

First report after qualitative staged research.

SEGREGATION IN NORTHERN IRELAND – IMPLICATIONS FOR COMMUNITY RELATIONS POLICY

Professor Joanne Hughes (University of Ulster), Ms Andrea Campbell
(University of Ulster), Professor Miles Hewstone (University of Oxford)
& Professor Ed Cairns (University of Ulster)

Contact:

Professor Joanne Hughes
School of Policy Studies
University of Ulster at Jordanstown
Shore Road
Newtownabbey
BT37 OQB

Tel: 02890368389

E.mail: je.Hughes@ulster.ac.uk

Abstract

During the late 1980s, the British Government announced a policy agenda for improving inter-group relations between Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland. Paramilitary cease-fires and the signing of the Belfast Agreement in 1998 offered a renewed impetus to this agenda. Recent trends suggest, however, that Northern Ireland is becoming an increasingly segregated society and that patterns of division have become 'ingrained'. The research presented in this paper explores enablers and inhibitors of cross-community contact in two of Belfast's most segregated Protestant and Catholic communities and suggests implications for current efforts to devise a policy programme that advocates a 'shared future'.

Introduction

Northern Ireland has always been characterised by a high degree of segregation between its main Protestant and Catholic communities. This segregation intensified following the outbreak of conflict in 1969 when, most notably in Belfast, intimidation of minority communities living in mixed areas led to enforced population movements into segregated neighbourhoods.

Twenty years on, against a background of a seemingly intractable conflict and in acknowledgement of the potentially damaging effects of prolonged segregation on inter-group relations, the British Government in the late 1980s announced a community relations policy agenda which aimed primarily to increase cross-community contact in Northern Ireland's increasingly divided society. The approach was based on some variant of the 'contact hypothesis' (Allport, 1954) which asserts that guided contact between divided communities under conditions which are conducive can ameliorate negative social attitudes.

A community relations infrastructure was established to operationalise and deliver the policy. This included the establishment in 1987 of a Central Community Relations Unit (CCRU)¹. Reporting directly to the Head of the Northern Ireland Civil Service, the Unit was charged with 3 main objectives: (1) To ensure that everyone in Northern Ireland received equality of opportunity and equity of treatment, (2) to promote increased cross-community contact and (3) to foster mutual understanding and respect for cultural diversity (CCRU, 1992). Other major initiatives which followed in the late 1980s/early 1990s were, the establishment of a semi-autonomous Community Relations Council, aimed at encouraging those groups that, for political reasons, might be resistant to accepting funding from a central government unit (CCRU), and a Community Relations Programme for Northern Ireland's 26 District Councils - reflecting a view that Council's would be best placed to identify need at local level and respond accordingly. In addition, during the same period, the Department of Education for Northern Ireland (DENI) established a cross-community contact scheme for segregated schools and offered financial support for new planned

¹ Renamed the Community Relations Unit in 2000

integrated schools that would educate, together, children from Protestant and Catholic communities (Knox & Hughes, 1996).

A wide range of local level community relations projects have been supported through these interventions, ranging from large scale cross-community events to more focused anti-sectarian work (see Knox & Hughes, 1996) and in general, evaluations have been positive (see Knox & Hughes, 1996; Hughes, 1997; Quirk *et al.* 2001).

Community relations has not though been without detractors and a charge that has sometimes been levelled is that those who lead the most segregated lives are least likely to participate in organised community relations activity (Hughes, 1997).

Criticisms have also been directed at the short-term, superficial nature of many initiatives, with some commentators even suggesting that such an approach can have a detrimental effect on inter-group relations by reinforcing prejudice and bigotry (see Hinds, 1994). More fundamentally, community relations policy has been criticised for attending only to the symptoms of division (segregation) rather than its root causes (structural, political and social disadvantage and inequality) (McVeigh, 2002; Hughes & Donnelly, 2003; Shirlow *et al.* 2005).

Seemingly, lending some support to these criticisms, recent trends show that after almost two decades of sustained community relations activity, segregation and polarisation are increasing in Northern Ireland (see below) and attitudes towards community relations are less positive than when the policy was first conceived (Shared Future Consultation Document, 2003). Reflecting these negative trends and the apparent limitations of community relations policy and practice, this paper employs qualitative techniques to explore the issue of inter-group attitudes and relations with residents in two of Belfast's most segregated communities. The aim is to elucidate those factors that inform individual and group decisions to engage primarily with co-religionists and / or to eschew opportunities for contact. The paper ends with some reflections that might usefully inform the work of community relations policymakers and practitioners.

Segregation in Northern Ireland

Approximately 35 to 40 per cent of the Northern Irish population live in completely segregated neighbourhoods (see Hewstone, Cairns, Voci *et al.*, 2004; Hughes, 2001). Other types of segregation also exist including, for example, personal and marital (Gallagher & Dunn, 1991), educational (Darby, Murray, Dunn, Batts,

Farrene & Harris, 1977; Gallagher, 1989; McClenaghan, Cairns, Dunn & Morgan, 1996) and segregation at work, sport and leisure (Niens, Cairns & Hewstone, 2003). Residential segregation is particularly significant though as it pervades many aspects of social life and often reinforces other types of segregation. Shirlow's (1999) study in North Belfast showed that residents living in the Glenbryn (Protestant) and Ardoyne (Catholic) areas have restricted access to jobs, shops, and leisure facilities as a result of segregated housing and the concomitant geographical boundaries this imposes. A similar study by Darby (1986) found that in adjoining Catholic and Protestant communities in a deprived area of Belfast, residents of each community frequented different offices to access the same public services such as housing and social welfare.

It is important to qualify at this point that the extent of segregation is by no means total with recent estimates suggesting that approximately over 50 percent of the population live in mixed neighbourhoods (Boyle & Hadden, 1994). Also, there is covariance between levels of segregation and social class with disadvantaged working class areas significantly more likely to be highly segregated than affluent middle class areas (Shirlow, 2001). That said, research suggests that the level of residential segregation has increased since the late 1990s with the majority of people now opting to live in residentially polarised areas (Cairns & Hewstone, 2002; Niens et al, 2003; Hughes & Donnelly, 2002; OFM&ODM, 2002). Compounding the problem, it has also been noted that recent segregation has been accompanied by an increase in 'chill factors', referring to the demarcation of sectarian boundaries with graffiti, flags, kerb painting and other manifestations of cultural political identity and paramilitary association (Hughes & Donnelly, 2002). In addition to increased residential segregation, a recent Community Relations Review indicates that friendship patterns between Protestants and Catholics have remained almost constant between 1968 and 1998 with a sizeable majority of young people mixing only with their co-religionists. Similarly, mixed marriages continue to represent only a small proportion of the total marriages in Northern Ireland although there is data to suggest a slight increase (OFM&ODM, 2002).

Perhaps, somewhat paradoxically, these recent trends coincide with a momentous period in the political history of Northern Ireland that has seen the achievement of multi-party agreement on key constitutional issues (outlined in the Belfast / Good Friday Agreement 1998) and the related advent of paramilitary cease-

fires. Although a cause and effect relationship has not been empirically established, the zero sum nature of Northern Ireland politics has been employed to explain why in a period of low intensity conflict people are increasingly opting for segregated living (see Hughes & Donnelly, 2002).

Whatever the explanation, increased segregation is an ongoing concern for Government in Northern Ireland. In a recent review of community relations policy it was noted that policy effort to promote cross-community contact had affected only limited success and greater effort must be made to tackle patterns of division that have become 'ingrained' (OFM&DFM, 2003). Acknowledging this, and in response to the critics of community relations policy, a revised policy and strategic framework entitled 'A Shared Future' was released in March 2005 (OFM&DFM, 2005). In it, Government commits to a more coherent, co-ordinated and long-term approach, that places responsibility for improving relations at all levels of public sector delivery. Policy aims are articulated not just in terms of greater cross-community contact, as was formerly the case, but with regard to the establishment, over time, of a 'shared society' defined by a culture of tolerance, and the achievement of reconciliation and trust (OFM&DFM, 2005, p.3). The document also makes clear that 'benign apartheid' is not an option, *'We are not talking about an apartheid society. A 'cultural variety' in constant motion is very different from, and highly preferable to, a limited 'variety of cultures' set in aspic'* (OFM&DFM, 2005, 8).

Moving towards the type of society envisaged in 'Shared Future' will clearly represent a major challenge for those in Northern Ireland's most segregated and divided communities. Indeed, such shifts can only really begin when the reasons for segregated living are firmly established, understood and addressed. Before outlining our methodology and findings, we present a review of theoretical literature that has evolved to help explain willingness or otherwise of members from conflicting groups to engage with the outgroup.

Theoretical Background

Emotion plays an important role in determining behaviour and has long been recognised as having significant implications for intergroup relations (Allport, 1954; Bettelheim & Janowitz, 1950; Hovland & Sears, 1940). Essentially emotions are considered to be a multi-faceted phenomenon of subjective feeling that is accompanied by physiological (activation of the nervous system, with the consequent

release of hormones, that regulate the emotional status), cognitive (specific thoughts or beliefs), and behavioural (intended action) responses (Ekman & Davidson, 1994; Zajonc, 1998). They serve an adaptive function as modes of relating to changing demands in different environments (Frijda & Mesquita, 1994; Lazarus, 1991) and represent a process by which events that are relevant to individual or community well-being are signalled to a person's cognitive and action system following an individual's appraisal of their environment (Frijda, 1986). In this way, emotions serve as mediators for evaluative and decision-making processes and subsequent behavioural choices (Carver & Scheier, 1990; Clore, 1992; Frijda, 1986; Jarymowicz, 1997; Wiley, 1990).

With regard to emotions that inhibit contact, social psychologists have identified fear (Bar-Tal, 2001) and anxiety (Blair, Park & Bachelor, 2003) as dominant. Fear is a subjective aversive feeling that arises from the perception of threat, either present or anticipated. It involves both physiological and psychological reactions enabling an adaptive response to dangerous situations (Gray, 1989; Ohman, 1993; Rachman, 1978). Fear reactions can be evoked through conscious and unconscious processes and by direct and indirect signs of danger. A protracted experience of fear causes a number of effects. Specifically, it sensitises alertness to threatening cues, it gives priority to processing information about potential threats, it causes an overestimate of danger, it facilitates the selective retrieval of information related to fear, it increases expectations of threat and it increases the accessibility of knowledge that was effective in responding to previous threatening situations (Clore, Schwarz & Conway, 1994; Gallagher & Clore, 1985; Gray, 1989; Isen, 1990; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; LeDoux, 1995, 1996; Ohman, 1993). Additionally, empirical evidence suggests that fear has more general effects on cognitive processing, such as the avoidance of risk and new situations

Although emotions are generally considered the preserve of individuals, some research points to 'collective emotional orientation' to help explain the perpetuation of division in societies with intractable conflicts (Bar-Tal, 2000; Rime & Christophe, 1997). This relates to memories and ideologies held by individuals and shared by communities that can inform and justify a collective fear of the outgroup and hostility towards it. The zero-sum nature of intractable conflicts can serve as a basis for a collective fear orientation where fear is adaptive in preparing members to cope with the constant threats and dangers inherent in such societies. Threats can be symbolic,

realistic or both (Stephan & Renfro, 2003). Realistic threats involve threats to the in-group's very existence, the physical wellbeing of its members and the group's political and economic power, whereas symbolic threats are associated more with threats to the in-group's value system, belief system or world view (Stephan & Stephan, 2000). Although adaptive in dealing with threat, collective fear can also lead to a collective freezing of beliefs and can have an inhibiting effect on attempts to improve intergroup relations, not least because it increases the desire to avoid risk and new situations such as engaging in contact with members of the out-group (Bar-Tal, 2001).

all the same?

In addition to fear and the concomitant perception of threat, intergroup anxiety can also inhibit contact. Intergroup anxiety refers to psychological and physiological reactions that people experience as a consequence of interacting with members of other groups or even at the thought of such interaction (Blair et al, 2003). Research suggests that intergroup anxiety is a common feature in many intergroup contact situations (Hyers & Swim, 1998; Islam & Hewstone, 1993; Stephan & Stephan, 1985) and a range of suggestions have been advanced to account for this. Anxiety may stem from fear of exploitation by the out-group (Smith, 1999; Stephan & Stephan, 1985), fear of criticism in relation to one's beliefs (Lazarus, 1991), and fear of rejection by both the in-group and out-group (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). The presence of anxiety can have important implications for intergroup relations. Of direct relevance, anxiety, like fear, increases the desire to distance oneself from the out-group and avoid intergroup contact.

With regard to positive mediators, research has begun to focus on the benefit of both direct and indirect cross-group friendships. Direct cross-group friendship is believed to play a significant role in intergroup relations with recent theoretical discussions emphasising the benefit of affective relationships and interpersonal intimacy with out-group members (Cook, 1984; Herek & Capitanio, 1996; Pettigrew, 1997). Pettigrew (1997), for example, demonstrated that having an out-group friend was associated with lower levels of both blatant and subtle prejudice, greater support for pro-out-group policies and more generalised positive attitudes to the entire out-group. Of significance, these effects did not occur when an individual had contact with out-group members as co-workers or neighbours (Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe & Ropp, 1997).

However, the observed benefits of direct cross-group friendship remain problematic with regard to one of the central tenets of the social identity approach. Social identity theory distinguishes between interpersonal and intergroup processes (Brown & Turner, 1981; Tajfel, 1978). When personal identity is salient an individual's needs, beliefs, and motives primarily determine behaviour. In contrast, when people's social identity is activated people come to perceive themselves as more interchangeable exemplars of a social group than as unique personalities (Turner et al, 1987). Under these conditions, collective need, beliefs and motives become primary (Verkuyten & Hagendoorn, 1998). It follows then that interpersonal interactions such as cross-group friendships should have little effect on intergroup attitudes. Although some research (Pettigrew, 1997; Marcus-Newhall; Miller, Holtz & Brewer, 1993) indicates that interpersonal interactions can lead to positive generalization of the out-group, the consensus is that generalisation of the out-group is only likely to occur if group memberships are made salient during interpersonal interactions. Conversely, salience of group membership tends to be associated with a range of negative emotions such as fear, anxiety, and discomfort (Bodenhausen, 1993; Stephan & Stephan, 1985; Wilder, 1993).

In an attempt to integrate the controversies between interpersonal and intergroup approaches Pettigrew (1997, 1998) suggests that category salience should only be increased over time. He argues that interpersonal interaction should take precedence, followed by increased category salience and the subsequent positive generalisation of out-group members. Pettigrew also suggests a third step involving re-categorization where group memberships are replaced by a common in-group identity (Gaertner, Dovidio, Anastasio, Bachman & Rust, 1993; Sherif, 1966) or dual identity (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). However, the most valuable contribution of Pettigrew's (1997, 1998) 3-stage approach is thought to be the emphasis he placed on direct cross-group friendships. It is believed that repeated contact with an out-group friend involving affective ties and self-disclosure facilitate the development of Pettigrew's 3 stages (Paolini, Hewstone, Cairns & Voci, 2004).

It has also been suggested that contact effects can operate indirectly or vicariously. Wright et al (1997) postulate that knowledge that an in-group friend has an out-group friend can lead to more positive intergroup attitudes. Indirect cross-group friendship occurs for three main reasons. First, the out-group member is assumed to show positivity and friendliness toward the in-group friend. Second, the

in-group friend demonstrates more positive out-group attitudes and tolerant in-group norms (Haslam, McGarty & Turner, 1996; Liebkind, & McAlister, 1999). Finally indirect friendship leads to cognitive inclusion of the in-group and out-group members in the self (Smith & Henry, 1996).

According to Wright et al (1997) indirect cross-group friendship might have greater potential than direct cross-group friendship in achieving positive intergroup relations. In a cross-group friendship group membership is more likely to be salient to an individual not directly involved in the friendship. Furthermore, simply observing an in-group / out-group friendship is likely to be associated with weaker levels of anxiety than direct contact. Such observations can also help in reducing ignorance of the out-groups culture and subsequently reduce the fear often associated with interacting with the out-group. In addition, indirect cross-group friendships are much easier to implement on a large scale and could represent a potentially powerful means of widespread prejudice reduction (Wright et al, 1997).

In Northern Ireland, research has already been carried out to test the effect of both direct and indirect cross-group friendships between Catholics and Protestants (Paolini, Hewstone, Cairns & Voci, 2004). This research found that both types of friendship were associated with a reduction in out-group prejudice and increased perceived out-group variability via an anxiety-reduction mechanism. This finding that direct and indirect friendship reduced intergroup anxiety has important implications in so far as emotions such as anxiety and fear can lead to avoidance of the out-group.

The theoretical literature presented here suggests a number of factors which can inhibit or facilitate contact between members of conflicting groups. Specifically, emotions such as fear and anxiety are associated with a decreased willingness to engage in contact while the development of affective ties and direct and indirect cross-group friendships promote contact. Taking account of these concepts our research sought to explore the quantity and quality of any cross-community contact with residents in highly segregated communities; the degree of interest in contact where none or very little exists; the nature of perceived threat from the out-group and the content of fear and anxiety relating to cross-community contact.

The Research

The research approach employed here is in the qualitative, naturalistic tradition of Geertz's 'thick description', where emphasis is on achieving a 'depth' of understanding through detailed and nuanced description of the issues under study (Geertz, 1973). The aim is to explicate contact issues, in context, thus no attempt is made to extrapolate beyond the immediate research setting, and no claim is made as to the generalisability of our findings. Data collection was primarily through in-depth semi-structured interviews with residents of two selected segregated communities. In each community access to individuals was gained through community groups / organizations in the first instance. Then, through a process of snowball sampling fifteen interviewees were generated (30 in total). The age of the interviewees ranged from 16 to 87 and the majority of those interviewed were female. Interviews were complemented by a focus group facilitated in each of the two areas. Both interviews and focus groups covered issues such as: the extent of cross-community contact through personal social networks, the extent of indirect contact through others in the respondents' social network, perceptions of the acceptability of cross-community contact within the respondents community, general attitudes to cross-community contact, and more general issues such as discrimination, equality and the current political situation in Northern Ireland.

The Communities

The two communities (Ballybeen and Andersontown) selected for this study are segregated working class estates in Belfast. Ballybeen is a large working class Protestant estate on the outskirts of Dundonald in East Belfast. It was built in the 1960s and with a population of approximately 10,000 it is the second largest housing estate in Northern Ireland. Similarly, Andersontown is a large working class Catholic estate in West Belfast with a population of approximately 6,000. The rationale for choosing these two areas is that they are both to a large extent isolated from other communities and areas as both are located within wider communities of majority own group residents. Hence, those living in Ballybeen and Andersontown are likely to have a limited amount of daily contact and interaction with out-group members. Both the class dimension and the extent of physical segregation was an important determinant in the selection of these two areas for this study, as previous research has shown, there is often a cyclical and interdependent relationship between relative

disadvantage, physical or psychological isolation and ongoing intergroup conflict (Hamilton, 1995).

Findings

As anticipated, segregation is very much a part of life for individuals living in Ballybeen and Andersonstown, with majority of a Protestants and some Catholics reporting little or no contact with the other religious community. For both communities, fear, anxiety and suspicion are presented as major psychological obstacles to intergroup contact. A common thread underpinning negative emotional responses is a preoccupation with the past and the embeddedness of negative experiences in memory. Amongst older residents, in particular, incidents of intimidation and victimisation that sometimes led to community separation in the first place were cited as justification for retaining a distance from the out-group.

I've had bad relations with them in the past. I was put out of my home years ago and from then on I haven't really had any contact with them (Catholic, Andersonstown).

My Mother was burned out of North Belfast. At 73 years of age she was burned out of her house and that whole area (Protestant, Ballybeen).

Younger interviewees and particularly Catholics, also tended to draw on prior experiences of sectarianism and prejudiced attitudes in predominantly one religion workplaces to explain their fears of the outgroup. Supporting the distinction made in the theoretical literature, many interviewees indicated a collective dimension to their past experience, often referring to acts of one *community* against the other. When asked if he would consider contact with Protestants, one Catholic male replied,

No chance...people here have too many bad memories. I mean how many people would you get living here that were put out of their homes that used to live in Protestant areas?...Quite a few (Catholic, Andersonstown).

Anger at what had happened in the past alongside fear of engendering similar distress was salient in responses of those who preferred to associate with coreligionists. The inability to dissociate from the past, whether at individual or collective level, seems to be a powerful mediator of willingness or ability to engage with the outgroup.

Although negative past experience is used by both communities to explain fear of contact, the data also indicate divergent dimensions of anxiety and suspicion.

X

For Protestants, fear of Catholics and hostility towards them is clearly linked to a perception of changing status differentials between the two communities. Many in Ballybeen articulated their opposition to (as they saw it) the 'concessions' made to 'Catholics' in and since the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement and whilst some accepted the need to redress past imbalances, there was a general consensus that efforts on the part of the British Government to reduce discrimination in Northern Ireland had impacted negatively on the Protestant community.

...Quite without a doubt there was discrimination against Catholics in the past. You know, they're now trying to address that and Protestants coming up behind are suffering the consequences of it. It's getting the balance right and to address that balance I think Protestants are being penalized in jobs and promotions and in the civil service (Protestant, Ballybeen).

A particularly difficult issue for many in Ballybeen is the reform of the Royal Ulster Constabulary (outlined in the Belfast/Good Friday Agreement) and the concomitant 50:50 recruitment pattern for applicants to the Police Service for Northern Ireland (PSNI). Some referred to personal experience of friends/relatives having been turned down for positions in the PSNI in favour of appointing less well qualified Catholic applicants, in fulfilment of the Government requirement to recruit equally from both communities.

...The police force is positive discrimination gone crazy. Young people in this estate have been through the [application] process maybe 5 times and they're still not getting the jobs because there's not enough Catholics to balance it out. You know, and they are being penalized because Catholics are not taking up the opportunities that was made for them. That is very, very, wrong (Protestant, Ballybeen).

The idea of a Catholic community in the ascendancy (the peace process is euphemistically referred to as the 'Republican process' by some interviewees) coupled with Protestant's concern that they are being *forced* to relinquish a historically more dominant position by an unsympathetic British government has apparently fuelled grievances. Fears of Catholics and the associated sense of threat are compounded by a perception amongst some Protestant's that they have been '*outwitted*' by more politically astute Catholic community.

There is a great suspicion and I don't deny it. There is a great suspicion at the back of my mind when I'm talking to a Roman Catholic. You know

everything's going their way now. The Sinn Fein got what they asked for. So I would have to be honest with you the suspicions still there. I mean its going round in full circle as some people have said you know. And it's going back now. The ball's in the Nationalist court and their scoring the goals
(Protestant, Ballybeen).

In Ballybeen where social identity is highly salient, Smyth's (1995) argument that segregation provides safety and a foundation for maintaining individual and collective identity at times of perceived threat may have some resonance. Protestants in Ballybeen see their community and the wider Protestant community as 'under siege'. Traditional certainties including their perception of a relatively superior position *vis a vis* Catholics, and the support of the British Government have, in their view, been undermined in recent years by macro level events and there is deep uncertainty about the future. It may be that feelings of vulnerability are moderated by psychologically and physically 'safe' own group environment.

Interestingly, those Protestants who were most vehement about the threat posed by Catholics seemed to differentiate least between members of the Catholic community. Rather, the tendency was to assume that, by definition, all Catholics share a common extremist and Republican political and social agenda. In the above quotation, for example, the terms 'Roman Catholic', 'Sinn Fein' and 'Nationalist' are used almost interchangeably. This perception of outgroup homogeneity is common in conflict situations and has been used to explain the perpetuation of inter-group hostility. According to Park et al (1991), when out-group members are seen as interchangeable, indiscriminate action against any or all ^{entire} all-group members can be more easily rationalized.

In contrast to Protestants, Catholics are more optimistic about political and social change in recent years. All interviewees accepted that the relative position of Catholics had improved as a result of interventions designed to ameliorate discrimination and disadvantage (including, Fair Employment legislation and equal opportunities policies).

Yeah things are a lot fairer definitely yeah. I mean they probably have a bit to go yet but they are trying. They really are trying (Catholic, Andersonstown)
Catholic fears and suspicion of Protestants were articulated less in terms of the threat that Protestants pose to the material position of Catholics, and more in terms of a perceived psychological predisposition that Protestants hold towards Catholics. Many

respondents attributed negative characteristics to Protestants including 'intolerance', 'bitterness', 'hatred' and 'prejudice'. When asked to expand on why he feared contact with Protestants, one interviewee replied,

You know the thing about Protestants - Protestants are...not all Protestants, but they are brought up to have hatred towards Catholics. You know it's kind of bred into them that Catholics are scum and dirt, whereas Catholics are not brought up that way. Protestants are taught to hate Catholics whereas Catholics are not taught to hate Protestants. I would feel apprehensive (Male Catholic, Andersonstown).

In relative terms, these negative stereotypes are given expression in behaviour patterns that some Catholics can distance themselves (and their community) from,

If there was a woman married to a Catholic fella in our district when the troubles came they were never put out, but if you had a Catholic boy in the other [Protestant] estate, he was burned out. Our crowd would never have done that (Catholic, Andersonstown).

Seemingly regardless of their asymmetrical basis, the negative perceptions that Protestants and Catholics hold of each other are commonly articulated in terms of how they perceive expressions of cultural identity by the other community. In both Ballybeen and Andersonstown, flag-flying, cultural festivals and symbols, the wearing of football supporter strips, expressions of language diversity are all interpreted by those who fear the outgroup as further justification for that fear. They are seen as the outgroup asserting itself and engaging in threatening behaviour towards the ingroup. In reference to a Saint Patrick's Day event in Belfast, one woman stated:

I wouldn't go to it and have green, white and gold shoved in my face...I would be offended (Protestant, Ballybeen).

Interestingly, though, many of those who were engaged in 'cultural' activity did not conceive of their actions as intimidatory or threatening and found it difficult to reconcile 'other's' interpretation of them in these terms. In reference to the 12th of July Orange Parades for example one Ballybeen woman said, '*sure it's just a good day out - it shouldn't offend anybody*'. The knowledge that such events are perceived as offensive by the outgroup is explained by the ingroup as reflective of ulterior motive. Some older residents in Ballybeen for example suggested that there had been a time when 12th of July festivities had been enjoyed by many Catholics. The

perceived shift in mindset amongst Catholics was attributed to political expediency on the part of Sinn Fein and as further evidence of efforts to undermine Protestant community and culture.

In addition to the emotional and psychological barriers to building intergroup relations, a number of interviewees referred to more tangible inhibitors. Demarcated territory, in particular, made members from both communities feel very uncomfortable and most indicated that they actively avoided areas that were signposted by flags, murals etc as 'belonging' to the other community. In addition, where more 'physically' neutral areas were perceived as having become more disproportionately associated with the other community, there was evidence of ingroup avoidance. This was particularly stark in relation to Protestant responses to Belfast City Centre with many indicating that whilst they would have shopped/socialized in Belfast a few years ago, they now preferred to travel to Newtownards or Bangor (both of which are majority Protestant towns). This behavioural shift was explained as an acknowledgement that Belfast had become more 'green' (and therefore less welcoming) for Protestants.

Even in cases where strong intergroup friendships had been established between individuals from segregated communities, there was a tendency to meet only in 'neutral' areas. Whilst many Catholics felt this was unnecessary in relation to Protestants entering Andersonstown (arguing that Protestants would be welcomed) it was acknowledged in Ballybeen that Catholic fears of Protestant/Loyalist communities are not unfounded. Ballybeen has a strong paramilitary presence, evidenced by murals, flags, and memorials to 'fallen' paramilitary 'heroes'. Residents are acutely aware of the power wielded by paramilitaries and reference was made on a number of occasions to the control they (paramilitaries) exert through, for example, informal justice procedures for perceived 'anti-social' behaviour on the part of young people (of which association with Catholics would be considered a fairly major offence). Consequently, the potential for cross-group contact in this area is limited by the extent to which people fear repercussions from their own community. Protestant respondents who admitted to having Catholic friends expressed reluctance towards bringing them into the estate.

I think there's a lot of people in this estate wouldn't appreciate Catholics coming to visit your home (Protestant, Ballybeen)

Well when you socialise I wouldn't feel comfortable going to the local bar or anything with Catholics in case the ones round the bar found out that they were Catholic. I think I would be scared of something starting up then (Protestant, Ballybeen).

In some instances this fear of reprisal caused people to end their friendships with Catholics completely.

The acceptability of outgroup association underlines another significant difference between the two communities. In general, there was stronger support for, and acceptance of, inter-community relations in Andersonstown than in Ballybeen. That said, even where more tolerant attitudes prevailed in Andersonstown, many people cited lack of opportunity and ambivalence as reasons for predominantly own group association.

Well I work in my own area and I socialise in my own area and I don't really go outside the area other than into the town now and again and that would only be very rarely (Catholic, Andersonstown).

The data presented above highlights the factors that seemingly inhibit contact between the two communities in Northern Ireland. Now we consider recurrent themes in the data suggesting factors that may facilitate cross-community contact and the development of positive inter-group relations.

In the same way that negative prior experience of the outgroup had a detrimental effect on willingness to contact; it seems that more positive experiences in the past correlate with greater willingness to contact in the present. Older residents from both communities who were friends with outgroup members prior to the outbreak of 'the troubles' in 1969 remembered former relationships with fondness and lamented the fact that the conflict had driven them apart. Some saw the more peaceful situation that exists today as an opportunity for renewing old friendships and indicated strong receptiveness to contact.

I had a friend whenever I was 16 and she came from the Falls road and I really loved her. We used to keep each other going about being Catholic and Protestant and there was never any animosity. And I worked with Catholics and they were really lovely people. They were really great. That's in the 1970's now. You know but then when I left I never went back and we kept in close contact for a while but then the 70's were really hard. There was a lot

of trouble then and I would have been scared to go and visit them. I would have been scared. But I wouldn't mind getting in contact even now
(Protestant, Ballybeen).

Similarly a Catholic interviewee remarked,

When I was 16 I started working in the shipyard and I met Protestant friends. I worked in the power station. I worked in the airport and through my work I met Protestant people. I haven't kept in contact with them but I would love to meet them again. Great fellas you know. I just never see them because of the religious thing here (Catholic, Andersonstown).

Even in cases where people could relate *both* negative and positive past experiences (as opposed to only negative) the positive seemed predominant in terms of current disposition towards the 'other'. One woman who had been burned out of her home in a mainly Protestant area, but had positive experience of working with Protestants in a mixed environment and counted Protestants amongst her friends, indicated a strong inclination to trust Protestants. Her response was typical of those who described mixed intergroup experiences – all of whom, at the very least, made a distinction between 'good' and 'bad' members of the outgroup. 

In addition to past experience, there is also evidence to suggest that the extent of present day contact and the quality of relationships may be important mediators of positive social attitudes. Consistent with theoretical literature, our data suggest that the more intimate and interpersonal relationship becomes, the more participants in it are willing (and in some cases enthusiastic) to build intercommunity relations. The distinction that interviewees make between superficial and more intimate relationships is generally described in terms of willingness to self-disclose and trust. An often repeated example of the transition from 'acquaintance' to 'friend' is a shift from avoiding reference to sensitive intergroup that could offend, towards openness and honesty in discussing politics and religion. At the most intimate end of the spectrum of degrees of intimacy is inter-religious marriage. Interviewees who had direct experience of mixed marriage (either their own or that of a close relative) expressed very positive attitudes towards the outgroup and have least reservations about contact.

As a matter of fact my wife and I are mixed. She's a Catholic and I'm a Protestant. So we've no problems from that point of view. We never have. I

have plenty of Protestant friends, stacks of Catholic friends (Protestant Ballybeen).

My daughters married to a Protestant. His mother and I meet up in town and go on holiday together and things like that. You know so yeah I've no problem with it you know and thank God neither do they (Catholic Andersonstown).

Perhaps reflective of the quality of more intimate cross-group relationships is the potential for transgenerational contact. One 86 year old Catholic woman (Mary) described how her grandmother had converted to Catholicism when she married her grandfather. Both families retained strong links and values of tolerance and respect had always been made salient during her upbringing. Mary, although Catholic, has always been active in inter-church work and her children have always mixed extensively with Protestants.

My children are like myself, they treat people the way they would like to be treated themselves. They love the Protestant people as much as they love the Catholics...sure most of my children are married to Protestants (Catholic, Andersonstown).

In a similar case, a male interviewee in a mixed religion marriage said that his children 'had as many from the other community at their wedding as [from] their own' (Catholic, Andersonstown). These findings not only support other empirical research which posits a link between contact, affective ties, interpersonal intimacy and more positive out-group attitudes (Cook, 1984; Herek & Capitanio, 1996; Pettigrew, 1997) they also highlight how more positive attitudes can become manifest in positive behavioural change.

Even where out-group ties are more superficial there appears to be some positive effects for those involved. Respondents from both religious communities who had participated in community relations events and had been exposed to outgroup views/perceptions in a sympathetic environment, reported greater understanding, empathy and willingness to engage in future contact than those who had not. Hence, whilst firm cross group friendships might not have been forged, there seemed to be some value in initiatives that had challenged received thinking.

It's just learning. I think actually getting the insight to realise. I mean we maybe believe 'ours [beliefs] is better than theirs' and vice versa and it's not

really. If you learn about it and hear about it, it just gives you a whole new insight (Protestant, Ballybeen).

In a similar vein, there was some evidence to support research indicating beneficial effects from vicarious experiences of friendship (Dovidio et al, 2003; Wright et al, 1997). As the following discussion shows, simply having friends who are already in contact with outgroup members can help individuals become more discriminating in relation to the outgroup.

How do you feel about your friends having friends from the other community?

It wouldn't bother me in any way, no.

Do you think it makes you more tolerant?

Yeah. I don't know. Just maybe if there's something on the news about a particular area or something and you would go, 'Sure that's a dive up there' or something'. They would say, 'They're not all tarred with the one brush. There are different ones and there's ones that are basically just like us'. I think friends that have Catholic friends would stick up for them more, you know...trying to get it through that they're not all tarred with the one brush and trying to get me to understand 'They're not all like that you know'.

(Protestant, Ballybeen).

The ability to discriminate between different 'types' of out-group member is it seems an important building block for intergroup relations. Interviewees in Andersonstown were, on the whole, much more amenable to cross-community contact and accepting of mixed relationships than those in Ballybeen, and often this was attributed to an acknowledgement, based on experience, that the other community cannot be treated as a monolithic block. The idea that there are 'good and bad' is pervasive in many interview transcripts, and seemingly opens the possibility for the development of affective ties. In Ballybeen, (though not exclusively) where fewer interviewees had any outgroup contact, there was a greater tendency to demonize the whole of the Catholic community and on this basis, to eschew opportunities for contact.

Conclusions

This research set out to explore enablers and inhibitors of cross-community contact in some of Northern Ireland's most segregated and divided societies with a view to making suggestions that might usefully inform the deliberations and actions

of policy-makers/practitioners as they seek to build better community relations in Northern Ireland. The key findings lend support to theoretical analyses of positive and negative mediators that influence receptiveness to contact and the nature of inter-group relations. At one level, both communities experience anxiety, fear, suspicion and a sense of threat that inform and perpetuate division and these psychological barriers are reinforced by physical boundaries represented by demarcated territories, 'no-go' areas, segregated institutions and housing. Contributing to the theoretical literature, our data suggest that whilst there are common underlying causes of a negative emotional orientation to the out-group (past experience of hostility; fear of conceding security/safety) there are also patterns of response that are more characteristic of one community or the other.

The content of Protestant fear/suspicion is apparently informed primarily by developments in recent years that (in the view of many Protestants) have precipitated a shift in patterns of relative disadvantage. These shifts are interpreted within a zero-sum framework where Protestant concessions to 'Republicans' are considered to have impacted negatively on the Protestant community whilst raising the status of Catholics. Catholics, on the other hand, whilst accepting that there may now be greater equality in Northern Ireland, attribute ongoing fear of Protestants to their perception of Protestant intolerance and bigotry. For each community, fear of the other is exacerbated by outgroup expressions of cultural/political identity that are interpreted by the ingroup (though not necessarily by the outgroup) as triumphalist and/or intimidatory.

On a positive note, there is confirmation in our data that contact, whether vicarious or direct, even in the most unlikely circumstances, can and does serve to facilitate the development of trust and understanding between the two communities. Moreover, the degree of intimacy, characterized by the level of contact with individual out-group members and willingness to self-disclose may have important ripple effects – with those in the most intimate relationships (mixed marriages) indicating similar behaviour patterns of association in their dependants. That said, opportunities for sustained inter-group contact are limited in segregated communities with the workplace cited as the environment most likely to engender the type of relationship that can lead to positive attitudinal and behavioural change.

What then are the messages of this research for the policy/practitioner community in Northern Ireland? First, it is clear that a 'one size fits all' approach to

✓ cross-community contact is unlikely to be effective. The nature of the problem is different for working class Catholics and Protestants in segregated communities and this should be reflected in interventions designed to tackle it. This is not to say that the type of short-term, symptom-driven, approach that has characterized community relations work in Northern Ireland for many years will necessarily work if only it recognizes that the problems militating against good relations are different for the two communities. Our data add weight to a growing understanding within the practitioner and policy community that the nature of the community relations problem in Northern Ireland is systemic and multifaceted. No amount of short-term cross-community initiatives, however well-conceived or bespoke, can tackle the mutually reinforcing problems of segregation, disadvantage (real and perceived), paramilitary control in working class communities, the legacy of the past, divergent political aspirations and the pervasive 'them' and 'us' mentality that continue to inform inter-community prejudice, hostility and violence.

Accepting this analysis also recognizes that a dedicated unit of government charged with responsibility for improving relations cannot, working alone, resolve community division. Rather, an integrated approach that recognizes the 'inter' and 'intra' community contingencies of the problem and places responsibility for improving relations at the centre of all areas of public sector delivery is required. To some extent this argument has been won, the Shared Future policy document presents a blueprint for action with Government advocating a case for an inter-departmental approach under the terms of Section 75. A 'Good Relations Panel' is proposed (A Shared Future, p.48) which, Chaired by the Head of the Northern Ireland Civil Service and comprising senior representatives from key Government Departments, local Government and the Community Relations Council, will report to Ministers on progress towards Shared Future policy objectives. The Shared Future Document advocates the promotion of shared space through, for example, sympathetic housing schemes, the development of shared workplaces and education initiatives that prepare young people to participate in a shared society. In a parallel theme, respect for cultural diversity is writ large in the document.

Assuming a return to devolved administration, these developments clearly have potential in terms of building a better future for both communities in Northern Ireland. However, many questions remain, particularly in relation to the form that any departmental/inter-departmental action will take, the indicators/outcomes of progress

and the sanctions that will be applied in respect of failure to comply with the Statutory Duty. Our data underline the tensions between the policy objectives of a 'shared' and 'diverse' society. In Northern Ireland where segregation is the norm (particularly amongst lower socio-economic groups) one community's expressions of diversity are seen as infringing on the rights of the other to live in a society free from fear. The ideas of 'shared' and 'diverse' are not mutually exclusive, but hard decisions need to be taken at all levels of government regarding the points of conceptual inter-face and the ramifications for action. For example, does a shared society promote neutrality, as has been the case in the workplace (see Osborne & Shuttleworth, 2004) or does it embrace cultural pluralism, as has been the case in support for independent schools and the development of diverse (but largely exclusionary) cultural traditions (Irish language/Ulster Scots). Or is there some way of accommodating the tensions inherent in these apparently contradictory agendas? Identity theory would suggest that a common identification with a shared future, where both communities accept that the achievement of a lasting peace will be dependent on them acknowledging and responding to their interdependence, may go some way to facilitating the latter.

This message may have permeated the thinking of the policy makers - the concept of a Shared Future, which can be traced back to the Belfast Agreement, represents a significant policy reorientation. The community relations agenda that was formerly more about the management of community relations in a divided society, now promotes an alternative 'shared' society. However, there is little evidence that residents in communities such as Ballybeen and Andersonstown conceive of a society that can be different from their divided and segregated reality, and perhaps herein lays the real challenge for Government.

References

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Bar-Tal, D. (2000). From intractable conflict through conflict resolution to reconciliation: Psychological Analysis. *Political Psychology*, 21, 351-365.
- Bar-Tal, D. (2001). Why does fear override hope in societies engulfed by intractable conflict, as it does in the Israeli society? *Political Psychology*, 22, 3, 601-627.
- Bettelheim, B., & Janowitz, M. (1950). *Dynamics of prejudice: A psychological and sociological study of veterans*. New York: Harper.
- Blair, I. V., Park, B., & Bachelor, J. (2003). Understanding intergroup anxiety: Are some people more anxious than others? *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 6, 2, 151-169.
- Bodenhausen, G. V. (1993). Emotions, arousal, and stereotypic judgements: A heuristic model of affect and stereotyping. In D.Mackie & D.L.Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception* (pp.13-37). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Boyle, K., & Hadden, T. (1994). *Northern Ireland: The choice*. Harmondsworth, Middlesex: Penguin.
- Brown, R., & Turner, J. C. (1981). Interpersonal and intergroup behaviour. In J.C.Turner & H.Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup behaviour* (pp.33-65). Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Cairns, E. & Hewstone, M. (2002). The impact of peacemaking in Northern Ireland on intergroup behaviour. In G. Salomon, & B. Nevo (Eds.), *The nature and study of peace education* (pp217-28). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Carver, C. S., & Scheier, M. F. (1990). Origins and functions of positive and negative affect: A control-process view. *Psychological Review*, 97, 19-35.
- Clore, G. L. (1992). Cognitive phenomenology: Feelings in the construction of judgement. In L. Martin & A. Tesser (Eds.), *The construction of social judgement* (pp133-164). Hillsdale. NJ: Erlbaum.
- Clore, G. L., Schwarz, N., & Conway, M. (1994). *Affective causes and consequences of social information processing*. In R.S.Wyer Jr. & T.K.Srul (Eds.), *Handbook of social cognition* (2nd ed., vol. 1, pp.323-417). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Central Community Relations Unit (CCRU). (1992). *Community Relations in Northern Ireland*. Belfast: CCRU

Community Relations Unit (CRU). (2003). *'A Shared Future': A consultation paper on improving relations in Northern Ireland*. Belfast: CRU.

Community Relations Unit (CRU). (2005) A Shared Future - Improving Relations in Northern Ireland: The policy and strategic framework for good relations in Northern Ireland, (21 March 2005), [PDF; 1062KB]. Belfast: Community Relations Unit (CRU), Office of the First Minister and Deputy First Minister (OFMDFM).

Cook, S. W. (1984). Cooperative interaction in multiethnic contexts. In N.Millar & M.B.Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp.155-185). New York: Academic Press.

Darby, J. (1986). *Intimidation and the control of the conflict in Northern Ireland*. Dublin: Gill and Macmillan.

Darby, J., Murray, D., Batts, D., Dunn, S., Farren, S., & Harris, J. (1977). *Education and community in Northern Ireland: Schools apart?* Coleraine: The New University of Ulster.

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Kawakami, K. (2003). Intergroup contact: The past, present and future. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 6, 1, 5-21.

Ekman, P., & Davidson, R. J. (Eds.) (1994). *The nature of emotion: Fundamental question*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Feeney, B. (2000) 'Hopefully the

Frijda, N. H. (1986). *The emotions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Frijda, N, H., & Mesquita, B. (1994). The social roles and functions of emotions. In S.Kitayama & H.R.Markus (Eds.), *Emotion and culture: Empirical studies of mutual influence* (pp.51-87). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common in-group identity model*. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.

Gaertner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., Anastasio, P. A., Bachman, B .A., & Rust, M. C. (1993). The common in-group identity model: Recategorisation and the reduction of intergroup bias. In W.Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology*, vol 4, pp1-26. Chichester, UK: Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Gallagher, A. M. (1989). Social identity and the Northern Ireland conflict. *Human Relations*, 42, 917-935.

Gallagher, D. J., & Clore, G. L. (1985, May). *Emotion and judgement. Effects of fear and anger on relevant and irrelevant cognitive tasks*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Midwestern Psychological Association.

- Gallagher, A. M. & Dunn, S. (1991). Community relations in Northern Ireland: Attitudes to contact and integration. In P. Stringer & G. Robinson (Eds.), *Social attitudes in Northern Ireland: The first report*. Belfast: Blackstaff Press.
- Geertz, C. (1973). *The interpretation of culture*. New York: Basic books Inc.
- Gray, J. A. (1989). *The psychology of fear and stress* (2nd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hamilton, A. (1995). *The effects of violence in communities*. Sixth Publication. Coleraine Central. University of Ulster.
- Haslam, S. A., McGarty, C., & Turner, J.C. (1996). Salient group memberships and persuasion: The role of social identity in the validation of beliefs. In J.L.Nye & A.M.Brower (Eds.), *What's social about social cognition? Research on socially shared cognition in small groups* (pp.29-56). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Herek, G. M., & Capitanio, J. P. (1996). "Some of my best friends". Intergroup contact, concealable stigma, and heterosexuals attitudes towards gay men and lesbians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22, 412-424.
- Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., Voci, A., Paolini, S., McLernon, A., Crisp, R., Niens, U., & Craig, J. (2004). Intergroup contact in a divided society: Challenging segregation in Northern Ireland. In: D. Abrams, J.M. Marques, & M.A.Hogg (Eds.), *The social psychology of inclusion and exclusion* (pp265-292). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Hinds, J. (1994). *A guide to peace, reconciliation and community relations projects in Ireland*. Belfast: Community Relations Council.
- Hovland, C. I., & Sears, R. R. (1940). Minor studies of aggression: VI. Correlation of lynching with economic indices. *Journal of Psychology*, 9, 301-310.
- Hughes, J. (1997). *Rerouting community relations in the wake of Drumcree*. Ulster Papers in Public Policy and Management, 63.
- Hughes, J. (2001). Constitutional reform in Northern Ireland: Implications for community relations policy and practice. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 12, 257-282.
- Hughes, J. & Donnelly, C. (2002). Ten years of social attitudes in community relations in Northern Ireland. In A.M.Gray, K.Lloyd, P. Devine. G.Robinson & D.Heenan (Eds.), *Social attitudes in Northern Ireland. The Eighth Report*. London: Pluto Press.
- Hyers, L. L., & Swim, J. K. (1998). A comparison of experiences of dominant and minority group members during an intergroup encounter. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 1, 143-163.

Isen, A. M. (1990). The influence of positive and negative affect on cognitive organisation: Some implications for development. In N.L.Stein, B.Leventhal, & T.Trabaso (Eds.), *Psychological and biological approaches to emotion* (pp75-94). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Islam, M. R., & Hewstone, M. (1993). Dimensions of contact as predictors of intergroup anxiety, perceived out-group variability, and out-group attitude: An integrative model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 700-710.

Jarymowicz, M. (1997). Questions about the nature of emotions: On unconscious and not spontaneous emotions. *Psychological Journal*, 3, 153-170. (In Polish).

Knox, C., & Hughes, J. (1996). 'Crossing the Divide: Community Relations in Northern Ireland' *Journal of Peace Research*, 33, 1, 83-98.

Lazarus, R. S. (1991). *Emotion and adaptation*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Lazarus, R.S., & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal and coping*. New York: Springer-Verlag.

LeDoux, J. E. (1996). *The emotional brain: The mysterious underpinnings of emotional life*. New York: Touchstone.

LeDoux, J. E. (1995). Emotion: Clues from the brain. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 46, 209-235.

Liekind, K., & McAlister, A. L. (1999). Extended contact through peer modelling to promote tolerance in Finland. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 765-780.

McClenaghan, C., Cairns, E., Dunn, S., & Morgan, V. (1996). Intergroup friendships: Integrated and desegregated schools in Northern Ireland. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 136, 549-558.

McVeigh, R. (2002). Between reconciliation and pacification: the British State and community relations'. *Community Development Journal*, 37, 47-59.

Marcus-Newhall, A., Miller, N., Holtz, R., & Brewer, M. B. (1993). Cross-cutting category membership with role assignment: A means of reducing intergroup bias. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 32, 125-146.

Niens, U., Cairns, E., & Hewstone, M. (2003). *Contact and conflict in Northern Ireland*. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Office of the First and Deputy First Minister (OFM & ODM). (2002). Review of Community Relations Policy, *Report of the Review Team*, Downloaded from <http://www.ofmdfmi.gov.uk/communityrelationsunit/harbisonreportannex.pdf>

Ohman, A. (1993). Fear and anxiety as emotional phenomena: Clinical phenomenology evolutionary perspectives, and information processing mechanisms. In M. Lewis & J.M.Haviland (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions* (pp.511-536). New York: Guilford.

Osborne, R. D., & Shuttleworth, I. (2004). *Fair employment in Northern Ireland: A generation on*. Belfast: Blackstaff.

Park, B., C.M., & Ryan, C.S. (1991). Social categorisation and the representation of variability information. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *European Review of Social Psychology* (Vol. 2, pp.211-245). Chichester: Wiley.

Paolini, S., Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., & Voci, A. (2004). Effects of direct and indirect cross-group friendships on judgements of Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland: The mediating role of an anxiety-reduction mechanism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30, 6, 770-786.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalised intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 173-185.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65-85.

Quirk, P., Stewart, J., & Hughes, J. (2001) 'PEACE', Community Relations Council's European Programme, Occasional Series No.3, October.

Rachman, S. J. (1978). *Fear and courage*. San Francisco: Freeman.

Rime, B., & Christophe, V. (1997). How individual emotional episodes feed collective memory. In J. Pennebaker, D.Paez, & B.Rime (Eds.), *Collective memory of political events: Social psychological perspectives* (pp.131-146). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Sherif, M. (1966). *Group conflict and cooperation: Their social psychology*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.

Shirlow, P. (1999). *Fear, mobility and living in the Ardoyne and Upper Ardoyne Communities*. Coleraine, School of Environmental Studies, University of Ulster.

Shirlow, P. (2001). Fear and ethnic division. *Peace Review*, vol 13, no 1.

Shirlow, P., Graham, B., McEvoy, K., O hAdhmaill, F. & D. Purvis. (2005). *Politically motivated former prisoner groups: community activism and conflict transformation*. Research report submitted to the Northern Ireland Community Relations Council (CRC). Belfast: CRC.

Smith, E. R. (1999). Affective and cognitive implications of a group becoming part of the self: New models of prejudice and of the self-concept. In D.Abrams & M.A.Hogg (Eds.), *Social identity and social cognition* (pp.183-196). Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Smith, E. R., & Henry, S. (1996). An ingroup becomes part of the self: Response-time evaluation. *Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin*, 22, 635-642.

Smyth, M. (1995). Borders within borders: Marital and ideological aspects of segregation. In M. Smyth (Ed.), *Three conference papers on aspects of segregation and sectarian division*: Templegrove Action Research Limited.

Stephan, W. G. & Renfro, C. L. (2003). The role of threat in intergroup relations. In D. M. Mackie & E. R. Smith (Eds.), *From prejudice to intergroup emotions: Differentiated reactions to social groups* (pp.191-207). New York: Psychology Press.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41, 3, 157-175.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp.23-46). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1986). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Verkuyten, M., & Hagendoorn, L. (1998). Prejudice and self-categorization: The variable role of authoritarianism and in-group stereotypes. *Personality & Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 99-110.

Whyte, J. (1990). *Interpreting Northern Ireland*. Oxford. Clarendon Press.

Wilder, D. A. (1993). Freezing intergroup evaluations: Anxiety fosters resistance to stereotypic information. In M. A. Hogg & D. Abrams (Eds.), *Group motivation: Social psychological perspectives* (pp.68-86). London: Harvester Wheatsheaf.

Wiley, J. R. (1990). Emotions as related to systems of behaviour. In N. L. Stein, B. Leventhal, & Trabasso (Eds.), *Psychological and biological approaches to emotion* (pp.385-404). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 1, 73-90.

Zajonc, R. B. (1998). Emotions. In D. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *The handbook of social psychology* (4th ed, vol 1, pp591-632). Boston: McGraw-Hill.