

April 2017

---

# Journal of Conflict Transformation & Security

---

**Navigating Identities and Emotions in the Field:  
a Local Researcher's Strategies in Northern Ireland**

By Rachel Rafferty\*

---

## Abstract

Divided societies like Northern Ireland present methodological challenges for researchers due to the roles that mutually-opposing group identities play in shaping social interactions. These challenges, which are heightened for local researchers due to their status as insiders to the conflict, can be overcome to some degree through the careful development of methodological strategies based on a reflexive approach. This article presents the case of a qualitative interviewing project undertaken by a local researcher that involved different identity groups in post-violence Northern Ireland. It examines the methodological challenges encountered because of the identified and emotional nature of the research, and it shares successful strategies both for building rapport with a wide variety of participants and for eliciting responses during the discussion of sensitive topics. A reflexive approach is shown as important in enabling local researchers in divided societies to conduct rigorous and trustworthy research.

**Key words:** field research, divided societies, identities, emotions, reflexivity.

\* Rachel Rafferty holds a PhD in Peace and Conflict Studies and is currently working as a Lecturer in Peace and Conflict Studies at the University of Otago. Her doctoral thesis focused on explaining how civil society activists develop different attitudes towards intergroup peacebuilding in a context of protracted conflict. Her broader research interests include post-conflict reconciliation, peace education and grassroots peacebuilding practices.

FIELD REPORT



**cesran** International

[www.cesran.org](http://www.cesran.org)

---

Journal of Conflict  
Transformation & Security  
Vol. 6 | No. 1  
April 2017

---

# Navigating Identities and Emotions in the Field: a Local Researcher's Strategies in Northern Ireland

## Introduction

Qualitative field research can be a valuable source of rich, contextualised information about societies affected by protracted violent conflict,<sup>1</sup> but such work does present significant methodological difficulties.<sup>2</sup> These challenges can be heightened for local researchers who will find themselves in the role of insider and outsider at different times; they will require strategies for both roles, as well as a means to address the tension between these different roles during analysis.<sup>3</sup> However, when these challenges are adequately addressed, local researchers in divided societies can be particularly well-placed to conduct research which is informed, but not dictated by, their lived experience of conflict.

This paper provides a reflexive account of my recent experience conducting qualitative interviews with community activists in my home country of Northern Ireland. Reflexivity is an important tool for qualitative researchers. It requires them to look critically at themselves and at their research decisions in order to consider how their social position, personal biases, and emotional reactions may have had an impact on the development of research findings.<sup>4</sup> However, although there is widespread recognition of the value of reflexivity in qualitative research, accounts of field work conducted by local researchers in deeply divided societies often address this concept either minimally or not at all.<sup>5</sup>

I reflect below on my recent field experiences in order to explore the identified and emotional dimensions involved in researching as a local in a deeply divided society. I share the strategies I developed to build rapport and handle sensitive topics, and I explain how researcher reflexivity helps to address the challenges involved in this kind of project. Reflexivity, this article seeks to demonstrate, enables local researchers in divided societies to develop sensitive and nuanced interview practices that can allow them to collect rich qualitative data from members of different identity groups in their home countries.

I first outline some of the general challenges involved in researching in a divided society such as Northern Ireland, and I go on to relate them to the broader issues involved in reflexivity, researcher positionality, and the conduct of qualitative interviews. I then present the case of my own research experience in post-violence Northern Ireland in 2014. I give special attention to the two primary challenges I encountered during this process; managing identity perceptions (my own and those of others) and confronting the emotional aspects of the research project. Both of these aspects of the research were inseparable from an additional ethical dimension which is examined concurrently with them in this article. I conclude by discussing the insights I gained into the particular issues that local researchers can expect to grapple with in a divided society. This article concludes that a reflexive approach is particularly valuable for local researchers in divided societies as they seek to build trust and rapport with a variety of research participants, and as they strive to address the challenges of being positioned alternately as an insider and an outsider during a single research project.

## The challenges involved in conducting field research in a divided society

The term “deeply divided” has been used to describe societies which are shaped around a single polarising identity division; the identity groups involved in the division can find



themselves at any stage in the conflict cycle from full-scale civil war to a post-conflict situation of hostile separation.<sup>6</sup> While all societies could be said to be divided to some degree, I use the term “divided society” in this article to refer to these types of contexts. Although divided societies may experience different levels of intergroup violence, they share important similarities in terms of their psychosocial dynamics. Common features of these societies include patterns of hostility and segregation between members of different identity groups, and high levels of collective emotions relating to the conflict.<sup>7</sup>

Deeply divided societies present field researchers with some specific challenges.<sup>8</sup> Even where intergroup violence has abated, at least temporarily, researchers face a variety of difficulties which include gaining access to wary participants and marginalised communities,<sup>9</sup> and building enough trust between researchers and participants to elicit honest and open accounts in a general atmosphere of low social trust.<sup>10</sup> In these kinds of situations, many topics can be highly emotive for participants and need to be broached with sensitivity to local context.<sup>11</sup>

While most of the literature that concerns field research in divided societies has been written by scholars who are at least partial outsiders to the conflicts at hand, there has been some consideration of the specific challenges that local researchers face. Locals cannot expect to be free from “ethnic and emotional baggage”,<sup>12</sup> and this “baggage” of identity, with its related emotions and biases, can affect how the local researcher will be perceived by various research participants.<sup>13</sup> It can also damage the credibility of a project’s findings if the researcher does not have an explicit strategy in place to prevent it from unduly influencing their data analysis process.<sup>14</sup> It is simply unrealistic for the local researcher to expect to be perceived as a neutral outsider by participants, and at the same time they need to be particularly aware of the ways in which their membership of an identity group may challenge their ability to take an objective position during the process of data analysis.<sup>15</sup>

As local researchers in divided societies interview participants from different backgrounds, they will find their social position shifting from that of trusted insider to potentially hostile outsider, and both positions present challenges. Researchers of the familiar need to be careful not to over-identify with those study participants who share the same social identity,<sup>16</sup> and neither can they assume that membership of a broad group will result in them being recognised as full insiders.<sup>17</sup> Members of other social groups may view the researcher as a potentially hostile observer,<sup>18</sup> and this will make it particularly difficult for the individual involved to gain access to, and build rapport with, certain respondents.

Local researchers can also face heightened emotional challenges. When a researcher has a personal connection to a topic, it increases the likelihood that they will experience emotional vulnerability and secondary trauma.<sup>19</sup> They must also take particular care not to allow their personal feelings towards research participants to influence how they conduct interviews.<sup>20</sup> A further concern is that local researchers need a certain amount of emotional courage in order to engage with topics that they have been socialised to view as sensitive.<sup>21</sup>

Despite these difficulties, a number of local researchers have successfully demonstrated their ability to gain access to participants from other identity groups, including individuals closely connected to the conflict.<sup>22</sup> Furthermore, by taking care to reflect on the impact of their social position and potential biases throughout the research process, they have been able to produce findings which meet the expectations for rigour and trustworthiness required for qualitative academic studies.<sup>23</sup>

The multiple challenges that local researchers face in a divided society can be overcome, and, when local researchers add their voices to the body of scholarship on their home country, they contribute valuable, highly contextualised research findings that are grounded in the lived experience of conflict. These kinds of outcome can only be achieved, however, if



researchers are highly self-aware and explicit about the roles that their identities and emotions play in shaping their research processes, and this is why a strong understanding of reflexivity is vitally important.

### **Reflexivity and field research in a divided society**

The importance of reflexivity in qualitative research is widely recognised.<sup>24</sup> Reflexivity involves a continual process of self-reflection by researchers, a process that necessitates a critical appraisal of their social position and personal subjectivities and close scrutiny of how these factors have affected research activities and outcomes. In terms of specific research practices, reflexivity involves the researcher reflecting on how their decisions around collecting and interpreting data have contributed to shaping their research findings.<sup>25</sup> The social scientist differs from her colleagues in the natural sciences in that she is not able to observe social phenomena with complete detachment. Whereas the natural scientist can view the behaviour of atoms or the progress of tectonic plate movements from a point of objectivity, the social science researcher is always, by virtue of their membership of the human race, personally connected to the research topic to some degree. In situations where a researcher is from the divided society they seek to investigate, this level of involvement is greatly heightened which in turn has consequences for the research process.<sup>26</sup>

Reflexivity is often linked to a social constructivist epistemology which understands knowledge about social phenomena as something constructed by the human mind rather than as an inherent fact waiting to be discovered.<sup>27</sup> However, approaches to reflexivity fall on a spectrum from relativist to objectivist.<sup>28</sup> Objectivist understandings of reflexivity view the process as an opportunity for the researcher to set aside or “bracket” their assumptions and personal biases, as well as to consider how participants’ perceptions of the researcher’s identity may have affected their interview responses.<sup>29</sup> This approach would seem to be particularly important for local researchers in divided societies as they confront the tensions between their lived experience of the social divide and a researcher’s responsibility to achieve a certain level of intellectual distance in order to arrive at fair-minded and theoretically-useful findings.

In qualitative studies, the researcher is the instrument through which research is carried out; when their personal subjectivities are made explicit, this can in fact lead to the development of more accurately delineated, nuanced, and trustworthy conclusions than might otherwise have been derived.<sup>30</sup> Reflexivity allows for a degree of “analytic accountability”,<sup>31</sup> and it can provide a pathway for the researcher to move beyond their personal subjectivities towards, not the achievement of universal objectivity, but a situated, embodied attempt at objectivity that is openly acknowledged as such.<sup>32</sup> In divided societies, group identities associated with conflict so completely pervade social interactions, cultural practices, and political structures that it is impossible for a local researcher to aspire to, or claim, neutrality, and so reflexivity is clearly highly relevant to research undertaken in these contexts.<sup>33</sup>

Reflexivity can benefit local field researchers at all stages of a study, from the design process, through data collection, to the analysis phase. During the collection of data in the field, a researcher’s membership of an identity group can potentially affect both her ability to access certain groups and the quality of interaction with participants.<sup>34</sup> Interactions between a researcher and participant take place within the relational dynamics of a particular cultural setting,<sup>35</sup> and this makes it particularly important for local researchers in divided societies to consider, during the analysis phase, how interviewees reacted to their identity and how this dynamic may have shaped the quality of conversation. Relational dynamics need to be accounted for in the research audit trail, and, where possible, creative strategies need to be designed in advance to either minimise the impact of these factors on data collection or to include observations on researcher-participant interaction in the data collected. These kinds of measures may actually enhance the accuracy of a study, given their potential to illuminate



fine details of social interactions in a divided society. The position of a local researcher as an insider familiar with the society as a whole may allow her to recognise nuances of behaviour and speech which might not be obvious to a researcher from elsewhere who is much less familiar with everyday social mores.

While many qualitative researchers now acknowledge the value of examining reflexively the impact of their social identity on the research process, the importance of emotional reflexivity has only begun to be recognised more recently.<sup>36</sup> Emotions are now considered by a number of scholars to represent an important dimension of field research,<sup>37</sup> not least because researcher emotions can influence decision-making around research design and the interpretation of data.<sup>38</sup> Local researchers in divided societies need to be particularly reflexive about their personal emotional reactions during the research process in order to achieve an interpretation of the statements made by participants from different backgrounds that is as balanced and fair-minded as possible. Without these kinds of measures in place, the findings of local researchers are vulnerable to accusations of personal bias based on group membership.

An emotionally reflexive approach opens up the possibility that researchers can use their recognition of their own emotions and the interplay of researcher and participant emotions in the discussion of sensitive topics, as valuable data which can illustrate how these factors shape everyday social interactions in a divided society.<sup>39</sup> Field notes and research journals can then become not only records of how a research process developed but a source of insight into the lived experience of interactions across identity boundaries in a conflict-affected environment.

Overall, a reflexive approach facilitates the development of appropriate field strategies which can ensure that findings will be found credible within the context of qualitative research; which is to say that findings will be marked by closeness to the topic studied, be true-to-life, and will accurately represent the perspective of those living the experience under consideration.<sup>40</sup> A local researcher who is dealing with multiple identity groups and varying levels of personal sympathy for the positions taken by respondents will need to be highly aware of the role that her personal history and emotions play in her decision-making. This kind of awareness of how social position and emotions shape interview dynamics creates the opportunity for researchers to develop strategies that ensure fieldwork reflects their academic responsibility to pursue answers to research questions in a spirit of critical self-awareness. The acknowledgement of the role of subjectivities in shaping the interpretation of the social world may, in fact, help to generate insights that cannot be gained via a methodology where researcher objectivity is assumed. Reflexivity can, therefore, enable local researchers in divided societies to come to more robust conclusions based on an explicit examination of the basis of their knowledge claims.

### **Qualitative interviewing in Northern Ireland**

In 2014, I carried out life-story interviews on a one-to-one basis with 29 community activists from a range of backgrounds in my home country of Northern Ireland. The purpose of the research was to understand why some of those activists working on intergroup peacebuilding have developed their motivations. This topic also required me to interview people whose activism was not shaped by a concern for the quality of relations between identity groups, and some among them viewed intergroup peacebuilding with some suspicion. During fieldwork, I had to navigate interview processes with respondents from my own and other social groups, and I needed to address the possibility that the interview topics could be both politically and emotionally sensitive, even after almost 20 years of relative peace. I also discovered my own capacity for reacting emotionally to disclosures made during interviews, and this highlighted the challenges for local researchers in divided societies who strive to separate their professional role from their personal sense of self.



### Overview of the research project and context

Northern Ireland is often viewed as a “post-conflict” society, but it is still deeply divided.<sup>41</sup> Although “Protestant” and “Catholic” group identities are better understood as ethno-national rather than religious categories, these terms are still in common local use and delineate divisions which still shape much of social life including how children are schooled, where people live, and with whom they form relationships.<sup>42</sup> Levels of intergroup violence in Northern Ireland are much diminished, but a state of affairs in which social separation and political hostility continue has been aptly described as one of “no war, no peace”.<sup>43</sup>

Political violence has greatly reduced since the signing of the 1998 Belfast Agreement, yet this small country of 1.6 million inhabitants is still coping with a legacy of widespread trauma, economic weakness characterised by relatively high levels of deprivation, and embedded patterns of social division between Catholics and Protestants.<sup>44</sup> There is still a great deal of contention about what caused the conflict and whose use of violence was or was not justified, and the pursuit of social reconciliation remains difficult in Northern Ireland long after the signing of the peace agreement.<sup>45</sup>

Under the terms of a reflexive approach, my biography—constructed against this backdrop—becomes a proper subject for scrutiny when I begin work as a local researcher. I was born and grew up in Northern Ireland in a Catholic family. I was influenced by a father who exposed me to Irish nationalist narratives and culture and by a mother who introduced me to a more liberal worldview. Exposure to these differing worldviews has given me some personal experience of both feeling a sense of belonging to a cohesive social group, and of the freedom that results from choosing to live as a self-defining individual connected to others from multiple backgrounds.

I am old enough to have personal memories of the violence known as “the Troubles”, and, although I was lucky to grow up in an area which saw relatively low levels of direct violence, my childhood was nonetheless overshadowed by army patrols and checkpoints, military helicopters thundering overhead, and the weekly litany of news reports announcing the latest deaths from paramilitary attacks. I grew up as part of a small and publicly acquiescent Irish Catholic minority in a town with a strong Protestant-British identity, and, like most people in Northern Ireland, I was socialised to avoid discussing contentious issues in public, as a matter of personal protection. I also had important opportunities throughout my life to form close relationships with Protestant individuals. As an adult, I worked for five years with a local peace centre where I saw it as my purpose to help break down barriers of fear and prejudice between groups. However, despite this past work, I could not guarantee that respondents would not view me in narrow terms as simply a member of the Catholic community, as my communal background could be guessed from my Irish family name.

My aim in carrying out the research project was to develop a grounded theory, derived from research data, about how the motivation to engage in intergroup peacebuilding arises at the individual level. Grounded theory methodology follows a process of “emergent design” in the early stages, and involves the researcher in taking a carefully structured approach to developing theory through a process in which data is subjected to “constant comparison”.<sup>46</sup> This inductive research approach, where theory is developed from real-world data, was particularly useful for me as a local researcher as it required me to set aside any pre-existing assumptions and simply observe what patterns emerged as I compared data against data. I also made efforts to minimise the impact of my personal worldview on the research process through strategies which included creating space in interviews for respondents to bring other topics into the discussion, creating full transcriptions of interview recordings and performing member-checking for these transcripts, and writing field notes in which I reflected on the possible impacts of my identities and emotions on the interview process.



Primary data collection took the form of semi-structured, short-form, life-story interviews because identity, values, and socialisation experiences are known to influence activist behaviour.<sup>47</sup> Each participant gave a single interview which lasted for around one-and-a-half hours. I began each interview by inviting the respondent to give an overview of their life story in their own words. I then followed up with a number of semi-structured questions about their early socialisation processes, “turning point” experiences, values, and motivating goals. Secondary data included my written observations on the interview dynamic between me and the respondent, as well as notes on my personal experience of each interview.

The sample of 29 community activists included many participants who were working for peace, with whom I shared an affinity, as well as many others for whose political positions I would feel little personal sympathy. These individuals included a Republican Irish language activist, a member of the exclusively Protestant Orange Order, and a local politician who represented a party that was opposed to the peace agreement. Additional challenges and considerations stemmed from the fact that the sample contained at least three interviewees who had previously been imprisoned for committing violence, and two former members of the security forces, as well as at least nine people who had had close personal experiences of political violence.

The broad range of participants—including both Catholics and Protestants, moderates and people with more extreme political views—challenged me to navigate the intersections of my own biography with those of the interviewees. The interview format also asked respondents to engage with sensitive topics, both in terms of their individual biographies (such as their relationships with their parents and their religious views), and their experiences of violence and division within our society. All of this required me to develop careful strategies for building trust and rapport and to consider how to manage the emotional impact of the interview process on me and the study's participants.

### **Building rapport across identity boundaries**

How we see ourselves is not always how others view us, as field researchers have discovered.<sup>48</sup> A field researcher therefore needs to be sensitive to her social position within the research setting and to consider how others perceive her. Strategies can then be developed accordingly so that she can present a researcher persona which will help her achieve key research goals without engaging in unethical deception.<sup>49</sup> Finding the means to build rapport with research participants is particularly important when researching sensitive topics.<sup>50</sup>

In a divided society, participants can be hostile to a researcher's perceived background; they may respond either by clamming up or by using the encounter as an opportunity to promote a political narrative aggressively rather than to give more open, personal responses.<sup>51</sup> A local researcher will therefore need to develop specific strategies to gain access to suitable research participants and to build rapport across identity boundaries; she must also, at a later stage, reflect on and make explicit the extent of her success or failure to engage with the “other”.

The primary challenge that faced me as I entered the field was the need to build a strong level of rapport, not only with respondents with whom I shared many similarities, but also with those from other identity groups. Self-presentation was crucial here, and I was aware that my own biography provided both strengths and limitations in terms of how I could build rapport with respondents. I am probably more experienced than many people in Northern Ireland at building rapport across identity boundaries and I have a useful familiarity with both Protestant and Catholic cultures; however, I also knew that there was a significant likelihood that I would be identified as Catholic due to my family name, a common indicator of group belonging in Northern Ireland. I was also sensitive to the fact that my life had been relatively



untouched by direct violence during the Troubles and that respondents who had experienced violence personally might view me as a naive and privileged outsider.

Researchers in divided societies face a dilemma about whether or not to reveal their social identities.<sup>52</sup> Transparency is an important ethical consideration, but when a local researcher's identity is revealed it can cause technical problems that affect the conduct of the research.<sup>53</sup> I chose not to draw attention to my Catholic background, but I was willing to admit it honestly if questioned by a participant. Instead, I sought to position myself, first and foremost, as a student researcher, a role that is popularly associated with aspirations to be balanced and objective but also with a certain amount of naivety about the "real world". Secondly, I chose to emphasise any identities in which I and a particular participant might share, whether religious, geographic, or gender-based.

My status as a student researcher allowed me to maximise perceptions of my youthful naivety, and this seemed to offer me the best way to approximate a position of relative neutrality in the eyes of participants. By positioning myself as a kind of *tabula rasa*, I invited participants to impart their intimate knowledge, personal perspectives, and experiences to someone who was genuinely interested in learning from them, and I was careful not to make any statements that would indicate my own assumptions about the conflict.

I was able to leverage my gender, relative youth, and student status to create a way of engaging with sensitive topics. I realised early on in my research that the non-threatening persona I had adopted was encouraging honest disclosure from all participants. I even wore particularly "studenty" clothes for some interviews to try to accentuate this aspect of my persona. In addition, I found that a strategy of cold-calling potential interviewees directly was helpful, as it allowed me to make an instant connection and build some rapport. My softly spoken female voice may also have helped allay any fears that potential interviewees might have had that I had some hostile reason for wanting to research their experiences.

I was always careful to describe my research goal in broad, non-contentious terms, and I positioned the project as one that involved me in simply engaging with a wide variety of community activists in a bid to understand why they were passionate about the causes they worked for. When I interacted with people who were not working towards intergroup peacebuilding, I did not mention directly the potentially contentious topic of reconciliation. A broad explanation of the research goal seemed to be successful in providing the research with enough legitimacy for me to access potentially suspicious participants in a divided society like Northern Ireland.<sup>54</sup>

During interviews, I made mostly non-committal but broadly encouraging responses to participant disclosures. By presenting myself as someone who wanted to learn from participants, I hoped both to inspire confidence in respondents from a range of backgrounds and to offer them an opportunity to educate me about their perspectives and worldview. When probing participants in an effort to engage them with more sensitive topics, I framed challenging questions in ways that separated contentious statements from my own persona and allowed me to retain rapport with the interviewees. I sometimes suggested, for example, that I was "just playing devil's advocate"; at other times, I prefaced questions with caveats such as "I don't think this is true, but some people might say...". This approach allowed me to frame questions as opportunities for participants to express their counter-perspectives. I never openly took issue with a participant's response, no matter how much I personally disagreed with it.

My strategies for building rapport also involved me in attempting to draw attention to any similarities between me and the interviewee, while simultaneously downplaying any possibly contentious identity distinctions. The accent and dialect use of English speakers in Northern Ireland is unique to those six counties and is used by Protestants and Catholics alike, so my



familiarity with local dialect words offered a valuable way in which I could highlight a degree of shared identity between me and the research participants. The Northern Irish are also noted for a wry and black sense of humour, and comedy was widely used as a strategy to foster emotional resilience during three decades of political violence. By laughing lightly along with participants as they recounted sometimes shocking realities, I hoped to show my shared knowledge of the surreal social situation in which we all grew up. Humility is also a shared cultural value across identity groups in Northern Ireland, and so I was careful not to perform the identity of academic expert, instead reassuring participants that I was learning a lot from them.

During this project, I was dealing with people who identified strongly as either Catholic or Protestant, as was evidenced by the roles they were playing in their own communities, and there were times when I felt it would be effective to make subtle changes in how I presented myself and my research. For example, in order to be sensitive to preferences over contentious nomenclature.<sup>55</sup> I referred to “Northern Ireland” when communicating with Protestants and to “the north of Ireland/ Northern Ireland” when communicating with Catholics. These choices were made so that I was able to show respect for participants’ differing sensitivities; they also helped me to emphasise my willingness to acknowledge each interviewee’s position. When chatting informally with Catholic interviewees before an interview, I would sometimes drop hints about my Catholic background, whereas with Protestants I often mentioned the town in which I grew up and thus hinted that I was well acquainted with Protestant narratives and culture.

Safety is both an ethical and methodological consideration for researchers who are working in a violently divided society.<sup>56</sup> Even in post-violence Northern Ireland, there is a legacy of socialisation that disposes people to perceive the discussion of certain topics as risky because of their potential to lead to dangerous acts of self-revelation in conversations with people from different identity backgrounds. I therefore took some time before each interview to reassure participants that they were in control of the process and of the information they would impart. I also reassured them that their identities would be kept as confidential as possible if they wished. Some participants raised concerns, but all were happy to proceed.

It was also important to reflect carefully on how interviewees responded to me. To some extent it is methodologically impossible to know how research participants react to a researcher’s perceived identity unless they explicitly express their views.<sup>57</sup> However, I did gain a number of indications that I had overcome respondents’ reservations and built rapport well by the end of some interviews across a wide range of participants. Interviewees spoke openly about a wide variety of topics which included some that might be considered sensitive or contentious. Many of them exhibited emotional vulnerability, and admitted honestly that they had been imperfect when it might have been easier for them to represent themselves as having conformed to socially desirable norms. Moreover, the interviews finished on friendly terms, and most respondents lingered on a little to chat informally instead of ushering me straight out of the door.

Like any field research project, this study was not unremittingly successful, but a reflexive approach to failure means that when problems arise they can become a source of learning. While I managed to interview a broad range of participants, I was not successful in gaining access to members of more politically extreme social groups. These actors are not easily contacted by telephone or through personal referrals, and I did not find a way to build trust during cursory email exchanges. My sample includes a spectrum of opinion but lacks evidence from people who have extreme views about supporting violence, and this represents an important limitation which will have to be made explicit when the findings are published. A key lesson learnt from this experience was that engagement with marginal groups works best when a lot of time is committed in advance of the interview phase to the development of contacts and relationships.



In reflecting on the research process, I can see that many of my identities, not just my religious background, shaped these research encounters. However, I am also confident that my interview strategies helped me to have as open a dialogue as possible with a broad range of participants within the social constraints that arise in the context of a deeply divided society. I am glad that I was not so intimidated by the challenges involved in interviewing across identity boundaries that I did not attempt it, as I did collect some very useful data from which powerful insights can be drawn. A reflexive approach helped me to recognise that I cannot assume an automatic connection with another human being simply because we share a group identity; at the same time, it also indicated that means exist to build rapport with respondents who identify with a group on the other side of the social divide. In the end, each participant deserves to be engaged with as a unique individual, without researcher expectations and assumptions interfering in the encounter. Researcher reflexivity can facilitate the development of strategies to achieve this person-to-person engagement and lead to more effective field research in divided societies.

### **Handling the emotional challenges created by sensitive topics**

Emotions are generally understood to form a domain which is comprised of subjective experience, expressive reactions, physiological reactions, and certain types of cognition.<sup>58</sup> These phenomena, which are difficult to record and analyse accurately, have traditionally been viewed with mistrust within academia. However, when research is viewed as a kind of emotional labour in which emotions must be expressed or managed in order for a task to be completed,<sup>59</sup> a number of important issues are brought to light. This approach acknowledges the emotional challenges involved for anyone who seeks to act as a scientific researcher in a social setting. It highlights how this work involves trying to manage tensions between empathy and objectivity as well as cope with the emotional costs of repressing one's natural responses to participant statements.<sup>60</sup> When the emotional labour involved in social science research is recognised, it becomes possible to address the emotional reactions of the researcher in fieldwork encounters and to assess how it affects researcher interpretations of different individuals and their narratives.<sup>61</sup>

In cases where divided societies exist, especially those which have recently experienced or are still experiencing severe violence, any research topic related to the conflict has the potential to evoke negative emotions in both the participants and the local researcher.<sup>62</sup> The act of researching topics that pertain to violence or suffering can be particularly emotionally challenging for researchers and can even lead to secondary trauma.<sup>63</sup> However, this should not lead researchers to avoid emotionally sensitive topics when they are researching conflict-affected societies as this can have a dangerously sanitising and distancing effect on the production of academic knowledge.<sup>64</sup>

A local researcher in a divided society faces difficult questions about how to address themselves towards topics of violence, prejudice, and division, particularly when they themselves may have had negative personal experiences of these problems. The researcher in these kinds of cases must then be highly reflexive with regards to the role that her own emotions play in shaping research decisions. There is also a need for researchers to develop strategies that help them to avoid becoming overwhelmed by emotions while in the field so that they can successfully complete their projects.

Furthermore, any researcher in a divided society needs to consider carefully how to engage interviewees with sensitive topics without evoking emotional reactions that could re-traumatize a participant and/or lead them to cancel an interview and withdraw from the project. A local researcher in a divided society therefore requires strong emotional awareness so that she can be sensitive, noting, and responding appropriately to, the feelings expressed by participants. Conversely, if the researcher is overly cautious about provoking emotional reactions, the interview may fail to engage with important topics and the research



may inadvertently result in an incomplete portrayal of life in a society affected by violent conflict.

My process of emotional reflexivity began when the design stage for the interview protocol brought certain considerations to light. Firstly, I wanted interviewees to have control over what they revealed so that each participant would be the person to set the emotional tone of their interview. I felt it would be unethical, and probably counterproductive, for me to try and push respondents into addressing life events which were traumatic for them to recall. Secondly, being aware that Northern Ireland has a strong culture of silence—summed up by the common refrain “whatever you say, say nothing”—I wanted to invite respondents to relax gradually into the research interview. I started, then, with very open questions about their lives and only then moved onto more sensitive topics such as group identity or religious belief. Finally, I wanted, as a gesture of reciprocity, to make the interview experience as pleasant as possible for interviewees. I listened attentively and enthusiastically to their accounts, and I ended the interviews on a positive note by asking them to describe what a better future for Northern Ireland would look like to them. The latter strategy was intended to help them leave behind any negative emotions that had been evoked when relating how their life experiences had been impacted by the past violence of the Troubles.

I also found it was important ethically and methodologically to be appropriately responsive to participant emotions during interviews. Mostly, I found it best to mirror respondents’ emotions, listening quietly if they were solemn or laughing along with them if they made a joke. Local cultural knowledge was useful in that I could recognise participants’ light and humorous retelling of violent social settings as a coping mechanism that it would be inappropriate for me to challenge. However, on a few occasions I deliberately intervened to diffuse an interviewee’s emotional response to an anecdote they were relating, particularly when feelings of shame arose and I felt a participant was being unduly hard on themselves. I made it clear that I greatly appreciated their willingness to reveal sensitive memories, but reminded them to view their actions in a wider context. It seemed an important part of building rapport to divert participants from become mired in negative emotions as they revisited difficult memories.

While I had spent some time before going into the field preparing to handle participants’ emotions, I had not foreseen the emotional impact of the study on me as a local researcher. I found myself interviewing both individuals who had engaged in political violence in the past and individuals who had suffered personally from this type of violence and this led to me experiencing a strong sense of moral confusion as I sought to make sense of their respective positions. This difficult mental state was undoubtedly exacerbated by the fact that the interviews also triggered some of my personal memories of growing up in a society where deadly violence was an ever-present possibility.

I have identified three negative emotions which presented challenges for me while I implemented this research project and which required me to reflect on how my personal feelings were impacting the research. Firstly, I recognised that fear had the potential to shape sampling. I was conscious that, unlike a researcher visiting from abroad, I could not escape the consequences of mistakes made in the field. I held a certain fear that if I angered individuals with paramilitary connections, this could have negative consequences for me and my family. I also found that, as someone who had been socialised to avoid certain people and areas for personal protection, it was emotionally challenging for me to visit certain parts of Belfast, or to interview individuals with past paramilitary involvement. My principal strategy for overcoming fear was to keep my attention on the research goal. I challenged myself to make contact with people I felt uncomfortable about if interviewing them could contribute towards that goal. I found that the act of writing reflexive research notes offered me a useful process for recognising and setting aside those fears that were not justified. Building rapport



with interviewees also reduced the chances of any respondent coming away from the interview feeling anger towards me.

Another emotion that presented challenges to the research process was aversion. I did not react with equal emotional equanimity to every respondent and to every element of their life stories. At times during interviews I experienced an uncomfortable physical reaction when I heard statements that I saw as supporting or excusing either violence or prejudice. At these times, I needed to make an effort to keep my facial expression neutral and attentive. Later, practising reflexivity allowed me to question to what extent my aversion to the use of violence has been shaped by the privilege of growing up at a relative distance from the violent events that engulfed certain communities in Northern Ireland. Indeed, I now recognise that any desire to judge certain actions is best set aside when acting as a researcher; it is more appropriate, and more useful to the goal of producing useful knowledge, to concentrate on understanding how each individual's unique life experiences have influenced their decisions.

Throughout the study, I also had to cope with personal feelings of sadness and powerlessness. The act of researching the life stories of individuals who had lived through a sustained period of political violence triggered some of my own memories of that time. When confronted directly with the traumatic experiences of others, I experienced a certain shame at my own powerlessness as a researcher to do anything more than just listen. In this case, I found that a process of debriefing, which I undertook by sharing my experience of the emotional impact of the research with a trusted other, helped me to manage my own emotions. Writing reflexive research memos also helped me to acknowledge and process the emotions that were evoked by encountering the lived experience of individuals harmed by violent conflict, even while I implemented a study focused on developing abstract theory.

A constant effort to be cognisant of the contentious nature of some topics and to stay sensitive to the emotional reactions of the people involved were important factors in eliciting honest and emotionally vulnerable accounts from participants. Looking ahead to the process of data analysis, the challenge will be to use my personal connection to the conflict as a means to understand the experiences of others on an empathetic level, without allowing personal feelings to distort the more detached and intellectual process through which findings are deduced. I have been left with an inner tension between my empathy for stories of victimhood and my attempt to understand the perpetrators of violence. While it is personally challenging, I hope that productive insights will emerge out of this tension which do not decontextualize decision-making but rather help to understand individuals' actions in the light of both their antecedents and their consequences.

### **Discussion and conclusions**

My field experiences obviously arise from just a single case of local research, but while my experiences cannot be generalised to produce universal truths, some of the insights that can be derived from my experience are transferable to similar contexts. Challenges similar to the ones I encountered can be anticipated by local researchers in other contexts where the socio-psychological features of divided societies—the powerful impact of group identities on social interactions and the commonality of emotional reactions to conflict-related topics—will also be encountered. This study has drawn attention to some strategies that may be useful to local researchers in divided societies, but each researcher will need to adapt their strategies to take into account their personal identity and emotions and the particular context that their society provides.

Necessarily then, the context of Northern Ireland in 2014 and my own biography need to be accounted for before any conclusions can be drawn from the field experiences I have recounted in this article. The sustained reduction in violence in Northern Ireland since the



1990s, and the subsequent proliferation of grassroots peacebuilding initiatives, may have created a particular social moment where sensitive topics can be more freely discussed between people from different backgrounds. I would not have expected to have gained such useful data 20 years ago, and researchers in societies where the conflict is currently more intense may find that they must work harder to build trust across lines of identity division. At the same time, my years of experience as a peace worker meant that I was more accustomed to, and more comfortable than many in, building rapport across identity boundaries.

I have found that the process of reflexively analysing my experiences helped me to learn a number of lessons about the process of conducting field research as a local in a divided society. Local researchers can conduct robust, credible, and qualitative field research if they reflect carefully on their own social positions and personal subjectivities. A reflexive approach also helps the researcher to create effective strategies to build rapport within and beyond her own identity group. Therefore, field researchers should not be intimidated from attempting to engage with different participants due to their own social location. My case illustrates some hope for success when shared identities are made salient and when the researcher presents herself as non-threatening and willing to learn from participants. Rapport is ultimately built between two individuals, and while we should be aware of the impact of our identities in a cultural context, we must also be flexible and responsive to the uniqueness of each encounter. Furthermore, although identities and emotions present challenges to data collection in the field, it should be remembered that reflexive memos written during the field research process can also provide valuable data because they illustrate the lived experience of social interactions in a divided society.

Identities and emotions will inevitably affect the research process, and so it is vital that we should become aware of, and make explicit, our decisions as local researchers in a divided society; this reflexivity can in fact contribute to the development of more trustworthy and credible findings than those which would emerge from less transparent research processes. Self-awareness around our own emotions as researchers allows those emotions to be noted down in memos and then, potentially, incorporated as research data. This process can also help local researchers in divided societies to acknowledge and process their personal emotions so that these feelings do not negatively impact on research encounters or the attempt to analyse data in the most balanced ways possible. When we use a reflexive approach to consider how identities and emotions play out during our research encounters, we can also add rich, contextualised insights about the lived experience of social division to our pursuit of theoretical understanding. Hence, a reflexive approach to field research in divided societies can contribute to the development of academically rigorous knowledge about social conflict that is, at the same time, grounded in an empathetic understanding of violence and division as lived human realities.



## Notes

1. Amour, "Practical, Theoretical, and Methodological Challenges"; Brewer, "Sensitivity as a Problem in Field Research".
2. Amour, "Practical, Theoretical, and Methodological Challenges"; Brewer, "Sensitivity as a Problem in Field Research"; Cammett, "Political Ethnography"; Dixit, "Field Research in Conflict Zones"; Eriksson, "Researching Community Restorative Justice"; Knox, "Establishing Research Legitimacy"; McEvoy, "Elite Interviewing"; Wood, "The Ethical Challenges of Field Research".
3. Brewer, "Sensitivity as a Problem in Field Research"; Dixit, "Field Research in Conflict Zones"; Knox, "Establishing Research Legitimacy"; McEvoy, "Elite Interviewing".
4. Berger, "Now I See It"; Munkejord, "Methodological Emotional Reflexivity".
5. Finlay, "Reflexivity and the Dilemmas of Identification".
6. J. P. Lederach, *Building Peace*.
7. Bar-Tal, "From Intractable Conflict"; Bar-Tal et al., "Sociopsychological Analysis"; Kriesberg, "Nature, Dynamics and Phases"; J. P. Lederach, *Building Peace*.
8. Amour, "Practical, Theoretical, and Methodological Challenges"; Bolak, "Studying One's Own"; Brewer, "Sensitivity as a Problem in Field Research"; Cammett, "Political Ethnography"; Dixit, "Field Research in Conflict Zones"; McEvoy, "Elite Interviewing"; Wood, "The Ethical Challenges of Field Research".
9. Knox, "Establishing Research Legitimacy"; Lundy, "Participation, Truth and Partiality".
10. Amour, "Practical, Theoretical, and Methodological Challenges"; Knox, "Establishing Research Legitimacy".
11. Brewer, "Sensitivity as a Problem in Field Research"; Cammett, "Political Ethnography"; Dixit, "Field Research in Conflict Zones".
12. Arthur, "Elite Studies in a Paranocracy", 205.
13. Brewer, "Sensitivity as a Problem in Field Research"; Lundy, "Participation, Truth and Partiality"; McEvoy, "Elite Interviewing".
14. Hermann, "The Impermeable Identity Wall"; McEvoy, "Elite Interviewing".
15. Arthur, "Elite Studies in a Paranocracy"; Finlay, "Reflexivity and the Dilemmas of Identification"; Hermann, "The Impermeable Identity Wall".
16. Berger, "Now I See It".
17. Bolak, "Studying One's Own"; Lundy, "Participation, Truth and Partiality"; Manohar, "'Yes You're Tamil'"; Oriola et al., "The Ambivalent Insider/Outsider".
18. Brewer, "Sensitivity as a Problem in Field Research"; Knox, "Establishing Research Legitimacy"; Oriola et al., "The Ambivalent Insider/Outsider".
19. See J. Chatin, "*I Wish He Hadn't Told Me That*"; Coles et al., "A Qualitative Exploration".
20. McEvoy, "Elite Interviewing".
21. Brewer, "Sensitivity as a Problem in Field Research".
22. See, for example, Knox, "Establishing Research Legitimacy"; McEvoy, "Elite Interviewing".
23. As demonstrated by Knox, "Establishing Research Legitimacy"; McEvoy, "Elite Interviewing".
24. Krefting, "Rigor in Qualitative Research"; C. Marshall et al., *Designing Qualitative Research*; Pillow, "Confession, Catharsis, or Cure?".
25. Munkejord, "Methodological Emotional Reflexivity".
26. Finlay, "Reflexivity and the Dilemmas of Identification"; Hermann, "The Impermeable Identity Wall".
27. Berger, "Now I See It".
28. Dowling, "Reflexivity".
29. Ibid.
30. Berger, "Now I See It"; Krefting, "Rigor in Qualitative Research"; Munkejord, "Methodological Emotional Reflexivity".
31. Stanley, "The Mother of Invention".



32. See Haraway, "Situated Knowledges".
33. Arthur, "Elite Studies in a Paranocracy"; McEvoy, "Elite Interviewing"; Brewer, "The Ethics of Ethical Debates".
34. Hermann, "The Impermeable Identity Wall"; Lundy, "Participation, Truth and Partiality"; McEvoy, "Elite Interviewing".
35. Berger, "Now I See It"; Bolak, "Studying One's Own"; Manohar, "'Yes You're Tamil!'".
36. Munkejord, "Methodological Emotional Reflexivity".
37. Chong, "Coping with Conflict"; Emerald et al., "Vulnerability and Emotions"; Pickering, "Undermining the Sanitized Account".
38. Munkejord, "Methodological Emotional Reflexivity".
39. See Emerald et al., "Vulnerability and Emotions".
40. Krefting, "Rigor in Qualitative Research".
41. Mac Ginty et al., "No War, No Peace"; P. Nolan, *Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report*.
42. P. Nolan, Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report.
43. Mac Ginty et al., "No War, No Peace".
44. P. Nolan, Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report.
45. Lundy & McGovern, "Truth, Justice and Dealing with the Legacy of the Past"; P. Nolan, *Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report*.
46. K. Charmaz, Constructing Grounded Theory.
47. Nasie, M. et al., "Activists in Israeli Radical Peace Organizations".
48. Manohar, "'Yes You're Tamil!'"; McEvoy, "Elite Interviewing"; Oriola et al., "The Ambivalent Insider/Outsider".
49. Chong, "Coping with Conflict"; Manohar, "'Yes You're Tamil!'"; Oriola et al., "The Ambivalent Insider/Outsider".
50. Browne et al.; "Politically Sensitive Encounters".
51. McEvoy, "Elite Interviewing"; Oriola et al., "The Ambivalent Insider/Outsider".
52. Brewer, "Sensitivity as a Problem in Field Research"; Oriola et al., "The Ambivalent Insider/Outsider".
53. Brewer, "Sensitivity as a Problem in Field Research".
54. See Knox, "Establishing Research Legitimacy".
55. Ibid.
56. Amour, "Practical, Theoretical, and Methodological Challenges"; Oriola et al., "The Ambivalent Insider/Outsider"; Wood, "The Ethical Challenges of Field Research".
57. Brewer, "Sensitivity as a Problem in Field Research".
58. Munkejord, "Methodological Emotional Reflexivity".
59. Nutov et al., "Feeling the Doctorate".
60. Chong, "Coping with Conflict".
61. McEvoy, "Elite Interviewing"; Robben, "The Politics of Truth".
62. Brewer, "Sensitivity as a Problem in Field Research"; J. Chatin, "*I Wish He Hadn't Told Me That*".
63. Coles et al., "A Qualitative Exploration"; Emerald et al., "Vulnerability and Emotions".
64. E. Dauphinée, *The Ethics of Researching War*; Pickering, "Undermining the Sanitized Account".



## References

- Amour, P. O., "Practical, Theoretical, and Methodological Challenges of Field Research in the Middle East", *Historical Methods: A Journal of Quantitative and Interdisciplinary History*, Vol. 45, No 3, 2012, p.143-149.
- Arthur, P., "Elite Studies in a Paranocracy: the Northern Ireland Case", Moyser, G. and Wagstaffe, M. (eds.), *Research Methods for Elite Studies*, London, Allen & Unwin, 1987.
- Bar-Tal, D., "From Intractable Conflict through Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation: Psychological Analysis", *Political Psychology*, Vol. 21, No 2, 2000, p.351-365.
- Bar-Tal, D., Oren, N. and Nets-Zehngut, R., "Sociopsychological Analysis of Conflict-Supporting Narratives: A General Framework", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 51, No 5, 2014. p.662-675.
- Berger, R., "Now I See It, Now I Don't: Researcher's Position and Reflexivity in Qualitative Research", *Qualitative Research*, Vol. 15, No 2, 2013, p.219-234.
- Bolak, H. C., "Studying One's Own in the Middle East: Negotiating Gender and Self-Other Dynamics in the Field", *Qualitative Sociology*, Vol. 19, No 1, 1996, p.107-130.
- Brewer, J. D., "Sensitivity as a Problem in Field Research: A Study of Routine Policing in Northern Ireland", *The American Behavioural Scientist*, Vol. 33, No 5, 1990, p.578-593.
- Brewer, J., "The Ethics of Ethical Debates in Peace and Conflict Research: Notes Towards the Development of a Research Covenant", *Methodological Innovations*, Vol. 9, 2016, 1-11.
- Browne, B. C. and McBride, R., "Politically Sensitive Encounters: Ethnography, Access, and the Benefits of 'Hanging Out'", *Qualitative Sociology Review*, Vol. 11, No 1, 2015, p.34-48.
- Cammett, M., "Political Ethnography in Deeply Divided Societies", *Qualitative Methods*, Vol. 4, No 2, 2006, p.15-18.
- Charmaz, K., *Constructing Grounded Theory*, California, Sage, 2014.
- Chatin, J., "I Wish He Hadn't Told Me That": *Methodological and Ethical Issues in Social Trauma and Conflict Research*. Paper presented at the Fourth Advances in Qualitative Methods Conference, Banff, Canada, 2003.
- Chong, K. H., "Coping with Conflict, Confronting Resistance: Fieldwork Emotions and Identity Management in a South Korean Evangelical Community", *Qualitative Sociology*, Vol. 31, No 4, 2008, p.369-390.
- Coles, J., Astbury, J., Dartnall, E. and Limjerwala, S., "A Qualitative Exploration of Researcher Trauma and Researchers' Responses to Investigating Sexual Violence", *Violence Against Women*, Vol. 20, No 1, 2014, p.95-117.
- Dauphinée, E., *The Ethics of Researching War: Looking for Bosnia*, Manchester, Manchester University Press, 2009.
- Dixit, M., "Field Research in Conflict Zones: Experience from India and Sierra Leone", *International Studies*, Vol. 49, No 1-2, 2013, p.133-150.
- Dowling, M., "Reflexivity", Given, L. M. (ed.), *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*, London, Sage Publications, 2008, p.747-748.
- Emerald, E. and Carpenter, L., "Vulnerability and Emotions in Research: Risks, Dilemmas, and Doubts", *Qualitative Inquiry*, Vol. 28, No 8, 2015, p.1-10.
- Eriksson, A., "Researching Community Restorative Justice in Northern Ireland: A Cross-Cultural Challenge", *Victims & Offenders*, Vol. 6, No 3, 2011, p.260-274.
- Finlay, A., "Reflexivity and the Dilemmas of Identification: An Ethnographic Encounter in Northern Ireland", Smyth, M. and Robinson, G. (eds.), *Researching Violently Divided Societies: Ethical and Methodological Issues*, London, Pluto Press, 2001.
- Haraway, D., "Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective", *Feminist Studies*, Vol. 14, No 3, 1998, p.575-599.
- Hermann, T., "The Impermeable Identity Wall: The Study of Violent Conflict by 'Insiders' and 'Outsiders'", Smyth, M. and Robinson, G. (eds.), *Researching Violently Divided Societies: Ethical and Methodological Issues*, London, Pluto Press, 2001.
- Knox, C., "Establishing Research Legitimacy in the Contested Political Ground of Contemporary Northern Ireland", *Qualitative Research*, Vol. 1, No 2, 2001, p.205-222.



- Krefting, L., "Rigor in Qualitative Research: The Assessment of Trustworthiness", *The American Journal of Occupational Therapy*, Vol. 45, No 3, 1990, p.214-222.
- Kriesberg, L., "Nature, Dynamics, and Phases of Intractability", Crocker, Osler Hampson, F. and Aall, P. (eds.), *Grasping the Nettle: Analyzing Cases of Intractable Conflict*, Washington DC, United States Institute for Peace, 2005, p.65-97.
- Lederach, J. P., *Building Peace: Sustainable Reconciliation in Divided Societies*, Washington, DC., United States Institute of Peace, 1997.
- Lundy, P., "Participation, Truth and Partiality: Participatory Action Research, Community-Based Truth-Telling and Post-Conflict Transition in Northern Ireland", *Sociology*, Vol. 40, No 1, 2006, p.71-88.
- Lundy, P. and McGovern, M., "Truth, Justice and Dealing with the Legacy of the Past in Northern Ireland, 1998-2008", *Ethnopolitics*, Vol. 7, No 1, 2008, p.177-193.
- Mac Ginty, R., Muldoon, O. T., and Ferguson, N., "No War, No Peace: Northern Ireland after the Agreement", *Political Psychology*, Vol. 28, No 1, 2007, p.1-11.
- Manohar, N. N., "'Yes You're Tamil! But are You Tamil Enough?': An Indian Researcher Interrogates 'Shared Social Location' in Feminist Immigration Research", *International Journal of Multiple Research Approaches*, Vol. 7, No 2, 2013, p.189-203.
- Marshall, C. and Rossman, G. B., *Designing Qualitative Research*, California, Sage Publications, 2011.
- McEvoy, J., "Elite Interviewing in a Divided Society: Lessons from Northern Ireland", *Politics*, Vol. 26, No 3, 2006, p.184-191.
- Munkejord, K., 2009, "Methodological Emotional Reflexivity: The Role of Researcher Emotions in Grounded Theory Research", *Qualitative Research in Organisations and Management: An International Journal*, Vol. 4, No 2, p.151-167.
- Nasie, M., Bar-Tal, D., Shnaidman, O. and Moghaddam, F., "Activists in Israeli Radical Peace Organizations: Their Personal Stories about Joining and Taking Part in These Organizations", *Journal of Peace Research*, Vol. 20, No 3, 2014, p.313-329.
- Nolan, P., *Northern Ireland Peace Monitoring Report*, Belfast, Community Relations Council, 2012.
- Nutov, L. and Hazzan, O., "Feeling the Doctorate: Is Doctoral Research that Studies the Emotional Labor of Doctoral Students Possible?", *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, Vol. 6, 2011, p.19-32.
- Oriola, T. and Haggerty, K. D., "The Ambivalent Insider/Outsider Status of Academic 'Homecomers': Observations on Identity and Field Research in the Nigerian Delta", *Sociology*, Vol. 46, No 3, 2012, p.540-548.
- Pickering, S., "Undermining the Sanitized Account: Violence and Emotionality in the Field in Northern Ireland", *The British Journal of Criminology*, Vol. 41, No 3, 2001, p.485-501.
- Pillow, W., "Confession, Catharsis, or Cure? Rethinking the Uses of Reflexivity as Methodological Power in Qualitative Research", *International Journal of Qualitative Studies in Education*, Vol. 16, No 2, 2003, p.175-196.
- Robben, A. C. G. M., "The Politics of Truth and Emotion Among Victims and Perpetrators of Violence", Nordstrom, C. and Robben, A. C. G. M. (eds.), *Fieldwork Under Fire: Contemporary Studies of Violence and Survival*, Berkeley, CA, University of California Press, 1995.
- Stanley, L., "The Mother of Invention: Necessity, Writing and Representation", *Feminism and Psychology*, Vol. 6, No 1, 1996, p.45-51.
- Wood, E. J., "The Ethical Challenges of Field Research in Conflict Zones", *Qualitative Sociology*, Vol. 29, No 3, 2006, p.373-386.

# JOURNAL *of* GLOBAL ANALYSIS



ISSN: 2041-1944

## Editor-in-Chief:

**Ozgur TUFEKCI, Dr.** | CESRAN International, UK

## Executive Editor:

**Husrev TABAK, Dr.** | CESRAN International, UK

## Managing Editors:

**Rahman DAG, Dr.** | CESRAN International, UK

## Assistant Editor:

**Seven ERDOGAN, Dr.** | Recep Tayyip Erdogan University, Turkey

## Editorial Board

**Yasemin AKBABA, Assoc. Prof.** | Gettysburg Col., USA

**Sener AKTURK, Assist. Prof.** | Koç University, Turkey

**Enrique ALBEROLA, Prof.** | Banco de España, Spain

**Mustafa AYDIN, Prof.** | Kadir Has University, Turkey

**Ian BACHE, Prof.** | University of Sheffield, UK

**Kee-Hong BAE, Prof.** | York University, Canada

**Mark BASSIN, Prof.** | Sodertorn University, Sweden

**Alexander BELLAMY, Prof.** | Uni. of Queensland, Australia

**Richard BELLAMY, Prof.** | Uni. College London, UK

**Andreas BIELER, Prof.** | University of Nottingham, UK

**Pinar BILGIN, Assoc. Prof.** | Bilkent University, Turkey

**Ken BOOTH, Prof.** | Aberystwyth University, UK

**Stephen CHAN, Prof.** | SOAS, University of London, UK

**Nazli CHOUCRI, Prof.** | MIT, USA

**Judith CLIFTON, Prof.** | Universidad de Cantabria, Spain

**Arusha COORAY, Dr.** | Wollongong University, Australia

**Mehmet DEMIRBAG, Prof.** | University of Sheffield, UK

**Zeki DOGAN, Prof.** | Nigde University, Turkey

**John M. DUNN, Prof.** | University of Cambridge, UK

**Kevin DUNN, Prof.** | Hobart and William Smith Colleges, USA

**Can ERBIL, Assoc. Prof.** | Boston College, USA

**Seyfettin ERDOGAN, Prof.** | Istanbul Medeniyet Uni., Turkey

**Stephen Van EVERA, Prof.** | MIT, USA

**Marc FLEURBAEY, Prof.** | Princeton University, USA

**Tasuku FUJITA, Assist. Prof.** | Jobu University, Japan

**Ayfer GEDIKLI, Assist. Prof.** | Istanbul Medeniyet Uni., Turkey

**Bulent GOKAY, Prof.** | Keele University, UK

**Ayla GOL, Dr.** | Aberystwyth University, UK

**Stefano GUZZINI, Prof.** | Uppsala Universitet, Sweden

**Elif Ince HAFALIR, Assist. Prof.** | Carnegie Mellon Uni., USA

**David HELD, Prof.** | London School of Economics, LSE, UK

**Tony HERON, Prof.** | University of York, UK

**Raymond HINNEBUSCH, Prof.** | Uni. of St Andrews, UK

**John M. HOBSON, Prof.** | University of Sheffield, UK

**Fahri KARAKAYA, Prof.** | University of Massachusetts  
Dartmouth, USA

**Michael KENNY, Prof.** | University of Sheffield, UK

**Abdulhamit KIRMIZI, Dr.** | Istanbul Sehir Uni., Turkey

**Oskar KOWALEWSKI, Dr hab.** | Warsaw School of Economics,  
Poland

**Cécile LABORDE, Prof.** | University College London, UK

**Scott LUCAS, Prof.** | University of Birmingham, UK

**Martina U. METZGER, Dr.** | Berlin Institute for Financial Market  
Research, Germany

**Christoph MEYER, Dr.** | King's College London, UK

**Kalypso NICOLAIDIS, Prof.** | University of Oxford, UK

**Ozlem ONDER, Prof.** | Ege University, Turkey

**Ziya ONIS, Prof.** | Koc University, Turkey

**Alp OZERDEM, Prof.** | CESRAN International, UK

**Danny QUAH, Prof.** | London School of Economics, UK

**José Gabriel PALMA, Prof.** | Cambridge University, UK

**Jenik RADON, Prof.** | Columbia University, USA

**Oliver RICHMOND, Prof.** | University of Manchester, UK

**Ibrahim SIRKECI, Prof.** | Regent's College London, UK

**Ian TAYLOR, Prof.** | University of St Andrews, UK

**Talat ULUSSEVER, Assist. Prof.** | King Fahd University, Saudi  
Arabia

**Ratna VADRA, Assist. Prof.** | Institute of Management  
Technology, India

**Ali WATSON, Prof.** | University of St Andrews, UK

**Brian WHITE, Prof.** | University of Sheffield, UK

**Stefan WOLFF, Prof.** | University of Birmingham, UK

**Yeliz YALCIN, Assoc. Prof.** | Gazi University, Turkey

**Birol YESILADA, Prof.** | Portland State University, USA

**Hakan YILMAZKUDAY, Assoc. Prof.** | Florida International  
University, USA

**Ibrahim Guran YUMUSAK, Assoc. Prof.** | Istanbul Medeniyet  
Uni., Turkey

# JOURNAL *of* GLOBAL ANALYSIS



ISSN: 2041-1944

**Peer-reviewed | Academic Journal**

**by CESRAN International  
(Centre for Strategic Research and Analysis)**

**[www.journalofglobalanalysis.com](http://www.journalofglobalanalysis.com)**

## Indexing & Abstracting

- Academic Index
- Bielefeld Academic Search Engine (BASE)
- Columbia International Affairs Online (CIAO)
- Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ)
- EBSCO Publishing Inc.
- EconLit
- EconPapers
- European Reference Index for the Humanities and Social Sciences (ERIH PLUS)
- European Sources Online
- Genamics JournalSeek
- IDEAS
- Index Islamicus
- Infomine
- International Bibliography of Book Reviews of Scholarly Literature in the Humanities and Social Sciences (IBR)
- International Bibliography of Periodical Literature in the Humanities and Social Sciences (IBZ)
- International Bibliography of the Social Sciences (IBSS)
- International Relations and Security Network (ISN)
- Lancaster Index to Defence & International Security Literature
- Peace Palace Library
- Research Papers in Economics (RePEc)
- Directory of Open Access Scholarly Resources (ROAD)
- Social Sciences Information Space (SOCIONET)
- Ulrich's Periodicals Directory