**Appendix**

The field trips and interviews were conducted within the following projects:

* *Youth in the Balkans and their cultures of communication, non-communication, and their notions of reconciliation* (2018–2020), affiliated at the Franz Vranitzky Chair for European Studies, supported by Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH on behalf of the German Federal Ministry for Economic Cooperation and Development.
* *How civic engagement leads to political participation. Learning from young active Europeans in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Kosovo, and Serbia* (2016–2017), affiliated at the Franz Vranitzky Chair for European Studies, supported by Erste Foundation.
* *Generation in-between. The “Europeanness” of the Balkan War children* (2015–2016), affiliated at the Franz Vranitzky Chair for European Studies, supported by Erste Foundation.

**Corpus overview**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Name of the interviewee and date of the interview | Date of birth | Place of residence |
| Tarik (28 October 2019), recorded in English | 1986 | Pristina (Kosovo) |
| Nedim (10 March 2019), recorded in English | 1988 | Sarajevo (BiH) |
| Lejla (8 March 2019), recorded in English | 1990 | Visoko (BiH) |
| Radenka (16 June 2016), recorded in English | 1992 | Born in Čačak, living in Belgrade (Serbia) |
| Elisa (15 June 2016), recorded in English | 1994 | Belgrade (Serbia) |
| Sara (12 April 2016), recorded in English | 1994 | Pristina (Kosovo) |
| Mario (12 July 2016), recorded in English | 1995 | Born in Srebrenica, living in Sarajevo (BiH) |
| Marko (27 October 2019), recorded in English | 1995 | Mitrovica (Kosovo) |
| Milica (9 October 2020), recorded in English | 1997 | Bar (Montenegro) |
| Dino (18 June 2020), recorded in Bosnian | 1999 | Goražde (BiH) |
| Eden (8 February 2020), recorded in English | 2000 | Sarajevo (BiH) |
| Luka (8 February 2020), recorded in English | 2001 | Sarajevo (BiH) |
| Dea (9 March 2019 & 20 July 2019), both recorded in English | 2001 | Sombor (Serbia) |
| Anja (8 March 2019), recorded in English | 2001 | Niš (Serbia) |
| Stefan (22 July 2019), recorded in English | 2002 | Požarevac (Serbia) |

**Narrative stimuli used for life-story interviews**

A life-story interview starts with a stimulus appropriate to evoke a longer, autonomous narration. For the main research we used the following stimuli for young people in general, and for trainers/organizers of youth exchange programs respectively:

*Stimulus 1:* Our research is about young people who live in the region. We’d like to know what life is like here. Please tell me about your life, you can start wherever you want. I will listen to you and then I will ask you some more questions.

*Stimulus 2 – Trainers and organizers:* I am interested in the life stories of people who are organizing youth exchange programs. Please tell me your story, look back to the times when you were a child and tell me how it was and how your life continued. I will now listen without interrupting you.

*Stimulus 3 – Trainers and organizers:* I am interested in the life stories of people who are organizing youth exchange programs. How come that you are here now? Please tell me your story in as much detail as possible.

For the life-story interviews conducted by local interviewers in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Montenegro, we used the following stimuli for non-participants from rural areas:

We are interviewing young people who live in rural areas of [name of the non-participant’s country]. We are interested in their opinions about what life is like here, and how satisfied they are with the living and working conditions as well as with political circumstances. I want to ask you: What do you think about [name of the non-participant’s country] as a country with two or even more ethnic groups? Please, tell me everything that comes to mind.

What is life like here? Tell me more about how it is to live in your village.

Alternative or additional questions to prompt the interviewees:

Can you tell me whether you think the history of your country is important to your biography?

We asked local interviewers to cover the following five thematic blocks in the interview:

1. System of beliefs (20–30 minutes)

2. Network of communication (20–30 minutes)

3. The Balkans (5–10 minutes)

4. Future plans (5–10 minutes)

5. Youth exchange programs (5–10 minutes)

We received three interviews from different rural towns in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and one interview from Montenegro. We had planned to commission additional interviews in other parts of the Western Balkans, but public health measures in the course of the Covid-19 pandemic prevented our local partners from conducting further face-to-face interviews.

**Drawing stimuli**

It was difficult to talk only to people who were born in the years 1999, 2000, and 2001. Usually, we met the youngest people of the exchange programs and interviewed them together, as a group, in order to make them feel more comfortable. In such cases, we asked our interview partners to make a simple drawing and explain it to us, talking about their communication networks.

*Drawing stimulus – Young people during exchange programs on site:* Who are you going to talk to when you are back home?

*Drawing stimulus – Young people after the exchange programs at their hometown:* Who did you talk to about your experiences? Please make a simple drawing of all the people that you talked to about your experience on the exchange program.

This method was very useful for exploring who the young people talk to about war-related topics, and who they choose not to talk to.

**Sequence analysis according to Froschauer and Lueger**

In their book about the Interpretative Interview, Froschauer and Lueger (2003) give an example of how to conduct a sequence analysis. They rely strongly on the theories of the founder of this methodological approach, Ulrich Oevermann. Thus, I chose their toolkit for the analysis. Froschauer and Lueger suggest that the one who interprets the sequence of the interview should not know about the content beforehand. Therefore, one of the team members prepared a sequence, and the other team members did not know much about the person or the answers given by the interviewee. The interpreters were shown only small text segments of the sequence, and for each text segment, we filled out the template provided by Froschauer and Lueger (Table 1).

*Table 1: Froschauer and Lueger, 2003, p. 123.*

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Paraphrase | Intentions, functions | Latent meanings | Different roles | How does the text continue? |

Each team member divided two sequences (paragraphs) of an interview into small text units and presented them one after the other. For each text unit, the interpreters had to fill out the template provided by Froschauer and Lueger (2003, p. 123) to grasp intentions, functions, latent meanings, and different roles of the text units and the interviewee. The final question was always about the forthcoming text unit: How does the text continue? Therefore, it was important that the interpreters did not know much about the person’s life story or the answers given by the interviewee.

The analysis of a single sequence took between two and four hours, which is why we limited ourselves to analyzing two sequences out of three interviews. The results of the exhaustively interpreted sequences were compared to eight other interviews and subsequently tested on the other interviews from the main corpus of life-story interviews.
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