

Title	Doing peace: the role of ex-political prisoners in violence prevention initiatives in Northern Ireland
Authors	Joyce, Carmel;Lynch, Orla
Publication date	2017
Original Citation	Joyce, C. and Lynch, O. (2017) 'Doing peace: the role of ex-political prisoners in violence prevention initiatives in Northern Ireland', Studies in Conflict and Terrorism, 40(12), pp. 1072-1090. doi: 10.1080/1057610X.2016.1253990
Type of publication	Article (peer-reviewed)
Link to publisher's version	https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/1057610X.2016.1253990 - 10.1080/1057610X.2016.1253990
Rights	© 2017, Taylor & Francis Group, LLC. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way. - http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/
Download date	2024-04-25 12:23:34
Item downloaded from	https://hdl.handle.net/10468/6478



“Doing Peace”: The Role of Ex-Political Prisoners in Violence Prevention Initiatives in Northern Ireland

Carmel Joyce & Orla Lynch

To cite this article: Carmel Joyce & Orla Lynch (2017) “Doing Peace”: The Role of Ex-Political Prisoners in Violence Prevention Initiatives in Northern Ireland, *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 40:12, 1072-1090, DOI: [10.1080/1057610X.2016.1253990](https://doi.org/10.1080/1057610X.2016.1253990)

To link to this article: <https://doi.org/10.1080/1057610X.2016.1253990>



© 2017 Taylor & Francis Group, LLC



Accepted author version posted online: 16 Nov 2016.
Published online: 30 Mar 2017.



Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)



Article views: 981



View related articles [↗](#)



View Crossmark data [↗](#)



Citing articles: 1 View citing articles [↗](#)



“Doing Peace”: The Role of Ex-Political Prisoners in Violence Prevention Initiatives in Northern Ireland

Carmel Joyce and Orla Lynch



Department of Criminology, University College Cork, Cork, Ireland

ABSTRACT

While a considerable amount of research has been conducted on community-based initiatives aimed at preventing violence, including the role of the ex-political prisoner community in preventative and counterterrorism work, little is known about how the ex-prisoners themselves manage their identity transition between the role they occupied during the conflict and their current role in violence prevention. We argue that it is important to consider the perspective of ex-prisoners who are both architects of their own process of desistance from political violence, as well active leaders of bespoke desistance programs. While many researchers have recognized the utility of the role of ex-prisoners in violence prevention work, theoretically, the way in which ex-prisoners *do* violence prevention through their use of language and intergroup contact and other resources, is poorly understood. Ultimately, the aim of the article is twofold: to understand the resources (discursive or otherwise) that the community of ex-political prisoners use in their preventative work and (2) to understand how this community understand their role in desistance programs in the context of their personal involvement in violent conflict, including the ways in which participants manage their identity transition.

In recent years, notions of de-radicalization have become central to discussions around preventing recidivism for those convicted of terrorist offenses as well as a means of preventing violent action among those who are deemed at risk of escalation due to extreme beliefs.¹ Of significant political concern are those individuals who have chosen to participate in Islamic-inspired extremism in theaters of war abroad as well as those supposedly *self-radicalized* individuals in Western countries.

In an effort to counteract this risk, many rehabilitation or de-radicalization programs have been undertaken by governments through formal behavior change initiatives managed by prison, police, and probation services (e.g., Deradicalization program, Saudi Arabia; Hayat, Germany; De-radicalisation—Targeted intervention, Denmark; Channel, UK) via nongovernmental organizations (NGOs) working with families (e.g., Women without Borders, Austria) through community groups (e.g., Street, UK) and via multi-team

CONTACT Orla Lynch  orla.lynch@ucc.ie  Department of Criminology, University College Cork, College Road, Cork T12 YN60, Ireland.

© 2017 Taylor & Francis Group, LLC

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

initiatives seeking to combine police and community approaches (e.g., EXIT, Sweden). The strategies employed in these initiatives are idiosyncratic, context related, funding dependant, and ideologically diverse. Fundamentally, however, all seek to achieve the same goal: a combination of cognitive and behavioral change to reduce the risk of offending and/or re-offending and thus to prevent further terrorist attacks.

Much has been written about the possibility of encouraging individuals to withdraw from or reject participation in terrorism and political violence. Debates have raged around the necessary individual and group factors that encourage individuals to end the violence, as well as the social and legal measures that can push individuals toward non-offending.² Parallel debates surrounding the cognitive processes inherent in radicalization and de-radicalization have similarly been voiced, blurring distinctions between desistance and de-radicalization as explanatory frameworks and obscuring the conceptual peculiarities of both processes. What is important within this debate is the very real possibility that a particular community of individuals—former fighters—can arguably desist from political violence, but by no means de-radicalize from the views that led them to, or guided them through, their choices in the first place.³

Within the literature that is generally referred to as terrorism studies, but also reflected in the broad counterterrorism and de-radicalization policies of a number of European and Middle Eastern countries, the notion of de-radicalization has gained significant currency as a key explanatory⁴ if not causal construct in the conceptualization of terrorism.⁵ Identifying vulnerability to radicalization, and thus presumably terrorism, has become a major policy imperative witnessed in the creation of so-called de-radicalization programs.⁶ The assumption inherent in such initiatives is of course that because radicalization is conceived of as somehow linked to terrorism and violence, de-radicalization can then prevent further incidences of offending; there is, however, little evidence for and understanding of such a process.⁷

Outside of the mainstream, discussions on de-radicalization and government-led de-radicalization programs, another sub-strand of preventative and rehabilitative *counterterrorism* work is silently underway in many communities; one that incorporates the role of former perpetrators in preventing future instances of terrorism and political violence. In the United Kingdom, a number of individuals are active in researching and implementing preventative programs (e.g., Quilliam Foundation). Similarly, in Norway, Sweden, and Germany former violent right-wing extremists regularly engage with individuals at risk of engagement with gang and political violence (e.g., EXIT). As unpalatable as it may appear politically, there are many instances of former perpetrators actively working to prevent terrorism and political violence or in other words “doing” de-radicalization; in many instances these groups operate below the radar of security and criminal justice services and would oppose the portrayal of their work as de-radicalization or counterterrorism initiatives⁸; Northern Ireland is a key example.

In Northern Ireland the communities of ex-prisoners were and are an integral element in the 1998 peace process that ultimately led to the disarmament of the main paramilitary groups active during the Troubles (1969–1998/2005); during and after incarceration, prisoners were involved in the design and implementation of the peace process; their buy-in to the process was seen as essential to the success of the entire undertaking. Upon their release, many ex-prisoners mobilized collectively to initially campaign for ex-prisoner rights and later extended their work to include community development and conflict transformation.⁹

The range of work undertaken by ex-prisoners is varied and includes (but is not limited to), practical community development work within and between communities, direct conflict-related work (i.e., working at interfaces), as well as the design and implantation of economic regeneration projects.¹⁰ Many researchers both within Northern Ireland and internationally have recognized the vital role of ex-prisoners in violence prevention and community development initiatives. However, theoretically, the way in which ex-prisoners *do* violence prevention through their use of language, intergroup contact, and other resources, is under-researched. Northern Ireland was chosen as a case study for this research due primarily to the significant involvement of ex-prisoners in violence prevention initiatives, but also due to the fact that these interventions are locally driven and community led; the approach to ideological extremism in the case of Northern Ireland is also an interesting case that challenges assumptions about the need for the de-radicalization of ideas in the case of Terrorism and Political Violence.

Additionally, while researchers have attempted to determine the utility of the role of ex-prisoners in preventative work, in the case of political violence in a society with sharp community divisions such as Northern Ireland, little is known about the psychological function that such preventative work holds for the ex-prisoners themselves (i.e., to process and make meaning out of their role in the conflict and to encourage sustained desistance). Importantly, and somewhat separate from other literature that looks at the role of ex-prisoners¹¹ in preventing violence, the issues of intergroup social identity, identity complexity, and intergroup contract are central in understanding individual ex-prisoner experience, particularly in the case of Northern Ireland. In this context the ways in which ex-prisoners create meaning of the past in their current role is largely overlooked by academics and policymakers alike, in favor of attending to the needs of other social groups.¹² This is despite the fact that researchers have highlighted a need among this population, particularly in terms of the elevated incidences of interpersonal difficulties, substance abuse, mental health issues, and suicide.¹³

In this article we argue that the ways in which ex-prisoners in Northern Ireland use their current role to make meaning out of their involvement in the conflict (and vice versa) is vital to ensure, not only their own continued support for the peace process, but also that of a younger generation searching for meaning in a post-conflict environment. This article will briefly discuss elements of social identity theory relevant to the work of ex-prisoners in Northern Ireland and subsequently present the results of a study conducted with a sample of over fifty ex-prisoners.

Social Identity Theory

In relation to political violence, achieving desistance involves the ceasing of violent terrorist activities. Importantly, desistance in instances of political violence is complex given the relative rarity of the violent events, the likelihood of parallel *criminal* activity and the role of the group in sustaining support for the violence. In such instances conceptions of de-radicalization are less useful in trying to understand a move away from violence because they simplistically link ideologies to behaviors as well as failing to capture the realities of offending for those involved in political violence. Importantly, in terms of behavioral de-radicalization individuals can and do desist from political violence all the while maintaining their personal and/or group-based ideologies, problematizing the notion that re-radicalization is a precursor to or related to the process of desistance.¹⁴

While significant conceptual dissimilarities exist, there are important parallels between both gang research on desistance and applying the concept to terrorism research. There are a number of shared foundational issues, particularly the parameters of desistance related to group membership; must all ties be cut or is a termination (even a reduction) in serious crime sufficient?¹⁵ Furthermore the notion of status change is an important factor in the literature on gang desistance. In desisting from gang violence, and as a result terminating relationships with that gang, there is a distinct and identifiable change in status for individuals.¹⁶ In the case of terrorist groups there is a complex interplay between *membership* of the organization and later membership of associated tangential organizations that effectively have the same individuals involved and may even espouse similar ideological positions; therefore, the termination of the group's existence is often not a reality. For example after the Good Friday Agreement (GFA) (and in some cases before) a number of ex-prisoners groups emerged linked to (among others) the Provisional Irish Republican Army (PIRA).¹⁷ For the purpose of group support and thus the group processes of desistance, the issue is whether there was in fact any status shift for desisters or whether the ex-prisoner groups mediated that shift, implying an interesting role for the de-criminalization or *tolerance* of nonviolent organizations linked to the original paramilitary groups. In the case of Northern Ireland, rather than abandon the group, individual members are more likely to redefine the characteristics associated with the group; a process known in the social identity tradition as "identity transformation."

Social identity has been used to explain the processes involved in identity transformation or the reshaping of socially devalued groups. Individuals can engage in a number of different strategies in response to negatively valued group membership.¹⁸ An individual can, for example, 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.¹⁹ Social creativity involves the strategic use of components of identity to shape and redefine aspects of the category. For example, group members may emphasize the variability within the group ("we're bad but we're not all bad"), they can make comparisons over time ("we're bad but we're better than we used to be"), or compare themselves to an alternative outgroup ("we're bad but not as bad as others") to buffer against their subordinate status or the negative associations with the group.²⁰ In Northern Ireland further complexity exists regarding the perceptions of the group (e. g., the PIRA), and whether it is actually perceived as a negative entity and devoid of social status. The GFA ensured that the PIRA as a violent organization had reduced social support, but given its history, its well-constructed narratives of liberation and justice, and its role as a key representative of community identity, the organization was still able to exist post peace process as a result of its identity transition through demilitarization.

This transition from "paramilitary" to "peacemaker" has perhaps been one of the most controversial attempts to redefine a social category in Northern Ireland.²¹ A number of researchers have examined Republican and Loyalist ex-prisoners' explanations for involvement in conflict and their transition to peace.²² Many ex-prisoners released as part of the GFA now work in the community, promoting nonviolence in the most volatile constituencies in Northern Ireland.²³ Ex-prisoners have educated themselves on the principals of restorative justice during incarceration and have applied these principals in the promotion of community policing upon their release, working closely with the Police Services of Northern Ireland (PSNI) to decriminalize behavior stemming from social and economic

disadvantage, trauma, and mental health.²⁴ However, little is known about how ex-prisoners manage the transition from “paramilitary” to “peace maker” and the practicalities of this transition.

Indeed, while a considerable amount of research has been conducted on the role of ex-prisoner in preventative work, little is known about how individuals themselves manage the identity transition between their role in the conflict and their current role in violence prevention. We argue that it is important to consider the perspective of ex-prisoners who are both architects of their own process of desistance from political violence, as well active leaders of bespoke desistance programs in Northern Ireland. While many researchers have recognized the utility of ex-prisoners role in preventative work, theoretically, the way in which ex-prisoner *do* violence prevention through their use of language and intergroup contact and other resources is much less understood. Ultimately, the aim of the article is twofold: (1) to understand the resources (discursive or otherwise) that participants use in their role in preventative work and (2) to understand how participants understand their role in desistance programs in the context of their previous role in the conflict, including the ways in which participants manage their identity transition.

Method

In order to investigate the role of ex-political prisoners in violence prevention and broader community development initiatives in Northern Ireland, semi-structured interviews were conducted with self-identified Republican ($n = 25$) and Loyalist ($n = 27$) ex-prisoners who are members of ex-prisoner support organizations involved in self-defined restorative justice projects, peace building initiatives, and ex-prisoner support services. In addition to identifying as politically motivated former prisoners, participants also self identified as “community activists,” “politicians,” and “restorative justice” and “peace practitioners.” Participants were not asked in advance of the interview to state their religious or political affiliations (which are assumed to align with their paramilitary affiliations). However, the identity categories participants used in the interview (i.e., Catholic, Protestant, etc.) was noted and informed the analysis. Respondents ranged in age between 37 and 65 years (*Mean age* = 53), all were born in Belfast.

To recruit participants the researchers contacted ex-prisoner organizations in Belfast via e-mail and later organized one-to-one meetings with representatives of the organizations. Interviews were conducted on the premises of the ex-prisoner organizations where participants worked in Northern Ireland between 12 October 2013 and 20 May 2014. The interviews were transcribed verbatim, entered into NVivo text-tagging software, and open-coded into “free nodes” or the smallest unit of meaningful data identified without restriction.²⁵ When possible, these labels were chosen to reflect “emic” categories that are likely to preexist in the participants’ repertoires, used by social actors themselves to explain certain phenomenon.²⁶

Three dominant themes were identified in the data: “preventing the transgenerational transmission of political violence,” “promoting peace through intra- and intergroup contact,” and “promoting restorative principals and capacity building”. Each subtheme was considered in relation to the main themes, which related upward to the preceding theme, thus demonstrating the hierarchy of meaning within the data.²⁷

Managing transitions:

- Ex-prisoners and identity continuity
- Transferring ownership of community issues

- Addressing issues underpinning criminality
- Preventing transgenerational transmission of political violence:
- Dispelling myths and romanticism
 - Firefighting and stabilizing interface violence
 - Dismantling processes of indigenous learning
- Promoting peace through intra- and intergroup contact:
- “Doing” intergroup contact: Constructive engagement with the outgroup
 - Challenging intergroup difference: The use of shared experience
 - Exporting peace: Creating transferable models of peace building

The development of themes was then used, in part, as a data management tool to organize segments of data for subsequent analysis. The extracts were analyzed using resources from discourse analysis.²⁸ More specifically, the basis on which participants constructed their own identities (and that of others), as well as how these identities were mobilized to perform different discursive actions, were identified in the text.

Analysis

In the following section, we will outline a three-tiered approach to understanding the role of ex-prisoners in encouraging desistance from violence namely personal, preventative, and symbolic dimensions. At the personal level, we will discuss how their role provides ex-prisoners with a sense of identity continuity between their past and current position in Northern Ireland. In addition, we will also discuss how ex-prisoners use their role to manage accountability for the past and their role in the conflict. At a preventative level, we will discuss how ex-prisoners mobilize their identities in their role in preventative work with youth at risk in Northern Ireland. Finally, at a symbolic level, we will discuss ex-prisoners use of direct interaction with ex-prisoner peers to simulate a vicarious experience of cross-group interaction. Throughout the analysis, particular attention is paid to how participants *do* violence prevention work in Northern Ireland through the mobilization of identities, the use of rhetorical devices to manage accountability, as well their use of legitimizing narratives to bridge the transition from “paramilitary” to self-identified “peace practitioner.”

Personal

Managing Identity Transitions

Ex-prisoners interviewed for this research often used their role in preventative work to emphasize the continuity of their role during and post conflict. Many of the ex-prisoners who were involved in violence during the Troubles, consider their current involvement in self defined restorative programs as a natural extension of their motivations for their participation in violence during the conflict.

P: I have been involved in my community from day one . this is what I've been doing all my life . trying to make my community better . I am still fighting for my community . it's a different fight but it's the same in many ways. (Republican ex-prisoner)

Indeed, it was common for a Republican ex-prisoner to draw parallels between their past and current roles, “fighting” on behalf of their community to end perceived injustices. In the following extract, a Republican ex-prisoner provides a collective narrative of “victims of injustices” and uses this narrative to bridge the transition between past and current roles in the community:

- P: You know and I saw enough of . of trouble on the ground and I saw enough army brutality or whatever to do me a lifetime . and I experienced it then first hand and the thing of it was I suppose I reached the conclusion about 15 years of age you know if you go back to the old adage “turn the other cheek” and when they slapped that one too I thought yea . it’s time I slapped someone’s cheek back
- I: So umm . then did you feel like you were a victim of injustice
- P: No I didn’t feel like I was that . I knew I was a [victim of] injustice
- I: [yeah yeah]
- P: There was no feeling about it . we fought for our communities before and we’re still fighting . it’s no longer an armed struggle but still a struggle. (Republican ex-prisoner)

At the start of the extract, the participant provided an account of his own observation and direct experience of perceived “brutality” by the British army. By initially positioning himself as an uninvolved observer of “brutality,” repeatedly (“to do me a lifetime”), the participant positions himself and others who were subjected to army brutality, as the passive recipients of harm. The participant then adopts the category introduced by the interviewer “I knew I was a victim of injustice,” but problematizes the subject nature of the statement “there was no feeling about it.” In such a way, the participant works up and adopts the identity of “victim of injustice” as justification for involvement in the conflict and, as indicated in the final line, their continued effort to “fight” for their cause; albeit unarmed. Their role in the community is held constant. The implications of such *identity* continuity is that individuals need not reimagine their violent past in terms of the current peace environment, but can situate their choice to participate in violence in light of the context in which they found themselves. Serving to *save face* allows the ex-prisoners to maintain their status in their community particularly among at risk youth, and provides a platform for the ex-prisoners to continue their community struggle by other means.²⁹ This attribution of their violent past as an artifact of personal and vicarious victimhood is reinforced by the regular addage of:

- P: “Anyone in their right minds would have done what we did” (Republican ex-prisoner)
- I: Knowing what you know now . would you have done anything differently?
- P: No . we were in a way situation . there was no doing anything differently . you didn’t think . you had to defend your community . that’s the bottom line. (Loyalist ex-prisoner)

In effect, constructing their involvement in violence as a response to injustice and the response itself as a crusade against this injustice allows ex-prisoners the flexibility to defend their personal history and motivations for violence. It also simultaneously allows ex-prisoners to encourage nonviolence in the contemporary arena through reference to the current lack of discrimination and vicimization on the streets of Belfast. In effect, their argument can be summed up by recalling an ex-prisoner statement

- P: Things are different now. (Republican Ex-prisoner)

However, importantly, and extremely relevant in their conversations with at-risk youth, the ex-prisoners reserve their right to support the role of violence in Northern Ireland (NI) in the future. They outline how in their work with youth who are or have participated in

violence on the streets of Belfast, be it as a result of the Flags Protests³⁰ or violence at the interfaces, that if circumstances were to change in NI society, there may well be a role for paramilitary action in the future. This is less an example of the risk these individuals may pose as violent actors and more relevant in justifying their own use of violence in the past.

P: I am too old now. (Republican Ex-prisoner)

Furthermore, this reliance on victimization and discrimination as a motivator for violent action allows the ex-prisoners to encourage what may be termed temporary desistance among the youth. The ex-prisoners are not seeking a lifelong commitment to nonviolence but a temporary avoidance of violence unrelated to one's ideological commitment to a cause or fundamental belief in the role of violence in political change. They are encouraging the youth not to engage in violence given the current context they face in NI. This is not to say that peace in NI is fundamentally at risk of collapse but reflects the reality of desistance; as demonstrated in the criminological literature, that all desistance is ultimately temporary.³¹

P: I wouldn't tell anyone not to take up arms. (Republican Ex Prisoner)

Loyalist ex-prisoners also emphasized the continuity between their past and their current role in the community. It was common for Loyalist participants to bridge the transition between their past and current role using the phrase "from defender to mender." The following extracts are taken from the transcripts of loyalist participants who discuss their role in the conflict, as well as their role in peace building using the phrasing "from defender to mender":

P: It was a natural progression . all my life I have been fighting for my community . so if . if . if the armed part of fighting for my community is over then I'll fight for my community in another way . "from defender to mender." (Loyalist ex-prisoner)

P: "Defender to mender" is what we say . we were defending our community in the past . now we're mending . you know working with the community . in the past every aspect of life here was dealt with by the organisation but our feeling was . if the conflict is over and the organisation is going to go away then it's important that the capacity of the community is built up . that the community takes that into their own hands. (Loyalist ex-prisoner)

In the above extracts, it is possible the continuity between their past and present role can also demonstrate their commitment to preventative work and community development. As demonstrated by the second extract, it was common for Loyalist ex-prisoners to emphasize their peripheral role in community capacity building, as a facilitator of this process rather than active participants. Toward the end of the extract, the participant shifts footing³² from the use of "we"—"the organisation"—to speaking about "the community" as an entity with agency "that the community takes it into their own hands." In effect, this can demonstrate the way in which ex-prisoners "do" restorative work by rhetorically distancing themselves from the account and shifting ownership for community issues to "the community" itself. The use of "defender" is one that reflects a common narrative employed by Loyalist ex-prisoners, similar to the exercise by Republicans in their reference to "victimisation and discrimination." In working up a justification of their use of violence, Loyalist ex-prisoners rely heavily on the their construction of the Troubles as Republican-initiated violence that resulted in the need to *protect* Loyalist communities.

Both Loyalist and Republican ex-prisoners used their discussion of restorative principles and practices to highlight the continuity between their role in the conflict and their current

role in preventative work. Their role in preventive work allows ex-prisoners to create a sense of identity continuity which, in turn, can serve a variety of functions. According to the Meaning Maintenance Model,³³ individuals strive to parsimoniously integrate beliefs about oneself across time and context. Ex-prisoners' role in preventative work provides them with an opportunity to emphasize the continuity of their identity, post conflict. In a post-conflict environment, it can provide a framework of meaning in which to interpret the past and to use their experiences as a preventative resource. Relatedly, this can, perhaps, be viewed as a strategy to manage accountability for past actions: if the participant has changed as a person, they are open to questions concerning "why," which, inevitably, casts a shadow of doubt over the legitimacy of their individual or group-based narratives for involvement.

Importantly, when discussing their role in preventative work with youth at risk in Belfast, the issue of responsibility and blame were notions that were continually addressed. This was particularly evident in ex-prisoners' retrospective accounts of their reasons for becoming involved in violence, but also in relation to specific acts of violence. As mentioned, quite often, participants attributed blame externally and minimized personal agency. Their actions were, in effect, retaliatory and in response to continual unprovoked attack. The following are examples from both Loyalist and Republican ex-prisoners:

I: Yea . and what was the justification of umm . for like your involvement (pause) in comparison?

P: Well the IRA . the IRA were killing everything and anything and you know . we were . we just had to do something . they were killing friends of ours . they were bombing . like like . when the Troubles started I was going into Newry . a small glorious village between Belfast and Lisburn ... they had blown up the two bars . they had blown up the hotel . they had blown up two or three shops. (Loyalist ex-prisoner)

P: If the police stop you . and your name is Peter Robinson . "ah mister Robinson off you go . I know you and your kids go to the same school as my kids . and everything is great and how you doing" . if you're Jerry Adams or Mary O'Neill or some Catholic sounding name and says West Belfast or North . parts of North Belfast . "ah ok just check your registration . do you want to step out of the car" and all of that stop and search they're doing in New York and all . is what we got . that apparatus of the state from helicopters in the sky . undercover soldiers . massive amounts of very visible soldiers . with high end resources . best cars . best technology and all that stuff . unlimited resources directed against us . right and I grew up and that's the world I grew up in . it's almost like Israel with the Palestinians you know . something had to be done you know. (Republican ex-prisoner)

Relatedly, as illustrated in the above extracts, participants in this study often drew heavily on social responsibility repertoires or the notion that it is their responsibility to "step up" and "defend our community." This has long been recognized in the literature on former prisoners in NI.³⁴ In all instances provocation was seen as the motivator for action. Participants often considered it their role to defend their community from any outside threat. The issue of responsibility for the conflict was thus diverted to those who initiated the provocation in the first instance. The participants also draw on documented international examples of injustice and compare their own experience to well-known instances of oppression and discrimination. The ex-prisoners' construction of their violent past as being related to their willingness to defend their community is further developed by the participants as a tool to construct themselves as victims, having sacrificed their life and their liberty for the sake of their community. Many of the ex-prisoners recall their hardship in prison, their personal sufferings through isolation, divorce, and exclusion, and their oftentimes *pariah* status politically in NI.

As illustrated in the above extracts, for the ex-prisoners in their discussion of their personal histories as well as in their accounts of their methods for dealing with youth at risk of involvement in political violence, the ideas that supported the violence are not called into question; the justification and motivations for the violence remain intact. A key element in encouraging desistance among the youth is the encouragement of a temporary moratorium on violence justified solely on the context—the time is not right. The work that ex-prisoners do with youth at risk of involvement in political violence is based not on a deconstruction of the ideology that is drawn on to explain their violence. Rather, ex-prisoners evoke their personal experience of injury, loss, and self-sacrifice as a deterrent to youth engagement in violence.

By continually referring to the context to their experiences, the ex-prisoners construct a logic that allows a justification for their violent past but at the same time, justifies their current nonviolent activities through the external attribution of their motivation for violence. Being able to establish a continuity between their violent past and their nonviolent present enables the ex-prisoners to create a coherent narrative of identity continuity and effectively attribute their actions entirely to the situation they found themselves in during the Troubles. Ultimately, “de-radicalization” and the abandoning of group-based ideologies were concepts that did not have residence in this context. However, participants were effectively engaging in work that would be termed behavioral “de-radicalization” in their role in preventative work with youth at risk. This is illustrated further in the next section.

Preventative: Preventing the Transgenerational Transmission of Political Violence

Both Republican and Loyalist ex-prisoners identified the superordinate goal of preventing the transgenerational transmission of political violence. Participants were universally concerned with “not wanting the next generation to inherit our experiences and to live with what we faced” (Loyalist ex-prisoner). Many drew on historical accounts of reincarnations of political violence as an illustration of the need to end cyclical violence in NI: “we have been here before” (Republican ex-prisoner). All participants spoke of their sense of social responsibility to end cyclical violence.

Although ex-prisoners did not spontaneously self-identify as “victims,” they did provide accounts of victimization as an illustration of the need to end cyclical violence in NI:

I: What motivates the work that you do?

P1: I don't want to see this happen again . I've carried too many of my friends . my relatives down the road in coffins . I don't want to ever do that again . I don't want anyone to ever have to do that . you know what I mean . I don't think anyone here today would. (Republican ex-prisoner)

During one of the interviews for this study, a participant accompanied the researcher to a gallery of images on display in a community center. The images were displayed in order to demonstrate the reality of conflict and the experiences implicit in involvement. The participant referred to the images as a “violence prevention resource.” In reference to one image in particular that showed a funeral cortage, including the hearse, and mourners, the participant evoked notions of personal victimization:

I: And this is a photo of?

P2: It's of the funeral yea . I remember that . I was there that day . this is to show young people that it isn't fun . people die . I lost my friends . uncles . every week there was someone . no one wants that. (Loyalist ex-prisoner)

Relatedly, as illustrated in the above extract, participants often evoked victimhood narratives in order to illustrate the “true cost of the conflict” (Republican ex-prisoner). All participants used their identities as a resource to illustrate the realities of conflict: the cost in terms of lives lost, time lost during incarceration, futures lost due to employment restrictions, injuries, and emotional repercussions for family members. Essentially, participants identified their role in “dispelling myths and romanticism” around the conflict.

Indeed, all participants considered their identity as a valuable public resource to “dispel myths and romanticism” surrounding the conflict and importantly, they also mobilized their identities for this strategic purpose. Although ex-prisoners never directly identified as a victim of the conflict, they did evoke notions of personal and collective victimization. However, the indirect claim to victimhood, in this particular context, was not used to absolve responsibility, shift blame, or acquire resources, but was used as a resource in-and-of-itself to illustrate the realities of violent conflict: “this is to show young people that it isn’t fun,” It was also not uncommon for political ex-prisoners to discuss their creation of victims and their infliction of harm (direct or indirect) as an illustration of the true cost of conflict:

I: What do you tell the young people you work with about your experiences?

P3: Well there is nothing glamorous about it to begin with . they think it was all fun and games . it wasn’t . lots of people died . I dug bodies out of buildings that were blown up . I saw things no one should ever have seen and did things too . there is nothing sexy about that. (Loyalist ex-prisoner)

It is interesting to note here that the participant inserts himself into the account in the first person pronoun “I dug out bodies,” “I saw things,” and omits the pronoun “I” with reference to their own actions: “did things too.” Also, while the participant “should never have seen” the things he did, there is no indication whether his personal actions were unjustified. We draw attention to these shifts in footing³⁵ not to suggest that the participants are avoiding responsibility for their actions or to cast value judgments. When individuals shift from first to second person pronouns, also known as footing shifts, it is often when they discuss contentious issues.³⁶ These shifts can be used to create distance, discursively, from the account being produced. In such a way participants can be seen to manage their identity within their account. We also note the numerous ways in which participants can use victimhood as a resource to illustrate the cost of the conflict, while also managing the issues that may arise from its use (i.e., issue of blame for the past).

In addition to evoking notions of personal victimization as a conflict transformation resource, political ex-prisoners also mobilize “class identities” as a superordinate identity highlighting similarities between subgroups:

P4: I tell them all the time . there is more you have in common than separate you . we are working class people in Belfast . there kids are struggling with the same issues . employment . getting a job . trying to get ahead in life. (Republican ex-prisoner)

Ex-prisoners use the superordinate identity “we are working class people.” The Common Ingroup Identity Model³⁷ would suggest that intergroup prejudice and hostilities can be reduced through the creative redefining of category boundaries to include superordinate categorizations. While other models of subgroup-superordinate categorization have been developed and suggest that superordinate categorization can exacerbate intergroup differences,³⁸

what is interesting here is that participants use superordinate categorization spontaneously in their work, perhaps as a resource to reduce intergroup hostilities.

As mentioned, the participants in this study continually drew on their ex-prisoner identity during the process of engaging with youth in preventative work. The ex-prisoners were acutely aware of the prestige accorded to this personal history among the youth in question:

I was on hunger strike twice . and the young people we work with . you know they know that . they heard stories . and you know that gives us a certain amount of umm (pause) say respect.
(Loyalist ex-prisoner)

A romanticism around the community spirit during the Troubles and the comradeship among the paramilitaries in the prisons is commonplace for the youth. In many accounts, the participants in this study acknowledge that they are seen as heroes, a part of a folklore that glorifies the Troubles. In an effort to refocus the youth on the reality of the Troubles, very personal accounts of loss are drawn on to de-mystify the experience of prison and the violence on the streets. Participants would also explain how their incarceration was made bearable due to the existence of effective political status within the prisons, a comradeship among inmates and a very vocal support network on the outside. This, they would explain, is why you must not be imprisoned now... “times have changed, the context is different.”

Symbolic: Promoting Peace Through Intra- and Intergroup Contact

Loyalist and Republican ex-prisoners are involved in collaborative work across interfaces in NI. This work, we argue, is particularly important on a symbolic level and represent an “imagined interaction” in the absence of intergroup contact.

I: How would you introduce yourself . like in a classroom like that . how would you introduce yourself to the young people in the room

P8: Well I would say I'm a former member of the UDA . and there would be someone with me . and Republican . Provo or whatever and they'd say who they are . it's important that they see we work together. (Loyalist ex-prisoner)

Often, and particularly in classroom contexts where ex-prisoners are asked to speak to young people about the dangers of intergroup violence, participants will use their “ex-prisoner” identities (i.e., paramilitary affiliations) to illustrate their willingness to engage collaboratively with members of the other community, their former enemies: “it's important that they see that we work together.” Indeed, the importance of “being seen” to engage with their ex-prisoner counterpart appeared consistently across ex-prisoner transcripts:

P6: If myself and . and ah (pause) my peers . my ex- . my combatants at that time . um could go down to the interface and walk across the street and start talking to people from the other side of the street who were ex-combatants from the other side . um that sent a message out into the community . we don't “just talk the talk” . that's what they say isn't it . they think if those guys can cross over and talk to each other . you know . you know . what's this all about . so it's getting that message across. (Loyalist ex-prisoner)

P7: ... they knew that we were able to go there and speak to each other and basically what people were saying was “well if it's good enough for them to be doing that surely it would be alright for us to do it.” (Republican ex-prisoner)

Participants also mobilized their conflict-related “community” identity to demonstrate their willingness to engage in intergroup contact with the “other community.” This (often

spontaneous) display of intergroup contact and cooperation could be particularly powerful in certain areas of NI where mixed group interaction (between Nationalist/Catholic and Unionist/Protestant) is minimal. Participants demonstrate an awareness of the utility of their direct contact with the other community and their use of direct contact as a resource: “its’ showing that we all work together.” This “showing” or “having been seen” to engage with the other community is an indicator of the performative function of direct contact, over-and-above what it is offering to participants (in terms of possible prejudice reduction); it is being used to provide a vicarious experience of cross-group interaction.

Additionally, we argue, participants’ display of intergroup interaction is being used as a discursive resource to demonstrate the legitimacy or credibility of their role. This is somewhat reminiscent of literature on community-based approaches to counterterrorism where the focus is on identifying members of particular communities who act as leaders and have the ability to represent as well as alter community views. In these instances it is also necessary for such individuals to first demonstrate their credibility as ingroup members.³⁹ There are various ways in which participants can use their account of intergroup interaction to work up their credibility. For example, in the first extract, the Loyalist participant introduces their partners in the interaction as “peer,” which suggests an equal interaction and is temporally distinct from “combatants at the time.” This equal interaction between ex-prisoner “peers” is communicating the message that they do not just “talk the talk,” allowing the listener to finish the phrase—they also “walk the walk.” The rhetorical commonplace—“talk the talk”—is a device to manage accountability and build credibility by appealing to sentiments that are assumed to be commonly held “that’s what they say isn’t it.”⁴⁰ In such a way, their direct interaction with ex-prisoner peers can be used as a rhetorical resource to demonstrate their credibility of the message being sold and of themselves as messengers.

Participants often discuss the symbolic aspect of their role in preventative work. In particular, as illustrated in the above extracts, participants emphasized the importance of “being seen” to interact with members of the other community and the symbolic connotations for those who witness the interaction “that sent a message.” The interaction between ex-prisoners across the interface is a marker of their ability and willingness to engage in collaborative work to meet superordinate goals. This can be seen as a working example of the notion of Contact Hypothesis first developed by Allport,⁴¹ which states that, theoretically, positive intergroup contact under certain conditions can reduce prejudice and hostility between groups. In terms of the Contact Hypothesis participants are “doing” positive intergroup interaction. However, in addition, we argue that participants are using their interaction with known outgroup members as a conflict transformation resource. More specifically, their interaction with the outgroup is being used strategically as “symbolic contact” to “carry a message” to fellow ingroup members that positive interaction with the other community is possible. This simulated interaction is in some ways, we argue, a hybrid of “extended” and “imagined” contact but with a performative, strategic function.

All participants engaged in the collaborative activity of “humanizing the ingroup” and used counternarratives for this strategic purpose. This role, for the most part, occurred on an intra-group level of interaction in which group members spoke to those in the other community—generally young people in a classroom context. Again, in addition to their identities as “political ex-prisoners,” participants’ conflict-related identities also played an important role. In the following extracts, participants discuss their engagement with young people in classroom settings:

I: Why do you think this work is important?

P9: Well I tell them I'm so and so . tell them a bit about myself the work I do . that I'm an ex-prisoner . some of these kids would never have met anyone from the other community . you know what I mean . let alone an ex-prisoner . so I tell them about life during the conflict and I think they say "I heard me ma say that or me da say that . they had those experiences too . maybe they're not monsters." (Loyalist ex-prisoner)

I: Yea of course . but when it comes to talking to young people there is a certain advantage to saying you're an ex-prisoner

P11: Yea it can be ... it's about breaking that down for young people . giving them the chance to understand . 'He's just like the person in my community who done that and experienced this' . so it's about . see when we talk to young people and I would go to different Catholic schools and stuff like that . umm (pause) you can surprise them . you know you can shock them sometimes . you know it's not what they're expecting to hear . you were the enemy you have to remember for some people in their community but I don't think they got the same baggage as us. (Republican ex-prisoner)

All participants use their identities as members of the "other community" in their interaction with young people in a classroom context. In certain communities in NI where direct interaction with members of the "other community" are rare, participants, as representatives of the other community, can challenge stereotypes that maintain intergroup differences: "maybe they're not monsters." Within these accounts, participants are also managing their identities as individuals involved in preventive work. Take the first extract—the participant's identity as an "ex-prisoner" is not introduced immediately, rather it follows a general introduction: "I tell them a little about myself." This introduces the notion of identity complexity, or that individuals can occupy different roles simultaneously and that their identity as "ex-prisoner" is not necessarily the most salient. This works to both manage their dual positions as "ex-prisoners" and "peace practitioners" and also, on a symbolic level, communicates the message to the audience that identities are complex and not always consistent with stereotyped notions of the "other community." Ultimately, participants evoke shared experience with the other community, which could, theoretically, function as a symbolic interaction, reducing intergroup differences.

Discussion

There is a considerable amount of research on the role of former political prisoners in preventing political violence.⁴² While we have provided corroborative evidence for some of the roles identified in the literature (i.e., stabilizing interface violence), we have also drawn attention to the resources participants use to perform these roles. In particular, we have illustrated in the analysis the ways participants *do* preventative work, through their use of their own identities, superordinate categorizations, "symbolic contact" and simulated interaction, as well as the active use of restorative principals. These findings highlighted the unique role of political ex-prisoners in conflict prevention by drawing attention to their use of their identities and that of others (i.e., their ex-prisoner counterparts) in their work. In doing so, we have not only provided thematic categorization of the role former political prisoners play in preventing political violence, but we have illustrated the various resources (discursive and otherwise) that participants mobilize to perform these roles. Importantly this categorization demonstrates the necessary complexity of so-called de-radicalization programs, the importance of personal and

community identity within this process, the necessity of grass-roots initiatives in this area. It also demonstrates the importance, palatable or not, of encouraging and enabling ex-prisoners to remain committed to nonviolence.

These findings also contribute to our understanding of the utility of superordinate goals in the process of preventing political violence among at-risk youth. In order to reduce prejudice and intergroup hostility, according to the Contact Hypothesis, the interaction between groups must be frequent and long term, each group should have equal status (within the interaction) and the interaction should facilitate superordinate goals that require collaborative engagement by both parties. The superordinate goal of “preventing transgenerational transmission of political violence” or in participants’ own words “not wanting young people to live with what I faced,” provides participants with a meaningful framework to engage collaboratively in pursuit of superordinate goals.

The analysis presented here also contributes to the literature on forms of simulated contact. In particular, the analysis speaks to the notion of “Symbolic contact” as a simulated interaction and how “being seen” to interact with the “other community” has a performative and strategic function to “send a message” to ingroup members that positive interaction is possible. In divided societies such as NI where direct contact is not always possible and other forms of simulated contact (i.e., “extended contact”) has been shown to be effective, the role of ex-prisoners in symbolic interaction can be particularly valuable. Researchers have suggested ways in which direct and extended contact can be practically combined.⁴³ In NI, we argue, the role of the ex-prisoner in preventative work is an illustrative example of the practical extension of the Contact Hypothesis in action.

There is also evidence in the analysis that participants are managing their entitlement to engage in preventative work (legitimacy concerns). The legitimacy concerns of ex-prisoners have been well documented in the literature, particularly among Loyalist ex-prisoners.⁴⁴ However, we argue that “legitimacy” is not a static concept (that is either present or absent) but is something that participants negotiate in the interview and in everyday interaction. For example, participants use their display of positive interaction with the other group to demonstrate that they do not just “talk the talk” and are therefore genuine and credible in their role as “peace practitioners.” Additionally, participants draw on the notion of sacrifice and victimhood as a tool to account for their entitlement to have a role as a community activist. They appear to distance themselves from their account of their involvement, particularly when discussing restorative practices, thereby illustrating the way in which they *do* restorative work. We reiterate the legitimacy concerned noted in the literature but also note the ways in which participants proactively manage these concerns.

Finally, this article has demonstrated that perhaps in an effort to manage accountability, participants attribute responsibility for their violent past externally through reference to the provocateurs who inspired their violence. By positioning themselves as having sacrificed their youth, health, freedom, and so on, they construct their involvement in terrorism as an artefact of the times in which they found themselves. They were *victims of circumstance* and the context to the Troubles is a key aspect of their narrative. As part of the preventative narrative, the ex-prisoners draw on this issue of context to delegitimize the role of violence contemporaneously.

In trying to understanding the issues of desistance for ex-prisoners and the prevention work carried out by these same individuals it is possible that in the case of NI, that process of desistance and prevention is one and the same. In considering the work of ex-prisoners with at risk youth in NI, it is clear that in the process of *doing* peace work, or *doing* counter-terrorism is at the same time the very process that allows ex-prisoners to continually reinforce their identity as *peace makers* while protecting their violent past as a legitimate part of this process.

In attempting to understand the grass-roots ex-prisoner-led initiatives underway in NI in light of the broader debates on de-radicalization from terrorism, there are important lessons that can be learned. While cognizant of the idiosyncrasies of the Troubles and the peace time environment in NI, there are many opportunities for the application of ex-prisoner-led violence prevention in NI to terrorism prevention elsewhere. A key lesson lies in the issue of so-called cognitive de-radicalization and its absence in the NI process. The absence of such an initiative in NI, and the arguably successful efforts of the ex-prisoners (given the status of the peace process) brings such a notion into question as a universal phenomenon. Related to this and emerging from the criminological literature is the notion of temporary desistance. The ex-prisoners do not attempt a frame breaking shift in youth cognitions, beliefs, and ideology. A recognition that all desistance is in effect temporary⁴⁵ may be a more appropriate frame for dealing with perpetrators of political violence in that a tailored lifespan approach can then be taken rather than seeking cognitive and behavioral change in one concentrated intervention.

Finally, we suggest some potential avenues for future research. As ex-prisoners themselves outlined in their interviews, it is often difficult to evaluate their work or, in their own words “how do you measure the absence of something” (Loyalist ex-prisoner)? Further research could systematically measure the effects of “symbolic contact” at both a local and a regional level to determine the effect, if any, that both victim and ex-prisoner education sessions have on attitudes toward outgroup members versus sessions led by neutral speakers. Future research could also involve interviews with young people who have participated in an education session led by a mixed-group ex-prisoner. It is worth considering the effect of *witnessing* direct contact between victims and ex-prisoners, as well as subgroups of ex-prisoners, on young peoples’ perceptions of conflict transformation, the legitimacy of the speaker, their own perceptions of ingroup and outgroup members, as well as the possibility for positive intergroup contact.

Funding

This research was conducted as part of a larger study that examined the role of victims and perpetrators in violence prevention, funded by the European Commission through the Specific Programme “Prevention of and Fight against Crime,” HOME/2012/ISEC/AG/RAD

Notes

1. John Horgan and Kurt Braddock, “Rehabilitating the Terrorists?: Challenges in Assessing the Effectiveness of De-Radicalization Programs,” *Terrorism and Political Violence* 22 (2010), pp. 267–291.
2. John Horgan, *The Psychology of Terrorism* (London; Routledge, 2006).
3. Sarah Marsden, “Conceptualising ‘Success’ with Those Convicted of Terrorism Offences: Aims, Methods and Barriers to Reintegration,” *Behavioral Studies of Terrorism and Political Aggression* 7(2) (2015), pp. 143–165.

4. Paul Mandeville, "Muslim Transnational Identity and State Responses in Europe and the UK After 9/11: Political Community, Ideology and Authority," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35 (3) (2009), pp. 491–506.
5. Peter Hopkins, "Young Muslim Men in Scotland: Inclusions and Exclusions," *Children's Geographies* 2 (2) (2004), pp. 257–272; Laura McDonald, "Securing Identities, Resisting Terror: Muslim Youth Work in the UK and Its Implications for Security," *Religion, State and Society* 39 (2–3) (2011), pp. 177–189.
6. See for example this British initiative, available at http://www.thesundaytimes.co.uk/sto/news/uk_news/National/article1433673.ece (accessed 13 November 2016); Orla Lynch, "British Muslim Youth: Radicalisation, Terrorism and the Construction of the 'Other,'" *Critical Studies on Terrorism* 6(2) (2013), pp. 241–261.
7. Jonathan Githens-Mazer and Robert Lambert, *Islamophobia and Anti-Muslim Hate Crime: UK Case Studies* (Exeter: EMRC, University of Exeter, 2011); Laura McDonald, "Securing Identities, Resisting Terror: Muslim Youth Work in the UK and its Implications for Security," *Religion, State and Society* 39 (2–3) (2011), pp. 177–189; Paul Mandeville, "Muslim Transnational Identity and State Responses in Europe and the UK After 9/11: Political Community, Ideology and Authority," *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 35 (3) (2009), pp. 491–506.
8. Basia Spalek, "Community Engagement for Counter-Terrorism in Britain: An Exploration of the Role of 'Connectors' in Countering Takfiri Jihadist Terrorism," *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism*, 2014. doi:10.1080/1057610X.2014.941436; Abdul Hakk Baker, *Extremists in our Midst. Confronting Terror* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2011).
9. Cornelia Albert, *The Peace Building Elements of the Belfast Agreement and the Transformation of the Northern Ireland conflict* (London: Routledge, 2009); Peter Shirlow, Brian Graham, Kieran McEvoy, Feilim O hAdhmaill, and Dawn Purvis, *Politically Motivated Former Prisoner Groups: Community Activism and Conflict Transformation* (Belfast: Northern Ireland Community Relations Council, 2005).
10. Peter Shirlow, *Politically Motivated Former Prisoners: Evaluation of the Core Funding Project 2006–2008* (Belfast: Community Foundations of Northern Ireland, 2008); Peter Shirlow, Brian Graham, Kieran McEvoy, Feilim O hAdhmaill, and Dawn Purvis, *Politically Motivated Former Prisoner Groups: Community Activism and Conflict Transformation* (Belfast: Northern Ireland Community Relations Council, 2005); Peter Shirlow and Kieran McEvoy, *Beyond the Wire: Former Prisoners and Conflict Transformation in Northern Ireland* (London: Pluto Press, 2008).
11. Spalek, "Community Engagement for Counter-Terrorism in Britain," *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* (2014). doi:10.1080/1057610X.2014.941436; Basia Spalek, *Governing Terror: Trust, Community and Counter-terrorism* (London: Bloomsbury Academic Press, 2013).
12. Brian Gormally, Shadd Maruna, and Kieran McEvoy, *Thematic Evaluation of Funded Projects: Politically-Motivated Former Prisoners and their Families* (Belfast: Institute of Criminology and Criminal Justice School of Law Queen's University Belfast, 2007). Available at PN_%5b+Thematic+Evaluation+of+Funded+Projects+Politically+motivated+former+prisoners+and+their+families%5d_020210-1.pdf (accessed December 2015).
13. Ruth Jamieson, Peter Shirlow, and Adrian Grounds, *Ageing and Social Exclusion among Former Politically Motivated Prisoners in Northern Ireland* (Belfast: Changing Ageing Partnership, 2010). Available at <http://www.law.qub.ac.uk/schools/SchoolofLaw/Research/InstituteofCriminologyandCriminalJustice/Publications/worddocs/Fileupload,226499,en.pdf> (accessed 24 June 2015).
14. John Horgan, "De-Radicalization or Disengagement? A Process in Need of Clarity and a Counterterrorism Initiative in Need of Evaluation," *Revista de Psicologia Social*, 24 (2) (2011), pp. 291–298.
15. Dena C. Carson, Dana Peterson, and Finn Aage Esbensen, "Youth Gang Desistance: An Examination of the Effect of Different Operational Definitions of Desistance on the Motivations, Methods Associated with Leaving the Gang," *Criminal Justice Review* 38 (2012), p. 510.
16. Ibid.
17. Kieran McEvoy, Peter Shirlow, and Karen McElrath, "Resistance, Transition and Exclusion: Politically Motivated Ex-Prisoners and Conflict Transformation in Northern Ireland," *Terrorism and Political Violence* 16 (3) (2004), pp. 646–670.

18. Bertjan Doosje, Naomi Ellemers, and Russell Spears, "Perceived Intragroup Variability as a Function of Group Status and Identification," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 31(5) (1995), pp. 410–436; Naomi Ellemers, Ad Van Knippenberg, and Henk Wilke, "The Influence of Permeability of Group Boundaries and Stability of Group Status on Strategies of Individual Mobility and Social Change," *British Journal of Social Psychology* 29 (3) (1990), pp. 233–246.
19. Henry Tajfel, ed., *Differentiation between Social Groups: Studies in the Social Psychology of Inter-group Relations* (London: Academic Press).
20. Gabi Haager, Amelie Mummenden, Rosemarie Mielke, Mathias Blanz, Uwe Peter Kanine, "Zum Zusammenhang von negativer sozialer Identität und Vergleichen zwischen Personen und Gruppen: Eine Felduntersuchung in Ost- und Westdeutschland," *Zeitschrift für Sozialpsychologie* 27 (1996): 259–277.
21. Kieran McEvoy, Peter Shirlow, and Karen McElrath, "Resistance, Transition and Exclusion: Politically Motivated Ex-Prisoners and Conflict Transformation in Northern Ireland," *Terrorism and Political Violence* 16(3) (2004), pp. 646–670.
22. Kieran McEvoy and Peter Shirlow, "Re-Imagining DDR: Ex-Combatants, Leadership and Moral Agency in Conflict Transformation," *Theological Criminology* 13 (1) (2009), pp. 31–59; Clare Mitchell, "The Limits of Legitimacy: Former Loyalist Combatants and Peace-Building in Northern Ireland," *Irish Political Studies* 23 (1) (2008), pp. 1–19; Kieran McEvoy, Peter Shirlow, and Karen McElrath, "Resistance, Transition and Exclusion: Politically Motivated Ex-Prisoners and Conflict Transformation in Northern Ireland," *Terrorism and Political Violence* 16 (3) (2004), pp. 646–670.
23. Mitchell, "The Limits of Legitimacy."
24. Community Restorative Justice Ireland, *Standards and Values of Community Restorative Justice Practice*. 2010. Available at <http://crji.ie/wp-content/uploads/2010/12/CRJI-Standards-and-Values.pdf> (accessed December 2015).
25. Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke, "Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology," *Qualitative Research in Psychology* 3 (2) (2006), pp. 77–101.
26. Kenneth L. Pike, *Language in Relation to a Unified Theory of the Structure of Human Behavior* (2nd ed.) (The Hague: Mouton, 1954).
27. Braun and Clarke, "Using Thematic Analysis in Psychology."
28. Charles Antaki and Sue Widdicombe, eds., *Identities in Talk* (London: Sage, 1998); Jonathon Potter, *Representing Reality: Discourse Rhetoric and Social Construction* (London: Sage, 1996); Derek Edwards and Jonathon Potter, *Discursive Psychology* (London: Sage, 1992).
29. Dena C. Carson, Dana Peterson, and Finn Aage Esbensen, "Youth Gang Desistance: An Examination of the Effect of Different Operational Definitions of Desistance on the Motivations, Methods Associated with Leaving the Gang," *Criminal Justice Review* 38 (2012), p. 510.
30. Ken Pennington and Orla Lynch, "Counterterrorism, Community Policing and the Flags Protests: An Examination of Police Perceptions of Northern Ireland's Operation Dulcet," *Studies in Conflict & Terrorism* 38(7) (2015), pp. 543–559.
31. Shaun D. Bushway, Terrance P. Thornberry, and Marvin, D. Krohn, "Desistance as a Developmental Process. A Comparison of Static and Dynamic Approaches," *Journal of Quantitative Criminology* 19 (2003), pp. 129–153.
32. Erving Goffman, *Forms of Talk* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1981).
33. Steven J. Heine, Travis Proulx, and Katheen D. Vohs, "The Meaning Maintenance Model: On the Coherence of Social Motivations," *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 10 (2) (2006), pp. 88–110.
34. Richard English, *Armed Struggle. The Story of the IRA* (London: Palgrave MacMillan, 2003); Shirlow et al., *Politically Motivated Former Prisoner Groups*.
35. Goffman, *Forms of Talk*.
36. Ibid.
37. Samuel L. Gaertner and John F. Dovidio, *Common Ingroup Identity Model. The Encyclopedia of Peace Psychology* (2011). doi: 10.1002/9780470672532.wbepp041
38. Michael Wenzel, Amélie Mummendey, and Sven Waldzus, "Superordinate Identities and Inter-group Conflict: The Ingroup Projection Model," *European Review of Social Psychology* 18(1) (2007), pp. 331–372.

39. Martin Innes, "Policing Uncertainty: Countering Terror through Community Intelligence and Democratic Policing," *The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 605 (1) (2006), pp. 222–241.
40. Jonathon Potter, *Representing Reality: Discourse Rhetoric and Social Construction* (London: Sage, 1996).
41. Gordon W. Allport, *The Nature of Prejudice* (Cambridge, MA: Perseus Books, 1954).
42. Shirlow, *Politically Motivated Former Prisoners*; McEvoy and Shirlow, "Re-Imagining DDR: Ex-Combatants, Leadership and Moral Agency in Conflict Transformation," *Theological Criminology* 13(1) (2009), pp. 31–59; Shirlow et al., *Politically Motivated Former Prisoner Groups*.
43. Rhiannon N. Turner, Richard J. Crisp, and Emily Lambert, "Imagining Intergroup Contact can Improve Intergroup Attitudes," *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* 10 (2007), pp. 427–441.
44. Mitchell, "The Limits of Legitimacy"; Gormally, Maruna, and McEvoy, *Thematic Evaluation of Funding Projects*.
45. Bushway, Thornberry, and Krohn, "Desistance as a Developmental Process."