Northern Irish Protestant subjects, Northern Irish Catholic subjects, and English Protestant subjects were taught a series of conditional discriminations using a matching-to-sample procedure. In the presence of Northern Irish Catholic names, subjects were trained to select three-letter nonsense syllables, and in the presence of the nonsense syllables subjects were trained to select Northern Irish Protestant symbols. Subjects were then tested to determine whether the Protestant symbols and Catholic names had become related through symmetry and transitivity. A generalization test was employed to allow for a preliminary investigation of the transfer of experimentally generated equivalence responding to untrained, socially loaded names. Preliminary findings suggest that prior social learning might interfere with equivalence responding. The relevance of these results to the theoretical interpretation of the equivalence phenomenon and to social attitude measurement in general is discussed.

During the past 20 years of "The Troubles" in Northern Ireland, the processes of "Telling" (correctly identifying the denominational origin of others) and of "Taking Sides" have been the center of considerable attention for social scientists (Cairns, 1989). Contemporary explanations involve elaborate interactive models to account for the development and maintenance of distinct social identities. One such theory currently generating considerable interest is the Social Identity Theory (SIT) of Tajfel (1978).

Tajfel states that the existence of highly distinct group social identities is essential for the development of a perpetual state of animosity between two groups. Put simply, Tajfel argues that the tendency to categorize people and objects is a normal strategy employed by people to reduce the complexity of their social worlds. However, he points out that this also heightens the perceived differences between groups and exaggerates the similarities within groups, thus maximizing the extent of intragroup coherence and increasing the probability that perceived intergroup differences can become a source of conflict. Tajfel's theory also proposes that, just as individuals classify others, they also categorize themselves. He postulates that individuals have a marked tendency to strive to enhance the image of themselves. One way to do this is by enhancing their image of the group to which they belong relative to that of the "other" group. However, it is suggested that this process contributes to the emergence and perpetuation of conflict in relatively small, enclosed communities where the opportunity to change one's social identity is restricted (cf. Tajfel, 1978).
From a behavioral perspective, Tajfel's SIT theory may provide insight into the likely sources and forms of reinforcement (e.g., the verbal behavior of other members of the same social group) for social categorization. However, substantial differences exist between social psychological and behavioristic approaches in the underlying epistemology that guides the direction of investigation. Consider, for example, a typical social psychological experiment in which a subject is asked to tell whether a "stereotyped" face should be rated as either Catholic or Protestant (see Cairns, 1980, 1983; O'Donnell, 1977; Stringer, 1984). In such an experiment, aspects of the relations between the stimuli and responses have already been trained in the social context. Consequently the researcher focuses upon the end products of the processes of social categorization, rather than on the processes themselves. A behavioral analysis would consider the identification of these processes to be the main object of enquiry. In other words, instead of inferring behavioral processes on the basis of purely predictive data, it would be more illuminating to induce them directly in an experimental setting.

This goal may be attained by the employment of relevant procedures that have already been developed in the study of "stimulus equivalence." This phenomenon helps to account for the emergence of novel behavior in the context of the conditional discrimination procedure known as matching-to-sample (Catania, 1984; Sidman & Tailby, 1982). Specifically, when language-able humans are taught a number of conditional discriminations, the stimuli often become related in untrained ways. For instance, when a person is taught to match A to B and then A to C, it is likely that the person will also match B to A, C to A (symmetry), B to C, and C to B (combined symmetry and transitivity) without any further training. This has been called "stimulus equivalence," and the stimuli are said to have formed "equivalence classes."

Researchers have also demonstrated that the discriminative functions of one member of an equivalence class can transfer, without explicit training, to other members of the class (Barnes & Keenan, 1989; Wulfert & Hayes, 1988). In other words, if a subject is trained to match A to B and A to C, and is then reinforced for emitting a specific response in the presence of B, it is likely that the subject will also emit that response in the presence of C, without being reinforced for doing so.

Usually in these studies, the stimuli used are arbitrary and there is no systematic relation between them in terms of physical dimensions: "What is brought to bear in a given instance of arbitrarily applicable relational responding is a history applicable to the given situation" (Hayes, in press). Given that behavior in these settings stems from manipulatable antecedent histories, the employment of socially pertinent stimuli might uncover the principles which determine characteristic responding to particular categories of social stimuli.

The Northern Irish situation provides an ideal setting for the development and application of procedures based on this stated rationale. The people of Northern Ireland use a wide variety of information in order to identify and categorize the
sectarian alignment of others (cf. Cairns, 1980). Perhaps the simplest way that this is done is by obtaining a person's name because in Northern Ireland these are arranged in near mutually exclusive Catholic and Protestant name clusters showing very little cross over (cf. Cairns, 1984).

The organization of a group of beliefs or attitudes relating to an individual might emerge in the following way. If a person is confronted for the very first time with an individual called Sean, and has lived in a community where the name Sean is positively related with a Catholic context and Catholic is positively related with terrorism, then the behavioral principle of stimulus equivalence makes it likely that Sean and terrorism are seen as equivalent stimuli. This behavioral interpretation suggests that responding to a stimulus can depend on its relationship to other "socially loaded stimuli" rather than on a history of direct reinforcement with the pertinent stimulus in question.

The present experiment was designed in order to determine whether social categorization could be examined usefully within the stimulus-equivalence paradigm. Because the simultaneous presentation of Protestant and Catholic stimuli during the training phase of the experiment might alert subjects to the oppositional nature of the stimuli, a nonstandard equivalence procedure was employed. Subjects were first trained to relate three Catholic names to three nonsense syllables and subsequently to relate the nonsense syllables to three Protestant symbols. Intermittent reinforcement was introduced during the training phase so that the absence of feedback during testing was not in stark contrast to training. This was a standard stimulus equivalence training procedure. However, during the test phase a novel Protestant name was introduced as one of the three comparison stimuli. In order to circumvent some of the interpretive limitations arising from this nonstandard procedure, subjects' religious affiliations and nationalities were obtained and the data was organized according to group membership. Finally, three novel names (Catholic, Protestant, and neutral) were employed for a "generalization" test in order to further examine the extent to which prior social training affects subjects' performance in the experimental setting.

**Method**

**Subjects**

Twenty three University of Ulster undergraduate and postgraduate students volunteered to serve as subjects. The religious affiliation and nationality of each subject was determined on the basis of the subjects' responses to the following questions: (1) "Do you consider yourself to be Protestant or Catholic?" and (2) "Are you from Northern Ireland or England?" These questions were presented to each subject at the end of the experimental session. Twelve subjects were Northern Irish Catholics, six were Northern Irish Protestants, and five were English Protestants.
Apparatus

Subjects were seated at a table in a small experimental room with an Acorn Computer Limited, British Broadcasting Corporation (BBC), Model B microcomputer with a Cumana (Model CS400) floppy disk drive and a Kaga Denshi (Model KG-1 2NB-N) computer monitor which displayed green characters on a black background. Stimulus presentations and the recording of responses were controlled by the computer which was programmed in BBC BASIC. The Catholic, Protestant, and neutral names were taken from Stringer (1984). The rationale for the selection of the Protestant symbols is outlined in the Appendix.

Instructions and Pretraining

The experimental sequence was divided into three stages: (a) training with continuous reinforcement, (b) training with intermittent reinforcement, and (c) testing.

Subjects were presented with either a nonsense syllable or a first and last name in the top center of the monitor screen (the "sample" stimulus). Three "comparison" stimuli were displayed approximately 3 inches below this and were each separated by 2 inches across the screen. Subjects were instructed at the start of the experiment that they had to select a comparison stimulus by pressing one of three designated keys. These keys were marked as left (Z), middle (V), and right (M), and they corresponded to the relative positions of the comparison stimuli.

At the beginning of the experiment the following text appeared on screen:

In this experiment you will be shown an item at the top of the screen along with 3 items below it. Your task is to learn which of these items goes with the one at the top of the screen.

Press the SPACE BAR to continue.

After the subjects pressed the space bar the following appeared on the screen:

JEAN

KAQ   YUH    QAS

For example, here your choices are either `KAQ', YUH', or `QAS'. You choose one that goes with `JEAN'. In other words, when JEAN, is displayed you choose one item from the three displayed below.

You choose by pressing one of three keys on the keyboard.

Z ........................................... LEFT
V ........................... CENTRE
Try pressing one of these keys now and see what happens.

Subjects were exposed to this single task for four trials so that they would be familiarized with the matching-to-sample procedure (the details of the matching-to-sample procedure will be outlined below). None of the four stimuli used in the pretraining task were employed in the actual experiment. After the four pretraining trials, the monitor screen cleared and the following instructions appeared.

If you have any questions please ask the experimenter now.

Type 'BEGIN' when you are ready to start the experiment, and then hit the RETURN key.

When subjects typed BEGIN the training phase of the experiment commenced. The stimuli employed in the experiment are presented in Table 1.

**Experimental Sequence**

Stage 1: Training with continuous reinforcement. In this stage, the trained relations depicted in Table 1 were established using continuous reinforcement. Training began with one of three Catholic names randomly chosen to serve as the sample stimulus. Beneath this, the three nonsense syllables served as comparison stimuli and they were arranged in a random order across the screen. (This was so for all presentations of comparison stimuli throughout the experiment). After a correct response (e.g., selecting ZID in the presence of Brendan Doherty), the screen cleared and the word "CORRECT" appeared on the screen; this was accompanied by a 3-s high pitched tone. When subjects responded incorrectly, the word "WRONG" appeared instead and it was accompanied by a 3-s low pitched tone. (The nature of this feedback was consistent across all stages of the experiment.)

The next sample stimulus was randomly chosen from the two remaining Catholic names and the nonsense syllables again served as comparison stimuli. Finally, the remaining Catholic name was used as the sample stimulus and it was also accompanied by the nonsense syllables as comparison stimuli.

When two successive cycles of this combination of sample and comparison stimuli had been correctly completed, the second part of Stage 1 commenced. Here the sample stimuli were selected from the list of nonsense syllables, and the comparison stimuli were selected from the list of Protestant symbols. The manner in which the sample stimuli were selected was the same as that described for the first half of this stage. Similarly, two successive cycles of this new combination of sample and comparison stimuli had to be successfully completed before transition to the next part of the experiment.
Stage 2: Training with intermittent reinforcement. At the onset of this stage subjects were informed that they would not always be told whether their responses were correct or not. The following text appeared on screen:

In the next stage of the study you will not always be told if your response is right or wrong.

To continue with the experiment type 'GO' and then hit the RETURN key.

In fact, feedback ("CORRECT" or "WRONG") was given for only 50% of responses. The stimulus combinations described in Stage 1 were all presented in random order during this condition. Each stimulus combination was presented twice and if less than 100% of responses were correct, the procedure reverted back to the start of Stage 1. It was possible for each subject to restart the training three times before being asked to terminate the session and come back another day. If performance efficiency was 100% then the next stage began immediately.

Stage 3: Testing. No feedback was given to any subjects for any items during the test stage. Ten presentations of each of the stimulus combinations from Stage 1 were randomly presented. Randomly interspersed with these were ten presentations each of six other stimulus combinations. These 'novel' arrangements were grouped into two categories and are shown in Table 2. The stimuli in the left-hand column were arranged as a combined test of symmetry and transitivity between Protestant symbols and Catholic names. Each of the three Protestant symbols served as sample stimuli and two of the Catholic names served as comparison stimuli; one each of the Catholic names provided the combined test for symmetrical and transitive responding. An additional Protestant name was included as a comparison stimulus for each of these three combinations of sample and comparison stimuli. This was done in order to determine the extent to which prior social learning could interfere with equivalence responding.

The right-hand column of Table 2 shows the three other stimulus combinations presented during this stage. This generalization test was employed to allow for a preliminary exploration of the transfer of experimentally generated equivalence responding to other socially pertinent stimuli. Again the Protestant symbols served as sample stimuli, but this time the same three new names served as comparison stimuli. Each of these names was either Catholic (Eamon McAleer), Protestant (Robert Scott), or neutral (Ilya Galakov) within the Northern Irish context.

Verbal reports were not collected systematically, but many of the subjects voluntarily offered comments after completing the experiment. These reports were noted by the experimenter.

Results

Those subjects whose results predominantly reflected "expected equivalence
responding" in accordance with the training regime were classified as "PASS," whereas those subjects who predominantly selected the novel Protestant names instead of the expected Catholic names were classified as "FAIL." This classification, in conjunction with ethnic origin and religious affiliation, provided four major groupings for all subjects; subjects were renumbered for ease of exposition. The results are presented in Figures 1-4.

Figure 1 shows the results for N. Irish Protestants who generally failed to show equivalence responding. Except for Subject S4, who showed equivalence responding in the presence of LAMBEG DRUM (i.e., selecting Brendan Doherty), all subjects consistently chose the novel Protestant name in the presence of each sample stimulus (upper panels). This Protestant-Protestant link also appeared when three novel names were used as comparison stimuli (lower panels). The one Protestant-Catholic link which appeared for S4 did not transfer to the generalization test.

Of the five N. Irish Catholics classified as "FAIL" all but S8 showed a strong tendency to choose the novel Protestant name (William Smith) in the presence of LAMBEG DRUM (Figure 2, upper panels). The failure to show equivalence responding was more consistent across subjects during the other two sample stimuli. The lower panels of Figure 2 show a similar generalized Protestant-Catholic link for S8 in the presence of LAMBEG DRUM to that found for S4. Apart from this, Protestant-Protestant links were generally found to be the case for all subjects.

Figure 3 (top panels) shows the equivalence responding for N. Irish Catholics classified as "PASS." The relative incidence of choosing the expected Catholic name was very high for all subjects during all samples, except for S14 and S15 in the presence of UNION JACK. The lower panels of Figure 3 show a greater variety of responses than that seen in the previous two figures. Only one subject (S17) consistently preferred Protestant-Protestant links during all sample stimuli. The other subjects often distributed their responses across all three names.

Figure 4 shows the results for English Protestant subjects classified as "PASS." Equivalence responding predominated for all subjects during the three sample stimuli (upper panels). When novel comparison stimuli were used subjects generally failed to respond consistently.

Discussion

The five main findings in the present study were:

1. Six Northern Irish Protestants and five Northern Irish Catholics tended to choose a Protestant name in the presence of a Protestant symbol, thereby failing to respond in accordance with expected equivalence relations. The fact that these subjects made Protestant-Protestant links indicates that equivalence did not merely fail to emerge. Rather, this finding suggests that the use of previously trained social stimuli might have suppressed
equivalence responding.

2. All five English subjects and seven Northern Irish Catholic subjects chose the Catholic names, related through symmetry and transitivity, to Protestant symbols, thereby suggesting equivalence class formation.

3. Those Northern Irish Protestants and Catholics who failed the equivalence tests reliably chose Protestant names in the presence of Protestant symbols during the generalization test.

4. All English subjects and those Northern Irish Catholics who passed the equivalence test tended to show a higher degree of variability, compared to the fail groups, in their choices during the generalization test.

5. Those Northern Irish subjects who volunteered verbal reports indicated that they saw the appropriate symbols and names as either Protestant or Catholic. The English subjects, however, failed to identify any of the symbols or names as either Protestant or Catholic.

One criticism of the current study might be that the standard equivalence test was not employed. The standard procedure for testing for equivalence would involve presenting the three stimuli used as samples during Stage 1 training (i.e., Brendan Doherty, Seamus Quinn, and Patrick O'Hagan) as comparisons during the combined test for symmetry and transitivity. Thus, it could be argued that subjects might have been responding during the test on the basis of stimuli used during Stage 1 training versus stimuli not used during Stage 1 training. However, comparison, of English subjects' data with that of Northern Irish fails, suggests that subjects' preexperimental classes are reflected in performance in the experimental setting if the stimuli used in the experiment are members of those preexperimental classes. Moreover, S4 (Protestant Northern Irish fail) responded equivalently (i.e., 80%) during test presentations of Lambeg drum with Brendan Doherty and subsequently asked at the end of the experiment "What is a Lambeg drum?" This finding supports the idea that at least some Northern Irish subjects were not responding solely to novel stimuli, but on the basis of the preexperimentally established relationships between Catholic and Protestant names and Protestant symbols.

Within the context of the literature on stimulus equivalence, these findings represent a major departure from what has usually been observed. In those reported cases where equivalence responding has most often failed to emerge, the subjects have been either nonhumans (Sidman, Rauzin, Lazar, Cunningham, Tailby, & Carrigan, 1982) or language-disabled humans (Devany, Hayes, & Nelson, 1986). In the present study, however, we have demonstrated that previously established behavioral relations might interfere with the emergence of equivalence in language-able, adult humans. This is perhaps a new direction for the study of the equivalence phenomenon. For example, considerable attention has been paid to the identification of the general level of linguistic competence required for the emergence of stimulus equivalence (e.g., Dugdale & Lowe, in press; McIntire, Cleary, & Thompson, 1987). In the light of the present findings, however, it would appear that even verbally advanced, university undergraduates, from a particular social context, can fail to show equivalence responding with socially loaded stimuli. This finding highlights
the importance of always ensuring that reference to both the past and present contexts are incorporated into the experimental analysis of behavior (see, Barnes, 1989; Barnes & Keenan, 1989).

A Relational Control Interpretation

At a purely descriptive level, the present study suggests that the employment of socially trained stimuli might suppress the emergence of equivalence responding in the experimental context. At a more theoretical level, however, the present procedures and results might be relevant to a recent interpretation of stimulus equivalence in terms of relational control (for a detailed discussion of this, and other interpretations of the equivalence phenomenon, see Hayes, in press).

There are two central tenets to Hayes' relational control theory. Firstly, responding can be brought to bear on any set of relate, regardless of the physical properties of the relate involved. Secondly, equivalence is the outcome of a particular history. It is a relational network formed by arbitrarily applicable relational responding within the context of the relational frame of "sameness" or "coordination." Steele (1987) has systematically analyzed the independent roles of the relational frames of coordination, oppositeness, and distinction in the control of human behavior on a matching-to-sample task. Specifically, Steele pretrained an experimental group of subjects to relate "same" stimuli (e.g., a long line with a long line) in the presence of one contextual cue, "opposite" stimuli (e.g., a short line with a long line) in the presence of a second contextual cue, and "distinct" stimuli (e.g., a line with a square) in the presence of a third contextual cue. Following this pretraining, subjects were trained in an extensive network of conditional discriminations. Each conditional discrimination was made in the presence of one of the three contextual cues employed during pretraining. During testing three different kinds of performance emerged, each of which corresponded perfectly to the three relational frames of coordination, oppositeness, and distinction. A control group of subjects who did not receive the pretraining produced patterns of responding which were very different from those of the experimental group.

Within the social context of the Northern Irish conflict, the Protestant and Catholic stimuli used here may have been seen by Northern Irish subjects as opposites, whereas the neutral name may have been seen as distinct. Presumably, English subjects did not respond in this way to these stimuli. The anecdotal verbal reports obtained from some of the subjects certainly support this suggestion. On the basis of prior social training, therefore, Northern Irish subjects who failed might have been responding in accordance with the relational frame of coordination (i.e., Protestant symbols with Protestant names), and those Northern Irish subjects who passed, might have been responding in accordance with the relational frame of oppositeness (i.e., Protestant symbols with Catholic names). Although the English subjects would have been responding in accordance with coordination, this would have been on the basis of the experimental training only.
If the preceding analysis is correct, then one might expect three specific outcomes during the generalization test:

1. Those Northern Irish subjects who failed should choose novel Protestant names in the presence of Protestant symbols.
2. Those Northern Irish subjects who passed should choose novel Catholic names in the presence of Protestant symbols.
3. English subjects should respond inconsistently in the presence of novel Catholic and Protestant names.

Predictions 1 and 3 were upheld. The Northern Irish subjects who passed, however, tended to respond inconsistently during the generalization test.

The unexpected outcome in terms of Prediction 2 might have arisen because the relational frame of oppositeness had been brought to bear through equivalence relations (i.e., via a nonsense syllable) with only three different stimulus sets. This is in marked contrast to the large number of explicitly trained oppositeness, coordination, and distinction pretraining trials employed by Steele (1987). Perhaps if Steele's pretraining procedure was employed using Catholic and Protestant names, oppositeness responding might generalize to novel Catholic and Protestant stimuli for Northern Irish subjects.

The highly consistent Protestant-Protestant relations, made during the equivalence and generalization tests by those Northern Irish subjects who failed, should alert us to the possibility that relational responding in terms of coordination could be of a greater strength for these subjects than responding in accordance with oppositeness. If this were a general phenomenon, then the Northern Irish subjects who passed should have responded in accordance with the relational frame of coordination during the generalization test. The fact that this was not the case suggests that a history of oppositeness responding might have interfered with coordination.

In summary, it should be noted that the present study was not designed to test the relational control theory of stimulus equivalence. Nevertheless, viewing the current data from the relational control perspective provides us with a sound conceptual foundation for the identification and manipulation of the types of experimental history responsible for categorizing people into various social groups.

Ethical Concerns in Attitude Measurement

The measurement of attitudes in Northern Ireland is a difficult and often frustrated endeavor. Reluctance (particularly from adults) to express attitudes towards sectarian issues has been widely observed (cf. Cairns, 1987). Such difficulties are compounded by ethical problems that arise when the application of traditional "direct" test measures to children is considered. Researchers fear introducing naive children to the violent aspects of their culture. Consequently, the development of
social identities in Northern Ireland is a neglected area of research.

Some researchers, however, have developed covert nondirective means of measuring Northern Irish peoples' sensitivity to the arrangement of stimuli drawn from their social environment. These procedures rely consistently on the fact that these stimuli are already trained. This effectively leaves the researcher with little or no access to the learning processes involved in the production of individual results.

In the interests of providing greater access there is a need for a procedure that is both sensitive to the existent social categorization and which allows for control over learning processes within the experimental context. Results from the current study suggest that the present procedures may provide experimental techniques that are ideal for this purpose.

Conclusion

The design of the current study may be regarded as in some way arbitrary. For example, there are many possible permutations for presenting stimuli during test phases (e.g., mixed or blocked trials). Despite this, the novelty of the procedures outlined here are attractive for two central reasons. Firstly, the theoretical perspective and empirical findings in the area of stimulus equivalence and relational control theory may provide the social scientist with a laboratory analogue of social categorization in which a subject's history of relational responding can be controlled. Secondly, the general procedure is infinitely flexible in that socially relevant stimuli can be presented in written, pictorial, or verbal forms. Furthermore, the procedure is sufficiently covert to obviate any problems of an ethical nature.

DIAGRAM: Table 1. Matching-to-Sample Training

DIAGRAM: Table 2. Test Stimulus Presentations

GRAPHS: Figure 1. The number of times each comparison stimulus was selected in the presence of each sample stimulus for Subjects S1-S6. Percentage values shown at the bottom of the figure indicate the percentage efficiency obtained for each subject on the concurrently presented training stimuli. Top panels: The number of responses to the comparison stimuli during the combined test of symmetry and transitivity. These stimuli are presented below the corresponding sample stimuli shown in brackets. Bottom panels: The number of responses to the three novel comparison stimuli which were presented below the sample stimuli shown in brackets above.

GRAPHS: Figure 2. The number of times each comparison stimulus was selected in the presence of each sample stimulus for Subjects S7-S11. Percentage values shown at the bottom of the figure indicate the percentage efficiency obtained for each subject on the concurrently presented training stimuli. Top panels: The number of responses to the comparison stimuli during the combined test of symmetry and transitivity. These stimuli are presented below the corresponding sample stimuli
shown in brackets. Bottom panels: The number of responses to the three novel comparison stimuli which were presented below the sample stimuli shown in brackets above.

**GRAPHS:** Figure 3. The number of times each comparison stimulus was selected in the presence of each sample stimulus for Subjects S12-S18. Percentage values shown at the bottom of the figure indicate the percentage efficiency obtained for each on the concurrently presented training stimuli. Top panels: The number of responses to the comparison stimuli during the combined test of symmetry and transitivity. These stimuli are presented below the corresponding sample stimuli shown in brackets. Bottom panels: The number of responses to the three novel comparison stimuli which were presented below the sample stimuli shown in brackets above.

**GRAPHS:** Figure 4. The number of times each comparison stimulus was selected in the presence of each sample stimulus for Subjects S19-S23. Percentage values shown at the bottom of the figure indicated the percentage efficiency obtained for each subject on the concurrently presented training stimuli. Top panels: The number of responses to the comparison stimuli during the combined test of symmetry and transitivity. These stimuli are presented below the corresponding sample stimuli shown in brackets. Bottom panels: The number of responses to the three novel comparison stimuli which were presented below the sample stimuli shown in brackets above.
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Appendix

The conflict in Northern Ireland is roughly 300 years old. However, this conflict has not always been characterized by intergroup violence. Rather, its long history is typically punctuated with intense short periods of "blood-letting." The current "round of the troubles" is proving to be an exception to this general pattern. It can be seen to have begun in 1969 with the movement of British troops onto the streets of Northern Ireland (this can be credibly contested, however this event is a convenient landmark).

We have seen the twentieth anniversary of the troubles come and go. More than 2,600 deaths can be directly attributed to this conflict, and there is still no sign of its termination by any means, be they political, economic, social, or military. All sides appear to have their heels as firmly dug in as ever, and any political moves aimed at reconciliation seem to stimulate yet more sectarian posturing.

One of the most visible aspects of the divide in Northern Ireland is the way in which people readily align themselves with the symbols and trappings of various "political" organizations and "religious/political" orders. The "Orange Order" is a widely recognized Protestant example of the latter, and therefore was included in the current study as a Protestant symbol.

The people of Northern Ireland rally to physical emblems, particularly at times of heightened sectarian awareness. The Union Jack (the national flag of the United Kingdom) functions as such for the Protestant community, and the Tricolour (the national flag of the Republic of Ireland) functions in much the same way for the Catholic (Nationalist) community. Both of these stimuli function as highly pertinent
stimuli in the Catholic-Protestant divide, so much so, that one can tell which group predominates in an area by the color of the curbstones on their streets (i.e., red, white, and blue in Protestant areas; and green, white, and gold in Catholic areas). For this reason Union Jack was used as a Protestant symbol in the current study.

Finally, the Lambeg Drum is probably virtually unknown outside of Northern Ireland. A Lambeg Drum is an enlarged version of a bass drum which is played with a hard stick and is almost always unveiled for and played on special occasions, such as "The glorious Twelfth" of July. This day is regarded as the central day of the Protestant marching season and is celebrated to commemorate the defeat of the Catholic forces of James II by the Protestant forces of William III, at the battle of the Boyne in 1690. The drum is derived from a battle drum which served both to coordinate troops in the field and to intimidate opposition.

Those who may want to know more about the Northern Irish situation are referred to Beckett (1981), Connolly (1983), Downing (1980), Foster (1988), Kee (1982), and Lyons (1971).

This research was supported by a grant awarded to M. Keenan and E. Cairns by the Garfield Weston Trust. Contributions from Andrew Watt were in partial fulfillment of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Ulster, at Coleraine. Requests for reprints should be sent to any author of this article, Department of Psychology, University of Ulster, Coleraine, County Derry, N. Ireland, BT52 1SA.

~~~~~~~~

By ANDREW WATT, MICHAEL KEENAN, DERMOT BARNES, and ED CAIRNS University of Ulster at Coleraine

Item Number: 1991-17495-001