitative research in this thesis incorporates a conceptualization of interview data in line with the social constructivist approach such that it views interviews as a site of social interaction and seeks to examine how participants construct their national identity in talk, rather than probing for participants’ subjective understanding of pre-existing mental constructs. Having identified, broadly the conceptual approach to interview data, the following sections will provide a more in-depth look at DA as a research methodology.

3.3.1. Discourse analysis. It might be worth acknowledging from the onset that defining DA is a less than straightforward process, not least due to the fact that the term ‘discourse analysis’ has been applied to many different approaches to talk and text across disciplines (Potter & Wetherell, 1987; Wooffitt, 2005). In fact, ‘discourse analysis’ can be used as a generic term to refer to all forms of language analysis, including linguistics, sociolinguistics and ‘speech act theory’ (Wooffitt, 2005). Therefore, rather than attempting to disentangle the various forms of DA, this section
will instead provide a brief history of the interdisciplinary conception of DA as a foundation for the discussion of DA in psychology more specifically. In doing so, it also highlights the contribution of sub-sections of DA in other disciplines to shape the direction of discourse analysis in psychology.

DA originated in the sociology of scientific knowledge and marked a departure from traditional realist approaches to science by examining how the scientific community produced knowledge claims that validated scientific paradigms. For example, sociologists Gilbert and Mulkey (1984), originally set out to develop a single sociological account of how the scientific community resolved the disputes over scientific fact. However, they discovered that there was great variability in the interview accounts, which were constructed to perform certain actions. Jonathan Potter, a student of Gilbert and Mulkay, developed this approach, to identify discursive resources used by the scientific community that work up the facticity of accounts (Potter, 1996), which will be discussed in more detail in section 3.5.

Elsewhere in the social sciences, speech act theories and ethnomethodologies (Garfinkel, 1967) developed to deal with how individuals make sense of everyday situations. Thus speech act theories (e.g., Austin, 1962) identified that utterances are not just true or false statements about the world but have a performative function, highlighting the action orientation of language. These early theories in discourse analysis have informed the development of both DA and DP as it is applied to social psychological research, which will be the main empirical focus of the qualitative elements of this research.
3.4. Discourse analysis and discursive psychology

This section will discuss DA in social psychology and DP in terms of the commonalities and differences in their methodological approach. I will then discuss a rationale for using DA and DP in the present thesis, drawing on the common dominators in these two approaches. Firstly as a brief introduction, DA in social psychology is derived from the social studies of science, conversation analysis and ethnomethodology (Potter & Wetherell, 1987), while discursive psychology (DP) is a form of discourse analysis in psychology, developed by Edwards and Potter (1992) that draws on the rhetorical approach of Billig (1987) and the conversation analytic approach of Sacks (1992). Both approaches operate from the premise that psychological phenomena are actively constructed, reconstructed and understood in talk. However, DA in social psychology and DP differ in two major areas that have methodological implications, and will now be discussed.

Firstly, Potter and Wetherell (1987) attempted to identify structured discursive resources, and in doing so developed on Gilbert and Mulkay’s (1984) earlier work in ‘interpretative repertoires’ or building blocks on which we construct accounts. This takes the form of a central metaphor that individuals reflexively draw upon to construct certain actions (Wiggins & Potter, 2008). For example, Potter and Wetherell’s (1992) study of racist discourse in New Zealand identified the ‘Culture- as-Heritage’ repertoire that was used to treat culture as an inheritance that needed to be protected from contamination from the modern world and the ‘Culture-as-Therapy’ repertoire that was used to construct culture as a psychological resource available to the Maori people to safeguard against mental instability (Potter & Wetherell, 1994). The notion of interpretative repertoires has been used in numerous studies in DA in social psychology. However, this marks the first point of divergence from DP, which does not focus on
broader cultural or social structure, but instead examine how individuals address their local concerns in conversational interaction.

The second major difference between DA in social psychology and DP is the use of open-ended interviews in generating analytic data, which Potter and Wetherell (1987) utilise frequently as a method of data generation in their discursive work. DP is also interested in the analysis of everyday talk, however the focus is mainly, but not exclusively, on naturally occurring interactional data. Naturalistic data involves audio and visual recordings of conversations that occur in everyday social settings outside of the social construction of the interview context (Potter & Hepburn, 2005). Naturalistic data is guided by issues that happen naturally in the participants environment and ones not easily anticipated by the researcher (Potter & Hepburn, 2005). One of the merits of naturalistic data over traditional interview, therefore, is that the data is generated to avoid active researcher involvement (Potter & Hepburn, 2005). Although there are some merits to its use, discursive psychologists also recognise that the use of naturalistic data is not always the most appropriate approach to data collection in all case (Potter & Hepburn, 2005). I will return to this argument in Chapter 4, Section 1 when discussing the use of interview data in this thesis.

Despite some differences in methodological approach, there are important commonalities between Potter and Wetherell’s (1987) discourse in social psychology and DP. For example, both approaches draw on Billig’s (1996) rhetorical psychology. Billig (1996) suggests that the process of thinking is best understood as a process of argumentation and debate between self, others and ideologies inherent in everyday social interaction. These approaches also draw on the constructionist sociology of scientific knowledge (Gilbert & Mulkay, 1989) that examines the discursive processes that underpin knowledge production, particularly in the absence of consensus among the
scientific community. Additionally, both approaches look at how categories and
descriptions are used in everyday discourse to achieve certain aims and both offer a
reworking of the subject matter of psychology, looking at the ideas of agency,
attribution, memory and identity in terms of discursive interactions (Edwards, 1997;

Additionally, in recent years the DP approach has been particularly concerned
with the study of conversational interaction, using the techniques of conversation
analysis (e.g., Sacks, 1992; Sacks & Schegloff, 1979; Sacks, Schegloff & Jefferson,
1974). Discursive psychologists share the conversation analytic focus on the normative
nature of talk or the rules and norms that govern the interplay between participants in
interaction (e.g., Edwards & Potter, 1992; 2001). Therefore, DP views discursive
actions such as blaming, accounting for and establishing the normality of events as
embedded in a sequence of conversational interaction, rather than achieved on the basis
of a single sentence. Through the normative nature of interaction, participants
continually display and update their understanding of what is being achieved in talk.
Discursive psychologists therefore use the conversation analytic techniques as an
additional resource to make sense of the social activities that are being accomplished in
talk (Edwards, 2012).

The qualitative studies in this thesis draw on the commonalities of both the DA
and DP approach in social psychology. In order to answer the empirical questions in
relation to the qualitative elements of this thesis, I have adopted a methodological
stance in line with DA in social psychology and DP, where national identity is not seen
as a pre-existing psychological construct, but rather actively constructed in interaction
The first qualitative analysis seeks to examine how subgroup members within the same
nation display and construct their national identity in talk. Therefore a method of DA is
considered most appropriate when examining how individuals use the wide range of discursive resources available to actively construct particular versions of the social world.

The second qualitative analyses reported in this thesis incorporate a DP approach to answer questions concerning issues of entitlement and accountability in participant’s talk of representations of Irishness. DP is a particularly appropriate approach in this case as it draws heavily on CA when answering empirical questions. In addition, by looking at the sequential organisation of turn-taking as products of an interaction, the complimentary approaches of DA and CA can be used to examine how utterances are used to accomplish particular goals in their interaction (Wooffitt, 2005). In addition, photo elicitation will be used as an innovative method of generating data. The potential pitfalls of utilising this approach in generating data will be addressed, as highlighted by Potter and Hepburn (2005), in Chapter 4, Section 1. Having provided a rationale for the use of DA and DP in this thesis, the following section will highlight the benefits of these approaches over other methodological approaches to the analysis of language, as it pertains to the current research.

3.4.2. Other approaches to the analysis of talk-in-interaction. DA and CA are amongst a number of approaches that focus on the analysis of discursive interactions. In this section, I review a number of overlapping methodological approaches and explain why I have chosen DA and CA to pursue the present study. In particular, I review approaches that focus on the interplay between structure and discourse, such as critical discourse analysis (CDA) and Foucauldian DA. In discussing each of these approaches, I also focus on the benefits that DA and DP offer in relation to them.

Foucauldian DA originated in sociology but it has been argued that this approach was born out of the ‘crisis’ in psychology where researchers had begun to
question the positivistic orientations that dominated the discipline (Parker, 1989). Foucauldian DA developed with a clear political intention—language structures were seen to reflect power relations and inequalities in society (Parker, 1994). In addition, CDA considers the broader historical and political context in which language structures are embedded and attempts to determine how discourse reproduces power and social relations. While in order to answer the empirical questions put forward in this thesis a method of DA is needed that attends to local constructions of national identity in talk, this thesis is therefore not concerned with situating participants’ talk within overarching ideological frameworks and structures. I am concerned, however, with the rhetorical devices that individuals employ in conversational interaction as they seek to manage their identity concerns in talk.

3.5. Discourse analysis and rhetorical devices

Along these lines, the analytic focus here is on the discursive resources participants draw upon to manage and negotiate their identity, interactionally. For example, there are a number of interactional resources that participants can avail of to manage their national identity, in order to work up the facticity (Potter, 1996) of their own claim, or indeed to undermine the claims made by another. ‘Category entitlement’, for example, can be used to build up facticity of an account and the credibility of the speaker, whereas stake and interest can be formulated to undermine them (Potter, 1996). It might be helpful to provide illustrative examples of these strategies in order to demonstrate the ways in which participants reflexively manage and negotiate their concerns in talk.

Stake and interest refer to the notion that speakers have some degree of interest or investment in their descriptions and therefore have something to gain or lose. This
could be their credibility as the reporter of an event, that their account is not neutral or factual but reflects their ingrained prejudices and biases about the world. In fact, people treat each other and other groups as having desires, motivations and biases and display these concerns in talk.

Speakers are therefore faced with a ‘dilemma of stake and interest’ or the tension between producing “an account which attends to interest, without being undermined as interested” (Potter, 1996, p. 158). So for example:

**Example 1:**

Jones: There has been a lot of ideas put out, what is it, that the majority of rapes are committed by Islanders or Maoris and...

(From Wetherell and Potter, 1992: 96)

In this extract, the speaker is constructing highly blameworthy descriptions of minorities in New Zealand, and therefore the speaker’s vested interest in their description is likely to be a concern. The speaker manages this concern in talk by displaying that they are searching for someone else’s formulation - ‘what is it’. This displays that the idea is not the speakers but also that he can’t quite remember the specifics of the description. In such a way, he inoculates against any counterclaims to vested interest or that he might be a racist individual who actively notes negative descriptions of minority groups. This example therefore demonstrates how participants attend to dual concerns in interaction, to produce negative accounts of minorities while managing issues of stake and interest (Potter, 1996) that would undermine the objectively of their account.
Following on from this example, individuals can manage the dilemma of stake and interest in a number of other different ways. For example, the term category entitlement refers to individuals of certain social categories that are given the entitlement to speak on behalf of the group and are thus expected to know certain things or have certain epistemological skills. Doctors, for example, are expected to have knowledge of human anatomy and are entitled to speak from that position. When category entitlements are not given, they can be worked up by the speaker. For example, a ‘news reporter’ can evoke descriptions that define people that have specialist skills in reporting facts and therefore work up the entitlement to speak on behalf of the category. Category entitlement can therefore be a powerful discursive device to either directly or indirectly produce an account that is coming from a credible speaker who is not personally invested in the account.

In addition, extreme case formulation can be used to work up the facticity of an account by drawing on extremes of relevant dimensions of judgement (Edwards & Potter, 1992). For example, the statement ‘everyone carries a gun’ provides a version of possibly extreme events which may have occurred in a certain neighbourhood as normal, which therefore makes the speaker’s own gun handling an unexceptional case (Edwards & Potter, 1992). Another rhetorical resource used to warrant the facticity of a claim is that of ‘consensus and corroboration’ (Potter & Edwards, 1990), or constructing a version of events that is agreed across witnesses or has a set of independent observers to warrant the facticity of a claim. Both ‘extreme case formulation’ (Edwards, 2000) and ‘consensus and corroboration’ (Potter, 1996) can be used rhetorically to work up the objectivity of an account and inoculated against claims of vested interest.
In addition to managing the objectivity of claims, people are argued to manage issues of accountability in their use of language. For example, the term ‘footing’ originated from Goffman (1981) and refers to the alignment between the speaker and hearer of an utterance. Changes in ‘footing’ are a persistent feature of natural talk as individuals continually manage the production and reception of an utterance. Below is a brief overview of Goffman’s (1981) footing.

There are various social roles that an individual can adopt in conversational interaction. The role of the ‘speaker’ is the talking machine, a body engaged in linguistic activity (Goffman, 1981). The speaker functions as an ‘animator’, so that the words are heard as representing the beliefs and desires of whoever animates the utterance. The ‘speaker’ is represented through the personal pronoun ‘I’, however the use of ‘I’ also introduces a whole range of possible rhetorical devices to manage the speaker’s distance to their utterance. I will further discuss this point with reference to the ‘speaker’ and ‘animator’ s’ role in footing shifts (Goffman, 1981).

The ‘animator’ is not a social role as such but a “functional node in the communication system” (Goffman, 1981, p. 144) that functions to allow words to be heard as representing the beliefs of the speaker. An exception would be if the ‘animator’ read aloud a prepared script. This allows the speaker to animate words that they have no hand in formulating. In doing so, the speaker can express another person’s beliefs and opinions that is not heard as reflecting their own personal viewpoint. However, for the most part, the ‘animators’ utterances are intimately linked to their own beliefs and desires, and therefore rhetorical work is needed to create this degree of distance between themselves and the words being produced.

The speaker’s use of the personal pronoun ‘I’ can be used flexibly to create distance between the speaker and the words being produced. For example, hedging and
qualifying in the form of performative modal verbs (‘I wish’, ‘I think’, ‘I believe’) introduces some distance between the speaker and what is being said. In addition, breaks in fluency (i.e. ‘I can’t seem to talk clearly today’) can itself be animated fluently as the statement is clearly said, despite the speaker’s claim to conversational difficulty. Therefore, the speaker can animate their speech in such a way as to display rhetorical distance from the utterance being produced.

Another example of rhetorical displays of distance through ‘footing’ can be evidenced in recounting a tale (i.e. ‘I said shut the door’). Two animators are involved in this utterance. The animator who performed the utterance and the animated ‘I’ embedded in the statement that is only part of the world being told. Consider also the following example.

Example 2:
To the best of my recollection
   (1) I think that
   (2) I said
   (3) I once lived that sort of life

(From Goffman, 1981, p. 140)

Goffman provides an analysis of this example in terms of the role of the animator. According to Goffman (1981), the first line reflects a statement currently true of the animator (‘I think that’), the second line involves an embedded animator that is an earlier version of the present speaker (‘I said’) and the third line involves a double embedded animator, a still earlier version of the earlier speaker (‘I once lived that sort of life’). This illustrates the use of the ‘animator’ and embedded ‘animators’ to create
some distance between the speaker and the words being produced, which are assumed to reflect personal viewpoints, beliefs and opinions.

This notion of ‘embedded animators’ is an important one. Particularly if you consider that with shifts in footing from the 1st person to 2nd and 3rd person pronoun, an individual can ‘embed’ an entirely different speaker into the utterance. If ‘I’ the speaker is replaced with ‘we’ the utterance can now be understood to represent a collective entity, with their own beliefs and opinions, rhetorically distinct from the speaker of the utterance.

Goffman’s (1981) notion of ‘footing’ has been elaborated on by Potter (1996) in terms of ‘distanced footing’ or the rhetorical device used by speakers to manage accountability by discursively altering their perceived endorsement of a particular statement. Footing shifts tend to appear when there is a contentious issue being discussed or when contentious words are used. An example is provided below:

*Example 3*

Jack: [: : :) let’s face it, it’s not as if they’re wanted here. we have enough low-
life here already without importing [other people’s.
Hilda: [Jack! ((to Susan)) I’m sorry about
that. He’s not xenophobic. It’s it’s not =
Jack: = it’s not racist, no. We’ve never been racist, have we Hilda?
Hilda: No. We’ve got nothing against=
Jack: =nothing against the refugees. I have every sympathy for them. But you’d
be mad not to ask, why are they all coming here?

(From Condor, Figgou, Abell, Gibson, & Stevenson, 2006, p. 142)
In their analysis of this extract, the authors draw attention to the conversational features, particularly the notion of ‘footing’, when examining how speakers negotiate racist discourse. The extract begins where Jack has produced a hearably racist comment ‘we have enough low lives here without importing other peoples’ His wife, Hilda, intervenes to ward off a negative character assessment. I doing so, she orients to the accountability of her husband’s comment. At this point, Jack denies his previous utterance and shifts footing from ‘I’ who had produced the racist comment to the collective ‘we’ including his wife, whose identity is also at stake ‘We’ve never been racist, have we Hilda’. In response, Hilda adopts this collective footing and corroborates. Jack returns to an individual footing when evoking sympathy and constructs his racist comment as normative by shifting footing to the generic ‘you’ (Condor et al., 2006). This analysis indicates how the discursive recourses, such as footing, can be used to manage the accountability of prejudice talk.

These examples demonstrate how useful these analytic techniques are in terms of exploring the ways in which participants attend to issues of entitlement and accountability in their talk. I use this type of approach in Chapter 5 and 6. However in Chapter 6, I also incorporate the concerns of contemporary discursive psychologists with the inclusion of techniques from CA. This includes a conversation analytical perspective on social action (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Condor et al., 2006; Edwards, 1997), with the analytic focus on both the sequential organization of interaction and on what is made relevant by participants themselves (Schegloff, 1997). Before illustrating this further with examples from the discursive studies on identity that employ a DP approach with attention to conversation analytic techniques, it is necessary to briefly look first at the premise behind CA as a research methodology.
3.6. Conversation analysis

CA is based on a number of core assumptions concerning the use of language in interaction. Principally, conversational interaction is seen to reflect a social organisation, with rules and norms that govern the interplay between participants in talk. For example, a participant who poses a question would expect, and allow space in the interaction, for a co-participant’s response. These normative expectations can take the form of ‘adjacency pairs’ or sequential utterances performed by each participant in response to the other, in turn (Schegloff, 2007). Consider the following extract.

Example 4

 Harry: Didjih speak tuh Mary today?
 → (0.2)
 Harry: Did yih speak tuh Mary?
 Joy: Oh (. ) yeah I saw her at lunch.

(From Liddicoat, 2011, p. 108)

Here the adjacency pair takes the form of a question-answer sequence where Harry’s first utterance, also known as the first pair part (FPP) sets up a normative expectation of how the talk will proceed (Goffman, 1981; Schegloff, 2007). Following a question, it is normatively appropriate that the conversational participants would complete the turn by providing the conditionally relevant answer or ‘second pair part’ (SPP). Here, however, Harry’s question initially goes unanswered leading to a period of conversational silence. The silence is hearable as an accountable matter that Harry attends to by reproducing his prior turn to address the conversational silence. In response, Joy produces an answer SPP. These turn-taking organizations demonstrate the
normative framework that underpins social interaction. The absence in ‘turn-taking’ sequence in interaction is seen to deviate from the normative structure and is therefore a notable and accountable matter that requires investigation and resolving.

Repair sequencing is one mechanism of resolving certain ‘troubles’ in conversational interaction. Repair is classified by who initiates the repair (self or others), who resolves the problem (self or others) and how this unfolds within a turn sequence (Sacks, Schegloff, & Jefferson, 1974). For example, repair initiated by the speaker of the repairable is done in the same turn as the source of the trouble in the interaction and can be initiated by perturbations, hitches and cut-offs in talk (Schegloff, 2007). When the repair is initiated by a person other than the speaker of the repairable, repair is initiated in the turn subsequent to that containing the trouble-source. This can be accomplished through the use of various next-turn-repair-initiators (NTRI). Some NTRIs simply indicate that the recipient has detected some trouble in the previous turn (huh? What?). Others are more specific and indicate what part of the speech is repairable (who/where/when?), the power of which can be strengthened by appending a partial repeat. These are important indicators of difficulties encountered by co-participants and can signpost conversational topics which are sensitive in some way.

3.7. Discursive psychology and identity

The qualitative chapters of this thesis examine national identity from a discursive perspective, as something that is worked up or achieved in talk. According to Antaki and Widdicombe (1998), identity work is in the hands of the participants as it is them who make relevant and ‘orient to’ what is said in interaction. In order to highlight this in more detail, I am going to look at extracts from identity research in social psychology that apply a DP approach. Firstly I am going to look at the conversation
analysis in Widdicombe and Wooffitt's (1995) study on youth sub-cultures and in particular the strategies used in interactional sequences that work to resist ascription to a subculture identity. Then I will look at how minority group members manage issues of accountability in their talk.

3.7.1. Category membership. In Widdicombe & Wooffitt's (1995) study, the authors drew heavily on CA to examine how speakers accomplish membership and non-membership of youth subcultures, such as punks and Goths. The authors outline some strategies used by speakers to warrant their non-membership of a particular subcategory, as categorising oneself as a member would mean running the risk of loss of individuality—central to the subcategory membership. One such strategy is the use of an ‘insertion sequence’ (Schegloff, 2007) that intervenes between the first and second pair part of an adjacency pair and works to re-characterise the business of the interview.

Consider the following example:

Example 5

((Tape starts))
I: how would you describe (. ) yourself
And your appearance and so on
(. )
R: describe my appearance,
I: yeah
(1)
R: su-su slightly longer than average hair
((goes on to describe appearance))

(From Widdicombe & Wooffitt, 1995, p. 95)
The interviewer’s question at the beginning of the extract is the FPP of a question-answer sequence. However, rather than complete the turn with a preferred SPP and provide an account of self-identification with the subculture category, the responded produces an insertion sequence that recycles the interviewer’s question and amends the use of it. The beginning part of the interviewer’s question asked the respondent to ‘describe yourself’, the respond’s partial repeat omits ‘describe yourself’ and focuses on the later part of the interviewers question ‘your appearance’. This allows the respondent to re-characterise the business at hand by focusing instead on descriptions of artificial appearances.

By examining the turn-by-turn sequence of interaction and the discursive features of their talk, the authors identified another strategy that allowed participants to resist category affiliation and involved denying criterial features of group membership. This can be illustrated in the following example:

Example 6

I; WOULD you, would you say that you were punks
Or anything like that
R3: no
R1: no
R2: [no
(.
R2: hh cos we haven’t got an attitude like, I mean
when you think punk you think, you think punk is hh
is not just the way you dress like you have to have
a certain way of thinking you know to be a punk and
We haven’t got- well I certainly haven’t got it anyways
You know I’m just
In the extract, the interviewer again produces the FPP of a question-answer sequence that makes relevant the sub-cultural category ‘punks’. The respondents repeatedly deny their subcategory membership. However, the interviewer orientates to this response as an incomplete turn, and therefore does not produce the next question. The respondent attends to the silence by orientating to their appearance as an accountable matter identifying them as sub-category members and manages this in talk by claiming the non-procession of defining characteristics such as ‘attitudes’ and ‘thinking’ that are not as easily accessible as dress style and therefore less open to public scrutiny.

The discursive analysis of subcategory membership in Widdicombe and Wooffitt's (1995) study highlights some important aspects of the methodology when examining how subgroups within the nation negotiate and construct their national identity in talk. It highlights that category membership is not a straightforward matter but requires the use of sophisticated strategies in conversational interaction to manage identity. By incorporating a CA approach, this will allow me to identify how participants use the normative sequence of interaction to manage their identity concerns in talk. Similarly the following section will illustrate the use of a DP approach to examine how minority group members manage the accountability of their ethnic self-definitions.

3.7.2. Accountability. When people describe events, according to Edwards (1997), they attend to the issue of accountability in their talk. That is to say, when participants provide accounts of events or experiences, they attend not only to the description but also to reflexively managing their own identity within the account. This
notion has its roots in ethnomethodological views of utterances as having a performative function but also, for present purpose, it is useful to emphasise its importance in identity research from a DP perspective. For example, Verkuyten and deWolfe (2002) use a DP approach to examine the accountability of ethnic self-definitions in minority member’s talk. The following extract provides an illustrative example:

**Example 7**

Sven: Erm (3) let’s see (2) what does it mean to be Chinese? (3) 
Sven: Yes (2) in principle, in principle erm (2) I do not really feel (5) erm (4) 100 percent Chinese, nor 100 percent Dutch [so]
Wai-Ling: [Yes, yes]
Sven: I am who I am, so you know, in fact, erm
Wai-Ling: Yes, I know what you mean, but I feel 100 percent Chinese
Sven: You do?
Wai-Ling: Yes, I did grow up in the Netherlands [(2) but (1) yes
Sven: [Hm
Aizhen: Were you born in the Netherlands?
Wai-Ling: I wasn’t born in the Netherlands, I was born in Hong Kong, but (.) erm there are quite a lot of things you pick up (.) from your parents and the like and erm at school you pick up other things
Sven: [Yes, yes
Wai-Ling: Nevertheless I feel 100 percent Chinese
Chun-Kin: Yes, perhaps (2) 100 percent is perhaps a bit erm (.) too extreme,
I think
Sven: Yes

(From Verkuyten & deWolf, 2002, p. 378)

At the start of the extract the interviewer asked Sven to attend to his ethnic minority identity, ‘what does it mean to be Chinese’, and in doing so makes the act of
ethnic self-definition relevant and accountable (Verkuyten & deWolf, 2002). In the author’s analysis of this account they first draw attention to the conversational features, although the analytical focus is not on the sequential organization of interaction in the strict CA sense; the “pauses, hesitations, self-corrections and false starts” signpost conversational topics that are sensitive or difficult in some way (Verkuyten & deWolf, 2002, p. 379), affording an opportunity to examine how these concerns are managed and dealt with in talk.

Next, the author draws attention to a number of discursive features that work to manage the accountability of ethnic self-definitions. Firstly, the repeated use of ‘in principal” suggests that formulating an ethnic-self definitions is a less than straightforward matter and that ethnic self-understanding can change given the circumstances and situational demands. The use of ‘in principal’ therefore provides an opportunity for the participant to reconstruct their ethnic definition, which works discursively to manage the accountability of definitive statements of ethnic self-identification. Furthermore, the participant make reference to ‘feeling 100% Chinese’ which the author suggests is a common discursive resource participants employ to provide an “account for not accounting” that is considerably difficult to undermine as it refers to the internal states of the speakers, which only they have access to. Third, the participants evokes an account of ‘doing’ early socialization that works to evoke a sense of ethnic identity that has been moulded in childhood and again, this account works to manage their accountability and personal responsibility for constructing self-definitions.

This discursive analysis in Verkuyten and deWolf’s (2002) study highlights the applicability of this form of analysis when examining how individuals in the present study attend to issues of accountability when constructing their national identity in talk.
In particular, it highlights the interactional nature of identity construction and the ways in which individuals seeks to manage their identity concerns in talk.

3.8. The discursive and experimental approach

The discursive approach has been criticised for being more subjective in its interpretation than experimental and statistical studies. Edwards (2012) noted that in talks to psychology departments, the discourse-and-interaction basis of the psychological topics was initially received as “somewhat naïve and redundant” (p. 2). There was a sophisticated and established tradition of experimental studies investigating the topics under question- memory, attribution, identity. Therefore the discursive work was initially considered to be a misguided distraction from the rigour of laboratory studies.

The analysis of discourse has been considered, at best, to be an appropriate preliminary to experimental studies (Manstead, 2008). However, Edwards (2012) argues that DP has its own empirical basis that does not require statistical evidence to confirm its ‘power’ or place within scientific psychology. DP examines how psychological concepts that are defined and operationalised in experimental psychology, for example memory, attributes, identity, are shaped for the functions they serve. The notion that these common sense psychological ideas need to be replaced by scientific ones ignores the fact that common sense psychology is part of the reality of everyday life (Edwards, 2012).

It is possible, however, for discursive and experimental psychologists to discover a common ground by acknowledging the existence of an ‘interpretative gap’ for both qualitative and quantitative research (Edwards, 2012). The interpretative gap is the distance between the object under investigation and what you eventually want to say.
about it. The interpretative gap can be large or small. For example, Edwards (2012) argues that the gap is quite large in experimental research as the object under investigation (i.e. what people actually did) is no longer available but is presented instead in a numerically coded and statistically processed form. Comparatively, Edwards (2012) argued that the gap is much smaller in DP as the “object of analytic interest is talk as talk” [emphasis in original] and therefore the distance between object, data and analysis is quite narrow (Edwards, 2012, p. 5).

This can of course be argued alternatively from an experimental psychology perspective. In comparison to experimental studies, qualitative studies have been criticised for being subjective rather than objective and for relying on interpretation rather than statistics and logic (e.g., Kilk & Miller, 1986; Niaz, 2008). From this perspective, the interpretative gap can also be quite large in qualitative studies and particularly if participants’ accounts are treated as a window into their inner mental and emotional experiences (Edwards, 1997). The discursive approach is no exception. Although there are some guidelines in conducting discourse analysis in psychology (e.g., Antaki, Billig, Edwards & Potter, 2003) for the most part analysts are encouraged to focus on the functional nature of talk and to develop the “skills” to identify patterns and variations in discourse (Potter & Wetherell, 1987, p.169). Therefore, with no standard method (Potter & Wetherell, 1987), there is a considerable amount of opportunity in the analytic process to impose varying interpretations on the data. In the absence of a standard method therefore it can be argued from an experimental perspective that the interpretative gap in discourse analysis is potentially varied and quite large.

The methodological debates between the discursive an experimental approach provides further evidence for the appropriateness of mixed methods in this thesis. The
important aspect to note is not the primacy of one method over another but the existence of common ground in the need to ‘mind the interpretative gap’ when conducting both qualitative and quantitative research in social psychology (Edwards, 2012). In line with the pragmatist approach, I acknowledge the limitations of both approaches to research, and in doing so, I do not aim for conclusive definitive reflections on the social world. Instead, I aim to draw on the strengths of each approach to answer separate sets of empirical questions, grounded in the epistemological underpinnings of each tradition.

3.9. Conclusions

In this chapter I have argued for a mixed method investigation, acknowledging the potential criticisms and highlighting the methodological advantages for the purposes of this research. In discussing the qualitative aspect of this thesis, I have made a case for using a Discursive Psychology approach to answer the empirical questions under investigation. In particular, I have noted how a Discursive Psychology approach allows for an investigation of rhetorical resources individuals employ to manage and negotiate their national identity in talk. A method of DP has been proven useful when examining how individuals construct their national identity in talk (Stevenson & Muldoon, 2010) and is therefore considered apt for the present purpose to examine how subgroup members manage and negotiate their national identity in talk.

I have also argued for a combined DA and CA approach to the examination of issues of entitlement and accountability in participants’ talk of representations of Irishness. It is argued that CA allows for the close analysis of the unfolding of conversational interaction which has been proven useful when examining issues of accountability and category membership in social psychological research investigating subgroup identity (Widdicombe & Wooffitt, 1995). From a DA perspective I will
identify some of the resources speakers use to either work up their own entitlement or
indeed undermine the claims made by others (see Chapter 5). This is also a particularly
useful methodology in qualitative chapter two, where I examine issues of entitlement
and accountability in participants’ talk of the other group’s representation of Irishness.

Finally I have argued that a mixed method approach will allow me to answer the
questions identified in the literature review. To begin with, in Chapter 5, I use a method
of DA to examine how individuals within the nation use discursive resources to manage
and negotiate their national identity in talk. In Chapter 6, I use a DP approach that
focuses on sequences of conversational interaction as social action in order to examine
more closely how participants engage with the photo elicitation task. In Chapters 8 and
9, I employ a quantitative approach by manipulating participants’ perceived position
and examining their evaluations of Irishness and similarity judgements. Finally, in
Chapter 9, the qualitative and quantitative approaches in this thesis will be discussed
separately in relation to the existing literature on national identity, subgroup
membership and superordinate identification.
Chapter 4

Research method

4.1. Introduction

This chapter provides an overview of the method of data collection employed in the qualitative elements of this thesis. I will firstly discuss issues concerning the use of interview data in social psychological research. This will be followed by an overview of the literature on photo elicitation interview methods. I will also argue for the need to apply an ethnomethodological approach to the understanding of participants’ use of photographic imagery in interview contexts. Second, this chapter will describe the characteristics of research participants. In line with the theoretical underpinnings of this thesis, a rationale for the recruitment of research participants is included, and is prefaced by a discussion of minority and majority membership criteria (Tajfel, 1978). This will be followed by a brief overview of the interview context and procedure. This chapter will conclude with an overview of the analytic method employed in this thesis.

In Chapter 3, I argued for a mixed methods approach with qualitative components involving DA and DP. One of the issues raised was the use of interview data in social psychological research (see Section 3.3.). Potter and Hepburn (2005) identified some problems inherent in the use of interview data. This included the tendency to delete the interviewer out of the interaction by including only the participants’ responses in the analysis of data and relatedly, the inconsistency of transcription conventions for representing interactions. There is also a tendency to underreport the interview setting in sufficient detail and the failure to consider the interview as an interaction (Potter & Hepburn, 2005). These are considered contingent problems, which the researcher can attend to relatively easily (Potter & Hepburn, 2005).
There are also various ways of negotiating these issues in interview data. In relation to the issue of deleting the interviewer out of the interaction and the related issue of inconsistent transcription convention, the authors propose including the interviewer’s questions and interjections in the transcription, as well as developing a consistent style of transcription that captures the interactional quality of talk (Potter & Hepburn, 2005). In order to address the issue of insufficient detail of the interview context, Potter and Hepburn (2005) recommend including in the write up the textual material related to recruitment and any recorded interaction between participants and researcher which occurs prior to the interview.

However, other issues are an inescapable feature of doing interview research and are therefore not as easily addressed (Potter & Hepburn, 2005). For example, it is possible that the interviewer introduces their own research agenda into the interview and receives the same agenda back in a refined form. However this issue is difficult to disentangle and is therefore also difficult to address. Similarly, the notion that the interviewer is invested in their research topic and must therefore also manage ‘interested’ talk in conversational interaction (Potter & Hepburn, 2005) is a level of complexity in research interviews that is rarely explicitly addressed. In light of the issues inherent in interview data, the authors advocate for the use of naturalistic data that is guided by issues that happening naturally in the participant’s environment and not easily anticipated or influenced by the researcher.

However, the authors also acknowledge naturalistic data is not always the most appropriate approach to data collection in all cases (Potter & Hepburn, 2005) and other authors advocate the use of a reflexive approach to the consideration of the limitations of interview and focus on group interactions when analysing data (e.g. Tanggaard, 2007).
Here I argue that the use of a method of photo elicitation interviews is appropriate and useful in this particular research context. It is noted that this method is particularly useful in research with disenfranchised group and difficult to access populations (Ortega-Alcazar & Dyck, 2011; Parkin & Coomber, 2009). Additionally, the second qualitative chapter incorporates a reflexive approach to the analysis of the photo elicitation interviews, incorporating the active involvement of the interviewer into the analysis of interactions. In doing so, I hope to consider in more detail the debates surrounding the use of interview data in social psychological research. The following section will provide an overview of methods of photo elicitation. This will incorporate an understanding of the perceived advantages and disadvantages of the use of photo elicitation in research, from a discursive perspective.

4.2. Photo elicitation interview

Photo elicitation interview (PEI) is a method that uses photographs as the basis of in-depth interviews and can be implemented in a variety of different ways. One type of PEI involves the use of photographs taken by the researcher from printed media, archives or family albums, to elicit discussion from research participants (Harper, 2002; Collier & Collier, 1991). A second type involves instructing participants to generate photographs in advance of an interview on a particular research topic and later to discuss their photographs in interview context. This second type of photo elicitation was used in the qualitative elements of this thesis and is referred to in the literature in various ways, including auto-driven photo elicitation (Heisley & Levy, 1991), reflexive photograph (Douglas, 1998) and participatory photo interview (Kolb, 2008). However, the common element is the use of participants’ own photographs generated for the purposes of the particular study.
The implementation of photo elicitation in practice involves providing participants with cameras in advance of the interviews and instructing them to take photographs of a particular research topic (Heisley & Levy, 1991). The cameras are then collected and the photographic film is developed. During the interviews, participants are provided with a copy of their photographs. The interviewer prompts the participants to account for the photographs that they have taken, with reference to the research topic (Douglas, 1998). To initiate further discussion, participants can then be prompted to completed tasks within the interview, such as ranking their photographs in order of preference (Harper, 2002). These prompts can be incorporated into a semi-structured interview schedule however the discussion is generally guided by the participants’ photographs (Kolb, 2008). I will now discuss the perceived advantages and disadvantages, as noted by researcher employing a method of PEI in research studies. I will also examine these perceived advantages and disadvantages alternatively, from a discursive perspective.

4.2.1. Advantages of photo elicitation. There are some advantages in the use of participant’s photographs in interview contexts. Principally, researchers have noted that photo elicitation provides participants with a sense of entitlement to speak (Ortega-Alcazar & Dych, 2011, Harper, 2002). Participants’ ownership of the photograph is believed to enhance their agency to take ownership of research agenda, introducing their own topics and categories into the conversational exchange (Ortega-Alcazar & Dych, 2011). As such, participants’ entitlement to speak, as afforded through the photo elicitation task, is believed to reduce the power imbalance between researchers and those who are the subject of research (Croghan, Griffin, Hunter, & Phoenix, 2008). This is evidenced through the greater likelihood of their adopting the role of expert in the
interaction (Kolb, 2008), and guiding and shaping the flow of conversational discussion (Harper, 2002).

In addition, photo elicitation is believed to capture and evoke discussion that is thought to lay dormant in traditional interview contexts (e.g., Phoenix, 2010; Mitchell, Molestsane, Stuart, Buthelezi & DeLange, 2005; Mitchell, 2008). For example, photo elicitation was used with health care professionals working with young people with HIV/AIDS in South Africa (Mitchell et al., 2005). The photographs of empty classrooms, empty beds and school buses used for transportation to daily funerals evoked valuable and insight-provoking discussion of despair and the tendency for health care professionals to demonise the young people’s activities (Mitchell et al., 2005). In traditional interviews, the topics of discussion are generally guided by the interview schedule. Therefore these aspects of the participant’s social world captured in the photographs, would not likely feature in the traditional interview and would therefore not be discussed.

It is also argued that the use of photo elicitation interviews can potentially buffer against the inherent disadvantages of traditional interviews where respondents’ memories of events and experiences are likely to fade, and become incomplete or inaccurate over-time, leading to over-simplified and truncated accounts (Harper, 2002). Photo elicitation can potentially counteract this problem, providing vivid, visual stimuli that can enhance and enrich memory recall (Harper, 2002). However, from a discursive perspective, these incomplete, truncated accounts could be used strategically to evoke faded memory and incomplete recall for a particular rhetorical purpose (e.g., Edwards & Middleton, 1986, 1988). Again, this highlights the need for a reflective consideration of participants’ display of understanding of the photo elicitation task.
Researchers using photo elicitation have furthermore noted its usefulness in bridging what might be the’ culturally distinct worlds’ of researcher and their participants. Collier and Collier (1992) have stated that use of photographs in interviews have an important role to play in establishing communication between two or more people by anchoring the discussion in the image that is now shared between both parties. This is perceived as particularly useful in interviews with social groups that have a distinct cultural background, which cannot be taken-for-granted as shared between interviewer and researcher participants. However, while this perceived advantage has been documented from the perspective of the researcher concrete documentation for such enhanced ‘intersubjectivity’ remains to be established.

4.2.2. Disadvantages of photo elicitation. Closely linked to the perceived advantages of using photo elicitation as a research tool, are a number of potential pitfalls encountered by researcher in their implementation of this research technique. Specifically, researchers have noted that the sense of entitlement to speak afforded to research participants through PEI has also lead to a tendency of researchers to write the interviewer out of the analysis (Jenkings, Woodward, & Winter, 2008). While the photographs can elicit discussion from research participants, their discussion occur within an interview context. Therefore, the interviewer also attends to silences, producing implicit and explicit prompting which co-constructs the conversational interaction (Sacks, 1992). In addition, the perceived advantage of PEI in creating third party rapport by attributing agency to the photographs can, in practice, draw attention away from collaborative work of the interviewer and interviewee (Jenkings et al., 2008).

The following is an example of the tendency of researcher to write the interviewer out of the analysis. The example is taken from research assessing children’s perspectives through participatory photo interviews (Jorgenson & Sullivan, 2010):
‘That’s my computer, I couldn’t live without a computer, because I need it to do my homework’ (Jessica)

‘That’s my computer, I can do so many things with it, and it’s always there for me, no actually it’s hard to go somewhere with it but it’s always there for it. I can watch DVDs on it (Kirsten)

‘That’s my Playstation 2, it’s the thing I need to live’

(Jorgenson & Sullivan, 2010, p. 10-11)

In the author’s analysis of their young participants’ engagement with the photo elicitation task, it was common for authors to present single stand-alone statement from the participants concerning their photographs, with no indication of the interviewer’s role in the production of the data. There is no notation of timed pauses, implicit (ahah) or explicit prompting (can you tell me more about that), backchanneled responses (‘umm’), minimal news receipts (‘yeah I see’) that would be characteristic of conversational interaction between two or more parties (Sacks, 1992). Therefore the extracts are presented here outside of normative context of interview interaction, and are isolated from the conversational structure in which they were embedded.

This form of presentation of extracts was not exceptional and in fact the majority of extracts in this study did not note the interviewer in the transcription. The authors concluded from these extracts that the use of photo elicitation provided a greater understanding of how household technology “animated children’s world and defines who they are” (Jorgenson & Sullivan, 2010, p. 9). However, the analysis provides no indication of participant’s construction of their identities through their use of the photo elicitation task in conversational interaction. Rather it is the photograph that is attributed the agency to construct and define the child’s identity or ‘who they are’ (p. 10).
This leads to a second related pitfall encountered by researchers analysing data generated through photo elicitation—the fixation on the role of the photograph in the interview, rather than the participant’s use of the photograph in the interview context. To continue with the example from the study on child participation in photo elicitation (Jorgenson & Sullivan, 2010), the authors proceed to highlight the difficulty experienced by children in capturing typical, everyday family life. The authors also noted that the family scene depicted in the photographs had been staged for the camera and they therefore argued that it was, “contrived for the occasion” (Jorgenson & Sullivan, 2010, p.10). In other words, these photographs were identified as problematic and their use in building research accounts was reconsidered as based “seemingly fabricated scenes” (p. 10). This interpretation of the use of PEI in interviews overlooks the performative nature, how participants display their use of the photographs in interaction, rather than placing emphasis on solely the photographs and what that contributes or detracts from the research interview.

4.2.3. Photo elicitation and identity discourse. Given the perceived advantages of using a method of photo elicitation in social psychological studies of identities, it is perhaps surprising that there has been comparatively much less focus on the applicability of this method in discursive studies of identities, with a few exceptions (e.g., Jenkings et al., 2008; Woodward & Jenkings, 2011). One such study highlighted the need to consider the interactive and collaborative nature of research interviews, where researcher and interviewees co-produce interview data (Jenkings et al., 2008). The researchers noted some of the advantages of PEI discussed in the literature in allowing participants to engage reflexively in the processes, attending to the photographs in terms of what is and is not captured and completing gaps in their discussion as co-respondents. The researchers also noted the proposed advantage of PEI
in bridging the culturally distinct world of researcher and their participants, facilitating communication about unfamiliar environments and topics (Collier & Collier, 1986).

In theory, this type of data collection technique involves a collaborative effort, the researcher asks questions of the photographs and the participants act as knowledgeable informants in their social world. In practice, however, the researchers note that the collaborative process of meaning construction in interaction is persistently omitted from the analysis of interview data using photo elicitation. In an attempt to rectify this omission, the authors engaged in a retrospective analysis of accounts of military identity provided by British military personnel (Woodward & Jenkings, 2011). The researchers concluded that the elicitation of participant’s understandings of the photographs is something collaboratively achieved by both the interviewer and interviewee and unfolds during the course of the interaction.

Consider the following extract:

R: [....] so it was 15 or so years ago, a lot of these, he must be eight or nine there, late 20s now, grown adults aren’t they? And where they all end up? It would be interesting, I would really like to be able to go back there, to see how life has changed? Because I as a nation have spent millions of pounds putting money in, and investing troops, you know, the second war that has gone on in Iraq now. It is certainly the situation in Iraq is a lot different to when I was there. I’d be interested to see, take some of the photos back to Iraq and see what has changed if anything. If you are able to do that, I don’t know what the security situation would be like.

I: A bit rough. So did you choose that one because...

R: The circumstances you know. A lot of those kids had been in the mountains as well. So a lot of people had started to return to the cities and the towns. It was almost, they see us as their saviours really.

I: So is this a bit of a liberation photo?
R: Yeah, I think so, yeah, may be a little bit of that yeah. They were certainly pleased I were there.  

(Jenkings et al., 2008, p. 4)  

In their analysis of the extract, the researchers relay the participant’s descriptive account of the photograph. The respondent reflects on the possibility of change in the situation from when the photograph was taken (‘the situation in Iraq is a lot different to when I was there’), the investment of money, ‘troops’ and a ‘second war’ and the respondent’s interest in returning with the photographs to ascertain the extent of change in the situation. The authors also note that the interviewer introduces a category into the exchange (‘a liberation photo’) that demonstrates the interviewer’s reflexive listening of the account and how it corresponds to the research agenda. The participant’s response is noted as a tentative agreement (‘yeah I think so, yeah’) and the authors suggest that this indicates that the participant is “aware” (p. 5) of the researcher’s role in the interaction to insert their research agenda and reflexivity collaborate in this process.  

Alternatively, I argue that this extract can be discussed in terms of the participant’s display of understanding of the task, to bring into relief its performative function to address discursive concerns in talk and importantly, the interviewer’s role in this interaction. For example, from a discursive perspective, participants are not simply reflexively participating in the process but are doing and displaying their active reflexive engagement. This affords participants the opportunity to introduce their own research questions and analytic categories into the exchange (i.e. evoking change over time). It is possible that the participants are attending to issues of accountability in depicting children in the context of war and therefore use their understanding of the photographs to evoke change over time, in order to discuss ‘grown adults’ rather than the children depicted. However, the strategic display of understanding of the photograph
is lost in the descriptive gloss of this extract that is viewed a ‘partial coming together of understandings’ (p. 4) between the researcher and research participants.

Similarly, the interviewer’s insertion of an analytic category (i.e. the ‘liberation photo’) can be viewed alternatively as problematising participants’ use of the task, by displaying the greater entitlement of the interviewer to speak in interaction (Abell, Locke, Condor, Gibson & Stevenson, 2006). However, this is merely speculative as the level of transcription detail presented here is without noted pauses and intonations; thus the conversational quality of this interaction is lost. For example, what is interpreted as ‘tentative agreement’ could possibly contain noted pauses, conversational cut-off and self-repair (e.g., Sacks, 1992; Sacks & Schegloff, 1979), that would suggest that participants are orienting to issues of accountability in their talk which would require further investigation. Additionally, the author’s interpretation of the perceived awareness of the research participants masks any consideration of participants’ strategic use of this perceived awareness of research agenda and interview context, in order to shape the conversational interaction.

4.2.4. Rationale for use of photo elicitation in this research. Taken together, an examination of the studies employing PEI provided a clear rationale for the use of photo elicitation in this particular research context. Firstly, it has been noted that photo elicitation is a particularly strong method in interviews with disadvantaged and marginalised group (Ortega-Alcazar & Dyck, 2011; Parkin & Coomber, 2009) and is therefore appropriate for use in the current investigation. Like Jenkins and colleagues, I have also highlighted the need to consider the reflective nature of data generation and analysis co-produced in interaction (Jenkins et al., 2008; Woodward & Jenkins, 2011). However, this work also signpost some aspects questions that are left unanswered, such as whether participants’ strategically use the task to address their
discursive concerns in conversational interaction. I argue that it is possible to unpack the perceived advantages and disadvantages of PEI by examining how two sets of participants orient to the same task as they address their discursive concerns in conversational interaction.

4.3. Interview participants

The following section will deal more specifically with the characteristics of research participants in group interview and include an overview of the interview context and procedure. I then conclude this chapter with an overview of the analytic method employed in Chapters five and six.

4.3.1. Strategic selection of Irish Travellers as a research group. Participants were chosen on basis of spanning the diversity of positions within the national group and hence maximising the likelihood of eliciting different patterns of discursive construction and display of national identity. The ostracism of Irish Travellers has been well-documented in the media (Hunt, 2008; Hutten, 2008). Irish Travellers experience high levels of exclusion from mainstream Irish society. Examples include residents organising against the provision of Irish Traveller accommodation, the need to deny Irish Traveller identity in order to secure employment and the refusing of entry into social venues (Pavee Point, 2007). Irish Travellers therefore live on the ‘margins of Irish society’ (Department of Justice, Equality and Law, 1996). Their marginal status with the Irish nation means that Irish Traveller will have to fight for recognition of rights as Irish nationals. Therefore, I argue that is a very likely site of the use of proactive discursive strategies of national identification.

Also as noted in the introduction to this thesis, the Traveller community in Ireland occupy an unusual position within the nation of being marginalised but not
afforded the protection of ethnic minority status. This can be illustrated best with a quote from Pavee Point (2007): ‘Travellers remain the most marginalised group in that society, highly visible as a ‘problem’ precisely because they are invisible as an ethnic group’ (p. 3). Therefore, this is an ideal site for the consideration of the effects of peripherality and minority subgroup status upon group members within the nation.

4.3.2. Participants. The qualitative study reported in this thesis recruited participants from two social groups in Ireland, selected to afford two contrasting status positions: young (majority) Irish students and (minority) Irish Travellers, hence maximising chances of variability in their discursive resources and actions. Irish Travellers are a clearly identifiable minority group and are distinguishable from the majority population, according to Tajfel’s (1978) definition. For example, there are differences both in terms of objective determinants of co-existence (i.e. low levels of education, literacy and training levels) and subjective internalization of psychological separateness (i.e. feeling part of a minority, Pavee Point, 2007). On the other hand, Irish students were recruited on the basis of their high level of education and their affiliation with a prestigious third level institution in Ireland (Devine-Wright & Lyons, 1997). All students were Irish born and did not report being part of a social recognised underprivileged minority group.

The recruitment of Irish students took place within Irish Universities. Irish Travellers were recruited from a partnership organisation in Dublin designed to promote awareness of equal rights. Both Irish Traveller and Irish student participants were recruited using a method of snowball sampling (Goodman, 1961). The process of snowball sampling involves asking research participants to nominate another person with similar characteristics to participate in the research process. A method of snowball sampling was considered particularly apt in this instance as it is a sampling technique
often used to recruit marginalized groups and other difficult to access populations (Goodman, 1961).

This process of snowballing sampling involved a number of stages. Firstly, the researcher contracted gatekeepers at an Irish university and the partnership organization in Dublin via email and later, in follow up phone calls. In the initial email contact, the researcher provided gatekeepers with background information concerning the research topic and method of photo elicitation. Second, the gatekeeper agreed to circulate this email or in the case of Irish Traveller, to relay the information in the email to members of the organization interested in participating in the research. Irish student were asked to contact the researcher via email and nominate another young Irish-born student to participate in the research. This information was communicated to Irish Travellers via the gatekeeper and they were each asked to nominate another Irish Traveller of similar age to take part in the research. Four Irish Traveller participants nominated individuals that were not involved in the partnership organisation and who resided in a halting site in Dublin city.

Appointments were arranged to meet with both sets of participants separately. For Irish Travellers, these appointments were arranged through the gatekeeper to meet either in the partnership organization or on a halting site in Dublin. Irish students contracted the researcher directly and arrangements were made to meet in a room on the grounds of the Irish university. A total of three appointments were made with each interview pair, firstly two weeks prior to the group interviews to distribute disposable camera, again one week prior to the interviews collect the cameras and finally the day of the group interviews to conduct the research.

A total of 10 group interviews were conducted with Irish Travellers (n= 10) and Irish students (n=10) between February 2009 and May 2009. The group interviews took
place in pairs and participants were matched according to age cohort (19-26 years) and
gender (M=10, F=10). For further characteristics of participants, see Appendix 1. An
inherent advantage of interviewing pairs of participants is that, through correcting and
disagreeing with each other, participants illuminated what is considered normatively
appropriate in interactions (Stevenson & Muldoon, 2010). In addition, pairs of
individuals were chosen to offset the difficulties in identifying individual speakers
(Morgan, 1988).

However, one of the possible disadvantages of conducting paired interviews is
that participants might dominate the role of the interviewer and perhaps detract from the
research focus on the interview (Breakwell, 1990). While being cognisant of the
drawbacks in conducting group interviews and also drawing on the strength of this
method, the purpose of the group interviews were to create a forum in which to examine
subgroup member’s constructions and displays of Irish national identity in everyday talk
and interaction.

4.4. Interview context and procedure

The group interviews were conducted within 6 months of report in which the
state failed to recognise the ethnic status of Irish Travellers (CERD, 2005). This has
followed years of social exclusion, in which the legitimate identity of Irish Traveller
remains invisible to policy and decision makers. This study is also set against numerous
published articles in national newspapers reflecting on the high levels of suicide among
the Travelling population (Hunt, 2011; Hutten, 2008).

Three Irish Traveller group interviews were conducted at the premises of a
partnership organization in Dublin, where Irish Travellers and members of the majority
population work together to address the issues faced by Irish Travellers as members of a marginalised and discriminated minority. The aim of the partnership organization is to improve the quality of life of Irish Travellers by advocating for social justice, solidarity, socio-economic development and human rights. The remaining two Irish Traveller group interviews were conducted on a halting site (an area for caravans and sanitary services), also in Dublin, where members of the Travelling community reside. The group interviews of Irish students were conducted in an allocated meeting room on the grounds of the national university in Dublin. Care was taken to insure that all group interviews were conducted in a closed area that limited distraction and outside influence, only including the facilitator and two participants at any given time.

4.4.1. Interview procedure. The study used a method of photo elicitation interviews (PEI) that involved informing participants that the research concerned their perceptions of Irishness. All procedures were conducted according to the requirements of the psychological Society of Ireland and the British Psychological Society as well as being approved by the University of Limerick Research Ethics Committee. Informed consent was obtained orally from Irish Traveller participants and in written form for Irish students.

Two weeks prior to the group interviews, the researcher provided the participants with disposable cameras. Photographic representations of Irishness were of interest as one of the main analytic concerns of this thesis were participants’ display and construction of national identity. Photographic representations of Irishness were considered to facilitate discussion of what constitutions Irishness and varying constructions of national identity in interaction. St. Patrick’s Day was considered a particularly appropriate day for taking photographs of Irish identity related phenomenon (Blaylock, Stevenson, O’Donnell, Muldoon, Reicher, Bryan, 2012). Firstly, St. Patrick’s
Day has been observed as the Irish national day since the 17th century and is widely viewed as a celebration of the Irish Diaspora around the world. Second, the St. Patrick’s Day event in Dublin has ethos of inclusion and is celebrated by a diverse range of ethnic and social groups in Ireland. Photographic representations of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day will provide an opportunity to explore whether individuals within the nation display and construct their national identity in different ways. The participants were therefore instructed to take photographs of ‘whatever you consider to be Irish on St. Patrick’s Day’. They were given no further instruction. Six Irish students attended the St. Patrick’s Day parade in Dublin, the remainder of the research participants did not.

Immediately prior to commencing the group interviews, participants were given a copy of their photographs. They were asked to remove any photographs they do not wish to discuss in the group interviews. The discussion was focused on exploring participants’ constructions of Irish national identity and the topics were heavily guided by the photographs taken by the participants prior to the focus group. A framework for initiating discussion (see Appendix 2) was devised from a pilot study and examination of the literature, which included asking participants to create a photo sequence and rank the photos in order of preference i.e. ten favourite photographs. In addition, approximately midway through the group interviews, participants engaged in a ‘photo exchange’ and viewed the photos generated by the other group (i.e. Irish Travellers are given some photos of Irish students and vice versa). The focus groups lasted approx 40 minutes and a full debriefing took place afterwards.

4.5. Analytic method

The interview transcripts were analysed as interactional data and two separate analyses are reported in Chapters five and six. The analytic foci of Chapters five and six
were different however and this difference was reflected in the analytic process. In Chapter five, the primary focus was on how subgroup members display and construct their national identity in talk. The analytic focus of Chapter six was twofold. The first aspect of the analysis focused on participants’ display of understanding of the photo elicitation task. The second aspect focused on the turn-by-turn sequence of interaction between participants when they are asked to comment on the other participants’ representations of Irishness. The overview of the analysis will be divided broadly into three stages, transcription, coding and micro-analysis, although these are not necessarily mutually exclusive as they were carried out largely in tandem, with each feeding back into the other.

4.5.1. Transcription. All discussions were audio-taped and later transcribed verbatim using Jefferson Transcription which is a systematic scheme for coding transcripts. Full Jeffersonian transcription (Jefferson, 1984) annotates speech, vocal utterances, movement as well as other verbal and non-verbal interaction between interview participants. In the analysis reported in Chapter five, a full Jeffersonian Transcription was not deemed necessary and instead, an abridged version of Jefferson transcription was used. This includes noted pauses, overlapping speech and some non-verbal action such as laughing, nodding and smiling. Potter and Hepburn (2005) suggested that transcription should be as detailed as possible even if analysis is not focused on the minutiae of interaction. However, this limits the number and length of extracts that could be provided in support of the analysis. In addition, an abridged version of Jeffersonian convention was thought to add to the conversational quality, while allowing for the focus to be on the identity management strategies participants employ to manage their national identity in talk.
Again, an abridged version of Jeffersonian conventions was used in the first section of Chapter Six (Appendix 3, Section 1), as it allowed the analytic focus to be on participants’ display of understanding of the photo elicitation task rather than the micro-detail of participants’ turn-taking interaction. The analysis of the photo exchange, however, required a full Jeffersonian Transcription (a glossary of Jeffersonian transcriptions symbols in included in Appendix 3, Section 2). The analysis incorporated the concerns of contemporary discursive psychologists and incorporated a conversation analytical perspective on social action (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998; Condor et al., 2006; Edwards, 1997). This required detailed transcription and close inspection of the micro-detail of conversational interaction

4.5.2. Coding. This coding began with detailed reading and re-reading of the interview transcripts with notes being taken of anything which appeared to be relevant to participants. The transcripts were then entered into N-Vivo text tagging software for analysis. This proceeded slightly differently given the differences in analytic concerns in each chapter. In Chapter five, the first stage of analysis focused on identifying occurrences in talk in which participants made reference to their own national identity or that of others. In the first stage of analysis of Chapter six, the focus was on identifying instances in which conversational participants, including the interviewer made reference to the photo elicitation task, their own and other participants’ representations of Irishness.

The initial coding was followed by a second stage of coding. In this stage the data was divided into relevant sub-categories and sections of participants’ talk were coded in terms of a series of gross categories. At this stage of analysis, the selection of data was biased towards over-inclusion and as such borderline cases were included. Initially the data was coded in terms of the topic of conversation. This yielded stretches
of talk relevant to the particular topic. In the analysis of Chapter five, this concerned
generalised accounts of national identity, accounts specifically oriented to identity-
related behaviour on St. Patrick’s Day, and in which circumstances, the speaker
engaged in such behaviour. This also included accounts of representations of Irishness,
national emblems and symbols, media personalities and accounts of national stereotypes
and character. In addition, Irish Traveller transcripts were coded for accounts of
discrimination and Irish Traveller culture, as made relevant by participants in
interaction.

In the analysis of Chapter six, the second stage of coding focused on stretches of
talk based on the initial coding, in which the participants and interviewer made relevant
aspects of the photo elicitation task. This included extracts in which participants
introduced their own photographs, extracts in which participants made explicit reference
to their own photograph, other participants’ photographs and nature of the photo
elicitation task. The extracts were coded for the interviewer’s role in the interaction,
which included extracts in which the interviewer made reference to participant’s
photographs and explicitly referenced the photo elicitation task. In addition, aspects of
the photo elicitation task in which the interviewer instructed participants to perform
particular actions was coded which included extracts concerning the photo sequence and
the photo exchange.

4.5.3. Microanalysis. In Chapter five, I aim to identify the identity management
strategies or the descriptive devices and properties of talk employed to mobilize
identities (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998). Therefore, extracts were analysed using
resources from discursive psychology and rhetorical psychology (e.g., Antaki &
Widdicombe, 1998; Benwell & Stokoe, 2006; Billig, 1987; Potter, 1996) so that the
basis on which inclusion within the national category was accomplished, as well as how
membership was negotiated and managed, was identified within the text. From this, an account of all the data was developed inductively and deviant case analysis (Silverman, 2001) was used to examine exceptional instances to amend and develop an exhaustive account of the data.

In the first aspect of the analysis of chapter six, the interview data was treated as an interaction by, for example, paying analytic attention to the interviewer’s role in the interaction as well that of the interviewee. Therefore, rather than considering participants’ responses as isolated fragments of talk, the way in which responses were occasioned by the interviewer's questioning was central to the analysis. Similarly, the particular context of the photo elicitation interview was treated as being of particular importance. The way in which interviewee and interviewer oriented to the particular conventions of the photo elicitation interview was central to the analysis of how their talk of the task were used to perform particular discursive actions.

The analysis of photo exchange in chapter six reflected the concerns of contemporary discursive psychologists in its inclusion of conversation analytic techniques. Discursive psychologists are increasing influenced by the perspective and methods of CA. In incorporating a conversation analytic perspective, discursive psychologists view discursive actions (i.e. blaming, rebutting, denying, accounting) not as isolated features of talk but as embedded in sequences of conversational interaction. In the analysis of the photo exchange and in line with the DP approach, I used the normative structure of sequences of interaction as a resource to make sense of the social activities that were being accomplished.
4.6. Summary

This thesis employs a method of photo elicitation interviews to obtain qualitative data. I outlined the perceived advantages and disadvantages of photo elicitation as a research tool and highlighted the need to examine how participants themselves display an understanding of the photo elicitation task in conversational interaction. The following two chapters will report the results of these discursive analyses.
Chapter 5

Claiming and displaying national identification

5.1 Introduction:

As evidenced in Chapter 2, there have been various perspectives on national identity in the social psychological literature. For example, the SCT approach considers the cognitive processes that govern individuals use of the corollaries of national identity (i.e. national stereotypes, national categories), to be dependent upon contextual variations and dimensions of social comparison. Within the tradition of Discursive Psychology, much of the empirical focus has been on how individuals themselves construct their national identity according to the norms of identity expression and the local interactive business at hand. However, this thesis is novel in its consideration of how individuals, who were selected to afford different social positions in interaction, manage and negotiate their national identity within the same national context. Before presenting the discursive analysis of the chapter, the following introduction will provide a brief overview the discursive approach to national identity in the social psychological literature. I will discuss these findings contributed to an understanding of the importance of considering the different discursive strategies available to members of the same national category.

The discursive approach to national identity has illustrated how nationals in different social political context orient to different norms of identity expression in conversational interaction. Scottish nationals, for example, typically treat the proactive assertion of national identity as normative appropriate in conversational interaction (Kiely et al., 2005). Their English counterparts on the other hand, typically assert a banal taken-for-granted sense of national identity and distance themselves from
proactive displays of national sentiment deemed normatively inappropriate (Condor, 2006). Similarly, Irish adolescents in Northern Ireland consider overt displays of Irishness to be normatively appropriate, while these are downplayed and problematised by their Republic of Ireland counterparts who assert a banal form of identity expression (Stevenson & Muldoon, 2010). The findings of the discursive approach to national identity suggest that there are different forms of national identity expression in talk (namely proactive and banal displays) that group members adopt in different national contexts to address their discursive concerns.

These different forms of identity display have been attributed to differences in socio-political context, such as the unique conversational landscape of ‘border regions’ (Stevenson & Muldoon, 2010), the ‘identity politics’ of post devolution national accounting (Condor & Abell, 2006) or the perceived security of the national category (Condor, 1996). However, it remains unclear whether these different ways of expressing national identity are co-present in the same national context. This chapter aims to address this theoretical gap in the literature by considering individuals within the same ‘banal backdrop’ (Billig, 1995) to nationalism. In doing so, any strategic deployment of categories, memberships and expressions of national identity can be brought to the fore.

It is argued in Chapter 3 that in order to investigate the ways in which individuals actively construct national identity in interaction, a discursive psychological perspective is most appropriate. The proponents of discursive psychology have paid much attention to the manner in which identities are actively and strategically constructed and managed in talk. This approach has also been used extensively in the SCT tradition to examine how politicians construct their own national protypicality (Reicher & Hopkins, 1996; 2001). This perspective has also been particularly useful in
the study of national identity by identifying the different norms displayed by different national groups.

The present chapter will therefore address the gap in the empirical investigation of national identity and will employ a discursive analysis to examine how different identity strategies are used by members of the same nation in their talk of their national identities. The chapter will be divided into two major sections; accounts of Irishness and accounts of St. Patrick’s Day. In the first section, the aim to examine the identity management strategies, or the descriptive devices and properties of talk, employed to mobilize identities (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998, see also Chapter 3, section 3.7). The analysis then takes a closer look at participants’ talk of St. Patrick’s Day, highlighting how participants orient to the norms governing identity displays at this ostensibly inclusive national event.

5.2. Irish Travellers’ accounts of Irishness

The discussions, which took place in group interviews attended by Irish Travellers, shared some general characteristics that distinguished them from discussions involving their settled counterparts. In their talk of Irishness, Irish Travellers persistently oriented to their marginal subgroup position in talk and claimed high levels of social exclusion from mainstream Irish society. Participants also explicitly attributed their social exclusion to others in Ireland who did not see them as Irish. These concerns over being excluded from the national group were reflected in their talk of what constitutes Irishness. More specifically, Irish Traveller participants often oriented to their marginal status and used talk of Irishness to work up accounts of entitlement to inclusion within the category. This was done in several ways and included the use
proactive use of identity markers (Kiely et al., 2005) and the strategic repositioning of others outside of national category.

The proactive establishment of membership within the national category recurred throughout Irish Travellers’ discussions of national identity. This took a variety of forms including the presentation of identity markers (Kiely et al., 2005) as criteria of Irishness. For example, it was common for these participants to use their photographs of Irishness to support their claim to inclusion within the national category. In the following extracts we see Niall discussing one of their his photograph of the spire (see Photo 1):

*Photo 1. The spire monument in Dublin.*
Extract 1: ‘I might be a Traveller but I see the spike and...I think I’m Irish’

1 I: Ok (.) I’ll start with you Niall (.) is there any particular reason why you
2 picked this photo?
3
4 Niall: It’s just because Dublin is like the capital of Ireland so (1..0) so like it’s
5 definitely Irish and this umm was built years ago to mark like to give
6 Ireland and to give like Dublin as well (0,2) like a monument like Paris has
7 the Eiffel Tower like say ummm (0.1) like America has the statue of
8 liberty and it’s something to like say like say its Irish (.) you know that kind 8
9 of way (.)
10 I: Yeah (.)
11
12 Niall: So it kind of stands out for us like cos we’re like Irish and like people can
13 come back here to see the spike you know (.) so I’d reckon like its Irish like
14 you know (.)
15 I: Yeah definitely (.) and would that have any significance for you?
16 Niall: Umm I’m not sure (.) well yeah I guess cos I live here like you know
17 and I see the spike everyday like (.) I think it’s Irish then (.) like if you’re
18 from Dublin and you know the spike it’s like you’re Irish like you know
19 2.0) I might be a traveller but like when I see the spike I know umm (1.0)
20 I: Yeah (.)
21 Niall: Like I was born here and spend all the time in Dublin and so like I see the
22 spike and I think I’m Irish (.) I’m a traveller but I’m Irish too and the spike is
23 for everyone (.) all Irish people who were born here you know [pause] and
24 then foreigners visit and know it’s Irish (.) that’s what I think anyways (.)

At the start of the extract, the interviewer asks Niall to account for the
photograph he has chosen to discuss. Niall begins by hedging ‘it’s just’ (line 3) to
minimise his interest in the account (Goodman & Burke, 2011) before situating the
photograph, as an important landmark, within the geographical boundaries of Ireland. This is followed by a definitive statement confirming the Irishness of the photograph ‘its definitely Irish’, which is extended to contexts outside of Ireland, such as ‘Paris’, or ‘America’ (lines 4-6), increasing the objectivity of the account by presenting it as commonplace in multiple contexts (Potter, 1996).

The participant then uses the photograph to make a proactive claim to Irishness, first working up the Irishness of the photograph ‘its definitely Irish’ (line 3 & 4), then speaking in the first person plural ‘we’re like Irish’ (line 10) before shifting footing (Goffman, 1981) in the following line to refer again the photograph ‘its Irish’ (line 11). These shifts in ‘footing’ rhetorically manage the participants from personal claims to Irishness, which could appear interested. Instead the participant works up the Irishness of the photograph, effectively taking the sensitive concerns away from the speaker and making it part of what is described (Potter, 1996).

When the interviewer probes the personal significance of the photograph in line 13, the participant makes relevant his subgroup membership ‘I might be a Traveller’ (line 17) and again uses the photograph to make a proactive claim to national identity, mobilising the criteria of birth right and residency. The participant presents the claim as self-evident and something that is common through the generalised use of ‘you’ in lines 15-16 (Verkuyten & deWolf, 2002). Finally, at the end of the extract, the participant evokes birth right as a criterion of Irishness and constructs ‘Irish people’ as separate from ‘foreigners’ who again provide external validation confirming the Irishness of the photograph ‘the foreigners visit and know it’s Irish’. Evoking an external audience strengthens the claims made regarding the Irishness of the photograph (lines 22-23).

Irish Travellers also used images of nature in order to position themselves within the national category, evoking a sense of Irishness that was natural and organic. Images
of animals, in particular, were used to evoke birth right as a criterion of Irishness. Participants were inclined to simultaneously work up an account of the Irishness of the photograph and their own discursive claims to inclusion within the category. Consequently, there was a common tendency for respondents to use their photographs as a visual prop to justify their accounts of Irishness, such that their assertion that the photographs were indeed Irish were used interchangeably with the justification of their own claim to inclusion based on membership criteria (i.e. residence).

An example of the use of natural categories can be seen in extract two. Brian had presented a photograph of ‘Irish flowers’ (see Photo 2). The extract therefore begins with the ‘Irishness’ of the photo being established.

Photo 2. Flowers

Extract 2: The flower is Irish...it’s different with people

1  Brian: The Irish flowers come from the Irish soil like (.) it’s like from the ground
2   like
Niall: What you talking about (looks at BC)

Brian: Shut up you (.) I know what I’m taking about (pause) it’s like the Irish soil
that the flowers come from. (.) they are definitely Irish so (.) you know what I
mean (.)

I: Can you tell me a little more about that?

Brian: Yeah like if the flower grows from the soil and we’re in Ireland...the flower is 9
Irish (.) it’s different with people (pause) we’re born here but people think
we’re not Irish (.) we grew up here (.) like most Travellers never left Ireland 11
in their lives like (.) like they we’re born here and grew up here and people 12
still say we’re not Irish (.)

Brian had previously chosen a photograph of a flower and justified his choice by
evoking a sense of natural organic qualities. From Niall’s response in line 3 however, it
is clear that Brian has violated the Gricean maxim of relevance (Grice, 1975), which
states that conversation contributions should refer closely to the issue at hand.
Therefore, his response requires some repair work (Schegloff, Jefferson, and Sacks
1977). In doing so, Brian reacted defensively, asserting his position as a knowledgeable
speaker ‘I know what I’m talking about’ (line 3). Brian reiterates his claim as a
definitive statement ‘definitely Irish so’ and seeks corroboration (Potter, 1996) in lines
4-5. The Irishness of the flowers is then depicted as natural and organic, unlike that of
unspecified ‘people’ (line 8). At the end of the extract, the participant makes their
subgroup membership relevant and states as a matter of fact, that Irish Travellers ‘never
left Ireland in their lives’ (lines 9-10). As noted by Billig (1987), all arguments are
constructed in relation to their counter-arguments and here, the participants’ talk
displays that they anticipate potential counterarguments that may refer to their nomadic
lifestyle.
These extracts demonstrate that Irish Travellers made relevant their subgroup membership as ‘Travellers’ relative to the broader national category ‘Irish’. In addition, Irish Traveller orient to their marginalized identity as evidenced in explicit statements of exclusion i.e. ‘we’re born here but people think we’re not Irish (Extract 2, lines 9 & 10)

To rhetorically undermine their exclusion from the national group, Irish Traveller participants proactively asserted a claim to inclusion mobilizing criteria of birth right and residency.

Another mechanism whereby Irish Travellers rhetorically undermine their exclusion from the national category is by appealing to internal states, which are not open to refutation (Wittgenstein, 1958; Verkuyten & deWolfe, 2002). In the following extract, Joe has previously chosen a photograph of a religious statue (see Photo 3). The extract begins with the interviewer directing participants to explicitly consider the nature of the task ‘you took this as something that was Irish’ (line 1). Noteworthy is the interviewer’s use of past tense ‘was’, which is potentially hearable as problematising the current relevance of the participant’s representation of Irishness.

Photo 3. Religious statue
Extract: 3: ‘We believe in the same thing’

1 I: You took the picture as something that was Irish (.)
2 Jack: Yeah it’s Irish yeah (.)
3 Paddy: Religion (2.0) the Catholic like religion is still like a big thing for settled people like and we’re the same that way like (.)
4 Jack: I don’t think (.)
5 Paddy: The religion the same like (.)
6 Jack: I don’t think they have them statues in the settled home like (. I don’t know (. I don’t think so (.)
7 Paddy: No [long pause] but we believe in the same thing like (. you know what I mean (.)
8 I: So you have that in common (.)
9 Paddy: Hah (.)
10 I: The same (.)
11 Paddy: Yeah it’s the same yeah (. we pray to the same God like (. we’ll all going to heaven in the end like (laughs)

Jack responds in the present tense and states ‘it’s Irish yeah’ (line 2) and re-establishes the current relevance of the Catholic religion in Ireland. The participant then emphasises its importance particularly for the Settled community ‘religion is still a big thing for Settled People’ (line 3). Here, the participants evoke the category ‘Catholic’ (line 3) and work up an account of a ‘category bound activity’, not as a common sense knowledge base intended by Sacks (1972), but more as a vehicle to mobilise a discursive construction of similarity with Irish Travellers in terms of religious artefacts. However, Jack also orientates to intergroup differences and questions whether there are
religious statues in Settled homes. This leads to a reformulation that shifts focus away from religious artefacts and instead refers to common beliefs and practices ‘we believe in the same thing’, (line 9) ‘we pray to the same God’ (line 14). It is these less tangible aspects, such as religious beliefs, that are more open to strategic manipulation by the claimant as it is difficult to dispute internal states (Wittgenstein, 1958; Edwards, 1999). Finally, Paddy refers to an after-life, which, regardless of Jack’s orientation to difference, he constructs as a shared belief among Irish Travellers and Settled People, ‘we’re all going to heaven in the end like’ (lines 14 & 15).

It is worth noting the shifts in footing (Goffman, 1981) in this extract, which suggest that participants are orienting to group differences in their talk. The participant introduces the photograph of religious artefacts at the beginning of the extract as important for ‘settled people’ and his subsequent use of ‘we’ evokes Irish Travellers as a group rhetorically distinct from ‘Settled people’. The participant's subsequent use of ‘we’ includes both groups ‘we believe in the same thing’ (line 9), ‘we pray to the same god’ (line 14), ‘we’ll all go to heaven in the end’ (lines 14). The participant therefore evokes similarities between ‘we’ Irish Travellers and ‘Settled people’ to negotiate their subgroup membership within the national category.

Traveller groups used a variety of symbols to indicate the experience of a ‘felt identity’ as shared by others in the national group. As noted by Wittgenstein (1958), appeals to internal feelings are difficult to challenge in interaction as an individual is typically considered to be best placed to comment upon their own internal state. Here the national flag (see Photo, 4) is presented as a symbol which evokes a feeling of Irishness within the national context.
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Extract 4: When they see the flag they feel Irish

1. I: So there’s something about the Irish flag.
2. Niall: Yeah there is yeah. It’s very Irish and every Irish person when they see the flag they feel Irish.
3. Brian: Yeah like you know you feel it.
4. Niall: The flag is part of Ireland.
5. I: Do you notice the flag then like if you saw one on a building.
6. Niall: Yeah I would notice it when I’m walking down the street in Dublin with me cousin and I would notice the buildings with the flags. Wouldn’t you like? ((addressed to researcher))
7. (2.0)
8. I: Ah yeah what about it would you notice.
10. I: I mean you notice the Irish flag but do you know why like why the Irish flag and not other flags.
Here we see Niall establishing that the flag is an integral part of nation- ‘it’s very Irish’ (line 2), ‘part of Ireland’ (line 5) and notably, it is presented as invoking a feeling of Irishness in both participants (lines 2 & 3). This reference to the ‘inner world’ (Potter, 1996) of feeling Irish in response to the Irish flag is then presented as characteristic of all members of the nation “every Irish person” (line 2) using ‘extreme case formulation’ (Edwards & Potter, 1992) that draws on extremes to make the speaker’s own claim unproblematic and unexceptional. Hence the interviewees negotiate their position within the nation by invoking a common psychological experience with the wider national community.

Although the interviewer does not explicitly challenge the truth of the participant’s evocation of shared experience with ‘every Irish person’ (line 2), her repeated questioning ‘do you notice the flag’ (lines 6 & 12) challenges the assertion that the Irish flag elicits a consistently felt response among all category members.

Niall initially responds unequivocally ‘yeah I would notice it’ (line 7) and seeks clarification of shared knowledge from the interviewer ‘wouldn’t you like?’ (lines 7-8). However, Niall reconstructs his response on the basis of personal experience that is presented as routine, ‘when I’m walking down the street in Dublin’ (line 7). Such routine constructions of events, termed ‘script formulations’ (Edwards, 1994), act as a pre-emptive rebuttal technique reducing the risk of being challenged, as to do so would explicitly challenge the factual basis of their personal experience (O’Doherty & Davison, 2010). When questioned further about ‘why the Irish flag and not other flags’ (lines 13 & 14), Brian again asserts that the flag is indicative of being within the nation
but also elicits a feeling of belonging ‘people feel like they belong here’ (line 16). It would be particularly challenging to discount this claim to belonging in light of the reference to the inner world of feelings, which are by definition private and unknown, without also questioning the integrity of the speaker (Verkuyten & deWolfe, 2002).

A final identity management strategy whereby Travellers attempted to undermine their exclusion from the national category was through an appeal to other national contexts outside of Ireland. In the following extract, participants are discussing their experiences of Irishness abroad.

Extract 5.: The only place in the world

John: The only place we’re counted as Travellers in the world I think is Ireland (2.0) and they do treat us differently and they all put us down as the same (. ) if you go to England you’re counted as Irish (. ) they call you an Irish paddy or something like that if they are calling you names but you’re never called (1.0) only some parts of England you’re called a pikey or something like that (. )

Ann: Yeah (. )

J: They’d call you a pikey and all that kind of stuff (. )

Ann: Yeah yeah (. )

John: But mostly you’re known as Irish (. ) you’re never known as a Traveller (. )

I: Yeah I see (. )

Here, John makes relevant their subgroup membership ‘Traveller’ early in the extract and the discursive business at hand is to present Ireland as exceptional and deviant to the more general appreciation of ‘Travellers’ as Irish elsewhere in the world. The treatment of Travellers as different from the Irish in Ireland is depicted as existing
within an isolated context ‘the only place in the world’ (line 1) using extreme case formulation (Edwards & Potter, 1992). The appeal to extremes works to construct the treatment of Travellers in Ireland as exceptional. The participant suggests that there are different mechanisms in place in different contexts; Travellers in Ireland are ‘treated differently’ (line 2), while in most parts of England there is no distinction made by others- ‘you’re counted as Irish’ (line 3). By acknowledging that they are labelled as ‘Irish’ and ‘Paddy’ the participant emphasises the absence of the use of the ‘Traveller’ category. Therefore, the participant evokes different national context in order to emphasise their similarity with Settled Irish people under different circumstances and highlight their exclusion from the national group as exceptional and perhaps unjustified, in the Irish national context.

In the next extract, we can see how the criteria of religion and birth right are used strategically to place others outside the national category in talk, and by default, themselves inside. The extract begins with the interviewer identifying an alteration the participant made to the photograph. The photo is of a poster in a partnership organization in Dublin designed to highlight issues of discrimination. The poster once read ‘you still don’t feel Irish’. The participant inserted the name ‘Tim’ [pseudonym] and altered the photograph to have it read ‘Tim still don’t feel Irish’ (see Photo 5).
Extract 6.: If I was same as Tim then I’d call me-self British as well

1  I: Did someone put Tim. (.)
2  John: Yeah Tim because he’s from Northern Ireland (A takes the photo)
3  Ann: Tim still don’t feel Irish (reads message on photo aloud) I didn’t even see
4   that heh heh
5  John: He from a protestant family (.) he’s not protestant himself (.) he’s not
6   Catholic (.) I don’t think he believes in god himself (.) I don’t know what he 7  does (.) but (1.0) you know Tim he’s from up in Northern Ireland (.)
8  I: Yeah (.)
9  John: He has a British passport I think (.) if I was same as Tim then I’d call me-self
10  British as well (.) his whole family brought up that way isn’t it (.) If Tim
11  was brought up by a Catholic family then he would be Irish and could call
12  himself (.) Irish (.) so you can’t blame him for that (.)
13  I: But you guys feel Irish (.)
14  John: I’m Irish yeah (.)
There are three particularly interesting aspects in this interaction. Firstly, Tim’s place of origin ‘he’s from Northern Ireland’ works discursively to create a ‘relevant category environment’ (Sacks, 1972) in which the account producer trades on cultural knowledge of ‘Northern Ireland’ with a known religious divide. John then refers to the religious affiliations of Tim’s family, with Tim somewhere in-between ‘not Protestant’, ‘not’ Catholic- an ambiguous category (line 5-7). From the onset, therefore, Tim’s religious identity is problematised, and is constructed as malleable and open to interpretation by others.

Second, Jack uses Tim’s problematised religious identity to justify his exclusion from the national category and their subsequent inclusion. This is done by further undermining Tim’s religious identity, similar to Paddy in Extract 3, Jack refers to the internal state of religious belief but this time to highlight the lack of belief of another ‘I don’t think he believes in God himself’ (line 6).

Third, a hypothetical situation is then introduced which temporally switches roles ‘if I was same as Tim then I’d call me-self British as well’ (line 9-10) and moves away from Protestant as the relevant category. This switch is perhaps used to manage issues of accountability for producing potentially hearable sectarian comments. Finally, when asked ‘do you guys feel Irish’ (line 13), the participants refer to the same religious criteria to indirectly answer the question and support their claim to Irishness. Thus by manipulating Tim’s religious identity, the participants can use the same strategically
selected criteria to justify his exclusion and their own subsequent inclusion within the national category.

Further evidence of participants’ use of identity markers to strategically manage and negotiate their position within the nation, is presented in the following extract. At the beginning of the extract, the interviewer presents the participants with two categories and asks them to consider their position relative to both.

*Extract 7: We are Irish*

1. I: So you say you’re Irish and Traveller (.) is it a bit of both?
2. Jack: No they’re both (3.0) inside of each other like (.) do you know what I mean like (.) we’re Irish and Traveller like but Settled people (.) settled people try and be saying we’re Travellers like (.) that’s it (.)
3. Paddy: Not Irish at all (2.0)
4. I: Yeah (.)
5. Jack: That we’re not quite Irish but we are Irish like (.) we’ve been around for years and years and (2.0)
6. Paddy: Much longer than some of the Settled people here in Ireland (.)
7. I: Umm (.)
8. Paddy: The (.) the [long pause] we’re more Irish than the foreigners that are coming in here (.) Ireland is full of foreigners now like (.)
9. Jack: Sure we have the same skin colour at least (laughs)
10. Paddy: Same accent (.)
11. Jack: As the (.)
12. Paddy: Well near enough like (.)
13. Jack: As the Irish people (.)
In response to the interviewer’s question, Jack initially adopts a dual identity position with both categories “inside of each other” (line 2). However, this is presented as a contested opinion as Jack first speaks on behalf of his own group “we’re Irish and Traveller” (line 3) and then reports the conflicting speech of another “Settled people try and be saying we’re Traveller that’s it” (lines 3-4). This contested opinion is then followed by the participants’ attempts to develop an account of their entitlement to inclusion within the category, through stating their duration of existence in Ireland in comparison to ‘some of the Settled people’. In this way, length of residence is presented as prototypical of the national community and contrasted to more recently arrived sections of the community. This facilitates a more general comparison to ‘foreigners’ which works to highlight similarities in the markers of ‘accent’ and ‘skin colour’ between the Travelling community and the majority of other ‘Irish people’ (lines 11-14). In this way, the participants collaboratively work up an account of sharing Irish characteristics and simultaneously negotiate their group position by placing others outside of the category.

Irish Travellers proactive display of national identity was also evidenced in their accounts of St Patrick’s Day celebrations in Dublin city centre. The main parade on St Patrick’s Day was typically understood by these participants as representing the national community and having the role of bringing Irish people together. In their photographs (see Photo 6 & 7), these respondents indicated that overt displays of Irishness evidenced membership of the Irish community at the event.
Extract 8.

1 Niall: Well you look at that photo there like ((selects photo 6)) or the
2 women with her child and the women is wearing a green shirt (pause) like
3 you wouldn’t even know they are Irish like you know (.) but then you like at
4 this one (selects photo 7)) and like there is the two women
5 with the hats and Paddy’s day ribbons and that very Irish now (.)
6 Brian: Ah yeah that’s very Irish now (.)
7 Niall: Well them two are definitely Irish (.) you can tell by what they’re
8 wearing (.)
9 Brian: Ah yeah they’re very Irish now (.)
10 I: Is that what you’d be wearing?
Here overt displays of Irishness at the St. Patrick’s Day event were presented as authentic expressions of national sentiment. In contract, subtle displays of Irishness, are indicative of a lack of national sentiment and therefore an accountable matter at the event ‘you wouldn’t even know they are Irish (lines 2-3). Overt displays are taken as indicative of national sentiment. In contrast, subtle and underplayed displays of Irishness ‘wearing a green shirt’ are taken as evidence of a lack of national sentiment and presented as accountable behaviour at the event ‘you wouldn’t even know they are Irish (lines 2-3). Moreover, in line with the Travellers’ own proactive claims of national identity within the interview context, here participants orient to overt displays of Irishness as normatively appropriate and indicative of being inside of the national category ‘they’re very Irish now’ (line 9).

However, none of our sample actually attended the event or mentioned friends or family attending and their talk of the event centred around issues of exclusion.

Photo 8. The crowd at St. Patrick's Day.
Extract 9

1 I: Would you feel part of the crowd (.) let’s say you were there
2 watching the parade (.) would you feel closer to everyone ((points to
3 photo 8))
4 (0.3)
5 Ann: U:mm (.) yeah it’s like an Irish day so
6 John: We’re all Irish (.)
7 Ann: We’re Irish (.)
8 John: The only difference is that I’m a Traveller (.) that I live in a caravan
9 I: Yeah
10 John: But at the end of the day (.) I was born in Rotunda hospital and the
11 fella beside me in the crowd could have been born in Rotunda hospital 13
12 so that’s the way I look at it anyways (.) but some people don’t look at 14
13 it that way do they ((looks at researcher))
15 (2.0)
16 I: Um:m (0.1) yeah (.) u: mm

Here the respondent presents this understanding of the St. Patrick’s Day event as a day
for all Irish people. Both participants present themselves as part of the category,
reiterating ‘we’re Irish’ (lines 5–6). However, this statement of inclusion is qualified
with the acknowledgement of the recognized difference of the Travelling community
‘the only difference is’ (line 8). Subsequently, while the participant builds up an
argument for criteria inclusion on the basis of birth right (lines 10–11), this argument is
followed by the speculation that an external audience might contest this basis of this
claim ‘but some people don’t look at it that way do they’ (line 13 & 14). In effect, for
the Traveller respondents, the ostensibly inclusive nature of the event typically only
served to further highlight their own exclusion from the category.
5.3. Summary

This section is concerned with the way in which Irish Travellers construct and negotiate their national identity in interaction. Firstly, it has been evidenced in the analysis that Irish Traveller participants’ oriented to and made relevant their marginal subgroup identity in talk. More specifically, participants oriented to a broader framework of exclusion and made the intergroup context relevant by explicitly acknowledging the existence of a critical audience who resist their claims to inclusion with the national category (i.e. ‘we’re Irish but other people don’t see it that way’).

Therefore, this section focused particularly on how Irish Traveller participants orient to their subgroup identity in interaction and their use of identity management strategies to undermine their exclusion from the national group. Irish Travellers were additionally concerned with rhetorically work up a justification for their presence at the St Patrick’s Day event. Similar to their proactive establishment of criterial membership that occurred throughout the dataset, Irish Travellers proactively asserted a claim to Irishness and considered overt displays of Irishness to be indicative of being inside of the national category.

5.4. Settled peoples’ accounts of Irishness

In contrast to Irish Travellers’ discussions of Irishness, Settled participants did not make relevant any subgroup membership in talk and instead their account of Irishness took for granted their own inclusion within the national category. In the following extract, Settled participants Cian and Alex are discussing a photograph of an Irish flag (see Photo 9), something Billig (1995) considered part of the everyday unnoticed representations of the nation.
Extract 10: ‘It would just be there in the background somewhere’

1  I:  Yeah (.)
2  Cian:  Like Americans (.) like American’s are proud to be American and are like
3  “here’s our flag (.) lets put it up in front of our house and everywhere”
4  (.) whereas Ireland is a bit more (2.0) you don’t want to showing off too
5  much (.)
6  Alex:  Its not something I’d pay any attention to through (.)
7  I:  You wouldn’t really pay attention to (.)
8  Alex:  I wouldn’t really notice if it was all (. or if I didn’t really see one (. you
9  know what I mean (.) it would just be there in the background somewhere (.)
10  I wouldn’t really strike me or something (.)
11  I:  And yourself (. would you notice the Irish flag around the place?
12  Cian:  No I wouldn’t notice it really and I don’t think it would resonate with me or
13  anything you know (.)

Photo 9. Irish flags
Cian has previously chosen a photograph of an Irish flag and uses a form of active voicing (Potter, 1996) in lines 2-3 (‘here’s our flag’) that constructs a hypothetical co-participant to highlight the extreme displays of American patriotism, ‘in front of our house and everywhere’ (line 3). This is contrast to Ireland where this behaviour would be associated with a negative character assessment ‘showing off’ (lines 4-5). This example of ‘extreme case formulation’ (e.g., Pomerantz, 1986) appeals to extremes in order to work up the description of overt displays of national sentiment. This description is then used to contrast against what he orients to as normative displays for Irish people. In the following turn, Alex does not engage in this comparison but instead asserts a banal unnoticed and taken-for-granted sense of national identity ‘in the background somewhere’ (line 9). Cian corroborates (Potter, 1996) and in doing so, displays that the response is normatively appropriate.

Indeed, it was common for respondents to comment upon the unusual nature of the task and how thinking about their own Irishness did not come easily to them. In addition, as in the example above, when participants were asked to consider their own Irishness, they often oriented to this type of explicit talk as normatively inappropriate in and employed discursive strategies to deal with this concern. The following extract is quite typical.

Extract 11: I don’t think about it at all

1 I: So when you think of the Irishness do you mainly think of the past?
2 Kevin: Sometimes yeah (2.0) because now-a-days these things weren’t as readily available as they were back then. (.) you know what I mean (.) this wasn’t
3 we haven’t had a rebellion since then
4 heh heh there aren’t as many harp players around (selects photo 10
there used to be hundreds
of them trained by each other in the 17\textsuperscript{th} and 18\textsuperscript{th} centuries (.).

I: Is that the same for you TM (.), like when you think about Irishness do you mainly think of the past?

Delia: I don’t think about it at all to be honest (.)

Kevin: I don’t ever think about it either but it’s just after taking the photos (.)

Delia: I guess I would notice it more when I’m abroad (.), like you would notice an Irish flag more and like you would make like a beeline for the nearest Irish person (.), you know (.). Us Irish people are very clannish (.), like Deliamy Teiran said it right like you know the one where he says that Irish people infest rather than invade heh heh

Kevin: Oh yeah I know that one heh heh it’s so true isn’t it (.)

\textit{Photo 10. Harp}

As was a common feature in the dataset, when asked to explicitly consider ‘Irishness’, Kevin invokes historical, cultural and musical elements in his response
He also displays a high level of entitlement to speak on behalf of the group through his use of ‘we’ and adopting an adversarial footing against an implied outgroup ‘we haven’t had a rebellion since’ (line 4). However, when the interviewer then provides Delia with an invitation to corroborate ‘is that the same for you?’, this is resisted (line 7). She opts instead to directly disavow the salience of identity ‘I don’t think about it to be honest’ (line 9). Kevin then justifies his own previous account by attributing it to the unusual nature of the task. In this way he acknowledges Delia’s implied criticism and orients to the accountability of explicit talk of Irishness. Therefore, when respondents commented upon their own talk of national identity, this was presented as normatively inappropriate. This is in contrast to Irish Travellers accounts where it was deemed normative appropriate and desirable.

Delia then offers a response to the interviewer’s question but does so in a manner as to inoculate herself against criticism of inappropriate attention to national identity. Delia does this by invoking the context of being abroad as an exceptional instance. Thus she can explicitly attend to her national identity in talk but in a manner which presents this as exceptional rather than typical of her experience. To further distance himself from expressions of inappropriate nationalistic sentiment, Delia’s invocation of heightened awareness of Irishness abroad is presented in a comical and self-deprecating way rather than as an ideal attribute (lines 14-16). This provides a further point of contrast to the Irish Traveller’s accounts, where their invocation of Irishness abroad was treated as an exemplary experience (Extract 6 & 7).

In addition to providing an allowable context in which to explicitly attend to their national identity, the experience of being abroad was used to demonstrate the unusual and artificial nature of national identity in such contexts.
Extract 12: I’d be considered a crazy person

1 Tina: Well my second one is the Irish flag ((selects photo 9,)) of course that’s a (2.0) the same really (.) the Irish flag is representative of Ireland and represents Ireland all over the world (.) every time I’ve been abroad and in different places and I see the Irish flag and I just happen to (2.0) and I just stop and have a look at it and think wow the Irish flag and I just happen to be so umm (.) how do I say it like (.) I just want to hug it heh heh heh

8 Tina Heh heh

8 I: heh heh (.) and is that the same or different when you’re here in Ireland?

9 Tina: No not at all when I’m here in Ireland (.) sure I would be considered a crazy person here if I did like (laughs) but when I was in the states for Paddy’s once (.) I was people (.) like Irish families hanging their little flag outside the door which an awful lot of people did over there even the ones who weren’t like (2.0) 100% Irish

14 Mike Yeah (.)

15 Tina: But in the States so many of them claim to be Irish (.)

Here the participant presents a photo of an Irish flag and but through a long pause, he displays some difficulty in talking about this in the context in which it was taken (a government building in Dublin). Instead, similar to the above extract, he immediately moves on to discussing its salience elsewhere in the world. Again, there is an acknowledgement of the heightened visibility of the Irish flag aboard, where it is also considered acceptable to have heightening feelings of affinity towards it ‘I just want to hug it’ (line 6). This is explicitly contrasted to the situation in Ireland, where similar
feelings or behaviours are presented as extreme and unnatural, verging on pathological
‘I would be considered a crazy person here’ (line 8 & 9). Again, in contract to Irish
Travellers, Settled participants treat the overt expression of national identity abroad as
allowable, but claim it would be unnatural in their own national context.

In addition, the experience abroad was often used to discern between
authentically Irish and those who weren’t ‘100% Irish’ (line 12) but claimed Irishness
on a less authentic basis. The use of ‘100%’ Irish also indicates that this is phrased
carefully, indicating that the respondent is treating exclusion from the category as a
delicate and accountable matter. Against a background of their assumed Irishness
respondents were clearly engaged in the business of managing the reputation of
Irishness by distancing themselves from inappropriate or inauthentic representations of
their national identity.

In the following extract, the participant has taken a photograph of a toy
leprechaun and subsequently engages in the discursive business of managing the
reputation of Irishness.

*Extract 13: Managing Irishness*

1 I: Very good (.) and someone took a photograph of a leprechaun (selects photo
2 11,)
3 Mike: Yeah well I just took a photo of this toy leprechaun (.) I just took it basically
4 as a joke cos it’s such an American or a foreign thing to say is Irish and it’s
5 so offensive (.) it’s like telling you know a like a Mexican people that they
6 like beans or whatever or like an Asian person that they like rice of whatever
7 (.).
it’s always the Leprechaun with us or potatoes (.) so I just thought I’d put that in for the laugh (.)

Tina: A plastic paddy kind of thing (.)

Mike: Yeah I put it in to please the masses heh heh

This extract is characteristic of Settled peoples’ accounts of Irishness where the interactional business at hand involves the regulation of what is positive or negative, as well as authentic or inauthentic about Irishness. Firstly, this is done by presenting an
iconic photo of Irishness and attributing it to an external uninformed audience as representing their actual beliefs, which is deemed ‘offensive’ (line 2-4). This is followed by stereotypical accounts of other nationalities used to highlight the one-dimensional attribution of Irishness ‘always the leprechaun with us’ employing a form of ‘extreme case formulation’ (Edwards, 2000, Pomerantz, 1986) in lines 4-6 emphasising the unreasonableness of this stereotypical representation. Tina sums up this account with ‘a plastic paddy kind of thing’ indicating that it is an inauthentic representation and has derogatory connotations (line 8). In the light of this criticism of the image, Mike provides a justification for the inclusion of the ‘offensive’ inauthentic photo, displaying an awareness of an external audience and an attempt ‘to please the masses’ (line 9).

This recurred throughout the dataset in a variety of forms which all worked to condemn representations of Irishness which were deemed to be inauthentic, outdated, or in some way damaging to the Irish reputation abroad. In effect these respondents display a banal sense of national identity and use this ‘banality’ as a signifier of their entitlement to dictate what the characteristics of the group are in accordance with their own tastes and preferences.

The management of Settled participants’ discursive concerns was also evident in their talk the St. Patrick’s Day event in Dublin. Settled participants used their talk of the event to distinguish between authentic and inauthentic representations and to regulate the reputation of the national group. A popular claim (Pehrson, Reicher, Stevenson & Muldoon, under review) that recurred throughout the interviews was that ‘everyone can be Irish on St Patrick’s Day’.

Extract 14: Everybody is Irish
I: Did you think the parade was for everybody (.) do you think everyone would feel comfortable there?

Delia: I think so yeah (.) I don’t know if you (laughs) could have ummm (.) in terms of finding something from your culture maybe not but I think you are still welcome to pretend to be Irish (.)

Kevin: Yeah everyone is Irish on St. Patrick’s Day (.) that’s what they say isn’t it (.) you know all the foreigners get into it and (pause) it’s for everyone (.) everyone’s included (.)

Delia: Yeah I think the foreigners are more into being Irish or at least wearing all the crazy green crap (.) it’s funny really when you look at it (.) but it’s good everyone feels included (.)

Here the interviewer asks the participants to consider the level of inclusiveness of the St. Patrick’s Day event. In response, Delia presents the events as inclusive, if not representative of other cultures and as a matter of personal choice whether or not to attend. However, while the event is constructed as highly inclusive, Settled participants treat it as a site in which to distinguish between authentic and inauthentic representations of the national community. Delia uses the rhetorical commonplace ‘everyone is Irish on St. Patrick’s Day’ as a device to manage accountability by appealing to sentiments that are assumed to be commonly held ‘that’s what they say isn’t it’ (Potter, 1996). This is followed by detached observations of foreigners’ extreme and overt displays of Irishness that, from a spectator’s perspective, is amusing ‘it’s funny really when you look at it’ (line 10). In such a way, participants first create a
version of the event that is highly inclusive and then effectively comment and adjudicate the authenticity of the membership of participants.

Therefore, despite this overt expression of inclusively, on closer inspection, their talk was actually aimed at discriminating between the authentic and artificial elements of Irishness. In particular the main axis by which this discrimination occurred was through the assertion that overt displays of Irishness were indicative of being outside of the national category.

Extract 15: I don’t have to wear green it’s running through my veins

1 Cian: Judging from that day you often saw like little kids just covered in paint and the hats and scarves and like every single thing they could get and maybe then with the smaller kids their parents would be there with absolutely no sign of Paddy’s Day on their person like (2.0) apart from their child you know (.)
6 I: Yeah (.)
7 Alex: It’s like they didn’t join in themselves and then (.) and then like tourist would be wearing all the get-up as well (.) like the picture I took here (selects photo 7) I took this because they’re typical foreigners (.)
10 Cian: These are foreigners (.) they go all out don’t they (.)
11 I: Did you two get dressed up for Paddy’s?
12 Cian: I don’t have to wear green (.) it’s running through my veins

Cian provides a detailed description of the range of displays of identity behaviour on St. Patrick’s Day, firstly contrasting the extreme displays of ‘little kids just covered in paint’ (line 1) with that of their parents ‘with absolutely no sign of
Paddy’s Day on their person’ (lines 3 & 4), see Photo 12. Alan identifies and purposely takes a photo of foreigners who are typified by their explicit display. When asked ‘did you two get dressed up’, Cian indicates that there is no need to display markers of true Irishness as it ‘running through my veins’ (line 12)

Photo 12. St. Patrick’s Day onlookers

Indeed for those Settled respondents who did actually adopt some form of explicit display, it was evident that this was an accountable matter. In the following extract, Settled participants discuss face painting at the event (see Photo 13)
Extract 16: you’d just look stupid cos you’re like an Irish guy

1 I: Why did you feel it was stupid?

2 Kevin: Yeah I didn’t want to have something too in your face (.)

3 Delia: On your face heh heh

4 Kevin: Like a shamrock or some shit (.) I just got green lines under my eye or

5 something like that I think (.)

6 Delia: You think ((addresses Kevin))

7 Kevin: I can’t (.) yeah I think it was two green lines (.)

8 I: And why didn’t you want it to be too in your face?

9 Kevin: I don’t know (1.0) I guess (2.0) that’s a good question

10 (pause) you’d think that you’d just look stupid cos you’re like an Irish guy

11 you know (.) I suppose it’s more of a thing you think of tourists doing you

12 know (.)

13 Delia: That’s true (.)
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Overt displays of Irishness are presented here as inappropriate in a number of ways. Kevin has indicated that her did in fact have Irish adornments at the St Patrick’s Day event and has been trying to distance himself from this behaviour by framing it as ‘stupid’ (line 1). Here he continues to attempt to downplay the extent and significance of his own display, reporting that he ‘just got green lines under my eye or something like that I think’ (lines 4-5) emphasising the minimal, irrelevant and non-memorable nature of the decoration. Of particular note, is the way in which he presents his display as inappropriate, on the basis of ‘being an Irish guy’ (line 10-11) as opposed to being a tourist. In the same manner as Cian in the previous extract, he is displaying the assumed and unequivocal nature of his own national identity in contract to overt displays of Irishness that are indicative of being outside of the national category.

5.5. Summary

This section focused on how Settled participants managed their national identity in talk. The main interaction concern of Settled participants were two fold, first to manage any explicit talk of Irishness that would undermine their banal sense of national identity in talk and second, to manage the reputation of the national group. Settled participants’ deployed a number of discursive devices to address their local interactional concerns. For example, Settled participants disavowed the salience of national identity and stressed the ‘not noticing’ of symbols of Irishness (extract 10 & 11). Participants also evoked the experience of being abroad as an allowable context in which to speak explicitly about national identity (Extracts 11 & 12). Participants also managed the reputation of Irishness and authentic and inauthentic representations (Extract 13). In their talk of the St. Patrick’s Day event, Settled respondents to proactively distanced
themselves from overt displays of Irishness, which they deemed inauthentic, inappropriate and generally indicative of being outside of the national category.

5.6. Discussion:

One of the principal concerns of this chapter was to whether different ways of expression national identity are co-present in the same national context. There is an acknowledged gap in the study of national identity on how subgroup members orient to their positioning within the same nation and how this translates into the negotiation of group position in interaction. It is therefore illustrated in this chapter that subgroup members orient to their group position and employ different interactive resources to manage their discursive concerns in talk. It is suggested in the analysis that their doing so indicates some possible mechanism whereby the division between groups within the nation is evidenced and reproduced. First however, there will be a discussion of how the findings relate to the discursive literature on national identity.

5.6.1. Discourse analysis and national identity. It has been argued in this chapter that both sets of participants orient to their social position in talk and employ discursive resources to manage and negotiate their national identity. Irish Traveller participants orient to their marginal minority group position in talk and similar to Scottish nationals (Kiely et al., 2005) they proactively assert a claim to national identity and strategically use criterial markers of Irishness to negotiate their group position. However, unlike Scottish nationals, Irish Travellers’ proactive claims to national identity cannot be attributed to identity politics in this national context. Rather participants’ proactive and ‘hot’ displays of national identity are employed as strategic discursive resources to manage group position in talk. From their marginal position in
talk, Irish Traveller participants orient to overt displays of Irishness as normatively appropriate and indicative of being inside of the national category.

Settled participants, on the other hand, do not orient to a subgroup position in talk but assert a banal sense of national identity (Billig, 1996; Stevenson & Muldoon, 2010), which affords them an entitled majority group position to regulate the boundaries of Irishness. Settled participants therefore are similar to English nationals (Condor, 1996) who assert a taken-for-granted sense of national identity such that their interactive business is to manage explicit talk of nationalism, often by disavowing or denying national identity. Similarly, Settled participants orient to explicit talk of Irishness as normatively inappropriate and adopt various discursive strategies to manage their difficulty in talk. Participants often disavowed the salience of national identity (‘I don’t really think about it to be honest’) and stress that feelings of national sentiment were confined to a particular context (i.e. being abroad). In such a way, Settled participants constructions of national identity in talk, closely reflects the version of nationalism put forward by Billig (1995) that treats national identity as part of the banal backdrop to everyday life (Condor & Abell, 2006; Condor, 2010).

However, these findings make some important contributions to the literature on banal nationalism (Billig, 1995) that is worth stressing at this point. Firstly, it is not that participants are simply unaware of their national surroundings and that these fade into the backdrop of everyday life. Both sets of participants construct their national identity within the same national context, within the same ‘banal’ backdrop, yet it is only Settled participants who adopt a ‘banal’ identity position in talk. In fact, Settled participants can choose an overt form of identity expression (i.e. explicit talk of photographs of Irishness), however explicit talk is oriented to as normatively inappropriate and regulated by conversational co-participants. This suggests that for these respondents
‘banal nationalism’ is part of an identity strategy adopted and mobilised in talk rather than an unnoticed aspect of their everyday life.

In addition, ‘banality’ is seen as a marker of entitlement and is used strategically as a resource (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998) to regulate the boundary of Irishness. While asserting a sense of national unawareness in talk, Settled participants dictated the shape and characteristics of the national group. Participants evoke the perspective of an American tourist to highlight a distinction between inauthentic displays of Irishness (e.g. a leprechaun) from an uninformed audience and subtle and authentic displays of national identity. Participants considered overt displays of Irishness to be normatively inappropriate and indicative of being outside of the national category. Effectively, participants’ banal senses of national identity were used as signifiers of their entitlement to regulate Irishness. Irish Travellers proactive displays marked them as being outside of the national category, suggesting that some forms of identity display can potentially have ironic consequences for those who use them.

5.6.2. Minority- majority relations. Although epistemologically distinct, the discursive findings also speak to literature on minority and majority group membership. In particular, the axis of differentiation between minority and majority group members in terms of being ‘mindful’ has been problematised by the discursive findings presented in this chapter. The discursive findings challenge the traditional depiction of majority group members as ‘mindless’ and suggest instead that majority group members in this particular research context, strategically display their identity as ‘banal’ and taken-for-granted. Irish students can choose to depict themselves as ‘mindful’ of their group membership and were evidenced doing so. However co-participants regulate and problematised explicit talk of Irishness, orienting to this ‘mindful’ explicit talk of Irishness as normatively inappropriate. This suggests that, far from being ‘mindless’,
majority group members’, display of identity as banal and taken for granted, reflects a discursive act aimed at achieving desired goals.

The discursive findings also bring into relief the strategic behaviour of minority group members by suggesting that such group members do not passively accept their group membership. Indeed Irish Travellers, who orient to their marginal position, proactively and strategically negotiate their group position in talk (see Chapter 6). In addition, the discursive findings described in this thesis suggest that aspects of minority membership such ‘mindfulness’, ‘heightened awareness’, ‘greater subjective importance’ and ‘feelings of psychological separateness’ are not simply a passive by-product of their group membership, but can be evoked and actively used strategically, to negotiate group position. ‘Heightened awareness’ was evoked by Irish Travellers to highlight the unfair treatment by other groups’ members, who denied their claims to Irishness. Irish Traveller participants’ evoked heightened ‘feelings’ of group membership that are notoriously difficult to undermine to strengthen their claim to Irishness. Therefore, the discursive findings would indicate that membership of a minority group is not a passive process but can be evoked actively and used strategically to negotiate group position.

These discursive findings have, in effect, contributed to the literature on intergroup relations by highlighting how each set of participants orient to the norms governing identity displays and use their position strategically to address their discursive concerns. Irish Travellers orient to their marginal position, consider proactive displays of Irishness to be normatively appropriate and use this strategically to negotiate their group position (i.e. strategically selecting criteria of Irishness to proactively assert a claim to national identity). Settled participants on the other hand, strategically display their identity as banal and taken for granted, which they deem as normatively
appropriate. Importantly, the discursive findings contributed to the literature on national identity and intergroup relations by bringing into relief both majority and minority group members’ strategic uses of national identity.

5.6.3. Perceived social position. The discursive findings have also contributed to the literature on intragroup behaviour by problematising the traditional depiction of peripheral and prototypical group members. Firstly in terms of conceptualizations of the behaviour of peripheral group members, in discursive terms, Irish Travellers who orient to their marginal position, are not merely behaving as ‘good group members’ to speed up the acceptance process, but are proactively and strategically attempting to negotiate their position in talk. In addition, from a discursive perspective, ‘outgroup derogation’ and aspects of intragroup prototypicality are not considered underlying cognitive processes activated by peripheral group position, but discursive resources that can be mobilised and used strategically to negotiate and manage group membership. Irish Travellers strategically select criterial markers of Irishness (religion, length of residence, skin colour) and compare themselves advantageously to ‘black sheep’ to present themselves as prototypically Irish and unfairly marginalized by others, based on fulfilling their own strategically selected criteria. The discursive findings therefore demonstrate the strategic considerations of Irish Traveller participants who orient to their marginal position and attempt to proactively negotiate this position in talk.

The discursive findings are not entirely consistent with Jetten and colleagues (e.g., Jetten, 2006; Jetten et al., 1997) traditional depiction of prototypical group members as generally ‘doing less’ in terms of strategic behaviour than their peripheral counterparts. For Irish students, ‘doing less’ in terms of displays of national identity is strategic and a marker of group position, affording a degree of entitlement from that position to regulate the boundaries of Irishness (i.e. distinguishing between
authentic/inauthentic displays and positive/negative aspects of Irishness). In addition, the notions of power, prestige, charisma and leadership characteristics are depicted in the intragroup prototypicality literature as gifts ‘bestowed’ on prototypical group members. This is therefore slightly divorced from their strategic involvement and use of group position. However, the discursive findings described in this chapter suggest that settled participants assert a banal, taken-for granted sense of national identity and its possible that this ‘banality’ can be used strategically to police the boundaries of Irishness.

In summary, the discursive findings in this chapter suggest that these divergent displays of understandings among individuals within the same nation can potentially have interactive consequences by marking individuals as being inside or outside of the national category. This will be further explored in next chapter through an examination of participants’ display of understanding of the photo elicitation task.
Chapter 6

Entitlement, inclusion and the utility of photo elicitation

6.1. Introduction

As illustrated in Chapter one of this thesis, national identity has been conceptualized and investigated in a number of competing and contrasting ways in the social psychological literature. The SCT approach considers the cognitive underpinnings of participants’ flexible use of national categories. In doing so, SCT demonstrates the ways in which the category can change depending on the comparative context (Hopkins & Murdock, 1999), levels of dimension of social comparison (Hinkle & Brown, 1990) and constructions of political discourse (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). In contrast, the Discursive Psychology tradition derived from the work of Billig (1987), Potter and Wetherell (1987) and Edwards (1991), considers how speakers manage their identities in social interaction as part of a dynamic process in talk. However the discursive literature on national identity has neglected to consider the possibility that individuals within the same national context display and construct their national identity in different ways.

This gap in the literature was in part addressed in the previous empirical chapter by demonstrating that members of the same national category will adopt different forms of identity display in conversational interaction. The analysis also suggests the possibility that such differences might reproduce dominance and inequality in subtle forms in talk and text. However, the potential consequentiality of adopting different forms of identity displays for entitlement and inclusion within the nation, as evidenced and reproduced in talk, is currently under-explored. In this chapter, I argue that a
reflexive consideration of the use of photo elicitation affords an opportunity to examine in greater detail participants’ use of different identity display strategies. In particular, I will focus on the ways in which participants’ display of understanding of the task reflect issues of entitlement and accountability. In addition, the analysis of the photo exchange provides an opportunity to examine shifts in dynamic within the interview context. Firstly, the following section provides a brief overview of discursive approach to issues of entitlement and accountability.

6.1.1 Discourse, Entitlement and Accountability. There has been a considerable amount of research in recent years that examines the ways in which ethnic minorities carve their place within the host nation and equally, to the ways in which majority members assess and receive their claims to inclusion within the nation (e.g., Kinket & Verkuyten, 1999; Verkuyten & Nekuee, 1999; Verkuyten, 1991). In terms of the sociological literature Kiely et al., (2005) illustrate how Scottish nationals assess the legitimacy of migrants’ claims to Scottishness and in doing so, engage with the interactional nature of identity construction. The authors draw attention to the ways in which migrants strategically select aspects of their national identity and orient to issues of entitlement. This study also alludes to some interesting findings in terms of participants producing claims that display an understanding of others evaluating their entitlement to inclusion within the nation. However, the analysis reflects a general tendency in sociological work on national identity to focus on the content of claims at the expense of any interpretation of the functionality of discourse.

There are a number of studies which apply a discourse analytic approach to investigate how majority group members attend to the accountability of ‘prejudiced talk’ while expressing and denying racist utterances (e.g., Rapley, 1998; Van Dijk, 1992; Wetherell & Potter, 1992). Within the analysis, the researchers identify the
discursive devices used by participants to attend to issues of accountability and present a favourable self-image, while uttering complaints about minority group members. The work of Condor et al., (2006) does not consider racist and prejudiced discourse to be self-evident and instead focuses on how the discursive action as ‘racist’ and ‘prejudiced’ may in itself be treated as a collaborative accomplishment. In doing so, the responsibility to manage the accountability of prejudiced talk is shared jointly by the speaker and co-participants. These studies highlight different ways in which participants attended to issues of accountability in talk, while managing their identity interactionally.

6.2.1. Interviews as research tools. Methodological debates in discursive psychology have considered some of the pitfalls inherent in the use of data obtained from interviews and instead advocate for data obtained from naturalistic setting. The authors caution against the tendency of researchers using interview data to write the interviewer out of the conversational interaction and the risk of importing the research agenda into the interview context (Potter & Hepburn, 2005). In the qualitative elements of this thesis, the cautionary comments and ways of negotiating pitfalls were acknowledged and incorporated into the analysis (when it was consistent with the empirical question to do so). However, it is argued here that the use of photo elicitation in this thesis provides a unique opportunity to explicitly address the ‘inherent’ flaws in interview methods by reflexively considering participants’ orientation to the interview context as the object of empirical investigation.

Researchers have noted some inherent advantages to the use of participants’ photographs in interview contexts. Principally, the literature highlights the potential for photo elicitation to provide participants with a sense of entitlement to speak, through their active engagement with the research process (Ortega-Alcazar & Dych, 2011, Harper, 2002; Croghan et al., 2008). Closely linked to this perceived advantage is a
potential pitfall encountered by researchers to attribute agency to the photograph, at the expense of acknowledging the collaborative work of the interviewer and interviewee in interaction. More specifically, Jenkings et al., (2008) concluded that the participants reflexively participate in the process of meaning generation in their interaction with the interviewer. However, it is necessary to consider participants’ engagement with the task, not simply in terms of reflexively participating in the process, but as displaying their reflexive engagement. This brings into relief the performative function to address their discursive concern in talk (see also Chapter 3, Section 3.7.).

6.3.1. The present investigation. The mains of this chapters are two-fold: first, to further consider the potential consequence of divergent displays of identity for individuals' inclusion and entitlements within the nation and second, to contribute to the methodological debates about the utility of photo elicitation. This present chapter therefore seeks to contribute both theoretically and methodologically to the studies of identity in the social psychological literature by examining how participants display an understanding of the photo elicitation task. More specifically, this chapter will attempt to answer the question: do participant’s display of understanding of the task reflect their discursive concerns to manage issues of entitlement and accountability as they engage with their own and the other participants’ representations of Irishness. However, it is first necessary to negotiate some potential pitfalls in discussing the use of photo elicitation from a discursive perspective.

In the photo elicitation literature there is a presupposition that photographs hold meaning that only the participants have access to, as generators and owners of the photographs. The positive by-products of their ownership of the photographs are a sense of entitlement to speak and accountability to the ‘meaning’ behind the photographs. This reflects a phenomenological understanding of the photo elicitation task, where the
‘meaning’ and ‘ownership’ elicited through the task is a reflection of a subjective reality (Silverman, 2001).

However, in terms of the analysis in this chapter, and in line with a more ethnomethodological approach, ‘ownership’, ‘accountability’ and other such concepts are only discussed in so far as participants themselves make these relevant in interaction (Hugh-Jones, 2010). The focus is therefore on how participants use these concepts to negotiation of their discursive concerns in talk.

Additionally, the photo exchange provides a unique opportunity for these two sets of participants, who have minimal interaction (CHP, 2007), to engage with each other’s representations of Irishness (Harper, 2002). This effectively simulates an intergroup response from research participants as they are asked to reflect on the other group’s photographic representations, which will be evidenced in the analysis. However, in line with the discursive approach, ‘groups’ and ‘intergroup responses’ will only be discussed in so far as individuals orient to these aspects of PEI in conversational interaction.

The main empirical investigation of this chapter will therefore be two-fold (1) to employ a DP approach to the understanding of how each group orients to the photo elicitation task (2) to incorporate a contemporary DP approach that incorporates an analysis of the organizational interpretations people themselves employ in the moment-by-moment course of conversation as they view and comment on the other group’s representations of Irishness. The following section will deal with Irish Travellers’ display of understanding of the photo-elicitation task.
6.2. Irish Travellers, photo-elicitation and entitlement

As evidenced in Chapter 6, Irish Traveller participants, orient to their marginal minority membership in talk and use criterial markers of Irishness to proactively assert a claim to inclusion within the national category. It is argued in this section that Irish Traveller participants’ display of understanding of the photo elicitation task is used as a discursive resource to further undermine their exclusion from the national group.

In support of this argument, attention is drawn to how participants display their ownership of the photographs, particularly when introducing the task. Second, participants’ display of ownership will be examined in terms of their opportunity to work up their entitlement to comment on the content of Irishness. Participants then use their talk of task as a discursive ‘resource’ to ‘accomplish’ being a member of the national category (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998). In doing so, attention will be paid to how participants manage dilemmas of stake and interest (Potter, 1996, see also Chapter 3 for description) that could undermine the legitimacy of their claims to inclusion. In addition, particular attention will be paid to the way in which participants’ responses are occasioned by the interviewer's questioning and how this might shape the conversational interaction.

On first inspection, Irish Traveller participants appeared to adopt a dual approach to the photo elicitation task, generating iconic photographs of Irishness and photographs deemed idiosyncratically part of their own culture. In the following extract, Niall is discussing a photograph of his Irish passport (see Photo 14).
Extract 1: ‘It shows your identity’

1 Niall: [...] but ummm yeah (0.3) that’s the reason why I picked her (.) um (.) cos Irish like and Irish school ((points to photo 1))
2 I: The Irish school (.)
3 Niall: Y::eah (.) umm the second one I’d pick is (.) my passport ((picks up photo)) the reason I picked this like (.) like it’s your [Irish passport]
4 I: It shows that you’re Irish (0.1) it shows your identity (.) its shows like what culture you have (.) you’re Irish (.) you’re ummm (.) American or whatever and again it has the harp like (.) like a symbol of Ireland like you know (um::m=)
5 Niall: Ye[ah] it says citizen of Ireland so (.) so (.) this is my passport (.) it shows that I’m Irish (0.2)
6 I: So (0.1) you use it for that reason (.) its like (.) this is my passport (.) I’m Irish (0.1)
Niall Yeah its shows that I’m Irish (.) umm (0.1) the third (.) the third one I’ve chosen here would be this one here with the caravan ((points to photo 3))

There are number of interesting features in this extract which suggest that the participants display an understanding task as one affording an opportunity to work up or accomplish being a member of the national category. First, Niall self-selects the photograph of his Irish passport and positions himself as the owner of the item ‘me passport’ (line 6). In the rest of the turn however, he shifts to the second person ‘it shows you’re Irish’ (lines 9 & 10) and second person possessive pronoun ‘your Irish passport’ (line 7), ‘your identity’ (line 9). This use of ‘distanced footing’ (Potter, 1996) allows participants to manage their stake or interest in the claim by rhetorically altering their proximity to a particular statement. This also works to strengthen subsequent claims based on shared ownership of the passport.

Participants’ display of ownership affords an opportunity to work up an account of category membership that entitles them to comment on the content of Irishness. First, the participant works up the Irishness of the photograph. This is done by presenting the passport as something particular to Ireland by incorporating ‘culture’ and the symbolic representation of ‘the harp’ (lines 4 & 5). This is followed by a marker of common knowledge ‘you know’ (Edwards & Mercer, 1987; Schiffrin, 1987). It is then presented in a generic fashion ‘it show (.) you’re Irish (.) you’re American or whatever’ (line 4) and thus is formulated as general statement rather than a personal viewpoint. This allows the participants to establish the Irishness of the photograph while simultaneously distancing themselves from personal claims that could be perceived as interested and in some way biased.

The participants then use their talk of the photograph as in interactive ‘resource’ (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998) to proactively assert a claim to inclusion within the
category. Niall’s display of ownership of his photograph of an Irish passport ‘this is my passport’ (line 13) and evidence of criterial membership ‘it says citizen of Ireland’ (line 13) can be used support his own claim to inclusion within the category ‘I’m Irish’ (line 14). The passport is in effect presented as incontrovertible proof of citizenship in Ireland ‘it shows that I’m Irish’ (lines 7 & 8). However, the participants also ensures that claims made on the basis of ‘me passport’ (line 6) are not only from the direct viewpoint of the speaker, but also concern ‘your passport’ (line 7) and are therefore from the perspective of any reasonable person in the same position (Muhlhausler, Harré, Holiday, & Freyne, 1990). In such a way, participants use their display of understanding of the task as a ‘resource’ to accomplish Irishness (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998), while managing issues of stake and interest that could undermine the legitimacy of their claims (Potter, 1996).

It is interesting to note that the interviewer’s interjection at the beginning and end of the extract prompts the participant to select another photograph. This can be interpreted in a number of different ways, for example, the interviewer’s interjection at line 4 ‘Irish school’ is a reiteration of the participants’ previous statement which could be hearable by the participant as a synopsis of this statement and therefore, a signal to initiate a topic shift (Sacks, 1996). At the end of the extract, however, it is possible that the interviewer’s question concerning the ‘use’ [emphasis added] of the passport could work to problematise the discursive business being done. More specifically, it has have highlighted in the analysis that participants engage in the business of stake inoculation by adopting a ‘distanced footing’ (Potter, 1996) to objectify their national identity claims. However, this is problematised by the interviewer’s use of close footing, as the ‘use’ (line 16) makes explicit the participants strategic use of the photograph to claim Irishness.
In the following extract Joe introduces his photograph of a caravan and in a similar way to the above extract, the participant displays his ownership of the photograph at the beginning of the extract. In doing so, the participants use their displays of ‘ownership’ as a resource to work up their entitlement to comment on the content of Irishness. Here the participant is discussing a photograph of a caravan (see Photo 15).
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Photo 15. Caravan

Extract 2: ‘The caravan is on Irish land...its very Irish’

1  Mary  I took this first one (. ) its (0.2) of the caravan (. ) it’s where I live (. ) my
2  family live (. ) there like (0.2) like everyone I know
3  I:  [U::m]
4  [Like] they tried to make Travellers live (. ) like settled people like (. ) like in
5  houses (. ) some of the Travellers live in houses but the Traveller way of life
6  is in caravans (. ) like this one like ((holds photo))
7  (0.3)
8  Peddy:  We can show you the other ones like outside (. )
9  I:  Sure after that would be great (. )
10 Mary:  Like me cousins lives in the one there (point to photo) sometimes there are
five or six people living in the caravan (.) it’s not a lot of room like but that’s the Traveller way of living (.) heh heh

(0.1)

I: And you took this photo because

(0.1)

Mary: I took this photo like (.) like because people think cos we not in Settled houses that we’re not Irish (0.2) but we are Irish you know (.) we live on the land (.) like we’ve been living inside the cou[ntry=

Peddy: = We’ve been here for years like (.)

(0.1)

Mary: Just because we have a different way of life. (.) we’re still Irish (.) we live in Ireland (0.2) so the photo there is the caravan on the Irish land like (.) it’s very Irish (.)

(0.2)

I: So you took the photo because (.) it’s very Irish (.)

Mary: ↓ Yeah (0.3) the second photo here ((pick up next photograph))

Early on in the exchange, Mary displays her ownership of the photograph ‘I took this one’ (line 1). Similar to extract 1, Mary uses a form of ‘distanced footing’ (Potter, 1996) first speaking from a personal viewpoint ‘where I live’ (line 1) and then discursively altering her proximity to the statement. Again, this works rhetorically to manage counterclaims of vested interests that would undermine the legitimacy of subsequent claims made on the basis of the photograph. In effect, these shifts in ‘footing’ to include the participant, family members and ‘everyone’ (line 2) sets up the objectivity of account and strengthens any claims that would based on shared ownership of the item.

The participants then display their entitlement to discuss aspects of Irish Traveller culture. This display of entitlement is evidenced in adopting the role of interviewer (Kolb, 2008) evoking descriptions of living conditions (line 8), issues of discrimination (line 9) and contexts outside of the interview ‘we can show you the other
ones like outside’ (line 6). Here, the participants, as members of the Irish Travelling community, are entitled to speak (Potter, 1996) in terms of their experiences of Irish Travellers culture and display this entitlement by evoking detailed knowledge of Irish Traveller culture.

In line 7, the interviewer asks the participant to justify their choice of photograph. At this point the participant engages in ‘stake confession’ (Potter, 1996) making their vested interest explicit in lines 16 and 17, and in doing so, they make relevant their marginal minority group membership. Stake confession is a rhetorical device that treats the speaker as having already taken his or her own interests into account, thereby inoculating against criticisms of vested interest (Potter, 1996). This allows the participant to orient to their marginal subgroup membership in talk to highlight the unfairness of their exclusion from the national group ‘people think just because we’re not in Settled houses that we’re not Irish (lines 16-17)’.

The participants then use their talk of the photograph as a ‘resource’ to undermine their exclusion from the national group and accomplish Irishness (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998). The participants use the photograph to present evidence of their existence within the geographical boundaries of the nation ‘the caravan is on Irish land’ in response to Settled people denying their right to membership. This is followed by a definitive statement confirming the Irishness of the photograph ‘it’s very Irish’ (line 18). In such a way, participant’s talk of the photograph is used interchangeably with their own claim to inclusion within the national category.

However, the fragility of the participants’ display of entitlement to comment on the content of Irishness is revealed in line 19 when the interviewer echoes the participant’s statement, similar as in extract one, referring them back to the task. (having previously been asked to justify their choice of photograph in line 14). The participant
provides a minimal response ‘yeah’ (line 26) and initiates a topic shift by selecting another photograph. It is possible that interviewer’s question is hearable as challenging the participant’s justification for generating the photograph, thereby implicitly challenging the participants’ use of the photograph to accomplish being part of the national category. ‘so you took the photo because it’s very Irish then’ (line 19). It is interesting to note that the interviewer’s insertion of a backchanneled response in line 3 and explicit prompting for elaboration in line 11 do not appear to lead to conversational difficulties. It is only when the interviewer makes the task explicit ‘so you took the photo’ (line 19) that the participant initiates a topic shift. Again, this suggests that the interviewer is problematising the participants’ use of the task as a ‘resource’ to undermine their exclusion from the national group and ‘accomplish’ being a member of the national category (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998). In the following extract, participants are discussing a photograph of tinsmitting (see Photo 16).
Extract 3: ‘This is the Traveller way of life but its part of Irish history’

Nancy: It’s tinsmitting (.) you know what that is now don’t you (directs question to Interviewer)
I: I think so yeah (.)
Nancy: It them buckets and things there that the Travellers used to make years ago (.)
Bridie: It’s the traveller way life but it is part of Irish history too but they don’t have them in the school books (.) but it is part of the Irish history (.)
I: And so you have dogs here do you ((pick up photo 10))
Bridie: I’m not sure why I took that (.) they’re just dogs (laughs) well obviously its Irish so it has to be an Irish breed like you know (.)
I: Yeah
Nancy: Well it’s an Irish dog so (.) like us (.) we’re born here and so we’re Irish (.)
Bridie: Yeah so it’s an Irish dog (.)

Similar to extracts one and two, there are a number of noteworthy aspects of this exchange that contribute to an understanding of participants’ use of the task to address their discursive concerns and importantly, to the interviewer’s role in this interaction. The first notable point about this extract is that the talk does not reflect the standard norms of interview interaction (i.e. interviewer asks question, participant provides answers). Rather, Nancy adopts the role of interviewer seeking confirmation of shared knowledge ‘you know what that is don’t you’ (lines 1-2). The interviewer provides an uncertain response in turn (line 3), which affords Nancy the opportunity to display her entitlement to speak and provide clarifying information. Nancy does so by describing ‘tinsmitting’ as an activity Irish Travellers used to engage in ‘years ago’, evoking a historical past. Bridie takes up this account, engages in collaborative completion
(Potter, 1996), and actively locates ‘Traveller life’ in ‘Irish history’, while acknowledging the absence of Traveller history in formal education (line 5-6).

Second it is worth noting that in contrast to Extracts 1 & 2, the participants do not display their ownership of the photographs early on in the exchange. Rather, participants use of ‘the Travellers’ suggests a ‘distancing device’ (Potter, 1996) that discursively alter their proximity to the statement and inoculates against any potential counterclaims of vested interest that could undermine its legitimacy. Additionally, in the absence of displays of ownership of the photographs, the participants use of ‘the Travellers’ works rhetorically to invoke respective category entitlement to knowledge and experience (Potter, 1996). This allows participants to continue the discursive business of using their photographs to undermine their exclusion from the national group.

Third, at line 7 there is a notable shift in entitlement to speak. The interviewer re-establishes her position and inadvertently challenges the participants’ representation of Irishness, holding them accountable for the photograph of dogs ‘do you have dogs here’; the question, by omitting any reference to nationality, highlights the fact that it is not self-evidently Irish. It is at this point that Bridie makes relevant her ownership of the photographs ‘I’m not sure why I took that’ (line 8) and responds to shifts in entitlement by mitigating, justifying and renegotiating her position. She begins first by ‘hedging’ her account (Goodman & Burke, 2011) ‘I’m not sure why’ (line 8), to accomplish uncertainty or tentativeness in expressing opinion and then downgrades her choice of photograph ‘they’re just dogs’ and produces some laughter (line 8). The interviewer provides a continuer (‘yeah’, line 10), which allows Nancy to re-establish her entitlement to speak. In doing so, she asserts the Irishness of the photograph in a reformulation with an appeal to common sense ‘well obviously’ and refers to the linage
or pedigree of the animal (line 8-9). The assumption offered to the listener here is that Irishness is equated with place of birth and strong family bonds to place, which is made explicit in the following line in support of her own claim to inclusion within the national category ‘we’re born here so we’re Irish’ (line 10).

Particularly noteworthy here is the interactional difficulty that occurred after the interviewers’ question in line 7. In the previous two extracts the participant selects another photograph, thereby initiating a topic shift and perhaps in order to re-establish their entitlement to speak. However, in this extract, it is the interviewer who selects the photograph and initiates a topic shift and the participant must now manage their accountability for taking the photograph, while attempting to re-establish their entitlement to speak. This results in a considerable amount of interactional difficulties (i.e. conversational cut-offs and false starts).

6.2.1. Summary. It is argued in this section that participants’ display of understanding of the photo elicitation task affords an opportunity to work up their entitlement to comment on the content of Irishness. Participants use their talk of the photographs as a discursive ‘resource’ to ‘accomplish’ being a member of the national category (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998). More specifically, the participants use their talk of the photographs as a ‘resource’ to mobilise criterial markers of Irishness (birth right, residence) to justify their own inclusion within the category.

Discursive research has examined the role of interviewer self-disclosure as a research strategy to manage power relations and build rapport with respondents (Abell, Locke, Condor, Gibson & Stevenson, 2006). Photo elicitation, as a research tool, is thought to off-set traditional power dynamics in interviews and builds rapport with respondents (Harper, 2002). However, the extracts above also illustrate how the insertion of the interviewer in the interaction can, in fact, close down interview talk and
problematise the business being done. As evidenced in the analysis, the interviewer’s
question can problematise the participant’s use of the task, as it can be hearable as
undermining the participant’s account of the Irishness of the photograph, thereby
displaying the greater entitlement of the interviewer in the interaction (Abell et al.,
2006).

The following section will employ a DP approach, focusing on the constructed
nature of participant’s utterance and the kind of interactional business being performed.
The contemporary concerns of discursive psychology will be attended to by
incorporating a conversation analytical perspective on social action (Antaki &
Widdicombe, 1998; Condor et al., 2006; Edwards, 1997) with the analytic focus on both
the sequential organization of interaction and on what is made relevant by participants
themselves (Schegloff, 1997).

6.3. Irish Travellers and the photo exchange

Following on from the previous section, this section will deal with participants’
conversational interaction during the photo exchange, where participants were given the
opportunity to view the photographs generated by the other group. The following
analysis focuses on the interaction immediately after the photo exchange and then, when
participants are asked to compare the two sets of photographs.

The following extracts are taken from the group interviews of Irish Traveller
participants, Ann and John. The participants had previously been discussing arranged
marriages as a feature of Irish Traveller culture. The extract begins with the interviewer
initiating a topic shift using a non-verbal prompt to discuss the photographs generated
by the other group.
Extract 4:

1. John: What if she’s ugly [heh.heh]
2. I: [heh.heh]
3. Ann: [heh.heh]
4. Ann: But looks don’t always count either >>it’s like you know
5. John: It’s what’s inside that co(h)unts
6. (1.0)
7. Ann: ↑Ye(h)ah that’s it now heh heh
8. I: Exactly (1.0) ↑ok (1.0) >>I have one more set of photos for you guys
9. to look at .hh
10. Ann: >>You could get married to a lovely girl and she could turn out to be
11. the worst mistake you ever made ↑you know things like that
12. (1.0)
13. John: O:k ↓we’re off the point A [heh.heh]
14. I: [heh.heh]
15. Ann: [heh.heh]
16. I: ((hands photos to participants))
17. (0.8)
18. I: ↑This is a settled person who took these photos now
19. (1.0)
20. John: A settled person
21. I: ↑[Y:eah]
22. (2.0)
23. John: Its ↓Irish (2.0) see the ↑hurling is involved again (1.0) all this Gaelic
24. football kind of stuff >>↑it’s a ve::ry big part of Irish culture
25. (2.0)
26. Ann: ↑Flags
27. (2.0)
28. John: The garda
29. (1.0)
30. I: The o:ld guards yeah
31. (2.0)
32. John: <<I wonder if this is the only country that has ↑garda on the back (1.0)
33. >>you know in America it’s the police and in England it’s the police
34. (.) all other countries it’s the police but I think this is the only country
35. that has the garda
There are aspects of this exchange which suggest that participants are orienting
to shifts in entitlement to speak, having agreed to engage with the other set of
photographs. Prior to the photo exchange, participants are engaging in a form of story-
telling sequence or a series of turns that relay a particular event (Schegloff, 1997). Here,
there is minimal input from the interviewer, which suggests that participants are
displaying their entitlement to speak (Kolb, 2008). However, when participants are
handed the photographs the pattern of conversational interaction changes.
Conversational disruptions can signal that there are aspects of the exchange which are
difficult or sensitive in some way (e.g., Condor et al., 2006; Verkuyten & deWolfe,
2002).

Here, conversational disruptions are visible immediately after the photo
exchange in line 16. This is followed by a considerable pause with no noted action by
the participants, no space fillers, placeholders or audible breathing that would signal
recognition by the participants that the silence needed to be attended to (Jefferson,
1987). In the absence of any extended talk by the participants, it is the interviewer who
attends to the conversational silence in line 18 by providing the participants with
additional information. This lengthy pause could indicate at this point that there is trouble in talk. However, participants are also engaged in a task that displaces attention from them onto the photographs, normalizing conversational silence (Harper, 2002).

There is further evidence of conversational difficulties after the interviewer’s turn in line 18. John offers a truncated version of the interviewer’s statement ‘a Settled person’ which indicates that the statement was heard by the participants and that the request for clarification could therefore function as a space-filler to delay response (Yates, Taylor, & Wetherell, 2001). The overlapping speech of the interviewer in the following line responds to the request for clarification. After a considerable pause (Pfeffer, 1995), in line 16 there is a pronouncement by John confirming the Irishness of the photograph, completing the non-verbal request to discuss the photographs initiated by the interviewer 6 lines previously. Here it can be seen that following a period of extended silence and space fillers to delay responding, the participants confirm the Irishness of the other set of photographs.

Having confirmed the Irishness of the other photographs, there are aspects of this exchange that follows which suggest that participants are displaying their lack of entitlement to comment on the other group’s representation of Irishness. Firstly, an initiation of side sequence exchange in line 32 invites speculation about an aspect of the photograph in a different context. This effectively moves participants’ talk away from the current, collective representation. Second, participants adopt the role of interviewer in lines 37-46. In line 39 the first part pair (FPP) of a question-answer sequence is designed to initiate action that incorporates the interviewer into the turn-taking organization ‘Is it the Irish word for police’ (Schegloff & Sacks, 1973). This sequence is repeated in line 43 where Ann initiates a question-answer adjacency pair ‘Isn’t it LAPD or something in America’, followed by the SPP provided by the interviewer.
‘think so yeah’ (line 46). However unlike when Irish Travellers were discussing their own photographs, their questioning in this account affords the interviewer greater entitlement to speak in interaction.

In the following extract from later in the same interview, participants are asked to make a comparison between their own and the other set of photographs. This follows a period of talk in which the participants are engaging in the interaction sequence initiated above, asking the interviewer questions concerning the other group’s representations. The interviewers question effectively attempts to refer participants back to the task at hand, discussing the other group’s representation of Irishness.

**Extract 5: Asked to make comparison**

1. I: ↑S:o the pictures (1.0) >>are they different from your own in any way (3.0)
2. Ann: ↓J do you want to look at any of them ((hands photos to J))
3. I: Are they ↑different from your own in anyway (1.0)
4. Ann: ↑These pictures (1.0)
5. I: Yeah do you think it’s ve:ry ↑different or ve:ry ↑similar (2.0)
6. Ann: Yeah kind of ↑similar because there is [all Irish flags]
7. John: [all Irish flags]
8. Ann: Football (1.0)
9. J: But they’re all the parade ↑you know that kind of way (1.0)
10. Ann: Gaelic (1.0) the football (2.0)
11. John: It’s all the parade (1.0) so they could have done something different (1.0)
12. I: Different would be ↑more Irish?
In the previous extract, it can be seen that participants orient to shifts in entitlement to speak. Here, participants are engaging in the interactional activity of managing the accountability of their own photographs when viewing those generated by the other participants. Again there are a considerable among of interactional difficulties that occurs when participants are asked to compare their own and the other groups’ representation of Irishness. Ann subsequent turn does not complete the action with a preferred SPP but instead inserts another question directed at the other participant ‘do you want to look at any of them’ (line 3). The interviewer repeats the request in line 5 and in the following turn, Ann again delays the preferred SPP and instead seeks clarification ‘These pictures’ (line 7). The interviewer repeats the question for the third time in line 9 and Ann’s following turn completes the action with a preferred SPP.

Here, the participants are putting a considerable amount of interactive work into avoiding and redirecting questions. Questions are vehicles for other actions (Schegloff, 2007). For example in line 3, Ann’s question is effectively passing the responsibility for generating the SPP to John ‘do you want to look at any of them’. The participant also
seeks clarification and delay responding in line 7. This interactive work suggests that participants are displaying difficulty accounting for their own photographs when viewing those generated by the other group.

In line 20, the interviewer prompts John to elaborate on his previous turn, which criticises Settled participants’ approach to the task ‘they could have done something different’ (line 19). Here, participants’ talk of the photographs display their entitlement to speak, commenting on, and critiquing the other group’s representation. However, when the interviewer attempts to distil the critique to determine which representation is considered ‘more Irish’ (line 19) again interactional difficulties occur in terms of delayed SPPs and repeated requests ‘It would be ↑more Irish’ (line, 27), displaying difficulty maintaining their entitled position in interaction. Ultimately, this sequence of conversational interaction confirms the Irishness of the set of photographs of the other participant ‘so that’s another Irish thing’ (line 33).

In the following extracts, Nancy and Bridie have agreed to view the other set of participants’ photographs.

Extract 6: During the photo exchange:

1 I: ↑That’s great (1.0) ↑.now I just have two more set of photos to show you. (1.0) one is taken by an uh::mm (1.0) ↑settled person >who was in
2 or around Dublin on Paddy’s Day and the other was an uh::mm an
3 American guy and he is uh:m (1.0) he is actually watching the parade.
4 (1.0) so (. ) uh:m
5 (2.0)
6 Bridie: ↑Are you going to show us there.
7 I: ↑Yeah (. ) ↑if that’s ok
8 Bridie: >>Yeah show us there ((hands first set of photo to participants and
9 they spread the photo across the table))
Bridie: ↓look at the photos they took (1.0) we took stupid photos heh heh
11
I: ↑No not at all (1.0) there is no ↑right or ↑wrong photos (1.0) it is just
12 whatever you think (.). its not in comparison now (1.0) its just a
different perspective
13
14 Bridie: Uh:m (3.0)
15
16 Nancy: ↓Theirs would be more Irish than ours would be.
17
18 Bridie: ↑H:ah
19
20 Nancy: I said theirs would be more ↑Irish than ours would be
21
22 I: ↑You think so
23 (1.0)
24
25 Nancy: Well ours would be more Traveller than Irish
26 (1.0)
27
28 Bridie: ↑What you talking about (.). sure that’s what the settled people would
29 say.
30
31 Nancy: It is though like look at them ((hands photos to Bridie))
32 (2.0)
33
34 Bridie: Well ↑you look at that photo there like

Bridie first compares her own photographs to those of the other participants, despite this not being requested by the interviewer. Thus she orients to the photo exchange as a comparative task and downgrades her own photographs in comparison to the other set ‘we took stupid photos’ and produces isolated laughter that is not shared with the other participant (line 12). The other participant makes relevant the intergroup context and those contesting their representations of Irishness ‘that is what Settled people would say’ (Extract 9, line 24 & 25).

The participants attempt to maintain an entitled position in interaction, which leads to two incidences of ‘disagreement-implicated other-initiated self-repair’ (Schegloff, Jefferson, & Sacks, 1977). Other initiated repair sequences often serve as pre-disagreements by intervening between a first and second pair part thereby violating
the preference for continuity and thus signalling trouble in the speakers talk (Schegloff, 2007). The first incidence occurs in line 18, where Bridie’s response ‘hah’ indicates a problem in talk. This introduces the possibility that what the speaker was saying was irrelevant or incorrect (Schegloff, 2007). Nancy’s subsequent turn repeats the statement mirrored in elevated tone and inflection to address the repairable item. ‘I said theirs would be more ↑Irish than ours would be’ (line 19). Nancy therefore interpreted Bridie’s response as a straightforward problem in hearing. In response to the interviewer’s question in line 20, Nancy again downgrades their own photographs in comparison to the other set ‘well ours would be more Traveller than Irish’ (line 22).

The second incidence of ‘other initiated self repair’ occurs in lines 24-25 ‘what are you talking about’ signalling that Bridie identified a problem in talk (Schegloff et al., 1977). In the disagreement-implicated post expansion, the speaker can choose to address the repairable items by adjusting their response, backing down, or moving towards compromise (Schegloff, 2007). However, in this case, the speaker does not back down but instead attempts to resolve the trouble in talk by referring the participant to the photographs generated by the other group ‘it is though like look at them ((hands photos to Bridie))’ (line 26).

Extract 7: Asked to make comparison:

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I: S:o (1.0) do you think the photos are different or ↑similar to your own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2.0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nancy: Like when you look at them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(0.2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I: Yea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nancy: I think they are &gt;&gt;a good bit different because theirs is Irish and ours are Irish and Traveller like ↑you know what I mean (1.0) these are ↓just Irish like ((points to the photos)) so I would say like they’re a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Of particular interest here are these two instances of other-initiated repair. These highlight disagreement between the conversational participants and the use of the photographs as a discursive resource to address the repairable items. There are some interactional difficulties as participants attempt to maintain an entitled position in talk while accounting for the relevance of their own representation. However, Nancy referred to the photographs to address the interactional difficulties. This inevitably resulted in both participants confirming the Irishness of the other set of photographs.

6.3.1 Summary. In the previous section, Irish Traveller participants often used their photographs as a discursive ‘resource’ to undermine their inclusion from the national group. However, the interviewer’s questioning problematised participants display of entitlement to speak. In this section, Irish Traveller participants also display interactional difficulties during the photo exchange (i.e. requests for clarification, conversational cut-offs, self- and other initiated repair). These suggest participants are orienting to shifts in entitlement to speak, while managing the accountability of their own photographs of Irishness, in light of viewing the other set.

To address interactional difficulties, the participants again refer to the photographs as a discursive ‘resource’ to manage shifts in entitlement. This is done by passing the photographs (and therefore the responsibility to generate SPP) to conversational co-participants and initiating side-sequence exchange that incorporate the interviewer into the interaction. However, unlike section one where their talk of their photographs is used to mobilise criterial markers and ‘accomplish’ Irishness, this resource is not afforded to participants in their talk of the other participants’
photographs. This works to reveal the fragility of participants’ display of entitlement to comment on the content of Irishness. More specifically, despite attempts to manage shifts in entitlement to speak through their use of the photographs, participants inevitably reach a consensus that downgrades their own photographs and confirms the Irishness of the other set of participants’ representations of Irishness.

6.4. Settled people, photo-elicitation and accountability

We will argue in this section that Settled participants orient to the photo elicitation task as a challenge to account for their photographs while managing any explicit talk of Irishness that would undermine the banality of their national identity in talk. On first inspection, the photographs taken of by the Settled participants were different from Irish Travellers, being either of generic representations of Irishness or more idiosyncratic photographs relating to the respondents’ own individual interests. As demonstrated in the previous chapter, Settled participants’ talk took for granted their inclusion within the national group and their discursive concern was to manage any explicit talk of national identity, while also managing the reputation of Irishness.

In contrast to Irish Traveller however, Settled participants typically did not display their ownership and involvement in the photo-generating process. Instead participants attribute their talk of Irishness either to the photographs, an external audience, or the unusual nature of the task. In the following extract, Tim has chosen to speak about a photograph generated by the other participant. Midway through the extract, the interviewer redirects the conversation to the participants own photograph of a shamrock discussed earlier in the interview.

Extract 8: ‘It didn’t mean anything to me personally’
The pub is part of the Irish scene like ((points to photo 17) especially internationally (.) the pub and the sing song and [pause] the pint of Guinness or the several pints of Guinness on the table (laughs)

I: Ok (.)

Mary: And the laugh and the after hours (.)

I: Ok and just going back to the shamrock one for a minute (. ) can you just tell me a little bit about what that was like (.) did it have any meaning for you back then when the shamrock was put on you (.)

Tim: Well it did (.) like I knew it was serious business (laughs) I mean I don’t think it meant anything to me personally when I was a kid but I knew better not to take it off like (laughs) I think it was more for my parents (.) their way of saying we’re proud to be Irish and so are our kids (. ) even if we hadn’t a clue like (. )

Photo 17. The pub
There are aspects of this exchange which suggest the participants orient to the photo elicitation task as one requiring them to manage the accountability of any explicit talk of Irishness. Firstly, in contrast to Irish Travellers, Tim chooses to speak about the other Mary’s photograph. This displays their lack of direct involvement in generating the photograph and therefore could also work rhetorically to manage the accountability of their comments. Second, and again unlike Irish Travellers approach to the task, the participant does not relate the photographs to himself. Instead, the participant provides tokens of Irishness ‘the pub’, ‘the sing-song’, ‘the Guinness’ ‘the laughing and the after hours’ (line 5) without any display of involvement in the photo generation process.

Finally, when the interviewer attempts to re-direct the conversation back to the photograph Tim has generated of a shamrock, the participant speaks about the photograph in the context of being a child. This works rhetorically to assert his lack of responsibility and avoid explicit talk of Irishness. In the following line, he makes explicit the lack of personal significance of the item ‘don’t think it meant anything to me personally’ (line 10). Finally the participant manages issues of stake and interest (Potter, 1996) by attributing any explicit talk of Irishness to his parents ‘their way of saying we’re proud to be Irish’ (line 13).

In the following extract Con and Ann have chosen to discuss each others’ photographs.

Extract 9: ‘I don’t really think about it to be honest’

1 Con: I really like this photo (photo 18)
2 Ann: I like the one you had of the sky above the (inaudible) but I can’t see it there
3 (.)
4 Con: Yeah its there (hands photo to Ann) ah yeah that’s it (.) the one with the
5 flags (.) I thought that was pretty cool (.)
6 I: Ok Con (.) I’ll start with you (.) you picked this photo [pause] any
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particular reason (.).

Con: Nah its just nice [pause] and it looks like you have two guys there
(looks closely at photo) their all in flat caps and they’re looking around and 10
[pause] they have no drink (higher tone)

Ann: No (.).

Con: No (.), that’s a bit surprising for an Irish monument (laughs)

I: Yeah?

Con: Yeah come on (.), like the first thing people think of when they think of the
Irish is drink (.), particularly years ago when people used to sit around like
that with their flat caps on and sing a few songs and have a few drinks like (.).

I: Is that different or the same as what you think of Irishness (.).

Con: [long pause] I don’t really think about it to be honest (laughs) I more
picked this photo because it looks nice (.), it just relaxing and a nice picture (.)

Photo 18. Monument

Similar to the extract above, participants display in their talk an understanding of
the photo elicitation task as one requiring them to manage the accountability of any
explicit talk of Irishness. Firstly, both participants have chosen to refer to each other’s
photographs and, as participants were not directly involved in generating their chosen photo, this affords an opportunity to manage the accountability of their comments.

In line 6, Con is encouraged to explicitly talk about their representation of Irishness. He initially denies any personal significance and instead describes the photograph in detail, evoking the stereotypical view of an external audience ‘the first thing people think of’. When probed further in line 17, the participant disavows the salience of his identity and instead provides an evaluative description ‘its just relaxing and a nice picture’. Again the use of ‘just;’ here, has a structural position (Goodman & Burke, 2011), inserted as a repetition of a statement following a restart. This works discursively to appeal to common knowledge and emphasise the self evident nature of the original statement ‘I took this photo because it looks nice (. ) its just relaxing’. This may also serves to ward off further discussion (Goodman & Burke, 2011).

Settled participants also evoked the perspective of an external audience to manage any explicit talk of Irishness. Here they are discussing a photograph of the blarney stone (see Photo 19).
Photo 19. The blarney stone

Extract 10: It’s a big thing for the visitors’

1 Kevin: The next photo here is of the Blarney stone (photo 9) the Blarney stone [long pause] well the Blarney stone always (.) I think (.) I think as an Irish person we hear more of the Blarney stone [pause] if we go abroad (.) from people abroad who believe in this kissing the Blarney stone (.) I don’t know anyone in Ireland who has kissed the Blarney stone or ah [pause] feel like they’ll get anything out of kissing the Blarney stone (laughs)

7 Delia: What are you meant to get out of it when you kiss it (directs question at Kevin)

9 Kevin: The gift of the gab I think (.)

10 Delia: Like the ability to speak (.)

11 Kevin: Yeah like you’re chatty yeah (.)

12 Delia: That’s a shit gift (said in low tone)

13 Kevin: (laughs) well it seems to be a big Irish thing for the visitors that come to Ireland to kiss the Blarney stone (.)

15 Delia: Yeah big time (.)

16 Kevin: So I guess for that reason (.) I think it’s a [pause] it’s just ah its just (.) it’s just Irish umm [long pause] what’s the word [long pause]

18 Delia: Banana (laughs)

19 Kevin: No not banana (laughs) like no other country has such a thing (.)

[9 lines omitted]

21 Delia: Have you ever been to the Blarney stone (directs question at Kevin)

22 Kevin: No I haven’t (0.4) I kind of (.) I kind of have no desire to either (laughs)

As was typical of Settled participants’ group interviews, they did not display their ownership of the photograph rather, from Kevin’s introduction, it is ambiguous who had generated the photograph (line 1). He first discusses the photograph in the context of being abroad and evokes the internal states of others who ‘believe’ in kissing the Blarney Stone (line 3 & 4). This is set against the national context, where this would not be considered normative behaviour ‘I don’t know anyone in Ireland who kissed the
blarney stone’. This is reinforced by Delia questioning the traditional ritual of kissing the Blarney Stone, followed by a sequence of interaction between the participants with comical undertones that initiate laughter (lines 15-17). This gives the overall impression to the reader that the Blarney Stone and the traditional ritual, is of little personal significance to the participants. This is made explicit in the last line of the extract where Kevin asserts an expressed lack of interest in the representation ‘no I haven’t (0.4) I kind of (.) I kind of have no desire to either’ (line 22). In addition, these hesitations and restarts give the impression that the request to discuss the representation, did not come easily to him.

6.4.1. Summary. Settled participants display an understanding of the photo elicitation task as one that requires them to manage the accountability of their photographs, while asserting a banal sense of national identity in their talk. Participants employed a number of discursive strategies to manage these concerns in talk, including disavowing the salience of national identity, evoking different context and an external audience. This works rhetorically to avoid explicit talk of national identity, while managing the reputation of Irishness. Therefore, Settled participant used their display of understanding of the photo elicitation task to address their discursive concerns and to manage their national identity, interactionally.

The findings of the first section of the analysis also suggest that the interviewer has a role to play in the interaction, problematising and disrupting each set of the participants’ use of the task to address their discursive concerns. In Irish Traveller group interviews, the analysis reveals how the insertion of the interviewer can display the greater entitlement of the interviewer in the interaction (Abell et al., 2006), thereby problematising the participant’s display of entitlement to speak. For Settled participants, the interviewers questioning presented a different challenge; it made explicit the nature
of the photo elicitation task as one requiring participants to account for their representations of Irishness. To manage this dilemma of accounting for their photographs while maintaining a banal sense of national identity, participants employed rhetorical devices to attribute explicit talk of Irishness to the unusual nature of the task or to an uninformed external audience. Overall therefore, the analysis demonstrates how the interviewer’s questioning can problematise the participants’ use of the task to manage their discursive concerns in talk.

The following section will examine in more detail participants turn-by-turn sequence of conversational interaction to further investigate issues of accountability in Settled peoples’ talk of Irishness. More specifically, what happens in conversational interaction during the photo exchange, when participants no longer have ownership of the photographs, will be examined. They are therefore no longer accountable for the photographs they have taken but must discuss the photographs generated by the other set of participants.

6.5. Settled people and the photo exchange

This section of the analysis examines what happens in the moment by moment course of conversational interaction when participants engage in a photo exchange and are presented with the other set of photographs. The analysis will be divided into two main sections of the interview transcripts: (1) during the photo exchange and (2) when asked to make a comparison (following the photo exchange). The following two extracts were taken from the group interviews of Ann and Con. The extract begins with the interviewer introducing the photo exchange.

Extract 11: During photo exchange- viewing Irish Traveller’s photos
I: That’s true [heh heh]

Ann: [heh heh]

I: *ok so if you guys don’t mind (2.0) I-I have another set of (.) photos
(1.0) we can just talk through them *briefly

Con: No bother

I: *Ok >just to say (1.0) this *group was also asked to take photos >>of
whatever they consider to be Irish on St. Patrick’s *Day so (1.0) this is
what it looked like ((hands photos to participants))

Ann: *Oh my God ((puts hand over her mouth))

(2.0)

I: W-Who do you think >>might have taken these photographs

Con: “Travellers” ((sits back and folds arms))

(4.0)

Ann: >>I didn’t realise those were caravans actually ((point to photo))
(2.0)

I: How were you able to (1.0) *identity these pictures as (.) >having been
taken by *Travellers
(2.0)

Ann: W::ell (1.0) the piebald is (3.0) typically (1.0) >>it’s the Traveller
horse *like and the caravans (0.2) but ↓I didn’t notice they were
*caravans at first’
(2.0)

I: *You as we:ll Con (1.0) was that the (1.0) >>first thing you saw that
identified
(1.0)

Con: ↓Yeah (1.0) like the (1.0) .hh caravans and the horse there and
the * rubbish* (2.0) >>and the trap over and *beyond* (1.0) there the pony
and trap ((points to photo)) >>that’s typically a Traveller situation
(1.0) ↓that definitely what I think

Ann: Definitely the pabald (0) sticks out *big-time
(1.0)

I: *And (.) Ann you said *oh my God when you first saw the photos (1.0)
>is there any particular reason *why
(1.0)

Ann: Y:eah its just *because (.) I-I thought that girl looked really cross
heh heh that’s why I said *oh my G(h)od (1.0) >she looks like she’s
Following on from the interviewer’s introduction Con agrees to view the photographs generated by the other group. The interviewer’s subsequent turn introduces the photo exchange and ends with a non-verbal request to discuss the photographs by handing them to the participants. Ann’s turn is an explicit reaction to the photograph-‘oh my God’ (line 9). After a considerable pause, the interviewer’s turn involves an adjacency pair inviting the participants to consider who might have taken the photographs. Con provides the preferred SPP and in a low tone identifies the group ‘Travellers’, sits back, folds his arms and does not enter the conversational exchange for another 5 lines until he is asked a direct question by the interviewer. This can be seen as a display of excessive entitlement as he chooses to opt out of the conversation despite risking breaking norms of conversational interaction whereby protracted silences would need to be addressed (Schegloff, 2007). In his absence from the conversation, the responsibility to address conversational silences is left solely to Ann who engages in the business of managing the accountability of her explicit reaction to the photograph.

Ann begins in line 19 with a pronouncement that she did not notice the caravans, an iconic representation of Irish Traveller culture. In the following turn, the interviewer initiates a question-answer sequence directed at Con, as he had originally identified the
group as Travellers ‘How were you able to (1.0) identity these pictures as (.) >having been taken by Irish Travellers’ (line 20). However, it is Ann that provides the preferred SPP and again asserts that she did not notice the caravan. In line 16 the interviewer addresses Con directly and in the following turn he provides the preferred SPP and identities features of the photograph rather than attending to the entire image. This suggests that the Con could be attending to the accountability of his comments to the photographs, which he has identified as Irish Travellers’ representations of Irishness. He does so by refraining from the conversational interaction (i.e. delayed SPPs) and by attending descriptively to features of the photographs.

The interviewer’s question at line 32 involves an adjacency pair and the question makes Ann accountable for her reaction to the photograph. Ann responds with a preferred SPP and invites laughter, however it is not shared by the other participant. Con initiates a question-answer pair sequence in line 40 focusing on a feature of the photo, rather than the person depicted ‘is that through a mirror’? At this point, Ann could, of course choose to attend to Con’s question. However the preferred SPP is delayed until line 42. Ann chooses instead to pursue the line of business she had already put in motion to which she is orienting to as highly accountable, namely her reaction to the photograph.

Extract 12: Asked to make comparison:

1   I:      N(h)o (1.0) so these ↑photo (1.0) are they very different or >similar to your own (0.1)
2   Ann:   Very different (1.0) I mean the setting is very different to begin with so
3   (2.0)
4   I:     >Are there any ↑similarities at all
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Ann: What’s this a driving licence
I: No, it’s a passport
Ann: No, I don’t really know what you’d take a photo of your passport
Con: Yeah it seems a bit random [heh heh]
Ann: [heh heh]
Con: It’s like taking a picture of your birth cert or something heh heh

The interviewer initiates an adjacency pair that invites the participants to compare the two sets of photographs. Ann almost immediately provides the preferred SPP, placing emphasis on ‘very different’ and then shifts focus to ‘the setting’ and re-emphasises ‘very’ different. In line 6, the FFP of an adjacency pair invites the participants to consider similarities between the two groups’ representations. Ann responds with a question seeking clarification and delays the preferred SPP until line 11 where she questions the relevance of the photograph. Con’s subsequent turn further downgrades the photograph ‘it seems a bit random’ (line 13), followed by shared laughter between the participants.

In discursive terms, for Ann and Con, the main interactional business during the photo exchange is to manage the accountability of their comments about (or in reaction to) Irish Travellers’ representations of Irishness. Both participants engage in this discursive business in different ways. For example, Con first attempts to refrain from the discussion, only reacting when explicitly addressed. In those instances, he engages in the interactional activity of commenting on the features of the photographs rather than the people depicted. This ensures that Con comments are not attached to the people in the photographs, but rather to an inanimate background and features. Ann, on the other hand, does not have the luxury of refraining from conversation due to her explicit...
reaction to the photograph, for which the interviewer holds her accountable. Ann
attempts to manage her accountability in talk by repeatedly claiming not to notice the
iconic representations of Irish Traveller culture and inviting laughter to minimise her
stake in the comments.

In Tim and Mary’s group interview, during the photo exchange, the photos were
introduced as having been taken by Irish Traveller participants. Similar to the extracts
from Ann and Con above, participants attempted to manage the accountability of their
comments by refraining from the discussion.

Extract 13: During the photo exchange:

1  I: ↑Ok (0.1) s::o (0.1) >>I just have one more set of photographs ↑here
2     (0.1) >>if you guys would like to take a look ↑at ↑them
3     (0.1)
4  Tim: ↑Yeah sure
5     (0.1)
6  I: U::m (0.1) ↑these were taken by >>a member of the Traveller
7    community and they were also asked
8  Tim: [na]
9  Tim: N::a its ok (0.1) I won’t ’ bother looking at them ‘
10     (0.1)
11  I: ↑No
12     (0.1)
13  Tim: >>No I’m not bothered
14     (0.2)
15  Mary: Y::eh I’m (h)k too
16     (0.1)
17  I: A::h (0.1) ok (0.1) that’s ↑grand (0.1) >>we won’t bother with that so
18     ↑that’s no problem (0.2) I guess (0.1) I guess we’re at the end of the
19     interview now so (0.1) >>I’d just like to thank you guys for ↑taking
20     part.
21     [we can]
Again, similar to Con’s reaction to the Irish Traveller’s photographs in the previous extract, here the conversational sequence can be seen to indicate, in discursive terms, a participants’ excessive display of entitlement to speak. This is evidenced in the conversational sequence that follows as participants decline to view the photographs generated by Irish Traveller participants. This is despite agreeing to do so initially, when the owners of the photographs were ambiguous.

Declining a request is a dispreferred response and one that would generally be avoided or alternatively where participants would attempt to soften the decline (Schegloff, 2007). It can be seen here that participants have initially provided the preferred response by agreeing to view the photographs in line 4. In the subsequent line, the interviewer provides additional information that the photographs were taken by Irish Travellers. At this point the participant, in a low tone, declines to view the photographs. In line 15, the co-participant confirms the relevance of the response and also declines to view the photographs.

In line 17, the interviewer signals the end of the group interviews by thanking the participants for taking part and signals the closing down of the discussion ‘we’re at the end of the interview so’. In the following line, the participant offers to further discuss the ‘other photos’ orienting to the fact that the participants provided the dispreferred response by declining to view the Irish Traveller’s photographs. The interviewer declines this offer and closes the discussion. In this instance, participants
are displaying in their talk the entitlement to choose which photographs they are willing to view, declining to comment on the Irish Travellers’ representations of Irishness and attempting to soften the decline by offering to view the other set of photographs (Schegloff, 2007).

The following extracts are taken from the focus groups of Kevin & Delia. Unlike the two previous FGDs, the identity of those who had generated the photographs is not revealed early on in the exchange. As a result, qualitatively different discussion emerges.

Extract 14: Directly before photo exchange:

1 I: ↑Ok >>anything else missing that would create a::hh (1.0) more rounded ↑image
2 Delia: ↑Oh
3 (3.0)
4 I: ↑Yeah
5 Delia: Non-national people (1.0) foreigners (3.0)
6 I: So you think that would yeah (1.0) create a more rounded image (1.0)
7 yeah
8 Delia: Well (1.0) they’re ↓definitely in Ireland so (1.0) to overlook it would be (1.0) foolish
9 I: Uh:hum and (1.0) you think (0.2)
10 Kevin: Sorry ((coughs)) oh you I have no (1.0) I think it’s a ↓good thing to have the different nationalities (1.0) I think its good
11 I: ↑Ok (1.0) so ah ah in agreement there
12 Delia: Yeah ↑definitely
13 I: Ok so is there anything you would ↑remove from these photographs like if you were to (2.0) like if you had an option ↓just > to get rid of something
14 Delia: >Westlife [heh heh]
15 I: [heh heh]
16 Kevin: A:hh (2.0) ah >I don’t think so
Kevin: A:hh I don’t know ↓I like all of them (1.0) ↑>I would keep everything
I have here cos

[yeah]

Kevin: It all represents Ireland to me

I: ↑Ok

Kevin: And u::m (1.0) if I took one out it would be just (1.0) "I don’t know°

(2.0)

I: You’re holding that photograph there >>any particular reason

Delia: No (1.0) I- I just said I’d get rid of ↓West(h)life and Ryan

Tubri(h)ty heh heh

I: O(h)k heh heh that’s fine heh

Here, participants are given the option to alter the photo sequence to make it more representative of Ireland today. The participant almost immediately responds with an elevated ‘oh’ that is not the preferred SPP but a signal of realization. It also serves as an insertion sequence (Schegloff, 2007) that intervenes between the first and second pair part of an adjacency pair. This is followed by a considerable pause of three seconds (Jefferson, 1987). The insertion sequence functions to allow the listener to prompt elaboration and allows time for the participant to consider the production of the SPP. Attention to the conversational feature provides some indication that participants are attending to the accountability of their talk.

Further evidence for this can be seen following the interviewer’s insertion in ‘yeah’ (line 5) after which, Delia almost immediately provides the preferred SPP and states that the lack of acknowledgment of the presence of foreigners would be ‘foolish’, orienting to the accountability of this omission. This also works rhetorically to displaying their identity as a rational, socially conscious speaker. This is followed by a backchanneled response by the interviewer and a partially constructed FPP of an
adjacency pair- ‘um:mm you think’. Kevin responds with a SPP that first signals an
acknowledgement of her absence from the conversation ‘sorry’ and then provides a
disclaimer (Condor et al., 2006) that would inoculate against any claims of prejudiced
talk ‘I think it’s a good thing’.

From a discursive perspective, participants are collaboratively building up a
collective representation of Irishness, policing the boundaries, including non-nationals
and simultaneously managing prejudiced talk. As evidenced in the previous chapter, the
discursive business at hand is to regulate the reputation of Irishness. This is seen at the
end of the extract where the participants use photographs of ‘Ryan Tuburty’ [media
personality in Ireland] and ‘Westlife’ [Irish boy band] to regulate the reputation of the
national group.

Extract 15: During photo exchange- viewing Irish Traveller’s photos

1  I: ↑Now ((swallows)) I’m just going to show you a second set of
2    photographs ↑ ok
3  Delia: °Yep°
4  I:  There a different ↑group (1.0) they were also (.) taking photos of
5    whatever they consider to be Irish on St. Patrick’s ↑ Day u::m (0.2) >>
6    they weren’t at the parade as well (5.0) S::o ↑here we go (1.0) her(h)es
7    ah (1.0) here’s their photographs ((photos
8    handed to participants))
9  Both: ((inaudible whispers))
10 I:  If you want to take a look though them there
11 Delia: ↓ This is a ni(h)ce one @<
12 I:  ↑without naming the ↑group (2.0) >> when you’re ready I -I’d just like
13    you to describe what type of (2.0) people you (. ) think >>would have
14    taken these photographs
15    (0.3)
16 Delia: A:::h (2.0) may::be
Kevin: The spire would be ah ah ah ↓tourist I think
Delia: >> yeah maybe people who weren’t ↑ exactly (. ) like (1.0) indigenous
to Ireland or something
I: Uh:um
Delia: ↑Cos they seem to have like (1.0) an ↑outside view of Irishness like .hh
a passport ((holds photo)) the ↑the flag (. ) the spi(h)re
I: Y:eah >> so you think that’s an outside view ↑yeah
Delia: Y::eh ↑Well >>>its seems to be kind of
Kevin: ↑Well (1.0) we wouldn’t (1.0) I wouldn’t take a pict(h)ure of the
spi(h)re
Delia: N:ah >>>that wouldn’t mean ↓Irishness for me
Kevin: [kids in uniform]
Delia: [↑maybe maybe maybe]
↑maybe>>a Dublin person would take a picture .hh (1.0)>I wouldn’t
take a picture of my↑ pass(h)port
(1.0)
I: No ↑why not
Delia: C:os >>its just something every Irish person has and (2.0) it .hh just
kind of goes without saying (1.0) >> anyone from any nationality has
that its ↓doesn’t really define you you know
I: ↑Um
Delia: ↑or define Irishness
I: U:mm there’s other ↑ things
Delia: ↑O::h ((notices another photo)) (0.1) ((inaudible whispers))
(7.0)
Kevin: The Irish ↑f:lag
I: A:hum
(4.0)
Kevin: A:hh (3.0) ↓what was the question again
I: A::h ↑What kind of people would have taken these ↑photographs
Delia: [heh heh]
Kevin: heh heh Again a ↑tourist >I wouldn’t take a picture of an Irish flag
Delia: I definitely >wouldn’t take a picture of a c:aravan
(2.0)
I: U:mm ok (1.0) s:o I’ll just tell you then (1.0) the people who took
these photos are actually ↓Irish Travellers
(1.0)
Delia: Oh really @
(1.0)
Kevin: ↓Oh

When the photo exchange is introduced by the interviewer at line 1, Delia agrees to view the photographs and the participants discuss them among themselves in inaudible whispers (line 9). The interviewer provides further promoting in line 10 and in the following line the participants provide an evaluative statement ‘this is a nice one’. The bubbling laughter constructs this comment as questionably genuine. In the subsequent turns, the participants collaboratively work to situate the other participants’ photographs outside of the national category. In line 22 for example, Delia explicitly comments on the viewpoint as peripheral ‘outside view of Ireland’, which is reinforced by the other participant who corroborates, dismiss the photographs of the passport as a valid representation of Irishness and states that ‘It doesn’t really define you’. Delia further asserts their national identity as taken for granted ‘it just kind of goes without saying’ (lines 35-36).

In line 40, when the interviewer asks the participants to explicitly consider what defines Irishness, there is a considerable amount of interactional difficulties. Firstly, the participants fail to produce the preferred SSP but rather engage in the interactional activity of identifying and naming photographs, ‘the Irish flag’ for example (line 43), without elaborating or commenting further. Again, it can seen here how participants might be using the photo elicitation task to manage their accountability in talk by displacing attention onto the photographs and normalising the production of dispreferred conversational sequences. In line 40, Kevin requests the interviewer to
repeat the question, which suggests that the participant heard the question, though possibly was reluctant to engage.

In line 49, the interviewer repeats the initial request to identify who had produced the photographs. Again, the participants place the producers of the photographs outside of the national category and make a clear distinction between their own and the other group’s representation of Irishness. In line 50, Delia states that she definitely would not have produced a photograph of a caravan. The choice of ‘caravan’ is perhaps significant as it is an iconic representation of Irish Traveller culture and it is definitely (with notable emphasis) not included in the participant’s representation. In lines 52-53, the interviewer reveals that the photographs were taken by Irish Travellers.

In discursive terms, not naming the group allows participants to manage the accountability of their comments, as it is no longer attached to the other set of participants. Therefore, the interaction sequences indicate a smooth flow of speech when attributing the photographs to those outside of the national category that might not have been possible if the other set of participants were identified from the onset, requiring participants to manage their identity as non-prejudiced speakers (as seen in the previous extracts). The participants do encounter interactional difficult however when asked to define and speak explicitly about Irishness. Rather than complete the request, the participants use their talk of the photographs to decline the producing of the preferred SPP, thus avoiding explicit talk of Irishness. This would suggest that participants are orienting to explicit talk of Irishness as normative inappropriate and using their talk of the photograph to mange this concern. This allows participants to get on with the interactional business of policing the boundaries of Irishness, commenting on and dismissing the other group’s representation, without running the risk of their comments being construed as prejudiced talk.
Extract 16: Asked to make comparison:

1 I: So (1.0) do you think the photos are very different or similar to your
2 own
3 (1.0)
4 Kevin: I think they are very very different to what we’d take as pictures
5 (1.0)
6 Delia: Yeah I wouldn’t (. ) I wouldn’t take a picture of a caravan or a spire
7 >>maybe a kid in a school uniform (1.0) the football pitch (2.0) nah I
8 wouldn’t unless it was maybe Croke park or something (1.0) Irish flag
9 ↑no (1.0) ↓no I wouldn’t take any of these pictures
10 (2.0)
11 I: >>You wouldn’t take any of them as being ↑Irish.
12 (.)
13 Delia: No

At the start of this extract, the FFP of an adjacency pair invites participants to
consider the similarity and differences between the photographs. Kevin immediately
provides the preferred SPP in Line 4, ‘very very different’, this is noteworthy in light of
his previous comment that his representation wasn’t exactly how he viewed Irishness. In
the following turn, Delia corroborates with Kevin and identifies features of the
photograph rather than discussing the representation. In line 11, participants are made
accountable by referring them back to the nature of the task (‘you wouldn’t take them as
being Irish’) The participant responds by explicitly denying the other set of participants’
representation of Irishness.

6.5.1. Summary. In the previous section, Settled participants were discussing
their photographs of Irishness and unlike Irish Traveller participants, they often
rhetorically distanced themselves from the photo generating process. In this section, the
task is altered so that participants are now discussing the other participants’ representations. This presents a new challenge; participants must now account for their comments on the other set participants’ representations of Irishness. The results of the analysis can be subdivided according to whether to the identities of those who had generated the photographs were revealed or not.

First, when participants were told who had generated the photographs, they typically used the photographs as a resource to manage any hearably prejudiced talk. For example, participants engage in question-answer sequences that identified features of the photographs, rather than attending to the entire image. This ensures that their comments were not attached to those who had generated the photographs, but rather to inanimate backgrounds and features. Alternatively, participants display their excessive entitlement, choosing not to attend to conversational silences thereby risking breaking norms of conversational interaction, to avoid commenting on the other photographs.

Second, when participants were not told who had generated the photographs, they regulated the boundaries of Irishness and used the photographs to engage in the collaborative discursive activity of placing others outside of the national category (i.e. ‘its like something a tourist would take’) and used the anonymity of the photo generators to manage the accountability of their comments. When asked to relate the two sets of photographs, Settled participants respond by explicitly denying the other set of participants’ representation of Irishness.

Overall, Settled participants used their talk of the other set photographs to manage explicit talk of Irishness and to maintain their identity as non-prejudiced speakers. This allowed them to get on with the interactional business of using their ‘banality’ as a strategic resource to police the boundaries of Irishness.
6.6. Discussion

The main aims of the present chapter were twofold, firstly to extend the findings of empirical chapter 6 in order to further consider the possibility that divergent displays of identity can have interactive consequences. This involved the use of a DP approach that incorporates an analysis of the organizational interpretations that people themselves employ in conversation interaction, as they view and comment on other participants’ representations of Irishness.

The second goal of this chapter was to consider the strengths of the photo elicitation task demonstrated in the literature in terms of affording a sense of entitlement to speak (Collier & Collier, 1986) and ensuring that participants are accountable for their photographs of Irishness (Samuels, 2004). However, rather than considering these perceived ‘advantages’ from a researcher’s perspective as previously documented (Harper, 2002), here the way in which participants themselves display an understanding of the photo elicitation task in talk is explored.

Therefore, it is illustrated in this chapter how each set of participants use their understanding of the photo elicitation task as an interactive resource to manage their discursive concerns. The contributions of the findings will now be discussed in terms of the discursive literature on national identity and prejudiced discourse. This chapter will conclude with a discussion of photo elicitation as it contributing to debates and critiques of interviews data in social psychological research.

6.6.1. Discursive approach to national identity. Each set of participants display different understandings of the photo elicitation task. These differences further contribute to the literature on ‘banal nationalism’ (Billig, 1995) by demonstrating the
use of ‘banality’ as a strategic resource in interaction. Participants were given an identical task and therefore the same discursive resources are afforded to each set of participants to negotiate their national identity in talk. However, only Settled participants adopt a banal identity strategy. In fact, Settled participants display an understanding of the photo elicitation task as a challenge to manage explicit talk of Irishness, further demonstrating that ‘banality’ is a resource mobilised in talk, rather than part of the banal backdrop to everyday life. Irish Traveller participants, assert their identity proactively, which Settled participants deem as indicative of being outside of the national category. Again these findings signal potential interactive consequences by demonstrating that the use of banality as a strategic resource to negotiate entitlement to inclusion within the nation is used unevenly across member so the national group.

The second section of analysis provided an opportunity to examine the potential interactive consequences of divergent displays of identity for inclusion within the category. When discussing the other set of photographs, Irish Traveller participants initially display their entitlement to comment on the content of Irishness. However as they are no longer able to use talk of their own photographs to accomplish being part of the national category, their subsequent talk reveals the fragility in their sense of entitlement to speak. For Settled participants, on the other hand, their use of banality as a discursive resource acts as a signifier of entitlement to police the boundaries of Irishness. Settled participants demonstrate their excessive entitlement and manage the accountability of their comments through refusing to discuss or engage with the other participants’ representations of Irishness. In addition, Settled participants display their entitlement by placing others outside of the national category, based on their representations (i.e. ‘its like something a tourist would take’).
In effect therefore, the analysis has demonstrated how differences in identity displays can reproduce inequality and dominance in subtle forms, even in this artificial interview environment. Settled participants display their identity as banal. This ‘banality’ is then used as a discursive resource to mobilise their entitlement to exclude others from the national group on the basis of their proactive displays that mark them as outside of the national category.

6.6.2. Claims and receipt of claims. These findings also contribute to the literature on claims and receipt of claims of national belonging, demonstrating the dynamic, two-sided, interactional nature of identity construction in talk. Research by Kiely and colleagues (2005) has identified the ‘markers and rules’ of conversational interaction and suggest that the production of migrants’ claims to belonging is shaped in response to other Scottish nationals receiving and evaluating their claims to inclusion. This chapter has contributed to this literature in a number of keys aspects. To start, rather than attending to the content of identity claims, the current analysis considered the use of different forms of identity display to achieve particular goals in interaction. In doing so, the analysis revealed how participants orient to an external audience evaluating their claims and seek to manage any potential counterclaims of vested interest that could be ‘received’ by others and used to undermine their claims to inclusion. In addition, rather than examining the receipt of claims by simply asking participants to consider other peoples’ hypothetical claims to national identity (i.e. Kiely et al., 2005), here participants are presented with the other participants’ photographs of Irishness and the subsequent analysis examines the sequence of conversational interaction as social action. Importantly, the analysis demonstrated the need to consider both claims and receipt of claims of national identity, not in terms of content but rather their strategic use of language, to demonstrate their social position in talk. In other
words, while the literature suggests that identity construction is a two-side interactional process, the photo swap provided an opportunity to demonstrate the possible discursive mechanisms that reproduce inequality and exclusion in everyday social interaction.

6.6.3. Prejudice and racist discourse. The main findings of the analysis of the photo swap highlight some important contributions to the literature on prejudice and racist discourse. There has been a considerable amount of discussion concerning the discursive devices used by participants to attend to issues of accountability and present a favourable self-image as rational non-prejudiced speakers, while uttering racist comments towards ethnic minority groups (e.g., Rapley, 1998; Van Dijk, 1992; Wetherall & Potter, 1992). The work of Condor et al. (2006) considers prejudice discourse not as self evident, but as a local accomplishment- marker of intimacy, solidarity etc- that is intricately woven into the tapestry of everyday social interaction. Here it can be seen that ‘prejudice talk’ is both a local accomplishment and an issue of prejudice management that requires strategic resolution, dependent on the conversational demands of the particular interactional situation. For example, when participants are told who had generated the photographs, they engage in a strategic act aimed at managing their identity as socially conscious, non-prejudiced speakers. In such a way, participant’s talk of the other set of photographs is similar to research by Van Dijk (1992) where they attend to the accountability of the comments in the process of prejudice management in talk. However, when participants are not told who had generated the photographs, they use the photo generator anonymity to manage the accountability of prejudiced comments. In doing so, they engage in prejudice talk similar to research by Condor et al., (2006) as a marker of intimacy and solidarity, allowing participants to get on with the collaborative discursive activity of placing others outside of the national category. Therefore, it is argued here that it is both an
accountable matter requiring prejudice management as well as a local accomplishment woven into everyday social interaction. These variations in prejudice discourse reflect the interactional business being done.

6.6.4. Interviews as a research tool. The discursive findings in this chapter have made some important contributions to the photo elicitation literature, as well as contributing to debates concerning the use of interviews as data in discursive psychology. In terms of proposed advantages, photo elicitation is believed to entitle individuals to shape and guide the conversational discussion (Kolb, 2008; Douglas, 1998). Closely linked to the perceived advantage of photo elicitation to entitle individuals to speak in interaction, is the potential pitfall to ‘write the interviewer out’ of the conversational exchange. This perceived advantage and disadvantage will now be discussed in relation to the findings of this chapter.

The discursive analysis presented in this chapter has worked to problematise the idea that photo elicitation entitles participants to speak; so much so that the interviewer role in the interaction is downplayed or omitted. Irish Traveller participants display their entitlement to speak in a similar manner described in the literature, such as adopting the role of interviewer (Kolb, 2008) guiding the flow of conversational discussion. However, it is also argued here that participant’s sense of entitlement to speak is not a self evident bi-product of their ownership of the photograph, but is worked up and achieved in talk. Importantly, we have noted that the interviewer has an important role to play in this interaction and can unintentionally disrupt the participants’ display of entitlement to speak. The interviewer’s questioning can, in fact, display the greater entitlement of the interviewer in the interaction, which closes down the interview talk (Abell et al., 2006). Participants often self-select another photograph, thereby initiating a topic shift and introducing categories into the exchange (Ortega-Alcazar & Dych,
2011), however not as evidence of their entitlement to speak, but perhaps to negotiate the shifts of entitlement between researcher and research participants.

Additionally, it is argued in this chapter that this reflective ethnomethodological approach to the photo elicitation task speaks to the critiques of interviews highlighted by Potter and Hepburn (2008). Firstly, the authors caution against the tendency of researchers to write the interviewer out of the conversational interaction and suggest more detailed transcription convention to negotiate this pitfall in the use of interview data. However, it is suggested that in addition to adhering to the standard transcription convention, the ethnomethodological approach to photo elicitation explicitly acknowledges the role of the interviewer in the interaction, problematising and bring into relief participants’ use of the task to address their discursive concerns.

Second, Potter and Hepburn (2008) have suggested that there is a tendency for researchers to import their own analytic categories into the exchange. Photo elicitation however also provides participants with the opportunity to introduce their own categories into the exchange. However it is suggested that this does not necessarily ensure their entitlement to speak but that there is an active negotiation between the interviewer participants in interaction. Overall therefore, this analysis acknowledges the potential pitfalls in interview data but illustrates the benefits of a reflective ethnomethodological approach to photo elicitation interviews that actively incorporates the interview context into the analytic discussion.
Chapter 7

Prototypicality, identification and evaluations of display

7.1. Introduction

The overall aim of this thesis is to reconsider the conceptualization of national identity in the social psychological literature. This currently depicts members of the national category as sharing a common conception of what constitutes the nation and therefore acting accordingly as a unified, homogeneous group. A number of arguments will be put forward to challenge this pervasive image. More specifically, this thesis employs a mixed methods approach in order to answer separate sets of empirical questions grounded in the epistemological orientations of each tradition.

The first methodological approach taken was qualitative. Two studies which employed a discursive approach examined how subgroup members display and construct their national identity in talk. The findings of these two studies contribute to a growing body of literature which suggests that subgroup members orient to their social position and display different understandings of the norms governing identity related behaviour. The second methodological approach is quantitative. In this and the following chapter, a series of experimental studies will be described that are designed to examine the effects of manipulated perceived social position on participants’ evaluations of displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day. The development of these experimental studies was informed by the findings of the qualitative studies.

Taken together, these empirical investigations seek to challenge the concept of national identity in the social psychological literature by considering it in terms of the understandings of individuals and subgroups. There are however a number of possibilities and pitfalls in discussing both qualitative and quantitative traditions in
social psychology. These need be highlighted in advance in order to negotiate the parameters of each methodological approach in relation to the underlying theoretical concerns of the present thesis.

7.1.1. Mixed methods: Possibilities and pitfalls. It has been argued that a combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches in social research is both philosophically incompatible and logically impossible (Bazely, 2007). Edwards and Potter (1992), however, specified that the perceived incompatibility between qualitative and quantitative research traditions in psychology is not in terms of the shared theoretical concerns, but in terms of the operationalizations that typically mask these concerns. Therefore, the mixed methods approach in this thesis attempts to draw on the mutual theoretical concerns of both traditions in regards to identity expression, while being mindful of the deviations in epistemological orientations to these concerns. More specifically, the experimental approach is based on defining pre-existing groups and identifying differences in group processes, while in the discursive approach, ‘groups’ only exist in so far as individuals orientate to group membership in their talk. In the absence of a common language therefore, it could be argued that the methodological approach in this thesis can open a dialogue between these two perspectives regarding the common theoretical concerns that underpin the study of national identity in the social psychological literature.

In order to negotiate these pitfalls in advance, it is necessary to clearly state the parameters of the research findings and also distinguish between ‘reliability’ in the experimental approach presented in this chapter and ‘variability’ in the discursive approach used in the qualitative elements of this thesis. In the experimental approach to intra- and intergroup relations, the focus is often on the processes that underpin social relations. Therefore, the concern is with ‘reliability’, or the idea that the same
phenomenon can be witnessed multiple times on different occasions and therefore the results can be generalized to the wider population (Niaz, 2008). Discursive Psychology, on the other hand, focuses on how language can be used flexibly to manage social relations. Therefore, the concern is with ‘variability’, rather than ‘reliability’, placing emphasis on the functional use of discourse that varies across time and context (Reicher, 2010). Each set of empirical findings in the present thesis are bound within their own epistemological framework. However, they contribute to an overall understanding of displays of identity related behaviour, both in how individuals attend to psychological phenomenon such as national identity in interaction and in how individuals use this understanding to guide their behaviour in novel experimental situations.

Although the mixed methods approach in this thesis attempts to speak to intergroup theorists and discursive psychologists alike in terms of commonalities in theoretical concerns, the findings fall within the parameters of their respective research traditions. Therefore, it is important to state clearly from the outset that no claims are made in relation to the reliability of the discursive findings but rather variability is emphasised through participant’s flexible use of language to manage the social world. In terms of the experimental findings, on the other hand, reliability is a concern. However, it is possible for the findings of both traditions to speak to, and inform a greater understanding of national identity, once clearly presented within the constraints of each epistemological approach. As such, this thesis aims to avail of the possibilities afforded by a dialogue between the two research traditions.

Having negotiated the perimeters of the discursive and experimental approach, a brief overview of the contributions of the discursive findings to the intragroup prototypicality and intergroup literature will be provided. More specifically, there will
be a discussion of how the discursive findings and the re-examination of the literature informed the development of the experimental hypotheses in this chapter.

Despite developing in parallel, there are a number of commonalities in the intragroup prototypicality and majority/majority literature that contribute to an understanding of differences in identity expression, relative to the position people occupy in the social world. Firstly, both fields have been shown to downplay the strategic behaviour of prototypical and majority group members, whose behaviour is considered more as a normative backdrop to that of their counterparts. Peripheral group members and minority groups, on the other hand, are both depicted as valuing their group membership and displaying their loyalty to the group. However, in the intragroup prototypicality literature, the strategic behaviours of these group members are generally depicted as a passive process and a cognitive by-product of their group membership. What is lost in this interpretation is an understanding of how group members, occupying different social position, actively and strategically display their identity.

The discursive findings described in this thesis contributed to knowledge of the functionality of discursive displays of identity in talk. In the discursive tradition, the terms shared by the intragroup prototypicality and minority/majority literature such as, ‘status’, ‘relative size’, ‘group membership’, ‘feelings’ of peripherality, group loyalty and psychological separateness, exist only in so far as individuals orient to them in conversational interaction. The discursive findings suggest that each set of participants orient to their social position in talk. Irish Travellers orient to subgroup membership. Irish students do not, which affords to them a majority group position. From these discursive positions, each set of participants display an understanding of the norms governing identity displays, which affords different identity styles (banal, proactive) that they can use strategically in talk to negotiate and manage their social position.
7.1.2. The present experimental investigations. The gap between discursive and experimental approaches to research can be perceived as wide. Here however, it is argued that there are significant commonalities that support use of mixed methods in this context. Taking the discursive findings in this thesis; both sets of participants orient differently to the norms governing identity displays. Irish Traveller participants orient to their marginal, minority group membership in talk and consider proactive, overt displays of Irishness to be normatively appropriate. Irish student participants, on the other hand, do not orient to their subgroup membership. Instead, they assert a banal, taken-for-granted sense of national identity which they deem normatively appropriate. Moreover, students use this ‘banality’ strategically to regulate the boundaries of Irishness.

In an experimental context, however, rather than participants’ orienting to group position (in discursive terms), they can be experimentally placed into categories (i.e. prototypical, peripheral) though manipulated feedback, in a paradigm developed by Jolanda Jetten and colleagues for this purpose. From either a prototypical or peripheral position, participants can then be asked to actively respond to a set of identical, meaningful stimuli (subtle and overt displays of Irishness). This therefore provides the opportunity for both groups to enact their prior understanding of normative displays of identity and strategically use forms of identity displays. For example, those placed in the prototypical group are afforded a banal nationalism strategy where they can value subtle displays and downplay those that are overt. Those in the peripheral group are afforded a proactive identity-claim strategy, and are predicted to value overt displays of identity to strategically assert their group position. In addition, identification was included to explore the possibility of interactions with the dependents variables, as well interactions with manipulation of perceived prototypicality (Jetten et al., 2002). It must
be stressed that this is not an experimental testing of the discursive results, though it does represent the enrichment of an existing experimental paradigm through the consideration of discursive findings.

**Study 7.1.**

Therefore, the first set of quantitative studies will examine whether experimentally manipulating participants’ perceived position within the group will impact on their ratings of both subtle and overt displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day. Irish participants’ perceived position was manipulated by providing them with false feedback that they are either prototypical or peripheral of the group of other Irish participants. Participants are then asked to evaluate subtle and overt displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day, along various dimensions relevant to the display.

It was predicted that, following a prototypicality manipulation, participants who are told that they are peripheral to the group of Irish participants will rate overt displays of Irishness higher than subtle displays, on 4 dimensions evaluating the display (typicality, appropriateness, authenticity and wearing). In contrast, when group members are told that they are prototypical of the group of Irish participants in the computer database, they are expected to value subtle displays of Irishness over overt displays in all four dimensions.

**7.2. Method**

**Participants**

A total of 121 undergraduate students (88 women, 33 men) with a mean age of 19.77 years (SD = 5.1) participated in a computer-based task in exchange for partial course credits. In line with the aims of the experiment, participants who indicated that their
nationality was not Irish (n= 10) were not included in the final sample. Therefore, the final sample consisted of 111 university students (79 women, 32 men, \( M_{age} = 19.76, SD = 5.13 \)) who were randomly allocated to either the prototypical (n= 55) or peripheral (n=56) groups.

**Design**

This study used a 2 (perceived position: prototypical, peripheral) x 2 (degree of display: subtle, overt) x 4 (dimension of display: typicality, appropriateness, authenticity, wearing) full factorial mixed design, with perceived social position as the between-subjects variable and the within-subjects variables being degree and dimension. The dependent variable was an agreement scale in which participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with four statements on a 7-point scale where 1 represented ‘do not agree at all,’ and 7 represented, ‘completely agree’. The agreement scale related to the display of Irishness according to the four dimensions mentioned above, (1) typicality of the target, (2) authenticity of the display (3) appropriateness of display and (4) likelihood of wearing the display.

**Apparatus and Materials**

MediaLab (2010) research software for psychological experiments was used to display stimuli and measures in this experiment. The measurements included:

**Identification ratings.** Level of identification with the category ‘Irish’ was assessed on a 7 point scale (1= do not agree at all, 7= completely agree) using 7 items adapted from the Luhtanen and Crocker’s (1992) collective self-esteem scale. The items were, ‘I feel good about being Irish’, ‘I often regret that I am Irish’ (reverse), ‘In general, I am glad to be Irish’, ‘Overall, I often do not like being Irish’ (reverse), ‘Being Irish is a very important part of me’, ‘If someone says something bad about the Irish, they say something bad about me’, ‘If I were born again, I would want to be Irish’. A
total scale score was computed for all ratings of the identification items. The possible ranges of scores on the identification measure were 7 to 49. The internal consistency of this scale has been shown to be good, with Cronbach’s \( \alpha = .70 \) (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992). In the present study, internal consistency was excellent (Cronbach’s \( \alpha = .81 \)).

**Selection of stimuli.** To select the stimulus material, a pilot study was conducted where 5 Irish born university students rated a total of 72 photographs on a 7-point scale (1 extremely subtle, 7= extremely overt) that varied in explicitness of display of Irishness worn by individuals depicted in the photographs. From 72 photographs that became the stimulus material, two sets of 6 photos that showed good inter-rater reliability (100% agreement) were chosen (see also Appendix 4). One set consisted of photographs that were related most ‘subtle’ (scores of 1-2) and the other set, most overt (scores of 6-7). In the two sets of photographs, there were two photos per age category: older age, middle age and children. A reliability analysis was conducted on all scale items (typicality, appropriateness, authenticity, wearing) for subtle and overt displays. The subtle and overt display items had good internal consistency with a Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .87 for subtle display items and .90 for overt display items.

**Displays of Irishness and measures of agreement.** Each of the twelve photographic items were rated four times using the 7-point agreement scale (1= do not agree at all, 7= completely agree). Agreement ratings were made on the dimension of the display, including typicality (‘I would consider this person to be a typical Irish person on St. Patrick’s Day’), appropriateness, (‘I would consider what this person is wearing to be an appropriate display of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day’), authenticity (‘I would consider what this person is wearing to be an authentic display of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day’), and wearing (‘I would consider wearing this on St. Patrick’s Day’).
Therefore, the possible range of scores for the subtle items on each dimension was 6 to 42, and the possible range of scores for the overt items on each dimension was 6 to 42. For this analysis, mean scores for each dimension and level of display (i.e. typical/overt) were calculated to avoid any item-specific fluctuation in scores.

**Procedure**

Participants were recruited through an online university participation system and tested on the university campus. After giving informed consent, participants were seated in cubicles and given short instructions on how to operate the software. Their participation consisted of a series of computer-based tasks, firstly they answered questions concerning their level of identification with being Irish, after which they completed two tasks. The first task involved answering a 10 item ‘General Beliefs and Attitudes Questionnaire’ after which, participants were asked to wait (a programmed delay of 3 minutes) while being exposed to a message displayed on the screen that the computer is “calculating your individual result in comparison to other Irish participants in the larger computer database”. Participants were then provided with false feedback that their scores were similar to either the 19% (peripheral condition) or 72% (prototypical condition) of other Irish participants (c.f., Jetten, Branscrombe & Spears, 2002). Immediately after the prototypicality feedback was displayed, perceptions of the manipulation of participants’ perceived social position is assessed using one item: ‘Do you think you are a typical group member based on your score’? (Jetten et al., 2003) and were asked to provide a categorical ‘yes’ or ‘no’ response. In the second task, each of the 12 photographs (6 subtle, 6 overt) were presented four times and participants were asked to rate their level of agreement with four statements assessing four dimensions (typicality, appropriateness, authenticity, likelihood of wearing the display) on a 7 point
scale. Finally, participants were thanked for their participation, fully debriefed and informed that the feedback they received in the experiment was entirely false.

7.3. Results

Manipulation checks

A chi-square test was performed to determine if ‘yes’ and ‘no’ responses to the manipulation check items were distributed differently across prototypical and peripheral groups. The test indicated a significant difference between prototypical and peripheral group in their responses to the manipulation check items, $X^2 (1, n= 111), p < .001$ (an alpha level of 0.5 was adopted). The results suggest that the number of participants in the prototypical group answering ‘yes’ ($n= 43$) to the manipulation check item was significantly higher than that expected by chance ($n= 26$). This is compared to 10 participants who said ‘yes’ to the same item in the peripheral group.

Evaluations of displays of Irishness across dimensions

The primary aim of this study was to test whether manipulating participants’ sense of perceived position within the group would affect their ratings of displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day. Inspection of the mean agreement scores between groups indicates that there is little difference between prototypical and peripheral groups on all dimensions. However, all participants’ agreement ratings were lower in the wearing condition than on the other three dimensions (Figure 7.1). The midpoint of the scale 94) indicates a neutral response (‘neither agree nor disagree’), whereas 1 indicates disagreement.
These observations were examined using a 2 (display: overt vs. subtle) x 2 (condition: peripheral vs. prototypical) x 4 (dimension: typicality, authentic, appropriate, wearing) ANCOVA, with level of identification as a covariate (see Table 7.1 below). The results revealed a main effect of dimension, $F(3,324) = 15.00$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .122$. All participants reported lower levels of agreement at the prospect of wearing the displays of Irishness used in this experiment ($M= 3.62$, $SD= .98$), in comparison to their agreement on typicality ($M= 4.92$, $SD= .66$), appropriateness ($M= 5.05$, $SD= .71$) and authenticity ($M= 4.86$, $SD= .77$). In fact, ratings on the wearing dimension were not significantly different from the ambivalent midpoint of the scale. However, this main effect of dimension was qualified by significant two way interactions between
dimension and identification, $F(3,324)= 3.64, p< .013, \eta^2 = .033$ and between display and dimension, $F(3,324)= 4.22, p= .006, \eta^2 = .038$. In addition, there was a main effect of the covariate, level of identification $F(1,108)= 7.45, p= .007, \eta^2 = .065$ (Table 7.1). This indicates two things, that the agreement ratings across dimensions differed between subtle and overt displays, and that the relationship between ratings and levels of identification, depended on the specific dimension measured.

To further investigate the interaction between display and dimension, a simple effects analysis was conducted to investigate the effect of degree of display on the different dimensions (see Table 7.2). It is noted that for simple effects analyses amelioration of alpha levels is not required (Keppel, 1991). The results showed that subtle and overt displays were only rated differently in the authentic and wearing conditions. Participants provided higher agreement scores for overt rather than subtle displays on the authentic dimension ($p = .025$), indicating that they found overt displays more authentic than subtle displays. The reverse was true for the wearing dimension with higher scores for subtle rather than overt items ($p = .006$). It should be noted that, even though the ratings for wearing of subtle displays were higher than overt displays, they were higher near the mid-point of the scale that indicates neutral ‘neither agree nor disagree’ responses. There were no differences on the typical and appropriate dimensions.
Table 7.1.

Main and interaction effects for condition, dimension, degree and identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Within subjects effects</td>
<td>(3,324)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension $\times$ Identification</td>
<td>3.64</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension $\times$ Condition</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.270</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree $\times$ Identification</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree $\times$ Condition</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.767</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension $\times$ Degree</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension $\times$ Degree $\times$ ID</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dimension $\times$ Degree $\times$ Condition</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between subjects effects</td>
<td>(1,108)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identification</td>
<td>7.45</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7.2.

Results of simple effects analysis of dimension and degree

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Degree of display</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Subtle</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typicality</td>
<td>$M$ 4.90</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$ .84</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appropriate</td>
<td>$M$ 4.97</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$ .82</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic</td>
<td>$M$ 4.73</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>5.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$ .89</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wearing</td>
<td>$M$ 3.82</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>7.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$SD$ 1.16</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second interaction was between the covariate identification and dimension.

Another analysis was then carried out by regressing identification levels on each
dimension, irrespective of degree. Inspection of the beta coefficients was then used to
explore the interaction. These results revealed that the more participants identified with the group, the higher their agreement on the dimensions of authenticity ($\beta = 0.34, p = .022$) and wearing ($\beta = 0.68, p = < .001$).

**Summary**

On first inspection of the data, there appeared to be few observable differences between groups. For example, both prototypical and peripheral groups provided low scores when asked whether they would consider wearing overt and subtle displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day (i.e. indicating ambivalence on the scale). Further analyses revealed that the experimental manipulation, which had suggested to participants that they were either prototypical or peripheral of the group, did not significantly affect participants’ level of agreement with dimensions of Irishness that varied according to degree of display. This finding therefore, did not support the experimental hypothesis.

However, the analysis did reveal significant differences in participants’ agreement scores between subtle and overt displays on dimensions of Irishness. More specifically, the analysis suggests that all participants agreed more with the authenticity of overt displays but were more likely to consider wearing subtle rather than overt displays of Irishness. Moreover, results suggested that participants who identify more strongly with the category of Irish, tended to rate higher the agreement with the authenticity of displays of Irishness and were more likely to consider wearing such displays, irrespective of whether the display was subtle or overt.
7.4. Discussion

We hypothesised that individuals informed that they are on the periphery of the group after a comparison task would be more likely, than those informed of their typicality in relation to core group membership, to endorse overt rather than subtle displays of Irishness. More specifically, the peripheral group were expected not only to provide objectively higher evaluations of overt displays (i.e. the typicality, appropriateness and authenticity of the displays) but also, to personally endorse the wearing of overt rather than subtle displays of Irishness. The prototypical group were hypothesised to value subtle rather than overt displays of Irishness and as a result, would indicate their endorsement of such items both in their objective evaluation (typicality, appropriateness and authenticity) and their personal endorsement of wearing displays of Irishness. The experimental hypotheses were informed by findings from the discursive studies (Chapters 5 and 6) and aimed to advance the intragroup prototypicality literature by providing both prototypical and peripheral groups with strategic resources (subtle, overt) to demonstrate their group position. The data did not support the experimental hypotheses.

However, there are several findings that are worthy of discussion. Participants distinguished between the items and the dimension of display, as well as indicating some important considerations in terms of participants’ own long-term self-reported levels of national identification. Thus, even in the absence of support for the experimental hypothesis, there are some useful contributions to the literature on national identity, and minority/majority group membership.

Firstly, the findings can be interpreted in the context of Tajfel’s (1972) conceptualization of social psychological experiments. Irish participants entered into the experimental context with a prior understanding of the norms governing identity
displays and may have used this understanding to guide their behaviour in the novel situation of a laboratory experiment. When asked to evaluate displays on a social dimension, participants considered overt displays of Irishness as an authentic display on St. Patrick’s Day. However, when participants were asked whether they would personally wear the displays of Irishness, all participants demonstrated their ambivalence to doing so, particularly in relation to overt displays of Irishness. Their responses revealed that participants considered it normatively appropriate to value overt displays of Irishness on a social dimension. However, the personal endorsement of wearing displays of Irishness is considered normatively inappropriate, with participants indicating their disagreement with wearing overt items.

Consistent with the idea that pre-existing understanding of identity would likely influence task behaviour, strength of identification was an important variable. Identification influenced the evaluations of identity displays along the dimension of authenticity and wearing. The findings demonstrate that variations in strength of identification predict participants’ identity-related behaviour. These findings also indicate that participants will respond differently to qualitatively different stimuli, with variations in strength of identification. As participants’ strength of identification increased, so did the endorsement of items on the dimensions of authenticity and wearing. However, on the dimension of wearing, those highest on identification only indicated a neutral indifference to the wearing of items, again revealing participants understanding of normatively appropriate displays of identity related behaviour.

Overall, the findings from Study 7.1., point to some important considerations in relation to the experimental design. Firstly, the findings highlight a need to examine more closely the distinction between dimensions that reflect on participants’ social identity versus dimensions reflecting their individual identity within the group.
Secondly, the findings point to the necessity of considering level of identification as a between subjects variable, allowing for group comparison. This is consistent with previous findings (Schmitt & Branscrombe, 2001; Jetten et al., 2003) suggesting that participants’ level of identification is likely to affect how individuals interpret the personal relevance of the prototypicality feedback concerning their position within the group. Thus the next study (Study 7.2) was designed to advance the present findings by incorporating into the experimental design an explicit consideration of the importance of level of identification and the distinction between individual and social dimensions in evaluations of displays.

**Study 7.2.**

In this experiment, Irish participants, categorised as high or low in national identification, were randomly allocated into prototypical or peripheral groups and asked to evaluate displays of Irishness along dimensions that reflected their social identity more generally (typicality of target) or their own identity within the group (likelihood of wearing the display). The prototypicality literature would suggest that high identifying group members will identify with the ingroup according to how well they fit the group prototype and should therefore be threatened by prototypicality feedback that places them on the periphery of the group (Schmitt & Branscrombe, 2001). Relatedly, insofar as high identifying participants are more threatened by prototypicality feedback than low identifiers, high identifying peripheral members would be expected to provide higher score on dimensions evaluating the display.

On the other hand, from this perspective, low identifiers are less likely to have internalized their group membership into their sense of self and to be affected by prototypicality feedback. Therefore, if low identifiers consider the category to be less
important to them, then feedback about their prototypicality should be seen as irrelevant (Schmitt & Branscrombe, 2001; Jetten et al., 2003). In Study 7.1, as participants’ identification scores increased so did their agreement with the authenticity and likelihood of wearing the display and therefore identification impacts on participants’ evaluations of displays of Irishness. However a between-groups comparison was not made. Therefore it was not possible to test the hypotheses that high and low identifiers will respond in a qualitatively different manner to feedback. Thus, Study 7.2 was designed to examine the between-group effect of low and high identification on prototypicality manipulations.

In addition, the manipulation check items were revised in order to provide participants with a wider range of response choices. Scale items were incorporated in line with the use of prototypicality manipulations in the literature (Jetten et al., 2002; Jetten et al., 2003). In addition, an open-ended item was included that was designed to access participants’ emotional reactions to the manipulation. The rationale for the inclusion of the open-ended item developed from reflection on the results of the manipulation check in previous study, which suggested that participants were interpreting the prototypicality manipulation as intended. This manipulation failed to produce any significant differences between groups in their evaluations of displays of Irishness. However, attitudes are not just composed of the cognitive, information processing component but also the affective component, which may well be a powerful motivator of behaviour in the first stance. Therefore, cognitive and affective measurements of reactions to the manipulation were included in the revised studies.

We also chose to study only two dimensions of displays of Irishness in Study 7.2, specifically ‘typicality’ and the likelihood of ‘wearing’ the display. These dimensions were chosen for several reasons, particularly in relation to the distinction...
between ‘etic’ and ‘emic’ categories. ‘Etic’ categories are those that are imported by the analyst into the research context and ‘emic’ categories are likely to pre-exist in the participant’s repertoires, used by social actors themselves to explain a certain phenomenon (Pike, 1954). For the purposes of this study, categories were used that were clearly ‘emic’. Therefore it was decided to study the dimensions of ‘typicality’ and ‘wearing’ both to reflect emic categories existing in participants’ own language (evidenced in the discursive work) and to allow for an investigation of possible distinction between dimensions in participants’ evaluations of displays of Irishness.

In relation to these manipulations, it is hypothesised that high identifying participants induced to think of themselves as peripheral group members would provide higher ratings of overt displays of Irishness along the typicality and wearing dimensions and lower ratings for subtle displays. The converse will be true for high identifying participants assigned to be prototypical group members. However, there will be no significant differences for low identifiers on ratings of displays of Irishness.

7.5. Method

Participants

A total of 69 undergraduate students (54 women, 15 men; Mage= 19.19, SD= 1.5) took part in a pre-test session in exchange for partial course credits. In line with the aims of the experiment, participants who indicated that their nationality was not Irish (n= 27) were not included in the final sample. From the remaining 42 participants, a high (n=22) and low (n=20) identification group were categorised using a median split on identification scores in the total sample. They were randomly allocated to either the prototypical (n= 21) or peripheral (n=21) groups. Each cell of the design was as follows:
high identifying prototypical participants (n=9), high identifying peripheral participants (n=12), low identifying prototypical participants (n=11) and low identifying peripheral participants (n=10)

**Design**

This study used a 2 (perceived position: prototypical, peripheral) x 2 (level of identification: high, low) x 2 (degree of display: subtle, overt) x 2 (dimension of display: typicality and wearing) full factorial mixed design, with perceived social position and level of identification as the between-subjects variable and the within-subjects variables being degree of display and dimension. The dependent variable was mean scale scores on a 7 point scale measuring evaluations of displays along two dimensions, (1) the typicality of the individual in the photograph where 1 represented ‘not very typical’ and 7 ‘very typical’ and (2) their level of agreement with wearing displays of Irishness where 1 represented, ‘do not agree at all,’ and, 7 ‘completely agree’.

**Apparatus and Materials**

MediaLab (2010) research software for psychological experiments was used to display stimuli and measures in this experiment. The measurements included:

**Identification ratings.** Level of identification with the category ‘Irish’ was assessed in an identical manner to study 1, on a 7 point scale (1= do not agree at all, 7= completely agree) using 7 items adopted from the Luhtanen and Crocker’s (1992) collective self-esteem scale. In the present study internal consistency was good (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .79$). The median value used to determine high and low identifiers was 40.
**Manipulation check and emotional reactions.** The prototypicality manipulation was assessed by asking participants to indicate their agreement with the following statements: ‘In terms of the feedback I received, I have a lot in common with other Irish participants in the computer database’ (Jetten et al., 2002), ‘I am a good example of an Irish person’ and ‘I am a typical Irish person’ (Jetten et al., 2003). The reliability of these three items were high (Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .90).

In line with the rationale presented in Section X, participants’ emotional reactions to the manipulation were assessed with an open ended question “please describe in a few words how you feel at this moment” (Jetten et al., 2003).

**Displays of Irishness and scale items.** The stimulus material used was identical to the material used in experimental study 1: twelve photographs depicting displays of Irishness, varying in explicitness of display (subtle, overt). Each of the 12 photographic items were rated two times using a 7 point Likert scale, measuring evaluations of typicality of the individuals in the photographic image and level of agreement the wearing of display items. The typicality scale was adopted from a study by Ma and Correll (2010) assessing the typicality of a target individual ('how typical do you think this person is of an Irish person on St. Patrick’s Day’). The scale measuring levels of agreement of wearing displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day, was identical to experimental study 1 (‘I would consider wearing this on St. Patrick’s Day). The possible range of scores for the subtle and overt items on each dimension was 7 to 42. Mean scores for each dimension and level of display (i.e. typical/overt) were calculated used in the analysis.
Procedure

The study consisted of two sessions, separated by one week, the first session completed on the online university experimental participation system and the second, in an experimental lab on the university campus. In session one, participants completed a series of online pre-test questionnaires. The first questionnaire involved a measure of identification with the category ‘Irish’. To enhance the creditability of the manipulation of perceived position, participants were also asked to complete a ‘General Beliefs and Attitudes Questionnaire’ (Jetten et al., 2002). Participants were told that the aim of the study was to determine how well they fit in with the group of other Irish participants and were informed that their individual result will be scored and provided to them in the next session.

After this pre-testing session, the main test was conducted in an experimental laboratory on campus, where participants were informed that their participation consisted of a series of computer based tasks. Participants were asked to complete a personality questionnaire. Participants were told that their responses on the personality questionnaire, along with the results of the pre-test questionnaire, were used to create “your personal profile that will be compared to other Irish participants in the larger research database”. Similarly to Study 1, in the first task, participants were asked to wait while the computer generated their result in comparison to other Irish participants. Participants were then provided with false feedback that their scores were similar to either 19% (peripheral condition) or 72% (prototypical condition) of other Irish participants in the larger computer database (Jetten, Branscrombe & Spears, 2002). Immediately after the prototypicality feedback was displayed, perceptions of the manipulation of participants’ social position were assessed using three items (Jetten et al., 1997) and an open-ended question (Jetten et al., 2003). In the second task, an
identical set of photographs was presented as those in study 8.1. The photographs were presented three times and participants are asked to provide ratings on scale items that evaluate the display in terms of typicality of the target (Ma & Correll, 2010) and how likely the participant would be to consider wearing the display on St. Patrick’s Day. Finally, participants were fully debriefed and informed that the feedback they received in the experiment was entirely false.

### 7.6. Results

**Manipulation checks**

A repeated measure analysis with condition (prototypical and peripheral groups) and level of identification (high, low) as between-subjects variables and the three manipulation check items as within subject’s factors revealed main effects for condition $F(1,38)= 67.85$, $p < .001$ and the manipulation check items $F(2,76)= 3.5$, $p = .035$. These main effects were qualified by a two-way interaction between groups and the manipulation check items $F(2,76) = 5.05$, $p = .009$. There were no other significant main or interaction effects (see Table 7.3).

**Table 7.3.**

Main and interaction effects for condition, ID level and manipulation checks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Check</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation check x Condition</td>
<td>5.05</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation check x Level of identification</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation check x Condition x Level of identification</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
<td>67.84</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of identification</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.950</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condition x Level of identification</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.321</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NB Degrees of freedom are shown in parentheses.

Inspection of means suggest that there are higher overall means on all three manipulation check items for the prototypical group ($M= 6.01$) than the peripheral group ($M= 2.62$). This indicates that those in the prototypical group were significantly more likely to agree with statement that they ‘have a lot in common’ with Irish people (Jetten et al., 2002), were a ‘good example’ and were ‘typical’ of other Irish people (Jetten et al., 2003), than those in the peripheral group. Thus, the manipulation checks indicated that the prototypicality manipulation was perceived as intended.

Evaluations of displays of Irishness across dimensions

This study aimed to determine whether high and low identifying participants, who were provided with protypicality feedback manipulating their perceived position within the group, would show differences in their ratings of displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day. This was tested by carrying out with a 2 (high vs. low ID) x 2 (peripheral vs. prototypical) x 4 (typicality, liking, wearing) x 2 (overt vs. subtle) analysis of variance. An alpha level of .05 was used throughout unless stated otherwise.

Initial inspection of the mean scores between groups suggests that all participants gave higher scores on the dimension of typicality than on the dimension of wearing. Participants rated both subtle and overt display as neutral (4) or below, indicating disagreement with wearing display items (Figure 7.2). In other words, participants appeared to consider individuals wearing displays of Irishness to be typical of Irish people on St. Patrick’s Day, however when asked to consider wearing displays items, participants personally disagreed with displays of Irishness, particularly overt displays.
Figure 7.2. Mean agreement scores for displays of Irishness for each dimension and degree of display. Error bars correspond to standard errors to the mean.

Ratings on the dimensions of typicality and wearing were then examined using a 2 (display: overt vs. subtle) x 2 (groups: peripheral vs. prototypical) x 2 (level of identification: high vs. low) x 2 (dimension: typicality and wearing) ANOVA. The results revealed a main effect of dimension, $F(2,37) = 103.79$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .73$, in that wearing was rated significantly lower than typicality. However, there was also a significant two way interaction between dimension and identification, $F(2, 37)= 5.46$, $p< .025$, $\eta^2 = .13$, which suggests that the mean ratings across the dimension of typicality and wearing differed with levels of identification (see Table 7.4.).

Table 7.4.

Main and interaction effects for condition, dimension, degree and ID = identification
A simple effects analysis was conducted to further investigate the effect of level of identification on the different dimensions (see Table 7.5). The results of the simple effects analysis suggest that high and low identifiers provide significantly higher ratings on the dimension of typicality than on the dimension of wearing \((p<.001)\) and that this difference in ratings on dimensions is greater for low \((\text{partial } \eta^2 = .66)\) than high identifiers \((\text{partial } \eta^2 = .46)\). The results are therefore two-fold: first that participants indicate greater agreement with the typicality of the display and disagreement with wearing of displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day, and second, that this difference was greater for low identifiers.
Table 7.5.
Results of simple effects analysis of dimension and ID level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID Level</th>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Typicality</td>
<td>Wearing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>F (1, 38)</td>
<td>p</td>
<td>Partial η²</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>32.92</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.464</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>.24</td>
<td>73.74</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.660</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Emotional reactions to the manipulation

In addition, the emotional reactions to the prototypicality manipulation were categorized (see Table 7.6.). For prototypical participants there was an equal percentage of positive and neutral coded responses (30%) and the remaining 40% were classified as negative (e.g. ‘I feel ordinary’). For peripheral participants however, the majority of responses were classified in the positive emotion category (54.5%), with the remaining responses coded as either neutral (22.7%) indicating that individuals felt unaffected or indifferent to the prototypicality feedback (i.e. ‘I don’t feel much of anything’) or positive (22.7%). Therefore positively coded responses most frequently occurred in peripheral group. For example, a peripheral participant’s emotional reaction to the manipulation was noted as follows: ‘being told that I am only similar to 19% of other Irish people made me feel unique and special, I like being an individual’.
Table 7.6.

Frequency and percentage of coded response for prototypical and peripheral groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Position</th>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prototypical</td>
<td>Positive ‘I’m feel good’</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative ‘I feel boring and unoriginal’</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral ‘I don’t feel anything’</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peripheral</td>
<td>Positive ‘I feel unique and special’</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>54.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative ‘I feel confused’</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Neutral ‘No comment’</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

The results of the manipulation check indicated that participants were interpreting the prototypicality feedback as intended. However, on first inspection there appeared to be an observable difference between participant’s mean agreement scores on the dimension of typicality and wearing. Further analysis revealed that there was no significant difference between groups. However, both high and low identifiers rated displays of Irishness and provided significantly higher ratings on the dimension of typicality than on wearing. This suggest that high and low identifiers agree with the typicality of displays but were not inclined to personally endorse the wearing of displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day. The difference however between dimensions was greater for low identifiers.

7.7. Discussion

It was hypothesised that differences in participants’ levels of national identification would moderate the effect of the prototypicality manipulation. It was
expected that high identifying participants, who are more likely to identify with the group, would be more affected by prototypicality feedback - particularly feedback placing them on the periphery of the group and demonstrate this affect in their ratings of displays of Irishness along the dimensions of typicality and wearing. Furthermore, it is predicted that low identifiers, who are more likely to describe themselves in individualistic terms, would be less affected by prototypicality feedback. Therefore, for these participants no effect was expected for the manipulation.

Additionally, it was hypothesised that high identifiers, who are told they are on the periphery of the group would be more likely than the high identifying prototypical group members to endorse overt rather than subtle displays of Irishness. More specifically, high identifying peripheral group were expected to not only provide higher objective evaluations of overt displays according to their ratings of the typicality of the person depicted but also, to personally endorse the wearing of overt rather than subtle displays of Irishness. The high identifying prototypical group are hypothesised to value subtle rather than overt displays of Irishness and as a result, would indicate their endorsement of such items both in their objective evaluation (typicality) and their personal endorsement of wearing displays of Irishness.

The results partially support the experimental hypothesis. Although participants indicated that they had interpreted their prototypicality feedback correctly, there were no significant difference between groups in their ratings of displays of Irishness on St. Patrick's Day along the dimensions of typicality and wearing. However, both high and low identifiers rated displays of Irishness differently along dimensions, irrespective of degree of display. More specifically, both high and low identifying participants agreed with the typicality of displays of Irishness but were not willing to personally endorse the wearing of such items. This was particularly true for low identifiers who indicated that
their level of (dis)agreement were more extreme on these dimensions than high identifiers.

Participants responses to the open-ended items provided some additional descriptive information concerning their interpretation of their prototypicality feedback. More specifically, the coding of the emotional reactions to the manipulation indicate that participants in the peripheral group tended to provide positive response (i.e. ‘I feel unique’) in response to the prototypicality feedback that places them on the periphery of the group, contrary to what you might expect. This suggests some possible mechanisms whereby individuals may be buffering against the effects of the prototypicality feedback placing them either in central or peripheral position within the group of Irish participants.

These findings are consistent with the results presented in study 7.1. Again, when reflecting on their own identity, participants downplay the personal desirability of wearing displays of Irishness. However, the effect of degree present in study 7.1. was not present in study 7.2. Measurements of identification with the national group proved to be an important variable in both studies. In study 7.1., identification influenced the evaluations of identity displays along the dimension of authenticity and wearing. This pointed to some important considerations in the modification of the present study, designed to examine the between group effect of low and high identification on prototypicality manipulations. Although high and low identifiers did not respond in a qualitatively different manner to prototypicality feedback, they did distinguish between dimensions in their ratings of displays, providing higher ratings on the dimension of typicality than on wearing.
Overall, the findings suggest that the experiment might have elicited intra-group effects such that individuals are managing their reputation as group members within the group.

7.8. General discussion

The qualitative findings reported in Chapters 5 and 6 informed the development of the experimental hypotheses tested in studies described in this chapter. These quantitative studies collectively aimed to contribute to the intragroup prototypicality literature by providing both prototypical and peripheral groups with strategic resources when evaluating both subtle and overt displays of Irishness on dimensions reflecting their individual identities within the group (wearing) and their social identities more generally (typicality, appropriateness, authenticity).

It was hypothesised that the prototypical group, who are told they are representative of the group of Irish people, would value subtle as opposed to overt displays of Irishness as a way of possibly demonstrating the security of their group position. The peripheral group, on the other hand, was expected to value overt rather than subtle displays of Irishness, effectively demonstrate the insecurity of their position. The experimental hypotheses received no empirical support but do yield two new findings that contribute to an overall understanding of individuals use of identity displays and in particular, suggest a strategic element: (1) that participants’ long-term national identification affects their evaluations of displays of Irishness along dimensions and (2) that all participants meaningfully distinguished between dimensions, particularly when invited to respond in terms of their own behaviour within the group (i.e. wearing dimension) as opposed to social identity in general (i.e. typicality). These findings inform an understanding of the literature on ingroup identification and
intergroup relations, which will be discussed, as prefacing the subsequent experimental chapter. This will be discussed in cognitive, motivational and instrumental terms. However, I will firstly discuss the results of the prototypical manipulation, as it relates to the literature on national identification.

**8.8.1. National identity and prototypicality manipulations.** Although the prototypicality manipulation was successful in terms of participants interpreting the prototypicality feedback as intended, it did not affect their ratings of displays of Irishness. These findings point to some important considerations in terms of the theoretical underpinnings of prototypicality manipulations in the literature. Although the national group has been conceptualized as interchangeable with other ‘social groups’ in the social identity literature, there is also a possibility that national identity differs qualitatively from other forms of identity examined in the prototypicality literature.

Level of identification and prototypicality differ in key respects that impact on their malleability in an experimental context (Jetten et al., 2002). Identification with the group indicates the extent to which the group is integrated into the self-concept, while prototypicality is concerned with the position of the self in relation to other group members. While these two concepts could be theoretically distinct, it is argued that when experimentally creating social groups, the extent to which their identity is established and integrated into the self-concept, should clearly impact on the malleability of this group identity in an experimental context.

In the prototypicality literature, ‘social groups’ have been experimentally created by providing participants with information concerning their position within a ‘socially skilled personality category’ (Noel et al., 1995) or the group of ‘detailed perceivers’ following the results of a comparative perceptual task (Jetten et al., 1997). Alternatively,
experimental studies on intragroup prototypicality, manipulated participant’s perceived position within the group of university students (Cheng, Fielding, & Terry, 2011; Jetten et al., 2003). However, there is no indication, in these studies, of whether ‘groups’, either artificially constructed or real-world, foster established identities. In fact, if participants are arbitrarily placed into an experimentally constructed ‘social group’ this would suggest that participants’ perceived position within these constructed groups are also particularly malleable in the experimental context.

The use of identification measures in these studies also differ in important respects to its use in the current experimental investigation. In a study by Cheng et al., (2011), the identification measure was used to as a salience manipulation and was not incorporated into the analysis. Other studies manipulate perceived prototypicality within the group of university students and concluded that high scores on the identity measure confirmed that this identity was important to participants (Jetten et al., 2002; Jetten et al., 2003). There is no indication of the length of time at university or whether participants’ group membership was integrated into their self-concept. In fact, this particular type of social group is characterised by an identity of finite duration (i.e. three to four years of undergraduate study) and would be one in a state of identity flux and therefore is likely to differ in important ways to participant’s long-term, ascribed national identity.

Researchers have highlighted a number of distinct characteristics of the national group, which is worth further consideration at this point. For example, researchers in the sociological literature have drawn a distinction between ethnic and civic forms of national identity to demonstrate the complexity of the conceptualization in the literature. Civic national identity is generally believed to be voluntary in character and has laws and institutions as uniting feature, while ethnic national identity is seen as
genetically pre-determined and outside of the domain of free-will (Smith, 1998).
According to this ethnic definition therefore (Greenfield, 1992), an individual’s national
identification could not be changed, altered or manipulated for experimental purposes.
If participants themselves view their national identity as stable, ascribed and outside of
the boundaries of free-will, this would impact on the believability of their
prototypicality feedback placing them on the periphery of the group. Overall therefore,
the unique and complex nature of national identification could potentially have
consequences for experimental manipulations of participants’ position within the
national group. Having considered the theoretical underpinnings of the prototypicality
manipulation, I will now discuss the results in terms of cognitive, motivational and
instrumental interpretations.

7.8.2. Instrumental explanations. These findings can be interpreted in
instrumental terms, which contribute to an understanding of individuals’ strategic use
aspects of their group membership to meet their individual or group-based needs. The
social identity approach developed as a reaction to the predominance of individualistic
approaches to social psychological phenomenon at that time. This approach aimed to
return to the collectivist view of the group, where the behaviours of individuals within
the group are guided by the norms and values of their group membership. However,
recently the social identity approach has been criticised for neglecting the possibility
that individuals can strategically manage individual identities within the group (Hornsey
& Jetten, 2004).

The experimental findings in this chapter introduce the possibility that
individuals within the group strategically use aspects of their group membership. For
example, all participants displayed a degree of distance between themselves and the
national group in their evaluations of displays of Irishness. More specifically,
participants in both studies agreed the typically of displays of Irishness but indicated their reluctance to personally endorse displays, particularly overt displays of national identity. In instrumental terms, participants might indicate that there is a degree of difference between themselves and the national group.

Additional support for an instrumental interpretation of the experimental findings can be found in participants’ emotional responses to the prototypicality manipulation. For example, participants who are told they are peripheral of the group and commented that their emotional reaction to the manipulation was ‘feeling happy to be an individual’ could be interpreted as a strategy to ‘see oneself as loyal but non conformist’ or as part of a group ‘that normatively prescribes individualism’. This would allow participants to strategically present themselves as different while simultaneously part of the group (Hornsey & Jetten, 2004). The comments can also be interpreted as a reaction to the prototypicality manipulation, where participants can be seen to resort to their individual identities within the group to buffer against prototypicality feedback that they are peripheral of the group.

However, it can only be speculated at this point whether participants’ differential use of aspects of the intragroup context (i.e. indication of difference between themselves and the national group in their evaluation of displays) is driven by strategic considerations. I will argue that participants’ display of difference between themselves and the national group has an instrumental function, which requires further investigation in the subsequent experimental chapter. Firstly, however, I will offer some possible alternative explanations for the findings presented in this chapter in cognitive and motivational terms, highlighting overall contributions to the literature.

7.8.3. Cognitive explanations. There are also cognitive explanations for the experimental finding that suggest the possibility of greater cognitive accessibility of
group membership among certain individuals within the group. In fact, these findings are reminiscent of the behaviour of majority and minority group members, relative to differences in cognitive awareness of their membership. For example, those higher on identification behave in a similar way to minority group members (e.g., Simon & Hamilton, 1994; Brewer & Weber, 1994) in that they appear more cognitively preoccupied with their group (Simon & Brown, 1987) and are more likely to display their group membership (i.e. by wearing displays of Irishness and endorsing the appropriate of overt displays). On the other hand, those lower on identification behave in a similar way to majority group members (e.g., Simon & Hamilton, 1994; Lucken & Simon, 2005), as they appear less cognitively aware of their group members and are more likely to describe themselves in individualistic terms (i.e. display a reluctance to endorse the wearing of displays of Irishness). These findings contribute to the literature on national identity literature and strength of identification (e.g., Feather, 1996; Matera et al., 2005) and suggest that variations within the national group in terms of the cognitive accessibility of their group membership, impact on their evaluations of identity related behaviour.

The emotional reactions to the manipulation further contribute to an understanding of the cognitive explanations of the experimental findings. Although there are variations in strength of identification within the national group, participants’ responses to the prototypicality manipulation also suggest that they are behaving similar to majority group members. In particular, peripheral participants’ responses to the prototypical feedback that they feel ‘unique’ and ‘special’, suggest that participants are exercising the freedom to resort to their individual identities without the risk of societal repercussions (Tajfel, 1978). Participants would possibly resort to their individual
identities to butter against the effect of the prototypicality feedback placing them on the periphery of the group.

7.8.4. Motivational explanation. There are also some motivational explanations for the differences between high and low identifiers in their evaluations of displays of Irishness. Researchers have also suggested motivational explanations for the moderating effect of group identification for levels of ingroup stereotyping (Spears, Doosje, & Ellemers, 1997), ingroup bias (e.g., Roccas & Schwartz, 1993) and group cohesiveness (Turner, Hogg, Turner & Smith, 1984). Underlying the motivational account of these findings is the theory of ‘positive distinctiveness’ or that individuals are motivated to differentiate the ingroup from relevant outgroups along relevant dimensions of comparison (c.f., Brown, 1984; Tajfel, 1982; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Similarities between groups are likely to lead to threats to group distinctiveness and identity (e.g., Brown & Abrams, 1986). Distinctiveness threat is typically experimentally manipulated in terms of similarities in intergroup attitudes and status (e.g., Brown, 1984).

Participants in the studies presented in this chapter were asked to evaluate displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day. There is a possibility that there ethos of inclusion and cultural diversity at the parade, would be interpreted as a threat to group distinctiveness. In other word, the inclusive message that ‘everyone is Irish on St. Patrick’s Day’ could depict similarities among attendants at the event. This would potentially explain the differences between high and low identifiers in their evaluations of displays. According to Spears et al., 1997, participant’s initial level of group identification determines whether group members are likely to distance themselves from the group or display group solidarity when their identity is threatened. High identifiers have been found to respond to group threat with more ingroup stereotyping, while low identifiers distance themselves from the group (Spears et al., 1997). Similarly, the
findings in this chapter suggest that low identifiers display a degree of distance between themselves and the national group in their evaluations of displays of Irishness.

7.8.5. Conclusion. In summary, the findings of the present chapter were two-fold: (1) that participants’ pre-existing level of national identification affected their evaluations of displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day and (2) participants distinguished between displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day and in particular, when reflecting on their identities within the group (wearing dimension) versus that of group members more generally (typicality, appropriateness and authenticity dimensions). Having reflected on the possible cognitive, motivational and instrumental underpinnings of these findings, there are three main observations that will be incorporated into the empirical framework on the subsequent experimental chapter.

Firstly, I have noted that, interpreting the prototypicality feedback as intended, the prototypicality manipulation did not affect participants’ evaluations of displays of Irishness. One possible reason for the absence of effect of the prototypicality manipulation, is that there are aspects of national identity that are unique to this social group. For example, national identity is understood as ascribed, outside of the boundaries of free-will, taken-for-granted as self-evident and pre-determined (Rutland & Cinnirella, 2000). This was taken into consideration in the design of the experiments in the following chapter, which includes a different type of prototypicality manipulation. In addition to receiving their own prototypicality feedback, participants will also be given information concerning the centrality or peripherality of another group member following the results of a comparison measure. The addition of prototypicality feedback, as concerning an external source (i.e. the prototypicality of a target individual) is designed to increase the believability of experimental manipulations.
Secondly, it is argued that participants distinguish between themselves and other group members in their ratings of displays of Irishness and in doing so, they are differentially using aspects of the intra-group context. In order words, in their evaluations of displays of Irishness, participants provide positive objective evaluations of the typicality of the group of Irish people as a whole. However, by refusing to personally endorse the wearing of such items, participants are in effect distancing themselves from these collective representations of Irishness. In the following chapter, these findings are expanded upon by providing participants with the opportunity to use aspects of intragroup dimension, outside of the context of St. Patrick’s Day. Participants will be asked to rate an identical list of attributes according to how likely they would be to use the attribute to describe themselves versus the national group. It is hoped therefore that this would allow participants to alter aspects of the intragroup context (i.e. their own position relative to the national group).

Finally, it has been argued in this chapter that there is a possibility that participants could strategically alter aspects of the intergroup context, such as their proximity to the national group, in order to perhaps manage their reputation as group members within the national group. However, cognitive and motivational explanations of the experimental findings, along with more instrumental functions are also acknowledged. In the following chapter participants will be provided with an opportunity to alter aspects of the intragroup context prototypical and peripheral subgroups within the national groups.
Chapter 8

Protypicality, identification and similarity judgements

8.1. Introduction

The findings of the previous chapter have informed the development of the experimental studies presented in the current chapter. More specifically, in the previous chapter it has been argued that participants’ differential use of aspects of the intragroup context could be driven by strategic motivations. In order to unpack participants’ strategic use of aspects of the intragroup context, it is necessary to introduce an intra- and intergroup comparative context.

There are several theoretical underpinning to this decision. Firstly, the intragroup prototypicality literature suggests that the strategic behaviours of peripheral group members are heightened in the presence of other group members (e.g., Noel et al., 1995). Secondly in terms of the intergroup prototypicality literature, there has been some recent focus on participants’ instrumental use of prototypicality judgments (Sindic & Reicher, 2008); however participants’ strategic use of aspects of their group membership in an intergroup comparative context is currently under-explored. These studies are designed to expand the scope of theoretical consideration of prototypicality in the SCT tradition, which will now be discussed to preface the rationale for the current experimental investigations.

The theoretical underpinnings of prototypicality judgement have been one of the more central concerns of SCT tradition (Oakes et al., 1994; Turner et al., 1987). This falls broadly into relatively distinct and mutually exclusive areas of inquiry, (1) the intra-group prototypicality literature concerned with the extent to which group members embody the definitions and characteristics of the group and (2) the intergroup
prototypicality literature concerned with the extent to which ingroups and outgroups are seen to be prototypical of the superordinate category encapsulating both groups. Both areas of the literature assume that individuals compare and evaluate group/group members against a normative frame of reference (i.e. the category prototype or superordinate category) and along relevant/valued dimensions of comparison (i.e. certain defining characteristics) and propose some cognitive/motivational processes that might underlie this phenomenon.

In terms of the intragroup prototypicality literature, research suggests that those on the periphery of the group are motivated to increase the centrality of their group position. Peripheral group members will alter their group position by engaging in strategic behaviour, such as symbolically rejecting ‘bad group members’ to prove their loyalty to the group (Jetten, 2006). The strategic behaviour of peripheral group members is most pronounced in the presence of fellow group members who are believed to monitor and evaluate their behaviour (e.g., Noel et al., 1995). This would suggest that the perceived centrality of group position has an effect on the way participants behave towards other group members.

In terms of intergroup prototypicality, Mummendey and colleagues have proposed the theory of Ingroup Projection to account for peoples’ tendency to consider their ingroup as more prototypical of the superordinate category than other subgroups within the category (Waldzus & Mummendey, 2004; Waldzus, Mummendey, & Wenzel, 2005; Waldzus, Mummendey, Wenzel, & Weber, 2003; Wenzel, Mummendey, & Waldzus, 2007). This is a motivational account based on an assumption within Social Identity Theory (SIT) that group members strive for a positive social identity. A salient superordinate category can threaten group distinctiveness and highlight the relative prototypicality of subgroups within the category.
Recently, researchers have considered the instrumental use of prototypicality judgements (Sindic & Reicher, 2008) and noted that individuals can, in fact, downplay or minimise their ingroup prototypicality as a way of sustaining a separatist position. From this perspective, ingroup projection is viewed as a public and strategic act aimed at achieving desired goals. Moreover, that ingroup projection will not always occur, as previously thought (i.e. Waldzus & Mummendey, 2004) but rather there are strategic, instrumental decisions underlying this process of ingroup projection. The variability in ingroup projection derives from the variability in individuals and group based interests. However, participants’ strategic use of intragroup prototypicality judgements within a superordinate category is currently under-explored.

8.1.1. The present investigation. This chapter therefore aims to consider the effect of perceived social position and participants’ strategic use of aspects of intragroup prototypicality (i.e. their ratings of similarity between themselves and the national group) in both an intragroup and intergroup comparative context. In the first study presented in this chapter participants’ perceived sense of prototypicality in an intragroup comparative context (when viewing a prototypical and peripheral target) is manipulated and participants’ are provided the opportunity to indicate the degree of similarity between themselves and the national group through an assignment of national attributes. It is hoped that the introduction of the target prototypicality feedback will heighten participants’ awareness of the intra-group comparative context. It is argued that this allows participants to adjust the aspects of the intragroup context, such as their proximity to the national group, managing their place within the nation, relative to other prototypical and peripheral group members.
This chapter is additionally concerned with participants’ perceived similarity between themselves and the national group, relative to subgroups within the nation. It will draw on theories of instrumental prototypicality (Sindic & Reicher, 2008) and in doing so it considers individuals’ strategic use of aspects of national identity to manage and negotiate group position. However, it is also worth noting that, a particular focus on instrumental accounts in this thesis does not suggest that this supersedes other complimentary cognitive/motivational explanations of prototypical judgements.

The studies presented in this chapter use a modified version of the ingroup projection paradigm. In studies that investigate ingroup projection, participants are presented with a list of attributes generated by the experimenter and are asked to rate their likelihood of selecting each attribute to describe their ingroup, an outgroup and the superordinate category encapsulating both groups (e.g., Walduz et al., 2005). However, the studies presented here differ in two key aspects. Firstly, this chapter does not make claims as to whether ingroup projection occurs or not in this context. Instead it acknowledges the absence of measure of dual identification with the ingroup and superordinate category necessary for relative ingroup projection (RIP) to occur (Mummendey & Wenzel, 1999). Second, a pilot study was conducted to elicit national attributes specific to the Irish national context that can be used to determine participants’ display of difference between individuals and the national group.

**Study 8.1.**

It was expected that participants who were told they are were either prototypical or peripheral of the group of Irish participants and then asked to view the response patterns of a target of matched prototypicality (i.e. prototypical participant viewing a
prototypical target) would rate themselves similarly to their co-nationals on group attributes. In contrast, prototypical participants asked to view a peripheral target, will provide lower ratings on attributes assigned to themselves than to ‘typical Irish people’, while peripheral participants asked to view a prototypical target will provide higher ratings on national attributes assigned to themselves than to the national group.

These predictions were informed by the experimental results in the previous chapter. These results suggested that participants indicated a degree of difference between themselves and the national group in their evaluations of displays of Irishness. More specifically, the results suggest that participants agreed with the typicality of displays of Irishness, but displayed reluctance to personally endorse the wearing of display items, particularly overt displays. Identification was included to explore the possibility of interactions with the dependents variables, as well interactions with manipulation of perceived prototypicality (Jetten et al., 2002). This chapter therefore aims to further explore participants’ indications of perceived similarity or difference to the national group. In doing so, prototypical and peripheral participants were provided with resources (i.e. assigning attributes to self and national others) to alter their proximity to the national group.

**Pilot study**

The pilot study was conducted to increase the legitimacy of the target prototypicality feedback and to create a list of attributes that are specific to the Irish national context, as generated by Irish student participants. The preliminary investigation therefore consisted of two focus group discussions, in which the interviewer prompted participants to generate national attributes and their responses were recorded by an independent observer. Irish students were encouraged to
collaboratively generate a list of 10 national attributes resolving any disagreement or discrepancy through discussion.

**Method**

**Participants**

A total of 10 Irish participants took part in two focus group discussions (N=3, N=7). All participants were Irish both university students and ranged in age from 27 to 35 years.

**Procedure**

Participants were recruited using online university registration system and received partial course credit for their participation. The focus groups took place in an informal setting and were not audio recorded. Instead, participants were told that an independent observer would generate a written record of their responses and that participants would be given the opportunity to view and modify the collective responses in order to collaboratively generate a list of national attributes.

Initially, the discussion was prompted by a number of questions including, ‘how would you describe a typical Irish person’ and ‘what are some common attributes you would use if you were to describe a typical Irish person’. The independent observer was instructed to record a list of all the attributes that the participants had collectively generated (N=22). Following the initial discussion, the independent observer placed the list of attributes in the centre of the discussion table and participants were encouraged to revise and refine the list, choosing 10 attributes that would most closely describe ‘typical Irish people’. Any disagreement was resolved with further discussion. The duration of the focus group discussions were approximately 30 minutes, after which
participants were fully debriefed and thanked for their participation. The final list of attributes is as follow: friendly, humorous, easy-going, outgroup, pessimistic, conservative, sarcastic, religious, humble and optimistic.

8.2. Main Study: Method

Participants

A total of 116 University students were recruited through an online university registration system and received partial course credit for their participation. In line with the aims of the experiment, participants who indicated their nationality was not Irish (n=14) or were part of a recognised minority subgroup (n=4) were not included in the final sample. The final sample consisted of 98 university students (74 women, 24 men, Mage = 21.6 years, age range: 17-35 years), who were randomly allocated to one of four conditions: (1) prototypical participant/prototypical target (n = 23), (2) peripheral participant/peripheral target (n = 24), (3) prototypical participant/peripheral target (n = 23), (4) peripheral participant/prototypical target (n = 28).

Design

This study used a 2 (perceived social position: prototypical, peripheral) x 2 (target prototypicality: prototypical, peripheral) full factorial mixed design, with perceived social position and target prototypicality as the between-subjects variables. The dependent variable was the difference in attribute ratings assigned to the self versus the national group. Strength of identification was the co-variate.
Apparatus and Materials

This study was conducted as a series of consecutive computer-based tasks, using MediaLab (2010) research software for psychological experiments. The measurements included:

Identification ratings. Level of identification with the category

An identical measurement of national identification was employed to that reported in the Chapter X, page Y. In the present study, internal consistency was also good (Cronbach’s α = .77). As subgroup membership is a variable in this study, participants were asked to indicate whether they identified with any other social group in Ireland. All participants identified with being Irish and none indicated being part of a particular subgroup within Ireland (although some indicated that they identified with their college cohort, family and friendship groups).

Ratings of attributes. Participants were presented with 10 attributes at 3 time points. Initial baseline ratings were made before any of the experimental manipulations, when participants rate the likelihood of choosing the attribute if they were to describe ‘typical Irish people’. After the perceived position and target prototypicality manipulations, participants rated the same 10 attributes according to how likely they would be to select the attribute when describing ‘yourself’ and also ‘typical Irish people’.

Manipulation check. The success of the perceived position manipulation was assessed immediately after participants received false prototypicality feedback, by asking participants to indicate their agreement with the following statements: ‘I am a good example of an Irish person’ and ‘I am a typical Irish person’ (Jetten, Branscombe, Spears & McKimmie, 2003). The reliability of these two items was excellent (Cronbach’s alpha = .95).
The manipulation check for target prototypicality was assessed using the following item: You have recently viewed the scores of another Irish participant, would you consider this participant to be a good example of an Irish person?

Procedure

Participants were recruited through an online university participation system. After giving informed consent, participants were seated in cubicles and asked to read short instructions on how to operate the software. Their participation consisted of a series of computer-based tasks. First of all, questions were completed concerning level of identification with being Irish and the 10 item ‘General Beliefs and Attitudes Questionnaire, the latter designed to provide false feedback. Then, participants were presented with a list of 10 attributes and were asked to rate their likelihood of choosing the attribute presented, if they were to describe a typical Irish person. During a programmed delay of 3 minutes, participants were exposed to a message displayed on the screen that the computer is “calculating your individual result in comparison to other Irish participants in the larger computer database”. Participants were then provided with false feedback that their scores are similar to either 19% (peripheral group) or 72% (prototypical group) of other Irish participants (c.f. Jetten, et al., 2002). Immediately after the prototypicality feedback was displayed, two items assessed the perception of the manipulation of perceived position.

Participants were then given the opportunity to view the response patterns of a participant, they were told, scored either very high or very low on the comparison measure. This involved informing participants that the target member’s pattern of responding was very similar to other Irish participants in the computer database (prototypical target group). Alternatively, participants are informed that the target
member’s responses were not similar to other Irish participants in the computer database (peripheral target group). Participants were presented with target ratings that varied according to varying according to low, moderate or high rating. Ratings were selected randomly and were presented to all participants. Participants were then asked to re-rate each of the 10 attributes according to how likely they would be to use that attribute to describe themselves. After this, participants were presented with three items designed to assess the effect of the target manipulation.

Participants were presented with the same 10 attributes for a third and final time. Again, they were asked to rate their likelihood of choosing the attribute presented, if they were to describe a typical Irish person. Finally, participants were thanked for their participation, fully debriefed and informed that the feedback they received in the experiment was entirely false. All procedures were conducted in accordance with the ethical regulations of the psychological Society of Ireland, the British Psychological Society and were approved by the University of Limerick Research ethics Committee.

Data analysis:

The DV was calculated as follows: firstly, the total mean scores for ratings of all attributes assigned to the self and typical Irish were calculated separately. Second, the difference score was computed by subtracting the mean ratings on attributes assigned to the self from the mean attribute ratings assigned to the national group. A score of zero indicates that there are no differences in attribute ratings assigned to the self versus the national group. Difference scores below zero can be interpreted as lower attribute rating assigned to the self versus the national group, while the opposite is true for difference scores above zero.
8.3. Results

*Manipulation checks*

To determine the effectiveness of the manipulation of, participants’ prototypicality, an independent-samples t-test was conducted. There was a significant difference in mean scores of the manipulation check items between prototypical ($M=5.55$, $SD=1.13$) and those peripheral groups, $M=2.31$, $SD=1.29$: $t(96)=14.29$, $p=.001$. This indicates that both groups interpreted the target manipulation check as intended.

*Ratings of attributes to self and others*

The primary aim of this study was to test whether manipulating perceived prototypicality of self and that of a target group member would affect the way participants rated themselves and typical members of the national group on national attributes. Inspection of the mean difference scores suggest that all groups provide lower ratings for attributes assigned to themselves than those assigned to typical members of the national group. Second, this is most pronounced for prototypical participants who are viewing a peripheral target group member. These participants appear to provide indicate the greatest degree of difference between themselves and the national group, in their attribute ratings. (see Figure 8.1.).
These observations were examined using a two-way between-groups analysis of variance with level of identification as a covariate (see Table 1 below). An alpha level of .05 was used unless stated otherwise. The results revealed a main effect of target prototypicality, $F(1, 90) = 14.72, p < .001, \eta^2 = .14$, and identification with the national category, $F(1, 90) = 7.36, p = .008, \eta^2 = .07$. However, these main effects were qualified by a significant two way interaction between target prototypicality and identification, $F(1, 90) = 13.15, p < .001, \eta^2 = .13$ (Table 8.1). This indicates that level of identification influences the effect of target prototypicality.
Table 8.1.

*Main and interaction effects for participant and target prototypicality and identification*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(1,90)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pts Prototypicality</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.980</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Prototypicality</td>
<td>14.72</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>7.36</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pts Prototypically x Target Prototypicality</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Prototypicality x ID</td>
<td>13.15</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pts. Prototypicality x ID</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.784</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Prototypicality x Pts. Prototypicality x ID</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ID= strength of identification with the category ‘Irish’*

*Pts = participants*

Inspection of the beta coefficients was used to explore the interaction between the target prototypicality and identification. These results revealed that for those viewing a peripheral target, as their level of identification increased, so did the proximity between attributes assigned to the self and to typical co-nationals ($\beta = .089$, $p = .004$) compared to those viewing a prototypical target ($\beta = -.021$, $p = .239$). This suggests that for those lower on identification, when viewing a peripheral target, there is greater difference between self and typical co-nationals in their ratings of attributes (lower scores for self than others). More specifically, as identification increases, the difference decreases so that for those higher on identification viewing a peripheral target, there is little difference between participant’s’ ratings of attributes assigned to themselves and typical co-nationals (see Figure 8.2).
Figure 8.2. Scatterplot depicting average difference in attribute ratings for prototypical and peripheral target groups, with strength of identification.

**Summary**

On first inspection of the data, participants in all conditions appeared to provide lower ratings on attributes assigned to themselves than their typical co-nationals. There appeared to be few observable differences between the prototypical and peripheral conditions, as well as those viewing the response patterns of a prototypical target group member in their ratings of attributes. However, for those viewing a peripheral target, there was an observable discrepancy, with participants indicating higher ratings in their assignment of attributes to typical co-nationals and lower rating of attributes assigned to themselves, than in any other condition.
Further analysis revealed that the prototypicality manipulation, which suggested to participants that they were either prototypical or peripheral of the group, did not significantly affect participant’s’ ratings of attributes assigned to themselves or to typical co-nationals. However, the target prototypicality manipulation, which showed the response patterns of either a prototypical or peripheral target, did significantly affect participant’s’ ratings of attributes and therefore these findings partially supported the experimental hypothesis.

Subsequent analyses revealed a significant interaction between the target manipulation and participant’s strength of identification. Those lower on identification when viewing a peripheral target, provided lower ratings for themselves on national attributes than to typical co-nationals - effectively displaying a degree of dissimilarity between themselves and typical others in the national group. As strength of identification increased however, those viewing a peripheral target display a degree of similarity between themselves and typical Irish people so that for those highest on identification, there is little difference in their ratings of attributes.

8.4. Discussion

We hypothesised that prototypical participants viewing a peripheral target would provide lower ratings on attributes assigned to themselves than to ‘typical Irish people’, while peripheral participants asked to view a prototypical target will provide higher ratings on national attributes assigned to the self than to typical co-nationals. It was also hypothesised that there would be no effect for participants viewing a target of matched prototypicality (i.e. prototypical participants viewing the responses of a prototypical target). The experimental hypotheses were informed by the findings of the previous experimental previous experimental, which suggested that participants distinguish
between themselves and other member of the national group, in their evaluations of displays of Irishness (i.e. agreeing with the typicality of displays, but not personally endorsing such displays).

The data partially supported the experimental hypotheses. Although, the manipulation check indicates that the perceived prototypicality manipulation was interpreted as intended, there was no observable effect of the manipulation on the assignment of attributes for participants in the prototypical and peripheral conditions. However, the target manipulation did appear to have an effect on attribute assignment. More specifically, in the peripheral target condition, as participants’ strength of identification increased, the difference between themselves and their typical co-nationals decreased, as indicated in their attribute ratings.

These findings build on the results of the previous experimental chapter, as well as enhancing the understanding of intragroup prototypicality, as it relates to national identity. The findings of the previous experimental chapter suggested that participants meaningfully distinguish between displays of Irishness, relative to whether the endorsement of the display would reflect group members more generally or their own identity within the group. Here it can be seen that, for those lower on identification and viewing a peripheral target, they indicate greater dissimilarity between themselves and the national group in their ratings of attributes.

Overall, this finding mirrors and extends the findings of the previous chapter by demonstrating participants’ use of intragroup prototypicality (i.e. the degree of similarity between themselves and the national group) outside of the context of St. Patrick’s Day. In addition, this study provides further evidence for the importance of considering variations in strength of identification in studies of prototypicality within the national group. Strength of identification with the national group was found to be an
important factor impacting both participants’ reaction to a peripheral target and subsequent assignment of attributes to the self and typical co-nationals. Therefore, it would appear that the co-variate identification interacts with participants’ reaction to the peripheral target, such that participants demonstrate greater distance between themselves and the national group in their assignment of attributes.

Importantly, this appears to suggest some strategic element to participants’ use of aspects of their intragroup prototypicality. In particular, those lower on identification display greater distance between themselves and the national group (as indicated in their ratings of attributes) but only when viewing a peripheral target. This might suggest that participants alter their proximity to the national group, and thus their proximity to peripheral members within the group, in order to manage their own identity within the group identity. In addition to strategic consideration, it is also possible that those lower on identification would be less invested in the group and therefore opt for an individualistic strategy (Spears et al., 1997) in response to being presented with a peripheral co-national.

Overall, the results of Study 8.1 merit further consideration. It is unclear why lower identification may lead to self presentation as dissimilar to typical co-nationals when presented with an atypical target. It is possible that respondents perceived the atypical responses as reflecting negatively upon the individual, the group or themselves. The following experiment examines this more closely by adopting both an intragroup and intergroup consideration of prototypicality. More specifically, the aim will be to replicate the findings of the current study and extend the findings to examine how participants use elements of the intragroup context (i.e. present the distance between themselves and the national group), in an intergroup as well as intergroup comparative context when viewing group members of different prototypicality.
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Study 8.2.

In Study 8.2, participants’ perceived prototypicality was manipulated. They were also shown the response patterns of a target participant who they are told are either prototypical or peripheral to the group of Irish people. Participants then completed a series of tasks that correspond to two experimental hypotheses. The first task sought to replicate the findings of study 8.1., and therefore, participants followed an identical procedure. It is hypothesised that, with increased strength of identification, participants viewing a peripheral target will display increased similarity in their ratings of attributes assigned to themselves and the national group (H1).

The second task is designed to extend these findings by considering participants’ similarity judgements in an intragroup comparative context. The hypotheses are derived from an examination of the literature and the results of the previous studies. Firstly, I argue that the introduction of a superordinate frame of reference could highlight the relative prototypicality of group members and increase the success of the prototypicality manipulations (Wenzel et al., 2005). Moreover, differences in perceived prototypicality are likely to affect the way in which participants view their position, relative to others within the superordinate category. In order to investigate this, prototypical and peripheral subgroups were introduced. The prototypical subgroup is Gealteacht people. The ‘Gealteacht’ refers to areas in Ireland where Irish is the predominant language. People from Gealteacht areas constitute 2.1% of the population, 72% of whom are fluent Irish speakers. Government policies have been developed to protect and promote the Irish language in these areas. Participants are provided with information that ‘Gealteacht people are a minority in Ireland that speak Irish as their first language, which the government feel is important for the culture and heritage of Ireland’.
The peripheral subgroup is Irish Travellers. This subgroup is matched numerically with Gealteacht people in that they are also a minority group in Ireland. However, their position within is different. The distinct culture and heritage of Irish Traveller is not recognised by the Irish government and individuals within this community experience high level of exclusion and discrimination. Participants are provided with information that ‘Irish Travellers are a minority group in Ireland and are generally believed to exist of the fringes of Irish society’. These two groups were chosen to reflect two different subgroup positions within the superordinate category. This will allow for an examination of the ways in which individuals adjust their own position within the nation, relative to subgroups occupying different positions within the broader category.

It is hypothesised based on the findings of the previous studies that prototypical participants will indicate greater dissimilarity between themselves and the national group. In addition, these participants will indicate greater similarity between Irish Travellers and the national group. The opposite is hypothesised for peripheral participants, who are expected to indicate greater similarity between themselves and the national group and greater dissimilarity between Irish Travellers and the national group. This hypothesis is based on the previous studies which suggest that those in an insecure position within the group will seek to display their loyalty to the group. Finally it is expected that both prototypical and peripheral participants will indicate the perceived similarity of the Gealteacht subgroup to the national group (H2). Overall, these variabilities in similarity judgements are believed to reflect the variability in individual and group-based interests.
8.5. Method

Participants

A total of 109 University students were recruited through an online university registration system and received partial course credit for their participation. In line with the aims of the experiment, participants who indicated their nationality was not Irish (n=10) or who identified with a recognisable minority subgroup (n=2) were considered in the analysis but were not included in the final sample. The final sample consisted of 97 university students (70 women, 27 men, \(M_{age} = 20.4\) years, age range: 18-37 years), who were randomly allocated to one of four conditions: (1) prototypical participant/prototypical target (n=20), (2) peripheral participant/peripheral target (n=24), (3) prototypical participant/peripheral target (n=25), (4) peripheral participant/prototypical target (n=28).

Design

The set of studies reported were designed to test two experimental hypotheses. Firstly, the study was designed to replicate the findings of the previous experimental study and therefore was identical to the design employed in Study 8.1 (see section X). In addition to the original design a manipulation of target prototypicality was added to test the second experimental hypothesis. For the purpose of clarity, the two sets of hypotheses will be tested separately. To test the second experimental hypothesis the study used a 2 (perceived social position: prototypical, peripheral) x 2 (target prototypicality: prototypical, peripheral) x 2 (subgroup prototypicality: prototypical, peripheral) x 3 (similarity: self/Typical Irish people, Gealteacht people/Typical Irish people, Irish Travellers/Typical Irish people) full factorial design, with perceived self-prototypicality and target prototypicality as the between-subjects variables and the
within-subjects variables being subgroup prototypicality and similarity judgements (i.e. self versus typical Irish, etc). The dependent variables were mean similarity judgement (in which participants were asked to rate separately the similarity between themselves and typical Irish people), as well as the ratings of the two subgroups and typical Irish people, on 7-point scales where 1 represented, ‘very different,’ and, 7 represented, ‘very similar’. Strength of identification was the co-variate. Mean scores for similarity ratings for self versus typical Irish people, Gealteacht people versus typical Irish people and Irish Travellers versus typical Irish people were calculated separately and used in the analysis.

**Apparatus and Materials**

This study was conducted as a series of consecutive computer based tasks, using MediaLab (2010) research software for psychological experiments. The measurements included:

**Identification ratings.** The measurement of strength of identification with the category ‘Irish’ was assessed in an identical manner to Study 8.1. (see section X). Internal consistency for this scale in the present study was good (Cronbach’s α = .79).

**Measurement of perceived similarity**

The items (on the measurement of perceived similarity) consisted of 7 diagrams. Each diagram consisted of two circles of equal size, vertically centred on a horizontal line. From top to bottom the circles were depicted as appearing closer together; the first diagram the circles were furthest apart, were side by side on the third diagram and overlapped almost totally in the seventh diagram (see figure 8.3.). Each circle was labelled from top to bottom on a scale from 1 to 7 (1= very different, 4= neither similar nor dissimilar, 7= very similar).
Figure 8.3. Measurement of perceived similarity where participants were asked to indicate the similarity between the two categories using the scale provided.

The measurement of perceived similarity was presented three times and labelled: (1) myself, typical Irish people, (2) people from Gealteacht areas, typical Irish people, (3) Irish Travellers, typical Irish people. The concentric circles depicted participants’ experienced relation to the group and between groups, mapped onto the spatial diagram. This mapping can comprise several dimensions including belonging, identification and similarity (Schubert & Otten, 2002), however for present purposes and in line with the aims of the experiment, the focus was on participants’ similarity judgements.
Manipulation check and emotional reactions. The success of the perceived position manipulation was assessed immediately after participants received false prototypicality feedback, by asking participants to indicate their agreement with the following statements on a 7 point Likert scale (1= do not agree at all, 7= completely agree): In terms of the feedback I received, I have a lot in common with other Irish participants in the computer database (Jetten, Branscrombe & Spears, 2002), ‘I am a good example of an Irish person’ and ‘I am a typical Irish person’ (Jetten et al., 2003). The reliability of these three items were satisfactory (Cronbach’s alpha coefficient of .74).

The manipulation check for target prototypicality was assessed by asking participants to indicate their agreement with the following statements on a 7 point likert scale: ‘You have recently viewed the scores of another Irish participant, would you consider this participant to be a good example of an Irish person’?

Procedure

Participants were recruited through an online university participation system. Participants gave informed consent, were seated in cubicles and given short instructions on how to operate the software. The first section of the experiment followed an identical procedure to that in Study 8.1, where participants first completed an national identification measure (Luhtanen & Crocker, 1992), followed by a procedure designed to manipulate participants perceived social position (e.g., Jetten et al., 2002) and target prototypicality manipulation. Participants were then asked to rate attributes according to how likely they would be to choose the attribute when describing themselves and separately, typical Irish people.
Next, participants were presented with a measurement of perceived similarity consisting of 7 diagrams corresponding to a 7 point scale (see figure X). The measurement was presented three times in random order and participants were instructed to choose the diagram that represents most precisely the perceived similarity between (1) themselves and typical Irish people groups, (2) Gealteacht people and typical Irish people, (3) Irish Travellers and typical Irish people. Finally, participants were fully debriefed and informed that the feedback they received in the experiment was entirely false.

8.6. Results

Manipulation checks

To determine the effectiveness of the manipulation of, participants’ prototypicality, an independent-samples t-test was conducted. There was a significant difference in mean scores of the manipulation check items between prototypical ($M=4.81$, $SD=1.31$) and those peripheral groups, $M=4.28$, $SD=1.38$: $t(96) = -1.52$, $p=.032$. This indicates that both groups interpreted the target manipulation check as intended.

In terms of the target prototypicality manipulation, an independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the scores of the manipulation check for prototypical target and peripheral target groups. There was a significant difference in mean scores of the manipulation check between those viewing a prototypical target ($M=5.14$, $SD=1.44$) and those viewing a peripheral target, $M=2.96$, $SD=1.71$: $t(96) = 6.85$, $p=.013$. This indicates that both groups interpreted the target manipulation check as intended.
Difference in assignment of attributes to the self and the national group

Inspection of the mean difference scores are below zero on the scale which suggest that all groups provide lower attribute ratings assigned to themselves than their attribute ratings assigned to the national group. Second, prototypical participants who are viewing a peripheral target group member appear to provide indicate the greatest degree of difference between themselves and the national group, in their attribute ratings (see Figure 8.4).
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*Figure 8.4. Mean difference score between self and national group target prototypicality and the participant prototypicality groups. Error bars correspond to standard errors to the mean.*

These observations were examined using a two-way between-groups analysis of variance with level of identification as a covariate (see Table 8.2, below). Identification was included to control for interactions with the dependents variables. The results revealed a main effect of target prototypicality, $F(1, 89) = 13.48, p < .001, \eta^2 = .13$, and
identification with the national category, $F (1,89) = 4.30, p = .041, \eta^2 = .05$. However, these main effects were qualified by a significant two way interaction between target prototypicality and identification, $F (1, 89) = 12.59, p=.001, \eta^2 = .12$. This indicates that level of identification influences the effect of target prototypicality.

Table 8.2.

*Main and interaction effects for participant and target prototypicality and identification*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>Partial $\eta^2$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pts Prototypicality</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.723</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Prototypicality</td>
<td>13.48</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ID</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pts Prototypically x Target Prototypicality</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Prototypicality x ID</td>
<td>12.59</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pts. Prototypicality x ID</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.808</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Target Prototypicality x Pts. Prototypicality x ID</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.248</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ID = strength of identification with the category 'Irish'*

*Pts = participants*

Inspection of the beta coefficients was used to explore the interaction between the target prototypicality and identification. These results revealed that for those viewing a peripheral target, as their level of identification increased, so did the proximity between attributes assigned to the self and to the national group ($\beta = .089, p= .004$) compared to those viewing a prototypical target ($\beta = -.021, p= .239$). This suggests that for those lower on identification, when viewing a peripheral target, there is greater difference between self and national other in their ratings of attributes (lower scores for self than others). More specifically, as identification increases, the difference decreased
so that for those higher on identification viewing a peripheral target, there is little difference between participant’s’ ratings of attributes assigned to themselves and the national group (see Figure 8.4).

Inspection of the beta coefficients was used to explore the interaction between the target prototypicality and the covariate identification. These results revealed that for those viewing a peripheral target, as their level of identification increased, so did the proximity between attributes assigned to the self and to the national group ($\beta = .065, p = .036$), compared to those viewing a prototypical target ($\beta = .016, p = .471$). This suggested that for those lower on identification, when viewing a peripheral target, there was greater distance between self and other in their ratings of attributes (lower scores for self than others). As identification increased, the difference decreased so that for high identifiers, there is little difference between self and others in ratings of attributes.

![Figure 8.4](image_url)  
*Figure 8.4. Scatterplot depicting average difference in attribute ratings for prototypical and peripheral target groups, with strength of identification.*
Similarity ratings in an intergroup comparative context

In order to test the second experimental hypothesis, participants’ perceived prototypicality and that of a target group member was also manipulated. Participants were then asked to make similarity judgements in relation to themselves and the national group, as well as subgroups and the national group. On first inspection of the mean similarity ratings, there appears to be little difference between prototypical and peripheral conditions, as well as those viewing the responses of a prototypical target in their similarity judgements of themselves and subgroups, relative to the national group. However, all participants appeared to indicate dissimilarity between themselves and typical Irish people and greater similarity between both subgroups and the broader category. There appears to be greater observable discrepancy between participants’ ratings of proximity between themselves and the national group, versus Gealteacht people and the national group (Figure 8.5.).
Figure 8.5. Mean similarity ratings in target prototypicality and the participant prototypicality groups. Error bars correspond to standard errors of the mean.

These observations were examined using a 2 (participants prototypicality) x 2 (target prototypicality: prototypical, peripheral) x 2 (subgroup prototypicality: prototypical, peripheral) x 3 (similarity: self/Typical Irish people, Gealteacht people/Typical Irish people, Irish Travellers/national group) ANCOVA with strength of identification as a covariate (see Table 8.3. below). The predicted main effect for perceived similarity was significant, \( F(2,178) = 4.88, p = .009, \eta^2 = .05 \). In addition, there was a two-way interaction between perceived similarity and participants’ prototypicality, \( F(2,178) = 3.09, p < .048, \eta^2 = .03 \) and between similarity and identification, \( F(2,178) = 4.45, p < .013, \eta^2 = .05 \), as well as a higher level three-way interaction between similarity, participants’ prototypicality and identification \( F(2,178) = 3.37, p = .036, \eta^2 = .04 \). This indicates that firstly, participant’s perceived prototypicality affects the difference in their ratings of similarity between themselves and subgroups in comparison to the national group and secondly, that the relationship depends on strength of identification with the national category.

Table 8.3.

Main and interaction effects for participants and target prototypicality, similarity and identification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>( F )</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>Partial ( \eta^2 )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Similarity</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity x Pts Prototypicality</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Similarity x Target Prototypicality</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.522</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The three-way interaction between participants’ prototypicality, similarity and the covariate identification was explored by splitting the data according to participant prototypicality and then exploring the interaction between ID and similarity. Thus identification levels were regressed on the mean similarity ratings for self versus ‘typical Irish people’, ‘Gealteacht people’ versus ‘typical Irish people’ as well as the similarity ratings for ‘Irish Travellers’ versus ‘typical Irish people’. Inspection of the beta coefficients was used to explore this effect. As 6 separate tests were carried out, a more conservative rejection criteria was used and therefore the alpha level was adjusted to .01. For prototypical participants, higher identity scores were associated with higher similarity ratings between Gealteacht and typical Irish people ($\beta = .122, p = .004$). However level of identification did not significantly impact on their ratings of similarity between themselves versus typical Irish people ($\beta = .081, p = .082$) or in their similarity ratings between Irish Travellers and typical Irish people ($\beta = .073, p = .119$). For the peripheral condition participants, their strength of identification did not significantly impact on their ratings of similarity between themselves and typical Irish people ($\beta = -$...
.058, \( p = .094 \)), Gealteacht and typical Irish people (\( \beta = .009, \ p = .831 \)), or their similarity ratings between Irish Traveller and typical Irish people (\( \beta = .002, \ p = .968 \)).

In addition to this three-way interaction, the two-way interaction between participants’ prototypicality and similarity was analysed separately using a paired-samples t-test. A conservative alpha level of .01 was used. The results suggest that participants in both prototypical and peripheral conditions rate the similarity between themselves and the typical Irish group to be significantly lower than that of Gealteacht people and Irish Traveller versus the national group, respectively. There was no significant difference in the similarity ratings for Gealteacht people versus typical Irish people, compared to that of Irish Traveller and typical Irish people (see table 8.4.). This suggest that both prototypical and peripheral groups rate the similarity between themselves and the national group to be significantly less (indicating dissimilarity) than the perceived similarity between Gealteacht people and Irish Travellers versus the national group (indicating similarity).

Table 8.4.

**Results of paired samples analysis of participants’ prototypicality and similarity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prototypical</th>
<th>Similarity</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( t ) ((1,44))</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self/TypIrish</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>-7.0</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geal/TypIrish</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self/TypIrish</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>-3.9</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trav/TypIrish</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geal/TypIrish</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trav/TypIrish</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Peripheral</th>
<th>Similarity</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>( t ) ((1,51))</th>
<th>( p )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self/TypIrish</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geal/TypIrish</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self/TypIrish</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td></td>
<td>-4.9</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trav/TypIrish</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geal/TypIrish</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trav/TypIrish</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.3</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
To further investigate these results, an independent samples t-test was conducted and revealed that both prototypical and peripheral groups rate the similarity between themselves and typical Irish people to be significantly below neutral 4 (p<.001), effectively indicating their perceived dissimilarity from the national group. The similarity between Gealteacht and Typical Irish people was also significantly above neutral 4 for both prototypical (p<.001) and peripheral conditions (p=.032), indicating a the perceived similarity between the two groups. However, only peripheral participants’ rate the similarity between Irish Travellers and typical Irish people to be above 4 (p=.026), again indicating similarity. The prototypical participants’ similarity rating ratings did not differ significantly from neutral (p=.367). Therefore these findings indicate that participants in both conditions rate themselves as dissimilar to the national group and rate Gealteacht people as similar. Also, participants in the peripheral condition rate Irish Travellers as similar to the national group, while the those in the prototypical condition indicate that Irish Travellers to be neither similar nor dissimilar to typical Irish people.

Summary

First, the results of the manipulation check items revealed that participants in the prototypical condition was more likely to agree with statements that they are ‘typical’ of the group of Irish people (Jetten, et al., 2003), than those in the peripheral condition. Also, participants provided higher mean agreement scores for the typicality of the prototypical versus peripheral target. The results of the manipulation check therefore suggest that participants interpreted both the perceived position and target prototypicality manipulation as intended.
The first section of analysis examined the difference in participants’ assignment of attributes to the self and the national group. The findings replicated that of study 8.1., and suggested that there is a relationship between participants’ strength of national identification and the indication of the difference in attribute rating for self and the national group, when viewing a peripheral target. More specifically, for those lower on national identification and viewing a peripheral target, they indicated a greater difference between themselves and the national group (i.e. lower scores for self than the national group). As strength of national identification increased this indication of difference decreased, so that for those highest on identification there was little difference between themselves and the national group, as indicated in their ratings of attributes.

The second section of the analysis examined participant’s indication of similarity to the national group in an intergroup comparative context. This was designed to determine whether participants would adjust aspects of the intragroup context, such as the degree of similarity/difference when presented with prototypical and peripheral subgroups. Findings indicate that perceived prototypicality impacts on ratings of similarity between participants relative to the national group as well as similarity between subgroups and the nation and that these relationships depend on the strength of national identification. More specifically, in the prototypical condition, participants identification with being Irish was associated with greater ratings of similarity between Gealteacht and typical Irish people, with those highest on national identification considering Gealteacht participants to be very similar to the national group on the comparison measure.

In addition, participants in both prototypical and peripheral conditions rated their similarity to the national group lower than the ratings of perceived similarity between
each subgroup to the national group. Participants in both conditions rate themselves as
dissimilar (below neutral 4) to the national group and rate Gealteacht people as similar
(above neutral 4). However, only peripheral participants rated Irish Travellers as similar
to the national group, while prototypical participants indicated that this subgroup was
neither similar nor dissimilar to Irish people.

8.7. Discussion

In this chapter, participants completed a series of computer-based tasks that
corresponded to two experimental hypotheses. First, it was hypothesised that with
increased strength of national identification, participants viewing a peripheral target will
display increased similarity between themselves and typical co-nationals in their ratings
of attributes, thus replicating the findings of study 8.1. Second, it was hypothesised that
prototypical participants will indicate greater dissimilarity between themselves and the
national group. In addition, these participants will indicate greater similarity between
Irish Travellers and the national group. The opposite is true for peripheral participants,
who will indicate greater similarity between themselves and the national group and
greater dissimilarity between Irish Travellers and the national group.

This hypothesis is based on the previous studies which suggest that those in an
insecure position within the group will seek to display their loyalty to the group by
engaging in outgroup derogation (Noel et al., 1995). Effectively, both prototypical
participants participant’s are expected to adjust elements of the intragroup context to
distance themselves from peripheral subgroups within the broader national category
thus strategically managing their own position within the group.

The first experimental hypothesis was supported, effectively replicating the
findings of study 8.1. The results demonstrate a relationship between participants’
strength of national identification and their ratings of attributes assigned to the self versus the national group, but only when viewing the response patterns of a target group member who they are told is on the periphery of the national group. Those lower on identification, displayed greater difference between themselves and the national group in their ratings of attributes. However as participant’s strength of identification increased, participants’ indication of difference decreased so that for those highest on identification, there was little difference between themselves and the national group.

The second experimental hypothesis was partial supported. The analysis indicated that both groups emphasised the perceived similarity of Gealteacht people to the national group, as expected. However, both prototypical and peripheral participants indicated their perceived dissimilarity to the national group, rather than just prototypical participants as hypothesised. In addition, both sets of participants, but peripheral participants in particular, indicated the perceived similarity of Irish Travellers to the national group, contrary to the hypothesis. In addition, strength of national identification was an important co-variate. More specifically, the findings indicated that, for prototypical participants, as their identification increased, so did their indication of perceived similarity between Gealteacht and typical Irish people.

### 8.8. General Discussion

The findings in the previous chapter informed the development of the experimental hypotheses in the studies described in this chapter. These studies collectively aimed to contribute to the intra-and intergroup prototypicality literature by providing participants with the opportunity to adjust elements of the intragroup context, such as their similarity to the national group, in order to manage their prototypicality and that of fellow group members or subgroups within the nation. The first set of
studies (Studies 8.1 and 8.2a) were designed to determine whether prototypical and peripheral groups would adjust the difference between themselves and the national group (as indicated in their ratings of attributes), when viewing prototypical and peripheral target group members. The final study (study 8.2.b) was designed to examine the possibility of participants’ strategic use of intragroup prototypicality to distance themselves from peripheral subgroups within the broader national category, thus strategically managing their own position and the reputation of the group. The following is a brief synopsis of the main findings of this chapter.

Firstly, the finding that participants’ strength of national identification affects their displays of difference between themselves and the national group as well as with subgroups and the broader nation, is evidenced in the experimental studies of this chapter. In particular, strength of identification affected the way in which participants reacted to the target prototypicality manipulation and their subsequent assignment of national attributes to themselves and the national group. Participants lower on identification, on viewing a peripheral target, displayed lower mean attributes assigned to themselves than to the national group. On the other hand, as strength of identification increased, the difference between themselves and the national group decreased so that for those highest on identification, when viewing a peripheral target, there was little observable difference between themselves and the national group. For those in the prototypicality condition, there was a steady similarity with typical co-nationals regardless of national identification.

Secondly, in an intergroup comparative context, participants’ experimentally manipulated prototypicality, along with their strength of national identification, affected participants’ ratings of similarity between themselves and the national group relative to similarity between subgroups and the national group (as indicated in study 8.2.b.). More
specifically, both prototypical and peripheral participants indicated that they were
dissimilar to the national group and emphasised the similarity of Gealteacht people to
the national group. In addition, prototypical participants who identified strongly with
the national group indicated greater similarity between Gealteacht and typical Irish
people, with participants highest on national identification considering Gealteacht
participants to be very similar to the national group. Only the peripheral group rated
Irish Travellers as similar to the national group, while prototypical participants
indicated that this subgroup was neither similar nor dissimilar to Irish people on the
comparison measure.

Thirdly, it is worth emphasising that participants’ use of the intragroup context
(i.e. the degree of similarity between themselves and the national group) was not only
related to their strength of identification and perceived social position but also
dependent on the information they received concerning the social position of a target
group member (study 8.1 and 8.2.a.) and relative to subgroups within the broader nation
(study 8.2.b.). In the first two studies in this chapter, participants lower on identification
reacted to the feedback concerning the peripherality of a target group member by
displaying greater difference between themselves and the national group. In the final
study, participants reacted to the information they received concerning the
prototypicality of Gealteacht people and indicated the perceived similarity between this
subgroup and the national group. This will later be discussed in terms of the
instrumental use of prototypicality judgements but for present purposes, it is necessary
to highlight that participants’ displays of similarity/difference are linked to information
concerning the social position of others within the nation.
We will now discuss these findings in instrumental, cognitive and motivational terms, highlighting the contribution of the experimental findings to the intra- and intergroup prototypicality literature, intergroup relations and national identity literature.

**8.8.1. Instrumental explanation.** These experimental findings can be interpreted in instrumental terms. Researchers have recently begun to examine the strategic use of prototypicality judgements and have noted that individuals will project the greater relative prototypicality of outgroups, if it suits their instrumental goals.

Similarly, in this chapter, it is has also been noted that participants indicate dissimilarity between themselves and the national group and indicate similarity between subgroups and the nation. It has been evidenced that participants are making these judgements on the basis of prototypicality information they have received regarding fellow nationals. Taken together, it appears that participants are altering their proximity to the national group on the basis of information received concerning the prototypicality of group members or subgroups within the national category, thus managing their position and that of other members within the national group.

It is argued that this could serve an instrumental function. Take first the findings that low identifying participants distance themselves from the national group, when viewing a peripheral target. This could have an instrumental function to strategically distance themselves from peripheral members of the national group. In other words, peripheral group members deviate from the ingroup prototype and are therefore detrimental to the group as a whole. In distancing themselves from the national group (in their attribute ratings), participants are effectively distancing themselves from potential contaminants of the group that could damage and devalue the reputation of the group. This is of course merely speculation and hence several real-life groups were considered in the elaborated experiment.
On this basis the findings of the final study can similarly be interpreted in terms of the instrumental function of prototypicality judgements. It is possible that prototypical participants were using their similarity judgements to manage their own position within the group, relative to subgroups within the nation. Participants displayed a degree of distance between themselves and the national group, while dictating the proximity between subgroups and the nation. In doing so, the prototypical group emphasised the similarity between Gealteacht people and the national group, who they are told are ‘important for the culture and heritage of Ireland’, and thus a valued part of the national group. In addition, prototypical participants consider Irish Travellers, neither similar nor dissimilar to the national group. Again, this may have an instrumental function. It would allow the prototypical group to avoid positioning the Irish Traveller subgroup within the nation, while also managing their own self image. In other words, if participants were to indicate that Irish Travellers were dissimilar to the group of Irish people (as hypothesised), they might run the risk of presenting a negative self image. Effectively, by indicating a neutral response, this allows prototypical participants to indicate the ambiguous nature of Irish Travellers’ position relative to the national group, again manage their position within the group and the reputation of the national group as a whole.

**8.8.2. Motivational explanations.** The experimental findings can also be interpreted in terms of the motivational underpinnings of group behaviour to achieve positive distinctiveness. Prototypical participants define themselves more in group terms when distinctiveness is threatened (Jetten et al., 1997). This might be particularly so for high identifying group members. Participants might adopt a group strategy, in this case positively evaluating subgroup members within the nation, which reflects positively on the group as a whole. In other words, participants who are told they are
prototypical and are also given positive information about the prototypicality of a subgroup group within the nation, could positively evaluate the subgroup as a strategy to achieve positive distinctiveness.

In addition, the literature suggests that individuals on the margins of the group are motivated to increase the centrality of their position within the group (Lewin, 1948; Noel et al., 1995). Peripheral participants therefore adopt strategies to negotiate their position within the group. For example, peripheral group members are motivated to prove to others that they are in fact ‘good group members’ if not representative of the group, by offering to help with tasks that benefit the group (Jetten et al., 2003) and symbolically rejecting ‘bad group members’ that are not representative of the group (Noel et al., 2005). The findings in this chapter are contrary to what you might expect, in that peripheral participants indicate the perceived similarity between Irish Travellers and the national group. However, it also provides information on additional strategies employed by peripheral group members to manage their position with the group.

8.8.3. Cognitive explanation. These findings can also be interpreted in terms of variations in strength of identification and the associated differences in cognitive accessibility of group membership. Similar to the findings in the previous chapter, those lower on identification displayed a greater degree of difference between themselves and the national group in their rating of attributes, while those higher on identification indicated that there was little to no difference between themselves and the national group. Again these findings are reminiscent of the behaviour of minority and majority group members, however there also appears to be a strategic element at play.

Although majority group members have traditionally been depicted as ‘mindless’ in terms of their group membership, the experimental results presented in this chapter suggest otherwise. Irish students might strategically use aspects of the
intergroup context to distance themselves from the national group and to negotiate their position relative to other more or less prototypical group members. This could suggest that participants are not simply unaware of their group membership, but are using their group membership strategically to manage the reputation of the group.
Chapter 9

General conclusion

9.1. Introduction

National identity has been the focus of much academic discussion in recent years (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). However researchers in social psychology have not yet considered the possibility that there are different forms of identity display co-present in the same national context. This has perpetuated the assumption that identification with the national category equates to uniformity of identity expression. In contrast, the present thesis sought to explicate the ways in which individuals display and evaluate national identity within the same national context. The primary aim of the thesis was therefore three-fold. The first aim was to examine the interactive resources deployed by individuals within the same national context to manage and negotiate their national identity in interaction. The second was to further explore the different ways in which those occupying different positions within the national group evaluate displays of national identity. The third aim was to avail of the complimentary strengths of both qualitative and quantitative methodologies to provide new insight into the topic of national identity that has, oftentimes, eluded researchers from both traditions (Reicher & Hopkins, 2001).

In this chapter, I present the overall findings of this thesis and argue that the culmination of the theoretical contributions of the preceding empirical chapters demonstrate that, far from acting uniformly in terms of identity expression, members of the same national category display and evaluate national identification in different ways. These differences among members of the same category also suggest some important policy and practical implications in relation to group-based entitlement and inclusion.
within the nation. This chapter is divided into six parts. The first section summarises the main analytical findings in the four empirical chapters. The second section discusses the theoretical contributes to both the discursive and social identity approach to national identity, as well as theories of intergroup relations, intra- and intergroup prototypicality. The third section outlines the methodological contributions of this thesis. The fifth section deals with the limitations of the present research and possible future directions. The sixth section will deal with practical and policy implications. Finally, I will offer some concluding comments.

9.2. Synopsis of empirical findings

The first empirical chapter was concerned with the ways in which individuals within the same nation display and construct their national identity in talk. The findings demonstrated that both sets of participants employed different interactive resources to manage and negotiate their national identity in talk. More specifically, Irish Traveller participants made relevant their marginal minority group identity and proactively assert a claim to national identity, strategically using criterial markers of Irishness to negotiate their national identity in interaction. Settled participants, on the other hand, asserted a banal taken-for-granted sense of national identity and were additionally concerned with regulating the reputation of the national group. Both sets of participants also oriented to different norms governing identity expression in talk. More specifically, Irish Traveller participants asserted their identity proactively and considered overt displays of Irishness as indicative of being inside of the national category. Their settled counterparts on the other hand, avoided explicit talk of national identity and considered overt displays of Irishness to be normatively inappropriate and indicative of being outside of the national category.
The second empirical chapter provided an opportunity to examine in more detail the potential consequences of adopting divergent forms of identity displays for entitlement and inclusion within the nation, as evidenced and reproduced in talk. The first section of analysis incorporated a reflexive ethnomethodological approach to examine participants’ displays of understanding of the photo-elicitation task. Both sets of participants oriented to the same task in different ways and importantly, these variations in approach to the task reflected participants’ discursive concerns to manage and negotiate their local interactive concerns in talk. Irish Traveller participants, who make relevant their marginal subgroup membership, used their display of understanding of the task to rhetorically undermine their exclusion from the national group. Settled participants, on the other hand, oriented to the task as a dilemma to account for their photographs while managing any explicit talk of Irishness that would undermine their banal, taken for granted sense of national identity. Additionally, the insertion of the interviewer in the interaction problematised participants’ use of the task and brought into relief the discursive business being done. For Irish Travellers the insertion of the interviewer displayed the greater entitlement of the interviewer in interaction (Abell et al., 2006), problematising the participants’ own display of entitlement to comment on the content of Irishness. For settled participants, the interviewer’s questions made explicit the nature of the photo elicitation task as one requiring participants to explicitly discuss their photographic representations of Irishness, which was counter to their banal assertion of national unawareness in talk.

The second section of analysis examined participants’ conversational interaction during the photo exchange, where they are given the opportunity to view the photographs generated by the other set of participants. Irish Traveller participants displayed their entitlement to comment on the content of Irishness. The fragility of their
entitlement was revealed as participants were no longer able to use their own photographs as a discursive ‘resource’ to ‘accomplish’ being part of the national category (Antaki & Widdicombe, 1998). Settled participants, on the other hand, displayed their entitlement by refusing to discuss the other set of photographs, explicitly denying representations of Irishness and placing others outside of the national category, based on their photographic representations (i.e. ‘it’s like something a tourist would take’). In effect, Settled participants’ display of identity as ‘banal’ acts as a signifier of their entitlement to exclude others from the national group on the basis of their proactive displays, which marked them as outside of the national category. Overall therefore, the analysis demonstrated how differences in identity displays can reproduce inequality and dominance in subtle forms in conversational interaction.

Overall therefore, the discursive findings in this thesis worked to challenge the assumption in the social psychological literature that members of the same national category will display identical forms of identity expression. These findings demonstrate the individuals within the same national context adopt different styles of identity display to manage and negotiate their national identity interactionally. Additionally, both sets of participants orient to different norms of identity expression in talk. This was reflected the divergent understanding of the appropriateness of overt displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day. Importantly, the analysis also suggested that these differences in identity display among members of the same nation could potentially have interactive consequences for entitlement and inclusion within the nation.

The third empirical chapter was informed by the discursive findings and set out to determine whether experimentally manipulating participants’ perceived social position within the national group will impact on their ratings of displays of Irishness. The findings of this chapter were two-fold: first the participants’ national identification
affects evaluations of displays of Irishness along dimensions and second, that all participants distinguished between displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day. This is particularly so when participants reflecting on their identities within the group (wearing dimension) versus that of group members more generally (typicality, appropriateness and authenticity dimensions). It is suggested that the experiment could be eliciting intra-group effects, such that participants are displaying differences between themselves and other group members in their evaluations of displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day.

These findings further problematised the assumption in the literature that individuals within the nation understand and evaluate displays of national identity in the same way. In doing so, the quantitative findings provided further evidence for the existence of variations in strength of identification among members of the national category (e.g., Martera et al., 2005; Feather, 1996). Additionally, these variations impact on the ways in which participants perceive and evaluate collective displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day. Therefore, these experimental findings contributed to the understanding of variations within the national group and by providing participants with different identity strategies (subtle, overt), individuals were able to demonstrate the differences in identity evaluation among members of the same national group.

The final empirical chapter provided participants with the opportunity to adjust elements of the intragroup context, such as their similarity to the national group, in order to manage their social position and that of fellow group members within the nation. The findings indicated that participants take into account prototypicality information concerning fellow group members, when indicating the degree of similarity between themselves and the national group. More specifically, in the first set of studies, those lower on national identification indicated greater distance between themselves and the national group, but only when viewing a peripheral target. In the final study, both
prototypical and peripheral group indicated the dissimilarity between themselves and
the national group, while emphasising the similarity between a prototypical subgroup to
the national group. It has also been suggested that this might serve an instrumental
function to manage their position within the group relative to other members of the
broader national category.

These findings not only suggest that differences among members of the national
group impact on their evaluations of themselves versus the national group, but also that
these differences could serve a strategic, instrumental function. Building on the
findings of the previous experimental chapter, participants are evidenced altering their
proximity to the national group relative to the prototypicality information concerning
other group members within the broader category. In other words, not only are there
differences between group members in terms of their identity expression and displays,
the experimental findings suggests that these differences can be used by participants to
manage their position within the national group and that of fellow group members.

Overall therefore, the empirical chapters have deconstructed the traditional
image of the national group as displaying uniformity in their identity expression, to
consider instead the factions that exist within the nation. The findings suggested that, in
discursive terms, individuals within the same national context displayed their identity in
different ways and that these differences had interactive consequences for inclusion and
entitlement within the nation. In the experimental studies, participants indicated
differences between themselves and others within the national groups, in their
evaluations of displays. I have argued that participants could strategically alter their
proximity to the national group, thus managing their own reputation within the group.
The final experiment suggested the possibility of instrumental functions of prototypical
judgements to manage both an individual’s position within the group, relative to
subgroups and within the broader national category. Therefore, far from behaving as a unified whole, members of the national category strategically display their identity in different ways to manage their social position within the broader nation.

9.3. Theoretical contributions

The following section will deal with the theoretical contributions of the empirical findings presented in this thesis. At this point, it is worth acknowledging the debates in mixed-methods research (e.g., Patton, 1989; Morgan, 1988; Bazeley, 2004), particularly the issue of whether qualitative and quantitative components can and should be integrated (Bazeley, 2004). Often in sequential mixed methods research, the results and conclusions of the each analysis are presented separately and typically in the general conclusion, the results of each separate analysis is used to inform an understanding of the other (Bazely, 2004). This form of presentation of mixed methods data is not without its own limitations (see also Chapter 3, Section 3.2.), however for present purposes I will now discuss the contributions of the discursive findings and experimental findings separately, followed by a brief overview of the possible contributions of the discursive findings to the understanding of the experimental results and vice versa.

9.3.1. Strategic banality. First and foremost, these findings have contributed greatly to the research on ‘Banal Nationalism’ both in the sociological and social psychological literature (Billig, 1995). In differentiating endemic nationalism from a more everyday ‘unnoticed’ form, Billig (1995) highlighted the power inherent in an ideology that is relatively unchallenged and unexamined but can be evoked at any point to mobilise action. The discursive findings contribute to important theoretical advances in the research on banal nationalism. Firstly, the discursive studies in this thesis are
novel in their consideration of individuals within the same ‘banal backdrop’ to nationalism (Billig, 1995) effectively bringing into relief the interactive resources participants use to manage their national identity in interaction. The theoretical contributions will now be discussed in relation to (1) advancements in the discursive literature on national identity, (2) the strategic use of banality as a discursive resource and (3) the interactive consequences of divergent displays of national identity for entitlement and inclusion within the nation. Although epistemologically distinct, I will also argue that the discursive findings problematise ‘banal’ assumptions in the intra- and intergroup relations literature.

Firstly, the analysis mirrors some of the findings in the discursive literature on national identity, while extending these findings in key aspects. Irish Traveller participants orient to their marginal minority group position in talk and similar to Scottish nationals (e.g., Kiely et al, 2005) they proactively assert a claim to national identity and strategically use criterial markers of Irishness to negotiate their national identity in interaction. However, unlike Scottish nationals, Irish Travellers’ proactive claims to national identity can not be attributed to identity politics in this national context, rather participants’ proactive and ‘hot’ displays of national identity are employed as strategic discursive resources to manage their identity in talk. Settled participants talk of national identity is similar to that of English nationals (Condor, 1996) who assert a banal, taken-for-granted sense of national identity such that their interactive business is to manage explicit talk of nationalism. Therefore, in examining individuals within the same nation, the divergence in identity displays between members of the same national category cannot be attributed to differences in socio-political context. Importantly, this allows for a consideration of ‘banality’ as a strategic discursive resource mobilised in interaction to achieve discursive goals.
Second, the discursive findings presented in this thesis have evidenced the use of strategic banality as an interactive resource. Settled participant’s display of national identity in talk, closely reflects the version of nationalism put forward by Billig (1995) that treats national identity as part of the banal backdrop to everyday life (Condor & Abell, 2006; Condor, 2010). However, Settled participants’ explicit talk is oriented to as normatively inappropriate and regulated by conversational co-participants, suggesting that ‘banality’ is a position adopted and mobilised in talk rather than part of the banal backdrop to everyday life. Settled participants used this ‘banality’ as a strategic resource to manage the reputation of the group, identifying overt proactive displays of Irishness as normatively inappropriate and outside of the boundaries of the national group. Therefore, for Settled participants, ‘banality’ is a strategic resource mobilised in talk as a signifier of entitlement to dictate the shape and characteristics of the national group.

Third, the discursive findings demonstrate the interactive consequence of divergent displays for entitlement and inclusion within the nation. Settled participants use banality as a strategic resource to exclude others from the national category on the basis of their proactive displays of identity, which they deem normative inappropriate. Irish Travellers make relevant their minority group position. Therefore explicit talk of national identity is required to undermine their exclusion from the national group, which paradoxically marks them as being outside of the national category. Research has documented the role of discourse in the reproduction of power and domination in society, however this is often evidenced in media and the discourse of political elites (Van Dijk, 2008). However, the discursive psychological approach employed in this thesis focuses on subtle forms of power and dominance woven into the tapestry of everyday social interaction. It is argued in this thesis that banality is a powerful discursive resource that can be evoked and mobilized by members of the national
category as a marker of their entitlement to regulate the boundaries of Irishness and exclude others from the national group. The power inherent in this discursive device is that it is mobilised in situated everyday social interaction among members of the national group, normalising its use and making it difficult to identify and challenge.

Finally, the discursive findings although epistemologically distinct, have worked to problematise the ‘banal’ assumption, in the intra- and intergroup relations, that prototypical and majority group members form the normative frame of reference, against which to highlight the strategic considerations of the counterparts. More specifically, the literature tends to downplay the strategic behaviour of prototypical and majority group members. However, the analysis suggested that both Irish Travellers and Settled participants were strategic in their discursive displays of national identity. Irish Travellers strategically used markers of Irishness to negotiate their national identity in interaction. Settled participants were also strategic in their displays of identity and far from being ‘mindless’, they problematised and regulated ‘mindful’ talk of Irishness that could undermine their taken-for-granted sense of national identity. Therefore, the discursive analysis presented in this thesis brought into relief the strategic behaviour of both group members through their functional use of language to manage and negotiate their national identity in interaction.

9.3.2. Strategic use of intragroup prototypicality. The experimental findings presented in this thesis have made theoretical contributions to the intra- and intergroup prototypicality theories of national identity, as well as speaking to the discursive findings in this thesis. The intra- and intergroup prototypicality literature, to this point, have remained relatively distinct and have developed in parallel. However, the findings reported in the final experimental chapter suggest that ingroup prototypicality information is relevant and meaningful for participants in an intergroup comparative
context. Moreover, participants’ perceived prototypicality impacted upon their perceived similarity to the national group, versus that of subgroup within the nation. As such, the intra- and intergroup prototypicality literature are not entirely separate, as presented here. Importantly, this interplay between intra- and intergroup prototypicality within the superordinate category suggests important contributes to both areas of the literature.

Firstly, these findings contribute to the theories that have developed to account for the consequences of inclusion into a superordinate category for subgroup members (e.g., Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986; Wenzel et al., 2007). These theories focus on decategorized and recategorized group boundaries with resultant reductions in intergroup bias (e.g., Gaertner et al., 1990). The CIIM (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986) suggest that the imposition of a common superordinate category decreases the psychological distance between the self and former outgroup members. In contrast, the IPM (Mummendey & Wenzel, 2007) and MIDM (Hewstone & Brown, 1986) suggest that the introduction of a salient superordinate category can create a threat to group distinctiveness and acerbate intergroup conflict. Theorists in this area have focused on reconfiguring the group boundaries to increase intergroup cooperation within the superordinate category.

The experimental findings in this chapter contribute to the superordinate literature in two key aspects. First, the findings suggest that the imposition of a superordinate category can in fact exacerbate intragroup differences with the nation. For example, the success of the prototypicality manipulation in an intergroup context suggests that the inclusion of the superordinate category can impact upon participants’ evaluations of their similarity to the national group. These experimental findings therefore represent a novel contribution to the understanding of intergroup relations.
within a superordinate category, as the experimental findings consider the role of intragroup prototypicality and participants’ displays of proximity to the national group, relative to subgroups within the nation.

Second, these experimental findings contribute to an understanding of the process of recategorisation in the literature. In the CIIM (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986) the boundaries of the superordinate category are recategorized to decrease the psychological distance between the self and former group members. Here however, the boundaries of the national group are not experimentally altered; rather participants are given the opportunity to display the degree of distance between themselves and the national group in response to the imposition of a superordinate category. In doing so, the findings speak to Tajfel’s (1978) theoretical concern in relation to the strategies individuals adopt in response to the perceived inequality between groups. Importantly however, it is not only those on the margins of the group that deploy identity management strategies, as is commonly depicted (e.g., Ellemers & Spears, 1995). Prototypical participants also strategically alter their proximity to the national group. This suggests that the process of ‘social creativity’ (Tajfel, 1978) might not be confined to socially devalued groups and that those in more secure positions also employ different strategies to manage their position and that of fellow group members within the national group.

Relatedly, I argue that this strategic display of distance from the national group can be viewed as an identity management adopted by individuals in the experimental context. This is consistent with the literature, which suggests that high identifying group members adopt group strategies under conditions of identity threat and that low identifiers distance themselves from the group. However the findings also suggest that intragroup prototypicality can possibly be used strategy by members of the national group to alter their position, relative to subgroups within the nation. Therefore,
intragroup prototypicality, as the position of the self in relation to other group members (Jetten et al., 1997) can also be used flexibly and strategically to negotiate complexity social relations within the superordinate nation.

Similarity, although epistemologically distinct, there are some parallels worth noting between the discursive and experimental findings presented in this thesis. The experimental findings demonstrate that participants have established norms, which govern their evaluations of displays of identity-related behaviour on St. Patrick’s Day. More specifically, Irish students were reluctant to personally endorse the wearing of displays of Irishness, particularly overt displays. Similarly, in the discursive findings, Irish students distance themselves from overt displays of Irishness which they deem normatively inappropriate and indicative of being outside of the national category. Therefore, both in the experimental context and interview context, Irish students did not personally endorse the wearing of displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day. In such a way, the experimental findings mirror Irish students’ discursive displays of normative identity related behaviour on St. Patrick’s Day.

9.4. Methodological contributions

The discursive findings presented in this thesis have made some important methodological contributions to the photo elicitation literature. There are a number of perceived advantages to the use of photo elicitation in research. For example, photo elicitation is believed to evoke discussion that traditionally evades verbal communication (Mitchell et al., 2005), bridging the culturally distinct world between researcher and researched (Heisley & Levy, 1991; Collier and Collier, 1992) and to entitling individuals to shape and guide the conversational discussion (Kolb, 2008; Douglas, 1998). These perceived advantages and disadvantages of photo elicitation
have traditionally been documented from the perspective of the researcher (e.g., Harper, 1996). The approach to photo elicitation in this thesis is novel its reflective consideration of participants’ displays of understanding of the task. I will now discuss the contributions of the discursive findings to an understanding of the advantages and disadvantages of photo elicitation as a research tool.

First, it is necessary to reconsider the advantage of photo elicitation to capture and evoke discussion that lay dormant in traditional interview contexts (Mitchell et al., 2005). From a discursive perspective, participants could evade communication as a strategic act to shape or alter the interaction, which could have interactive consequences in terms of their engagement with the task. Settled participants, for example, oriented to the photo elicitation task as a challenge to manage explicit talk of Irishness that could undermine their banal, taken-for-granted sense of national identity. In other words, the inherent advantage of photo elicitation in evoking discussion was in fact a discursive concern for Settled participants, which they managed and negotiated in conversational interaction. It is argued therefore that, rather than viewing the use of photographs as spontaneously evoking discussions that evade verbal communication, it is perhaps more useful to consider participants’ own displays of understanding of the task in order to bring into relief the discursive business at hand.

Second, the discursive findings also challenge the assumption that photo elicitation can bridge the culturally distinct world of researcher and research participants (Collier & Collier, 1992). This is considered particularly useful in interviews with social groups that have a distinct cultural background, which cannot be taken-for-granted as being shared between the interviewer and research participant. This advantage was evidenced in the analysis of the discursive findings. For example, Irish Traveller participants took photographs of Irish Traveller culture and personal aspects of their
lives (i.e. mass cards, interiors of caravans, partnership organizations and traditional crafts) that would not be accessible to the interviewer. However, I argue that there is a general tendency in the photo elicitation literature to attribute agency to the photographs, at the expense of considering participants’ strategic use of their talk of the photograph for interactional purposes. From a discursive perspective, it is not simply that the photographs are bridging culturally distinct words, but Irish Travellers strategically used their display of understanding of the task to evoke shared characteristics between themselves and the Settled community.

Third, photo elicitation is believed to empower individuals to introduce their own topics and categories into the exchange (Ortega-Alcazar & Dych, 2011; Kolb, 2008). Closely linked to this perceived advantage, is the potential pitfall of attributing agency to the photograph, writing the interviewer out of the interaction (Jenkings, Woodward, & Winter, 2008). I argue, from a discursive perspective, that participants’ sense of entitlement to speak is not a self-evident by-product of their ownership of the photograph, but is worked up and achieved in talk. Importantly, I have noted the interviewer’s role in the interaction, unintentionally problematising the discursive business being done. More specifically, the interviewer’s questioning can display the greater entitlement of the interviewer in the interaction, which closes down the interview talk (Abell et al., 2006). Participants often select another photograph, thereby initiating a topic shift and introducing categories into the exchange (Ortega-Alcazar & Dych, 2011), however not as evidence of their entitlement to speak, but perhaps to negotiate the shifts in entitlement between researcher and research participants in interaction.

The reflexive consideration of the method of photo elicitation has not only contributed to the photo elicitation literature but has also to the debates surrounding the
use of interview data in social psychology. The critique of research interviews in
discursive psychology reflects a central concern that research interviews generate
conversational interaction that is an artefact of the interview context, rather than the
more spontaneous, ‘natural’ interaction one would expect to obtain from naturalistic
settings (Potter & Hepburn, 2008). The authors do not advocate eliminating research
interviews. They do however, qualify their concerns with cautionary comments to
discursive researchers to avoid such pitfalls as the tendency to write the interviewer out
of the conversational interaction and the risk of importing the research agenda into the
interview context (Potter & Hepburn, 2008). It has been argued however, that the use of
photo elicitation in this thesis challenged the notion of ‘inherent’ flaws in interview
methods, thus both acknowledging and making a number of important methodological
contributions to the debates surrounding the use of interview data in social psychology.

Firstly, the method of photo elicitation has challenged the notion that researchers
using interview data display a tendency to write the interviewer out of the
conversational interaction. A reflexive analysis of the ways in which each set of
participants oriented to the photo elicitation task, provided an opportunity to place the
‘artefact’ of the research interview (i.e. the interview task) under empirical scrutiny.
Contrary to eliminating the interviewer from the analysis, the interviewer’s contribution
to the interaction was central to the understanding of how conversational co-participants
displayed an understanding of the task and managed their discursive concerns. The
interviewer’s attempt to orient the individual to the task at hand can, of course, be
interpreted as an importation of research agendas into the interview context (Potter &
Hepburn, 2008). However the analytic focus is on the ways individuals manage and
negotiate these ‘imports’ and how they shape the conversational interaction. In other
words, these ‘imports’ into the researcher context by both interviewer and interviewee,
as well as the disruptions and flows in conversational interaction, were a matter of empirical interest.

9.5. Limitations and future directions

The present research is the first step in understanding the strategies employed by members of the same national category to manage and negotiate their membership within the national category. This research demonstrated the use of strategic banality as a discursive resource in interaction. In addition, the findings presented in this thesis have enriched and developed an understanding of the intra- and intergroup prototypicality literature, as well as demonstrating some important methodological contributions to research in social psychology. However there are some limitations worth noting that highlight the need for further investigation.

Firstly in terms of the discursive findings, a number of factors may have directly and indirectly influenced or differentially afforded our participants’ responses. The Irish Travellers were recruited from a Traveller’s advocacy organisation and hence may have been more alive to issues of equality and civic inclusion. There are many more axes of difference between these two sets of participants, including social class and educational status. In addition, the accent of the interviewer as hearably American could potentially afford different identity strategies. Nonetheless our data supports the central contention of this thesis by demonstrating variability in the overt and banal use of identity resources in interaction within the same national context.

Further research could focus on ethnomethodological approaches to sub-methods of photo elicitation. For example, the introduction of photographs generated by the researcher could afford an opportunity to reflectively examine the way participants orient to the research agenda in an interview context. In addition, further research could
explore participants’ displays of understanding of achieved photographs. This could allow analysis of participants’ use of temporal distinctions to construct versions of the national identity. Further research could also focus on eliciting talk about different groups within the nation and diasporic aspects of Irishness.

There are also some limitations to the experimental studies presented in this thesis. In terms of the studies which evaluated displays of Irishness on St. Patrick’s Day, it is worth noting that St. Patrick’s Day is a particular phenomenon that might not reflect individuals’ experiences of everyday Irishness. The carnival-like atmosphere can also throw into relief overt displays of Irishness. Further research could systematically examine displays of national identity in ‘banal’ and ‘hot’ national contexts. For example the commemoration of the 1916 Easter Rising in Dublin is an Irish national event that affords an opportunity to examine different displays of Irishness. Future research could also explore the perception of different groups in their displays of Irishness.

In terms of the limitations of the experimental studies in chapter 8, the attributes were generated for the purpose of the experiment by Irish students. From a discursive perspective, this process is more complex, as categories are flexible and context specific. For experimental purposes however, these attributes were abstracted from the context in which they were articulated. In addition, ‘Irish Traveller’ and ‘Gealteacht people’ were treated as generic social group. This is divorced from the personal experience, history and semantic context. Irish students could have experiences with these subgroups that may have coloured their perceptions of differences within the nation. Future research could explore this more systematically with the introduction of other prototypical subgroups within the nation, such as football supporters, to determine the robustness of the effects reported in this thesis.
9.6. Practical and policy implications

In addition, to the potential academic impact of these findings through dissemination at international conferences and in a published article (see also Appendix 6), there are clear policy and practical implications to this research. According to Pavee Point (2007) ‘a key issue in shaping social policy has been the way in which Irish Traveller identity has been conceptualized’ (p. 5). For present purposes, endorsement of the appropriateness of overt displays of Irish national identity jars with the majority group’s rejection of their authenticity. This poses a warning and a challenge to social policies geared towards including minorities. For example, the St Patrick’s Day celebration in Dublin is itself part of a wider policy agenda to promote inclusion and diversity within Ireland. For many Irish, the day has multiple functions (Blaylock et al., under review) but for Irish Travellers in particular, it throws into relief their marginalisation. These results recommend close attention to the local dynamics of identity politics in the design of such strategies of inclusion.

Pavee Point (2007) has highlighted the need for research to develop and implement policies aimed at inclusion of Irish Travellers. With a view to addressing this need, I intend on developing a publication for lay audiences highlighting the implication of the research findings for policies and provisions. I also intend on disseminating the findings to Irish Traveller groups and organizations in Ireland that address minority rights and inclusion.

9.7. Concluding comments

The findings presented in this thesis highlight the importance of variabilities within the nation group and the role of identity management strategies in shaping the national category. There has been much academic discussion concerning the identity
management strategies adopted by low status ethnic minority groups to reconstruct and redefine the relevant comparison dimensions of the group (Blanz, Mummendey, Mielke & Klink, 1998). Brown (2000) has highlighted the need to examine the identity management strategies employed by low status group members to construct and negotiate the perimeters of their group membership, to buffer against the psychological effects of structural inequality.

The empirical findings in this thesis highlighted various identity management strategies employed by individuals within the nation to manage and negotiate their position within the national group. The discursive findings have demonstrated that participants within the same nation deploy different identity management strategies to construct versions of national identity for different strategic purposes. The experimental findings have also noted participants’ instrumental use of intragroup prototypicality judgements to manage their social position within the group, relative to other group members. Importantly, the findings have also suggested that the different ways in which participants manage their identity, could have potential consequences for the reproduction of inequality and inclusion within the nation.

Therefore, it has been argued in this thesis that the examination of intra- and intergroup variations within the nation highlighted the importance of considering identity management strategies as a dynamic two sided process, actively negotiated between group members. In doing so, it has been revealed that the tendency in the literature is to prioritise the strategic considerations of one group over another, in terms of their deployment of identity management strategies within the nation. This negates the fact that identity strategies are embedded in a social context that involves the negotiation of identity relative to other group members. For example, the identity management strategies of Settled participants can act as a signifier of their entitlement
to exclude others from the national group on the basis of their proactive displays. These proactive displays are used by Irish Traveller to undermine their exclusion from the national group, paradoxically placing them outside of the national category. In summation therefore, it is argued that a revised comparative focus on identity management strategies employed by group members can bring into relief their strategic use in regulating and policing the boundaries of the national group.
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Appendices

Appendix 1: Participant’s details

Table 1.

Irish Travellers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants pairs</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Niall</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Jack</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paddy</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. John</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Peggy</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Nancy</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridie</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.

Settled participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participants pairs</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Gender</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Kevin</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delia</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cian</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alex</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tina</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Tim</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Con</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ann</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Female</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2: Interview schedule

Participants are presented with the entire set of photos they have generated.

If there are any photographs you do not want to discuss, you can remove them and place them to the side.

- When you look at all these photos here, is there any one that sticks out for you and if so, why?
  Prompt: Does any photo catch your eye? Is there any photo that you are drawn to?

- Can you choose a photo and tell me a little bit about what the photo is about?

- Why did you choose that photo?
  Prompt: does the image have particular significance to you?

Participants are asked to choose their favourite 10 photos, creating a photo sequence.

- What has been left out of this photo sequence? (Harper, 2002)
  Prompt: people? Places? Things?

- How would you describe this photo sequence?

- Where do you place yourself within these photos?
  Prompt: do you think you belong in the photo? Where would you be in the photo if you could place yourself in it? Would you prefer not to be in the photo, if so, why?

Participants are asked to rank the photos in order of importance to them (1st being their favourite photo and so on)

- How would you describe the meaning behind the photos which you have ranked highest in order of importance
Participants engage in a photo exchange (for example an participants from the travelling community are given the photo sequence of Irish participants etc)

- Can you describe the person you imagine to have taken these photos?
  

  *The participants are then told what group took those photos*

- How do these photos differ from the photos you have taken?
  
  *Prompt: Is there anything extra in these photos that were not in you own?*

- What is missing from these photos?
  
  *Prompt: People? Places? Things?*

- Would you change anything in these photos?
  
  Is there anything you would add to these photos? Is there anything you would remove?
Appendix 3: Transcription convention

Section 1: Glossary of abridged version of Jeffersonian (1984)

(0.2) Numbers in round brackets measure pauses in seconds (in this case, 2 tenths of a second). If they are not part of a particular speaker’s talk they should be on a new line.

(.) A micropause, hearable but too short to measure.

((holds photo)) Additional comments by the transcriber, e.g. about features of the context or delivery.

heh heh Voiced laughter

= solid.= we had ‘Equals’ signs marks the immediate ‘latching’ of successive talk, whether of one or more speakers, with no interval.

Section 2: Full Jeffersonian Transcription

In addition to the transcription symbols outlined above, there are the following symbols:

sto(h)p i(h)t Laughter within speech is signalled by h’s in round brackets.

[ ] Square brackets marks the start and end of overlapping speech. They are aligned to mark the precise position of the overlap.

↑↓ Vertical arrows precede marked pitch movement, over and above normal rhythms of speech.
Underlining Indicates emphasis; the extent of the underlining within individual words locates emphasis and also indicates how heavy it is.

She wa::nted Colons show degree of elongation of the prior sound; the more colons, the more elongation.
Appendix 4: Stimulus material for experiments (Chapter 8)

Overt displays
Subtle displays