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ABSTRACT

INTERGROUP FORGIVENESS IN THE MIDDLE EAST:
COGNITIVE AND AFFECTIVE ANTECEDENTS TO INTERGROUP
FORGIVENESS AND THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN INTERGROUP
FORGIVENESS AND PSYCHOLOGICAL WELL-BEING AMONG ISRAELI JEWS

by Alon Rice

May 2011

In the past three decades, there has been a burgeoning interest in the scientific study of interpersonal forgiveness. However, only a few studies have elucidated cognitive and affective variables related to intergroup forgiveness. Moreover, no study has examined the degree to which intergroup forgiveness may contribute to one’s psychological well-being, nor has any study thoroughly examined intergroup forgiveness in Israel. Current study results have shown a significant relationship between quality of intergroup contact between Israeli Jews and Israeli Arabs/Palestinians, and Israeli Jews’ forgiveness attitudes toward Palestinians, a relationship mediated by Israeli Jews’ trust, attitudes, and empathy toward Palestinians, as well as diminished anger and their ability to appreciate heterogeneity among Palestinians. Moreover, there was a significant relationship between superordinate religious identity/categorization and intergroup forgiveness attitudes, and attributionally complex Israeli Jews were less likely to embrace negative intergroup forgiveness attitudes than their attributionally simple counterparts. Finally, anger toward Palestinians was predictive of negative affect among Israeli Jews, but not when ones’ predisposition to forgive was controlled for. Practical implications of the study results are discussed.
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The writer would like to thank the dissertation director, Dr. Mark M. Leach, and the other committee members, Dr. Virgil Zeigler-Hill, Dr. Tammy Greer, and Dr. Jamie Aten, for their advice and support throughout the duration of this project. I wanted to express my deep appreciation to Dr. Leach, my major professor and dissertation director, who has always had faith in me even when I appeared to lose faith in myself. His support, dedication, knowledge, insight, and honest feedback have significantly contributed to my success thus far, as a scholar, researcher, and as a clinician, and have been a major source of inspiration in times of crisis.

I also wanted to thank my dear friends and colleagues in Israel, including Vered Cohen, Asaf Badihi, Nisim Asraf, Anna Rice, and Howard Rice, for their most valuable support associated with the data collection. They did so out of pure concern for my degree progress and candid interest in my study, without any expectation for monetary or any other tangible reward.
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT ....................................................................................................................... ii  

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS ........................................................................................................ iii  

LIST OF TABLES ............................................................................................................. vi  

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS ............................................................................................ vii  

CHAPTER  

I. INTRODUCTION .......................................................................................... 1  
   Statement of Research Purpose and Outline  

II. REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE ............................................................ 5  
   Defining and Studying Forgiveness  
   Forgiveness and the Monotheistic Religions: Judaism, Islam, and Christianity  
   Forgiveness Correlates  
   Intergroup Forgiveness: The Emergence of a New Field  
   Study Hypotheses  

III. METHOD ..................................................................................................... 51  
   Participants  
   Instruments  
   Procedure  
   Statistical Analysis  

IV. RESULTS ..................................................................................................... 62  
   Descriptive Statistics  
   Challenges with Participants  
   Matters Pertaining to the Variable of Infrahumanization  
   Challenges with the Independent Variables  
   Hypotheses Testing  

V. DISCUSSION .................................................................................................. 78  
   Summary of Study Findings  
   Study Implications
Study Weaknesses
Suggestions for Future Studies

APPENDIXES ...................................................................................................................89

REFERENCES ...................................................................................................................110
LIST OF TABLES

Table

1. Descriptive Statistics..................................................................................................62

2. Pearson Correlation between the Two Components of Intergroup Forgiveness, Outgroup Anger, Outgroup Perception of Heterogeneity, Outgroup Attitudes, Outgroup Trust, Outgroup Empathy, and Quantity/Quality of Contact ..............65

3. Barron and Kenney’s Four-Step Mediation Analysis with Quality of Intergroup Contact as the Independent Variable and Never Forgiving as the Dependent Variable..................................................................................................................71

4. Barron and Kenney’s Four-Step Mediation Analysis with Quality of Intergroup Contact as the Independent Variable and Future Forgiving as the Dependent Variable..................................................................................................................72

5. Sobel Test Statistics for the Significance of the Mediatory Roles of Empathy, Attitudes, Anger, Infrahumanization, Outgroup Perception of Heterogeneity, and Trust Outgroup in the Relationship between Quality of Intergroup Contact and Never Forgiving..................................................................................................................73

6. Sobel Test Statistics for the Significance of the Mediatory Roles of Empathy, Attitudes, Anger, Infrahumanization, Outgroup Perception of Heterogeneity, and Trust Outgroup in the Relationship between Quality of Intergroup Contact and Future Forgiving ..................................................................................................................74

7. Correlation between PANAS (Positive and Negative Affect), Intergroup Forgiveness, Outgroup Anger, and Outgroup Attitudes .........................................................76
LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

Figure

1. The Roles of Intergroup Anger, Infrahumanization, and Outgroup Attitudes as Mediating the Effect of Intergroup Contact on Intergroup Forgiveness (Tam et al., 2007) ..........................................................................................................................38

2. The Roles of Intergroup Anger, Infrahumanization, and Intergroup Empathy as Mediating the Effect of Intergroup Contact on Intergroup Forgiveness (Tam et al., 2008) ..........................................................................................................................39

3. The Relationship between Quality of Intergroup Contact, Mediating Variables, and Never Forgiving .........................................................................................................................69

4. The Relationship between Quality of Intergroup Contact, Mediating Variables, and Future Forgiving ..........................................................................................................................70
CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Statement of Research Purpose and Outline

What does forgiveness mean? The words “I forgive you” are used habitually in
every-day language, usually following a perceived wrong-doing committed against the
one granting the forgiveness. The forgiver may grant forgiveness to the wrongdoer upon
request, or grant it regardless of the contrition experienced by the wrongdoer. The
offended individual may utter forgiveness phrases without actually meaning it, probably
because of the value his or her cultural or familial surround attributes to offering
forgiveness or the tangible reward associated with offering forgiveness (e.g.,
reconciliation). Oftentimes, we offer forgiveness because we realize that doing so may
alleviate the wrongdoer’s anxiety or may assuage his or her ruminative guilt. If
forgiveness is offered often enough, without deliberation or contemplation, it may lose its
functional value or may not be taken seriously by the individual receiving the
forgiveness.

While the superlative virtue of forgiveness has been traditionally edified and
promoted by world religion (especially by the Christian faith), recent empirical evidence
allude to the potential psychological benefits that healthy interpersonal forgiveness may
facilitate. For instance, there is evidence to suggest that healthy interpersonal forgiveness
decreases anxiety and depressive symptoms, and improves one’s overall life satisfaction
(e.g., Brown, 2003; Enright, 2001; Enright & Fitzgibbon, 2000; Ryan & Kumar, 2005;
Sapolsky, 2005). Moreover, interpersonal forgiveness has been shown to be related to
one’s overall psychological well-being (Bono, McCullough, & Root, 2008; Karremans,
Van Lange, Ouwerkerk, & Kluwer, 2003) as measured by Positive Affect Negative
Affect Scale (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Various forgiveness-focused interventions have been shown to reduce psychopathology and to increase psychological functioning (Worthington, 2005). For instance, a short term forgiveness intervention with men struggling with unforgivingness toward their partners for performing abortion, based on Enright’s forgiveness process model, has helped them reduce symptoms of anxiety, anger, and grief (Coyle & Enright, 1997). A brief psychoeducational forgiveness intervention with undergraduate students resulted in reduced vengeful and increased positive feelings toward the offender, as well an increase in reconciliatory behaviors (McCullough & Worthington, 1995). Also, a forgiveness intervention based on Enright’s model helped promote psychological adjustment with adolescents whose parents had gotten divorced (Freedman & Knupp, 2003), and was associated with reduced symptoms of anxiety and depression and increased hope and forgiveness among females incest survivors (Freedman & Enright, 1996).

However, while the functional utility of adaptive interpersonal forgiveness processes (i.e., forgiveness between one person and another) following an injury has been adequately explored, the possible gains associated with other modes of forgiveness, such as intergroup forgiveness, have been generally overlooked. As long as the world is divided into nations, and ethnic, cultural, and religious groups, collective identities will persist. These collective identities, while constituting a source of pride and security, may predispose a member of an in-group to experience rancorous feelings toward out-group members, whose actions are perceived as intending to harm the in-group members or sabotage their collective goals. The continual violent conflicts between groups of people (e.g., between Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland; Israelis and Palestinians in
the Middle East) may create an atmosphere of hostility, which may uniquely impact one’s psychological well-being.

It appears that only few published articles have addressed the issue of inter-group forgiveness, most of which have focused on forgiveness in the context of post Catholics-Protestants conflict in Northern Ireland (e.g., Hewstone, Cairns, Voci, Hamberger, & Niens, 2006; McLernon, Cairns, Hewstone, & Smith, 2004; Moeschberger, Dixon, Niens, & Cairns, 2005; Tam, Hewstone, Cairns, Tauch, Maio, & Kenworthy, 2007). However, while some of these articles have demarcated factors that may attenuate or foster inter-group forgiveness, none of these articles seem to address perhaps one of the most pivotal questions in the realm of applied psychology; that is, the degree to which inter-group forgiveness may uniquely contribute to one’s psychological well-being.

The following study focused on the Palestinian-Israeli animosity. The following dissertation topic attempted to empirically illuminate conceptual links between pivotal socio-cognitive and affective variables as they may be related to intergroup forgiveness in Israel. In addition, the plausible effect of intergroup forgiveness on one’s psychological well-being was explored, beyond which may already be explained by one’s dispositional proclivity to be forgiving (Lawler-Row & Piferi, 2006; Thompson et al., 2005).

However, prior to reviewing the rather scarce literature concerning intergroup forgiveness and proposing the research hypotheses, it is important to introduce the broad concept of forgiveness. Hence, the initial introductory section discusses definitions and different angles to the study of forgiveness. This section purports to accentuate the complexity, heterogeneity, and ambiguity associated with the study of forgiveness. Further, because forgiveness has been conceived of as a virtuous human character delineated and fostered by monotheistic theologians (McCullough & Worthington, 1999),
the second brief section is devoted to discussion about forgiveness from the points of view of monotheistic faiths (i.e., Judaism, Islam, and Christianity). The third section is dedicated to accentuating the interpersonal, personality, affective, and socio-cognitive factors associated with forgiveness. The fourth section discusses the new line of forgiveness study, namely, intergroup forgiveness. Finally, in the fifth section, the study hypotheses are proposed, comprising pivotal affective and cognitive variables as they pertain to intergroup forgiveness, following a brief discussion pertaining to the roots of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Defining and Studying Forgiveness

In the previous section, it was indicated that forgiveness has been associated with improved psychological benefits. However, how do forgiveness scholars define this broad hypothetical construct of forgiveness prior to launching into testing its potential personal or interpersonal benefits? As aforementioned, the virtue of forgiveness has been taught and disseminated by world religions in order to promote spiritual growth and connection with one’s Higher Power (McCullough & Worthington, 1999). However, in the past three decades, researchers, scholars, and clinicians have all shown burgeoning scientific as well clinical interest in the potential psychological benefits associated with forgiveness (McCullough & Worthington, 1999).

Compared to well-studied psychological variables such as depression, anxiety, and anger, which have (relatively speaking) clear and unambiguous consensual definitions, conceptualizations of the convoluted concept of forgiveness have largely diverged (Worthington, 2005). At its core, forgiveness involves the relinquishing of ongoing resentment toward an offender or offenders (Enright, 2001). Also, it involves the assuaging of malevolent or vindictive motives against the offending parties (McCullough, Fincham, & Tsang, 2003). In essence, forgiveness may be described as replacing malicious thoughts, feelings, and motives toward the offending person(s) with positive thoughts, feelings, and motives, and pro-social behavioral changes if continued contact with the offender is sought (McCullough & Worthington, 1999; Worthington, 2005). However, if continued contact with the offender is not sought, impossible, unfeasible, or potentially deleterious to either the victim or the offender, forgiveness may be construed
as the mitigation of ill feelings (e.g., resentment) and thoughts (e.g., vindictive thoughts) and the acquisition of benevolent feelings (e.g., compassion and empathy) and thoughts toward the offender (Enright, 2001). In order to make sense out of this broad construct, it may be beneficial to delineate the different angles of studying forgiveness, which include the dispositional versus specific, intrapersonal versus interpersonal, self versus other, receiving versus offering, and interpersonal versus group perspectives.

**Dispositional Versus Specific Perspective**

When studying forgiveness, one may explore the extent to which people are inclined or predisposed to forgive transgressors or people’s attitudes toward forgiveness. One’s overall inclination to forgive others or his or her attitudes toward forgiveness constitutes dispositional forgiveness (McCullough & Worthington, 1999). Studies surrounding dispositional forgiveness have shown that one’s religiosity and spirituality are associated with positive attitudes toward forgiveness (McCullough & Worthington, 1999). Measures such as Heartland Forgiveness Scale (Thompson et al., 2005), Forgiveness Questionnaire (Mullet, Houdbine, Laumonier, & Girard, 1998), and Tendency To Forgive Scale (TTF; Brown, 2003) have been often used to assess one’s predisposition to be forgiving.

When employing a more specific level to the study of forgiveness, one might have participants identify a transgressor or transgressors and inquire about the degree to which they have forgiven the transgressor(s) (McCullough & Worthington, 1999). At the most specific level, the researcher would inquire about the degree to which participants have forgiven an identified person or identified persons for committing specific transgressions (McCullough & Worthington, 1999). In a review article by McCullough and Worthington (1999), when applying such levels of specificity the correlation between religiosity and
forgiveness is rather marginal. A widely used instrument for assessing transgression-specific forgiveness is the Enright Forgiveness Inventory (EFI; Subkoviak, Enright, Wu, & Gassin, 1995), which measures the cognitive, affective, and behavioral/motivational components of one’s forgiveness of a specific transgression, and revealed the following forgiveness factors: negative and positive affect, negative and positive cognition, negative and positive behavior. Much of the research has focused on specific situations and includes instruments such as the EFI.

Intrapersonal Versus Interpersonal Perspective

Forgiveness can be construed as an intrapersonal or interpersonal process, the first referring to the internal (i.e., cognitive, affective, and motivational) changes associated with the experience of forgiving, while the latter referring to the interpersonal dynamics (i.e., behavioral) associated with forgiveness (McCullough & Worthington, 1999; Worthington, 2005). Some mental health professionals, philosophers, and theologians are more likely to emphasize the interpersonal prerequisites for forgiveness and dismiss the notion of forgiveness as a primarily private phenomenon (Lawler-Row, Scott, Raines, Edlis- Matityahou, & Moore, 2007). These scholars would argue that forgiveness should involve interactions between the victim and the offender.

While acts of interpersonal forgiveness such as reconciliation and compromise may restore relationships and promote psychological well-being (e.g., Hargrave, 1994; Ripley & Worthington, 2002) they may also be counterproductive or dangerous (Murphy, 2005). For example, after a year of separation from her physically abusive husband, during which time the wife has undergone an extensive psychotherapeutic work and rehabilitation, she may decide to “give it a chance” and to reunite with her husband. If the husband has undergone psychotherapy himself, addressed inherent unresolved anger
issues, expressed profound and candid contrition, and acquired adaptive skills to manage
his anger and eschew further acts of outrage directed against his wife, a spousal
reunification may turn out to be successful and fulfilling. However, if, upon reunification
and a short period of serenity, his abusive demeanor is resumed, the wife may incur
profound and irreparable physical and psychological damages.

When considering forgiveness, Enright (2001), one of the most prolific writers on
the therapeutic value of forgiveness, highlighted the intrapersonal and interpersonal
factors that do not necessarily denote forgiveness. First, forgiveness does not denote
condoning or overlooking. Enright acknowledges the inherent human need to see justice
served, and the dissonance caused by witnessing the offender “getting off the hook.”
Second, forgiveness does not necessarily mean reconciliation or unification. As
mentioned previously, reconciliation may often be counterproductive or dangerous. Also,
forgiveness is not to be confused with justifying, which involves making excuses for the
offender’s behaviors, as is often witnessed with the battered woman who excuses her
husband’s abusiveness by blaming herself for instigating his rage; nor does it denote
forgetting (whether intentionally or unintentionally) the hurtful events.

Finally, true forgiveness is not to be confused with unauthentic offerings of
forgiveness (Enright, 2001), sometimes called pseudoforgiveness. Offering forgiveness
because of pressures imposed by one’s social or religious norms is an example of an
unauthentic forgiveness. Unauthentic forgiveness may manifest itself through one’s
offering of forgiveness in order to alleviate the anxiety experienced by the transgressor.
Forgiveness may also be offered because of the instrumental value gained by offering it
(Enright, 2001).
Forgiving Others or Forgiving Self

The bulk of the forgiveness literature focuses on the cognitive, affective, motivational, and behavioral aspects associated with forgiving others, who are typically family members, a spouse, an intimate partner (e.g., boyfriend or girlfriend), a friend, or others of significance. However, oftentimes the object of resentment and unresolved anger is self, as is often the case with recovering alcoholics or drug addicts who, upon realization of the impact their substance use has had on their loved ones, are inclined to experience shame and self-loathing, feelings that are typically reinforced by acts of unforgivingness (e.g., acts of vengeance, retaliation, or avoidance) displayed by the offended parties (e.g., a spouse, a family member, a partner, or a friend).

Unlike other-forgiveness, reconciliation with self, in terms of self-love and self-acceptance, is unavoidable in the process of self-forgiveness (Enright, 1996). According to Enright (1996), forgiving self entails “truly car[ing] for oneself as a member of the human community…[and]…acknowledg[ing] that the self will give a genuine effort to change in the future” (p. 110). Enright (1996) argued that self-forgiveness as well as other-forgiveness involves an emotional, cognitive, and behavioral response to an objective wrong-doing. Moreover, an authentic self-forgiveness entails experiencing remorse over the transgression, empathizing with the pain of the victim, or possibly making (or planning to make) necessary amends for one’s wrong doing, as apposed to a narcissistic self-forgiveness, which involves “letting oneself off the hook” by either minimizing the magnitude of one’s wrong-doing or making rationalized self-serving justifications for one’s actions (Enright, 1996).

Tangney, Boone, & Dearing (2005) proposed that the emotions of guilt and shame are differentially related to one’s propensity to (authentically) forgive oneself. Shame and
guilt are self-conscious emotions found to be distinct affectively and functionally 
(Tangney & Dearing, 2002). When guilt is experienced, one typically reports contrition 
about an offense committed against another person. The focal point in this emotion is not 
the whole person but, rather, the mistaken behavior that caused pain to the other. Guilt in 
its pure form (i.e., shame free guilt) has been shown to be associated with pro-social and 
reparative behaviors, and empathetic perspective taking (Tagney & Dearing, 2002). In 
shame, however, the focal point is not one’s behavior but, rather, the self as an integral 
whole. This emotion is associated with feeling small and unworthy, and may be followed 
by defensive and destructive behaviors when one’s sense of self is in jeopardy (Tangney 
& Dearing, 2002). Therefore, Tangney et al. (2005) proposed that shame prone 
individuals, unlike their guilt prone counterparts, will be especially likely to find it 
difficult to forgive themselves, because it is much easier to forgive oneself for a specific 
behavior than it is to forgive oneself for whom one is.

Offering Versus Receiving Forgiveness

Just as with interpersonal forgiveness, the bulk of forgiveness literature focuses 
on theories, models, and factors associated with forgiving others rather than receiving 
forgiveness. Again, Enright (1996) distinguished between genuine and unauthentic 
acceptance of forgiveness. He maintained that genuine acceptance of forgiveness entails 
the realization that the offering of forgiveness is a free gift willingly granted by the 
offended party, and is not something that the offender necessarily deserves to receive. 
Nevertheless, the offender needs to see himself or herself as worthy of the forgiveness 
offered by the offended party and be willing and able to accept forgiveness (Enright, 
1996). Finally, forgiveness is genuinely accepted if the offender makes attitudinal 
changes associated with the offense, changes one’s behaviors toward the offended
person, expresses contrition regarding the offense, and shows respect for the offended party (Enright, 1996).

Interpersonal Versus Intergroup Forgiveness

Humans do not live in isolation and one’s interaction with his or her social surround is likely to promote the development of group identity (Aaron, Aaron, & Norman, 2004). Group identity constitutes shared values, standards, history, cherished traditions, practices, and world views, and fosters a sense of interconnectedness and belongingness. This sense of belongingness and interconnectedness, while constituting a major source of security, pride, self-esteem, may also predispose an ingroup member to harbor resentment against outgroup individuals who have harmed ingroup members and striven to undermine the ingroup and its collective goals (Aaron et al., 2004). Hence, in the context of intergroup relationships, resentment toward offensive outgroup members may be experienced even if one has not personally experienced the offense.

The forgiveness literature has predominantly addressed resentment experienced by an identified person who personally experienced a hurtful treatment by an identified offender, or harbored resentment against someone who harmed a significant other in one’s life. However, while issues pertaining to interpersonal forgiveness have been copiously studied within the past three decades, the study of forgiveness from an intergroup/collective standpoint is still in its nascent stages. This is particularly true when considering forgiveness of other faith groups, an important variable given the numerous deadly events that have occurred from one religious group to another. Since this research project pertains to intergroup forgiveness, matters concerning ingroup attitudes and demeanors will be discussed more elaborately in a later section. The following section will focus on forgiveness from the perspectives of monotheistic faiths.
Forgiveness and the Monotheistic Religions: Judaism, Islam, and Christianity

Forgiveness and Judaism

What distinguished the Jewish faith from early polytheistic faiths was God’s forgiving character, and his ability to absolve humans for their sins. However, receiving forgiveness from God was contingent upon repenting for one’s sins (McCullough & Worthington, 1999; Rye et al., 2000). According to Judaism, humans are required to forgive their offender(s), provided that the offender has expressed an honest contrition for his or her transgression(s) and attempted to make amends necessary to rectify his or her wrong-doing. The act of repentance in Judaism is referred to as “Teshuvah,” which literally translates as “return” (i.e., a return from a sinful and blasphemous to a righteous way; Rye et al., 2000). The offering of forgiveness in Judaism is a “Mitzvah,” a Hebrew word for a command dictated by God (Rye et al., 2000).

Forgiveness follows offenses committed either against one’s fellow human being or God. Historically, in the Jewish tradition, receiving forgiveness from God has been achieved by praying, fasting, and sacrificial offering (Rye et al., 2000). Every year, there is a “Yom Kippur,” or the Day of Atonement. During this day, it is customary for Jewish adults to divest themselves of nutrition, drink, bathing, grooming, pleasurable activities, and work, in order to harness all of their energy into a deep introspective state, allowing them to examine misdeeds and ungodly thoughts and feelings which warrant forgiveness. Thus, the plea for God’s forgiveness in Yom Kippur pertains to offensive or blasphemous thoughts, deliberations, feelings, and intents, as well as acts (Rye et al., 2000). The Yom Kippur prayer (Kol Nidre) beseeches God to forgive us for offenses committed intentionally or unintentionally, maliciously or innocently, behaviorally or only contemplatively (Rye et al., 2000).
Forgiveness and Islam

Just as within the Jewish faith, the Islamic faith emphasizes the necessity of repentance as a prerequisite for God’s forgiveness (Nasr, 2004). The image of Allah (God) as a forgiving entity is frequently repeated in the Qur’an, as God is referred to as “Al-Ghafoor” (the most forgiving), “Al-Afuw” (the most capable of releasing us from the burden of punishment), “Al-Tawwab” (the most accepting of repentance), “Al Rahman” (the most merciful and compassionate), and “All Hallem” (clement) (Nasr, 2004). According to the Qur’an, Allah is full of patience, not quick to judge, and gives his followers plenty of opportunities to repent (Nasr, 2004).

In the Islamic tradition, people cannot expect forgiveness from God unless they are willing and capable of forgiving others. The Qur’an places a great emphasis on the divine quality of forgiveness, and the special affinity between God and those who choose to forgive instead of retaliate (Nasr, 2004). The virtue of forgiveness is seen by some Muslims as exceeding that of justice (McCullough & Worthington, 1999).

Forgiveness and Christianity

Among the three monotheistic religions, Christianity places the most emphasis on forgiveness, as a condition for being a part of the “Kingdom of God” (McCullough & Worthington, 1999). In general, forgiveness is a fundamental obligation in Christianity, required by all Christian believers, regardless of the wrongdoer’s amends (Rye et al., 2000). Harboring resentment or having vindictive thoughts or intentions is considered sinful in the Christian tradition, as Jesus Christ taught his followers to love their enemies and “turn the other cheek” when assaulted. Christian followers are required to forgive their transgressors, “just as Jesus has forgiven [us]” (Colossians, 3:13). The New
Testament accentuates the venomous nature of resentment, grudge-holding, and vendetta, and their Godly remedy, which is love (Rye et al., 2000).

It is important to stress the notion that, in Christianity, anger is not necessarily depicted as a negative emotion. Christian theologians have cited sections from the New Testament alluding to the notion that “anger is permissible when it is directed against the [sinful] passions in oneself and/or the demons that provoke the passions in self and others” (Gassin, 2001, p. 189). In addition, Gassin quoted the Eastern Orthodox Church father Diodochos, who claimed that anger against others is permissible if it is directed against their sins, and is expressed in a peaceful manner, with the ultimate goal of helping the sinners notice and repent their sins. Hence, other-directed anger is seen by some Christians as justified or righteous if it is not pride-ridden and if stems out of a candid concerns for the spiritual well being of their fellow followers (Gassin, 2001). The following section will discuss forgiveness correlates.

Forgiveness Correlates

Thus far, forgiveness has been defined and conceptualized from multiple perspectives. In the following section, factors found to be closely related to forgiveness will be explored. Specifically, the following chapter will discuss the interpersonal, personality, and cognitive as well as affective variables that are likely to predict forgiveness. Because the bulk of forgiveness literature focuses primarily on issues related to interpersonal forgiveness, the word “forgiveness” in the following sections will refer to interpersonal forgiveness, unless otherwise indicated (e.g., self-forgiveness, intergroup forgiveness).
Interpersonal Factors Related to Forgiveness

The likelihood of forgiveness to be offered by an offended party is contingent upon the frequency in which the offense has occurred, the intentionality of the harm caused, the severity of the harmful act, and the offender’s expression of contrition following the harm (e.g., Fincham, Jackson, & Beach, 2005; Gold & Weiner, 2000; Green, Brunette, & Davis, 2008; McCullough, Worthington, & Rachal, 1997; Mullet & Girard, 2000; Takaku, 2001). Said differently, it appears that forgiveness is more likely to follow an offense if the offender did not repeat the offense, if the harm was not caused on purpose, if no serious harm was caused as a result of the offense, and if the offender has shown a candid remorse over the offense. In addition, the extent to which the offended person finds the offender responsible for the hurtful act is also likely to determine the likelihood of forgiveness to take place (e.g., Green et al., 2008; Mullet, Riviere, & Sastre, 2007), as is the psychological proximity between the offended to the offending persons (Mullet & Girard, 2000; Mullet et al., 2007). Finally, in the context of interpersonal discord, trust may play an important role in facilitating forgiveness and restoring relationships (e.g., Gordon, Hughes, Tomcik, Dixon, & Litzinger, 2009; Reid & Woolley, 2006).

The Forgiving Personality

Mullet, Neto, and Riviere (2005) summarized studies that had investigated the “forgiving personality” or personality characteristics/dimensions associated with one’s propensity to forgive others. They have especially elucidated the Five-Factor personality dimensions (i.e., Openness to Experience, Conscientiousness, Extraversion, Agreeableness, and Neuroticism) related to vengeance, resentment, and forgiveness propensity. Mullet et al. (2005) have observed a very strong negative correlation between
the personality dimension of agreeableness and revengeful and resentful tendencies. They have also observed a strong positive correlation between neuroticism and revengeful tendency. Related, strong positive correlations have between observed between measures of dispositional forgiveness of others and agreeableness, conscientiousness, and extraversion, as well as a strong negative relationship between measures of dispositional forgiveness of others and neuroticism (Mullet et al., 2005).

Other personality variables that negatively and significantly correlated with forgiveness of others include anger, hostility, distrust, paranoid style, and narcissism, while personality variables positively and strongly correlated with forgiveness of others include gratitude, warmth, and, altruism (Mullet et al., 2005). There is some evidence to suggest that a secure attachment style is more positively and significantly correlated with forgiveness of offenders than insecure attachment styles (i.e., fearful, dismissive, and preoccupied; Lawler-Row, Younger, Piferi, & Jones, 2006; Webb, Call, Chickering, Colburn, & Heisler, 2006).

With regard to self-forgiveness, neuroticism has also been found to be negatively and consistently correlated with self forgiveness (Mullet et al., 2005). Hence, neurotic individuals appear to have difficulty forgiving themselves for offending others. There is also evidence to suggest that proneness to guilt and shame is inversely related to self-forgiveness (e.g., Strelan, 2007; Tagney, Boone, & Dearing, 2005).

Strelan (2007) has shown narcissistic entitlement to be strongly and positively related to self-forgiveness. In addition, Strelan showed that this relationship was mediated by measures of self-esteem and guilt proness. In essence, Strelan’s study evinces that individuals with narcissistic entitlement appear to be quick to forgive themselves, a tendency likely to be related to their low propensity to experience guilt, and
high projected self-esteem. Finally, there has been a consistent evidence evincing that vindictive tendencies and dispositional forgiveness are related to one’s tendency to ruminate over offenses (e.g., Berry, Worthington, O’Connor, Parrott, & Wade, 2005; Suchday, Friedberg, & Almeida, 2006; Ysseldyk, Matheson, & Anisman, 2007). Hence, the amount of energy exerted into “mentally rehearsing” the offense appears to be associated with more vindictive and unforgiving attitudes.

Empathy and Forgiveness

Of all pertinent psychological variables, the variable that has been found to be most closely related to forgiveness is empathy (Enright, 2001; Mullet et al., 2005). The emotion of empathy has sparked a great deal of curiosity in the field of psychology (Davis, 1983). Traditionally, empathy has been conceptualized along the cognitive and affective dimensions, the first referring to one’s ability to comprehend others’ conditions and, hence, accurately predict their reactions, while the latter referring to the emotional reactions to others’ conditions (Davis, 1983).

Davis (1983) conceptualized dispositional empathy along four dimensions: Perspective Taking, Empathic Concern, Fantasy, and Personal Distress. The Perspective Taking domain pertains to an impassionate comprehension of others’ circumstances, and the ability to make accurate predictions about others’ behaviors based on pivotal information. The Empathic Concern domain pertains to one’s proclivity to “experience feelings of sympathy and concerns for others” (Davis, 1983, p. 115). The Fantasy domain pertains to one’s degree of involvement in imaginative (and empathy producing) activities. Finally, the Personal Distress domain pertains to one’s proclivity to experience the distress experienced by others. There is a cogent evidence to suggest that forgiveness is fostered by cognitive and affective components of empathic disposition (Mullet et al.,
As well as empathy-inducing interventions (e.g., Enright, 2001; McCullough et al., 1997).

**Attributional Complexity and Empathy**

If empathy constitutes such a motivating force in the facilitation of forgiveness, it may behoove forgiveness researchers to explore psychological factors closely related to empathy. For example, empathy has been found to be related to numerous personality variables, including openness, conscientiousness, agreeableness, and extraversion (e.g., Del Barrio, Aluja, & Garcia, 2004; Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006). Empathy has been significantly associated with intrinsic religious orientation, or practicing one’s religion for internal and sincerely religious purposes rather than external rewards (e.g., Watson, Hood, Morris, & Hall, 1987). In addition, empathy has been found to be negatively correlated with narcissistic personality trait (Mullet et al., 2005). Because the following study addresses issues pertaining to intergroup relations (e.g., intergroup emotions and attitudes), the author of this study elected to discuss the relationship between empathy and a pertinent attributional variable, namely, attributional complexity.

Attributional Complexity pertains to the complexity in one’s cognitive schemata, when determining the causality of human’s behaviors (Fletcher, 1986). Attributional Complexity theory, which incorporates components of Tolerance for Ambiguity (Furnham & Ribchester, 1995), Need for Cognition (Cacioppo & Petty, 1982), as well as cognitive differentiation (Crockett, 1965) and integration (Werner, 1957), maintains that individuals differ with regard to their level of attributional complexity, varying from attributionally simple to attributionally complex individuals. Specifically, individuals differ with regard to motivation in understanding and explaining behavior, preference for complex explanations for human behavior, awareness of social and interactional
influences on human behavior, use of complex and abstract concepts when making internal causal attribution (e.g., beliefs and values), reliance on abstract external concepts (e.g., culture and society) when making causal attribution, metacognition (evaluation of one’s own thought processes), and the consideration of past events as having possible influences on current behavior.

One may argue that as people become more attributionally complex, they are expected to have broadened their attributional horizons and become sensitized to the unique circumstances impinging upon others which, in turn, will render them more empathic toward others. This was assessed by Joireman (2004). Joireman had one hundred and eighty undergraduate students, psychology majors, complete Davis’ (1983) Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI), a trait empathy measure, as well as Fletcher’s (1986) Attributional Complexity Scale. Results indicated a significant positive correlation between the Empathic Concern and Perspective Taking scales of Davis’ (1983) Interpersonal Reactivity Index and Fletcher’s (1986) Attributional Complexity Scale. That is, his study suggests a strong relationship one’s attributional complexity and one’s emotional and cognitive empathic disposition.

Recent evidence suggests attributionally complex individuals are perceived by their peers more favorably than their attributionally simple counterparts. Specifically, Fast, Reimer, and Funder (2008) had 178 participants complete the Attributional Complexity Scale (Fletcher, 1986) and have the participants’ acquaintances rate the target participants along several personality dimensions. Results indicated that the higher participants scored on the Attributional Complexity Scale the more likely they were to be perceived by their acquaintances as positive, open, expressive, socially skilled, wise, thoughtful and, most importantly, empathic. Hence, there appears to be a relationship
between attribution complexity and empathy as measured by self report as well as others' report.

The above studies have elucidated a strong associative relationship between attribution complexity and one’s affective empathy as well as one’s ability to cognitively fathom what it might be like to be in the other person’s shoes. In addition, empirical literature pertaining to cognitive processes underlying causal attribution reveals that attributional complexity may foster qualities essential for the emergence of empathy. For example, Fletcher, Reeder, and Bull’s (1990) study has revealed that attributionally complex individuals are, overall, more accurate than attributionally simple individuals in assessing true attitudes of other people.

In their study (Fletcher, Reeder and Bull, 1990), 30 undergraduate students, with varying attitudes towards legalization of homosexuality, were randomly assigned to write essays that either supported or opposed the legalization of gay relationships. Thus, each writer was asked to advocate a position that was either consistent or inconsistent with his or her real attitude. Afterwards several copies of each essay were made. In the second stage of the study, 200 undergraduate students completed the Attributional Complexity Scale (ACS) and were then divided into two groups. Each member of the group was randomly assigned to read one of the 30 essays. The members in one group were encouraged to take their time and read the essays very carefully, and then think about the essays they had just read. The second group had been told that it had had ten minutes to read the essays, after which period they were asked to perform another cognitive task to prevent them from further thinking about the essays. Afterwards, both groups were asked to estimate the writer’s true attitude towards legalization of homosexuality. Within the participants who were encouraged to use in-depth processing of the essay (the first
group), attributionally complex participants were more accurate than attributionally simple participants in “deciphering” the writer’s true attitude toward legalization of homosexuality, based on his or her writing.

Furthermore, increased Attributional complexity seems to be associated with reduced tendency to commit the fundamental attribution error (e.g., Devine, 1989a; Pope & Meyer, 1999), a pervasive social phenomenon pertaining to individuals’ over-reliance on dispositional factors and underestimation of external influences that may explicate human behaviors (Jones & Harris, 1967). For instance, in a mock jurors study by Pope and Meyer (1999), participants were shown a 100-minute film depicting a person who was on trial for armed robbery. The researchers reported that, in the past, this video had been shown to elicit equal amount of “guilty” and “non-guilty” verdicts, indicating that the culpability of the defendant is equivocal. The participants were, then, asked to render their judgment about the case.

The researchers hypothesized that attributionally simple individuals would tend to over-rely on dispositional (i.e., look, speech, race) factors and disregard the dearth of incriminating evidence when rendering judgment about the case. Their hypothesis was confirmed. In comparison with attributionally complex participants, attributionally simple participants were significantly more prone to find the defendant guilty and to attribute his behavior to his disposition before and after the presentation of pivotal evidence. Attributionally complex individuals appeared to be more sensitive to the environmental circumstances that impacted the criminal behavior. Hence, the above studies suggest that attributionally complex individual tend to be more sensitive to the unique environmental forces that may influence individuals’ behaviors and are, overall, more accurate in social judgment tasks, both of which are essential components in the
facilitation of one’s perspective taking ability and one’s capacity to experience empathic concern toward others.

Thus far, it appears that no study has examined the relationship between individual differences in attributional complexity and forgiveness. However, because of the firm conceptual and empirical links between one’s level of empathy and forgiveness (e.g., Enright, 2001; Worthington, 2005), it is believed that the development of attributionally complex characteristics would render one more likely to forgive offenders. The proposed relationship between attributional complexity and forgiveness will be discussed more elaborately in the hypotheses section.

Intergroup Forgiveness: The Emergence of a New Field

In the following section, intergroup forgiveness correlates and models will be discussed. However, prior to introducing the unique topic of intergroup forgiveness, it may be important to acquaint the reader with some established theories of interpersonal forgiveness. Hence, the following section will begin with a brief discussion pertaining to existent theories of interpersonal forgiveness, followed by discussions about pivotal matters as they pertain to intergroup forgiveness. A brief subsection will also be dedicated to accentuating the potential clinical value of forgiveness within the context of intergroup relationships in Rwanda.

Theories of Interpersonal Forgiveness

The etiology of forgiveness (or lack thereof) has been conceptualized from numerous theoretical perspectives, including psychodynamic, interpersonal, and developmental theories. For instance, psychodynamically, Lapsley (1966) maintained that rigid “intrapsychic contracts,” or stanch rules of social engagement instilled by one’s caretakers during one’s early years, may compromise one’s psychological flexibility
required in order to achieve forgiveness. Doyle (1999) summarized the conceptual framework of reputable object relation scholars and practitioners concerning forgiveness (e.g., Gartner, 1988; Hunter, 1978). She contended that the emergence of empathy, an essential intrapsychic function in the process of forgiveness, entails healthy self-object differentiation, allowing the offended party to synthesize “good” and “bad” representations of the self (i.e., the offended party) as well as the object (i.e., the offender; Doyle, 1999).

Unlike psychodynamic theories that emphasize primarily the intrapsychic function of forgiveness, interpersonal models of forgiveness accentuate the roles of intrapersonal (e.g., thoughts and feelings) as well as interpersonal processes of forgiveness (e.g., Hargrave, 1994). Hence, from an interpersonal point of view, forgiveness entails interaction between the “victim” and “victimizer,” leading to adaptive interpersonal resolutions. According to Rusbult, Hannon, Stocker, & Finkel (2005), the intrapersonal approach to forgiveness, while sufficient in situations that require “neither past nor future with one another,” may be warranted if relational repairs are sought (p. 197). In the context of interpersonal relationships, expression of genuine contrition and acceptance of responsibilities for one’s wrongdoing are likely to foster the cognitive (e.g., appreciation of the wrongdoer’s circumstances under which the transgression has occurred) and affective (i.e., empathy) responses necessary to promote forgiveness (Rusbult et al., 2005).

In the context of family dynamics, offenses involve a violation of relational ethics, which creates a systemic imbalance, with the offended family member feeling entitled for an emotional compensation (Hargrave, 1994). According to Hargrave (1994), in order for a familial balance to be reinstated, two processes should take place. The first
process, coined by Hargrave as “exoneration,” is purely intrapsychic and warrants the development of empathy toward the offending family member. The second process of interpersonal resolution is behavioral and interpersonal in nature, and is coined by Hargrave as “forgiveness.” This process entails compromises from the offended and the offending family members. The offending family member, on the one hand, takes responsibility for his or her actions and takes the necessary steps to restore the relationship and to gain the trust of the offended family member. The offended party, on the other hand, relinquishes resentful feelings and malevolent motives, and attempts to re-establish trust and (possibly) reunification with the offender.

From a developmental perspective, perhaps the most thorough model of forgiveness was developed by Enright and his colleagues, a model that coherently embeds within it the cognitive, affective, motivational, and behavioral/interpersonal domains of forgiveness (Enright, 2001; Enright & The Human Development Study Group, 1991). Enright and his colleagues postulated that the process of forgiveness is fully achieved by attaining four major stages: Uncovering, Decision, Working, and Outcome/Deepening, each comprising several “units” or phase-specific components. Initially, during the Uncovering Stage, the prospective forgiver realizes the magnitude of the offense’s impact on his or her life, the defense mechanisms utilized in order to assuage adverse feelings (e.g., shame and guilt) associated with the offense, and the detrimental effects of his or her unforgivingness on his or her life. In addition, during this stage, the person identifies the maladaptive ways he or she has been dealing with the hurtful feelings and the potential personal benefits that may transpire from letting go of lingering resentment.
During the decision stage, the injured “explores the idea of forgiveness and what is involved in the process of forgiveness before committing to actually forgiving” (Freedman, Enright, & Knutson, 2005, p. 395). During the Working stage, the forgiver gets to know the wrongdoer by viewing him or her in context, develops empathy toward the wrongdoer, commences to experience compassion for the wrong-doer, and works on accepting the past and letting go of the pain. Finally, during the Outcome/Deepening Stage, the forgiver experiences an increase in well-being associated with the emotional release, uses the offensive experience as an opportunity to grow and find a new meaning and purpose in life, realizes that he or she is not alone, as many others have had similar experiences, and acknowledges that he or she also needed forgiveness from others in the past. Having briefly reviewed prevalent theories of interpersonal forgiveness, the attention will now focus on intergroup forgiveness.

**Intergroup Forgiveness: The Emergence of a Unique Field**

September 11th 2001 will be perhaps one of the most memorable day (if not the most memorable day) for the United States of America. The loss of thousands of innocent lives and the insufferable grief following the terrorist attack left many individuals confused and traumatized. Angry feelings prevailed, resentment was perpetuated, and vindictive motives were mobilized among millions of Americans who had never encountered or seen the victims before. These rancorous feelings were provoked as a result of a deliberate massive attack against a nation with shared goals, values, and belief system.

The bulk of the current forgiveness literature focuses primarily on angry and vindictive feelings triggered by direct and personal offenses. However, as witnessed after the 9/11 attack, the abolishment of the Apartheid regime in South Africa, the resolution
of the Tutsi-Hutus conflict in Rwanda, the Catholic-Protestant conflict in Northern Ireland, and throughout the ongoing bloody Israeli-Palestinian conflict, feelings of “unforgivingness” can be elicited and perpetuated when a violent act initiated and executed by outgroup individuals offends ingroup individuals who share collective national, religious, and ethnic identity. As indicated previously, as long as “human identities” exist, an attack (perceived or real) against a collective entity is likely to create an atmosphere of hostility, which may uniquely impact one’s psychological well-being.

Just as with interpersonal forgiveness, the study of intergroup forgiveness varies with regards to the level of specificity. From a dispositional perspective, one might appraise one’s overall “forgiving attitude” toward outgroup members. For example, Hewstone et al. (2006), have developed an eight-item scale that measures forgiving and reconciliatory attitudes among Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland. On a more specific level, one might investigate the degree to which an ingroup victim/survivor has forgiven an outgroup member who was responsible for the pain and suffering caused by the ingroup victim/survivor. McLernon, Cairns, Hewstone, and Smith (2004) developed a 22-item forgiveness questionnaire, adapted from Enright’s Forgiveness Inventory, in which Catholic and Protestant participants were asked to indicate the degree that they had forgiven outgroup individuals who committed certain violent offenses, cognitively, emotionally, and behaviorally.

Just as with interpersonal forgiveness, intergroup forgiveness was found to be strongly related to outgroup empathy (e.g., Cehajic, Brown, & Castano, 2008; Noor, Brown, Gonzalez, Manzi, & Lewis, 2008; Tam, Hewstone, Kenworthy, Cairns, Marinetti Geddes, & Parkinson, 2008). In addition, intergroup forgiveness appears to be inversely related to intergroup anger and rumination over offenses (Tam et al., 2007). Positive
outgroup attitudes were shown to be positively correlated with and negative attitudes were shown to be negatively correlated with intergroup forgiveness (Tam et al., 2007).

How likely is intergroup forgiveness to take place by ingroup victims after a mass genocide or brutal tortures were committed by outgroup perpetrators? Byrne (2003a) interviewed Black South Africans, survivors of vicious violence, torture, and murders committed against them or their relatives by people in authority (White Afrikaans) during the Apartheid period, who were exposed to different accounts given by White perpetrators regarding their actions in front of the Truth and Reconciliation Committee, which included justifications, excuses, or apologies. Bryne revealed that the severity of the acts and lack of remorse were strongly related to the survivors’ unwillingness to forgive. In addition, data indicated that apologies and excuses were more likely to diminish anger in the survivors than justification (i.e., justifying the acts of genocide).

It is important to note, however, that the apologies offered by the White perpetrators in these accounts only comprised the words “I am sorry.” As Staub (2005) indicated, a true expression of contrition regarding a severe harm committed against the other consists of “acknowledgement of the harm done, assumption of responsibility for it, expression of seemingly genuine regret, sorrow for the harm one caused, and empathy for the victims” (p. 449). In addition, as alluded by Staub, expression of forgiveness may merely reflect cultural and religious norms and expectations rather than reveal one’s true thoughts and feelings. In Rwanda, for instance, the profound virtue of forgiveness edified and preached by the Catholic Church, of which many Rwandans are members, coupled with the government’s encouragement of reconciliation between the Tutsis and the Hutus, may reinforce expression of forgiveness (Staub, 2005).
The following subsections will be devoted to the unique discussion concerning the relationships between intergroup forgiveness and the following pertinent intergroup variables: intergroup contact, infrahumanization, out-group trust, common in-group identifications, and out-group heterogeneity. Another section will discuss intergroup forgiveness models, followed by a section uniquely devoted to illuminate the potential psychological benefits associated with implementing a group process intervention which endeavors to promote intergroup forgiveness and reconciliation. In essence, the following section will elucidate emotional and socio-cognitive variables found to be closely related to intergroup forgiveness.

**Intergroup contact and forgiveness.** In the midst of an era fraught with racial prejudices, discriminations, and acts of violence against Black Americans, Allport (1954) developed his Intergroup Contact Theory. Allport observed that prejudices and acts of discrimination were likely to be attenuated as Blacks and Whites came in contact with one another. However, four conditions, he contended, needed to be fulfilled in order for the intergroup contact to have positive effects. First, he argued that members of both groups should perceive equal status within a given situation. For instance, both European and African Americans in an integrative school system should perceive equal educational and career opportunities. Second, both groups need to work on achieving common goals. The movie “Remember the Titans” illustrates how the racially integrative football team’s quest for winning the championship facilitated a sense of harmony between White and Black players. However, having common goals may not be sufficient, as cooperation is warranted between the integrated group members in order to achieve the common goals. Finally, according to Allport, the final condition under which intergroup contact is likely to have a positive effect is through the support of the pertinent authorities. A plethora of
evidence indeed supports the notions that when these four conditions are met positive intergroup contact effects ensue (Pettigrew, 1998).

There are a number of changes that may occur as a result of positive intergroup contact? First, intergroup members get an opportunity to learn about the other group’s norms, customs, history, values, beliefs, and worldviews, a process which is purely cognitive in nature. Second, through confrontation of old beliefs, apprehensions, and biases, new pro-social behaviors toward outgroup members may ensue (Pettigrew, 1998). Third, successful intergroup contact involves a diminution in old maladaptive (e.g., anxiety) and the emergence of new adaptive (e.g., empathy) intergroup emotions (Pettigrew, 1998). Finally, positive intergroup contact is likely to lead to outgroup re-appraisal, which involves more complex and astute perspectives about the outgroup and abandonment of parochial prejudiced views, a process coined by Pettigrew as “de-provincialization” (p.72).

If positive intergroup contact does promote pro-social intergroup emotions, more perspicacious views of the outgroup, and facilitates pro-social behaviors toward outgroup members, one may logically deduce that empathy and forgiveness toward outgroup members are likely to germinate out of such positive intergroup contact. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that quality and quantity of contact between members of adversarial groups are associated with empathy and forgiveness toward outgroup victimizers (e.g., Cehajic et al., 2008; Moeschberger et al., 2005; Tam, Hewstone et al., 2008). Essentially, the relationship between intergroup contact and intergroup forgiveness appears to be mediated by one’s level of empathy (Moeschberger et al., 2005; Tam, Hewstone, et al., 2008).
Infrahumanization and intergroup forgiveness. The terrorist attacks in 2001 resulted in two significant travesties. The obvious one was the deaths of innocent people and the excruciating loss incurred by victims’ families and the loved ones. The second travesty observed was the emergence of us-against-them attitude or, what Janis (1972) would refer to as, Group Thinking. According to Janis, Group thinking is likely to occur in a highly cohesive society adhering to common goals and values, and is typically activated during times of distress and pressure. The emergence of group thinking is associated with compromised critical thinking, examination of pertinent information, confrontation of commonly acceptable ideas, as well as reliance on cognitive short-cuts or simple heuristics (stereotypical thinking) when appraising significant social situations.

Group thinking may also promote a sense of ingroup entitlement and outgroup belittlement (Janis, 1972). One manner in which such out group degradation may take place is through what Leyens and his colleagues referred to as “infrahumanization” (Leyens, Rodriguez-Perez, Rodriguez-Torres, Gaunt, Paladino, & Vaes, 2001). Infrahumanization pertains to the socio-cognitive phenomenon, according to which members of the ingroup are inclined to attribute more uniquely human emotions to themselves than to outgroup members. Compared to secondary, or uniquely human, emotions, such as love, pride, and empathy, primarily emotions are conceived as survival-ridden emotions shared by humans as well as animals, such as anger, fear, and pleasure.

The phenomenon of infrahumanization has been well documented in the social psychology literature (e.g., Castano & Giner-Sorolla, 2006; Marcu & Chryssochoou, 2005; Viki & Winchester, 2006). For instance, in a study by Marcu & Chryssochoou (2005), non-Gypsy British participants rated their Gypsy counterparts as experiencing
significantly fewer uniquely human emotions than they did. In a post Hurricane Katrina study (Cuddy, Rock, & Norton, 2007), Black and White adult participants were asked to rate the degree to which they believed ingroup and outgroup post Katrina victims had felt various uniquely human emotions (e.g., anguish, remorse, and mourning). Both Black and White participants in the study reported they believed outgroup victims to experience fewer secondary emotions than the ingroup victims.

There is evidence to suggest that infrahumanization is likely to occur when collective guilt is elicited by reminders of atrocities committed by members of the majority groups (Castano & Giner-Sorolla, 2006). Using the cognitive dissonance theory explanation (Festinger, 1957), infrahumanization is likely to be used by majority ingroup members as a method to resolve guilt stemming from the incongruence between one’s perception of self and his or her ingroup as moral, humane, and righteous, and exposure to contradictory information. By infrahumanizing outgroup members, it may be easier to justify atrocities committed against outgroup members and, hence, maintain a cohesive sense of moral integrity (Castano & Giner-Sorolla, 2006).

With regards to the relationship between infrahumanization and forgiveness, there is evidence to suggest that seeing outgroup members as possessing fewer uniquely human qualities than ingroup members is likely to impede intergroup forgiveness (e.g., Tam et al., 2007; Wohl & Brancombe, 2005). In other words, infrahumanization appears to be strongly and inversely correlated with intergroup forgiveness. Hence, the results of these studies accentuate the necessity of perceiving outgroup members as endowed with equally human characteristics in order for them to be deemed as worthy of forgiveness. The following subsection will closely examine relationships between outgroup trust and intergroup forgiveness.
Outgroup trust and intergroup forgiveness. Just as with interpersonal forgiveness (see previous section), in the context of violent intergroup conflicts, in order for in-group members to embrace the option of intergroup forgiveness and reconciliation as a viable tool for coexistence, it may be particularly important for in-group members to perceive out-group members as trustworthy individuals, whose underlying intentions exclude harming the in-group, its collective goals, or legitimacy to exist. For example, many Israelis and Palestinians appear opposed to reconciliatory initiatives, an opposition that is likely to stem from decades of suspiciousness and mutual mistrust.

A well renowned Israeli social psychology scholar, Professor Arie Nadler, has highlighted the significance of intergroup trust in facilitating positive attitudes toward intergroup reconciliation (Nadler & Liviatan, 2006). In his two studies, Jewish Israeli undergraduate students were exposed to an account by a Palestinian leader who addressed the Israeli suffering as a result of the ongoing Palestinian-Israeli conflict. In his account, the leader either expressed empathy or did not express empathy, took responsibility or did not take responsibility for the Israeli suffering. The students were asked to complete several measures of intergroup attitudes, among which were intergroup reconciliation attitudes and a measure that assesses their trust in Palestinians. An analysis of variance in both studies revealed a significant main effect for trust; that is willingness to reconcile increased as out-group trust increased. Moreover, there was a significant interaction between expression of trust and empathy, such that the effect of expression of empathy on intergroup reconciliation attitudes was evident only among Israelis who showed a high level of trust in Palestinians.

In addition, in a fairly recent study conducted by Ifat Maoz (2008), another well-known Israeli scholar in the realm of intergroup relations between Israeli Jews and
Palestinians, the effect that participation in structured meetings between Israeli Jews and Palestinians on Israeli Jews’ attitudes towards integrative solutions to the Palestinians-Israeli conflict was examined. This study revealed that participation in such peace-oriented meetings predicted integrative attitudes among Israeli Jews, and that the relationship between intergroup contact and integrative attitudes was mediated by Israeli Jew's level of trust in Palestinians. However, while integrative attitudes may be construed as a noteworthy component in the intergroup forgiveness process, they do not directly address forgiveness attitudes.

Heading Northwest, there is a cogent empirical evidence suggesting a significant effect of level of out-group trust on intergroup forgiveness attitudes among Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland (Hewstone et al., 2006; Noor et al., 2008) and Bosnian Muslims’ willingness to forgive Bosnian Serbs for misdeeds committed against them during the 1992-1995 war (Cehajic et al., 2008). Taken together, the above studies empirically support the notion that in order for an intergroup forgiveness to be achieved, some degree of trust is expected to be attained or restored between adversarial groups. After all, adopting forgiving or reconciliatory attitudes toward the outgroup, barring reassurance about the outgroup’s benevolent (or at least non-malevolent) predisposition toward the ingroup, may potentially jeopardize the well-being of the ingroup members.

*Forgiveness and common in-group identification.* Are we (humans) really all that different? The social psychology literature often times accentuates the individual differences that account for differences in human behaviors, emotions, thoughts, attitudes, and beliefs. In the realm of multiculturalism or intergroup relations, the underlying unique ingredients that distinguish one group of people from another appear to have a special appeal to many anthropologists. However, what about that which makes
us humans similar? Gaertner and Dovidio (2000) proposed that intergroup biases may be reduced as members of both in-group and out-group members adopt a more inclusive, or overarching, self-defining identity categories. Gaettner and Dovidio contended that creating an overarching, superordinate, identity categorization to which both conflicted groups can relate may enhance positive and attenuate negative intergroup attitudes, emotions, and behaviors. Laboratory experiments have, indeed, demarcated the effect of common in-group identification on reduction in intergroup biases and conflicts (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000; Gaertner, Mann, Murrell, & Dovidio, 2001).

Caution is needed, however, when utilizing such overarching superordinate categorization. The formation of such categorization need not exclude the cultural uniqueness of the ingroup, nor does such superordinate categorization supersede it (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). In fact, recent evidence suggests that, among White Americans, mental representations that integrates both superordinate and subordinate representations (European Americans) may be associated with diminished prejudices while solely adopting superordinate representation (i.e., Americans) may be associated with increased prejudices against African Americans (Dach-Gruschow & Hong, 2006). Dach-Gruschow and Hong (2006) argued that such dual representation underlies acknowledgement of the different identity aspects within one's cultural self-definition, rather than exclusively equating the superordinate categorization with one’s majority culture (i.e., “being American means being White”).

If common in-group identity categorization facilitates pro-social intergroup orientation, one might logically infer that such categorization is likely to cultivate intergroup attitudes, emotions, and behavioral tendencies warranted for healthy resolution of intergroup conflicts, such as intergroup forgiveness. Two studies have shown a strong
link between common in-group identification and intergroup forgiveness (Cehajic et al., 2008; Noor et al., 2008; Wohl & Brancombe, 2005). In a study by Cehajic et al. (2008), the more Muslim Bosnians identified with the superordinate identity category of being “Bosnians,” the more ready they were to forgive Bosnian Serbs for the atrocities committed against the Muslim population. In four controlled experiments conducted by Wohl & Brancombe (2005), North American Jews and Native Canadians who were implicitly encouraged to categorize their identity inclusively (i.e., in terms of being humans) were more willing to forgive Germans and White Canadians respectively for past atrocities, compared with participants who categorize their identity exclusively (i.e., in terms of being Jewish or Native Canadians). Hence, there appears to be a salient effect of common in-group identification on one’s willingness to forgive the offensive out-group.

**Outgroup heterogeneity and forgiveness.** The social psychology phenomenon of Outgroup Homogeneity Effect refers to in-group members’ general tendency to overestimate the out-group’s homogeneity and the in-group’s heterogeneity (Mullen & Hu, 1989; Ostrom & Sedikides, 1992). The adaptive nature of such intergroup bias is quite comprehensible. After all, intergroup members are more likely to come in contact with one another and, therefore, are more likely to have encountered the variability within the ingroup, including central tendencies and deviant exemplars (Ostrom & Sedikides, 1992). The relatively dearth of intergroup contact, on the other hand, may predispose the in-group members to rely on general categorical attributes when rendering judgment about out-group members (Ostrom & Sedikides, 1992).

The perception of the out-group as homogenous is likely to promote negative intergroup attitudes (e.g., Islam & Hewstone, 1993a) and stereotypes (e.g., Bartsch, Judd,
Louw, Park, & Ryan, 1997; Hewstone & Hamberger, 2000). Variables found to foster perception of out-group homogeneity include an increase in intergroup competition (Judd & Parks, 1993; Sassenberg, Moskowitz, Jacoby, & Hansen, 2006) and the ensuing increase in in-group identification (Castano & Yzerbyt, 1998). What appears to facilitate perception of out-group heterogeneity includes direct or indirect intergroup friendships, an effect that appears to be mediated by reduction in cross-group anxiety (Paolini, Hewstone, Cairns, & Voci, 2004). In essence, Paolini et al.’s (2004) study suggests that there appears to be a relationship between exposure to the “out-group culture” and augmented sensitivity to the out-group variability.

If intergroup contact facilitates an increase in the perception of out-group heterogeneity (Paolini et al., 2004), this, in turn, may render the in-group member more impervious to baseless inferences regarding the inherent tendency of the out-group as a whole (e.g., “all Arabs are terrorists”) drawn from deviant exemplars or cases (e.g., suicide bombing committed by a few individuals). If perceived diversification within out-group members renders deviant out-group exemplars distinguishable from the out-group’s general predisposition, one might reasonably argue that, in the context of intergroup conflict, intergroup forgiveness is more likely to germinate out of such perceptual change. This is exactly what Cehajic et al. (2008) have shown in their study.

Cehajic et al. (2008) have revealed a relationship between positive intergroup contact between Bosnian Serbs and Bosnian Muslims, and Bosnian Muslims’ willingness to forgiveness Bosnian Serbs for the years of anguish incurred by the Muslims. The relationship between intergroup contact and intergroup forgiveness was mediated by Muslims’ empathy and trust toward the Serbs, and perception of Bosnian Serbs as constituting a heterogeneous group of people. Hence, the data obtained in Cehajic et al.’s
study suggest that there appears to be a unique relationship between intergroup contact and intergroup forgiveness, such that positive intergroup contact facilitates perception of out-group heterogeneity which, in turn, enhances intergroup forgiveness. As indicated by Cehajic et al., the process of perceptual differentiation or subcategorization within the out-group “may facilitate forgiveness of the [out]group as a whole,” a process that may be accounted for by “the separation of negative exemplars from the image of the outgroup as a whole” (p. 354).

**Conceptual models of intergroup forgiveness.** Tam et al. (2007) conducted two studies involving Northern Irish Catholic and Protestant undergraduate participants. In these studies, participants were requested to complete the Intergroup Forgiveness Scale developed Hewstone et al. (2006), which measures intergroup forgiveness attitudes. They were also administered a scale that measures the adverse intergroup emotions of fear and anger developed by Mackie and Smith (2002), a measure of infrahumanization, and an outgroup attitude scale, which measures the degree to which ingroup members perceive outgroup members as cold-warm, negative-positive, friendly-hostile, generous-selfish, insensitive-sensitive, and insincere-sincere. Finally, the quantity and quality of intergroup contact between Catholics and Protestants was assessed (Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Vople, & Ropps, 1997).

Tam and colleagues proposed a unique intergroup forgiveness model. They surmised that the amount and quality of past positive interactions between Catholics and Protestants would predict decreased infrahumanization as well as decreased adverse emotions and improved attitudes toward outgroup members, which would, in turn, lead to intergroup forgiveness. In general, both studies revealed that group contact was significantly correlated with more positive outgroup attitudes and reduced intergroup
anger, and that outgroup attitudes and anger were significantly correlated with intergroup forgiveness, as predicted by the model. In addition, infrahumanization was inversely and significantly correlated with intergroup forgiveness in both studies. However, the negative correlation between intergroup contact and infrahumanization was non-significant (see Figure 1).

Finally, Tam et al. (2008) examined the roles of infrahumanization, outgroup anger, as well empathy felt toward the other (outgroup) community in mediating the relationship between social contact and intergroup forgiveness. Path analysis revealed that intergroup contact predicted intergroup forgiveness, a relationship that was mediated by outgroup anger and empathy. Unlike the previous study, there was a significant

Figure 1. The Roles of Intergroup Anger, Infrahumanization, and Outgroup Attitudes as Mediating the Effect of Intergroup Contact on Intergroup Forgiveness (Tam et al, 2007).
negative correlation between social contact and infrahumanization, and a non-significant negative correlation between infrahumanization and intergroup forgiveness (see Figure 2).

*Figure 2. The Roles of Intergroup Anger, Infrahumanization, and Intergroup Empathy as Mediating the Effect of Intergroup Contact on Intergroup Forgiveness (Tam et al, 2008).*

Taken together, the above studies suggest a relationship between social contact between ingroup and outgroup members and intergroup forgiveness, which appears to be mediated by intergroup attitudes, empathy, infrahumanization, and anger toward the outgroup members. The significant negative correlations between outgroup anger and intergroup forgiveness, and positive correlation between outgroup attitudes and intergroup forgiveness are consistent with the overarching conceptual framework of
forgiveness discussed previously, according to which forgiveness is associated with substituting resentful thoughts, feelings, and motives toward the offenders with positive ones. In order to conclude this section, the therapeutic benefits of intergroup forgiveness will be illustrated, using a group process intervention designed to facilitate reconciliation between Tutsis and Hutus in Rwanda and forgiveness within Tutsis who experienced or witnessed brutal violence, murder, and civil right violation by Hutu perpetrators.

**Potential benefits of intergroup forgiveness.** A group process intervention was developed by Staub and his colleagues (Staub, 2005), which was designed to promote forgiveness among Tutsis toward the genocide committed by the Hutus in Rwanda, and to facilitate the process of reconciliation and connection between these two major groups in Rwanda. Both Tutsi victims and Hutu perpetrators participated in the seminar that included lectures, discussions about the impact of traumatizing events experienced by the victims, understanding the origin of genocide as a social phenomenon and as it pertained to the situation in Rwanda, and the connection between deprivation of human needs and the emergence of genocide. This seminar provided Tutsi survivors with opportunities to tell their stories and express painful feelings (e.g., grief and loss) associated with the genocide, “with Hutus present as empathic witnesses” (p. 452).

The utility of the above seminar was examined by having 35 Tutsi and Hutu trained group leaders lead three different types of group. In the integrated groups, group leaders combined the above therapeutic model upon which they were trained with their own traditional approach. In the traditional groups, group facilitators did not receive the above training. Finally, members in the control groups received no treatment. Results suggested that “participants in the integrated group showed a reduction in trauma symptoms from before the treatment to two months afterward, both over time and in
relation to the two other groups” (Staub, 2005, p. 452). In general, in the integrated groups, Tutsi members expressed willingness to forgive Hutu members provided that the latter would make amends for the wrong-doing of their group. Moreover, Tutsi and Hutus “showed more positive orientation toward members of the other group, both over time and in relation to the traditional and control groups…, awareness of the roots of violence, [and a] willingness to work together for a better future” (Staub, 2005, p. 452).

Study Hypotheses

The following section will discuss the study hypotheses. However, because this study pertains to intergroup forgiveness in the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, a brief account of background information regarding the historical animosity between these two groups of people may be warranted.

The Israeli-Palestinian Conflict

The Israeli-Palestinian conflict constitutes a segment of a larger conflict, the Arab-Israeli conflict, the roots of which can be traced back to the late 19th century, a period of time characterized by Arabic and Zionist nationalism, and the burgeoning establishment of Jewish communities comprising European Jewish Immigrants. The Balfour Declaration in 1917 was the first formal recognition of a Jewish Homeland within a predominantly Palestinian territory ruled by the British government. After World War I, the United Kingdom was granted a mandate over, what was then known as, Palestine. The formal recognition of the State of Israel in April 1948 by the United Nations ignited vehement recurrent wars between Israel and its neighboring countries (Egypt, Jordan, Syria, and Lebanon) that adamantly refused to recognize the legitimacy of the new state (Gelvin, 2005).
The Arab-Israeli Wars cost the lives of thousands of Israeli and Arabic people, and resulted in the expansion of the Israeli territory beyond the borders formally recognized by the United Nation (i.e., the “Green Lines”). The concurred lands, including Gaza, the West Bank, and East Jerusalem, were settled by a predominantly Palestinian population that has always striven to gain its independence from Israel and to establish its own autonomous Palestinian state. The “intifada” or Palestinian resistance initially manifested itself though armed resistance against Israeli soldiers within the occupied territories. During the 1990’s, Palestinian militia groups (e.g., the Hamas) began expanding the scope of their assault as to include Israeli citizens (e.g., sending suicide bombers to major Israeli cities and launching katiusha rockets over to the southernmost cities of Israel). Such assaults were typically followed by significant military retaliations by the Israeli Defense Force (IDF). Despite IDF’s scrupulous efforts to exclusively target the individuals responsible for the terrorist attacks, Israeli military retaliations often resulted in hundreds of casualties, the majority of whom were innocent Palestinian civilians. The Israeli occupation of the Palestinian territories, the ensuing socio-economic and political degradation experienced by the Palestinians, the casualties and death toll associated with the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and the detrimental effects of these violent conflicts on the psychological well-being of both Palestinians and Israelis, have created an atmosphere of perpetual intergroup animosity, hostility, and hatred (Gelvin, 2005).

It is important to note that the Israeli-Palestinian conflict is sometimes referred to as the “Jewish-Palestinian conflict,” because the Palestinian resistance has been typically directed against the “Zionist establishment” and the Jewish ideologies underlying it. Hence, the conflicted parties here are, essentially, Jewish Israelis and Muslim Palestinians. Moreover, it is important to note that while the vast majority of Israeli
citizens are Jewish Israelis, twenty percent of the Israeli population consists of Arabic Israeli citizens. Many Arabic Israelis live in separate villages or towns predominantly settled by Arabs, where they preserve their culture, religion, heritage, and identity. Further, the majority of Arabic Israelis (around 80%) are self-identified as Palestinians, and support the efforts and battles by Palestine to achieve full independence (Gelvin, 2005). As self-identified Palestinians, these Israeli citizens have been adversely affected by the severe harm and deprivation incurred by the Palestinian people (Gelvin, 2005).

Israeli Arabs, sometimes referred to as Israeli Palestinians, are Israelis by citizenships (i.e., they hold a "blue" identification card), but are Palestinians by nationality. In a nutshell, what binds Palestinians people (whether they are Palestinian residents or Israeli Arabs) is their cultural identity rooted in the Middle East, their Arabic language, and ardent love for their land and heritage. The vast majority of the Palestinian people are Muslim, particularly of the Sunni branch of the Islam, although there is a significant number of Christian Palestinians (Gelvin, 2005).

Study Participants

Because the study took place within the Israeli territory, the study author aspired to collect data from Israeli Jews as well as Israeli Arabs (Palestinian nationals). However, unfortunately (although quite anticipated), possibly due to the delicate political situation and, hence, the possible fear of retaliation or repercussion among many Israeli Arabs to “admit” their support for Palestine and its resistance endeavor, despite diligent safeguards to insure confidentiality, the author of this study managed to collect information solely from Jewish participants. It is, therefore, of utmost importance for future scholars and researchers to examine Palestinians’ forgiveness attitudes toward the
State of Israel. The challenges associated with the one-sidedness of this study will be addressed and discussed more elaborately later on in this manuscript.

**Study Hypotheses**

The purpose of this study was threefold. First, it attempted to corroborate existent findings concerning intergroup forgiveness antecedents, although in the context of the Palestinian-Israeli conflict. In line with Allport’s Contact Theory which contends that positive intergroup contact promotes pro-social intergroup feelings and attitudes, there is cogent and consistent empirical evidence which elucidates the effect of positive intergroup contact on intergroup forgiveness, a relationship that is mediated by intergroup attitudes and anger, empathy, infrahumanization, trust, and perception of out-group homogeneity.

Based upon pertinent empirical evidence regarding precursors to (interpersonal and intergroup) forgiveness, the current study, which (originally) targeted Israeli Jews as well as Israeli Arabs, proposed that positive intergroup contact is likely to promote intergroup forgiveness attitudes. It was hypothesized that positive intergroup contact would enhance outgroup empathy, diminish intergroup anger, improve intergroup attitudes, augment outgroup trust, and will render members of the in-group more sensitive to the unique human emotions and diversity within the out-group, and that these cognitive and affective changes would, in turn, facilitate intergroup forgiveness attitudes. In other words, it was suggested that positive intergroup contact would have a significant effect on in-group members’ attitudes toward intergroup forgiveness, an effect that would be mediated by intergroup anger and attitudes, the perception of the out-group as a heterogeneous rather than homogenous group and as possessing equally human emotions,
the ability of the in-group members to experience empathy toward out-group members’ suffering, and in-group members’ ability to trust the out-group.

It is imperative to note here that the opportunities for intergroup contacts between Israeli Jews and Palestinians within the occupied territories (i.e., residents of Palestine) are awfully scarce due to the stern physical segregation between Israel and Palestine. Nevertheless, contacts (professional or personal) between Israeli Jews and Israeli Arabs (Arabs citizens of Israel) occur rather frequently. These contacts may provide Israeli Jews with opportunities to be exposed to, learn about, and develop cultural sensitivity to the unique fabric of the Arabic society and the Arabic cultural values that underlie the Palestinian belief system. Therefore, it is believed that positive intergroup contact between Israeli Jews and Israeli Arabs is likely to foster attitudinal and affective changes that may, consequentially, impact Israeli Jews' willingness to adopt forgiving/reconciliatory attitudes towards Palestinians.

In addition, the author of this study was interested in exploring the relationship between intergroup forgiveness and the following variables: individual differences in one’s attributional complexity and the degree of superordinate categorical identity shared by Israeli Jews and Israeli Arabs self-identified as Palestinians. Previous research findings have shown a noteworthy strong association between one’s level of attributional complexity and one’s empathic predisposition (Fast et al., 2008; Joireman, 2004). The strong association between attributional complexity and empathy may be related to attributionally complex individuals’ special inclination to show sensitivity to external influences that may impinge upon others when evaluating the causes of their behaviors (e.g., Fletcher et al., 1990).
Because empathy constitutes such an essential element in the development of forgiveness (Enright, 2001), it is argued that the empathy-promoting characteristics associated with attributional complexity, including the frequent utilization of metacognition when appraising other people’s behaviors, the consideration of one’s past event, history, and unique personal circumstances in influencing current behavior, and motivation to understand humans’ behaviors, are likely to predispose the attributionally complex individual to adopt forgiving attitudes. In the realm of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, it is believed that these characteristics will render Israelis and Palestinians (either residents of Palestine or self-identified Palestinians who are citizens of Israel) more cognizant, sensitive, and knowledgeable about the unique social, historical, and environmental circumstances underlying the out-group current suffering and, hence, will foster more forgiving and reconciliatory attitudes toward the outgroup. Hence, the author of the study proposed a strong positive associative relationship between attributional complexity among Israeli Jews and Israeli Arabs, and intergroup forgiveness attitudes.

Moreover, in the context of intergroup conflicts, common in-group identification, or the degree of perceived overlapping superordinate identity aspects between in-group and out-group members, has also been shown to correlate with intergroup forgiveness (Cehajic et al., 2008; Wohl & Brancombe, 2005). The superordinate identities in the above studies were assessed in terms of one’s degree of identification with the “human community” or one’s degree of national identification with his or her country.

However, in a land where one’s religious convictions and practices considerably impact one’s thoughts, feelings, behaviors, choice of life style, and self-definition, it may be reasonable to presume that there operates a similar cognitive system of superordinate and subordinate categorizations within one’s religious identity. For example, Jews and
Muslims represent two distinct religious groups of people, whose religions are associated with unique customs, beliefs, and practices. However, as indicated in a previous chapter, what seems to bind these groups of people together is their monotheistic faith, or belief in one, universal, invisible, righteous, and forgiving God.

On the surface level, a religious identity has been typically associated with one's affiliation with a religion or religious denominations, which distinguishes it from other religious groups (Alwin, Felson, Walker, & Tufis, 2006). On the more covert level, religious identity has been often discussed in terms of one's religiosity. Underlying one's religiosity or religiousness are one's belief systems, moral codes of conduct, as well as one's relationship with the universe, other human beings, and to the divine (Ysseldyk, Matheson, Anisman, 2010). Religiosity has been associated with multiple factors (Hill & Hood, 1999), and can be conceptualized along the cognitive (knowledge), affective (feelings God or the Divine), and behavioral dimensions (e.g., religious practices) (Cornwall, Albrecht, Cunningham, & Pitcher, 1986).

However, while one's religious identity may be defined by his or her beliefs in a religious doctrine, religious practices, and/or sense of connectivity with the divine, it is also related to one's sense of belongingness or affinity with the religious ingroup members, who share similar history, culture, status, social/political goals or aspiration, as well as difficulties (e.g., discrimination; Joseph, 2004). The process of the development of one's religious identity is beyond the scope of this study, and has been studied abundantly with various religions and religious denominations (Joseph, 2004). However, whether a Christian, a Muslim, or a Jew, one overarching theme that may characterizes religious identity development is what Hewitt (1989) refers to as the" strategy of exclusivity," associated with the process of accentuating the essential features in one's
faith that makes one's faith unique, separate, and (often times) spiritually/morally superior to other faiths. Healthy development of ethnic as well as religious identity has been linked with favorable psychological outcomes (e.g., Joseph, 2004). In the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, a positive ethnic and religious identity among Palestinian adolescents have been found to be significantly associated with psychological well-being (Abu-Rayya & Abu-Rayya, 2009). However, a religious identity that claims exclusivity to the point of dismissal of and disregard for other religious faiths is likely to promote prejudices, discrimination, fanaticism, and hinder coexistence (Hewitt, 1989).

Therefore, in line with previous research findings vis-à-vis superordinate/subordinate social identity, the author of the following study postulated that Israeli Jews and Arabs who embrace a superordinate/inclusive monotheistic religious belief (e.g., conceiving of Muslims’ God as the same as the God of the Jews; appreciating the common grounds shared by the Torah and the Islam) rather than subordinate/exclusive religious categorization (e.g., conceiving of Muslims’ God as fundamentally different from the God of the Jews; seeing no common denominator between the Torah and the Koran) are in a better position to adopt intergroup forgiveness attitudes. Thus, a strong and positive correlation between common in-group religious categorization/identification and intergroup forgiveness has been hypothesized in the following study.

Finally, the purpose of the following study was also exploratory in its nature. In a land where intergroup animosity and violence constantly and adversely impact one’s comfort, sense of safety, and poses threat to the valued goals shared by his or her in-group (e.g., self-determination), it is reasonable to surmise that such intergroup conflict will affect the group members’ overall psychological well-being. This study purported to
explore the potential relationship between pertinent intergroup attitudes/emotions and psychological well-being.

Browsing PsyInfo, there is an abundance of empirical evidence alluding to the psychological effects of direct exposure to terrorist attacks. However, recent evidence suggests that repeated exposure to media coverage of terrorist attacks may indirectly impact one’s psychological well-being (Blanchard et al., 2004; Slone & Shoshani, 2008). Such adverse psychological impacts include anger (Yukawa, Endo, & Yoshida, 2001), depression (Knudsen, Roman, Johnson, & Ducharme, 2005), and symptoms of Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (Lawyer, Resnick, Galea, Ahren, Kilpatrick, & Vlahov, 2006). Also, available literature suggests that interpersonal forgiveness has been related to reduced psychopathology and an increase in life satisfaction (Toussaint & Webb, 2005). Psychological interventions designed to induce adaptive interpersonal forgiveness have been shown to attenuate a wide array of psychopathological symptoms (Enright, 2001). A strong relationship between interpersonal forgiveness and one’s overall psychological well-being has also been evident (Bono et al., 2007; Karremans et al., 2003). Because of common fundamental cognitive and affective processes underlying both interpersonal and intergroup forgiveness (i.e., the relinquishing of resentful/vindictive and the acquisition of pro-social thoughts, emotions, and motives towards the offenders) it would be reasonable to surmise that similar relationship might surface between pivotal components of intergroup forgiveness and one’s psychological well-being. Therefore, the following study attempted to investigate the possible associative relationships between psychological well-being and the following variables among Israeli Jews and Arabs/Palestinians: intergroup attitudes, intergroup anger, and intergroup forgiveness attitudes. There is a reliable consensus that a major component in
forgiveness is the relinquishing of anger and vindictive motives toward an offender objectively culpable of committing (often willingly) an offense (Younger, Piferi, Jobe, & Lawler, 2004). Hence, it is contended that attenuation of anger constitutes an especially significant component in the attainment of forgiveness. However, a complete definition of forgiveness includes attitudinal/motivational components as well (Enright, 2001), and it was the author’s intention to investigate the degree to which these three components may plausibly play a role in promoting psychological well-being.

In short, in the following study, the following hypotheses were tested:

1. Quantity and quality of intergroup contact will predict intergroup forgiveness, a relationship that will be mediated by outgroup trust, degree of infrahumanization, outgroup attitudes, outgroup empathy, outgroup anger, and perceived outgroup heterogeneity.

2. Attributional complexity will be positively associated with intergroup forgiveness.

3. The degree to which ingroup members perceive their Higher Power/God and religious doctrine inclusively, rather than exclusively, will be highly correlated with intergroup forgiveness.

4. Intergroup forgiveness, and its related components (outgroup anger and attitudes) will predict psychological well-being, beyond which can be already explained by one’s tendency to be forgiving.
CHAPTER III

METHOD

Participants

Data were collected from one hundred and sixty six Israeli citizens using the snowballing method. Although the author of this study originally intended to collect data from Israeli Jews as well as Arabs, geographical constraints associated with the data collection significantly limited the opportunities to collect data from Israeli Arabs. The individuals who volunteered to assist the researcher with the data collection lived in Tel Aviv, Ramat Hasharon, Modiin, and Rosh Pina, all of which are areas primarily, if not homogenously, settled by Israel Jews. Therefore, data were collected solely from Jewish participants.

Instruments

Attributional Complexity Scale (ACS: Fletcher, 1986)

The ACS was developed to measure the degree of one’s cognitive schema’s complexity when assessing human behaviors. This scale contains 28 items (statements) and seven domains: temporal dimension (“I have thought a lot about the family background and personal history of people who are close to me, in order to understand why they are the sort of people they are”); metacognition (“I believe it is important to analyze and understand our own thinking processes”); interaction (“I think a lot about the influences I have on other people’s behavior”); complex internal (“to understand a person’s personality/behavior have found it important to know how the person’s attitudes, beliefs, and character traits fit together”); contemporary external (“I think a lot about the influence that society has on my behavior and personality”); preference for complexity (“I have found that the causes of people’s behavior are usually complex rather than
simple”); and motivational components (“I don’t usually bother to analyze people’s behavior”). Participants are requested to indicate the degree to which they endorse the items on a 7-point Likert scale.

Correlations between a Social Desirability Scale and the ACS are low (r=.01), suggesting that this measure does not measure tendencies to provide socially desirable responses. Also, there was a non-significant correlation between ACS and Internal-External Locus of Control (r=-.01), indicating discriminant validity. There was a significant positive correlation between the Need for Cognition and ACS (r=.36), indicating convergent validity. Fletcher (1986) reported the internal reliability coefficient to be .85 and test retest reliability across 18 days to be .80. The internal reliability coefficient for this study was .91.

*Intergroup Affective Empathy (Batson, 1991)*

This instrument consists of eight feeling adjectives (i.e., sympathetic, empathetic, concerned, moved, compassionate, warm, softhearted, and tenderhearted) associated with intergroup empathy. Participants are asked to indicate on a 0 (Not at All) to 5 (Extremely) scale the degree to which they experience these feelings when members of the other group are having problems. The internal consistency reliability of this instrument was found to exceed .85 (Noor et al., 2008). This scale was adapted to assess the degree to which Israeli Jews experience empathy toward Palestinians who suffered as a result of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The internal reliability coefficient for this study was .91.

*The Positive Affect Negative Affect Scales (PANAS; Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988)*

This scale was developed to measure subjective psychological well-being. Participants completing this measure are asked to describe how they feel on a 5-point Likert scale using 10 positive and 10 negative emotions, at the moment, today, in the past
few days, in the past few weeks, in the past year, and in general. For this specific study, because of the lingering intergroup conflict and its ongoing psychological effects, especially in light of the historically significant events in that had taken place in the past year, the author of this study chose to focus solely on feelings experienced in the past year. Watson et al reported significant negative correlation between the PA and NA items, which constitutes evidence for discriminant validity. They reported an internal consistency reliability (Cronbach Alpha) of .86 and .84 for PA and NA respectively for the past year (for the internal consistency reliability of the other time frames, see Watson et al., 1988). The Cronbach Alpha for this study which pertained to the way participants felt in the past year was .88 for Negative Affect and .85 for Positive Affect. However, the current correlation between NA and PA was very low (r = .033; p>.1), which is indicative of lack of discriminant validity for this study.

Tendency to Forgive Scale (TTF: Brown, 2003)

This brief, 4-item scale, was developed to “capture individual differences in the tendency to either let go of one’s offense experiences or hold on to them” (Brown, 2003, p. 761). This brief scale was developed to tap into individual differences with regard to tendency to forgive, rather than delineating the forgiveness process. Participants are asked to indicate on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) the degree to which they endorse the following items:

1. “I tend to get over it quickly when someone hurts my feelings.”
2. “If someone wrongs me, I often think about it a lot afterward.”
3. “I have a tendency to harbor grudges.”
4. “When people wrong me, my approach is just to forgive and forget.”
The internal consistency of this instrument was found to be adequate (alpha = .82), and scores on this instrument were reliable across an 8-week period (r = .71; N = 40). The negative correlation between scores on this scale and trait anger as measured by the State-Trait Anger Scale constitutes evidence for the construct validity of the TTF scale (Brown, 2003). In this study, however, the Cronbach Alpha for the four items was .491. However, after removing items 2 and 3, both of which were uncorrelated with the rest of the items, items 1 and 4 had an internal reliability coefficient of .62. Therefore, TTF scale for this study consisted of item 1 and 4.

Infra-Humanization (Leyens, Rodriguez-Perez, Rodriguez-Torres, Gaunt, Paladino, & Vaes, 2001)

The measure of infra-humanization was developed by Leyens and colleagues (2001) in order to assess attribution of primary and secondary emotions attributed to outgroup people by ingroup individual. In this measure, participants are asked to indicate, using a list of seven positive primary, seven negative primary, seven positive secondary, and seven negative secondary emotions experienced by the their in-group and members of the out-group, primary emotions referring to universal and secondary referring to uniquely human emotions (Leyens et al., 2001). The ratio between the differences in ingroup versus outgroup primary emotion attribution and/or ingroup versus outgroup secondary emotion attribution constitutes an index of the degree of infrahumanization (Leyens et al., 2001). This measure/list was used to address infrahumanization from the points of view of Israeli Jews by asking participants to indicate their perception of primary and secondary emotions experienced by the outgroup and ingroup (see Appendixes A and B). The ratio difference in secondary emotion attribution was used to gauge the degree of infrahumanization in this study.
Intergroup Forgiveness (Moeschberger, Dixon, Niens, & Cairns, 2005)

Based on Northern Irish adults and adolescents’ responses to series of interview questions posed by McLernon and his colleagues (2002), this slightly modified 8-item instrument was developed by Moeschberger et al. in order to measure post-conflict attitudes towards forgiveness and reconciliation among Catholic and Protestant undergraduate students on a 1 (Strongly Agree) to 5 (Strongly Disagree) scale. Factor analysis of the full scale revealed two factors: Never Forgiving and Future Forgiving. Future Forgiving contains four items gauging affirmative/supportive intergroup forgiveness attitudes, while Never Forgiving contains four items appraising opposition to the notion of intergroup forgiveness. The Never Forgiving factor yielded an internal reliability coefficient of .81 and the Future Forgiving factor yielded an internal consistency reliability of .80 in Moeschberger et al.’s (2005) study.

The items in this instrument were adapted to address intergroup forgiveness/reconciliation attitudes adopted by Israeli Jews in light of the ongoing conflict (see Appendixes A and B). For the sake of continuity within the questionnaire, the values of the scale were reversed such that 1 was indicative strongly disagreeing and 5 was indicative of strongly agreeing. The internal reliability in the current study was .78 for Never Forgiving and .73 for Future Forgiving (see Appendixes A and B). The correlation between the two intergroup forgiveness factors in this study was -.45 (p<.01), which is indicative of discriminant validity.

Intergroup Emotions (Tam, Hewstone, Cairns, Tausch, Maio, & Kenworthy, 2007)

Adapted from a previous scale (Mackie & Smith, 2002), this instrument was developed to assess the way Catholic or Protestant participants, citizens of Northern Ireland, felt toward outgroup members, on a 0 (Not At All) to 6 (Extremely) scale, using
the following list of emotions: angry, hatred, furious, irritated, nervous, anxious, fearful, worried, afraid, cheerful, happy, and pleasant. Factor analysis revealed that these emotions were loaded onto three major factors: Anger Items (angry, hatred, furious, and irritated), Fear Items (nervous, anxious, fearful, worried, and afraid), and Positive Emotion Items (cheerful, happy, and pleasant). Cronbach Alpha was .89, .93, and .92 for Anger Items, Fear Items, and Positive Emotion Items respectively. Again, these items were used to assess Israeli Jews' feelings toward the outgroup (i.e., Palestinians). However, for the purpose of this study, only the four items pertaining to anger were used for the analysis, the internal reliability coefficient of which was .93 for this study.

*Out-Group Attitudes (Tam, Hewstone, Cairns, Tausch, Maio, & Kenworthy, 2007)*

This measure was modified from the original version of Wright et al.’s (1997) “General Evaluation Scale.” In this measure, participants are asked to indicate on a one to five semantic differential scale the degree to which they perceive the other community as cold-warm, negative-positive, hostile-friendly, selfish-generous, insensitive-sensitive, and insincere-sincere. Tam et al. (2007) reported a Cronbach alpha of .82. for the above items. As with previous measures, this measure was modified to fit the current study by asking Israeli Jews to evaluate Palestinians, using the same words (in Hebrew) and the same semantic differential scale. The internal reliability of this scale in this study was .90.

*Out-Group Trust (Noor, Brown, Gonzalez, Manzi, & Lewis, 2008)*

This four-item scale was devised by the above authors to assess the degree of intergroup trust between Pro-Pinochet and Anti-Pinochet groups in Chile. Noor and colleagues reported an internal consistency reliability of .66. Again, this scale was adapted for this study to address the degree to which Israeli Jews perceive Palestinians as
trustworthy. Participants were asked to indicate on a 1 (Not at All) to 5 (Very Much) scale the degree to which they endorse items that pertain to outgroup trust (see questionnaire). Cronbach Alpha for this study was .74.

*Perceived Out-group Heterogeneity (Kashima & Kashima, 1993)*

This three-item measure was developed to assess the degree to which ingroup members perceive outgroup variability from 0 (Not at All) to 4 (Extremely). The internal consistency reliability of the measure was .73. Again, for the purpose of this study, this three-item scale was adapted to address the degree to which Israeli Jews perceive variability within Palestinians, using a 0 (Completely Disagree) to 4 (Completely Agree) scale. The internal reliability coefficient for this scale in this study was .88.

*Common In-group Religious Identification/Categorization*

For the purpose of the following study, the author of this study constructed a four-item measure tapping into the degree to which Israeli Jews categorize their religious faith exclusively (i.e., in terms of the religion’s unique features which are distinguishable from the other religion) or inclusively (i.e., in terms of the common constituents underlying all monotheistic faiths). Participants were asked to indicate on a 1 (Not at All) to 5 (Very Much So) scale the degree to which they endorse the following statements: “The God of the Muslims and Christians is significantly different from the God of the Jews” (reversed scoring), “The God of The Muslims and Christians is also the God of the Jews,” “I see no common denominator between the Islam, Christianity, and Judaism” (reversed scoring), and “there is a lot of parallel between the Islamic Qur’an, the New Testament, and the Jewish Torah.” Internal consistency was .66 for this scale.
**Intergroup Contact**

Participants were asked to indicate on a 1 (*Not at All*) to 7 (*Very Much*) scale the degree to which they have been in contact with members of the out-group throughout their lives, and whether the contact was typically positive or negative. Participants were also asked to rate on a 1 (*Not Good at All*) to 7 (*Excellent*) the quality of the intergroup contact. In the same section, participants were also asked to indicate if either they or significant others were personally impacted as a result of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, and if so when did the event(s) occur and how much it affects them nowadays on a 1 (*Not at All*) to 7 (*A Great Deal*) scale (see Appendixes A and B).

**Procedure**

The data collection approach was based on the “snowballing method.” Specifically, five relatives and acquaintances of the study author who is an Israeli national (i.e., five individuals altogether) each received a package containing between 80 and 160 envelopes. Each envelope contained a copy of the study questionnaire and an informed consent form to be signed by the prospective participant prior to completing the questionnaire. The informed consent form included the purpose of the study, the potential risks and benefits, a statement regarding confidentiality, contact information for further inquiry and in case participants would like to express any concerns, a statement that participation in this study is voluntary and that participants can withdraw from it at any time without penalty, and that this study was approved by the Institutional Review Board (see Appendix A for the Informed Consent Form and the Study Questionnaire in English). The five individuals receiving the packages were instructed to distribute the envelopes among their colleagues and friends. In the package, there were also empty envelopes with the label “Informed Consents” and empty enveloped labeled “Study
Questionnaire.” The five individuals recruited for the data collection had study participants sign the inform consent prior to completing the study questionnaire, and placed the signed informed consent forms in the “Informed Consent” envelope and the completed questionnaires in the “Study Questionnaire” envelope in order to safeguard participants' confidentiality.

Each of the five recruits was encouraged to further delegate data collection responsibility to other friends/colleagues. However, they were coached to convey the same instruction to their delegates regarding the importance of having participants sign an informed consent form and separating the questionnaires and the signed consent form (i.e., placing them in two separate envelopes) in order to safeguard confidentiality. These recruits used their discretion as to the number of envelopes (filled and empty) to give to each delegate, and were responsible for obtaining all completed (placed in two separate envelopes) and incomplete forms within a month after distributing them. The recruits themselves were requested (to the best of their ability) to mail all forms (complete and incomplete) to the study author no later than 8 weeks after they had been received.

The study questionnaire was labeled as “Intergroup Attitudes Questionnaire.” The questionnaire included the above inventories adapted for the purpose of this study, and was designed to take between 15 to 25 min to complete. The first page of the questionnaire contained questions pertaining to participants’ demographics; however, participants were not asked to reveal personal information that may compromise their confidentiality (e.g., names, addresses). The remaining pages contained the items of instruments aforementioned. The dissertation author has translated the (English) study questionnaire into Hebrew, and utilized the help of a bilingual friend and colleague, a special education teacher who obtained her Bachelor and Master’s Degrees from an
accredited U.S. university in order to insure accuracy in translation (see Appendix A for the English informed consent/questionnaire and Appendix B for the Hebrew translation).

Statistical Analyses

Three procedures followed in order to test the hypothesis that there is a relationship between quality of intergroup contact and intergroup forgiveness, a relationship mediated by outgroup anger, outgroup trust and attitudes, perception of outgroup heterogeneity, infrahumanization, and outgroup empathy. First, a correlational analysis was carried out in order to gauge the correlation between the IV, mediators, and DV's (Never Forgiving and Future Forgiving). Then, Barron and Kenney's (1986) four-step analysis was performed in order to test for mediation effects. Specifically, for each given mediator, a regression coefficient was obtained by having the IV regressed onto both DV (intergroup forgiveness) components (Never Forgiving; Future Forgiving), the IV regressed onto the mediator, the mediator regressed onto both DV components, and the IV and mediator both regressed onto each DV component.

In each step, in order for a mediation effect to be evident, a significant effect has to be observed. In addition, the effect of the IV on the DV's in step four is expected to be significantly reduced by the addition of the mediator. Finally, if a mediation effect was observed in the first analysis, it was followed by a Sobel Test Statistics to evaluate the significance of the mediation effect.

In addition, the relationship between intergroup forgiveness and individual differences in attributional complexity as well as the relationship between intergroup forgiveness and common in-group religious categorization/identificastion was explored by using regression analyses. Finally, correlational/regression analyses were employed in order to examine the degree to which psychological well-being (scores on the PANSA
Negative and Positive Affect) may be related to intergroup forgiveness factors (Future Forgiving and Never Forgiving) as well as intergroup anger and attitudes, holding dispositional forgiveness (a variable found to be linked with psychological benefits) constant, with Never/Future Forgiving as the direct measures of intergroup forgiveness attitudes gauging the motivational components of intergroup forgiveness, and with outgroup attitudes and anger as the "general" intergroup cognitive and affective components respectively.
CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Descriptive Statistics

One hundred and sixty-six completed questionnaires were returned to the researcher out of 620 questionnaires that were sent out (a return rate of 27%). Eighty-nine males and seventy-seven women responded to the study questionnaire, whose ages ranged between 18 and 71 (Mean = 36.40; SD = 13.41). Years of education ranged from 4 to 24 years (Mean = 15.13; SD = 3.32), and yearly income in New Israeli Shekels (NIS) ranged from 0 to 200,000 (Mean=52,292.56; SD = 4860.30). In terms of U.S. dollars, yearly income ranged between $0 to approximately $50,000 ($1 is worth about 3.7 NIS). Out of 166 participants, only 84 participants reported their yearly income, while the rest left the space blank, or filled the "income" space with comments (e.g., "I earn good enough," "Too poor to mention," etc). The median values for age, years of education, and income were 34, 15, and 50,000 respectively.

In addition, out of 166 study participants, 79 individuals provided responses which indicate that either they or significant others were personally impacted as a result of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. After removing an invalid response (a value of 9), on a 1 to 7 scale, the magnitude of the impact ranged from 1 to 7, and the mean and the median were 3.73 and 3 respectively (for descriptive statistics, refer to Table 1).
### Table 1

**Descriptive Statistics**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Education</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.13</td>
<td>3.321</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td>84</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>200000</td>
<td>58292.56</td>
<td>48607.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>36.41</td>
<td>13.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Infrahumanization</strong></td>
<td>144</td>
<td>-0.5</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quality Contact</strong></td>
<td>151</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Quantity Contact</strong></td>
<td>154</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outgroup Anger</strong></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>6.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Attributional Complexity Scale</strong></td>
<td>152</td>
<td>63.00</td>
<td>189.00</td>
<td>135.82</td>
<td>26.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outgroup Trust</strong></td>
<td>162</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>12.79</td>
<td>3.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superordinate Religious Categorization</strong></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>14.06</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outgroup Heterogeneity</strong></td>
<td>159</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>7.65</td>
<td>3.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outgroup Empathy</strong></td>
<td>156</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>17.42</td>
<td>10.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outgroup Attitudes</strong></td>
<td>163</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>16.82</td>
<td>5.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never Forgiving</strong></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Future Forgiveness</strong></td>
<td>165</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>3.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tendency to Forgive</strong></td>
<td>157</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>8.58</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Positive Affect</strong></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>40.50</td>
<td>6.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Negative Affect</strong></td>
<td>166</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>52.00</td>
<td>27.35</td>
<td>8.48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Challenges with Participants

Unfortunately, as discussed in the method section, data were gathered solely from Jewish Israeli respondents. This is likely to be primarily attributed to the fact that the data collection took place in cities/areas predominantly or homogeneously settled by Jewish Israelis (e.g., Central and Northern Tel Aviv; Rosh Pina). Moreover, despite the researcher’s scrupulous effort to ensure confidentiality (see Chapter III), many Israeli Arabs may have still felt reluctant to share their ill feelings towards Israel out of fear that their identity be divulged and fear of social repercussions if their "political opinions" are made public. The researcher is well aware of the unique challenges associated with the one-sidedness of this study, and the notion that future studies are required in order to examine intergroup attitudes and feelings experienced by Palestinians towards Israel, without which the picture is incomplete.

Matters Pertaining to the Variable of Infrahumanization

As indicated in Chapter III, in order to calculate infra-humanization, the proportion of secondary (i.e., uniquely human) emotions attributed to the outgroup (Palestinians) was subtracted from the proportion of secondary emotions attributed to the ingroup (Israeli Jews) using the list of emotions mentioned in the method section. A positive valence would be indicative of infrahumanization, as it suggests that the ingroup member considers his/her group as possessing more uniquely human emotions than the outgroup. Some participants made comments in the assigned space asserting that all of the words in the list are equally pertinent to both groups (e.g., "We are all humans, these feeling words are true for Israeli Jews as well as Palestinians"), in which case the valence was calculated to be zero. However, any word mentioned (e.g., "loving") that was not selected from the list did not count.
Some participants used these spaces to comment and express their feelings about the list of words (e.g., "This list is too narrow to describe a person"), in which case their responses were not scored. The mean score (M = 0.035; SD = 0.21) carries a positive valence, but is rather meager. Moreover, out of 144 valid responses to this portion/section of the questionnaire, 53 (more than one-third) Jewish Israeli participants responded in a matter that yielded a negative valence; that is, among 53 Jewish Israeli participants, the proportion of uniquely human emotions attributed to Palestinians was higher than that attributed to Israeli Jews (i.e., their own group).

Challenges with the Independent Variables

As can be seen in Table 2 (Correlation Matrix), there is a strong positive correlation between quantity and quality of intergroup contacts.

Table 2

*Pearson Correlation between the Two Components of Intergroup Forgiveness, Outgroup Anger, Outgroup Perception of Heterogeneity, Outgroup Attitudes, Outgroup Trust, Outgroup Empathy, and Quantity/Quality of Contact*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Future Forgiving</th>
<th>Never Forgiving</th>
<th>Outgroup Anger</th>
<th>Outgroup Attitudes</th>
<th>Outgroup Heterogeneity</th>
<th>Intra-Humanization</th>
<th>Outgroup Trust</th>
<th>Outgroup Empathy</th>
<th>Outgroup Contact</th>
<th>Quantity Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Future Forgiving</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never Forgiving</td>
<td>-.415**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup Anger</td>
<td>-.381**</td>
<td>.579**</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup Attitudes</td>
<td>.396**</td>
<td>-.527**</td>
<td>-.546**</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup Heterogeneity</td>
<td>.377**</td>
<td>-.653**</td>
<td>-.575**</td>
<td>.664**</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intra-Humanization</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.160</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup Trust</td>
<td>.310**</td>
<td>-.561**</td>
<td>-.528**</td>
<td>.589**</td>
<td>.645**</td>
<td>.182*</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup</td>
<td>.453**</td>
<td>-.514**</td>
<td>-.546**</td>
<td>.683**</td>
<td>.613**</td>
<td>.121</td>
<td>.578**</td>
<td>_</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 (continued).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Future Forgiving</th>
<th>Never Forgiving</th>
<th>Outgroup Anger</th>
<th>Outgroup Attitudes</th>
<th>Outgroup Heterogeneity</th>
<th>Infra-Humanization</th>
<th>Outgroup Trust</th>
<th>Outgroup Empathy</th>
<th>Outgroup Contact</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.339**</td>
<td>-.438**</td>
<td>-.376**</td>
<td>.407**</td>
<td>.444**</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.432**</td>
<td>.428**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity Contact</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>-.085</td>
<td>-.117</td>
<td>.225**</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.433**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  ** p< .01.
* p<.05

However, while there is a significant positive correlation between quality of intergroup contact and Israeli Jews’ forgiveness of Palestinians, no such relationship was evident between quantity of contact and intergroup forgiveness, nor was there a relationship between quantity of intergroup forgiveness and other pivotal study variables, let alone outgroup attitudes (r = .225 ; p< .01).

This may be attributed to the Israeli reality, in which intergroup contacts often occur in the context of mandatory military service. Many Israelis have had frequent contacts with Palestinians during their military service, although such contacts have often times been hostile or combative. Considering that (in general) Israeli Jews and Arabs live in segregation, satisfactory and growth-promoting intergroup contacts typically require proactive initiatives on both sides. Therefore, in the following study only quality of intergroup contact was used as the independent variable.
Hypotheses Testing

Controlling for Pertinent Variables in the Relationship between Quality of Intergroup Forgiveness and Intergroup Forgiveness

Because age ($r = -.329; p < .01$), years of education ($r = -.294; p < .01$) and income ($r = -.295; p < .01$) were significantly related to Never Forgiving, these variables and quality of intergroup contact were regressed onto Never Forgiving, in order to gauge the unique variance within scores on Never Forgiving accounted for by quality of intergroup contact. Indeed, after controlling for the above variables, intergroup contact still accounted for a unique and significant variance within scores on Never Forgiving ($\text{Beta} = -.498; p < .01$). Also, because of the significant positive correlation between age and Future Forgiving ($r = .240; p = .001$), both quality of intergroup contact and age were regressed onto the above DV, yielding a unique and significant variance within scores on Future Forgiving uniquely accounted for by the IV (quality of intergroup contact) ($\text{Beta} = .309; p < .01$).

Mediators Regressed onto the IV and DV

Prior to analyzing the mediation effects, it was important to gauge the degree to which the independent variable (Quality of Intergroup Contact) and the dependent variables (Never Forgiving and Future Forgiving) were uniquely accounted for by the mediating variables: Outgroup Empathy, Outgroup Attitudes, Perception of Outgroup Heterogeneity, Outgroup Anger, Outgroup Trust, and Infrahumanization. When the mediating variables were regressed onto the IV (quality of intergroup contact), only Outgroup Trust uniquely accounted for a significant proportion of variance within the IV ($\text{Beta} = .274; p < .05$). When the mediating variables were regressed onto Never Forgiving, Perception of Outgroup Heterogeneity ($\text{Beta} = -.385; p < .01$), Outgroup Trust
(Beta = -.246; p< .01), and Outgroup Anger (Beta = .229; p< .01) each accounted for a unique and significant variance within the scores. When the mediating variables were regressed onto Future Forgiving, only scores on Outgroup Empathy uniquely and significantly accounted for scores on Future Forgiving (Beta = .236; p < .05). Hence, the above regression analyses as well as the correlational analysis reveal a great deal of multicollinearity among the mediating variables.

Mediation Analysis

In order to determine the mediation effects of Outgroup Anger, Outgroup Attitudes, Infrahumanization, Outgroup Perception of Heterogeneity, Outgroup Trust, and Infrahumanization in the relationship between quality of intergroup contact and intergroup forgiveness, three steps followed: correlational analyses, Baron and Kenney's (1986) four-step mediation analysis, followed by Sobel test for the significance of mediation. As Table 2 evinces, barring infrahumanization, there was a significant correlation between quality of intergroup contact and the mediators, and the mediators and both DV factors (Never Forgiving and Future Forgiving; also, see Figures 3 and 4).
Figure 3. The Relationship between Quality of Intergroup Contact, Mediating Variables, and Never Forgiving.
Figure 4. The Relationship between Quality of Intergroup Contact, Mediating Variables, and Future Forgiving.

Also, using Barron and Kenney's (1986) four-way analysis, with the exception of infrahumanization, quality of intergroup contact predicted each one of the five mediators and intergroup forgiveness factors, the five mediators predicted intergroup forgiveness
factors, and the relationship between quality of intergroup contact and both factors of intergroup forgiveness was substantially reduced when both the IV and the mediators were regressed onto the DV's (see Tables 3 and 4).

Table 3

Barron and Kenny’s (1986) Four-Step Mediation Analysis with Quality of Intergroup Contact as the Independent Variable and Never Forgiving as the Dependent Variable

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediator</th>
<th>IV onto DV</th>
<th>IV onto M</th>
<th>M onto DV</th>
<th>IV and M onto DV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Beta = -.438</td>
<td>Beta = .428</td>
<td>Beta = -.514</td>
<td>IV: Beta = -.387, P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
<td>M: Beta = -.290, P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>Beta = -.438</td>
<td>Beta = -.376</td>
<td>Beta = .579</td>
<td>IV: Beta = -.248, P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
<td>M: Beta = .504, P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity</td>
<td>Beta = -.438</td>
<td>Beta = .444</td>
<td>Beta = -.653</td>
<td>IV: Beta = -.161, P&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
<td>M: Beta = -.618, P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrahumanization</td>
<td>Beta = -.438</td>
<td>Beta = .069</td>
<td>Beta = .087</td>
<td>IV: Beta = -.392, P&gt;.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
<td>P&gt;.1</td>
<td>P&gt;.1</td>
<td>M: Beta = .106, P&gt;.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Beta = -.438</td>
<td>Beta = .407</td>
<td>Beta = -.527</td>
<td>IV: Beta = -.255, P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
<td>M: Beta = -.438, P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Beta = -.438</td>
<td>Beta = .432</td>
<td>Beta = -.561</td>
<td>IV: Beta = -.225, P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
<td>P&lt;.01</td>
<td>M: Beta = -.486, P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Step 1: Quality of Intergroup Contact Regressed onto Never Forgiving.

Step 2: Quality of Intergroup Contact Regressed onto the Mediator.

Step 3: Mediator Regressed onto Never Forgiving.

Step 4: Both Quality of Intergroup Contact and Mediator Regressed onto Never Forgiving.

M: Mediator.
Table 4

*Barron and Kenny’s (1986) Four-Step Mediation Analysis with Quality of Intergroup Contact as the Independent Variable and Future Forgiving as the Dependent Variable*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediator</th>
<th>IV onto DV</th>
<th>IV onto M</th>
<th>M onto DV</th>
<th>IV and M onto DV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>Beta = .339</td>
<td>Beta = .428</td>
<td>Beta = .453</td>
<td>IV: Beta = .197  P&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>M: Beta = .370  P &lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>Beta = .339</td>
<td>Beta = -.376</td>
<td>Beta = -.381</td>
<td>IV: Beta = .221  P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>M: Beta = -.304  P &lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity</td>
<td>Beta = .339</td>
<td>Beta = .444</td>
<td>Beta = .377</td>
<td>IV: Beta = .251  P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>M: Beta = .274  P &lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrahumanization</td>
<td>Beta = .339</td>
<td>Beta = .069</td>
<td>Beta = .112</td>
<td>IV: Beta = .327  P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>P &lt;.1</td>
<td>P &lt;.1</td>
<td>M: Beta = -.084  P &gt;.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>Beta = .339</td>
<td>Beta = .407</td>
<td>Beta = .396</td>
<td>IV: Beta = .213  P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>M: Beta = .302  P &lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>Beta = .339</td>
<td>Beta = .432</td>
<td>Beta = .310</td>
<td>IV: Beta = .251  P&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>P &lt;.01</td>
<td>M: Beta = .190  P &lt;.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Step 1: Quality of Intergroup Contact Regressed onto Future Forgiving.

- Step 2: Quality of Intergroup Contact Regressed onto the Mediator.
- Step 3: Mediator Regressed onto Future Forgiving.
- Step 4: Both Quality of Intergroup Contact and Mediator Regressed onto Future Forgiving.

M: Mediator.

However, the effects of quality of intergroup contact on both factors of intergroup forgiveness continued to be significant even when regressed onto the DV's with the mediators. Hence, there was evidence for partial (but not full) mediation effects. Both Tables 3 and 4 describe the four steps of the mediation analysis with Never Forgiving and Future Forgiving as the dependent variables respectively. The letter "M" pertains to the mediator, while IV and DV are the Independent and Dependent Variables respectively.

Finally, in order to assess for the significance of the mediation effects discussed above, the Sobel test was utilized. Specifically, for each mediator, the regression weight
(the raw [unstandardized] regression coefficient or B weight) and the standard error for the B weights were calculated for the relationships between the quality of intergroup contact and the mediator, and the mediator and the two factors of intergroup forgiveness (Future Forgiving and Never Forgiving). Then, the Sobel Test statistics was performed and the corresponding p value was obtained for each one of the DV factors (see Tables 5 and 6).

Table 5

Sobel Test Statistics for the Significance of the Mediatory Roles of Empathy, Attitudes, Anger, Infrahumanization, Outgroup Perception of Heterogeneity, and Trust Outgroup in the Relationship Between Quality of Intergroup Contact and Never Forgiving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediator</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>Sobel Test Statistics</th>
<th>P value (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-0.20</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>-0.38</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-4.3</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infra-Humanization</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>p&gt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.68</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-5.4</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>-0.57</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note.  B1: Unstandardized B Weight In the Regression Coefficient with Quality of Intergroup Contact Regressed onto the Mediator.

E1: Standard Error In the Regression Coefficient with Quality of Intergroup Contact regressed onto the Mediator.

B2: Unstandardized B Weight In the Regression Coefficient with Mediator Regressed onto Never Forgiving.

E2: Standard Error In the Regression Coefficient with the Mediator Regressed onto Never Forgiving.
Table 6

Sobel Test Statistics for the Mediator Roles of Empathy, Attitudes, Anger, Infrahumanization, Outgroup Perception of Heterogeneity, and Trust Outgroup in the Relationship Between Quality of Intergroup Contact and Future Forgiving

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediator</th>
<th>B1</th>
<th>E1</th>
<th>B2</th>
<th>E2</th>
<th>Sobel Test Statistics</th>
<th>P value (2-Tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Empathy</td>
<td>2.39</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attitudes</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td>-1.45</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>-2.16</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrahumanization</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>p&gt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heterogeneity</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.314</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>p&lt;0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. B1: Unstandardized B Weight In the Regression Coefficient with Quality of Intergroup Contact Regressed onto the Mediator.

E1: Standard Error In the Regression Coefficient with Quality of Intergroup Contact regressed onto the Mediator.

B2: Unstandardized B Weight In the Regression Coefficient with Mediator Regressed onto Future Forgiving.

E2: Standard Error In the Regression Coefficient with the Mediator Regressed onto Future Forgiving.

As can be seen in Tables 5 and 6, with the exception of infrahumanization (which was unrelated to the IV and the DV’s), there was evidence suggesting that the mediation effects of Outgroup Empathy, Anger, Attitudes, Outgroup Perception of Heterogeneity, and Outgroup Trust were significant.

Attributional Complexity, Superordinate Religious Categorization/Identification, and Intergroup Forgiveness

In order to test the hypotheses that Attributional Complexity Scale (ACS) and Superordinate Religious Categorization/Identification (perceiving one's God and religious
doctrine inclusively relative to other monotheistic faiths) predict intergroup forgiveness, both ACS and the four-item scale measuring Superordinate Religious Categorization/Identification were regressed onto Never Forgiving and Future Forgiving. Both, ACS and Superordinate Religious Categorization/Identification combined, predicted Never Forgiving \[ R^2 = .132; F (140; 2) = 10.63; p < .01 \], with ACS (Beta = - .268; p < .01) and Superordinate Religious Categorization/Identification (Beta = -.204; p < .05) each accounting for a unique and significant variance within scores on Never Forgiving. When these predictors were regressed onto Future Forgiving, these variables combined accounted for a unique variance within Future Forgiving \[ R^2 = .042; F (139; 2) = 3.93; p > .05 \]; but only Superordinate Religious Categorization/Identification predicted Future Forgiving (Beta = .216; p < 0.05).

**Intergroup Forgiveness, Outgroup Anger and Attitudes, and Psychological Well-Being**

Finally, regarding the exploratory question concerning the degree to which intergroup forgiveness and its closely related constructs, outgroup attitudes and anger, may be related to psychological well-being, correlational analysis revealed that only Outgroup Anger was significantly correlated with the Negative Affect of the PANAS (r = .175; p < .05), while none of the above variables correlated with the Positive Affect of the PANAS (see Table 2).

The predictability of Negative (but not Positive) Affect of the PANAS by Tendency to Forgive scale was approaching significance (Beta = -.145; p = .070). While Outgroup Anger was predictive of Negative Affect of the PANAS when regressed onto PANAS alone (Beta = .175; p < .05), the proportion of variance within the PANAS Negative explained by Outgroup Anger was not significant when controlling for scores on Tendency to Forgive Scale ( Beta = .153; p > .05). In other words, when controlling for
tendency to forgive (a variable previously shown to be related to positive psychological outcomes), the significant (positive) relationship between outgroup anger and negative affect was insignificant. For correlation between intergroup forgiveness components, Outgroup Attitudes, and Outgroup Anger on the one hand, and Negative/Positive Affect of the PANAS, refer to Table 7.

Table 7

*Correlation between PANAS (Positive and Negative Affect), Intergroup Forgiveness, Outgroup Anger, and Outgroup Attitudes*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PANAS- Positive</th>
<th>PANAS Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never Forgiving</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future Forgiving</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup Anger</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.175*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outgroup Attitudes</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.103</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.** **p< .01.
    * p<.05

*Other Important Finding Not Included in, Although Related to, the Hypotheses*

Out of the 166 study participants, 79 individuals responded in a manner indicating either that they, a family member, a close relative, or any other person close to them had been personally injured as a result of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Of these individuals, the degree to which the event still affects them (the participants) today (on a 1 to 7 scale) was predictive of Never Forgiving (Beta = .222; p<.05) and Future Forgiving (Beta = -.326; p<.01). However the time lagged between the event and the time the questionnaire was completed was unrelated to intergroup forgiveness.
Moreover, neither magnitude of impact nor time lagged predicted Negative Affect (Beta = – 0.57 and p >.1 for magnitude; Beta = -.198 and p>.1 for time lagged) or Positive Affect (Beta = .027 and p>.5 for magnitude; Beta = -.081 and p>.3 for time lagged ) on the PANAS. The cumulative percentage of individuals who endorsed values of 4 and below on the question pertaining to current magnitude of effect (on a 1 to 7 scale) was 60.8 %, and the median (as previously discussed) was 3. Hence, there is evidence alluding to a restricted range of response pattern in relation to the above scale.

Finally, as has been previously noted, there has been a significant relationship between Attributional Complexity and Never Forgiving. Further analysis, however, further reveals that the relationship between ACS and Never Forgiving was mediated by one's level of outgroup empathy. Specifically, consistent with Barron and Kenney's (1986) four-step analysis, the following Beta values were obtained when ACS was regressed onto Never Forgiving, when ACS was regressed onto Outgroup Empathy, when Outgroup Empathy was regressed onto Never Forgiving and when both ACS and Outgroup Anger were regressed onto Never Forgiving respectively: Beta = -.253 (p<.01); Beta =.385 (p<.05); Beta = -.514 (p<.01); and Beta = -.087 (p>.1) for ACS and Beta = -.475 (p<.01) for Outgroup Empathy. Hence, the significant effect of ACS on Never Forgiving was nullified with the addition of Outgroup Empathy as a mediator, which is indicative of a full mediation effect.
CHAPTER V
DISCUSSION

Summary of Study Findings

The initial hypothesis of this study was that intergroup contact between Israeli Jews and Israeli Arabs and/or Palestinian will be associated with augmented intergroup forgiveness attitudes, a relationship that will be mediated by positive intergroup cognitions and feelings, which are increased positive attitudes, reduced anger, increased appreciation of outgroup heterogeneity, reduced infrahumanization, increased trust, and increased empathy. Study results show that quality of intergroup contacts between Israeli Arabs/Palestinians and Israeli Jews was associated with (overall) more positive forgiveness attitudes towards Palestinians among Israeli Jews, and that this relationship was mediated by all of the above variables but infrahumanization. In other words, consistent with previous studies conducted in Northern Ireland and Bosnia, and extant theories, quality of intergroup contact between Israel Jews and Arabs appears to facilitate outgroup trust, promote positive attitudes toward the outgroup (Palestinians), render the ingroup member less likely to perceive the outgroup members (i.e., Palestinian people) homogeneously, promote empathy towards the outgroup suffering, and attenuates anger towards the outgroup members which, consequentially, foster intergroup forgiveness attitudes amongst Israeli Jews.

In addition, study results have shown that, amongst Israeli Jews, attributional complexity and one's proclivity to perceive one's God and religious doctrine inclusively in relation to other monotheistic faiths (i.e., Islam and Christianity) both appear to be associated with diminished non-forgiveness attitudes (Never Forgiving). In other words, the more attributionally complex were the Jewish Israeli participants, and the more they
perceived their God as also the God of the Christians and Muslims as well and their religious doctrine (the Torah) as sharing common grounds with the other two monotheistic faiths (i.e., Superordinate/Common Religious Identification), the less likely they were to embrace a non-forgiving attitudes. However, only Superordinate/Common Religious Identification (but not Attributional Complexity) was associated with affirmative attitudes towards forgiveness (Future Forgiving). The significant negative relationship between attributional complexity and endorsement of non-forgiving attitudes was fully mediated by Israeli Jewish participants' level of empathy towards Palestinians.

Finally, another important purpose of this study was to explore the degree to which intergroup forgiveness (Never Forgiving and Future Forgiving) and its closely related components, Outgroup Attitudes and Outgroup Anger, may be related to psychological well-being. Of all the above variables, only Outgroup Anger was significantly and positively related to the Negative Affect of the PANAS, while neither attitudes nor both intergroup forgiveness components were related to the PANAS scales. However, the relationship between Outgroup Anger and PANAS-Negative Affect was non-significant when Tendency to Forgive (a variable previously shown to be significantly associated with psychological well-being) was controlled for.

Finally, among 166 study participants, only 79 participants responded in a manner suggesting that either they or their significant others had been personally injured as a result of the conflict, an event that still affects them (the participants) today. Among these individuals, the degree to which the injury affects them today was inversely related intergroup forgiveness. However, the time that has lapsed between the injury and their response to the questionnaire was unrelated to intergroup forgiveness. Moreover,
contrary to expectations, neither one of the above variables was associated with psychological well being as evident by scores of the PANAS.

Study Implications

Regardless of one's political affiliation, religious beliefs, and attitudes toward reconciliation, the events that have taken place in the past two decades have elucidated the notion that peace resolutions between (Jewish) Israelis and the Arabic world in general, and Israel and Palestine in specific are the only viable path to the cessation of the ongoing waves of violence. It has been proposed by previous peace psychology authors (e.g., the Northern Ireland studies) as it is proposed by the author of this study, that just as with interpersonal forgiveness process (e.g., Enright, 2001), in order for an adaptive process of reconciliation to take place between two historically adversarial groups of people (e.g., Protestants and Catholics residents of Northern Ireland; Bosnian Serbs and Muslims), changes in heart and mind akin to forgiveness are to precede.

According to Allport's (1954) Contact Theory, such positive changes in intergroup attitudes/cognition, feelings, and behaviors are contingent upon satisfactory, growth-promoting, and nurturing intergroup contacts in which members of both groups feel equal, and work in collaboration in order to achieve common goals that bind both groups together. In the context of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, proactive organizations such as Musalha ("Forgiveness" in Arabic) were established to promote intergroup forgiveness and reconciliation between Israeli Jews and Palestinians, by bringing them together and have them share experiences, fears, and aspirations. In Musalha, many social activities are initiated in order to provide members of each group with the opportunity to realize and appreciate the "humanness" of the other group members, become more well-versed with and sensitive to the outgroup culture, assert/affirm one's
own culture, while celebrating the gift of cultural diversity (For more information concerning the peace organization Musalaha, visit www.musalaha.org)

Naturally, however, people (whether Jews, Arabs, or Palestinians) who join such organizations do so voluntarily, driven by their "peace-mindedness," vision of coexistence, and a better Middle East. They are more likely to be left-winged in their political affiliation, and more readily embrace the notion of reconciliation regardless of their association with any specific organization. It has been contended that early interventions during the critical years of the person's development (i.e., early and late adolescence), while the child's worldviews are still malleable, and prejudices have not yet been ossified, is the most viable venue to foster trust, empathy, attitudes, and to diminish prejudices between two adversarial groups (e.g., Maoz, 2008; Shechtman, Wade, & Khoury, 2009). Many endeavors have been made to promote intergroup affinity between Israel Jews and Arabs during the child's school years (e.g., Spielberg, 2007).

In a unique study by Shechtman et al. (2009), 146 Arabic adolescents, high school students in Israel were assigned to be in an experimental classroom or a "control" classroom. The control classroom participated in a discussion regarding the Jewish-Arabic conflict and relations, while the experimental group participated in a forgiveness-promoting intervention based on the following steps: recalling the hurt, building empathy towards the rival group, giving an altruistic gift, and committing to forgiveness. Study results revealed that Arabic students in the intervention group have shown more empathy towards the Israeli Jews, and greater reduction in the endorsement of aggression, revenge, and hostility than students in the control group.

In addition, the current study results suggest that attributionally complex Israeli Jews, who generally employ more cognitive complexity when making causal attribution
about others' behaviors, and who are more likely to examine their own thought processes underlying their causal attribution, are less inclined to adopt a "never-forgiving" attitudes toward Palestinians, although they were equally inclined to embrace a "future-forgiving" attitudes as their attributionally simple counterparts. In other words, while attributionally complex participants were less opposed to the notion of intergroup forgiveness, they were not necessarily more supportive of it. Hence, while attributionally complex Jewish Israeli participants appeared less likely to hold a grudge against Palestinians, they may have still approached the forgiveness process between Israel and Palestine with reservation and caution.

As discussed in the introductory section, attributional complexity refers to the degree of complexity employed when one evaluates the etiology of human behaviors, and includes factors such as examining one's thought process ("metacognition") when explaining others' behaviors, the desire to seek complex rather than simple explanation for people's behaviors, and realizing that one's current behaviors stem (at least to some degree) from early experiences, and appreciation of the cultural and environmental/external circumstances impinging upon one's current behaviors (Fletcher, 1986). Extant literature evinces that attributionally complex individuals are likely to be more impervious to the fundamental attribution error (the automatic inclination to attribute deviant behaviors to internal factors while dismissing plausible external explanation) than their attributionally simple counterparts (Fletcher et al., 1990). Also, attributional complexity seems to be associated with a higher level of empathy (e.g., Joireman, 2004). If attributionally complex individuals are indeed more empathic and show more sensitivity to the environmental forces that influence one's behaviors, it would seem quite conceivable that they would be in a better position to be forgiving. Indeed,
current study findings suggest that the relationship between attributional complexity and intergroup forgiveness was mediated by Israeli Jews' empathy towards Palestinians.

Although attributional complexity is an "individual difference" variable (Fletcher, 1986), it is believed that a combination of proper educational and experiential opportunities can help augment one's level of attributional complexity. It is believed that such opportunities (or interventions) are most likely to be efficacious during the school years, especially during the adolescent years, as the child gradually gains the ability to conceptualize his or her world abstractly, develops his or her identity, and is in the process of consolidating one's world views and perspectives. Learning extensively about worlds' cultures as well one's own heritage, encouraging self-analysis from developmental as well as cultural standpoints, frequent utilization of open class discussions in which students are encouraged to dissect, examine, challenge, and re-evaluate their thought processes, and frequent intergroup or cross-cultural encounters are just a few examples of plausible precursors to the development of attributional complexity during the pupils' high school years. With the support of the government as well as the parents, the school educational environment may play a central role in the diminution of intergroup prejudices and cross-cultural appreciation.

In addition, Jewish Israeli participants who were able to appreciate the overarching themes common to Judaism, Islam, and Christianity and believed in an all-inclusive monotheistic God were more likely to adopt affirmative intergroup forgiveness attitudes and less likely to be opposed to intergroup forgiveness towards Palestinians. Amal Kouttab (2007) asserted in order for both groups (Israeli Jews and Palestinians) to come to terms with past hurts and reach a stage of emotional healing, it is important that both groups realize the common themes/grounds underpinning the suffering incurred by
both groups. Based on current study results, intergroup attitudinal changes may also be contingent upon recognition of the common spiritual grounds shared by Jews and Muslims.

By no means is it suggested here that Israeli Jews are to compromise or abandon deeply ingrained religious principles or adopt/accept aspects of the Islamic doctrine. Rather, regardless on one's level of religiosity or degree of adherence to one's religious faith, becoming familiar with the Koran, the Muslim history, and the Muslim way of life through reading, interactions with Muslim people and religious figures, and visiting Mosques, are likely to illuminate noteworthy resemblances (as well as the differences) between the two faiths. For instance, God in both religious faiths (Islam and Judaism) is perceived as a God with an endless capacity for forgiveness and love, a source of eternal light to which one can reach through acts of righteousness and loving kindness, and the origin of all creation. Both in Judaism and Islam there is a great deal of emphasis on maintaining the purity of the body and mind. Acts of charity carry a supreme value in both Judaism and Islam, and constitute a major means by which one can approach God and earn His/Her favor (Nasr, 2004; Rye et al., 2000).

Finally, there is evidence suggesting a significant positive correlation between outgroup anger (or anger towards Palestinians) and negative affect among Israeli Jews. This finding appears consistent with the theoretical framework and extant empirical evidence concerning potential detrimental effects of ongoing resentful/vindictive feelings (which constitute a major component in one's "unforgivingness") on one's psychological functioning (e.g., Enright, 2001). However, considering the correlational/associative nature of the analysis, a great caution needs to be taken to eschew unwarranted causal inferences, as it may be equally plausible that participants' overall affect influences the
way they generally perceive other people (including adversarial outgroup members).

Taken together, study results have failed to reveal relationships between other pertinent intergroup forgiveness components and psychological well-being as predicted by the study hypotheses.

Study Weaknesses

A major weakness of this study is that it is based solely on responses from Israeli Jews. As previously mentioned, this is likely to be primarily related to the geographical constraints associated with the data collection. Specifically, data collection was based on the snowballing method, which took place in areas primarily settled by Israeli Jews. It is also plausible that despite diligent efforts by the researcher to ensure confidentiality, Israeli Arabs who had the opportunity to participate in the study still felt reluctant to share their opinions regarding the intergroup conflict out of fear that their responses (likely antagonistic towards Israel) might be exposed, and that social repercussion might ensue for their dearth of national loyalty. It is of outmost importance for future studies to examine these intergroup attitudes and feelings from the points of view of Israeli Arabs and Palestinians (i.e., residents of Palestine) who were especially affected by the recent waves of violence and incurred severe physical and psychological harm followed by the recurrent IDF’s military strikes.

Furthermore, barring outgroup anger, the overall lack of associative relationship between forgiveness and its pivotal components on the one hand, and affect on the other hand among Israeli Jews may be plausibly related to the areas in which data collection took place. Data collection took place primarily in areas in Israel (central Israel) that were relatively distanced from the "conflict zone," as opposed to Southern Israeli cities such as Ashkelon and Sderot that have been directly affected by repeated assaults by
Palestinian extremists. The repeated launching of rockets to the Southern cities and the constant state of terror under which Southern Israeli citizens live has a major impact on their emotional well-being. This may delineate why out of 166 participants in this study, only 79 participants indicted that either he or she, a family member, or a significant others was personally injured as a result of the conflict who were (relatively speaking) unaffected by these events.

Another possible explanation for the lack of relationship between pivotal pertinent forgiveness variables and the PANAS may be related to the participants' approach to PANAS. As previously noted, there was a very low and insignificant correlation between the negative and positive affect scales. While individuals are obviously expected to experience both positive and negative feelings during a period of a year, the general proclivity of participants to respond to these scales in a homogenous fashion (e.g., giving high or low values to all positive and negative feelings) has also been taken into consideration. It is important to keep in mind that the ability and/or willingness to be candidly attuned to one's feelings are qualities not shared by all individuals.

Finally, it appears, based on participants' responses, that the instrument purporting to gauge infrahumanization was more confusing than informative. Because some of these English words have more than one interpretation in Hebrew it is quite plausible that original meanings were "lost in translation." Moreover, this list contains words not commonly used in the everyday language and, therefore, may not be equally familiar to all participants. Most noteworthy (based on some of the participants' responses to the list) is the notion that this list is quite narrow in scope and restrictive, as it forced participants to select words they might have not chosen if they had had other lexical
choices. It is quite possible that the study results pertaining to infrahumanization would have been more revealing and informative if participants had been simply allowed to free-write all of the emotion words they believed to be descriptive of Israeli Jews and Palestinians, and an independent judge (a person who is ignorant about the purpose of this study) had scored each word based on the degree to which it depicted a primary vis-à-vis secondary emotions.

Suggestions for Future Studies

In order to more closely examine the clinical implication of intergroup forgiveness among Israeli Jews, Israeli Arabs, and Palestinians, peace psychology researchers may consider examining the impact of forgiveness interventions on psychological well-being with individuals who were directly impacted by the intergroup violence. The efficacy of therapeutic interventions of forgiveness developed by psychologists (e.g., Enright, 2001) in order to heal hurts rooted in interpersonal offenses (e.g., extra-marital affair, incest) may be examined with Jewish Israelis and Palestinians who were personally victimized by the ongoing violent conflict.

In addition, no study has yet to examine intergroup forgiveness attitudes among IDF (Israeli Defense Force) soldiers, especially combat soldiers, many of whom have frequent (typically hostile) contact with Palestinians. There is also a logical reason to surmise a positive correlation between one's political affiliation and intergroup/reconciliation attitudes that has not been studied yet. In Israel, there are three major political parties: the Right Wing party or the "Likud," the Center party or the "Merkaz," and the Left Wing party or the "Maarach." It is expected that intergroup forgiveness will be inversely related to one's level of political conservativeness or "right-wingness."
Finally, the study findings that Israeli Jews' inclusive versus exclusive view of their God and religious doctrine are related to forgiveness attitudes towards Palestinians may be partially delineated by one's level of religious conservativeness. Hence, it is expected that conservative or traditional Jews will have more exclusive views of Judaism than reform/secular ones, which will differentially impact their proclivity to be forgiving towards Palestinians. Hence, building upon current study findings, future studies may examine the degree to which Israeli Jews or Palestinians/Israeli Arabs' level of religious conservativeness is associated with intergroup forgiveness attitudes, and if so, to which degree is the relationship between the two is mediated by common superordinate religious categorization.
APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT AND STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE IN ENGLISH.

THE UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
AUTHORIZATION TO PARTICIPATE IN RESEARCH PROJECT

Consent is hereby given to participate in the study titled: Intergroup Forgiveness in The Middle East: Cognitive and Affective Antecedents to Intergroup Forgiveness, and the Relationship Between Intergroup Forgiveness and Psychological Well-Being Among Israeli Jews and Self-Identified Palestinians.

1. Purpose: This study focuses on psychological elements that may impact intergroup perceptions, feelings, and attitudes as they may pertain to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Similar studies have been conducted in Northern Ireland after the Protestant-Catholic conflict and in Rwanda after the Tutsi genocide. The results of these studies have suggested that intergroup attitudes and empathy are associated with improved mental, emotional, and interpersonal conditions.

2. Description of Study: The researcher sincerely asks for your help in responding to items in a questionnaire that takes between 15-25 minutes to complete. This questionnaire pertains to Israeli Jews as well as Israeli Arabs who are self-identified as Palestinians who are 18 years of age or older. The first page of the questionnaire will contain questions pertaining to participants’ demographics; however, participants will not be asked to reveal personal information that may compromise their confidentiality (names, addresses, etc). The remaining pages will contain inventories that inquire about one’s tendency to forgive, psychological well-being, intergroup forgiveness, infrahumanization (or the degree ingroup members perceive outgroup members as possessing the same human emotions), intergroup empathy, intergroup attitudes, trust, feelings, and perceptions, God’s perception, the quantity/quality of interactions between members of the two groups, and a general measure of one’s cognitive complexity. In this study, Israeli Jews will respond to questions pertaining to attitudes, thoughts, and feelings toward Palestine while self Identified Palestinians will respond to the same questions pertaining to their attitudes, thoughts, and feelings toward Israel.

3. Benefits: No tangible reward will be given to the study participants. However, participation in this study may significantly contribute to the peace-psychology knowledge base vis-à-vis affective and cognitive antecedents to healthy forgiveness process between two historically rival national, tribal, or religious groups whose constant vehement animosity have led to deleterious physical (i.e., death and physical injury) or psychological (e.g., trauma) consequences, and stymied the aspired goal of reconciliation. Also, this study may illuminate the potential clinical significance of intergroup forgiveness in its various components on one’s psychological well being.

4. Risks: This study was designed to be non-offensive or non-harmful in nature. However, it does pertain to a very delicate and pressing matter in Israel, namely, the Israeli-Palestinian conflicts, which may possibly elicit adverse emotional responses among some participants. In such a case, you will be encouraged to contact the researcher, Alon Rice, at alon.rice@gmail.com or his supervisor Mark Leach Ph.D. at m.leach@louisville.edu in order to convey your concerns. If you wish to speak to the researcher personally, you may email the researcher your phone number or reach him at home.
number in Israel (which include the city code and the 7-digit number), and the researcher will make a concerted effort to call you back within 48 hours. Moreover, feel free to contact the researcher if you wish to receive full debriefing regarding the study once all research data have been collected.

5. **Confidentiality:** You will NOT be asked to provide identifying information in the study questionnaire, as to safeguard your confidentiality. Moreover, your signed informed consent form and completed questionnaire will be placed in two separate envelopes in order to ensure dissociation between your signature and the corresponding questionnaires.

6. **Participant's Assurance:** Whereas no assurance can be made concerning results that may be obtained (since results from investigational studies cannot be predicted) the researcher will take every precaution consistent with the best scientific practice. Participation in this project is completely voluntary, and participants may withdraw from this study at any time without penalty, prejudice, or losses. Questions concerning the research should be directed to Alon Rice MA telephone 0121 (USA) 917 821 6654 or email alon.rice@gmail.com. This project and this consent form have been reviewed by the Institutional Review Board, which ensures that research projects involving human subjects follow federal regulations. Any questions or concerns about rights as a research participant should be directed to the Chair of the Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS 39406-0001, 0121 (601) 266-6820. A copy of this form will be given to the participant.

Thank you,

Alon Rice  
Counseling Doctoral Student.  
The University of Southern Mississippi.

By providing your signature below, you indicate that you have read and agreed to participate in this study.

Participant's Signature:_____________                                       Date:________

Signature of the Person Explaining the Study_____________      Date:________
INTERGROUP

ATTITUDES QUESTIONNAIRE

ALON RICE MA

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTHERN MISSISSIPPI
Demographics


2) Age:______.

3) Number of years of education (including high school)______.


5) Approximate Yearly Income in Shekels__________.

6) Religion:______.
Dear Participant,

Thank you, again, for agreeing to participate in this study. It is of utmost importance that you respond to these items in a manner that is consistent with your TRUE attitudes, thoughts, beliefs, and feelings rather than what is socially desirable. There are no right or wrong answers. The identity of respondents will remain anonymous.

I. Please Indicate on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree) the degree to which these statements pertain to you:

1. “I tend to get over it quickly when someone hurts my feelings.” ___
2. “If someone wrongs me, I often think about it a lot afterward.” ___
3. “I have a tendency to harbor grudges.” ___
4. “When people wrong me, my approach is just to forgive and forget.” ___

II. This scale consists of a number of words and phrases that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate on a 1 (not at all) to 5 (very much so) to what extent you have felt the following emotions in the past year:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotion</th>
<th>In The Past Year (1-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interested</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determined</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excited</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspired</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alert</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Active</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attentive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scared</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upset</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distressed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jittery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashamed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. For Israeli Jews, please indicate on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) the degree to which you endorse the following statements.
1) It is important that Israelis never forget the wrongs committed by Palestinians.
2) Only if Israelis and Palestinians learn to forgive each other, can we be free of political violence.
3) It is important that Israelis never forgive the wrongs committed by Palestinians.
4) The Israeli nation has remained strong precisely because it has never forgiven past wrong committed by Palestinians.
5) The Israeli nation should seek forgiveness from Palestine for past violent transgressions.
6) The Middle East will never move from the past to the future, unless Israelis and Palestinians learn to forget about the past.
7) The Middle East will never move from the past to the future, unless Israelis and Palestinians learn to draw a line under the past.
8) Forgiving Palestine or the Palestinian people for past wrongs would be an act of disloyalty to Israel.

For Israeli Arabs, please indicate on a 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree) the degree to which you endorse the following statements.

1) It is important that Palestine never forget the wrongs committed by Israel.
2) Only if Israelis and Palestinians learn to forgive each other, can we be free of political violence.
3) It is important that Palestine never forgive the wrongs committed by Israel.
4) Palestine has remained strong precisely because it has never forgiven past wrong committed by Israel.
5) Palestine should seek forgiveness from Israel for past violent transgressions.
6) The Middle East will never move from the past to the future, unless Israelis and Palestinians learn to forget about the past.
7) The Middle East will never move from the past to the future, unless Israelis and Palestinians learn to draw a line under the past.
8) Forgiving Israel for past wrongs would be an act of disloyalty to Palestine.

IV. Please mark the words which you feel to be typical to Israeli Jews and Palestinian people from the following list:

Word List: Surprise, calmness, attraction, enjoyment, caring, excitement, pleasure, optimism, love, passion, elation, nostalgia, admiration, hope, pain, fear, anger, fury, panic, fright, suffering, humiliation, shame, guilt, disgust, melancholy, disconsolate, disenchantment.
V. Please indicate on a 0 (Not At All) to 5 (Extremely), the degree to which you experience the following feelings toward the Palestinians (if you are an Israeli Jew) or Israeli Jews (if you are an Israeli Arab) who have been having troubles as a result of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict:

a. Sympathetic____.
b. Empathetic____.
c. Concerned____.
d. Moved____.
e. Compassionate____.
f. Warm____.
g. Softhearted____.
h. Tenderhearted____.

VI. Please indicate on a 1 to 5 (circle value) the degree to which you perceive Palestinians (if you are an Israeli Jew) or Israeli Jews (if you are an Israeli Arab) as:

a. Cold               Warm
1  2  3  4  5

b. Negative              Positive
1  2  3  4  5

c. Hostile                Friendly
1  2  3  4  5

d. Selfish                Generous
1  2  3  4  5

e. insensitive             sensitive
1  2  3  4  5
f. insincere sincere.

1 2 3 4 5

VII. Please indicate from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree) the degree to which you endorse the following statements regarding Palestinians if you are an Israeli Jew, or towards Israeli Jews if you are an Israeli Arab.

a. I believe that most Palestinians/Israeli Jews are honest____.
b. I think that most Palestinians/Israeli Jews have good intentions____.
c. I think I can only trust very few Palestinians/ Israeli Jews____.
d. Most Palestinians/Israeli Jews are opportunistic____.

IX. Please indicate from 1 (completely disagree) to 5 (completely agree) the degree to which you endorse the following statements:

a. The God depicted by the Islam or Christianity is significantly different from the God Depicted by Judaism____.
b. The God of the Muslims or Christians is the same as the God of the Jews____.
c. I see no common denominator between Judaism and Islam or Christianity____.
d. There is a lot of overlap between the Jewish Torah and the Islamic Quran or the New Testament____.

IX. Please answer the following questions:

a. From 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much) how much contact have you had with Palestinians or Israeli Arabs if you are an Israeli Jew, or how much contact have you had with Israeli Jews if you are an Israeli Arab? _____.
b. Was the contact typically positive (Yes/No)?____.
c. From 1 (not good at all) to 7 (excellent), how would you rate the quality of contact?)____.
d. Have you or has a family member, a close relative, or any other person close to you ever been personally injured as a result of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict(Yes/No)?__
e. If you answered yes to the above question, how long ago did it happen?______.
f. If you, a family member, a close relative, or any other person close to you has ever been personally injured as a result of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in the past, how much does the event affect you today (1-Not at all; 7- A Great Deal)?__

X. Please indicate from 0 (not at all) to 4 (extremely) the degree to which you endorse the following statements regarding Palestinians if you are an Israeli Jew, or Israeli Jews if are an Israeli Arab.

a. In my opinion, all Palestinians/Israeli Jews are more or less the same____.
b. I think that all Palestinians/Israeli Jews are similar____.
c. Palestinians/Israeli Jews are very different from one another____.
XI. Please indicate on a 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much so) the degree to which each statement pertains to you.

1. I don't usually bother to analyze and explain people's behavior.
2. Once I have figured out a single cause for a person's behavior I don't usually go any further.
3. I believe it is important to analyze and understand our own thinking processes.
4. I think a lot about the influence that I have on other people's behavior.
5. I have found that the relationships between a person's attitudes, beliefs, and character traits are usually simple and straightforward.
6. If I see people behaving in a really strange or unusual manner I usually put it down to the fact that they are strange or unusual people and don't bother to explain it any further.
7. I have thought a lot about the family background and personal history of people who are close to me, in order to understand why they are the sort of people they are.
8. I don't enjoy getting into discussions where the causes for people's behavior are being talked over.
9. I have found that the causes for people's behavior are usually complex rather than simple.
10. I am very interested in understanding how my own thinking works when I make judgments about people or attach causes to their behavior.
11. I think very little about the different ways that people influence each other.
12. To understand a person's personality/behavior I have found it is important to know how that person's attitudes, beliefs, and character traits fit together.
13. When I try to explain other people's behavior I concentrate on the person and don't worry too much about all the existing external factors that might be affecting them.
14. I have often found that the basic cause for a person's behavior is located far back in time.
15. I really enjoy analyzing the reasons or causes for people's behavior.
16. I usually find that complicated explanations for people's behavior are confusing rather than helpful.
17. I give little thought to how my thinking works in the process of understanding or explaining people's behavior.
18. I think very little about the influence that other people have on my behavior.
19. I have thought a lot about the way that different parts of my personality influence other parts (e.g., beliefs affecting attitudes or attitudes affecting character traits).
20. I think a lot about the influence that society has on other people.
21. When I analyze a person's behavior I often find the causes form a chain that goes back in time, sometimes for years.
22. I am not really curious about human behavior.
23. I prefer simple rather than complex explanations for people's behavior.
24. When the reasons I give for my own behavior are different from someone else's, this often makes me think about the thinking processes that lead to my explanations.
25. I believe that to understand a person you need to understand the people who that person has close contact with.
26. I tend to take people's behavior at face value and not worry about the inner causes for their behavior (e.g., attitudes, beliefs, etc)____.
27. I think a lot about the influence that society has on my behavior and personality____.
28. I have thought very little about my own family background and personal history in order to understand why I am the sort of person I am____.

XII. Please indicate on a 0 (Not At All) to 6 (Extremely), the degree to which you experience the following feelings toward the Palestinians (if you are an Israeli Jew) or Israel (if you are an Israeli Arab):

   a. Angry____.
   b. Hatred____.
   c. Furious____.
   d. Irritated____.
   e. Nervous____.
   f. Anxious____.
   g. Fearful____.
   h. Worried____.
   i. Afraid____.
   j. Cheerful____.
   k. Happy____.
   l. Pleasant____.
APPENDIX IB

HEBREW TRANSLATION OF THE INFORMED CONSENT AND STUDY QUESTIONNAIRE.

נא прочי על אשר נועד לחלקת המחקר ושאלו: סולם של צעדים נ👩‍ الخلي, ואעון רגישים

וקנוניותו של־הין מתוכני על סולם של נ辜ardi, והיה של נ👩‍ الخلي, פאצ'יון פסיכוס של

ישראלים יהודים ושלארל‿יעם שלהרכים של המחקר.

 maç תלתיסף על ידנו של זה של העדוי שלペンחת של עדים פסיכוס של נ👩‍ الخلي, ואעון רגישים

1. את המחתך: ע_phrות הממחך מתוכנים פסיכוס של נ👩‍ חחי, תחתונות של עדים פסיכוס של נ👩‍ מחי, ואעון רגישים

2. את המחך: המחך מביא את עזרות בובלי של שאלון שם לקים בין תלבושת של ידנע, 15-25 דקות למקרא. השאלון מתוכן

3. את המחך: המחך מביא את עזרות בובלי של שאלון שם לקים בין תלבושת של ידנע, 15-25 דקות למקרא. השאלון מתוכן

4. ערכי עניין: ערך העניין של שאלון בין תלבושת של ידנע, מאון רגישים

(aron.rice@usm.edu)

(english@louisville.edu)
Institutional Review Board, The University of Southern Mississippi, 118 College Drive #5147, Hattiesburg, MS, USA, 39406-0001, tell 0121 (601) 266-6820. A copy of this form will be given to the participant.

Professor, 

Alon Reimov

Head of the Department of Clinical Psychology, The University of Southern Mississippi.
שאלוות לגבי גישות בין קבוצתיות
אלון רייס
אוניברסיטת דרום מיסיסיפי
דמוגרפיות

1. מין: א. זכר, ב. נקבה.
   ג. ____._

2. גיל.
   ____._

3. מספר سنوات לימוד (כולל תיכון).
   ____._

4. נשוי, ב. לא נשוי, ג. גרוש, ד. אלמנת.
   ____._

5. ההכנסה השנתית בערך.
   ____._

6. דת.
   ____._

(2) אנא דרג מ1 ( האווירי לologically) ל7 (מוכן):

אנא מiedad הסכמתך עם המשפטים הבאות:

1. אם מנסה/ للت��, אני מצביע/ על זה מוכן.
   ____._

2. אם מנסה/ísticas/ על ה whereas, אני בד, אני בד, אני בד, אני בד.
   ____._

3. יש לי טעויות/ lắm, יש לי טעויות/ הרבה, יש לי טעויות/ הרבה.
   ____._

4. אם מנסה/ אניواقع/ על זה, אניواقع/ על זה, אניواقع/ על זה.
   ____._
1. חשוב שישראלים לעולם לא ישכחו את הדברים הרעים שנגרמו על ידי הפלשתינים.
2.RunLoopונות פוליטית/ת לשני/רק כאשר ישראלים ופלשתינים יולמדו לסלוח אחד.
3.ישראלים לעולם לא יסלחו לפלשתינים על הדברים הרעים שהם גרמו.
4.פלשתין נשארה חזקה ביחוד בגלל שהיא לא סלחה לפלשתים על המעשים הרעים שנגרמו عليهم.
5.פלשתין צריכה להתנצל בפני ישראל על מעשי האלימות שנגרמו על ידה בעבר.
6.תאם אם כן ישראלים ופלשתינים יולמדו לסלוח אחד, המזרח התיכון לעולם לא ינוע מהעבר לעתיד.

 imágenes המ_EXPR_עב...
לאו/ה

7. המורדים התחמקו לולש ולנו ממענה לעונד, אלא אם כן ישראלים ופלשתינים ילמדו לשים בצד את המזרח התיכון לעולם לא ינוע מהעבר לעתיד.

8. לסלוח לישראל על המעשים הרעים שנעשו על ידי בעבדים היה裔ב למעשה בנים זה פלשתין.

7. אני רואה את יהודים/ית, 인정 דרג/ה (ה למקום/ה או למעלה) על פי צורה/ת שבה ראית את:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>קרם</th>
<th>חם</th>
<th>חנינה</th>
<th>חנינה</th>
<th>חנינה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חום</td>
<td>חום</td>
<td>חום</td>
<td>חום</td>
<td>חום</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ה鹳ראליים אנטישמיים:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>קרם</th>
<th>חום</th>
<th>חנינה</th>
<th>חנינה</th>
<th>חנינה</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חום</td>
<td>חום</td>
<td>חום</td>
<td>חום</td>
<td>חום</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
<td>חנינה</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
לא כנים                          כנים
5     4     3     2    1
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(8) אם ת選び יודא/ית ישראלי/ית, אנא דר/ה מ1 (מוצר אל מمصרים) ל 5 (מוצר מمصרים) את מדת הסכמתך:

המפשטים המבאים:

1. אנא מקפיל/ה שרוב הפלאטנטים הם הנוצרים.
2. אנא החל/ shalt הפלאטנטים שגוות טובות.
3. אנא החל/ shalt כי כל/ כל לאחרים אין עם רכיב פלסטיני בודידים.
4. רכיב הפלאטנטים הוא צעירים.

(9) אם ת選び יודא/ית ישראלי/ית, אנא דר/ה מ1 (מוצר אל מمصרים) ל 5 (מוצר מمصרים) את מדת הסכמתך:

המפשטים המבאים:

1. האלוהים של האיסלאם ואילו הנוצרים הוא אחד התכלית של היהדות
2. האל של המוסלמים או של הנוצרים הוא גם האל של היהודים
3. אני רואה שה photoshop עם מקנות משותף בין האיסלאם או הנוצרים ליהדות
4. יש לי משמעי בין הקוראן האיסלאמי והברית הישראלית להודרות

(10) עבור/על השאלות הבאות:

1. אם נזכך ר飏/ית ישראלי/ית, אנא דר/ה מ1 (בכסל לא) ל 7 (הרבן ממדא) עד כלฌה היה בקשת/ית ירח
2. אם נזכך ר飏/ית ישראלי/ית, אנא דר/ה מ1 (בכסל לא) ל 7 (הרבן ממדא) עד כלฌה היה בקשת/ית ירח
3. אם נזכך ר飏/ית ישראלי/ית, אנא דר/ה מ1 (בכסל לא) ל 7 (הרבן ממדא) עד כלฌה היה בקשת/ית ירח
4. אם נזכך ר飏/ית ישראלי/ית, אנא דר/ה מ1 (בכסל לא) ל 7 (הרבן ממדא) עד כלฌה היה בקשת/ית ירח
5. אם נזכך ר飏/ית ישראלי/ית, אנא דר/ה מ1 (בכסל לא) ל 7 (הרבן ממדא) עד כלฌה היה בקשת/ית ירח
6. אם נזכך ר飏/ית ישראלי/ית, אנא דר/ה מ1 (בכסל לא) ל 7 (הרבן ממדא) עד כלฌה היה בקשת/ית ירח
7. אם ניצאם ממסכים ישראלית/ית-פלשתינית, או כלฌה היה מסכים עם shine היהודים או הערבים על השאלות הבאות/אנא ענה (10)
כל הפלשתינים הם פחות או יותר אותו הדבר, לפי דעתי.
אני חושב שבכל הפלשתינים דומים במהותם.
ישנם הרבה הבדלים בין הפלשתינים
אני מדריך/אני бизнесמן הינו ערבי
da)
(ב)( very
אני מסכים/אני מתנגד
da)
(very
瘾)
(very
אני מסכים/אני מתנגד
da)
(very
אני מסכים/אני מתנגד
da)
(very
אני מסכים/אני מתנגד
da)
(very
אני מסכים/אני מתנגד
da)
(very
אני מסכים/אני מתנגד
da)
(very
אני מסכים/אני מתנגד
da)
(very
אני מסכים/אני מתנגד
da)
(very
אני מסכים/אני מתנגד
da)
(very
אני מסכים/אני מתנגד
da)
אני נוטה לפרש את התנהגויות האדם כמי שhawk על פינוק, ולא מתעמק, אני נוטה לפרש את התנהגויות האדם כמי שhawk על פינוק, ולא מתעמק, אני נוטה לפרש את התנהגויות האדם כמי שhawk על פינוק, ולא מתעמק, אני נוטה לפרש את התנהגויות האדם כמי שhawk על פינוק, ולא מתעמק, אני נוטה לפרש את התנהגויות האדם כמי שhawk על פינוק, ולא מתעמק, אני נוטה לפרש את התנהגויות האדם כמי שhawk על פינוק, ולא מתעמק, אני نוטה לפרש את התנהגויות האדם כמי שhawk על פינוק, ולא מתעמק, אני נוטה לפרש את התנהגויות האדם כמי שhawk על פינוק, ולא מתעמק, אני נוטה לפרש את התנהגויות האדם כמי שhawk על פינוק, ולא מתשלם.
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