

Running head: THE SHADOWS OF THE PAST

The Shadows of the Past: Effects of Historical Group Trauma on Current
Intergroup Conflicts

Word count: 13905

Abstract

We examined associations between two orientations based on historical group trauma, a form of enduring collective victimhood (Perpetual Ingroup Victimhood Orientation, PIVO) and the belief that one's group might itself become a victimizer (Fear of Victimized, FOV), and attitudes, cognitions, and emotions related to intergroup conflicts. PIVO was positively and FOV was negatively related to aggressive attitudes and emotions toward the outgroup (Study 1, Israeli-Palestinian conflict), and to the attribution of responsibility for a series of hostilities to the outgroup (Study 3, Israeli-Palestinian conflict). PIVO was negatively and FOV positively related to support for forgiveness and reconciliation (Study 2, Northern Ireland conflict). In experimental study 4, FOV predicted greater accuracy in remembering harm, regardless of victims' group identity, whereas PIVO was associated with reduced accuracy only when victims were Palestinians (outgroup members). Taken together, these findings indicate that both orientations have a significant impact on intergroup conflicts and their resolution.

Keywords: victimhood, intergroup conflict, aggression, memory

It is a sacred duty for me, as a (Holocaust) survivor, to protest against the persecution, the oppression and the imprisonment of so many people in Gaza, including more than 800,000 children. (Reuven Moshkovitz, Israeli peace activist, September 2010).

[After his liberation from the Dachau concentration camp] My father and his friends, bereft, beaten and bruised in body and soul, swore "never again". Through the grieving, bleeding roads of Europe they made their way to the State of Israel, so that no one in the world would ever be able to lift their hands against the Jews. (Chaim Shein, Israeli publicist, February 2014).

Can the same group trauma inspire diverse orientations, including lessons, narratives, and moral obligations? As the quotes above exemplify, different group members can derive very different lessons from the very same historical group trauma. Over sixty years ago, Allport (1954) suggested that a victimized individual

...will take one of two paths. Either he will join the pecking order and treat others in the way he has been treated, or else he will consciously and deliberately avoid this temptation. With insight he will say, "These people are victims exactly as I am a victim. Better stand with them, not against them". (Allport, 1954, p. 155)

In a similar vein, the same group trauma can inspire different worldviews in members of the victimized group. Group trauma is often assumed to produce a group victimhood mindset conceptualized as competitive victimhood (Noor, Brown, & Prentice, 2008; Noor, Shnabel, Halabi, & Nadler, 2012), multilevel collective victimhood (Schori-Eyal, Halperin, & Bar-Tal, 2014), or exclusive victim consciousness (Bilali & Vollhardt, 2013; Vollhardt, 2009, 2012; Vollhardt & Bilali, 2014). This important mindset has received increased scholarly attention in recent years, and has been associated with an increased sense of vulnerability and mistrust (Eidelson & Eidelson, 2003), fear of physical or symbolic annihilation (Montville,

1990; Wohl & Branscombe, 2009), hypervigilance (Ross, 2001), and a perception of the world as an actively hostile place (Bar-Tal, 1998, 2007; Janoff-Bulman, 1992; Staub & Pearlman, 2001). In the context of intergroup conflicts, a sense of group victimhood has been related to reduced group-based guilt (Wohl & Branscombe, 2008), shame, rage, and entrenched intergroup violence (Rice & Benson, 2005), greater outgroup mistrust and reduced willingness for intergroup forgiveness (Noor et al., 2008), reduced willingness for compromise and greater support for military actions against the outgroup (Schori-Eyal et al., 2014).

In the present research we conceptualized the group victimhood mindset as *perpetual ingroup victimhood orientation* (PIVO). The PIVO concept is defined as the belief that one's group is a constant victim persecuted continually by different enemies. PIVO shares some characteristics with competitive victimhood (Noor et al., 2008) and with the notion of siege mentality (Bar Tal & Antebi, 1992). Nonetheless, PIVO is novel in its emphasis on the reincarnation of past enemies in current ones. Thus PIVO may explain how temporally distant traumas can resonate in the descendants of those group members who suffered directly many generations later (Barkan, 2000; Licata & Klein, 2010; Wohl & Branscombe, 2005) and affect their responses to the point of "time collapse", in which historical context is disregarded and the past and present merge (Volkan, 1997).

So far little empirical attention has been paid to the possibility of additional mindsets that may evolve in the wake of traumatic events endured by the group, such as war and persecution (though for a notable exception see the discussion of inclusive victimhood in Vollhardt, 2009, 2012). We suggest that historical group trauma may also lead group members to what we term *Fear of Victimizing* (FOV): the apprehension that their group will become entangled in a "victim-to-victimizer" cycle,

aggressing their enemies with little regard for moral considerations. FOV is centered on of the concern that one's group might ruthlessly harm others and reflects the belief that suffering does not necessarily ennoble the mind. Rather, it can lead to moral callousness and to indifference to the anguish of others.

FOV is similar to PIVO in its focus on the historical group trauma and its possible consequences. Like PIVO it deals with concerns regarding the possible negative future of the ingroup. However, the content of the negative prospect is different. Whereas PIVO expresses the worry that the ingroup which has been a victim in the past, will also be a victim in the future (i.e., stability in the role of victim), FOV expresses the worry the ingroup will shift its role from victim to aggressor and harm others (reversal of the role of victim).

The FOV orientation might seem counterintuitive. Why would victims be worried about the eventuality that they would turn into victimizers? We suggest that the FOV orientation may be traced to several sources. In many cultures moral guidelines warn people against repeating evils that have been done (or could be done) to them unto others. For example, the Silver Rule that states "Do not do to others what you would not have them do unto you" is shared by most religions and many philosophical schools (Flew, 1979; Terry, 2007). Such moral rules are directed to all human beings, not particularly towards members of victimized groups. However, when members of victimized groups contemplate the evil done to their group, the ensuing "do not do unto others" clause may automatically follow. Recent research in fact suggests that observers attribute greater moral obligation not to harm others to members of historically persecuted groups (Warner & Branscombe, 2012).

FOV could also be the result of fear of moral contagion: people sometimes believe that "essence" or properties, including evil, are transmitted when two objects come into contact (Nemeroff & Rozin, 1994; Rozin, Haidt, & McCauley, 2008). For example, individuals who have experienced severe abuse in childhood are accompanied by doubts about their parenting abilities, and consequently the fear that they themselves may victimize their children (DiLillo, 2001; Fitzgerald, Shipman, Jackson, McMahon, & Hanley, 2005). Similarly, members of historically traumatized groups may believe that their ingroup's direct contact with oppressors places it in particular danger of becoming contaminated by the evil essence of their victimizers and turning evil themselves.

Antecedents of PIVO and FOV

What causes one group member to more strongly embrace an orientation of group-based victimhood while another develops a greater fear of emulating the deeds of the ingroup victimizers in treating the rival outgroup members? We suggest that PIVO and FOV have roots in motivations, and thus can be traced to personal values. Values express basic human motivations (Rohan, 2000; Schwartz, 1992) and give meaning to, energize, and regulate value-congruent behavior (Verplanken & Holland, 2002). As motivational constructs, values affect perception and interpretation (e.g., Sagiv, Sverdlik, & Schwartz, 2011).

We reason that the values people consider important are likely to affect the way they interpret and construe the history of their ingroup. Although all group members are subjected to the same societal messages and socialization agents regarding the shared trauma, the values that they hold dear may explain why some develop a

perpetual victimhood orientation, whereas others endorse a worldview that places emphasis on the fear of harming others.

In this research we drew on Schwartz's basic values theory which seeks to represent the values that are recognized across cultures (Schwartz, 1992; see reviews in Hitlin & Piliavin, 2004; Maio, 2010; Rohan, 2000). This theory has been tested and verified in extensive cross-cultural research (e.g. Davidov, Schmidt, & Schwartz, 2008; Schwartz & Rubel, 2005). Schwartz identified ten basic values that are ordered in a circular structure according to their conflicts and compatibilities. This structure can be summarized as two basic conflicts: (1) Openness to change values express the motivation for autonomy of thought and action (self-direction), and for novelty and excitement (stimulation). These values conflict with conservation values that express the motivation to preserve the status quo: commitment to past beliefs and customs (tradition), adhering to social norms and expectations (conformity) and preference for stability and safety (security). (2) Self-enhancement values express the pursuit of self-interests by focusing on gaining control over people and resources (power) or by demonstrating ambition, competence and success (achievement). These values conflict with self-transcendence values that express concern and care for close others (benevolence) or acceptance and tolerance of all people (universalism). We suggest that the most pertinent values to PIVO and FOV are tradition and universalism, respectively.

Tradition values represent the goals of respect, commitment, and acceptance of the customs and ideas that traditional culture or religion provide the self. We reason that having a perpetual victimhood orientation helps maintain tradition values because it reflects an overarching desire to maintain stability, and the tradition value corresponds to the enduring, invariable nature of enemies according to PIVO. The

perpetual ingroup victimhood orientation revolves around the immutability of the course of history: persecution is eternal and the ingroup is forever its victim.

Moreover, PIVO plays a central role in the construction of group identity and the consecration of the trauma through ceremonies and memorial days (e.g., the Shiite Ashura or the Jewish Passover ceremony; see Schori-Eyal, Klar, & Raz, 2016) which all reflect a strong emphasis on tradition and make it a compelling avenue for pursuing this value. Whereas the focus of FOV on the potential reversal of roles, which implies transitivity and fluidity in a central domain of group identity (i.e., morality) suggests that it would be highly incongruous with the tradition value.

The value of universalism represents the goals of understanding, appreciation, tolerance and protection for the welfare of all people and for nature. In terms of morality and ethics, universalism resonates with the autonomy ethic of avoiding harm and injustice (Shweder, Much, Mahapatra, & Park, 1997), and with the fairness/reciprocity moral foundation (Haidt & Graham, 2007; see Sverdlik, Roccas, & Sagiv, 2012, for a discussion of morality and values). Universalism is expected to correspond the most closely with FOV because of its inclusivity of all people as worthy of tolerance and protection. The key is not sensitivity to suffering and disapproval of those who cause harm, which is expressed in the value of benevolence and in the harm/care moral foundation, but rather in who is considered a subject that must be protected from suffering and harm. FOV, which views all groups as potential victims (and victimizers) and focuses on the suffering of those not included in one's ingroup, is therefore expected to be the most closely related to universalism. PIVO, which implies that group victimhood is exclusive and leaves little room for acknowledging even the potential of harm to others, is therefore incompatible with a value that stresses protection of *all*.

Consequences of PIVO and FOV

Although one of the goals of this study was to establish PIVO and FOV as two distinct and valid constructs, and to test values as their potential antecedents, the main aim of the present research was to examine how these two orientations stemming from historical group trauma affect emotions, attitudes, and cognitions in current intergroup conflicts. We suggest that the different foci of the two orientations capture the disparate ways in which each conceptualizes the legacy of historical suffering and can sometimes lead to contrasting responses to current intergroup conflicts. While most group members who strongly endorse one orientation are likely to exhibit low levels of the opposing orientation, it is possible for an individual to be high on both orientations (i.e., simultaneously believe that it is the ingroup's obligation to defend its members at all costs and that it must not harm other groups), or to be low on both (possibly attributing little importance or present relevance to the past and the group's painful history). Thus the two orientations are construed as generally negatively related to each other but not as mutually exclusive.

In line with previous research on group victimhood, we suggest that PIVO entails a commitment to the defense of the ingroup, and consequently greater support for aggressive measures against enemy outgroups and lower levels of guilt over excessive harm engendered by such measures. FOV, in contrast, entails a commitment to refrain from mistreating members of the enemy outgroup, leading to opposite response. In addition, we expect the comprehensive nature of these worldviews to color their proponents' cognitive perceptions as well. The two specific processes we examine in the present work are attribution of causality and memory of conflict-related events.

Present research

To test these hypotheses, we conducted four studies in the context of two intergroup conflicts that exhibit varying stages and intensity: the active Israeli-Palestinian conflict (focusing on Jewish-Israeli attitudes toward the conflict and the Palestinians), and the recently abated Northern Ireland conflict (examining both Catholics and Protestants). The first two studies deal with the effects of PIVO and FOV on emotions and attitudes, whereas the last two studies examine how the two orientations impact cognitive processes. In Study 1, conducted in Israel, we examine the associations of PIVO and FOV with emotional responses and behavioral tendencies toward the enemy outgroup. In Study 2, conducted in Northern Ireland, we explore the associations of PIVO and FOV with intergroup forgiveness and reconciliation. Studies 3 and 4 involved experimental tasks. In Study 3 (Israel) we examine the relationship between PIVO and FOV and attributing responsibility for the outbreak of a series of hostilities through temporal sequencing. In experimental Study 4 (Israel) we test whether PIVO and FOV affect group members' memory processes as expressed by their recall of events related to ingroup and outgroup victims of the intergroup conflict. We determined all sample sizes based on a medium effect size and 0.80 power.

Study 1

In Study 1 we examined PIVO and FOV among Jewish-Israelis at three different points in time. Sample 1a was collected during a period of relative calm in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Study 1b was conducted during and immediately following an escalation in the conflict that included massive Israeli operations in the Gaza strip and

Palestinian rocket fire on Israeli towns and settlements (Study 1b). Study 1c was collected on a subsample of participants who had taken part in Study 1a, during a period of renewed hostilities eight months after the first assessment. In all three samples we examined the relationships of PIVO and FOV with moral entitlement, tolerance of enemy collateral casualties, and group-based guilt. Studies 1b and 1c included additional measures, as detailed below.

Moral entitlement is the belief that it is acceptable for the ingroup to commit morally reprehensible acts against the enemy outgroup. Beliefs about moral entitlement are found among many members of groups involved in conflicts, as evidenced by the fact that up to 30% of the respondents in eight war-affected countries agreed with the statement "there is nothing that combatants should not be allowed to do" (ICRC, 2010). We propose that the link between individual past trauma and entitlement to receive special consideration (Bishop & Lane, 2000), focus on one's needs (McMullin, Wirth, & White, 2007) and behave selfishly (Zitek, Jordan, Monin, & Leach, 2010) extends to group identity such that the higher PIVO, the higher the moral entitlement. In contrast, the association between FOV and moral entitlement is expected to be negative. As FOV reflects a deep concern about the ingroup's moral character and the actions it takes, it serves as a warning not to violate ethical norms in wartime.

The core belief in the group's license to breach moral norms may serve as an antecedent to a variety of harmful actions. We thus predict that moral entitlement mediates the associations of PIVO and FOV with more specific behavioral tendencies and emotional responses. In the current study we examined group-based guilt – an aversive emotion experienced over actions taken by one's group that are perceived as illegitimate and harmful, even if the individual experiencing it did not participate in

the damaging act (Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, & Manstead, 1998; Roccas, Klar, & Liviatan, 2006), and on tolerance of enemy casualties, which we define as the endorsement of military tactics that inadvertently target civilians who are not actively aiding enemy militant forces. Because FOV is concerned with harming others – almost a form of prospective guilt – we expect moral entitlement to mediate the FOV-guilt relationship only partially. The full theoretical model is illustrated in Figure 1.

The usefulness of PIVO and FOV depends to a large extent on their contribution above and beyond orientations that have been studied in the past. Therefore Study 1b included other potentially relevant predictors of group-based guilt and tolerance of enemy collateral casualties; namely, religiosity, political orientation, group identification, Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) and the Social Dominance Orientation (SDO). Extensive research indicates that these constructs are strongly associated with dimensions of prejudice (Duckitt & Sibley, 2007) and with negativity toward outgroups (Altemeyer, 1998; Hall, Matz, & Wood, 2010; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). For example, religiosity was shown to be positively related to support for political violence (e.g., Canetti, Hobfoll, Pedhazur, & Zaidise, 2010) and military acts (e.g., Froese & Mencken, 2009). A Right-wing political orientation was found to be negatively related to group-based guilt (e.g., Roccas, Klar, & Liviatan, 2004), and positively related to exonerating cognitions in response to ingroup transgressions (e.g., Figueiredo, Valentim & Doosje, 2011) and to endorsement of unintentional killing of outgroup civilians (e.g., Kimhi, 2014; Pyszczynski et al., 2006; Uhlmann, Pizzaro, Tannenbaum & Ditto, 2009).

The relationship between group identification and group-based guilt is more complex (e.g., Doosje et al., 1998; Branscombe, 2004; Wohl, Branscombe, & Klar, 2006). Being identified with one's group is the basis for any group-based emotion

(Smith & Mackie, 2000), but it also provides the motivation to defend group identity (Branscombe, Doosje, & McGarty, 2002) and legitimize its actions. To resolve this paradox, Roccas and her colleagues suggested a dual conceptualization of group identification and found that attachment to one's group was positively related whereas glorification was negatively related to group-based guilt for the ingroup's past infractions (Roccas et al., 2006). Glorification has also been associated with higher levels of support for aggressive and extreme means against rival outgroups (Dugas, Schori-Eyal et al., 2015; Castano, 2008; Leidner, Castano, Zaiser, & Giner-Sorolla, 2010).

In sum, RWA, SDO, identification, religiosity and political orientation are expected to predict group-based guilt and condone harm to outgroup civilians. In Study 1b we tested the distinctive contribution of PIVO and FOV to the prediction of group-based guilt and tolerance of enemy collateral casualties above and beyond these well-established predictors. In Study 1c, we assessed whether the relationships between variables in the proposed model were not the result of measuring all the constructs at the same time. To do so, the main dependent variables were measured six months after the assessment of PIVO and FOV. During the second measurement we also measured participants' basic values; since values are stable and abstract motivational constructs (Jin & Rounds, 2012; Lönnqvist, Jasinskaja-Lahti, & Verkasalo, 2013; Schwartz, 1992) we did not expect them to have changed, and therefore they were tested as predictors of PIVO and FOV.

Study 1a

Participants and procedure. Four hundred and twelve Jewish-Israeli participants responded to an internet questionnaire in exchange for approximately

\$2.00 (<http://www.midgam.com/info.asp>). The sample was made up of 209 men and 203 women ranging in age from 18 to 73, $M=40.86$, $SD=15.02$. In terms of political orientations, 54.3% of the respondents defined themselves as rightists, 25.2% as centrist, and 18.7% as leftists (1.7% did not answer this question).

Measures

Unless stated otherwise, all items ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). To anchor perceptions of the group's history in a specific traumatic occurrence, participants were asked to recall an event in which the ingroup (the people of Israel) had been harmed by another group and write down a short representation of trauma in a specific event, and unless otherwise specified, preceded each measurement of Perpetual Ingroup Victimhood Orientation (PIVO). PIVO was assessed using 12 items (e.g., "*All our enemies throughout history share a common denominator – the will to annihilate us*", $\alpha=.89$). FOV was assessed using 13 items (e.g., "*We are in danger of treating other peoples in the same way that we were treated by our worst enemies*"; $\alpha=.94$). Moral entitlement was assessed using 10 items (e.g., "*Harming innocents is certainly justified when our existence is being threatened*"; $\alpha=.92$). Group-based guilt was assessed using 7 items based on Roccas et al. (2006; sample item: "*I feel guilty over the way Israel treats the Palestinians*"; $\alpha=.87$). Participants' tolerance of enemy collateral casualties (TECC) was assessed using their response to a vignette depicting the decision to assassinate an outgroup militant by firing rockets from an attack helicopter. Participants were presented with a table depicting the tradeoff between the number of likely collateral casualties and the probability of achieving the military goal (i.e., successful assassination), and were asked to decide on the magnitude of the missile based on the resulting expectancy of success/collateral casualties. The response scale ranged from 1 (40% chance of

success, no civilian casualties) to 5 (100% chance of success, up to 20 civilian casualties).

Results

We first examined the distribution of different historical traumas recalled by the participants. The events mentioned by the participants were categorized into five time periods, ranging from “antiquity” (e.g., the exodus from Egypt) to “1948-present”. Forty-five participants did not mention an event or wrote of irrelevant events (e.g., intergroup attacks); their scores on all variables were not significantly different from those of participants who wrote about a historical event, and therefore these 45 participants were included in following analyses. One event was most frequently mentioned (41.1%); 35 participants (8.5%) listed multiple events. The means, standard deviations, and correlations are presented in Table 1. Gender did not have an effect on any of the variables in this or in the remaining studies and will not be further discussed.

To assess the hypothesized relationships among the variables we used the AMOS 21 statistical program to conduct a Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) analysis. To assess the distinctiveness of the scales, we first implemented a measurement model. The measurement model consisted of factor-loading paths from the latent constructs (e.g., PIVO, FOV, group-based guilt) to their manifest indicators and non-directional correlations between the latent variables. Due to the large number of indicators, we followed the recommendations of Bandalos (2002) and Little, Cunningham, Shahar and Widaman (2002) and created parcels to optimize the measurement structure of constructs in SEM procedures. The measurement model displayed very good fit to the data ($\chi^2(38, N = 412) = 98.87, p < .001; NFI = .99; IFI = .99; CFI = .99; RMSEA =$

.06). Correlations between the constructs corresponded with the ones reported in Table 1. Factor loadings on all latent variables were significant and ranged from .73 to .91.

We assessed the full hypothesized model linking PIVO and FOV, via the mediating role of moral entitlement, to group-based guilt and TECC with structural equation modeling (SEM) using the AMOS 20 software. To assess overall model fit, we used the chi-square test, the comparative fit index (CFI), and the root mean square of approximation (RMSEA). A satisfactory fit is generally indicated by a non-significant χ^2 , a χ^2/df ratio ≤ 3 , a CFI $\geq .95$, and a RMSEA $\leq .08$ (p close $> .05-.10$; Hu & Bentler, 1999). The model provided very good fit to the data: $\chi^2=114.65$, $p<.001$; χ^2/df ratio=2.34; CFI=.99, RMSEA=.06 (p close=.19). Standardized parameter estimates were in line with our predictions and are shown in Figure 2. As indicated in the figure, PIVO led to an increase and FOV to a decrease in the perception that the ingroup is morally entitled to do anything to defend itself, which in turn led to heightened TECC and decreased group-based guilt. Moral entitlement fully mediated the effect of PIVO and partially mediated the effect of FOV.

We next tested an alternative model in which the order of variables was changed to reflect processes other than the one we proposed. In the alternative model, moral decision making leads to increased guilt, which is then mitigated by moral entitlement that leads to the PIVO and FOV orientation. We report the Akaike information criterion (AIC; Akaike, 1974) for comparison of non-nested models, where the model with the lowest AIC is considered most parsimonious and robust. The alternative model did not fit the data as well as the model we suggested: $\chi^2=548.13$, $p<.001$; χ^2/df ratio=10.75; CFI=.90, RMSEA=.16 (p close=.000). The value for the alternative model was AIC=626.19, compared to AIC=196.65 in our proposed model. The results

indicated the PIVO and FOV are indeed separate constructs, and provided support for our proposed model. However, to examine whether PIVO and FOV contributed to the prediction of group-based guilt and TECC above and beyond other predictors such as right-wing political view, as well as to examine its stability during conflict escalation, we conducted Study 1b.

Study 1b

Participants and procedure

Two hundred and fifteen Jewish-Israelis students completed the study in exchange for course credit (178 women, age range: 18-64, $M=24.94$, $SD=4.93$). As part of a larger study, presented as a study on social and political attitudes, they completed measures of Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Social Dominance Orientation, group identification, Perpetual in-group victimhood orientation (PIVO), Fear of Victimizing (FOV), moral entitlement (ME), group-based guilt, and tolerance of enemy collateral casualties (TECC). The study was conducted during a conflict escalation that involved an extensive ground-force operation in the Gaza Strip. To control for possible effects of PIVO and FOV on moral decision making, half of the participants completed the condoning measure before the PIVO and FOV measures, and the other half completed it following the measurement of these variables. No order effects were found.

Measures

Unless otherwise mentioned, all items ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) was assessed using the 16-item scale constructed by Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle (1994) ($\alpha=.87$).

Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) was assessed using Altemeyer's (1981) 30-item scale (responses ranged from 1, *do not agree at all*, to 9, *completely agree*; $\alpha=.88$).

Group identification was assessed using the 16-item, two-mode attachment and glorification scale (Roccas et al., 2006; ranging from 1, *strongly disagree*, to 7, *strongly agree*; attachment $\alpha=.93$, glorification $\alpha=.85$).

PIVO ($\alpha=.89$), **FOV** ($\alpha=.94$), **moral entitlement** ($\alpha=.92$), **group-based guilt** ($\alpha=.87$), and **tolerance of enemy collateral casualties (TECC)** were identical to the measures used in Study 1a.

Religiosity was assessed using a single item ("how religious are you?") with responses ranging from 1 (*not at all religious*) to 7 (*extremely religious*).

Political orientation was measured using two items (identification with right wing, identification with left wing, ranging from 1 [*not at all*] to 6 [*extremely*]). Political orientation was calculated by deducting the score of the left-wing item from the right-wing item; higher scores indicate right-wing political tendencies.

Results

We first submitted the data to the SEM analysis conducted in Study 1a. Again the model provided a very good fit to the data: $\chi^2=93.54$, $p<.001$; CFI=.98, RMSEA=.065 (p close=.10). We then proceeded to conduct two hierarchical linear regressions to assess the distinctive contribution of PIVO and FOV to predicting group-based guilt and TECC. In the first step, RWA, SDO, group identification, political orientation and religiosity were entered, predicting group-based guilt (Table 2). In the second step PIVO and FOV were entered. PIVO and FOV were both significant predictors of group-based guilt, above and beyond RWA, SDO, identification, religiosity and political orientation (F change=33.04, $p<.001$). The

same analysis was conducted to predict TECC (table 4), and again PIVO and FOV's contribution was above and beyond the other variables ($F_{change}=11.00, p<.001$).

The results of Study 1b thus provided additional support for the proposed model, as well as evidence that PIVO and FOV both have a distinct contribution over and above traditional predictors of the outcomes we examined. They also demonstrate that the relationships between variables in the model remain stable even during increased tensions and violent conflict escalation. The results indicated that the association between PIVO, FOV, and the two modes of group identification was somewhat complex, and resembled its relationship to other constructs such as group-based guilt (Roccas et al., 2006) and support for aggression against the outgroup. Glorification was positively associated with PIVO ($r = .43, p < .001$) and negatively associated with FOV ($r = -.33, p < .01$), whereas attachment (when controlling for glorification) was associated with neither ($r_{attachment*PIVO} = .13, p = .85; r_{attachment*FOV} = .02, p = .77$).

The goal of the next study was twofold: to examine whether the model would remain stable when the outcome variables were measured at a later time, and to test the role of personal values as possible antecedents.

Study 1c

Participants and procedure

Eight months after the completion of Study 1a, two hundred and sixty-two Jewish-Israeli participants were recruited from among the larger sample of Study 1a and responded to an internet questionnaire in exchange for approximately \$1.00. The sample was composed of 143 men and 119 women ranging in age from 19 to 73, $M=43.19, SD=14.72$. No significant differences in any of the variables (PIVO, FOV,

moral entitlement, group-based guilt, and TECC) were found between participants who only completed the first assessment and those who took part in both waves. Participants completed measures for personal values, moral entitlement, group-based guilt, tolerance of enemy collateral casualties, and social desirability.

Measures

Moral entitlement ($\alpha=.93$), **group-based guilt** ($\alpha=.95$), and **tolerance of enemy collateral casualties (TECC)** were identical to the measures used in the previous studies. Personal values were measured using the short values scale (Sekerdej & Roccas, 2016). Social desirability was assessed using six items based on Paulhaus (1991) (ranging from 1, *untrue*, to 7, *very true*, sample item: “*I don’t gossip about other people’s business*”; $\alpha=.75$).

Results

We first submitted the data to the SEM analysis conducted in Studies 1a and 1b, using PIVO and FOV collected in T1 (eight months prior to the study) while controlling for social desirability. The model provided a very good fit to the data: $\chi^2=138.60$, $p<.001$; CFI=.98, RMSEA=.064 (p close=.07). We then proceeded to test our hypotheses regarding values as predictors of PIVO and FOV.

We calculated zero-order correlations between PIVO, FOV, and the ten values. These correlations can be found in the table accompanying Figure 3. Consistent with our hypotheses, PIVO was strongly associated with tradition and FOV was strongly associated with universalism. Correlations with the other variables in the values circle followed the sinusoidal curve found in previous studies on values (Figure 3).

Discussion

Study 1 provided support for the predicted relationship between PIVO and FOV and explored their associations with emotional responses and behavioral tendencies during an ongoing current conflict. The two orientations that were negatively correlated and were demonstrated to be two distinct constructs in Study 1a, predicted group-based guilt and TECC in opposite directions, and were partially mediated by moral entitlement. Moreover, the predictive value of PIVO and FOV was above and beyond that of well-established variables (RWA, SDO, group identification and political orientation) that predicted negativity toward outgroups. PIVO was positively associated with tradition and conformity, and negatively associated with self-direction and universalism; a similar but opposite pattern was found regarding FOV, which was positively associated with stimulation, self-direction, and universalism, and negatively associated with tradition values.

The model was replicated across three samples collected during different phases of an intractable conflict. Sample 1a was collected during a relatively calm period with few open hostilities, whereas sample 1b was collected during a time of extensive bilateral aggression and sample 1c, a sub-sample of 1a, was also collected during a period of escalation characterized by frequent stabbing and shooting attacks on Israeli civilians. In addition, Study 1c demonstrated that the proposed model remained stable when the predictive variables (PIVO and FOV) were measured over a period of six months prior to the assessment of the dependent variables.

These findings indicate that the recollection of historical group trauma, corresponding to deeply-seated motivational constructs, can have very different outcomes. It can invoke a perception of collective victimhood (i.e., PIVO) and a more defensive-aggressive response to the adversarial group, but it can also evoke individuals' moral sensitivity (i.e., FOV) and resistance to potentially and morally

reprehensible ingroup actions. The history-based nature of the worldviews, particularly the ongoing sense of victimhood reflected in PIVO, is what enables group members to draw on events that took place in the distant past as occurrences that shape their society's common psyche, as well as their own.

Whereas PIVO was most strongly associated with tradition and FOV was related to universalism, the relationships with other values in the circle also merit discussion. The positive association of PIVO with conformity and FOV with self-direction values may reflect ingroup norms emphasizing beliefs in the unique victimhood of the ingroup and rejecting the notion that the ingroup might become a victimizer (for a discussion of the relative prevalence of different victimhood construals in Jewish-Israeli society, see Klar, Schori-Eyal, & Klar, 2013; Klar, 2016). The relationships found for benevolence and universalism are particularly interesting. Both values express the underlying motivation of concern for others. Benevolence, however, was not related to FOV. This may be because benevolence and universalism values involve different targets. Benevolence values express concern for people with whom one has frequent interactions, whereas universalism values reflect concern for all humankind. Thus, the goal of universalism values implies an extension of one's concern from the bounded group of people with whom one has frequent personal contact to the whole of humankind (Schwartz, 1992). The possible tension between concern for close others and concern for all humanity may help explain why FOV was correlated with one but not the other; this is similar to the pattern of correlations found between benevolence, universalism, and national identification (Roccas, Schwartz, & Amit, 2010).

To test the generalizability of PIVO and FOV beyond a specific social context, we conducted Study 2 in Belfast, Northern Ireland. We examined the role of PIVO

and FOV in predicting beliefs related to forgiveness and reconciliation among Catholic and Protestant participants, and their contribution relative to another measure of victimhood.

Study 2

The conflict in Northern Ireland reached some form of settlement with the signing of what is known as the Good Friday Agreement or the Belfast agreement. This 1998 agreement brought decades of violent contention over the question of Northern Ireland's status within the United Kingdom to an end. Despite its limitations, the Good Friday agreement attempted to provide a framework through which disagreement could be contained without resorting to violence (Gilligan, 2003). Over the many years of conflict in Northern Ireland, and particularly during the 30 years of "The Troubles" (Cairns & Darby, 1998), many people were the victims of violence perpetrated by both warring parties. Over three and a half thousand people lost their lives and some 40,000 people suffered injuries of various kinds (McDowell, 2007). Victimhood beliefs held by both Catholics and Protestants may thus play a crucial role in group members' willingness to forgive the actions of the past and move from a formal resolution to reconciliation.

Reconciliation is a healing process leading to mutual acceptance between conflicting groups (Staub & Bar-Tal, 2003). However, the psychological realities of conflict often resist change towards intergroup reconciliation, despite a political peace agreement (Noor et al., 2008). Successful reconciliation depends on finding a fitting way of dealing with past intergroup wrongdoings (Nadler, 2002; Staub, 2006). Forgiveness entails letting go of negative thoughts and resentment directed at those perceived as responsible for past wrongdoings, as well as forgoing reprisals. It

acknowledges and brings closure to the painful past, while encouraging groups to focus on a positive future (Minow, 1998; Nadler & Saguy, 2003).

We expected PIVO to be negatively associated with forgiveness and reconciliation because of its focus on historical wrongdoings as a perpetual reality. As long as the past is perceived as the present, closure and forgiveness are unlikely. Conversely, the more balanced approach of FOV, which acknowledges that both the ingroup and the outgroup are capable of perpetrating harm, should be more conducive to forgiveness and reconciliation, and was expected to be positively correlated with them.

The study also included another measure of group-based victimhood: competitive victimhood (Noor et al., 2008). In competitive victimhood the two groups in an intergroup conflict strive "to establish that their in-group was subjected to *more* injustice and suffering at the hands of the out-group than the other way around" (Noor et al., 2012, p. 352) and is negatively associated with tendencies towards intergroup forgiveness and reconciliation (Noor et al., 2008). Although competitive victimhood and PIVO share the belief in the uniqueness of group trauma, the crux of PIVO is the belief in the perpetual nature of the ingroup's victimhood (e.g., current adversaries re-embodiment historical opponents) and a resultant mistrust of outgroups. Given the different emphasis of the PIVO concept, we expected that it would make a distinct contribution to predicting aspects of reconciliation above and beyond competitive victimhood.

Method

Participants and Procedure

One hundred and forty-nine respondents (119 females, age range: 18-55, $M=25.30$, $SD=8.17$) completed the following scales: PIVO, FOV, competitive

victimhood, reconciliation and forgiveness. One hundred and thirty-six of the participants were students who completed the questionnaire online in exchange for course credit. The remainder of the participants completed a paper version. The study was presented as research on social attitudes and intergroup relationships. Participants identified themselves as having either a “Catholic” (N=89) or “Protestant” (N=54) background. Only 6 identified as “Other”.

Measures

PIVO ($M=2.20$, $SD=.81$, $\alpha=.89$) and FOV ($M=2.52$, $SD=.94$, $\alpha=.92$) were identical to the measures used in Study 1 (translated into English; participants were not asked to record a specific traumatic event from their group’s history). Competitive victimhood was assessed using five items based on Noor et al., 2008 (sample item: *"Overall, the proportion of trauma due to 'The Troubles' has been more severe in my community than in the other community"*; $M=2.73$, $SD=1.11$, $\alpha=.88$). Eleven items were used to assess forgiveness and reconciliation (sample item: *"I would like to ask my community to forgive the other community for their acts of violence"*; $M=4.30$, $SD=.72$, $\alpha=.91$). The response scales for competitive victimhood and for forgiveness and reconciliation ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*).

Results and Discussion

No reliable differences were found between Catholics and Protestants on any of the variables; therefore the data were collapsed across the two groups. We first calculated the correlation between PIVO and FOV, which was similar to the correlation found in Study 1 ($r=-.36$, $p<.001$). We then tested the hypotheses with hierarchical linear regression analysis (Table 2). Due to the wide range of participants’ ages, which was expected to affect the way in which they experienced and recalled the conflict, we controlled for age. In the first step age and competitive

victimhood were entered. Competitive victimhood was a significant predictor of intergroup forgiveness and reconciliation ($\beta = -.32, p < .01$). The higher the perception of one's ingroup as the more victimized party, the lower the willingness to forgive and reconcile. In the second step PIVO and FOV were entered. PIVO and FOV were both significant predictors of willingness to forgive and reconcile, above and beyond age and competitive victimhood ($F_{\text{change}} = 18.46, p < .01$). As expected, the higher the PIVO, the less positive the attitudes toward forgiveness and reconciliation that were expressed ($\beta = -.51, p < .01$). The opposite pattern emerged with FOV as predictor: the higher the FOV, the more positive the attitudes participants tended to express ($\beta = .16, p < .05$).

The results of Study 2, conducted in Northern Ireland, thus extend the implications of the two trauma-based orientations beyond those presented in the first study. The findings indicate that PIVO and FOV are relevant not only in an active violent conflict, but also in a conflict that has reached a degree of political resolution. While the levels of PIVO ($M = 2.28, SD = .87$) and FOV ($M = 2.54, SD = .96$) were lower than in the Israeli samples ($t(274) = 7.91, p < .01$; $t(275) = 9.89, p < .01$), they still retained their predictive power. Thus, PIVO and FOV are not restricted to a single intergroup conflict. The findings indicate that the same pattern of associations can also emerge in a different context, preceded by a different history of a conflict with very different actors.

The lower levels of PIVO and FOV in Study 2 may have been due to the relatively lower levels of ongoing conflict in Northern Ireland at the time and suggest that even after a prolonged and bloody conflict the activation of trauma-based orientations, such as that of other knowledge structures, is contextualized rather than chronic (see Eitam & Higgins, 2010). Although the historical events and their

psychological outcomes continue to resonate in the public realm, such orientations became less active in individuals' minds.

These results hence suggest that the trauma-driven orientations are important not only during the period of the active conflict but also throughout the transition from formal resolution to reconciliation. The willingness to forgive outgroup members and strive for a more harmonious intergroup relationship is fundamental to peaceful co-existence (e.g., Tam et al., 2008). PIVO is counterproductive to forgiveness and reconciliation, whereas FOV promotes them. Unlike PIVO, FOV does not include the implicit assumption that acknowledging outgroup suffering detracts from the ingroup's victim status. Those high on FOV can remember their own group's suffering but concede the pain of rival outgroups; one does not come at the expense of the other.

Finally, the current results underscore the distinctive contribution of PIVO and FOV even when competitive victimhood is taken into account. This suggests that representations of trauma are complex and multidimensional, and indicates that the two orientations make a unique contribution to understanding the role of group trauma in contemporary conflicts.

Studies 1 and 2 focused on attitudes, emotions, and behavioral tendencies. In the next study we turned our attention to a different process: attribution. We examined the effect of PIVO and FOV on the ways in which responsibility for outbreak of hostility is assigned.

Study 3

The study of attributions of responsibility at the intergroup level has focused mainly on the ultimate attribution error (Pettigrew, 1979). Studies have repeatedly shown that people make situational attributions for negative acts committed by an

ingroup member, but make dispositional attributions if the same acts are committed by an outgroup member (e.g., Doosje & Branscombe, 2003; see also Hewstone, 1990, for a review). Drawing on Pettigrew's theory to examine attribution of responsibility in the context of intergroup conflict, Bilali, Tropp, and Dasgupta (2012) investigated Turkish construals of the Armenian massacres at the beginning of the 20th century and Hutus' and Tutsis' construal of the ethnic conflict in Burundi. They found that each group attributed less responsibility to the ingroup than to the outgroup, and that respondents viewed the outgroups as instigators of the violence. In Study 3 we focused on individual differences in the attribution of responsibility for harmful actions, and examined PIVO and FOV as predictors.

We reasoned that responsibility for ingroup moral transgressions is an important component of both orientations. PIVO is the perception of the ingroup as an eternal victim, which inherently entails the belief that enemy outgroups, past and present, are at fault. Therefore high-PIVO individuals are likely to believe that the responsibility for mutual aggression cannot lie with the ingroup. Conversely, FOV is the concern that the ingroup might act reprehensibly, similar to their past enemies. Thus it entails an increased willingness to accept that the ingroup might be responsible for violent clashes with enemy outgroups.

In Study 3 we investigated the role of the two orientations in attributing responsibility and determining causality in a series of skirmishes. We presented Jewish-Israeli students with brief descriptions of four violent incidents which purportedly occurred between Israelis and Palestinians. Participants were asked to determine the order in which they thought the events occurred, and to indicate causality, if present.

The temporal sequence served as the indicator of implicit attribution of responsibility. We assumed that responsibility for the outbreak of hostilities would be placed on the party whose actions began the event sequence. In other words, by placing aggressive outgroup actions at the beginning of the event sequence, participants implicitly attribute responsibility for the outbreak of hostilities to the outgroup (“they started it”).

We also asked participants explicitly about responsibility both in the current series of events, and the conflict in general. We expected high PIVO to predict attribution of responsibility to the Palestinians and high FOV to predict attribution of responsibility to the Israelis.

Method

Participants and Procedure

Ninety-four Jewish-Israelis students (60 women, age range: 21-63, $M=26.71$, $SD=6.55$) completed the study in exchange for a ticket to enter a lottery to win a prize of 200 NIS (approximately \$50.00). The study was presented as a short study conducted by the Tel Aviv University Department of Psychology, and participants completed it in small groups.

Measures

All measures ranged from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). PIVO ($M=3.41$, $SD=1.18$, $\alpha=.89$) and FOV ($M=3.32$, $SD=1.52$, $\alpha=.95$) were identical to the measures used in the previous studies. The Temporal Sequencing Task (TST), developed for the study, was presented to participants as “perception of temporal sequence and construal of causality”. Participants were given four cards, each of which portrayed a violent clash between Israelis and Palestinians, all occurring in the same geographical region in the West Bank. In two cases the damage was incurred by

Palestinians, and in two cases by Jewish-Israelis. The events were chosen so that they would be of the same magnitude and any sequence would be plausible to the participants. Magnitude and plausibility were tested in a pilot study. Sample events: “*IDF mobile infantry entered Nablus in search of insurgents. Dozens of families were left homeless following the operation*”; “*Two Israelis were wounded when their car was shot at, while driving toward the Itz’har settlement near Nablus*”.

Participants were given a 30 cm sheet of cardboard depicting a time axis, the four event cards in random order, a stapler and staples. They were told that the board represented a “hypothetical timeline”, and were asked to read the four cards carefully and place them in the chronological order which seemed the most logical. Events could be placed at the same point on the board (representing simultaneous occurrences), or at different points (representing consecutive occurrences). Implicit causality was derived from the order in which the participants placed the cards. We assumed that the more events in which Israelis were harmed by Palestinians were arranged at the beginning of the sequence, the more responsibility would be attributed to the Palestinian outgroup, and vice versa. For each participant, the events were coded based on their location (the first event in the sequence was coded 1, the last event 4). Events that were placed in the same location were assigned a mean score code (e.g., 2.5). Two scores were computed: one for the events in which Palestinians were harmed and one for the events in which Israelis were harmed. The implicit causality score was calculated as the difference between the two scores. High scores on this variable indicated attribution of responsibility for the hostilities to Palestinians.

In addition to the Temporal Sequencing Task, explicit attribution of responsibility was also measured using two scales. Three items were used to assess attributed responsibility for the specific sequence of events (sample item: “*Regarding*

the events you just read about, which of the parties involved was the initial instigator?"; $M=3.29$, $SD=1.24$, $\alpha=.80$). General attributed responsibility was measured using the same three items, except that participants were asked to answer the questions with regards to the Israeli Palestinian conflict in general (e.g., "*In the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in general, which of the parties is usually the initial instigator of violent events?"*"; $M=2.87$, $SD=1.16$, $\alpha=.81$). On both measures the response scale ranged from 1 (*Palestinians*) to 7 (*Israelis*).

Results and Discussion

To test our hypotheses, we conducted a series of linear regression analyses. In the first regression analysis PIVO and FOV were entered as predictors of the order of events in the TST (representing implicit attribution of responsibility). PIVO was a significant predictor ($\beta=.26$, $p<.05$): the higher the PIVO, the more responsibility was attributed to the Palestinians. FOV was a significant predictor of the order of events ($\beta=-.24$, $p<.05$). The higher the FOV, the more responsibility was attributed to the Israelis ($F(2, 90)=11.037$, $p<.001$).

The second set of regression analyses included the same predictor variables, with explicit responsibility (specific, general) as the dependent variables. In the explicit responsibility items, high scores indicated attributing responsibility to the Israeli ingroup. As expected, low PIVO and high FOV predicted attributing more responsibility to the ingroup, both in the specific series of violent events described (PIVO: $\beta=-.19$, $p<.05$, FOV: $\beta=.61$, $p<.001$; $F(2, 89)=54.331$, $p<.001$) and in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict in general (PIVO: $\beta=-.29$, $p<.01$, FOV: $\beta=.57$, $p<.001$; $F(2, 89)=72.204$, $p<.001$).

The results of Study 3 indicate that the influence of PIVO and FOV extends beyond emotions and attitudes to cognitive processes such as attribution. They also

suggest that the two orientations are self-perpetuating: given ambiguous stimuli (in this case, not indicating causality in any direction), individuals choose to interpret the information they receive according to their dominant mindset. The resulting perceptual biases confirm and strengthen the original orientation. In the next study, we examined another cognitive process that may be part of the self-perpetuation of PIVO and FOV: memory.

Study 4

The strong motivation to view oneself and one's group in a positive light (Crocker & Luhtanen, 1990; Tajfel & Turner, 1986) can be compromised by information implying moral transgressions committed by the ingroup. Thus reminders of ingroup wrongdoing are often managed by defensive reactions such as denial, victim-blaming, derogation and inhumanization of victims or justification of the wrongdoing (Bilali et al., 2012; Castano & Giner-Sorolla, 2006; Noor et al., 2012; Roccas et al., 2004; Sullivan, Landau, Branscombe, & Rothschild, 2012) in order to maintain the ingroup's positive, moral and just image. Another reaction that may be prompted by this goal is *motivated forgetting*; namely, the process by which people attempt to avoid or forget information that is potentially embarrassing, painful, or threatening (Ceci & Bruck, 1995; Thompson, Morton, & Fraser, 1997). The processes tapped in motivated forgetting, whether selective inattention, suppression, or refusal to acknowledge or repeat threatening information (Cooper & Stone, 2004; Thompson et al., 1997; Wegner, 1989) help individuals restore their peace of mind that was upended by troubling information (Wegner & Schneider, 1989). Information about moral transgressions committed by the ingroup presents such a threat, and may induce convenient lapses of memory. Rotella and Richeson (2013) recently demonstrated that when American participants read a passage describing the negative treatment of

Native-Americans by early Americans (i.e., ingroup members) they exhibited poorer memory than when the perpetrators were described as European settlers (i.e., outgroup members). We assumed that the two orientations stemming from historical group trauma would have a motivational impact on similar processes of memory and forgetting.

In this study we examined how PIVO and FOV affect recollection of moral transgressions, both those committed by the ingroup (outgroup victims) and against it (ingroup victims). Because FOV represents sensitivity toward potential ingroup moral misconduct, we expected that high levels of FOV would lead to either increased sensitivity to the suffering of outgroup members, resulting in an interaction between FOV and victims' group identity, or that it would lead to a greater overall sensitivity to harm regardless of group identity. Conversely, we expected an interaction between PIVO and group identity i.e., increased forgetting of outgroup members' suffering, increased memory of ingroup members' suffering, or both.

Method

Participants and Procedure

One hundred and thirty-eight Jewish-Israeli students (99 women, age range: 19-61, $M=27.22$, $SD=6.50$) participated the experiment in exchange for course credit. The experiment was presented to the participants as two separate studies: a study on social and political attitudes, and a study on reading comprehension. Participants first completed the PIVO and FOV scales. They were then presented, as part of a reading comprehension study, with a one-page description of a family whose home was hit by a missile, and were asked to read it attentively as they would be asked about it later. Participants were randomly assigned to read either about a Jewish-Israeli family hit by a Palestinian rocket, or a Palestinian family hit by an IDF missile. After reading the

texts, participants were presented with a series of filler tasks. One hour after reading the texts, they were asked to answer multiple-choice questions about the text, and to complete a demographic questionnaire¹.

Tools

PIVO ($M=4.53$, $SD=1.15$, $\alpha=.87$) and FOV ($M=2.86$, $SD=1.38$, $\alpha=.94$) were identical to the measures used in the previous studies. The memory task was comprised of a one-page passage (367 words) describing either the Qasab family, living in the Palestinian city of Gaza, or the Hadad family, living in the Israeli town Sderot. The text described their daily routine disrupted by a direct hit by either an IDF missile or a Palestinian rocket, and the resulting injuries and damage. Except for the family members' names, place of residence, and group identity, all the details were identical. After a one-hour interval during which the participants completed filler tasks, participants were asked to recall the text they had read and to answer 13 multiple-choice questions testing their recall accuracy. Four questions were about neutral details (e.g., "what did the Qasab/Hadad family have for supper?") and nine were about the damage experienced by family members (e.g., "how long was the hospitalization of the most badly injured family member?"). Accuracy of recall was calculated as the sum of all questions answered correctly, ranging from 0 (no questions answered correctly) to 13 (all questions answered correctly).

Results and Discussion

To examine whether the manipulation affected memory as a function of PIVO, we used Hayes's (2013) PROCESS command: Model 1, $R^2=.07$, $F(3, 134)=3.18$, $p=.03$. Within this model, and taking into account the interaction, there was no

¹ The study also included a manipulation of victimhood salience (conducted through exposure to short texts describing multiple historical ingroup trauma), but the manipulation checks in this and in other unpublished studies showed this manipulation to be ineffective and it was therefore not included in the analyses.

significant main effect for the group identity manipulation ($b=-.29$, $SE=0.38$, $t=-0.75$, $p=.47$). More importantly, the two-way interaction was significant ($b=-.69$, $SE=0.34$, $t=-2.04$, $p=.04$, 95% confidence interval [CI] = [-1.35, -.02]), indicating that PIVO moderated the manipulation's effect on memory of harm. An analysis of the conditional effects revealed that the manipulation had a significant effect on participants with high PIVO (those whose victimhood score was 1 standard deviation above the mean score; $b=-1.07$, $SE=0.54$, $t=-1.97$, $p=.05$). As expected, the manipulation did not significantly affect memory of the damage narrative among low-victimhood participants (those whose PIVO score was 1 standard deviation below the mean score; $b=.50$, $SE=0.54$, $t=.92$, $p=.36$). The results indicate that high-PIVO participants recalled damage to outgroup victims significantly less accurately than same harm to ingroup members (see Figure 4).

We again used PROCESS model 1 to examine whether the manipulation affected memory as a function of FOV, $R^2=.06$, $F(3, 134)=2.81$, $p=.04$. Within the model there was no significant main effect for the group identity manipulation ($b=-.24$, $SE=0.38$, $t=-.63$, $p=.53$) or for the interaction between FOV and the manipulation ($b=.13$, $SE=0.28$, $t=.46$, $p=.65$). Only FOV ($b=.38$, $SE=0.14$, $t=2.75$, $p=.007$) had a main effect on memory accuracy.

The results of the study indicate that PIVO and FOV can have an effect on group members at a basic cognitive level. While FOV is related to increased memory to all suffering, which may imply that this worldview reflects a general humanistic tendency, PIVO is associated with a more selective form of attention bias. High levels of PIVO lead to tuning out the suffering of outgroup members, which is incongruent with the orientation's focus on the ingroup as the sole victim of aggressions past and present. This form of motivated forgetting, in line with similar findings (e.g., Sahdra

& Ross, 2007; Rotella & Richeson, 2013), not only helps manage the threat to the ingroup's moral identity but contributes to the perpetuation of the worldview that induces it.

General Discussion

In these four studies we sought to achieve a better understanding of the ways in which group members react to a shared historical trauma. Previous research provides support for the notion that experiences of group-level victimhood lead to conflict-enhancing emotions and cognitions (e.g., Noor et al., 2008; Wohl & Branscombe, 2008). The present research extends this body of research. Our main goal, however, was to examine another possible orientation that could develop following historical trauma. We reasoned that victimhood is not the only possible lesson that people learn from past suffering of the ingroup. Historical group trauma can also lead to fear of victimizing others (see also Klar, 2016; Klar et al., 2013; Vollhardt, 2009, 2012). The two orientations, PIVO and FOV, were expected to affect a variety of conflict-related attitudes, emotions and behavioral tendencies.

In Studies 1a, 1b and 1c the two constructs predicted levels of group-based guilt and support for aggressive actions against the enemy outgroup above and beyond classical predictors. The higher the PIVO and the lower the FOV, the more participants supported aggressive actions against enemy outgroup members, including civilians, and the less guilt they experienced over harm caused by the ingroup. These relationships remained stable in a follow-up study several months later (Study 1c). In Study 2 PIVO and FOV were tested in the context of the mostly resolved Northern Ireland conflict. PIVO was negatively and FOV was positively related to support for forgiveness and reconciliation. In Study 3, PIVO and FOV predicted the attribution of responsibility for the outbreak of mutual hostilities. The higher the PIVO and the

lower the FOV, the more participants viewed outgroup members as instigators and accountable for the hostilities. In Study 4, participants were presented with new information about damage to either ingroup or outgroup members; PIVO and FOV interacted with victims' group identity to affect accuracy of memory. Whereas FOV was associated with greater accuracy in memory regardless of the victims' group identity, high levels of PIVO were related with reduced accuracy of memory when the information presented was about outgroup victims.

Taken together, the findings of these four studies show that PIVO and FOV are present in different societies and phases of intergroup conflict. The two orientations predict general attitudes, emotions, cognitive processes, and behavioral tendencies. Thus they can have a significant influence on the course of conflicts, during both the active phases and when moving toward resolution and reconciliation. The different effects of the two orientations demonstrate that representations of historical group trauma can lead both to adverse effects such as mistrust and increased support for intergroup aggression (through PIVO) and to more beneficial effects, such as intergroup forgiveness (through FOV). This idea is further supported by recent experimental evidence suggesting that after being subliminally primed with a historical group trauma (swastika), high-PIVO participants reported *less* group-based guilt towards the Palestinians compared with those primed with a neutral symbol; in contrast, high-FOV participants exhibited *more* guilt compared with those in the control condition (Schori-Eyal, Klar, & Roccas, in preparation).

The Bases of PIVO and FOV

The present studies point to individual differences in both PIVO and FOV. What causes one group member to embrace an orientation of collective victimhood, while another develops an apprehension of harming rival outgroup members? Study

1c indicates that basic values (Schwartz, 1992) may be another precursor of the two orientations: PIVO was positively correlated with tradition values, whereas FOV was strongly associated with universalism values. Finally, need for cognitive closure – a desire for a firm answer, *any* answer, to a question and a low tolerance for ambiguity and confusion (Kruglanski, 2004; Kruglanski & Webster, 1996) – may be another antecedent of PIVO. Need for closure motivates individuals to enhance the “groupness” of their collectivity in an effort to create a firm shared reality manifested in a pattern of behaviors known as “group-centrism” (Kruglanski, Pierro, Manetti, & De Grada, 2006). The hypothesis that this desire to maintain a uniform, closure-affording worldview can be satisfied by perceiving the ingroup as a blameless victim regardless of changing circumstances; in other words, to embrace the PIVO worldview, has received empirical support in several contexts, including Jewish-Israelis, Palestinians in the West Bank, and Americans (Dugas et al., 2015). The need for cognitive closure and tradition values are also associated to each other (Calogero, Bardi, & Sutton, 2009), together indicating that PIVO may indeed satisfy deep-seated needs for closure and stability. These associations should be examined further. The self-perpetuating nature of the orientations and the impact they have on perception and the construal of social reality, as implied by the findings of Studies 3 and 4, should also be explored.

The Universality of PIVO and FOV

The present work illustrated the presence and effects of the two orientations in two societies: Israel and Northern Ireland. Can the findings be generalized to other societies as well? To what extent are the roles of PIVO and FOV affected by the specific social context? We are currently investigating these constructs in different regions and contexts. Findings from Poland (Skarżyńska, 2012), Serbia (Halperin,

Cehajic, & Schori, unpublished data), and the West Bank and Jordan (Dugas et al., 2015) are consistent with those presented in the current manuscript.

Future work should focus on the contextual variables that engender each orientation. We reason that a precondition for the development of FOV is the belief that one's ingroup has enough power to cause serious harm to other groups. The perils of victimizing others are all but alien to a group devoid of actual ability to cause significant harm. However, we suggest that such extreme powerlessness is rare. The weaker party in a conflict can often cause extensive damage to the stronger party. Attacks of this sort may run counter the humanistic perceptions and moral values of other group members, triggering FOV. Examples such as the protest of Artin Penik, a Turkish-Armenian who committed suicide by self-immolation to protest a lethal attack against civilians by ASALA, a militant Armenian organization (Guntar, 1985), imply that FOV can develop even when there are extreme power differences between the conflicting groups.

The Contribution of PIVO and FOV beyond Existing Constructs

The increased interest garnered by the notion of collective- or group-based victimhood has resulted in the introduction of various conceptualizations and measures of victimhood (e.g., Brasnscombe, Wohl, & Warner, 2016; Noor et al., 2008; Vollhardt, 2009, 2012). Despite the availability of such useful constructs, we believe that the two orientations presented and tested here make a contribution above and beyond existing scales. On the conceptual level, PIVO introduces a sense of enduring, ongoing suffering, which may explain the long-lasting impact of very distant historical events. FOV on the other hand vehicles the notion of increased moral sensitivity specifically toward a contemporary adversarial outgroup, not just any suffering outgroup, and may thus be a more reliable predictor of prosocial

behaviors. Although some of the outcomes of FOV are reminiscent of inclusive victimhood, a construal of victimhood which enables group members to acknowledge the resemblance between their group's suffering to that of others (Vollhardt, 2009, 2015), the two differ in important ways. Compared to inclusive victimhood, a potentially complex concept that can be interpreted in various fashions (Cohrs, McNeill, & Vollhardt, 2015), FOV more clearly identifies prosocial beliefs and is centered on apprehending the possibility of one's group ruthlessly harming others. Moreover, the lesson embodied by FOV is not that one shares the victim's identity with members of other groups, but rather that one has the potential of sharing the aggressor's identity with past enemies of the ingroup.

Conclusion

Our findings indicate that historical group trauma does not inevitably lead to the development of orientations that exacerbate intergroup conflict, such as a sense of ingroup victimhood. The two opposing orientations presented in this research have contradictory effects on group-based guilt, moral decision making, readiness for intergroup reconciliation, attribution of responsibility, and memory of harm to ingroup and outgroup members. By contributing to a better understanding of the impact of historical group trauma, this research points to complex patterns that emerge in the wake of collective calamities.

References

- Akaike, H. (1974). A new look at the statistical model identification. *Automatic Control, IEEE Transactions on*, *19*, 716-723.
- Allport, G. W. (1954/1979). *The Nature of Human Prejudice*. New York: Basic books.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg, Canada: University of Manitoba Press.
- Bandalos, D. L. (2002). The effects of item parceling on goodness-of-fit and parameter estimate bias in structural equation modeling. *Structural Equation Modeling*, *9*, 78-102.
- Bar-Tal, D. (1998). Societal beliefs in times of intractable conflict: The Israeli Case. *International Journal of Conflict Management*, *9*, 22-50.
- Bar-Tal, D. (2007). *Living with the Conflict: Socio-Psychological Analysis of the Jewish Society in Israel*. Jerusalem, Israel: Carmel Press.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Antebi, D. (1992). Siege mentality in Israel. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *16*, 251-275.
- Barkan, E. (2000). *The guilt of nations: restitution and negotiating historical injustices*. New York: Norton.
- Bilali, R., Tropp, L.R., & Dasgupta, N. (2012). Attributions of responsibility and perceived harm in the aftermath of mass violence. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, *18*, 21-39.
- Bilali, R., & Vollhardt, J.R. (2013). Priming effects of a reconciliation radio drama on historical perspective-taking in the aftermath of mass violence in Rwanda. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *49*, 144-151.

- Bishop, J., & Lane, R.C. (2000). Father absence and the attitude of entitlement. *Journal of Contemporary Psychotherapy, 30*, 105–117.
- Branscombe, N. R. (2004). A social psychological process perspective on collective guilt. In N.R. Branscombe & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Collective Guilt: International Perspectives* (pp. 320-334). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Branscombe, N.R., Wohl, M.J.A., Warner, R.H. (2016). Remembering historical victimization: Potential for intergroup conflict escalation and conflict reduction. In A. Miller (Ed.), **The social psychology of good and evil** (2nd edition). New York: Guilford Press.
- Cairns, E., & Darby, J. (1998). The conflict in Northern Ireland: Causes, consequences, and controls. *American Psychologist, 53*, 754-760.
- Calogero, R. M., Bardi, A., & Sutton, R. M. (2009). A need basis for values: Associations between the need for cognitive closure and value priorities. *Personality and Individual Differences, 46*, 154-159.
- Canetti, D., Hobfoll, S., Pedhazur, A., & Zaidise, E. (2010). Much ado about religion: Religiosity, resource loss, and support for political violence. *Journal of Peace Research, 47*, 575-587.
- Castano, E. (2008). On the perils of glorifying the in-group: Intergroup violence, in-group glorification, and moral disengagement. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*, 154-170.
- Castano, E., & Giner-Sorolla, R. (2006). Not quite human: infrahumanization in response to collective responsibility for intergroup killing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 804-818.
- Ceci, S. J., & Bruck, M. (1995). *Jeopardy in the courtroom: A scientific analysis of children's testimony*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

- Cohrs, C., McNeill, A., & Vollhardt, J. (2015) The Two-Sided Role of Inclusive Victimhood for Intergroup Reconciliation: Evidence From Northern Ireland. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*. DOI: 10.1037/pac0000141.
- Cooper, J., & Stone, J. (2004). Cognitive dissonance and the social group. In D. J. Terry & M. A. Hogg (Eds.), *Attitudes, behavior, and social context: The role of norms and group membership* (pp. 227–244). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Correll, J., & Park, B. (2005). A model of the ingroup as a social resource. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9, 341-359.
- Crocker, J., & Luhtanen, R. (1990). Collective self-esteem and ingroup bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 58, 60-67.
- DiLillo, D. (2001). Interpersonal functioning among women reporting a history of childhood sexual abuse: Empirical findings and methodological issues. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 21, 553-576.
- Doosje, B., & Branscombe, N.R. (2003). Attributions for the negative historical actions of a group. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 33, 235-248.
- Doosje, B., Branscombe, N.R., Spears, R., & Manstead, A.S.R. (1998). Guilty by association: When one's group has a negative history. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 872–886.
- Duckitt, J., & Sibley, C. J. (2007). Right wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation and the dimensions of generalized prejudice. *European Journal of Personality*, 21, 113-130.
- Dugas, M., Schori-Eyal, N., Kruglanski, A. W., Gelfand, M. J., Klar, Y., McNeil, A., ... Roccas, S., & (2015). The Hurt justifies the Means: Need for closure, group centrism, and extremism. Manuscript under revision

- Eidelson, R.J., & Eidelson, J.I. (2003). Dangerous Ideas: Five Beliefs That Propel Groups Toward Conflict. *American Psychologist*, 58, 182-192.
- Eitam, B., & Higgins, E. T. (2010). Motivation in mental accessibility: Relevance of a Representation (ROAR) as a new framework. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4, 951-967.
- Figueiredo, A., Valentim, J., & Doosje, B. (2011). A Shared Past and a Common Future: The Portuguese Colonial War and the Dynamics of Group-Based Guilt. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 14, 163-171.
- Fitzgerald, M. F., Shipman, K. L., Jackson, J. L., McMahon, R. J., Hanley, H. M. (2005). Perceptions of parenting versus parent-child interactions among incest survivors. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 29, 661-681.
- Flew, A. (Ed.) (1979). *A Dictionary of Philosophy*. London: Pan Books in association with the McMillan Press.
- Froese, P., & Mencken, F. C. (2009). A U.S. holy war? The effects of religion on Iraq War policy attitudes. *Social Science Quarterly*, 90, 103-116.
- Gilligan, C. (2003). Constant Crisis/Permanent Process: Diminished Agency and Weak Structures in the Northern Ireland Peace Process. *The Global Review of Ethnopolitics*, 3, 22-37.
- Guntar, M. M. (1985). Transnational Sources of Support for Armenian Terrorism. *Conflict Quarterly*, 31-52, retrieved from <http://journals.hil.unb.ca/index.php/JCS/article/viewFile/14692/15761>
- Haidt, J., & Graham, J. (2007). When morality opposes justice: Conservatives have moral intuitions that liberals may not recognize. *Social Justice Research*, 20, 98-116.
- Halperin, E., Cehajic, S. & Schori, N. unpublished data.

- Hall, D. L., Matz, D. C., & Wood, W. (2010). Why Don't We Practice What We Preach? A Meta-Analytic Review of Religious Racism. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 14*, 126-139.
- International Committee for the Red Cross (2010). *Summary Report: Afghanistan, Colombia, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Georgia, Haiti, Lebanon, Liberia and the Philippines, Online Survey and in-depth research, 2009*. Geneva, Switzerland: ICRC.
- Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. Guilford Press.
- Helgeson, V.S., Reynolds, K.A., & Tomich, P.L. (2006). A meta-analytic review of benefit finding and growth. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology, 74*, 797-816.
- Hewstone, M. (1990). The 'ultimate attribution error'? A review of the literature on intergroup causal attribution. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 20*, 311-335.
- Hu, L.T., & Bentler, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural equation modeling: a multidisciplinary journal, 6*, 1-55.
- Janoff-Bulman, R. (1992). *Shattered assumptions: Towards a new psychology of trauma*. New York: Free Press.
- Jin, J., & Rounds, J. (2012). Stability and change in work values: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 80*, 326-339.
- Kimhi, S. (2014). Moral dilemma in the war against terror: Political attitudes and regular versus reserve military service. *Ethics & Behavior, 24*, 1-15.

- Klar, Y. (2016). Four moral obligations in the aftermath of historical ingroup victimization. *Current Opinion in Psychology* (in press).
- Klar, Y., Schori-Eyal, N., & Klar, Y. (2013). The “Never Again” state of Israel: The emergence of the Holocaust as a core feature of Israeli identity and its four incongruent voices. *Journal of Social Issues, 69*, 125-143.
- Kruglanski, A. W. (2004). *The psychology of closed-mindedness*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Kruglanski, A. W., Pierro, A., Mannetti, L., & De Grada, E. (2006). Groups as epistemic providers: need for closure and the unfolding of group-centrism. *Psychological Review, 113*, 84-100.
- Leidner, B., Castano, E., Zaiser, E., & Giner-Sorolla, R. (2010). Ingroup glorification, moral disengagement, and justice in the context of collective violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*, 1115-1129.
- Licata, L., & Klein, O. (2010). Holocaust or Benevolent Paternalism? Intergenerational Comparisons on Collective Memories and Emotions about Belgium’s Colonial Past. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence, 4*, 45–57.
- Little, T. D., Cunningham, W. A., Shahar, G., & Widaman, K. F. (2002). To parcel or not to parcel: Exploring the question, weighing the merits. *Structural equation modeling, 9*, 151-173.
- Lönnqvist, J. E., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., & Verkasalo, M. (2013). Rebound effect in personal values: Ingrian Finnish migrants’ values two years after migration. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 0022022113480040*.
- McDowell, S. (2007). Who are the victims? Debates, concepts and contestation in 'post-conflict' Northern Ireland. *Conflict Archive on the Internet*. Retrieved 8

October 2015 from

<http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/victims/introduction/smcd07whoarethevictims>

- McMullin, D., Wirth, R.J., & White, J.W. (2007). The impact of sexual victimization on personality: A longitudinal study of gendered attributes. *Sex Roles, 56*, 403–414.
- Minow, M. (1998). *Between vengeance and forgiveness: Facing history after genocide and mass violence*. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Montville, J.V. (Ed.) (1990). *Conflict and Peacemaking in Multiethnic Societies*. New York: Free Press.
- Nadler, A. (2002). Social-psychological analysis of reconciliation: Instrumental and socio-emotional routes to reconciliation. *Peace education worldwide: The concepts, underlying principles, and research*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Nadler, A., & Saguy, T. (2003). Reconciliation between nations: Overcoming emotional deterrents to ending conflicts between groups. In H. Langholtz & C.E. Stout (Eds.), *The psychology of diplomacy* (pp. 29-46). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Nemeroff, C., & Rozin, P. (1994). The contagion concept in adult thinking in the United States: Transmission of germs and interpersonal influence. *Ethos, 22*, 158–186.
- Noor, M., Brown, R.J., & Prentice, G. (2008). Precursors and mediators of intergroup reconciliation in Northern Ireland: A new model. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 47*, 481-495.
- Noor, M., Shnabel, N., Halabi, S., & Nadler, A. (2012). When Suffering Begets Suffering The Psychology of Competitive Victimhood Between Adversarial

- Groups in Violent Conflicts. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 16, 351-374.
- Paulhus, D. L. (1991). Measurement and control of response bias. In L.P. Robinson, P. R. Shaver, & L. S. Wrightsman (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 17-59). New York: Academic Press.
- Pettigrew, T.F. (1979). The ultimate attribution error: Extending Allport's cognitive analysis of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 5, 461-476.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L., & Malle, B. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 741-763.
- Pyszczynski, T., Abdollahi, A., Solomon, S., Greenberg, J., Cohen, F., & Weise, D. (2006). Mortality salience, martyrdom, and military might: The great Satan versus the axis of evil. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32, 525-537.
- Rice, C.A., & Benson, J.F. (2005). Hungering for revenge: The Irish famine, the troubles and shame-rage cycles, and their role in group therapy in Northern Ireland. *Group Analysis*, 38, 219-235.
- Roccas, S., Klar, Y., Liviatan, I. (2004). Exonerating Cognitions, Group Identification, and Personal Values as Predictors of Collective Guilt among Jewish-Israelis. In N.R. Branscombe & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Collective Guilt: International Perspectives* (pp. 130-147). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Roccas, S., Klar, Y., Liviatan, I. (2006). The paradox of group-based guilt: Modes of national identification, conflict vehemence, and reactions to the in-group's moral violations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91, 698-711.

- Roccas, S., Schwartz, S. H., & Amit, A. (2010). Personal value priorities and national identification. *Political Psychology, 31*, 393-419.
- Ross, G. (2001). *The trauma vortex in action again in the Middle East*. Retrieved from <http://www.traumainstitute.org/articles.php>.
- Rotella, K.N., & Richeson, J.A. (2013). Motivated to “Forget” The Effects of In-Group Wrongdoing on Memory and Collective Guilt. *Social Psychological and Personality Science, 4*, 730-737.
- Rohan, M. J. (2000). A rose by any name? The values construct. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 4*, 255-277.
- Rozin, P., Haidt, J., & McCauley, C.R. (2008). Disgust. In M. Lewis, J.M. Haviland-Jones & L. Feldman (Eds.), *Handbook of emotions (3rd edition)* (pp. 757-776). New York: Guilford Press.
- Sagiv, L., Sverdlik, N., & Schwarz, N. (2011). To compete or to cooperate? Values' impact on perception and action in social dilemma games. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 41*, 64-77.
- Sahdra, B., & Ross, M. (2007). Group identification and historical memory. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*, 384–395.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in experimental social psychology, 25*, 1-65.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the content and structure of values? *Journal of Social Issues, 50*, 19-45. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1994.tb01196.x>.
- Schwartz, Shalom H. (2009). Draft Users Manual: Proper Use of the Schwarz Value Survey, version 14 January 2009, compiled by Romie F. Littrell. Auckland,

New Zealand: Centre for Cross Cultural Comparisons,

<http://www.crossculturalcentre.homestead.com>.

Schwartz, S. H. (2012). An Overview of the Schwartz Theory of Basic Values. *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2 (1). <http://dx.doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1116>

Schwartz, S. H., & Sagiv, L. (1995). Identifying culture-specifics in the content and structure of values. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 26, 92-116.

Schori-Eyal, N., Halperin, E., & Bar-Tal, D. (2014). Three layers of collective victimhood: effects of multileveled victimhood on intergroup conflicts in the Israeli–Arab context. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 44, 778-794.

Schori-Eyal, N., Klar, Y., & Raz, Y. (2016). Perpetual ingroup victimhood as a distorted lens: Effects on attribution and categorization. Manuscript under revision.

Schwarzer, R., & Knoll, N. (2003). Positive coping: Mastering demands and searching for meaning. In S. L. Lopez & C. R. Snyder (Eds.), *Positive psychological assessment: A handbook of models and measures* (pp. 393-409). Washington, D.C.: APA Books.

Shweder, R. A., Much, N. C., Mahapatra, M., & Park, L. (1997). The 'big three' of morality (autonomy, community, divinity) and the 'big three' explanations of suffering. In A. M. Brandt & P. Rozin (Eds.), *Morality and Health* (pp. 119-169). New York: Routledge.

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Skarżyńska, K. (2012). Grupowa martyrologia: psychologiczne funkcje przekonań o narodowej krzywdzie (Group martyrdom: psychological functional beliefs on national harm). *Psychologia Społeczna*, 4, 335-352.
- Sekerdej, M., & Roccas, S. (2016). Love versus loving criticism: Disentangling conventional and constructive patriotism. *British Journal of Social Psychology*.
- Staub, E. (2003). *The psychology of good and evil: Why children, adults and groups help and harm others*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Staub, E. (2005). The roots of goodness: The fulfillment of basic human needs and the development of caring, helping and nonaggression, inclusive caring, moral courage, active bystandership, and altruism born of suffering. In G. Carlo & C. Edwards (Eds.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation: Vol. 51. Moral motivation through the life span: Theory, research, applications*. Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Staub, E. (2006). Reconciliation after genocide, mass killing or intractable conflict: understanding the roots of violence, psychological recovery and steps toward a general theory. *Political Psychology*, 27, 867-895.
- Staub, E. & Bar-Tal, D. (2003). Genocide, mass killing and intractable conflict: Roots, evolution, prevention and reconciliation. In D. Sears, L. Huddy, & R. Jarvis (Eds.), *Handbook of Political Psychology* (pp. 867-894). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Staub, E., & Pearlman, L.A. (2001). Healing, reconciliation and forgiving after genocide and other collective violence. In S.J. Helmick & R.L. Petersen (Eds.), *Forgiveness and Reconciliation: Religion, Public Policy and Conflict Transformation* (pp. 205–229). Randor, PA: Templeton Foundation Press.

- Staub, E., & Vollhardt, J. (2008). Altruism Born of Suffering: The Roots of Caring and Helping After Victimization and Other Trauma. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 78, 267-280.
- Sullivan, D., Landau, M.J., Branscombe, N.R., & Rothschild, Z.K. (2012). Competitive victimhood as a response to accusations of ingroup harm doing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102, 778–795.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0026573>.
- Sverdlik, N., Roccas, S., & Sagiv, L. (in press). Morality across cultures: A value perspective. In M. Mikulincer & P. R. Shaver (Eds.), *The social psychology of morality: Exploring the causes of good and evil*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J.C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J.B., Cairns, E., Marinetti, C., Geddes, L., & Parkinson, B. (2008). Postconflict reconciliation: Intergroup forgiveness and implicit biases in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64, 303-320.
- Tedeschi, R.G., Park, C.L., & Calhoun, L.G. (Eds.). (1998). *Posttraumatic growth: Positive changes in the aftermath of crisis*. New York: Routledge.
- Terry, H. (2007). *Golden rules and silver rules of humanity: Universal wisdom of civilization*. Bloomington, IN: Authorhouse.
- Thompson, J., Morton, J., & Fraser, L. (1997). Memories for the Marchioness. *Memory*, 5, 615–638.
- Uhlmann, E. L., Pizarro, D. A., Tannenbaum, D., & Ditto, P. H. (2009). The motivated use of moral principles. *Judgment and Decision Making*, 4, 479.

- Verplanken, B., & Holland, R. W. (2002). Motivated decision making: effects of activation and self-centrality of values on choices and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82, 434.
- Volkan, V. (1997). *Blood Lines: from Ethnic Pride to Ethnic Terrorism*. New York: Farrar, Straus, & Giroux.
- Vollhardt, J.K. (2009). The Role of Victim Beliefs in the Israeli-Palestinian Conflict: Risk or Potential for Peace? *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 15, 135-159.
- Vollhardt, J.R. (2010). Enhanced external and culturally sensitive attributions after extended intercultural contact. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 49, 363-383.
- Vollhardt, J.R. (2012). Collective victimization. In L. R. Tropp (Ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Intergroup conflict* (pp. 136-157). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Vollhardt, J.R. (2015). Inclusive Victim Consciousness in Advocacy, Social Movements, and Intergroup Relations: Promises and Pitfalls. *Social Issues and Policy Review*, 9, 89-120.
- Vollhardt, J.K., & Bilali, R. (2014). The Role of Inclusive and Exclusive Victim Consciousness in Predicting Intergroup Attitudes: Findings from Rwanda, Burundi, and DRC. *Political Psychology*. doi: 10.1111/pops.12174
- Warner, R.H., & Branscombe, N.R. (2012). Observer perceptions of moral obligations in groups with a history of victimization. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 882-894.

- Webster, D. M., & Kruglanski, A. W. (1994). Individual differences in need for cognitive closure. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*, 1049 – 1062.
- Wegner, D.M. (1989). *White bears and other unwanted thoughts: Suppression, obsession, and the psychology of mental control*. London: Guilford
- Wegner, D.M., & Schneider, D.J. (1989). Mental control: The war of the ghosts in the machine. In J. Uleman & J. Bargh (Eds.), *Unintended thought* (pp. 287–305). New York: Guilford. Reprinted in R. P. Honeck (Ed.). (1995). *Introductory readings for cognitive psychology* (3rd ed.). Guilford, CT: Dushkin.
- Wohl, M.J.A., & Branscombe, N.R. (2005). Forgiveness and Collective Guilt Assignment to Historical Perpetrator Groups Depend on Level of Social Category Inclusiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *88*, 288-303.
- Wohl, M.J.A., & Branscombe, N.R. (2008). Remembering historical victimization: Collective guilt for current ingroup transgressions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*, 988-1006.
- Wohl, M. J., & Branscombe, N. R. (2009). Group threat, collective angst, and ingroup forgiveness for the war in Iraq. *Political Psychology*, *30*, 193-217.
- Wohl, M.J.A., & Branscombe, N.R. (2009). Group threat, collective angst and ingroup forgiveness for the war in Iraq. *Political Psychology*, *30*, 193-217.
- Wohl, M. J., Branscombe, N. R., & Klar, Y. (2006). Collective guilt: Emotional reactions when one's group has done wrong or been wronged. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *17*, 1-37.
- Zitek, E.M., Jordan, A.H., Monin, B., & Leach, F.R. (2010). Victim Entitlement to Behave Selfishly. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *98*, 245-255.

	Study 1b	M=5.65, SD=1.32	.34***	-	.27***	-	.16*	.34***	.004	
				.26***		.27***				
9. Glorification	Study 1c	N/A								
	Study 1a	N/A								
	Study 1b	M=3.89, SD=1.23	.53**	-	.47***	-	.31***	.60***	.19**	.65***
				.42***		.47***				
10. Religiosity	Study 1c	N/A								
	Study 1a	M=3.16, SD=2.11	.42***	-	.26***	-	.18***			
				.42***		.37***				
	Study 1b	M=2.33, SD=1.57	.44***	-	.27***	-	.10	.57***		.002
				.34***		.27***				
11. Right-wing orientation	Study 1c	N/A								
	Study 1a	M=4.65, SD=1.31	.49***	-	.50***	-	.31***			.46***
				.56***		.60***				
	Study 1b	M=-.34, SD=3.05	.58***	-	.59***	-	.43***	.50***		.18**
				.49***		.65***				.45***
	Study 1c	N/A								

† $p < .1$ * $p < .05$

*** $p < .001$

Table 2

Contribution of PIVO and FOV to predicting group-based guilt and TECC

Predictor	r^2		F change		β	
	Group-based guilt	TECC	Group-based guilt	TECC	Group-based guilt	TECC
<i>Step 1</i>	.53	.27	37.43***	12.02***		
RWA					-.31***	.1
SDO					-.04	.15*
Attachment					.08	-.04
Glorification					-.18*	.17†
Religiosity					.17**	-.18*
Political Orientation					-.50**	.38***
<i>Step 2</i>	.64	.30	33.04***	3.67*		
PIVO					-.24***	.16†
FOV					.36***	-.14†

RWA		-.15*	.01
SDO		-.06	.16*
Attachment		.07	-.03
Glorification		-.08	.11
Religiosity		.19**	-.19*
Political			.29***
Orientation		-.32***	

Table 3

<i>Contribution of PIVO and FOV to predicting forgiveness and reconciliation</i>			
Predictor	r^2	$Fchange$	β
<i>Step 1</i>	.11	9.86***	
age			.13
Competitive			
Victimhood			-.32***
<i>Step 2</i>	.28	18.46***	
PIVO			-.51***
FOV			.16*
Age			.16*
Competitive			
Victimhood			-.12

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$




Figure 1. Expected results of historical group trauma. This figure illustrates the expected results of historical group trauma and the relationships between them².

² Group trauma is represented in the model but its magnitude is not assessed. The relationship between group trauma and the associated worldviews is not quantified.




Figure 2. Model linking PIVO and FOV to group-based guilt and TECC via moral entitlement (Study 1a).




Figure 3. Zero-order correlations between PIVO, FOV, and basic values (Study 1c).




Figure 4. The effect of victims' group identity on the degree of accuracy in recalling harm as a function of PIVO.

