ResearchGate

See discussions, stats, and author profiles for this publication at: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/310176127

For the Sake of the Eternal Group: Perceiving the Group as Trans-Generational and Endurance of Ingroup Suffering

Article *in* Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin · November 2016

DOI: 10.1177/0146167216684123

CITATIONS
7

READS
201

3 authors:

Dennis Kahn
Interdisciplinary Center (IDC) Herzliya/Lund University
11 PUBLICATIONS **78** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

Yechiel Klar
Tel Aviv University
50 PUBLICATIONS **1,531** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

Sonia Roccas
The Open University of Israel
43 PUBLICATIONS **3,026** CITATIONS
SEE PROFILE

Some of the authors of this publication are also working on these related projects:

ANR XTREAMIS-DP Xenophobia, Radicalism in Europe, Anti-semitism, Islamophobia – Deradicalisation and Prevention - H2020 REV-INEQUAL-02-2016 Candidate View project

Perceiving the group as Trans-Generational View project

All content following this page was uploaded by Yechiel Klar on 18 September 2018.

The user has requested enhancement of the downloaded file.

Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin
2017, Vol. 43(2) 272–283
© 2016 by the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc
Reprints and permissions:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/0146167216684123
journals.sagepub.com/home/pspb
SAGE

For the Sake of the Eternal Group: Perceiving the Group as Trans-Generational and Endurance of Ingroup Suffering

Dennis T. Kahn[1], Yechiel Klar[1], and Sonia Roccas[2]

Abstract

We introduce the distinction between perceiving the group as Intra-Generational (IG; including only the present generation of group members) and Trans-Generational (TG; including all past, present, and future generations of the group). In four studies (N = 1,265) administered to Jewish Israeli, Palestinian Israeli, American, and Swedish samples, we demonstrate that a tendency to perceive the group as TG is related to willingness to endure ingroup suffering and that this relationship is mediated by the degree to which the interest of the group as a whole is given primacy over the interest of the group as a collection of group members (Primacy of Interest). Furthermore, experimentally raising the salience of the group as TG leads to increased willingness to endure ingroup suffering as compared with raising the salience of the group as IG, and the effect of the TG salience manipulation is mediated by Primacy of Interest.

Keywords

Trans-Generational, group perception, intergroup conflict, ingroup suffering, social identity

Received October 18, 2015; revision accepted November 6, 2016

> Responsibility towards History releases one from responsibility towards human beings.
>
> —Albert Camus (1964, p. 197)

People differ in the way they perceive the groups to which they belong. Although people generally have a sense of allegiance toward their ingroup (e.g., Druckman, 1994; Van Vugt & Hart, 2004; Zdaniuk & Levine, 2001), this sense of allegiance may have different meaning, depending on how the group is perceived. In the present research, we introduce the distinction between perceiving the group as Intra-Generational (IG) and Trans-Generational (TG). We suggest that in thinking about their ingroup, some group members focus on the present generation whereas others include all past, present, and future generations of the group. Perceiving the group as Intra-Generational implies focusing mainly on the current cohort of group members, whereas perceiving it as TG implies thinking of the group as extending beyond the current generation, stretching across past, present, and future generations. We reason that this distinction in the perception of one's ingroup has important consequences for group processes.

Perceiving the Group as IG and TG

To illustrate the distinction between perceiving the group as IG and TG, imagine two members of the same family. Both have a strong sense of belonging to the family, but differ in how they perceive it. The first family member perceives it as IG, that is, mainly in terms of its current members (e.g., father, mother, sons, daughters, grandmothers, cousins, etc.). The second family member perceives it as TG, including, in addition to current family members, all past and future generations of the family.

We neither see these perceptions of the group as opposites nor even negatively related. Rather, we see them as differing in temporal inclusiveness. A TG perception of the group implies including the current generation as well as past and future generations. We thus suggest that when thinking of one's group, the current members are always included.

[1]Tel Aviv University, Israel
[2]The Open University of Israel, Ra'anana, Israel

Corresponding Author:
Dennis T. Kahn, School of Psychological Sciences, Tel Aviv University, Tel Aviv 69978, Israel.
Email: dennis.t.kahn@gmail.com

However, group members differ in the extent to which they extend the perception of the ingroup to include past and future generations as well.

Perceiving the National Group as IG and TG

In the present article, we focus on the perception of the national group, for which we suggest that the distinction between perceiving the group as IG and TG is especially important. For many years, the temporal dimension of national identity received only meager attention in social psychology, with many researchers viewing groups as "synchronic collections of individuals co-existing and acting in parallel" (Condor, 1996, p. 305). In recent years, however, the temporal (or TG) dimension of national identity has attracted attention among scholars in social psychology (e.g., Liu & Hilton, 2005; Reicher & Hopkins, 2001; F. Sani, Herrera, & Bowe, 2009; M. Sani et al., 2007; Wohl & Branscombe, 2008, 2009).

One influential line of research in this area takes social representations of history as its subject matter (e.g., Kus, Ward, & Liu, 2014; Liu & Hilton, 2005; Reicher & Hopkins, 2001). In their analysis of identity and nationhood, Reicher and Hopkins (2001) analyze the role played by history in the creation of a collective identity and the mobilization of nationalistic sentiment. In a related line of research, Liu and Hilton (2005) describe how a nation's charter, the account of the origin and historical mission of the nation, affects responses to current events as well as the perceived stability and legitimacy of the prevailing social order. This charter provides a basis for a shared collective history, serves to strengthen ingroup cohesion, and defines the central values, beliefs, and norms of the group (Liu & Hilton, 2005; Moscovici, 1988).

Besides the literature on social representations of history, the perception of the *future* of the group has also been shown to be of importance to a number of intra- and intergroup phenomena. Notably, concern for the future vitality of the group, dubbed "collective angst" (e.g., Wohl & Branscombe, 2008), has been shown to affect a number of important variables relating to intergroup relations, such as ingroup protective measures (Wohl, Branscombe, & Reysen, 2010), forgiveness (Wohl & Branscombe, 2009), and opposition to immigration (Jetten & Wohl, 2012).

Furthermore, M. Sani and his colleagues (2007) have introduced the concept of perceived collective continuity (PCC). PCC includes two dimensions of perceived continuity of the group: perceived *cultural* continuity, that is, the extent to which group norms are seen as transmitted from one generation to another, and perceived *historical* continuity, that is, the extent to which different ages, periods, and events in group history are seen as causally interconnected (F. Sani et al., 2009; M. Sani et al., 2007). We see PCC and perceiving the group as TG as complementary concepts, which together provide a more comprehensive view of how the individual perceives the ingroup on a temporal dimension. While perceiving the group as TG focuses on perceptions of who is *included* in the group (e.g., the group also includes past and future generations), PCC addresses perceptions of continuity of the culture and history of the group (e.g., the culture of the group has always remained the same).

Although interest in the TG dimension of national groups is fairly recent in social psychology, in adjacent areas of study, such as nationalism and political science (e.g., Anderson, 1991; Smith, 2003), philosophy (e.g., Hoffer, 1951), cultural anthropology (e.g., Holy, 1996; Kohl & Fawcett, 1995; Radcliffe-Brown, 1945), and history (e.g., Hobsbawm, 1990; Hobsbawm & Ranger, 1983), it has long been acknowledged that the national group often is perceived as a primordial and abstract entity stretching from the distant past and into the distant future. One of the main elements emphasized in these disciplines with regard to the national group is a high level of TG inclusiveness, that is, perceiving the national group as a historical entity, stretching beyond the current generation of group members into the distant past and future.

Consequences of Perceiving the Group as TG: Primacy of Interest (PoINT) and Endurance of Ingroup Suffering

We reason that the perception of the group as TG has important implications for group processes. In this article, we focus on how the perception of the group affects people's willingness to endure the suffering of their fellow ingroup members. In the social-psychological literature about groups, "the interests of the group" is most commonly seen as a unified concept. However, the group sometimes has several sets of interests and these differing interests might at times come into conflict with each other. Central to our concerns, the interests of the current generation of the group can sometimes come into conflict with the interest of the group as TG. This conflict of interest is likely to appear when there is a need for the current generation of group members to make significant sacrifices for the sake of assets, values, and symbols associated with the group as TG. In these situations, the group's current members carry the costs, although they do not necessarily reap the benefits of their own efforts.

To illustrate this conflict, let us return to the example of the two family members. Suppose that the family in question owns an estate which has become a symbol of the family, its history, traditions, and longevity. The family has run into financial difficulties, making it very difficult to maintain the estate, which brings no revenues but requires a lot of hard

work and financial investment. Selling the estate would entail losing a valued symbol of the family's heritage, but could resolve the financial troubles of the current generation. Holding on to the estate would entail difficulty and financial hardship for the current generation, but would allow the transfer of an intact family heirloom to future generations. Thus, in this case, there is a conflict between what benefits the family when perceived as IG and what benefits the family when perceived as TG.

Several social-psychological theories have put forth explanations for the phenomenon of *self*-sacrifice for the sake of the nation, including social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1986), self-categorization theory (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987), terror management theory (Greenberg, Solomon, & Pyszczynski, 1997), identity fusion theory (Swann, Gómez, Dovidio, Hart, & Jetten, 2010), and interdependent self-construal (Orehek, Sasota, Kruglanski, Dechesne, & Ridgeway, 2014). However, the willingness to endure suffering and sacrifice for the sake of the nation is exclusively related not only to *self*-sacrifice but also to the willingness to sacrifice the interests (and even the lives) of one's fellow ingroup members.

We suggest that perceiving the national group as GF is a key concept in explaining such endurance of ingroup suffering. First, we expect that the bird's-eye perspective of the group entailed in the perception of the group as TG will lead to a shifting of the balance between the interests of the group as a collection of current group members and the interests of the group as a whole, toward the latter. To capture this phenomenon, we introduce the concept of PoINT, defined as the tendency to give primacy to the interests of the group as a whole over the interests of the group as a collection of current group members. Second, this increased tendency to give primacy to the interests of the group as a whole over its current members is expected to result in increased endurance of ingroup suffering. Stated in operational terms, perceiving the group as TG is hypothesized to lead to endurance of ingroup suffering, and PoINT is hypothesized to mediate this relationship.

Overview of the Present Research

In Study 1, we examined whether individual differences in perceiving the nation as TG predict willingness to endure the suffering of current co-nationals and whether this relation is mediated by the degree to which primacy is given to the interests of the group as a whole. We further examined whether perceiving the group as TG is empirically distinct and non-redundant from PCC. In Studies 2 and 3, we tested the causal effects of the different perceptions of the nation by manipulating the salience of the nation as Intra- versus TG. Finally, in Study 4, we applied the concepts to an actual public dilemma. To ensure the generalizability and robustness of our results, the studies were conducted in samples taken from several national groups (Jewish Israelis, Palestinian Israelis,[1] Swedes, and Americans).

Study 1

In Study 1, we examined the hypothesis that individual differences in the conception of the nation as IG versus TG are related to endurance of ingroup suffering and that this relationship is mediated by PoINT. Palestinian Israelis, Americans, Swedes, and Jewish Israelis took part in this study.

An additional purpose of the study was to examine empirically the distinction between perceiving the group as TG and PCC. We reason that perceiving the group as TG is particularly important to understand the *cost* for the current generation of an extended temporal perception of the group. Although research on PCC has focused on the beneficial effects on well-being of perceiving the group as a continuous entity, the focus in the current line of research is on the *cost* of an extended perception of the group—the *obligations* that these legacies place on current group members. We therefore hypothesized that perceiving the group as TG predicts variance on endurance of ingroup suffering over and above the effects of PCC.

We were further interested in the relationship between national identification (i.e., Roccas, Klar, & Liviatan, 2006) and the perception of the group as TG. Although we expect a positive relation between perceiving the group as TG and ingroup identification, these concepts are by no means synonymous. Ingroup identification refers to the strength of one's identification with the group, whereas perceiving the group as TG and IG refers to the *object* of such group identification—what (or *when*) is this group that we belong to? While individuals perceiving the group as IG identify mainly with their contemporaries, those perceiving the group as TG identify with past and future generations *as well* as their contemporaries. This sense of "double identification"—with the current generation as well as to past and future generations of the group—is expected to underlie a positive relationship between perceiving the group as TG and ingroup identification.

Method

Participants and procedure

Sample 1. Palestinian Israeli university students ($n = 140$, 57% female, M age = 22 years, $SD = 2.61$) participated in the study in exchange for participation in a lottery to win a monetary reward. The participants were approached by an experimenter on campus and were offered to participate in the study.

Sample 2. U.S. participants were recruited online ($n = 128$, 44% female, M age = 30 years, $SD = 11.80$)

using Amazon's Mechanical Turk (www.mturk.com; see Buhrmester, Kwang, & Gosling, 2011; Horton, Rand, & Zeckhauser, 2011).

Sample 3. Swedish participants were medical professionals, schoolteachers, and university students (n = 124, 75% female, M age = 38 years, SD = 14.57) who completed a computerized questionnaire on a voluntary basis. To ensure the attentiveness of the participants in the computerized Swedish sample, we used an instructional manipulation check (Oppenheimer, Meyvis, & Davidenko, 2009). It consisted of two items which stated, "To ensure that participants are reading the items, please do not respond to this item." The data of three participants were excluded from analyses because they responded to one or both these items, making the final number of participants in the sample 121 (74% female, M age = 37 years, SD = 14.56).[2]

Sample 4. Jewish Israeli university students (n = 105, 77% female, M age = 23 years, SD = 2.07) were approached in a group setting and were offered to participate in the study in exchange for course credit.

Sample 5. An additional sample was included in the study to examine whether perceiving the group as TG was empirically distinct from PCC. The sample consisted of Jewish Israeli university students (n = 104, 57% female, M age = 23.63, SD = 5.96) who were approached in a classroom setting and offered to participate in the study on a voluntary basis.

Measures

TG scale. The scale consists of five statements (one reversed item), assessing the degree to which the participants perceive the nation as TG[3] (e.g., "For me, the national group includes all the generations of group members that ever have and ever will live"): α = .77 (Sample 1), α = .78 (Sample 2), α = .75 (Sample 3), α = .85 (Sample 4), and α = .76 (Sample 5). The participants reported agreement on a scale from 1 (*do not agree at all*) to 7 (*agree completely*).

PoINT. The scale consists of five items, assessing the degree to which the participants give primacy to the interests of the group as a whole over the interests of the group as a collection of group members (e.g., "My national group is more important than the members that belong to it"): α = .82 (Sample 1), α = .88 (Sample 2), α = .85 (Sample 3), and α = .84 (Sample 4). The participants reported agreement on a scale from 1 (*do not agree at all*) to 7 (*agree completely*).

Endurance of Ingroup Suffering. The scale consists of three statements regarding the willingness to endure suffering of the group as IG (e.g., "The more we as a group are ready to endure hardships now, the better it will be for our national group in the distant future"): α = .58[4] (Sample 1), α = .75 (Sample 2), α = .83 (Sample 3), α = .72 (Sample 4), and α = .60 (Sample 5). The participants reported agreement on a scale from 1 (*do not agree at all*) to 7 (*agree completely*).

Ingroup Identification. In Sample 4, a scale of Ingroup Identification (Roccas et al., 2006; Roccas, Sagiv, Schwartz, Halevy, & Eidelson, 2008) was also included. The scale consists of 16 statements (e.g., "I feel strongly affiliated with Israel"), α = .93,[5] to which the participants indicate their agreement on a scale from 1 (*do not agree at all*) to 7 (*agree completely*).

PCC. PCC was measured in Sample 5 using the PCC scale (M. Sani et al., 2007), consisting of 12 items assessing the two dimensions of PCC—historical continuity, α = .86 (e.g., "Major phases of the history of my national group are linked to each other"), and cultural continuity, α = .86 (e.g., "My national group has preserved its traditions and customs throughout history"). The participants reported agreement on a scale from 1 (*do not agree at all*) to 7 (*agree completely*).

Results and Discussion

Distinctiveness of TG, PoINT, and Endurance of Ingroup Suffering. To test the empirical distinctiveness of the TG, PoINT, and Endurance of Ingroup Suffering scales, we carried out a confirmatory factor analysis using Analysis of Moment Structures Version 21.0 (AMOS 21.0; Arbuckle, 2012). We used a multigroup approach, running measurement invariance analysis over Samples 1 to 4 (Palestinian Israeli, American, Swedish, and Jewish Israeli samples). Sample 5 did not include the PoINT scale and was thus omitted from these analyses. After adding three correlation coefficients between error terms in the three-factor model (all error terms within the same factor), the goodness-of-fit measures indicated a good goodness-of-fit across the four cross-cultural samples on the metric measurement invariance level (χ^2 = 453.42, χ^2/df = 1.70, root mean square error of approximation [RMSEA] = .038, Tucker–Lewis index [TLI] = .916, comparative fit index [CFI] = .928), indicating that respondents across the different cultural groups attribute the same meaning to the latent construct under study (Van de Schoot, Lugtig, & Hox, 2012). We compared the hypothesized three-factor model (TG, PoINT, and Endurance of Ingroup Suffering) with a two-factor (PoINT and Endurance of Ingroup Suffering combined) and one-factor structure. The three-factor model showed a better fit to the data than either of the alternative models on all measures, and the Akaike information criterion indicated that the three-factor model provided a better trade-off between model fit and model complexity than the one- and two-factor models (see Table 1).

TG, PoINT, and Endurance of Ingroup Suffering. Means and standard deviations for the scales in Samples 1 to 4 are presented in Table 2. As expected, in all samples, perceiving the group

Table 1. Goodness-of-Fit Measures for the Different Models.

	χ^2	*df*	χ^2/df	RMSEA	TLI	CFI	AIC
Three factors	453.42	267	1.70	.038	.916	.928	751.42
Two factors	635.56	278	2.29	.052	.845	.862	911.56
One factor	1,074.99	285	3.77	.076	.665	.694	1,336.99

Note. Values indicated at the metric measurement invariance level. RMSEA = root mean square error of approximation; TLI = Tucker–Lewis index; CFI = comparative fit index; AIC = Akaike information criterion.

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations for TG, PoINT, and Endurance of Ingroup Suffering in Samples 1 to 4.

	TG		PoINT		Endurance of Ingroup Suffering	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Sample 1: Palestinian Israeli	5.76	1.04	5.59	1.09	4.98	1.11
Sample 2: United States	4.85	1.00	3.82	1.26	4.73	1.09
Sample 3: Swedish	4.10	1.36	2.13	1.13	2.72	1.42
Sample 4: Jewish Israeli	5.20	1.21	4.01	1.19	3.85	1.41

Note. TG = Trans-Generational; PoINT = Primacy of Interest.

Table 3. Correlation Coefficients for TG, PoINT, and Endurance of Ingroup Suffering Scales in Samples 1 to 4.

	PoINT	Endurance of Ingroup Suffering
TG		
Sample 1: Palestinian Israeli	.45**	.25**
Sample 2: United States	.53**	.47**
Sample 3: Swedish	.19*	.23*
Sample 4: Jewish Israeli	.42**	.34**
PoINT		
Sample 1: Palestinian Israeli		.51**
Sample 2: United States		.47**
Sample 3: Swedish		.52**
Sample 4: Jewish Israeli		.43**

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.
Note. TG = Trans-Generational; PoINT = Primacy of Interest.

as TG was significantly correlated to PoINT and to Endurance of Ingroup Suffering. PoINT was further significantly correlated to Endurance of Ingroup Suffering in all four samples (see Table 3). To test whether PoINT mediated the relationship between perceiving the group as TG and Endurance of Ingroup Suffering, we ran separate mediation analyses in each of the four samples, using Hayes's (2013) PROCESS macro (Model 4). As predicted, the indirect effect of TG on Endurance of Ingroup Suffering through PoINT was significant in all samples, indicating that PoINT mediated the relationship between TG and Endurance of Ingroup Suffering (see Table 4).

Table 4. Indirect Effect of the TG Scale on Endurance of Ingroup Suffering Through PoINT in Samples 1 to 4.

	b	*SE*	Low CI	Upper CI
Sample 1: Palestinian Israeli	.2432	.0696	.1363	.4089
Sample 2: United States	.1776	.0784	.0397	.3492
Sample 3: Swedish	.0957	.0533	.0147	.2339
Sample 4: Jewish Israeli	.1800	.0692	.0653	.3452

Note. TG = Trans-Generational; PoINT = Primacy of Interest; CI = confidence interval.

TG and ingroup identification. As predicted, ingroup identification, measured only in Sample 4, was significantly related to perceiving the national group as TG, $r(103) = .40$, $p < .001$, as well as to PoINT, $r(103) = .57$, $p < .001$, and Endurance of Ingroup Suffering, $r(99) = .52$, $p < .001$. To examine whether perceiving the group as TG explained variance on endurance of ingroup suffering over and above the effect of ingroup identification, we conducted a hierarchical regression. Endurance of ingroup suffering was entered as a dependent variable, ingroup identification was entered as a predictor in the first step, and perceiving the group as TG was entered as a predictor in the second step. As expected, TG explained additional variance on endurance of ingroup suffering over and above the effect of ingroup identification, R^2change = .034, $F^{change}(1, 102) = 4.72$, $p = .032$.

TG and PCC. Finally, we analyzed Sample 5 to examine whether perceiving the group as TG was empirically distinct and non-redundant from PCC. A principal components analysis (PCA) yielded a three-component structure, corresponding to the hypothesized TG component (Component 2) as well as the two PCC dimensions: historical continuity (Component 1) and cultural continuity (Component 3). The component loadings from the PCA can be seen in Table 5. All items loaded the strongest on their respective component and, in most cases, loaded <.3 on any other component. With regard to the items on the TG scale, all items but one loaded >.4 on the TG component while loading <.3 on the other components. The exception was the negative item "I don't believe that there is a national identity that we carry from generation to generation," which had a loading of −.36 on the TG component and −.30 on the PCC historical component. We then proceeded by examining whether perceiving the group as TG predicted endurance of ingroup suffering over and above the effects of PCC. We ran a hierarchical regression in which we entered PCC culture and PCC history in the first step and the Trans-Generational scale in the second step. In the first step, the R^2 was .09, increasing to $R^2 = .17$ when adding the TG scale (R^2change = .078, $F^{change} = 9.17$, $p = .003$). In contrast, PCC did not significantly add to the

Table 5. Component Loadings From a Principal Components Analysis of the TG and PCC Scales.

		PCC—historical	TG	PCC—cultural
PCC—Historical 1	The main events in the history of my national group are part of an "unbroken stream."	0.82		
PCC—Historical 2	There is no continuity between different ages in the history of my national group	−0.78		
PCC—Historical 3	There is a causal link between different events in the history of my national group	0.69		
PCC—Historical 4	Major phases of the history of my national group are linked to each other	0.62		0.38
PCC—Historical 5	The history of my national group is a sequence of interconnected events	0.61	0.31	
PCC—Historical 6	There is no connection between past, present, and future events in my national group	−0.57	−0.31	
TG1	When I think of my national group, I don't only think of the current generation, but also of all the generations of the group of the past		0.87	
TG2	For me, the national group includes all the generations of group members that ever have and ever will live		0.8	
TG3	When I think of my national group, I don't only think of the current generation, but also of all the generations of the group of the future		0.71	
TG4	Members of my national group in every generation share a common base that unite each other across the generations		0.41	
TG5	I don't believe that there is a national identity that we carry from generation to generation	−0.3	−0.36	
PCC—Cultural 1	My national group has preserved its traditions and customs throughout history			0.85
PCC—Cultural 2	Members of my national group have maintained their values across time			0.81
PCC—Cultural 3	The members of my national group will always be characterized by specific traditions and beliefs			0.73
PCC—Cultural 4	Throughout history, the members of my national group have maintained their inclinations and mentality			0.54
PCC—Cultural 5	Members of my national group transferred their traditions from generation to generation for several generations		0.44	0.5
PCC—Cultural 6	Shared values, beliefs, and attitudes of the members of my national group have endurance across time	0.32		0.41

Note. Loadings <.3 are not displayed in the table. PCC = perceived collective continuity; TG = Trans-Generational.

explained variance when TG was entered in the first step and the PCC scales were entered in the second step, R^2change = .040, $F^{\text{change}} = 2.33$, $p = .102$.

To summarize, the hypothesized factor structure of the TG, PoINT, and Endurance of Ingroup Suffering scales was supported. Furthermore, perceiving the group as TG was significantly related to the giving of primacy to the interests of the group as a whole and endurance of ingroup suffering. As predicted, PoINT mediated the relationship between perceiving the group as TG and endurance of ingroup suffering. This pattern was consistent across samples from four cultural groups despite their different social, political, economic, religious, and historical characteristics.

The positive relationship between perceiving the group as TG and ingroup identification also warrants further comment. The results from Sample 4 show that identification with the ingroup is moderately related to the perception of the group as TG. However, perceiving the group as TG is not redundant when taking into account degree of ingroup identification. In fact, TG explained variance on endurance of ingroup suffering over and above the effect of ingroup identification. Perceiving the group as TG was also shown to be distinctive and non-redundant from PCC.

We reason that conceiving of the group as TG has a causal effect on endurance of ingroup suffering. However, the design of Study 1 did not allow us to sufficiently test for causal effects. In Studies 2 and 3, we adopted an experimental approach and examined the effect of raising the salience of the group as TG.

Study 2

Examining temporary changes in the salience of perceiving the group as TG is important because the salience of the group as TG is raised in many commonly encountered situations. For example, the celebration of national holidays and memorial days that commemorate events in the history of the national group reminds group members of their common history and is likely to raise the salience of their representation of the nation as TG (e.g., Ben-Amos & Bet-El, 2005; O'Leary, 1999; Zerubavel, 1995).

The purpose of Study 2 was threefold. First, we sought to examine whether the perception of the national group as TG could be experimentally manipulated—that is, to investigate whether the perception of the group is susceptible to contextual effects in addition to being an individual difference

variable. We hypothesized that raising the *salience* of the group as TG would lead to an increased *perception* of the group as TG. Second, we hypothesized that raising the salience of the national group as Trans-Generational would increase endurance of ingroup suffering. Finally, we expected PoINT to mediate the effect of the TG salience manipulation on endurance of ingroup suffering.

Method

Participants. Two-hundred ten Jewish Israelis (55% female, *M* age = 27 years, *SD* = 5.04) participated in the sample. The participants were recruited from an online survey panel in exchange for a small monetary compensation.

Measures and procedure. The participants were randomly assigned to one out of three conditions—TG, IG, and Control. After being subjected to an experimental manipulation, the participants completed the PoINT, Endurance of Ingroup Suffering, and TG scales and a measure of ingroup identification. The Ingroup Identification scale was included to examine whether the experimental manipulation indeed made the group as TG salient or whether it mainly strengthened general ingroup identification. The Ingroup Identification scale was a shortened version of the scale of Ingroup Identification used in Study 1 (Roccas et al., 2006; Roccas et al., 2008) consisting of eight items. The reliabilities for the scales in the study were as follows: PoINT, α = .85; Endurance of Ingroup Suffering, α = .82; TG, α = .83; and Ingroup Identification, α = .89.

Experimental manipulation. In the TG condition, the participants were instructed to think about their national group throughout history (the people of Israel throughout history). They were further asked to freely choose three positive characteristics that have characterized their national group and describe why these characteristics are meaningful and positive. In the IG condition, the participants were first asked to think of their national group in the current generation (Israelis in the current generation) and were then asked to freely choose three positive characteristics that characterize the current generation of their national group and describe why these characteristics are meaningful and positive. In the control condition, the participants were asked to think of three important inventions and were asked to describe why these inventions were positive and meaningful.

Results and Discussion

The participants were unrestricted in their choice of characteristics and a large number of characteristics were named and described. In the TG condition, unity, faith, intelligence, strength, and survival were commonly mentioned as positive characteristics of the group, whereas in the IG condition, ambitiousness, entrepreneurship, warmth, happiness, and confidence were commonly cited. Telephone, lightbulb, and car are examples of interventions mentioned in the control condition.

We hypothesized that the TG manipulation would increase the participants' perception of the national group as TG. As predicted, there was a significant main effect of the experimental manipulation on the TG scale, $F(2, 207) = 4.59$, $p = .011$, $\eta^2 = .04$. The participants in the TG condition ($M = 5.25$, $SD = 1.13$) were higher on the TG scale than the participants in the IG condition ($M = 4.76$, $SD = 1.09$), mean difference (MD) = .49, $p = .049$, 95% confidence interval [CI] = [0.001, 0.98], and higher than participants in the control condition ($M = 4.73$, $SD = 1.19$, MD = .52, $p = .015$, 95% CI = [0.08, 0.96]). The effect of the experimental manipulation on ingroup identification was not statistically significant, $F(2, 207) = 2.64$, $p = .074$, $\eta^2 = .02$. Experimentally raising the salience of the group as TG, thus, indeed seemed to strengthen the perception of the group as TG, and these effects were not due to a general strengthening of ingroup identification.

Furthermore, as predicted, there was a significant main effect of the experimental manipulation on Endurance of Ingroup Suffering, $F(2, 207) = 5.14$, $p = .007$, $\eta^2 = .05$. A Tukey post hoc test revealed that the effect was mainly due to the difference between the IG ($M = 2.62$, $SD = 1.09$) and TG ($M = 3.42$, $SD = 1.54$) conditions, MD = −.80, $p = .005$, 95% CI = [0.20, 1.40]. There were no significant differences between the TG and IG conditions and the control condition ($M = 2.96$, $SD = 1.48$). We used Hayes's (2013) PROCESS macro to test whether PoINT mediated the effect of the TG manipulation on Endurance of Ingroup Suffering. Following Hayes and Preacher's (2014) recommendations, we contrast-coded the three-level experimental conditions to create two contrast variables, one comparing the TG condition with the IG and control conditions, and one comparing the IG condition with the TG and control conditions. We then proceeded to test whether PoINT mediated the effect of the TG manipulations, by entering one of the contrast variables as an independent variable and the other as a covariate. As hypothesized, PoINT mediated the effect of the TG manipulation (indirect effect $b = .17$, $SE = .09$, 95% CI = [0.0218, 0.3652]) but not the IG condition ($b = .06$, $SE = .08$, 95% CI = [−0.0955, 0.2163]) on Endurance of Ingroup Suffering.

The results show that the perception of the national group as TG can be experimentally manipulated in addition to being measured as individual differences. Raising the *salience* of the group as TG increases the degree to which the group is *perceived* as TG. Furthermore, the results provide support for the hypothesis that raising the salience of the group as TG leads to increased endurance of ingroup suffering compared with when the group as IG is made salient. Finally, the effect of the TG manipulation on endurance of ingroup suffering was mediated by PoINT.[6]

Study 3

The purpose of this study was to examine whether the findings of Study 2 would replicate with a different manipulation

of the temporal inclusiveness of the group. We used a manipulation that raises the saliency of the group's future as well its past. Furthermore, the study extends findings of Study 2 by including an additional cultural group. It was conducted among a sample of Jewish Israelis and a sample of Palestinian Israelis.

Method

Participants

Jewish Israeli sample. One hundred sixty-two Jewish Israeli students (69% female, *M* age = 27 years, *SD* = 5.89) participated in the study.

Palestinian Israeli sample. One hundred twenty-nine Palestinian Israeli students (56% female, *M* age = 22 years, *SD* = 2.66) participated in the study.

Procedure. In both samples, the participants were randomly assigned to one out of three conditions—TG past, TG future, and IG. After being subjected to the experimental manipulation, the participants completed the PoINT and Endurance of Ingroup Suffering scales. The participants took part in a lottery to win a monetary reward.

Experimental manipulation. We reasoned that focusing on events associated with the national group in the distant past or in the distant future would entail raising the salience of the national group as TG, whereas focusing on events associated with present-day group members would raise the salience of the group as IG. We hypothesized that the effect of raising the salience of the group as TG would be present regardless of whether the distant future or distant past was made salient. To examine this conjecture, we included TG manipulations for the past as well as for the future of the group. Besides the point in time at which the event takes place, the *valence* of the event (whether it is a positive or negative event) may also have implications for endurance of ingroup suffering. For example, past research indicates that the salience of events connected to past victimhood has a powerful effect on attitudes and emotions in a current conflict (Bar-Tal, Chernyak-Hai, Schori, & Gundar, 2009; Klar, Schori-Eyal, & Klar, 2013; Roccas & Elster, 2012). To prevent the raising of the salience of past victimhood rather than the salience of the group as TG, we focused on reminders of *positive* events in the past and future of the group.

In the TG past condition, the participants were asked to freely choose three meaningful, important, and positive events that have happened in the history of the people of Israel/the Palestinian people, describe the events in a few sentences, and explain why these events were meaningful, important, and positive.

In the TG future condition, the participants were asked to freely choose three meaningful, important, and positive events that may take place in the distant future of the people of Israel/the Palestinian people, many generations from now; describe these events in a few sentences; and explain why these events would be meaningful, important, and positive.

In the IG condition, the participants were asked to freely choose three meaningful, important, and positive events in the lives of present-day Israelis/Palestinians; describe these events in a few sentences; and explain why they think these events are considered meaningful, important, and positive.

Measures

PoINT. The reliabilities of the scale in the study were $\alpha = .86$ in the Jewish Israeli sample and $\alpha = .82$ in the Palestinian Israeli sample.

Endurance of Ingroup Suffering. The reliabilities of the scale in the samples were $\alpha = .84$ in the Jewish Israeli sample and $\alpha = .60$ in the Palestinian Israeli sample.

Results and Discussion

As in Study 2, the participants were unrestricted in their choice of events and a large number of events were mentioned. In the Jewish Israeli sample, past events included biblical events (such as the exodus from Egypt), the founding of the state of Israel and successful past wars, and military operations. Future events included for example future peace with the Palestinians and the Arab countries and future social changes and reforms. The present events often included family celebrations and work- and education-related events.

In the Palestinian Israeli sample, past events included Palestinian armed resistance and peace agreements reached in the past. Future events included the future establishment of an independent Palestinian state, gains in the Israeli Palestinian conflict, and achievements of Palestinian unity. Present events included weddings and work- and education-related events.

We conducted a one-way ANOVA to test for the main effect of the experimental manipulations on endurance of ingroup suffering. We expected both TG conditions (past and future) to increase endurance of ingroup suffering, compared with the IG condition. As predicted, there was a significant main effect of the experimental manipulation on endurance of ingroup suffering in the Jewish Israeli, $F(2, 159) = 4.23$, $p = .016$, $\eta^2 = .05$, as well as in the Palestinian Israeli sample, $F(2, 127) = 3.31$, $p = .040$ $\eta^2 = .05$. In the Jewish Israeli sample, a Tukey post hoc test revealed that participants in the TG past condition ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 1.70$) were significantly higher than those in the IG condition ($M = 2.88$, $SD = 1.54$), MD = .84, $p = .037$, 95% CI = [0.04, 1.64]. Furthermore, those in the TG *future* condition ($M = 3.77$, $SD = 1.68$) were also higher than the participants in the IG condition, MD = .88, $p = .022$, 95% CI = [0.10, 1.66]. There was no significant difference between the two TG conditions, MD = −.04, $p = .991$, 95% CI = [−0.76, 0.68]. In the Palestinian Israeli sample, participants in the TG past condition ($M = 5.18$, $SD =$

0.93) were higher than participants in the IG condition (M = 4.61, SD = 1.17), MD = .56, p = .062, 95% CI = [0.02, 1.15], and those in the TG future condition (M = 5.13, SD = 1.21) were higher than participants in the IG condition, MD = .52, p = .079, 95% CI = [−0.05, 1.09], although these differences only approached significance. There was no significant difference between the two TG conditions, MD = −.04, p = .981, 95% CI = [−0.53, 0.62]. We again used Hayes's (2013) PROCESS macro to test whether PoINT mediated the effect of the TG manipulation on endurance of ingroup suffering. The three-level experimental condition was contrast-coded to create two contrast variables, one comparing the TG future condition with the IG and TG past conditions, and one comparing the TG future condition with the TG past and IG conditions. We then proceeded to test whether PoINT mediated the effect of the TG manipulations, by entering one of the contrast variables as an independent variable and the other as a covariate. As hypothesized, PoINT mediated the effect of the TG past manipulation on endurance of ingroup suffering in the Jewish Israeli (indirect effect b = .63, SE = .22, 95% CI = [0.2615, 1.1100]) as well as in the Palestinian Israeli sample (b = .32, SE = .13, 95% CI = [0.0838, 0.5928]). Similarly, PoINT mediated the effect of the TG *future* condition in the Jewish Israeli (b = .40, SE = .21, 95% CI = [0.0600, 0.8615]) as well as in the Palestinian Israeli sample (b = .26, SE = .13, 95% CI = [0.0455, 0.5409]).

The experimental manipulation used in Study 3 contrasted events in the history/distant future of the national group with events in the private lives of current group members. In addition to manipulating temporal inclusiveness, this experimental manipulation could also have affected salience of public versus private events, constituting an alternative explanation for the results of this study. However, the manipulation used in Study 2 controls for this possible confound, as it focuses on characteristics rather than events. Furthermore, the TG as well as the IG manipulations used in Study 2 clearly refer to collective rather than private life.

Taken together, the results from Studies 2 and 3 provide support for the hypothesis that raising the salience of the TG group increases endurance of ingroup suffering, compared with raising the salience of the group as IG, and that this effect is mediated by PoINT. These effects held in two Jewish Israeli samples as well as in a Palestinian Israeli sample. As demonstrated in Study 2, these effects cannot be attributed to an increase in ingroup identification.

Study 4: The Israeli Prisoner Dilemma

In Studies 1 to 3, we found that perceiving the national group as TG predicted willingness to endure ingroup suffering. Would TG perceptions also be related to attitudes regarding concrete public dilemmas?

Gilad Shalit, an Israeli soldier, was captured by Hamas militants on June 2006 and was held captive in Gaza for more than 5 years. On October 2011, the Israeli government approved a deal with the Hamas for his release in return for 1,027 convicted members of Palestinian militant organizations (Levinson, 2011). During his captivity years, the fate of Gilad Shalit and the question on whether or not Israel should agree to an exchange deal with the Hamas gave rise to a persistent and heated debate within Israeli society. Supporters of a deal with the Hamas for freeing Gilad Shalit conducted mass rallies, hunger strikes, vigils, and marches across the country. As a response, opponents of making any deal with the Hamas conducted counter-campaigns.[7]

Importantly, both camps viewed their position as stemming from patriotism and love of the group. However, there was a difference between the sides in the degree to which the love for the group and the obligation toward it was directed mainly toward its current members or toward a more extended perception of the group. This difference was reflected in some of the arguments used by the different camps in the debate. Supporters of a prisoners swap to free Shalit stressed social solidarity and moral obligation toward the current group members. The soldier Shalit was titled "everybody's child" (e.g., Geffen, 2008) and "every Israeli's son" (e.g., Klein-Halevi, 2011), embodying the entire generation of young soldiers to which the entire group is responsible and morally obligated (one of the popular mottos during the campaign was "one for all and all for one"). Opponents of any prisoners exchange with the Hamas, in addition to the danger entailed in freeing hundreds of militants, stressed the obligation toward the greater nation. Surrender to terror was presented as a disgrace for the entire nation, a "tragedy forever" (Elkin, 2011) which would weaken the spirit of the country.

We reasoned that the "pro-exchange" position in the Gilad Shalit debate, stressing solidarity with and responsibility to current group members both as individuals and as a collective, is related to the IG perception of the group whereas the "anti-exchange" position, stressing the historical context and values such as protecting national honor and stature, is related to the TG perception of the group. We further expected PoINT to mediate this relationship.

Method

Participants and procedure. Israeli Jewish university students (n = 163, 47%, M age = 26 years, SD = 8.65) participated in the study on a voluntary basis.

Measures. The reliabilities of the TG and PoINT scales in the study were as follows—TG: α = .87, PoINT: α = .90.

Endurance of Suffering of an Ingroup Hostage. The scale consisted of four items assessing the degree to which one justified the continued suffering of captured soldier Gilad Shalit for the sake of the greater group. A sample item is "Even if prolonging the time that he is imprisoned would cause suffering for Gilad Shalit, the broad national interest

Table 6. Means, Standard Deviations, and Correlation Coefficients for TG, PoINT, and Endurance of an Ingroup Hostage Scales.

	M	*SD*	PoINT	Endurance of an Ingroup Hostage
TG	5.71	1.10	.64**	.27**
PoINT	5.12	1.29		.36**
Endurance of an Ingroup Hostage	4.17	1.46		

* $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$.
Note. PoINT = Primacy of Interest; TG = Trans-Generational.

has to determine whether we should sign the deal with the Hamas." Internal reliability of the scale was $\alpha = .68$.

Results and Discussion

Means, standard deviations, and correlation coefficients for the scales are found in Table 6. As expected, perceiving the group as TG was significantly correlated to PoINT and to endurance of suffering of an ingroup hostage. PoINT was further significantly related to endurance of suffering of an ingroup hostage. As in Study 1, we used Hayes's (2013) PROCESS macro, to test whether PoINT mediated the relationship between perceiving the group as TG and endurance of suffering of an ingroup hostage. As predicted, the indirect effect of TG on endurance of suffering of an ingroup hostage through PoINT was significant ($b = .0957$, $SE = .0533$, 95% CI = [0.0147, 0.2339]).

General Discussion

The purpose of the present research was to introduce the distinction between perceiving the group as TG and perceiving it as IG and to examine the implications of these group perceptions in the context of intergroup conflict. Although people generally feel attached to their groups and seek for ways for their groups to benefit (e.g., Brewer, 1979; Tajfel, 1982), our studies indicate that a perception of the ingroup as TG can lead to a willingness to sacrifice the interests of the current members of the group. Despite a resurgence of research on social representations of history and temporal dimensions of group perception (Liu & Hilton, 2005; F. Sani et al., 2009; M. Sani et al., 2007; Wohl & Branscombe, 2008, 2009), in social psychology, groups are still to a large extent conceptualized and operationalized as collections of current group members. The introduction of the differentiation between perceiving the group as TG and as IG addresses this gap in the social-psychological literature and enables the study of the consequences of a temporally extended group perception.

In Study 1, we obtained support for our main hypothesis that perceiving the group as TG is related to Endurance of Ingroup Suffering and that this relationship is mediated by PoINT. The results from the study were replicated across four cross-cultural samples (Jewish Israeli, Palestinian Israeli, American, and Swedish). Perceiving the group as TG was also found to explain variance on endurance of ingroup suffering over and above the effects of PCC (M. Sani et al., 2007). Thus, perceiving the group as TG is distinctive and non-redundant from PCC. In Study 2, we demonstrated that the perception of the group as Trans-Generational could be manipulated in addition to being an individual difference variable, that raising the salience of the group as Trans-Generational increases endurance of ingroup suffering compared with raising the salience of the group as IG, and that this effect was mediated by PoINT. This effect could not be explained by the influence of ingroup identification. Study 3 strengthened these claims using an alternative manipulation of perceiving the group as TG and testing the hypothesis in a Jewish Israeli as well as in a Palestinian Israeli sample. In Study 4, we applied the main hypotheses to a real-life public dilemma, involving a captured Israeli soldier, and showed that the hypotheses were supported in a real-life setting as well as in the laboratory. Effect sizes in the studies were generally medium-sized. This fact, coupled with the replication of the results using different experimental manipulations in a number of different samples differing in their demographic as well as cultural characteristics, speak to the reliability and robustness of the results.

The most important theoretical contribution of the studies is the realization that the group can have several sets of interest and, further, that certain perceptions of the group entail the possibility that these different sets of interests come into conflict with each other. Those who perceive the group both as IG and TG sometimes find themselves in a dilemma in which the interest of the group as TG comes into conflict with the interest of the current generation.

The research further expands on previous research on self-sacrifice for the sake of the collective (e.g., Swann, Gómez, Dovidio, Hart, & Jetten, 2010; Swann et al., 2009; Triandis & Gelfand, 1998) to include willingness to sacrifice *other* members of the ingroup for the sake of the group itself. Although we are focusing on the endurance of suffering of one's fellow ingroup members, we do not see this as being opposed to willingness for self-sacrifice. Endurance of ingroup suffering is likely to be positively related to willingness for self-sacrifice. Rather, we are pointing out that these individuals not only are willing to sacrifice themselves for the sake of the group but, somewhat paradoxically, are also willing to sacrifice the group (as IG) for the sake of the group itself (as TG). The present article constitutes the first attempt to explain the phenomenon of endurance of ingroup sacrifice.

A potentially fruitful line of research for future studies could be to examine whether perceiving the group as TG affects to what degree one perceives the assets of the group as being under the sole jurisdiction of the current generation

of group members or whether these assets are perceived to belong to all past, present, and future generations of the group. The latter is likely to lead to a lack of willingness to compromise on group assets and an unforgiving, punitive stance toward group members who show willingness to make such compromises.

Taken together, the results from the studies implore us to take into account the role of group perception in situations in which group members are expected to endure hardships for the sake of the greater group. Although common wisdom teaches us to learn from our history and plan for the long term, focusing on the present-day commonalities and short-term common interests may also bear some merit, especially to promote conflict resolution in the context of violent intergroup conflict.

Acknowledgment

The authors acknowledge the help of Yarden Dankner, Omri Gilan, Dafna Hoffman, Ruthie Pliskin, Alisa Reicher, Rawan Shamshoum, Raquel Sitman, and Adi Zafrir (presented in alphabetical order), who assisted in collecting the data for part of the studies.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This research was supported in part by the second author's Israeli Science Foundation (ISF) Grant 1211/05 and by the Open University of Israel's Research Fund.

Supplemental Material

The online supplemental material is available at http://pspb.sagepub.com/supplemental.

Notes

1. When referring to Palestinian Israeli participants, we intend Palestinian citizens of Israel.
2. As the Jewish Israeli and Palestinian Israeli samples were collected in the presence of the experimenter, there was no need for an attention check. In the computerized Swedish sample, we used a manipulation check to ensure the seriousness of the participants.
3. The interested reader can contact the first author of the present article for a detailed account of the scale creation of the TG scale.
4. Although the reliability of the Endurance of Suffering scale was low in the Palestinian Israeli sample, we deemed the overall high reliability in the cross-cultural samples as well as in the other studies to merit the use of the scale. However, the low reliability constitutes a limitation of the study and raises questions regarding the meaningfulness of this scale in the Palestinian Israeli sample. Future studies should consider revising the Arabic translation of the scale.
5. The scale has different components. In the present study, we had no differential hypotheses regarding the different components and computed a single identification score based on all items.
6. A second study was carried out in two additional separate samples, using the same experimental manipulation. In Sample 1 ($n = 43$), the participants completed the TG scale after completing the manipulation, and in Sample 2 ($n = 92$), the participants completed the Endurance of Ingroup Suffering scale after the experimental manipulation. In a close replication of the results from Study 2, the participants in the TG condition were higher on the TG scale and on Endurance of Ingroup Suffering than the participants in the IG condition.
7. The event used in the study is an actual event, which caused great suffering for those affected, in particular Gilad Shalit's family. The ethical implications of using such an event were discussed before collecting the data for the study. The details of the deal in question were widely discussed in the public discourse—including the media and the government. Because of the public nature of the event in question, we judged that the use of this event in the study was ethically justified.

References

Anderson, B. (1991). *Imagined communities: Reflections on the origins and spread of nationalism*. London, England: Verso.

Arbuckle, J. L. (2012). Amos (Version 21.0) [Computer program]. Chicago, IL: IBM SPSS.

Bar-Tal, D., Chernyak-Hai, L., Schori, N., & Gundar, A. (2009). A sense of self perceived collective victimhood in intractable conflicts. *International Review of the Red Cross*, *91*, 229-258.

Ben-Amos, A., & Bet-El, I. (2005). Commemoration and national identity: Memorial ceremonies in Israeli schools. In A. Levi & A. Weingrod (Eds.), *Homelands and diasporas: Holy lands and other places* (pp. 169-199). Redwood City, CA: Stanford University Press.

Brewer, M. B. (1979). Ingroup bias in the minimal intergroup situation: A cognitive motivational analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, *86*, 307-324.

Buhrmester, M., Kwang, T., & Gosling, S. D. (2011). Amazon's Mechanical Turk: A new source of inexpensive, yet high-quality, data? *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *6*, 3-5.

Camus, A. (1964). *Notebooks 1942-1951* [in French]. Paris, France: Les Éditions Gallimard.

Condor, S. (1996). Social identity and time. In W. P. Robinson (Ed.), *Social groups and identities: Developing the legacy of Henri Tajfel* (pp. 287-365). Oxford, UK: Butterworth-Heinemann.

Druckman, D. (1994). Nationalism, patriotism and group loyalty: A social psychological perspective. *Mershon International Studies Review*, *38*, 43-68.

Elkin, Z. (2011, October 22). Happiness for a day? A tragedy for generations! *Likudnik*. Available from http://www.likudnik.co.il/

Geffen, A. (2008). *Hayeled shel kulanu* [Everybody's child]. Tel Aviv, Israel: Helicon Records.

Greenberg, J., Solomon, S., & Pyszczynski, T. (1997). Terror management theory of self-esteem and cultural worldviews: Empirical assessments and conceptual refinements. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 29, pp. 61-139). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Hayes, A. F. (2013). *Introduction to mediation, moderation, and conditional process analysis: A regression-based approach*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Hayes, A. F., & Preacher, K. J. (2014). Statistical mediation analysis with a multicategorical independent variable. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology*, *67*, 451-470.

Hobsbawm, E. (1990). *Nations and nationalism since 1780: Programme, myth, reality*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hobsbawm, E., & Ranger, T. (1983). *The invention of tradition*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Hoffer, E. (1951). *The true believer*. New York, NY: HarperCollins.

Holy, L. (1996). *The little Czech and the great Czech nation: National identity and the post-communist social transformation*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Horton, J., Rand, D. G., & Zeckhauser, R. J. (2011). The online laboratory: Conducting experiments in a real labor market. *Experimental Economics*, *14*, 399-425.

Jetten, J., & Wohl, M. J. A. (2012). The past as a determinant of the present: Historical continuity, collective angst, and opposition to immigration. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *42*, 442-450.

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.

Klein-Halevi, Y. (2011, October 12). Everyone's son: A new read on Jewish life. *Tablet*. Available from http://www.tabletmag.com

Kohl, P. L., & Fawcett, C. (Eds.). (1995). *Nationalism, politics and the practice of archeology*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Kus, L., Ward, C., & Liu, J. (2014). Interethnic factors as predictors of the subjective well-being of minority individuals in a context of recent societal changes. *Political Psychology*, *35*, 703-719.

Levinson, C. (2011, October 11). TIMELINE / 1,940 days from Gilad Shalit's abduction to his release. *Haaretz*. Available from http://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/timeline-1-940-days-from-gilad-shalit-s-abduction-to-his-release-1.389452

Liu, J. H., & Hilton, D. J. (2005). How the past weighs on the present: Social representations of history and their role in identity politics. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *44*, 1-21.

Moscovici, S. (1988). Notes towards a description of social representations. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *18*, 211-250.

O'Leary, C. E. (1999). *To die for: The paradox of American patriotism*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Oppenheimer, D. M., Meyvis, T., & Davidenko, N. (2009). Instructional manipulation checks: Detecting satisficing to increase statistical power. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *45*, 867-872.

Orehek, E., Sasota, J., Kruglanski, A. W., Dechesne, M., & Ridgeway, L. (2014). Interdependent self-construals mitigate the fear of death and augment the willingness to become a martyr. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *107*, 265-275.

Radcliffe-Brown, A. R. (1945). Religion and society. *Journal of the Royal Anthropological Institute*, *75*, 33-43.

Reicher, S., & Hopkins, N. (2001). *Self and nation*. London, England: SAGE.

Roccas, S., & Elster, A. (2012). Group identities. In L. A. Tropp (Ed.), *The Oxford handbook of intergroup conflict* (pp. 107-122). New York, NY: Oxford 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 ingroup's moral violations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *91*, 698-711.

Roccas, S., Sagiv, L., Schwartz, S., Halevy, N., & Eidelson, R. (2008). Toward a unifying model of identification with groups: Integrating theoretical perspectives. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *12*, 280-306.

Sani, F., Herrera, M., & Bowe, M. (2009). Perceived collective continuity and ingroup identification as defense against death awareness. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *45*, 242-245.

Sani, M., Bowe, M., Herrera, C., Manna, T., Cossa, X., Miao, X., & Zhou, Y. (2007). Perceived collective continuity: Seeing groups as entities that move through time. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *37*, 1118-1134.

Smith, A. D. (2003). *Chosen peoples: Sacred sources of national identity*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Swann, W. B. Jr., Gómez, A., Dovidio, J., Hart, S., & Jetten, J. (2010). Dying and killing for one's group: Identity fusion moderates responses to intergroup versions of the trolley problem. *Psychological Science*, *21*, 1176-1183.

Tajfel, H. (1982). *Social identity and intergroup relations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behaviour. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.

Triandis, H. C., & Gelfand, M. J. (1998). Converging measurement of horizontal and vertical individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *74*, 118-128.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetherell, M. S. (1987). *Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell.

Van de Schoot, R., Lugtig, P., & Hox, J. (2012). A checklist for testing measurement invariance. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, *9*, 486-492.

Van Vugt, M., & Hart, C. M. (2004). Social identity as social glue: The origins of group loyalty. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *86*, 585-598.

Wohl, M. J. A., & Branscombe, N. R. (2008). Collective angst: How threats to the future vitality of the ingroup shape intergroup emotion. In H. Wayment & J. Bauer (Eds.), *Transcending self-interest: Psychological explorations of the quiet ego* (pp. 171-181). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

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. A., Branscombe, N. R., & Reysen, S. (2010). Perceiving your group's future to be in jeopardy: Extinction threat induces collective angst and the desire to strengthen the ingroup. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *36*, 898-910.

Zdaniuk, B., & Levine, J. M. (2001). Group loyalty: Impact of members' identification and contributions. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *37*, 502-509.

Zerubavel, Y. (1995). *Recovered roots: Collective memory and the making of Israeli national tradition*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

View publication stats