

“I feel I should put that work in”: Discourses of effortfulness and essentialism among post-Brexit applicants for Irish citizenship

Marc Scully 

Department of Psychology, Faculty of Arts,
Mary Immaculate College, Limerick, Ireland

Correspondence

Marc Scully, Department of Psychology,
Faculty of Arts, Mary Immaculate College,
South Circular Road, Limerick V94 VN26,
Ireland.

Email: marc.scully@mic.ul.ie

Funding information

Mary Immaculate College Research &
Graduate School, Grant/Award Number:
SF18-12

Abstract

This article explores the post-Brexit increase in applications for Irish passports through descent, and in so doing, seeks to develop a social/political psychology of diasporic citizenship. It draws on a focus group and 10 individual interviews, all conducted in 2018–19; participants were all based in England and had applied, or were in the process of applying, for Irish passports through descent in the aftermath of Brexit. Analysis, using perspectives from discursive psychology, attended to both rhetoric and narratives of citizenship in participants' talk about the application process and identification with Ireland and Irishness. Participants draw on discourses of both effortfulness and essentialism in working up claims to Irish identity, with effortfulness in acquiring transnational knowledge being particularly central in rhetorically legitimizing less secure claims. The analysis thus builds on previous political psychological work highlighting the centrality of “effortfulness” to contemporary constructions of citizenship, particularly in the United Kingdom (Anderson & Gibson, 2020; Gibson, 2009). It is furthermore suggested that explicitly labeled “noneffortfulness” can act as a rhetorical marker of belonging. The implications of these findings for concepts of diasporic citizenship and debates around *jus soli* versus *jus sanguinis* citizenship in both Ireland and Britain are discussed.

KEY WORDS

Brexit, citizenship, diaspora, effortfulness, passport applications, transnationalism

This is an open access article under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/) License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

© 2024 The Author(s). *Political Psychology* published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of International Society of Political Psychology.

THE SOCIAL AND POLITICAL PSYCHOLOGY OF CITIZENSHIP

Much recent social and political psychological literature on citizenship starts from the perspective of exploring the tension between those whose citizenship of a given polity is taken as relatively unproblematic, and those whose access to that citizenship, in a normative as well as a legal sense, is rendered contingent. Condor (2011) divides social-scientific debates around citizenship concepts into four broad areas: boundaries, dimensions, models and membership. Of these, *membership*, that is, the “criteria used to determine membership of a particular citizenship community and/or the bases upon which individuals may claim legal protection or civic or political entitlements” (p. 195) has been a prominent feature of this new wave of social-psychological research on citizenship, particularly in relation to migration. (See Xenitidou & Sapountzis, 2018, for an overview). Such studies can be divided into investigations of citizenship-related dialogue *about* migrants as members or not, of a polity (e.g., Gibson & Hamilton, 2011; Gibson et al., 2018; Kadianaki et al., 2018), investigations of migrants' *own* accounts of negotiating access and membership (e.g., Andreouli & Howarth, 2013; Ellis & Bhatia, 2019), or combinations of both (e.g., Stevenson & Sagherian-Dickey, 2018).

What such studies have in common is focusing on how migrants and nonmigrants negotiate membership of a polity to which people have differential access depending on the contingency of their citizenship: usually that of the nation-state (Andreouli, 2019). However, as per Condor's (2011) formulation, debates over *boundaries* may also encompass questions over transnational and postnational citizenship, and whether the boundaries of citizenship can be equated to those of the nation-state (p. 194). To this may be added the phenomenon of *diasporic* citizenship—where migrants and their descendants retain the legal citizenship of a nation-state and some form of relationship/membership to it as a polity, but outside the physical boundaries of that nation-state. This article will argue that many of the discourses identified, and concepts developed, in the social and political psychological study of citizenship as it pertains to the nation-state may also be applied to diasporic citizenship. In so doing, it will provide a new understanding of how membership and belonging is negotiated. Erdal et al. (2018) have usefully described the myriad interrelationships between the various contexts in which citizenship is made to matter, or not, as the citizenship-belonging nexus: This article argues that this nexus should be taken as referring to diaspora, as well as migration. In so doing, the article seeks to act as a corrective to the tendency in political psychology (the field), and Political Psychology (the journal), to conceptualize migration predominantly as a matter of “arrival” (normally of poorer people into wealthy, Western states) rather than “departure” (Green & Staerklé, 2023). Such an imbalance leads to an assumption that discourses of membership and belonging that may shape, and are shaped, by the actions and policies of state actors refer solely to immigrants within the borders of the nation-state, and not to those who may have emigrated from the nation-state and their descendants. That such assumptions are perpetuated by the lack of empirical attention that social and political psychology has paid to diasporic and transnational identifications has been highlighted by Verkuyten (2018) among others. To enquire after the diasporic citizen, therefore, is to expand the boundaries of the political psychological literature on migration and citizenship, in order to more fully understand the multiplicity of global identities, and how these are intertwined with each other, and with citizenships (Gleibs & Reddy, 2017).

TOWARDS A PSYCHOLOGY OF DIASPORIC CITIZENSHIP

The “diaspora turn” in policy among “sending states” has included greater facilitation of the preservation of, or access to, citizenship for emigrants and/or their descendants (Gamlen, 2008;

Ragazzi, 2014). The rights and responsibilities associated with such overseas citizenship are highly variable, as is the relationship between *jus soli* and *jus sanguinis* access to citizenship vis-à-vis emigrants (and their descendants) and immigrants (and their descendants) in such states. Nonetheless, this is an area of expansion in transnational governance, with a clear trend in the late twentieth and early twenty-first centuries towards greater tolerance and facilitation of dual citizenship on the part of nation-states (Harpaz & Mateos, 2019; Sejersen, 2008). Diasporic citizenship may overlap with dual citizenship but is marked out from it by two factors: (1) that citizenship of the nonnatal or resident country has come through descent, rather than by some other means, and (2) that in common with other forms of diasporic identification, it represents some form of psychological attachment to the original “homeland.”

Much of the existing literature, whether on dual or diasporic citizenship, highlights the pragmatic, instrumental nature of such citizenship (Joppke, 2019). Some passports are more powerful and covetable than others in conferring various rights upon the holder, particularly mobility rights (Spiro, 2019). This is a prominent feature of citizenship of member states of the European Union, which allows individuals to work and travel throughout the bloc. EU “passport citizenship” has been explored by Harpaz (2013) in the case of Israeli descendants of emigrants from Central and Eastern European states and Mateos (2019) among Mexicans of European descent. The latter case in particular highlights the occasional intersection between diasporic citizenship and histories of colonialism: The entitlement of a certain stratum of “Euro-Mexicans” to citizenship of EU countries through descent is the legacy of “pro-White” immigration policies promoted by a pro-European political elite in late nineteenth and early twentieth-century Mexico. Conversely, encouraging diasporic citizenship is increasingly used as a political strategy by postcolonial states, although again emigrant groups living in wealthy countries in the Global North tend to be preferred and in some cases recruited, as diasporic citizens (Dickinson, 2019; Schramm, 2020).

The majority of the broader social scientific literature has focused on the strategic nature of diasporic citizenship with the more affective nature of diasporic citizenship, as a means of maintaining psychological identification with the “homeland,” only occasionally invoked as an aspect of the relationship between the nation-state and the diasporic citizen. Naujoks (2017) highlights the “perpetuation function” of India’s specific form of diasporic citizenship in allowing those of Indian descent public and state-sanctioned recognition of their Indian identities. Similarly, Schramm (2020) emphasizes the importance of “soul” and the strong psychological sense of African identity among Ghanaian diasporic citizens. More thoroughly exploring the attitudes, emotions, and identities of diasporic citizens, however, requires bringing a political psychological perspective to bear. How might political psychological findings on discourses of citizenship as they are applied to, and taken up by immigrants, also shape understandings of what it means to be a diasporic citizen?

EUROPEAN DIASPORIC CITIZENSHIP AFTER BREXIT

In order to explore this and the intersections of instrumental and affective aspects of diasporic citizenship, we may take discourses of European citizenship in the United Kingdom in the immediate aftermath of the “Brexit” referendum as a case study. Brexit has been described as representing a point of emergence, where new identities with affective politics are in the process of creation (Andreouli et al., 2019). It may also be represented as an occasion of rupture, where a structural change at the social and political level has psychological implications at the individual level, particularly in relation to the individual’s life narrative, identifications, and imagined future (Awad, 2016). The efforts of segments of the population within Britain, as well as British citizens living abroad, to maintain European-ness in the context of the United Kingdom’s departure from the EU (Benson et al., 2022; Sredanovic & Della Puppa, 2023) may

therefore be conceptualized as attempts at ensuring continuity of identity, following the rupture that Brexit represents. However, where the strategy for so doing is through attempting to obtain the citizenship of another European country, this holds the potential of representing the creation of new emergent, hybridized identities.

The 2021 Census for England and Wales demonstrated a fivefold increase of UK-EU multiple passports held by UK-born residents since the previous census in 2011 (Fitch & Noble, 2023). Of particular note has been the sharp increase in applications for Irish passports from those living in Great Britain in the aftermath of the Brexit referendum result. While applications from Great Britain were relatively stable at the 40–45,000 level from 2012 to 2015, they increased to c. 63,000 in 2016, and further to 83,000 in 2017, and 98,000 in 2018, before peaking at 124,000 in 2019. This increase appears largely, although not entirely, attributable to an increase in applications for Irish passports from people of Irish descent living in Britain (Byrne, 2023).

A combination of relatively open access to citizenship through descent for the Irish diaspora and successive waves of Irish migration to Britain throughout the twentieth and early twenty-first century has resulted in an estimated 6 million people currently living in Britain being entitled to apply for Irish citizenship, and thus passports, should they so choose (Maybin, 2016). As provided for in legislation, those who at the time of their birth had one parent who was an Irish citizen born on the *island* of Ireland (i.e., inclusive of both the 26-county state and Northern Ireland) are automatically considered Irish citizens and are thus entitled to apply for an Irish passport. Meanwhile, those who have an Irish citizen parent born outside the island of Ireland or a grandparent born on the island of Ireland are entitled to apply for Irish citizenship through a process of Foreign Birth Registration. If successful, they may then apply for an Irish passport.

These qualifications of citizenship through descent are not noticeably more generous than those of the United Kingdom. Nonetheless, representations of this phenomenon in both British and Irish media and popular culture have framed this eligibility for Irish citizenship, often in a light-heartedly satirical tone (e.g., Shrimley, 2017), as a convenient loophole, particularly for those British citizens who wished to maintain access to free movement throughout the European Union. Wood and Gilmartin (2018) have drawn attention to the extensive coverage of high-profile figures applying for Irish passports for such reasons in British and Irish news media and refer to such narratives as examples of “pragmatic cosmopolitanism.”

The instinct within Britain to treat Irish citizenship as no more than a loophole is arguably emblematic of the lack of seriousness with which Irishness is conceptualized both within British politics and British social science (Hickman & Ryan, 2020). Within Irish commentary, a more pertinent comparison point has been the more restrictive access to citizenship for immigrants to Ireland, particularly since the 2004 referendum removing birth-right citizenship from the constitution (Wood & Gilmartin, 2018). The perceived relative ease through which members of the Irish diaspora can access Irish citizenship has regularly been juxtaposed with the plight of undocumented immigrants in Ireland in order to argue for increased citizenship rights for migrants to Ireland (e.g., Mullally, 2019). While such comparisons are undoubtedly pertinent, there is a tendency within them to caricature those applying for Irish passports as “Brits obtaining Irish passports for travel purposes”—such a characterization does not allow for, or enquire after, the potentially preexisting Irish identities of those of Irish descent in Britain and how these may have been brought into sharper focus by the Brexit process. In both spheres, therefore, there has been an overemphasis on pragmatism. While not denying that many of the initial motivations for applying for Irish citizenship may have been pragmatic, Brexit's status as a point of both rupture and emergence emphasizes the importance of focusing on the psychological affordances of such applications. At the same time, however, Brexit does not represent a Year Zero for Irish identity in Britain—those reassessing or newly articulating their Irishness do so in the context of the histories of how Irishness in Britain has previously been articulated and claimed.

IRISH DIASPORIC IDENTITIES IN BRITAIN

The various rhetorical justifications that can be invoked in claiming an Irish passport reflect both the heterogeneous experiences of those of Irish descent in Britain and also the broader discursive context within which Irish identities in Britain are recognized as legitimate or not. Hickman et al. (2005) argue that the identifications and positionings of second-generation Irish people in England occur at the intersection of two hegemonic domains—England and Ireland. The English domain is incorporating, denying the “difference” of Irishness, whereas the Irish domain is differentiating, denying commonalities with those of Irish descent. Discourses associated with both domains position the Irish identities of those of Irish descent in England as inauthentic. Applying this to the passports issue in England in particular, we can see how the incorporating domain of England might lead to Irish citizenship being viewed as a quirky loophole, that most English people ought to be able to avail of with a little creative thinking, as opposed to citizenship of a legally distinct nation-state with its own set of rights and responsibilities. The differentiating domain of Ireland, on the other hand, refers to “English/British people with Irish passports” without fully considering the spectrum of hybridized identities and transnational allegiances that have arisen in diaspora.

Research on those of Irish descent in Britain, and more particularly in England, has explored the ways in which such individuals negotiate their unique subject positions and identities and the rhetorical constraints in which they do so (Campbell, 1999; Hannafin, 2016; Leonard, 2005; Mac an Ghaill & Haywood, 2003). Such preexisting identities have occasionally been noted in both media and academic commentary on the phenomenon of the post-Brexit Irish passport application. Alongside “pragmatic cosmopolitans,” Wood and Gilmartin (2018) note representations of “ethnic apologists”: Such figures justify their actions in applying for Irish passports through highlighting long-standing family associations and identification with Ireland. This in turn may exacerbate issues of contestation among those of Irish descent in Britain as to who gets to represent themselves as “authentically” Irish (Scully, 2012). Lear (2020) argues that the relatively recent engagement with Irish identity among some of those now applying for Irish citizenship has led to some differentiation among those of Irish descent, which she refers to as a distinction between self-identified “Plastic Paddies” and “Passport Paddies.”

For many of those of Irish descent in England, their Irish identity is derived from family, community, and regularly through transnational links with specific locations in Ireland, but rarely through an official engagement with the Irish nation-state (Walter et al., 2002). This is in turn complicated by the partition of Ireland: Descendants of migrants from Northern Ireland, whether Nationalist, Unionist, or neither, are in the unusual position of being in a position to claim the citizenship of a state that neither they *nor* their ancestors have ever lived in (Devlin Trew, 2018). In general, there seems to be something of a reluctance among those of Irish descent to “officially” identify as Irish in encounters with the state, regardless of whether Ireland or the United Kingdom is the state in question. To this has also been attributed the relatively low numbers of people choosing the “White Irish” ethnic option in the census for England and Wales (Hickman, 2011). While applying for an Irish passport entails overcoming this reluctance to a degree, there is evidence that it may persist in relation to claiming certain citizenship rights beyond the right to travel. For instance, Barry Brown's (2023) research among applicants for Irish passports through descent highlights a strong taboo among this cohort against claiming voting rights while living outside Ireland.

SITUATING IDENTITIES WITHIN DISCOURSES OF CITIZENSHIP

This article seeks to develop the insights derived from the field of the social psychology of citizenship in a discursive analysis of how people of Irish descent are claiming Irish citizenship—not just legally, but rhetorically. It builds on previous work addressing how social actors construct “competent membership in a polity” as a basis for citizenship, particularly in relation to migration (Gibson & Hamilton, 2011; Gibson et al., 2018; Isin & Wood, 1999).

Debates over who should be entitled to access draw on rhetoric that is both historical and contemporary (Condor, 2006). Where the past is invoked in arguments for restricting access to citizenship, this is generally done in essentialist *jus sanguinis* terms, arguing for a blood connection between present-day citizens and their ancestors who were the “original” inhabitants of the nation (Kadianaki & Andreouli, 2017). However, as Wood and Gilmartin (2018) highlight, such essentialist “bloodline” claims on citizenship are also made by those who are entitled to citizenship through descent—an argument likely to develop further due to the increasing phenomenon of claiming diasporic citizenship through DNA testing (Schramm, 2020). As argued by Verkuyten (2003) and Figgou (2013), discourses of essentialism and deessentialism are available as rhetorical resources to speakers when constructing group categories, whether they are members of the said group, or not, or whether their membership is contingent. The rhetorical use of discourses of essentialism also does not necessarily imply a positive or negative evaluation of the group: Rather, their usage should be seen in both the immediate and broader argumentative context in terms of the sociopolitical functions they serve (Kadianaki & Andreouli, 2017). The analysis in this article corresponds to this tradition of discursive research on essentialism; however, it is worth noting that given the focus on “bloodline” citizenship through descent, I have concentrated on discourses of “biological” essentialism that have an embodied aspect.

Access to citizenship can also be rhetorically asserted or granted through *effort*: a perception of having worked at being a competent citizen who therefore is deserving of polity membership. The concept of the “effortful citizen” illustrates how citizenship rights are discursively constructed as contingent on some form of effortful labor on the part of the individual citizen (Anderson & Gibson, 2020; Gibson, 2009). This is particularly likely to be applied to those positioned as members of collectively constructed outgroups: in Gibson's original example, welfare recipients. The concept has subsequently been applied to immigrants in a British context by Andreouli and Dashtipour (2014), for whom it illustrates the theme of conditionality in constructions of British citizenship. “Earning” citizenship is constructed in terms of both economic and moral duties: The immigrant who has “earned” their citizenship both “gives back” to British society and displays suitable pride and gratitude in having “become” British. These strands are tied together in Gibson et al. (2018), which explores rhetorical linkages between immigration and entitlement to welfare in online discussions of EU immigration to Britain. Both pro-immigration and anti-immigration arguments invoked “effortfulness” as a means of casting immigrants as either deserving or undeserving members of a polity.

While the majority of such analyses rest on discourses *about* immigrants, the claims to membership *of* immigrants, particularly in Britain, also draw on understandings of effortfulness. For instance, the strategy of “defensive assertiveness” (McGhee et al., 2019) articulated by Polish migrants in Britain often rests on a collective self-image as “hard-working”—that economic participation and contribution to British society entitles them to a stake and a say in that society. Similar self-positionings as “useful citizens,” and therefore “deserving to belong,” can be found in Fathi's (2015) research on Iranian women doctors in Britain. Furthermore, Monforte et al. (2019) in interviewing migrants preparing to take the “Life in the United Kingdom” test found that the test was positioned as part of the process of proving that one was deserving of citizenship—in other words, demonstrating their worthiness of inclusion as a

competent member of the polity, while also implicitly excluding others either unwilling to put in the effort, or who do not possess the cultural capital required to pass the test.

The purpose of this article therefore is to explore how British-born applicants for Irish citizenship through descent work up justifications for their entitlement to an Irish passport, and in particular how they draw on discourses of essentialism and effortfulness in so doing. This in turn allows for a political psychological understanding of the meaning making around diasporic citizenship in a post-Brexit context.

METHODOLOGY

Ethical permission for this research was obtained from the author's institutional ethics committee. The target population for this research were people of Irish descent living in Britain who were eligible for Irish citizenship through descent, and had applied, or were in the process of applying for an Irish passport in the context of Brexit. Purposive sampling was therefore employed. Initial recruitment stemmed from a short article written by the author for *Irish Times Abroad*, a section of the Irish Times website aimed at the Irish abroad. Published in early May 2018, the article commented on the phenomenon of the rise in demand for Irish passports among those of Irish descent in Britain, and it finished with a general appeal for readers to get in contact via email if they were happy to discuss their own application process. The article was widely viewed and shared on social media, and as a consequence, 96 people made contact with me, from whom subsequent participants in the focus group and interview stages of data collection were drawn. It should be noted that responding to such an article likely indicates a relatively high level of engagement with contemporary Ireland and Irish media, and as such, no claims to representativeness are made from this cohort to the wider population of those of Irish descent in Britain, whether or not they have applied for Irish citizenship.

The data under analysis in this article is drawn from a focus group with 11 participants, which was held in the Irish Cultural Centre in Hammersmith in July 2018, and 10 phone interviews with individual participants which were held over the course of the summer of 2019. The participants in the focus group were distinct from those in the interviews. Relevant characteristics of those participating in the focus groups and interviews are outlined in Appendix S1 available in the online supporting information: All names employed are pseudonyms.

A similar schedule of questions was used to facilitate both the initial focus group and the subsequent interviews, with prompt questions coming under three headings: "Connections with Ireland and Irishness," "Getting a Passport," and "Using the Passport." The full schedule of questions can be found in Appendix S2 in the online supporting information.

As both the copresent facilitator of the focus group, and as the phone interviewer, how participants oriented towards me as both "assumed insider" and "assumed outsider" will have shaped their responses (Ryan, 2015). I am male and was in my mid-to-late 30s at the time of the research. Perhaps more relevantly, I have an accent that is audibly from the southern region of Ireland: The dynamics in interviews between Irish-born researchers and participants of Irish descent, and how they may shape what identity claims are made, are discussed further in Scully (2015).

My analytical approach attends to both rhetoric and narrative in discourses of citizenship among those of Irish descent, hence drawing on both interview and focus-group data. In common with the critical discursive social psychological approach to citizenship suggested by Anderson and Gibson (2020), I focus on negotiations of meaning of citizenship, belonging, and deservingness that are taken up and played out within a specific political context. However, I also attend to how understandings of what it means to claim membership of a polity may change and develop both as the political situation changes and over the course of changes in individual lives. As well as being in dialogue with anticipated disagreements and

counter-arguments (Billig, 1987), speakers may be taken as in dialogue with previous versions of themselves, previous identity claims (Taylor & Littleton, 2006), and also with imagined future selves (Taylor, 2010).

Within the context of this research, therefore, speakers' claims on Irish citizenship are rhetorically arranged around anticipated dismissals of such claims and are situated within the contemporary context of current public and political discourses of what it is to be a citizen, as well as being temporally situated within the collective experience of Irish people in Britain and the speaker's own relationship to this experience, past, present, and imagined future.

While my analysis was inherently iterative, it can be roughly divided into three phases, with the first being a familiarization process, using *NVIVO 12 Plus* for initial coding. Initial coding was relatively broad and attempted to capture the main topic under discussion in the interview or focus group at any given time. Coding was reflexive, with codes being edited and updated to reflect my evolving understanding of the data in relation to the research question (Braun & Clarke, 2021). In the second phase, I attended to speaker's orientations towards Irishness, Britishness, and/or Europeanness, and how they constructed and co-constructed meanings of citizenship. Co-constructions here may have occurred between participants in the focus group or between participants and me as the interviewer. Concretely, this involved attending to self-categorizations as Irish, or British, or European, alongside the meanings associated with these categories. In the third phase, I examined the discursive devices employed by participants in "building up" or *qualifying* category entitlements (Potter, 1996) to Irish citizenship. This involved a more fine-grained analysis of the participants' talk, posing the question "how has the participant made their claim on Irish citizenship rhetorically defensible?" and attending to discursive devices, as compiled by Wiggins (2017) as a means of answering that question. In keeping with my dual focus on rhetoric and narrative, I situated this more fine-grain analysis within a consideration of the stories used by participants, and how they serve an identity function within the interaction, drawing on Taylor's (2010) narrative-discursive approach. From this approach, I adopt a definition of narrative as a sequential story, with temporal elements, that is recounted in order to make a point. Furthermore, for the purposes of focusing on participants' own identity work in relation to Irish citizenship, I have prioritized narratives where the participant situates themselves as the protagonist of or an actor within the story. I align with Taylor, and with Phoenix (2008) in arguing that the immediate context of the interviews and focus group is inextricably linked with wider social contexts and understandings: This allows for an analytical focus on narrative that highlights both how it serves an identity function within the interaction and also allows "considerations of how socio-cultural issues and dilemmas are evident in talk, even if they are not explicitly oriented to" (p. 68). Finally, for the sake of coherence, in presenting the data for the purposes of this article, I have concentrated on narratives where the passport itself is present as a distinct object of discussion. As such, the extracts presented below are largely taken from those phases of the interview/focus groups roughly labeled on the question schedule as "Getting a Passport," and to a lesser extent, "Using the Passport." I have not included here answers elicited in the earlier "Connections with Ireland and Irishness" phase of the interview/focus groups; however, it may be supposed that participants will have been motivated to maintain consistency with their self-presentations in the earlier portion of the interview.

Analysis

In the following extracts, I provide an analysis of how discourses of effortfulness are drawn upon by speakers in working up category entitlements to making claims to Irish citizenship, while recounting narratives relating to applying for and receiving a passport. I also highlight how such discourses may intersect with claim justifications that are more essentialist in nature.

These are not necessarily dichotomous discourses—rather they are available for participants to draw upon in order to establish and rhetorically justify their contingent self-positionings as Irish citizens (Figgou, 2013; Verkuyten, 2003).

Doing “effortfulness”

The differential level of access to Irish citizenship based on whether one's parent or grandparent was born in Ireland results in different processes towards obtaining citizenship and, as a result, different narratives of the application process. For “third generation” applicants, such narratives become part of their “working up” of somewhat hesitant, contingent claims to Irish identity as well as to Irish citizenship. Extract 1 below details the application narrative of Miriam, whose claim to Irish citizenship arises from an Irish grandmother:

Extract 1:

Marc: Yea, so then the, ah, the process of you applying for the passport. Can you bring me through that?

Miriam: Yea, so, I remember kind of looking online and being quite overwhelmed to begin with, there was lots of certificates that you needed and am, to prove these kind of connections, and that felt quite overwhelming to begin with. But then I sort of talked to my dad and it took probably about 6 months or so to kind of get everything together. He, he had all the certificates that we needed from the family so, I remember really clearly, and I was really emotional getting my granny's birth certificate particularly from like (.) 1900s in kind of [town in Co.Tyrone], was it, or somewhere? And then their marriage certificate, my grandparents' marriage certificate, my granny's death certificate, my dad's birth certificate, my parents' marriage certificate, my birth certificate, a copy of my passport, just like all these things that you needed, you had to sign the copies so I could keep my passport but that could go off, and then witness the four certificates, so I remember it took a lot of determination to get these things together, and also I'm one of four, so we all obviously have a kind of claim, but because you need to send off the originals you could only get one at a time, so I was kind of the most determined and kind of I'm also the eldest, just, because I've got a twin brother, **[Marc: ok]** there's two of us, so I was like, right I'm kind of staking my claim as the eldest. **[Marc: hahaha]** but yeah I also felt quite guilty about that and, my brother, had obviously being engaged to an Irish woman, was like, “I want to do this too!”

Miriam presents an ordered, progressive narrative towards the valued endpoint (Gergen, 2001) of Irish citizenship. Her precision in detailing and listing the documentation necessary for her application is functional in adding credibility to her narrative, and by extension her category entitlement as a genuine applicant (Potter, 1996; Wiggins, 2017). Effortfulness is central to the narrative: Although the task initially seems overwhelming, with determination and support from family members, she successfully completes it. In common with other participants, narratives of the bureaucratic process of obtaining documents are interwoven with family narratives and reflections on her position within the family. Miriam represents the documents required not necessarily in the order in which she acquired them, but in intergenerational chronological order: grandparents to parents to self. What could be a relatively dry recitation thereby becomes an *affective* narrative: Miriam makes her emotional reaction to the documents central to her story. Investing family documents with emotional significance

is not atypical of genealogical narratives (Moore et al., 2020). However, this is not simply a genealogical project of self-discovery, but one that is being undertaken at the behest of the Irish state. A comparison may be drawn to Monforte et al.'s (2019) analysis of the naturalization process in the United Kingdom, where administrative hurdles and bureaucratic complexities are represented as a rite of passage that applicants need to prove they can negotiate in order to be able to demonstrate that they are deserving of citizenship. This representation is taken up by applicants themselves who argue that demonstrating their effort and work in engaging with the process in good faith becomes proof of their commitment to British society. In the above extract, Miriam has not just engaged in good faith with the process but has invested it with emotional significance: in particular, her grandmother's birth certificate which provides a link with the Irish origins of her family. Kadianaki and Andreouli (2017) have argued that invoking feelings can serve as a resource to support claims to citizenship: as a means of accentuating one's affective investment in the nation that is highly subjective and thus cannot be straightforwardly disproved. Here, I argue, it serves a psychological purpose in tying Miriam's bureaucratic narrative, her chronological family narrative, and her own narrative of beginning to "feel" Irish.

Interestingly, however, Miriam introduces a note of "trouble" to her family narrative (Taylor & Littleton, 2006) in setting up her and her twin brother's claim to be the first to obtain Irish citizenship as oppositional. While Miriam's claim rests on a form of primogeniture as well as her self-proclaimed determination, her brother is engaged to an Irish woman, arguably giving him a more "authentic" link with contemporary Ireland. That this should be seen as a potential source of identity trouble is underlined by Miriam's self-description as feeling guilty at preempting her brother's claim: Again the affective frame emphasizes that this is something of emotional value, and not just to Miriam. This is later resolved, as Miriam continues:

Extract 1 (cont.):

Miriam: but anyway I just remember getting the documents back and getting the certificate of registration of a foreign birth and sort of like, here's your Irish nationality, and it was really emotional. **[Marc:** yeah] I was just kind of, I felt really grateful I think am, and something quite powerful, sort of shifting and feeling sort of accepted ... and then it was really sweet because she, my brothers fiancée sent me a little, what was it? a little kind of card, with a shamrock on it, and it kind of saying like, y'know, you're Irish now, or welcome to the family kind of thing. Which was really sweet.

The resolution to Miriam's narrative allows the various strands of her story to be brought together, where, again, she uses emotion categories in describing the arrival of official documentation. Notably, Miriam describes her primary emotion on receiving the paperwork confirming her eligibility for Irish citizenship as gratitude: This has the effect of framing her citizenship as something of a gift from the Irish state, rather than her having claimed something to which she was entitled. This, in turn, has the effect of rendering her relationship with Ireland as an affective one, rather than being simply pragmatic. The "gift" framing of the narrative is accentuated by Miriam coupling the arrival of her official documentation with an actual gift from her brother's fiancée, underlining Miriam's new status as "an Irish person." This works to corroborate Miriam's claim to Irish citizenship and has the effect of casting her brother's fiancée as representative of the Irish people. (Again, encounters with and acceptance by Irish-born relatives are not uncommon in genealogical narratives; Nash, 2008). Thus, while the certificate of registration of a foreign birth is emblematic of acceptance by the Irish state, the card with a shamrock can be read as emblematic of acceptance by the Irish people. This "valued endpoint" to Miriam's narrative has the effect of resolving the trouble around potential questions of authenticity.

Miriam's narrative therefore highlights three key features that are common in other narratives of obtaining Irish citizenship through descent:

1. The central role of effortfulness in working up entitlement to Irish citizenship;
2. Gratitude towards the Irish state for the “gift” of citizenship, emphasizing the affective over the pragmatic;
3. Legitimation of one's entitlement to Irish identity is corroborated by the acceptance of Irish people whose “authenticity” is seen as being more secure.

These three features can be identified in other narratives of application, particularly among those of “third generation” applicants for Irish passports. The narrative below starts from the perspective of Colleen, whose claim to Irish citizenship is also through her grandmother, but who invoked her connection to contemporary Ireland through a friendship with two Irish-born women who she had met while living in Germany. She returns to this friendship when describing a moral dilemma around applying for Irish citizenship:

Extract 2:

Colleen: Coming in as a British person and taking a citizenship I'm not entirely entitled to kind of made me think about all of the history and yes, ok, it was generations ago, but there's still definite scars that I've seen in Ireland. And you know, British rule and all that. And so for me, it's a really big question of is it ok, to, I guess in modern terminology, am I culturally appropriating Irish [Marc: you know I was about to use that exact...yeah] citizenship [Marc: Yeah] And so I had a big conversation with my friends and one of them laughed because when she had to give a presentation to the Germans she actually used a photograph of me when describing Irish stereotypes [Marc:(laughs)] because I looked more Irish than either of them. If you're looking for traditional [Marc: Yes]. And I had a chat with them and was like what do you think? And they completely saw where I was coming from in terms of the European bit [Marc: Yeah] and didn't seem hugely bothered by the fact that I was, you know British, and all that British Irish, bla bla bla in history.

In common with previous work on the topic, historical narratives are invoked in constructions of what it means to be a “good” citizen. Colleen situates her own narrative within the broader historical narrative of British rule over Ireland: In initially positioning herself as a “British person,” she implicates herself in the “scars” caused by British rule in Ireland. In aligning herself, however hesitantly, with the historical colonizer rather than the colonized, Colleen is not necessarily implicating the actions of her ancestors but is rather constructing her contemporary British identity as politically problematic. This further underlines the complexity of the relationship between diasporic citizenship and histories of colonialism: It should perhaps be noted that Colleen's ambivalent position here might be reflected in that having raised the historical specter of British rule, and British-Irish conflict, she also seeks to minimize its contemporary relevance through deliberate vagueness. She refers to “British rule and all that” and “all that British Irish bla bla bla in history.” Nonetheless, claiming Irish citizenship, a claim that she uses hedging in describing, is a potential source of “identity trouble” in being potentially hearable as a form of “cultural appropriation.” In a similar vein to Miriam, this “trouble” is resolved through receiving “permission” from an Irish-born friend. Her narrative of bringing these concerns to her Irish friends initially presents one potential resolution—that of her physical appearance. Importantly, Colleen's presentation of herself as “looking more Irish than either of them” is presented as reported speech—that it is her Irish-born friends who

are describing her as looking like an Irish stereotype corroborates her claim to Irishness. This therefore is identity work that draws on both essentialism and effortfulness: An identity claim that is based on her physical appearance is inherently essentialist, but importantly, this is situated within a broader narrative of moral effort around the ethics of claiming an Irish identity. She expands on this aspect as the interview continues:

Extract 2 (cont.)

Colleen: But to me it was really something that I had to think about, because there is a culture that I've not grown up with ... And so I'm essentially getting a piece of paper which says I have a link to that culture, without actually having a link to that culture. **[Marc: Yeah]** But I think, having discussed it with them, as I know I said to you, I've since attempted to learn a bit of Irish, (*laughs*) and try a little bit. Not trying to be tokenistic but just because I guess I do have the honour being able to have that link so I want to at least explore it. **[Marc: Yeah]** So I know its value, if that makes sense.

Colleen takes a subject position as a moral actor in needing to take responsibility for educating herself about Irishness. Here, she is being an effortful citizen in representing herself as taking on something of a self-improvement project in learning Irish language and culture in order to address the deficit between being a citizen on paper and being an engaged citizen. (The importance of cultural knowledge and participation as a means of both inclusion and exclusion from discourses of entitlement to citizenship is also highlighted by Kadianaki and Andreouli, 2017). She uses a disclaimer to rhetorically anticipate suggestions that her engagement is tokenistic but rather reframes it, once again, in terms of gratitude for having the “honor” of a link through citizenship to this culture. Vaughan (2016) has highlighted how, for learners of Irish in the diaspora, the Irish language represents “an innate, essential part of being Irish” (p. 65), that is all the more valued for having been “earned.” Discourses of effortfulness and essentialism are therefore mobilized in tandem: Colleen's category entitlement to citizenship is bolstered by her effortfulness in acquiring knowledge of the Irish language, which will in turn provide her with a link to Ireland that gains its power from a form of cultural, if not biological, essentialism.

This notion of needing to apply effort to acquire transnational knowledge of contemporary Ireland is echoed in the focus group, and again it is particularly characteristic of those people whose category entitlement to claim Irishness might be seen as somewhat more tenuous and in need of working up.

Extract 3:

Lisa: Part of the process that I've been going through since I got my Irish passport on the day before Article 50 went through has been accustoming myself to the concept of belonging to, or the possibility of belonging to a different country which is not something I'd ever considered before and part of that process is obviously going, spending some time in Dublin, but also just reading Irish media, I follow a lot of Irish politicians and journalists and so on on Twitter now just to kind of **[Catelyn: yeah, me too, yeah]** try and, y'know, reading about the history so, y'know, reading biographies of kind of, leading Irish historical figures and so on, and just generally, kind of, I feel as though I need to educate myself in a kind of way of thanking the country that's given me this completely unexpected citizenship, I suppose, I would say. (*chuckles*) And it's a big learning process but I feel I, I should put that work in, y'know.

Lisa, whose claim to an Irish passport came from her grandfather, had established earlier in the discussion that neither she nor her family would have considered themselves as Irish prior to the Brexit referendum. The extent to which her identity work-in-progress around Irishness is linked to the Brexit process is emphasized by her beginning this narrative by temporally linking the arrival of her Irish passport to the U.K. government's invocation of Article 50 (the formal notification of an intention to withdraw from the European Union): This might be represented as a point of rupture, which has led Lisa to an emergent Irish identity. Lisa's account is characterized by hedging and provisional claim making. She represents the arrival of her passport not as an endpoint but as the starting point of a personal project of (similarly to Colleen) educating herself about Irish history and politics. With some agreement from others around the table, "putting in the work" is represented as a prerequisite of citizenship, and an appropriate *quid pro quo*, framed, once again, as gratitude.

Doing "noneffortfulness"

A topic of discussion in both focus groups and interviews was the distinction between second and third-generation migrants in terms of entitlement to Irish citizenship. The differential bureaucratic requirements involved required different levels of genealogical work from the participants but also allowed those with Irish parents to build up a category of entitlement to Irishness in a way not available to those with Irish grandparents:

Extract 4:

Paul: I, at least didn't have to get Irish citizenship, in fact it was one of the things that slightly surprised me 'cause I'd never known it that I've had dual nationality all my life. What I thought is that it would be easy to claim Irish citizenship, then the passport, and I found I already had Irish citizenship, and I just had to prove that I was Irish and then I could have the passport.

Lisa: Yeah, I had a very, on that point, I had a very funny conversation with my father, when I, he was fully behind me doing what I was doing but he never realised that he'd been Irish all his life (*laughter*) he's the most English man you've ever met in your life and I had to kind of say, he was kind of "so I can apply for it too," "no, no, you are Irish," (*exaggerated English accent*) "I don't understand what you mean, I didn't sign anything."

(*laughter*)

The effect of Paul's "discovery" that he had had dual nationality "all his life" is to reverse the relationship between state and citizen in terms of claim making; it is the Irish state, and by extension Irishness, that has claimed him. This has the effect of framing Paul's Irishness as inherent—something he has been all his life—and thus not open to challenge. This notion of a state-recognized inherent Irishness, even if you don't necessarily recognize it yourself, is humorously taken up by Lisa. The humour in Lisa's account derives from the "reveal" that her father, who is described not just as English, but in an extreme case formulation (Edwards, 2000) as "the most English man you've ever met in your life," has unknowingly been "Irish all his life." Lisa echoing Paul's use of the phrase "Irish all his life" affirms the inherent, essentialist quality of this Irishness: It is something he has been born with, rather than later acquired. Lisa's exaggerated account of the Englishness of her father emphasizes the assumed oppositional nature of Englishness and Irishness but also serves to juxtapose the logics of citizenship through birth with citizenship through descent—the very lack of a process through which one

can “sign something” to apply to be Irish that affirms Paul's Irishness is a source of confusion in Lisa's narrative. This again underlines the centrality of “effortfulness” in working up category entitlements towards claiming Irish citizenship: Where claims are likely to be heard as contingent, effortfulness is necessary, but contrarily, the very absence of required effort is taken as corroborating a claim.

The final extract, from my interview with Margaret illustrates how noneffortfulness is employed in identity work and how it intersects with more essentialist discourses in working up category entitlements towards claiming Irishness.

Extract 5:

Margaret: All down the flippin' years I've gone to get my British passport, my hair has to be blow dried and good bit of makeup on so I don't look too pale and freckly or anything. [Marc: Yeah] But I was going up to get the photo and I thought, you know, I'll just go like that for the Irish one because this is, you know, I've got this bunch of hair I've been fighting with my whole life, that goes 10 directions at once and a little potatoey face and I thought, well, they can have it. *(both laugh)* Let's not bother too much with this one. It's not as bad as I'm making out, I just remember going up to Snappy Snaps to get my photo and thinking, no I'll go as I am. No point polishing myself up too much at this point because this is what it is.

Margaret here draws a link between citizenship, “authenticity,” and facial features—where presenting her “British” face requires a certain amount of work, of *effortful citizenship*, but presenting her Irish face is “naturally” her, as she is. Presenting herself as Irish therefore acts as a resolution to an “identity trouble” narrative where (again) a lifelong conflict with her appearance is resolved through a decision to appear as Irish, not British. Undoubtedly, as with Colleen, this rests on an essentialist stereotype of what an Irish person looks like; Ni Maolalaidh and Stevenson (2014) have highlighted how, when speaking about people of Irish descent in England, references to pale skin, red hair, and freckles serve as “corroborative factualising” of Irishness (p. 250). Corroboration of Margaret's Irish identity thus rests on both discourses of essentialism and noneffortfulness: The effortfulness required to maintain Britishness underlines the contingency of the citizenship associated with the country of her birth, whereas the absence of such effortfulness underlines her entitlement to Irishness. Cho (2009) argues that the “neutral facial expression” required for passport photographs creates an ideal of an “unfeeling citizen,” which obscures any relationship between emotion and citizenship. She argues that this is particularly problematic in the case of the diasporic citizen, with the photograph intended for a document of identification that does not necessarily capture the truth of one's identity or the associated emotions. However, the passport photograph arguably becomes liberatory in Margaret's narrative in representing an end to the unpleasant set of emotions that came with her self-presentation as British.

DISCUSSION

When constructing narratives of the process of applying for an Irish passport through descent, participants drew on both discourses of effortfulness and essentialism. As such, they presented rhetorical positions that rested on both *jus sanguinis* and *jus soli* “common sense” discourses, expressed through narratives intended to justify these positions. In this argument, *jus sanguinis* essentialist discourses represent Irishness as something participants simply *are*, by virtue of their descent and/or upbringing, and does not therefore require additional effort. *Jus soli* discourses, meanwhile, represent Irishness as something that both resides in and is in the gift

of the Irish nation-state and therefore needs to be worked at, primarily by expressing a willingness to engage with and learn about the history, culture, and politics of contemporary Ireland. The availability of such discourses in doing identity work comes with both material and rhetorical constraints: Discourses of effortfulness are arguably particularly drawn upon by third-generation migrants specifically because other means of claiming Irishness are less available to them. Notably, discourses of effortfulness may also be characterized by explicitly marked *noneffortfulness*: This is more than simply the absence of effort, but rather that this absence is specifically named and constructed as notable in the interaction. Naming noneffortfulness intersects with different discourses of essentialism in complex ways, but just as both effortfulness and essentialism are resources that can be drawn upon by speakers in not necessarily contradictory ways, so too should noneffortfulness be seen as a distinct, but related, resource to essentialism that is also available when making claims on citizenship entitlement.

This article therefore advances social and political psychological research on the concept of the “effortful citizen” (Gibson, 2009). In common with Gibson et al. (2018), “effortfulness” is a way of accessing “deserving-ness” in terms of membership of a polity and, in common with McGhee et al. (2019) and Monforte et al. (2019), is one that is taken up by applicants for citizenship, as well as a broader rhetorical means of policing access. The major advance on previous work comes in highlighting that “effortfulness” is characteristic of diasporic citizenship outside the nation-state as well as in relation to pro- or anti-immigration arguments within it. While it is possible that this formulation is specific to the particularities of post-Brexit diasporic citizenship of Ireland, it would be worthwhile to investigate whether “effortfulness” is taken up by applicants for citizenship of other EU countries, post-Brexit, or whether it is characteristic of accounts of diasporic citizenship more generally.

In Gibson et al.'s analysis, effortfulness, and thus deservingness, is contrasted with “laziness” and thus nondeservingness. However, it is suggested here that attention needs to be paid to specific repertoires of noneffortfulness, which also play a role in legitimating category entitlements: Effectively, a dynamic where the less one has to do in order to obtain citizenship, the more one is seen as “naturally” entitled to it. A comparison may be drawn here to Clarke's (2023) research among White British citizens, where the more secure participants were in their citizenship, the less significance they afforded to it. A further similarity may be found with Andreouli and Dashtipour's (2014) analysis of interviews with citizenship officers where the “good” migrant is constructed as a “grateful” migrant who contributes to society. Gratitude runs strongly through the narratives of participants in this study, with effortfulness constructed as an appropriate way of articulating this gratitude.

More essentialist claims on Irishness, reflecting *jus sanguinis* logics of citizenship, also ran through participants narratives. This may be seen as similar to Wood and Gilmartin's (2018) categorization of “ethnic apologists” in their analysis of news-media coverage of Brexit-related applications for Irish passports: The public figures in their study are contrasted with “pragmatic cosmopolitans” in appealing to either Irish cultural pursuits or an innate sense of Irishness through descent in justifying their actions in applying for an Irish passport. However, the greater space to explore the stated motivations of applicants provided by in-depth interviews complicates this dichotomy: Rather, discourses of pragmatism, essentialism, and effortfulness are available for speakers to draw upon when constructing their narratives of applying for Irish citizenship.

In a similar manner, the analysis presented in this article supports the argument that dual or diasporic citizenship should not be seen as solely pragmatic or instrumental. Instrumental and affective justifications for applying for citizenship through descent are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Indeed, narratives of the application process itself, which one might anticipate being bureaucratic and therefore instrumental, are often couched in more affective terms, with emotion being invested in the arrival of particular documents and invocations of emotion around interactions with the state becoming rhetorical resources in themselves.

Returning to Hickman et al.'s (2005) argument that England and Ireland act as two hegemonic domains of identity with people of Irish descent positioned at their intersection, it is possible to trace how broader meanings of citizenship within each hegemonic domain shape the identity work around citizenship carried out by the participants in this research. The centrality of the "Life in the UK" citizenship tests as a means of policing access to British citizenship may have shaped participants' accounts of needing to learn about Irishness. The tests reinforce messages that British citizenship needs to be earned and is a privilege, not a right (Monforte et al., 2019). Where such discourses around citizenship in general have been normalized, this may explain participants' surprise at their "unearned" Irish citizenship and their rationale that they needed to do something to earn it. Although no such test exists in the Irish context, the self-improvement projects undertaken by applicants for Irish passports resemble studying for some unspecified future exam. Monforte et al.'s (2019) argument that citizenship tests reflect a broader neo-liberal conception of citizenship may be applied here: "Deservingness" has become publicly linked to individualized performances of self-improvement and willingness on the parts of applicants to become responsible for their own integration. It is perhaps not surprising that participants should have applied this logic to their own contingent sense of belonging vis-à-vis Irishness. It would be an interesting line of inquiry to investigate whether other such "spillover" effects of specifically British discourses of effortful citizenship can be identified in other contexts.

Regarding the hegemonic domain of Ireland, participants represent "putting in the work" vis-à-vis citizenship as acquiring knowledge about Irish history and contemporary politics and culture. Again, while this can be seen as an individual project of self-improvement, a comparison may be drawn to the discourse of "authenticity through transnational knowledge" suggested by Scully (2012). Within this discourse, members of the Irish diaspora may rhetorically defend themselves against real or anticipated charges of inauthenticity through demonstrating their knowledge of contemporary Ireland. "Putting in the work" may be interpreted as an attempt to acquire that knowledge. It is also notable that due attention is paid to acquiring knowledge about Irish history. This may be seen as a variation on the idea of a "moral obligation to the past" being associated with access to citizenship (Kadianaki et al., 2018) and demonstrates that this is a repertoire that can be employed *by* applicants as well as *about* them. Similarly, efforts to engage with Irish language and culture are centered in participants' identity work due to their assumed position as reflecting the essence of Irishness; as an effort to establish the affective relationship with intergenerationally transmitted Irish culture that is rendered as normative for Irish citizens.

Participants represent their own deficit in terms of the responsibilities of citizenship as lying in knowledge of Irish current affairs, history, language, and culture: Implicit in this is a prototypical Irish citizen though birth, residing in Ireland, who is assumed to be in possession of this knowledge, relatively unproblematically. Absent from participants' accounts, however, were any considerations of ongoing debates around the relationship between integration, belonging, "naturalized" citizenship, and legal and rhetorical barriers to such citizenship within Ireland itself (Michael, 2020; Otukoya, 2016; Wood & Gilmartin, 2018). Participants only tended to engage with such issues on direct questioning and were reluctant to offer an opinion: This might be attributed to a general reluctance among applicants for citizenship through descent to be seen as intervening in the political process within Ireland, as was found by Barry Brown (2023) with regard to the potential for nonresident voting rights. While the citizenship rights of those of Irish descent abroad are occasionally invoked as a rhetorical counterpoint among those arguing for increased rights for immigrants within Ireland, this is not reciprocated. Further analysis of rhetorical juxtapositions of immigration, emigration, and diaspora as they relate to citizenship rights in the Irish context is merited and would provide a basis for a political psychology of migration and citizenship in the round.

While this analysis provides a useful working framework with which to examine other forms of newly acquired dual citizenship in Britain post-Brexit, as well as contributing to ongoing debates around the nature of Irish citizenship in the diaspora, there may be specific limits to its transferability. Although not the original intention, all participants lived in England: Participants based in either Scotland or Wales may have articulated their identities in other ways given the different trajectories of post-Brexit politics in those countries. Similarly, it must be noted that while I found that participants tended to avoid representing themselves as motivated *solely* by pragmatism (in the manner of Wood and Gilmartin's (2018) "pragmatic cosmopolitans"), this is potentially an artifact of the sampling method. Participants were potentially more engaged with Irish media, and by extension Irish politics and culture, than applicants for Irish passports in Britain more generally; as such, I make no claims for the representativeness of this sample in more traditional positivist terms. However, the discourses drawn upon in this sample are sufficiently evident in other contexts to provide support for their importance within a social psychology of diasporic citizenship.

Finally, while I did not ask participants to self-identify in terms of social class, many of them evoked markers of social capital such as university education and leisure and career-related international travel: Participants might be argued to have been "doing" class (Scharff, 2008) in such instances. While participants expressed dismay at the potential loss of European citizenship, unlike other categories of migrants in Britain, they were not in danger of becoming precarious citizens as a result of Brexit. As such, their entitlement to dual citizenship, and the preferential treatment in the EU that affords, might be said to mark them out as a cosmopolitan elite, as in other studies of diasporic citizenship (Harpaz, 2013; Mateos, 2019). However, the complex postcolonial history and positionality of the Irish in Britain, as well as the experiences of anti-Irish prejudice some of the participants recounted, belies such a straightforward reading (Hickman & Ryan, 2020). In drawing attention to how diasporic citizens can be positioned as both elite *and* subaltern, both secure *and* contingent in their citizenship, and draw on discourses of essentialism, effortfulness *and* noneffortfulness in laying claim to their status, a political psychology of diasporic citizenship builds on and disrupts many of the assumptions and findings from the previous literature on citizenship and migration.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to thank the participants in this research who took the time to talk to me about their experiences of applying for Irish passports. I am grateful for seedcorn funding from the Research & Graduate School of Mary Immaculate College, which covered data collection and transcription costs. I have given presentations based on earlier drafts of this paper at the 2021 conference of the Association of European Qualitative Researchers in Psychology, and at the 2023 UK Political Psychology conference, as well as at a 2022 workshop organised by the MOBEL project based at the University of Crete. I have also presented this research at various symposia and seminars at both Mary Immaculate College and at the University of Limerick. I would like to thank the organisers of these conferences, seminars and symposia for the opportunity to present this research, and participants and discussants at these events for their comments. Colleagues in the Department of Psychology provided useful comments and feedback on an earlier draft of this paper, particularly Prof Niamh Stack. The article has benefitted from conversations with Dr Rahul Sambaraju and Dr Deirdre Folan. Finally, I would like to thank the anonymous reviewers and the editors for their constructive engagement with the article and helpful and incisive comments. Open access funding provided by IReL.

ORCID

Marc Scully  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0233-6849>

REFERENCES

- Anderson, E., & Gibson, S. (2020). Social citizenship and social psychology. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 14(2), e12510.
- Andreouli, E. (2019). Social psychology and citizenship: A critical perspective. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 13(2), e12432.
- Andreouli, E., & Dashtipour, P. (2014). British citizenship and the 'other': An analysis of the earned citizenship discourse. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 24(2), 100–110.
- Andreouli, E., & Howarth, C. (2013). National identity, citizenship and immigration: Putting identity in context. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behaviour*, 43(3), 361–382.
- Andreouli, E., Kaposi, D., & Stenner, P. (2019). Brexit and emergent politics: In search of a social psychology. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 29(1), 6–17.
- Awad, S. H. (2016). The identity process in times of rupture: Narratives from the Egyptian revolution. *Journal of Social and Political Psychology*, 4(1), 128–141.
- Barry Brown, V. (2023). "It just feels weird"—Irish external voting and the 'Brexit Irish'. In R. Barbalescu, S. Wallace Goodman, & L. Pedroza (Eds.), *Revising the integration-citizenship nexus in Europe: Sites, policies, and bureaucracies of belonging* (pp. 147–164). Springer International Publishing.
- Benson, M., Craven, C., & Sigona, N. (2022). *European belongings and political participation beyond Brexit*. MIGZEN Research Briefing 4. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.7070702>
- Billig, M. (1987). *Arguing and thinking: A rhetorical approach to social psychology*. Cambridge University Press.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). Can I use TA? Should I use TA? Should I not use TA? Comparing reflexive thematic analysis and other pattern-based qualitative analytic approaches. *Counselling and Psychotherapy Research*, 21(1), 37–47.
- Byrne, S. (2023). *Innovating to support our citizens*. [Government presentation]. Global Irish Civic Forum 2023.
- Campbell, S. (1999). Beyond 'plastic paddy': A re-examination of the second-generation Irish in England. *Immigrants & Minorities*, 18(2–3), 266–288.
- Cho, L. (2009). Citizenship, diaspora and the bonds of affect: The passport photograph. *Photography and Culture*, 2(3), 275–287.
- Clarke, A. (2023). The (in) significance of citizenship in white British citizens' narratives of national belonging. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 49(7), 1768–1785.
- Condor, S. (2006). Temporality and collectivity: Diversity, history and the rhetorical construction of national entitativity. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 45(4), 657–682.
- Condor, S. (2011). Towards a social psychology of citizenship? Introduction to the special issue. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 21(3), 193–201.
- Devlin Trew, J. (2018). Diaspora engagement in Ireland, north and south, in the shadow of Brexit. In J. Devlin Trew & M. Piersé (Eds.), *Rethinking the Irish diaspora: After the gathering* (pp. 15–57). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Dickinson, J. (2019). Postcolonial states, nation-building and the (un)making of diasporas. In R. Cohen & C. Fischer (Eds.), *Routledge handbook of diaspora studies* (pp. 260–267). Routledge.
- Edwards, D. (2000). Extreme case formulations: Softeners, investment, and doing nonliteral. *Research on Language and Social Interaction*, 33(4), 347–373.
- Ellis, B. D., & Bhatia, S. (2019). Cultural psychology for a new era of citizenship politics. *Culture & Psychology*, 25(2), 220–240.
- Erdal, M. B., Doeland, E. M., & Tellander, E. (2018). How citizenship matters (or not): The citizenship–belonging nexus explored among residents in Oslo, Norway. *Citizenship Studies*, 22(7), 705–724.
- Fathi, M. (2015). I make here my soil. I make here my country. *Political Psychology*, 36(2), 151–164.
- Figgou, L. (2013). Essentialism, historical construction, and social influence: Representations of Pomakness in majority talk in Western Thrace (Greece). *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 52(4), 686–702.
- Fitch, B., & Noble, S. (2023). *Dual citizens living in England and Wales: Census 2021*. Office for National Statistics. <https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/populationandmigration/internationalmigration/articles/dualcitizenslivinginenglandandwales/census2021>
- Gamlen, A. (2008). The emigration state and the modern geopolitical imagination. *Political Geography*, 27(8), 840–856.
- Gergen, K. (2001). Self-narration in social life. In M. Wetherell, S. Taylor, & S. J. Yates (Eds.), *Discourse theory and practice: A reader* (pp. 247–260). Sage.
- Gibson, S. (2009). The effortful citizen: Discursive social psychology and welfare reform. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 19(6), 393–410.
- Gibson, S., Crossland, M., & Hamilton, J. (2018). Social citizenship and immigration: Employment, welfare, and effortfulness in online discourse concerning migration to the United Kingdom. *Qualitative Psychology*, 5(1), 99–116.
- Gibson, S., & Hamilton, L. (2011). The rhetorical construction of polity membership: Identity, culture and citizenship in young people's discussions of immigration in northern England. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 21(3), 228–242.
- Gleibs, I. H., & Reddy, G. (2017). The social and political psychology of globalization and global identities. In C. Howarth & E. Andreouli (Eds.), *The social psychology of everyday politics* (pp. 65–78). Routledge.

- Green, E. G. T., & Staerklé, C. (2023). Migration and multiculturalism. In L. Huddy, D. O. Sears, J. S. Levy, & J. Jerit (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of political psychology* (3rd ed., pp. 852–889). Oxford University Press.
- Hannafin, S. (2016). Place, belonging and second generation return migration from Britain to Ireland. *Irish Geography*, 49(1), 29–46.
- Harpaz, Y. (2013). Rooted cosmopolitans: Israelis with a European passport—history, property, identity. *International Migration Review*, 47(1), 166–206.
- Harpaz, Y., & Mateos, P. (2019). Strategic citizenship: Negotiating membership in the age of dual nationality. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45(6), 843–857.
- Hickman, M. J. (2011). Census ethnic categories and second-generation identities: A study of the Irish in England and Wales. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(1), 79–97.
- Hickman, M. J., Morgan, S., Walter, B., & Bradley, J. (2005). The limitations of whiteness and the boundaries of Englishness: Second-generation Irish identifications and positionings in multiethnic Britain. *Ethnicities*, 5(2), 160–182.
- Hickman, M. J., & Ryan, L. (2020). The “Irish question”: Marginalizations at the nexus of sociology of migration and ethnic and racial studies in Britain. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 43(16), 96–114.
- Isin, E. F., & Wood, P. K. (1999). *Citizenship and identity*. SAGE Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781446218129>
- Joppke, C. (2019). The instrumental turn of citizenship. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45(6), 858–878.
- Kadianaki, I., & Andreouli, E. (2017). Essentialism in social representations of citizenship: An analysis of Greeks' and migrants' discourse. *Political Psychology*, 38(5), 833–848.
- Kadianaki, I., Andreouli, E., & Carretero, M. (2018). Using national history to construct the boundaries of citizenship: An analysis of Greek citizens' discourse about immigrants' rights. *Qualitative Psychology*, 5(1), 172–187.
- Lear, N. (2020). *Hierarchies of Irishness: The passport Paddy* [Conference presentation]. British Association for Irish Studies Virtual Conference 2020. <https://prezi.com/v/z6ncemdbpk9z/hierarchies-of-irishness-the-passport-paddy/>
- Leonard, M. (2005). Performing identities: Music and dance in the Irish communities of Coventry and Liverpool. *Social & Cultural Geography*, 6(4), 515–529.
- Mac an Ghaill, M., & Haywood, C. (2003). Young (male) Irelanders: Postcolonial ethnicities-expanding the nation and Irishness. *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 6(3), 386–403.
- Mateos, P. (2019). The mestizo nation unbound: Dual citizenship of euro-Mexicans and US-Mexicans. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45(6), 917–938.
- Maybin, S. (2016). How many Britons are entitled to an Irish passport? *BBC News*. <https://www.bbc.com/news/magazine-37246769>
- McGhee, D., Moreh, C., & Vlachantoni, A. (2019). Stakeholder identities in Britain's neoliberal ethical community: Polish narratives of earned citizenship in the context of the UK's EU referendum. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 70(4), 1104–1127.
- Michael, L. (2020). Immigration and citizenship. In R. Fox, M. Cronin, Ó. Conchubhair, & B. (Eds.), *Routledge international handbook of Irish studies* (pp. 203–219). Routledge.
- Monforte, P., Bassel, L., & Khan, K. (2019). Deserving citizenship? Exploring migrants' experiences of the ‘citizenship test’ process in the United Kingdom. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 70(1), 24–43.
- Moore, S., Rosenthal, D., & Robinson, R. (2020). *The psychology of family history: Exploring our genealogy*. Routledge.
- Mullally, U. (2019). Brexit shows up our nonsensical approach to Irish citizenship. *The Irish Times*. <https://www.irishtimes.com/opinion/una-mullally-brex-it-shows-up-our-nonsensical-approach-to-irish-citizenship-1.4057028>
- Nash, C. (2008). *Of Irish descent: Origin stories, genealogy & the politics of belonging*. Syracuse University Press.
- Naujoks, D. (2017). The transnational political effects of diasporic citizenship in countries of destination: Overseas citizenship of India and political participation in the United States. In D. Carment & A. Sadjed (Eds.), *Diaspora as cultures of cooperation* (pp. 199–221). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Ni Maolalaidh, M., & Stevenson, C. (2014). National identity in a foreign context: Irish women accounting for their children's national identity in England. *Discourse & Society*, 25(2), 245–262.
- Otukoya, B. (2016). Bheith Éireannach (Becoming Irish): Privilege or right. *Irish Studies in International Affairs*, 27(1), 57–73.
- Phoenix, A. (2008). Analysing narrative contexts. In M. Andrews, C. Squire, & M. Tambouku (Eds.), *Doing narrative research*. Sage. (pp. 65–78).
- Potter, J. (1996). *Representing reality: Discourse, rhetoric and social construction*. Sage.
- Ragazzi, F. (2014). A comparative analysis of diaspora policies. *Political Geography*, 41, 74–89.
- Ryan, L. (2015). “Inside” and “outside” of what or where? Researching migration through multi-positionality. *Forum Qualitative Sozialforschung/Forum: Qualitative Social Research*, 16(2).

- Scharff, C. M. (2008). Doing class: A discursive and ethnomethodological approach. *Critical Discourse Studies*, 5(4), 331–343.
- Schramm, K. (2020). Diasporic citizenship under debate: Law, body, and soul. *Current Anthropology*, 61(S22), S210–S219.
- Scully, M. (2012). The tyranny of transnational discourse: 'authenticity' and Irish diasporic identity in Ireland and England. *Nations and Nationalism*, 18(2), 191–209.
- Scully, M. (2015). The problem of a subjective authenticity and the articulation of belonging among the Irish in England—A psychosocial approach. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 12(1), 34–44.
- Sejersen, T. B. (2008). "I vow to thee my countries"—the expansion of dual citizenship in the 21st century. *International Migration Review*, 42(3), 623–649.
- Shrimley, R. (2017). Brexit and the great Irish granny grab. *Financial Times Magazine*. <https://www.ft.com/content/97823748-7715-11e7-90c0-90a9d1bc9691>
- Spiro, P. J. (2019). The equality paradox of dual citizenship. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 45(6), 879–896. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1369183X.2018.1440485>
- Sredanovic, D., & Della Puppa, F. (2023). Brexit and the stratified uses of national and European Union citizenship. *Current Sociology*, 71(5), 725–742.
- Stevenson, C., & Sagherian-Dickey, T. (2018). Territoriality and migration in a divided society: Lay theories of citizenship and place in Northern Ireland. *Qualitative Psychology*, 5(1), 135–154.
- Taylor, S. (2010). *Narratives of identity and place*. Routledge.
- Taylor, S., & Littleton, K. (2006). Biographies in talk: A narrative-discursive research approach. *Qualitative Sociology Review*, 2(1), 22–38.
- Vaughan, J. (2016). Landscapes of the Irish language: Discursive constructions of authenticity in the Irish diaspora. *Irish Journal of Applied Social Studies*, 16(1), 4.
- Verkuyten, M. (2003). Discourses about ethnic group (de-) essentialism: Oppressive and progressive aspects. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 42(3), 371–391.
- Verkuyten, M. (2018). *The social psychology of ethnic identity*. Routledge.
- Walter, B., Morgan, S., Hickman, M. J., & Bradley, J. M. (2002). Family stories, public silence: Irish identity construction amongst the second-generation Irish in England. *Scottish Geographical Journal*, 118(3), 201–217.
- Wiggins, S. (2017). *Discursive psychology: Theory, method and applications*. Sage.
- Wood, P. B., & Gilmartin, M. (2018). Irish enough: Changing narratives of citizenship and national identity in the context of Brexit. *Space and Polity*, 22(2), 224–237.
- Xenitidou, M., & Sapountzis, A. (2018). Qualitative methodologies in the study of citizenship and migration. *Qualitative Psychology*, 5(1), 77–84.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information can be found online in the Supporting Information section at the end of this article.

How to cite this article: Scully, M. (2025). "I feel I should put that work in": Discourses of effortfulness and essentialism among post-Brexit applicants for Irish citizenship. *Political Psychology*, 46, 603–622. <https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.13026>