

Methods

Paul Beggs

Department of Psychology

Hendrix College

PSYC 295: Research Methods

Dr. Jericka Battle

October 10, 2024

Methods

Participants

In the present study, we aim to explore the perspectives of Palestinian and Israeli Americans regarding the war in Israel-Palestine. To achieve a comprehensive understanding, we have decided to recruit a balanced sample consisting of 150 Palestinian Americans and 150 Israeli Americans. The participants are being sourced through the online recruitment platform, Prolific, known for its diverse and reliable participant pool.

The other demographic information that we would like to record would be the participant's age, their nationality (with follow up questions for verification), their gender, their sex, their education level, and if they have lived in Palestine or Israel in the past.

To be eligible to participate in this experiment, participants must be at least 18 years old. This age restriction is guided by ethical considerations, particularly given the sensitive nature of the content involved in the study. The decision to exclude individuals under 18 years old stems from the potential psychological impact of the experimental materials, which include video content that may evoke strong emotional responses. Engaging minors in such studies involves complex ethical approvals and heightened protective measures, which we decided to avoid to safeguard younger individuals from potentially distressing experiences.

Each participant will receive a compensation of \$5 upon completion of the survey. This token is intended to appreciate their time and effort, and to encourage thoughtful and committed participation. It also helps to ensure a higher completion rate, which is critical for the reliability and validity of the study's findings.

Furthermore, all participants will be provided with detailed information about the study's aims, the nature of the content, and their rights, including confidentiality and the voluntary nature of their involvement. They will also be informed about the availability of support resources should they experience discomfort at any point during or after their participation.

Materials

The primary material used in the present study was a **tedvideo<empty citation>** Talk video, specifically selected for its content and relevance to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. The video features a structured dialogue between an Israeli and a Palestinian, both of whom share personal narratives about their lives affected by the ongoing conflict. This conversation occurs in a safe, neutral setting, designed to foster open communication and mutual understanding.

The participants in the video discuss significant life events that illustrate the human impact of the conflict, such as personal losses, daily challenges, and moments of cross-cultural interaction that have shaped their perspectives. The setting of the dialogue ensures that both individuals can express their views without fear of retribution or violence, which is critical for encouraging honest and empathetic exchanges.

The choice of this video as a material for our study was based on research done by **sunstein2015wiser<empty citation>**. **sunstein2015wiser<empty citation>** have shown in their study that members of the same group—otherwise known as in-group—can have a more persuasive argument among other members of the same group, when compared to people who are not included (so called, out-group). Thus, we believe we can foster a sense of relatability using this avenue of study.

Measures

For the present study, we utilized the Inclusion of Other in Self (IOS) scale, developed by **aron1992inclusion<empty citation>**. This measure is particularly effective in quantifying the extent to which participants perceive themselves as overlapping with others, which in this context refers to members of the opposing group. We specifically recorded whether exposure to the **tedvideo<empty citation>** Talk elicits feelings of increased similarity between Israeli and Palestinian participants.

In terms of assessing willingness to engage in dialogue, we employed a Likert scale ranging from 1 to 7, where 1 indicates “I am not at all interested in having a conversation” and 7 signifies “I am very interested in having a conversation.” This scale provides a comprehensive

range of responses, enabling participants to express varying degrees of willingness to talk, from complete disinterest to strong interest, with intermediate options reflecting more moderate stances.

This approach was chosen to ensure that any changes in attitudes towards engagement and perception of similarity could be accurately captured, providing clear insights into the effects of the video exposure.

Design

Our study employs a straightforward between-subjects experimental design, focusing on two distinct groups: a control group and an exposure group. This design allows for clear comparison between baseline attitudes and the influence of the intervention.

Participants in the control group serve as the baseline for our study. They do not watch the **tedvideo<empty citation>** Talk video and therefore do not receive any intervention. Their responses provide a benchmark against which the effects of the exposure can be measured, reflecting their uninfluenced attitudes towards the other group.

Participants in the exposure group view the **tedvideo<empty citation>** Talk video featuring a dialogue between an Israeli and a Palestinian. This group's responses post-exposure are critical for assessing the impact of narrative-sharing on their perceptions and willingness to engage in dialogue.

By comparing these two groups, we aim to identify any significant differences in the IOS scores and the willingness to communicate as measured by the Likert scale. This comparison will determine whether exposure to empathetic cross-narrative dialogue can positively shift attitudes compared to no intervention.

The simplicity of this design minimizes variables and focuses directly on the efficacy of the intervention, enhancing the clarity and reliability of our findings. This approach also allows us to efficiently attribute any observed changes in attitude specifically to the intervention.

Procedure

The procedure for the present study was designed to ensure a controlled and ethical approach to assessing the impact of cross-narrative exposure on Israeli and Palestinian participants. The process was structured to maintain the integrity of the experimental conditions while ensuring participant safety and ethical compliance.

As stated in the Participants section, our participants were recruited through an online platform, Prolific, ensuring a diverse demographic spread appropriate for the study's needs. Upon joining the study, all participants were provided with an informed consent form. This document outlined the study's purpose, what their participation would involve, potential risks, and their rights, including confidentiality and the right to withdraw at any time without penalty.

After consenting, participants completed an initial survey. This included the IOS scale and the Likert scale for willingness to communicate, which served as a baseline measure of their attitudes towards the other group. No indication was given that the present study involved exposure to a specific type of content, to prevent biasing their responses.

For those who were a part of the control group, they proceeded to a waiting period, during which they engaged in neutral activities such as reading informational content unrelated to the conflict. Then, participants in the exposure group watched the **tedvideo<empty citation> Talk**.

Following the waiting period or video exposure, participants completed the same IOS and Likert scales again. This second set of measures aimed to capture any changes in their attitudes resulting from the intervention.

Upon completion of the post-exposure survey, all participants were debriefed. This stage was crucial, especially for the exposure group. Participants were informed about the study's specific aims and the reason behind using the **tedvideo<empty citation> Talk** video. They were also told why complete transparency was not provided initially: revealing the full nature of the experiment upfront could have influenced their natural responses, thereby threatening internal validity.

Ethical considerations were paramount, particularly in ensuring that any deception used

was justified by the present study's goals and was fully explained during the debriefing to maintain trust and integrity in the research process.