The Development of Intergroup Forgiveness in Northern Ireland

Frances McLernon* **and Ed Cairns**
University of Ulster

Miles Hewstone
University of Oxford

Ron Smith
University of London

As societies like Northern Ireland, Israel, and South Africa strive to resolve social conflict, there is growing theoretical and empirical interest in the role of intergroup forgiveness. This study examined intergroup forgiveness among 340 young adults in Northern Ireland. A short form of the Enright Forgiveness Inventory explored possible influences on propensity to forgive. All participants were Catholic and female (mean age 17.36 years), and had experienced verbal or physical injury or bereavement due to the Northern Irish political violence. Overall forgiveness levels were low in comparison with previous studies of interpersonal forgiveness but similar to previous studies of intergroup forgiveness in Northern Ireland. The strongest (negative) predictor of forgiveness was the perceived degree of hurt caused by the injury.

The conflict in Northern Ireland has a long and, at times, intense history (Cairns & Darby, 1998). Although the violence has now officially come to an end, it would appear that coming to terms with the concept of forgiveness is likely to be a painful and difficult one, at least for those who have suffered directly. One

reason for this is that in Northern Ireland, as in other post-conflict societies such as South Africa, the harboring of feelings of revenge and anger may be seen as one method of keeping faith with the dead, in not allowing the injury to be forgotten or trivialized (Ignatieff, 1998). If Northern Ireland is not to be plunged once more into the cycles of violence and revenge that have plagued it in the past, it is important that the concept of forgiveness, and particularly intergroup forgiveness, is explored. First, however, it is essential to ascertain the degree of acceptance of the concept of forgiveness that exists within the population of Northern Ireland. It is the aim of this study, therefore, to test the presence or absence of forgiveness in a sample of Northern Irish inhabitants who have been negatively affected by the Troubles.

The concept of interpersonal forgiveness has in recent years undergone a substantial amount of empirical psychological research (for a review, see McCullough, Pargament, & Thoresen, 2000). To date, however, few studies have examined the role of intergroup forgiveness in relation to the development of peace and reconciliation between ethnic groups, despite the fact that claims have been made for the therapeutic benefits of intergroup forgiveness in this context. For example, the value of forgiveness in freeing the survivor from unresolved feelings of anger and revenge has been described by writers such as Couper (1998), Holmgren (1993), and Shriver (1998). In turn, these ideas have been applied to the conflict in Northern Ireland by church and community leaders (Faith and Politics Group, 1997), politicians (Clinton, 1998; Kennedy, 1998) and relatives of those tragically killed or injured in the violence (McGoldrick, 1999; Wilson, 1987). Although it has long been established that people behave differently in intergroup settings than they do in interpersonal settings (Brown & Turner, 1981; Hewstone & Cairns, 2001; Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002), because of a shift from personal to social identity (Tajfel, 1978) and because of an emphasis on the ingroup rather than on the self, it is only recently that any research has been carried out into intergroup forgiveness (Couper, 1998; Fitzgibbons, 1986; Smedes, 1984).

A small amount of empirical research into ideas about forgiving the opposing group has been carried out in Northern Ireland (McLernon, Smith, Cairns, & Hewstone, 2001), and this study aims to add to that body of existing knowledge by adopting a definition of forgiveness which relates the concept to the idea of mercy. Enright and his colleagues have described forgiveness as the willingness to abandon one's right to resentment, negative judgement, and indifferent behavior toward one who unjustly injured us, while fostering the undeserved qualities of compassion, generosity, and even love toward him or her (Enright & the Human Development Study Group, 1991). According to this definition, forgiveness is not based on condonement, pardon, or justification, all of which may be seen merely as excusing the offence: Neither is it based on reconciliation, which may or may not occur in conjunction with forgiveness. Neither can forgiveness, in Enright's view, be equated with justice, either punitive, in which the offender

is punished for his or her wrongdoing, or restorative, in which the primary goal is to put right the harm done and restore the victim to his or her original state (Duff, Marshall, Dobash, & Dobash, 1994; Graef, 2001). Both of these types of justice require some form of retribution and subsequent action by the offender. Instead, in Enright's definition, the injured party offers a restoration of the relationship which is unconditional. In considering this definition of forgiveness, Enright and the Human Development Study Group (1991) view the concept on three levels: first, changes in the forgiver's affect toward the offender (for example, from resentment to compassion, from anger to love), second, changes in the way the forgiver thinks about the offender, that is the cognitive component of forgiveness (such as from condemning or making judgements to acceptance); and third, changes in how the forgiver acts toward the offender (for example, from vengeful acts to reconciliation). Therefore, according to Enright, forgiveness includes six components: the absence or presence of negative and positive affect, cognition, and behavior.

Rationale for the Current Study

The influences of age differences, religious beliefs, and gender differences in the development of forgiveness have been well documented. In particular, it has been suggested that younger people are less willing to forgive than older people, and this has been confirmed in a number of studies (Enright, Santos, & Al-Mabuk, 1989; Girard & Mullet, 1997; Hebl & Enright, 1993; Mullet, Houdbine, Laumonier & Girard, 1998; Park & Enright, 1997; Subkoviak et al., 1995). In the study of gender differences, most studies (e.g., Girard & Mullet, 1997; Mullet et al., 2003; McCullough & Worhtington, 1999; McCullough et al., 1998; McCullough, Worhtington, & Rachal, 1997) indicate that gender is neither a predictor of forgiveness, nor a moderating variable. A tenuous link has been suggested, however, by Brooks (2003), who showed that gender differences affect levels of depression, which in turn may influence the propensity to forgive. With regard to the relationship between religious belief and forgiveness, results are more mixed. Researchers such as Enright and Coyle (1998), Gorsuch and Hao (1993), and Poloma and Gallup (1991), have shown that interpersonal forgiveness appears to be related to religiosity. On the other hand, data from a study by Subkoviak et al. (1995) suggest that religious group membership might be related to forgiveness, whereas personal religiosity is not. Further, Mullet et al. (2003) found that age and religious involvement affect each other in an interactive way, with the link between increased church attendance and willingness to forgiveness increasing as a function of age. The majority of such studies which investigate links between forgiveness and age, gender, or religious belief have been based on the concept of interpersonal forgiveness. Little psychological research has looked at correlates of

intergroup forgiveness in societies in conflict, and from those that have (Azar, Mullet, & Vinconneau, 1999; Cairns, Hewstone, McLernon, & Lewis, 2002; Lessem, 2002;) the results are mixed. Intergroup forgiveness is a social, rather than a personal, construct, and may be better predicted by an individual's attitude toward the outgroup than by any of the variables of age, gender, and religious belief or affiliation (Cairns et al., 2002).

In light of these findings, no confirmation of age or gender differences, or the influence of religious belief was sought in the present study. Instead, we decided to explore possible correlates of forgiveness such as the severity of the injury, the length of time since the injury, and the perceived degree of hurt inflicted, and efforts were made to remove the possible confounding effects of age, gender, and religious affiliation by selecting only participants from one age group (adolescents and young adults aged 14–25 years), one gender (female), and one religious affiliation (Catholic).

Enright and the Human Development Study Group (1991) and, more recently, Hewstone et al. (in press) have pointed out that research such as that carried out by Enright, Santos, and Al-Mabuk (1989) suggests that one correlate of intergroup forgiveness is the cancellation of consequences: in other words, forgiveness is easier if harmful consequences of the act diminish with time. In the context of Northern Ireland, however, many of the consequences of violence such as bereavement or physical injury do not, by their nature, disappear. We, therefore, predicted that forgiveness will be less likely where the injury is more severe and unchangeable (e.g., bereavement), while forgiveness will become more likely as the reported injury is less severe (e.g., verbal attack).

Thus, in this study we examined the relationship between forgiveness and three possible correlates, (a) the type of injury incurred, whether verbal, physical or bereavement; (b) the length of time since the injury occurred; and (c) the degree of perceived hurt following the injury.

Method

Out of an original sample of 364 voluntary participants who completed the Group Enright Forgiveness Inventory-short Form (GEFI-SF, 340) participants reported that they had experienced verbal or physical injury or bereavement as a result of the Northern Irish political violence. These participants were included in subsequent analysis. All 340 participants were Catholic and female, drawn from three different secondary schools in Northern Ireland and a nearby university campus. The mean age of the 24 non-participants was 17.27 years. Of the remaining 340 participants, the mean age was 17.36 years (range 14–25 years).

Participants were told that the study was an investigation of attitudes to forgiveness and reconciliation between Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland.

All participants were assured of anonymity and of their right to withdraw from the study at any time.

The Questionnaire

Based on the definition of forgiveness as changes in the forgiver's affect, behavior, and cognition toward the offender, Enright developed the Enright forgiveness inventory (EFI). This is a 60-item scale designed to measure the existence of interpersonal forgiveness in response to injury (Subkoviak et al., 1995), and which is based on the three components of forgiveness, namely affect, behavior, and cognition. For our work in Northern Ireland, we shortened the EFI to 22 items (see Appendix One) and adapted it slightly to measure intergroup, rather than interpersonal, forgiveness. Validity and reliability testing of the shortened (group) version of the EFI indicated that the new measure (Group Enright Forgiveness Inventory—Short Form: (GEFI-SF) was psychometrically sound (Cronbach's alpha = .96; test-retest correlation over a 55 minute interval = .89). To establish the reliability of the GEFI-SF a measure of internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) was calculated for both versions using all items. This resulted in nearly identical estimates of reliability for the long version (.94) and the short version (.96).

Before completing the GEFI-SF participants were asked to indicate the nature of the incident they had experienced. Responses to this question were scored according to the type of injury (verbal abuse = 1, physical abuse = 2, or bereavement = 3). Participants were asked how deeply they had been hurt by the incident they had in mind (on a five-point scale from 1- No hurt to 5- A great deal of hurt) and to estimate how long ago the incident had happened (on a six-point scale ranging from 1- Less than six months to 6- More than ten years).

Participants were then asked to complete the short form of the Group Enright Forgiveness Inventory (GEFI-SF). The context used was that of the conflict in Northern Ireland, and the verbatim instructions on the questionnaire were:

> In Northern Ireland, most of us identify with one of two groups; Catholics or Protestants. Sometimes in the past, your group has been hurt by the other group, whether through words spoken or actual physical injury. We ask you now to think of that time when the other group hurt your group. For a few moments, visualize what happened. Try to see the member(s) of the other group, and to experience what happened. (McLernon, Smith, Cairns, & Hewstone, 2001)

Each item was rated on a scale from 1 to 6, and negative items were reverse scored. A mean total item score was calculated for the GEFI-SF. Mean item scores were also calculated for the three subscales of the questionnaire, namely affect, behavior, and cognition. All scores carried a possible maximum of 6 and a minimum of 1.

Table 1. Frequencies of Responses on Predictor Variables

Degree of Hurt, Length of Time and Type of Injury		
	N	%
Degree of Hurt		
A little	65	19.2
Some	93	27.4
Much	125	36.6
A great deal	57	16.8
Length of Time		
Less than 6 months	32	9.3
6 months–1 year	34	10.1
1–5 years	164	48.1
5–10 years	72	21.2
More than 10 years	38	11.3
Type of Injury		
Verbal abuse	229	67.4
Physical abuse	68	20.1
Bereavement	43	12.5
N = 340		

Results

Perceived Degree of Hurt

As Table 1 shows, the majority of respondents reported that they had experienced "some" or "much" hurt as a result of the incident they chose to report. Only 16.8% reported experiencing "a great deal" of hurt.

Length of Time (Since the Incident)

Respondents were asked to state the length of time that had elapsed since the incident they reported had taken place (see Table 1). Categories 1–2 years and 2–5 years were collapsed to create the category 1–5 years. This was the modal response (48.1%), although as Table 1 shows, there were a wide range of responses.

Type of Injury

Table 1 contains, also, details of the type of injury the participants chose to report. This shows the majority of incidents involved verbal abuse (67.4%), with only 20.1% involving physical injury and 12.5% bereavement.

Forgiveness: Scores on the GEFI-SF

The total forgiveness scores on the GEFI-SF for the sample ranged from individual means of 1.09 to 5.64, with an overall mean of 2.87 ($SD = 1.09$). Mean

scores on the subscales ranged from 1.00 to 5.88 for the affect subscale ($M = 2.56$, $SD = 1.20$); 1.00 to 6.00 for the behavior subscale ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 1.15$) and 1.00 to 6.00 for the cognition subscale ($M = 2.74$, $SD = 1.19$).

Alpha for the total scale was .95, and for the affect, behavior, and cognition components of the questionnaire Alphas were .91, .81, and .89 respectively.

Scores on affect, behavior, and cognition subscales correlated highly (.91, .90, and .92 respectively) with the total forgiveness score, and between .73 and .78 with each other.

Multiple regression analysis was carried out on the data to indicate the degree to which the three variables predicted forgiveness (degree of hurt, length of time and type of injury) and how much of the variance in the forgiveness scores could be attributed to each of the predictors.

Multicollinearity

Correlations between the predictor variables were low (.03, .07, .17), indicating that multicollinearity was unlikely to influence the analysis. Furthermore, collinearity tests produced tolerance statistics of .97, .97, and .99 for degree of hurt, length of time, and type of injury respectively, indicating a high degree of freedom from collinearity.

The Total Forgiveness Score

The model summary within the regression analysis shows that 10.6% of the variance in the total forgiveness scores was predicted by the model which included the three predictor variables.

The Forgiveness Subscales: Affect, Behavior, and Cognition

Looking at the individual correlations between each of the three predictor variables and the three components of affect, behavior, and cognition, the strongest correlation was between degree of hurt and the cognition component ($r = -2.0$; $p = .000$).

Degree of hurt also showed a significant correlation with the behavior component of the questionnaire ($r = -.24$; $p = .000$). No significant correlations were observed between the behavior component and type of injury or length of time ($r = -.09$ and .05 respectively).

The affect component of the questionnaire showed a significant correlation with degree of hurt ($r = -.30$; $p = .000$), although the correlations between the affect component and type of injury or length of time were not significant ($r = -.02$ and .01 respectively).

Examination of the beta coefficients in the analysis shows that the predictor variable which had most impact on the total forgiveness score was degree of hurt

($\beta = -.32$; $p = .000$), with length of time and type of injury showing beta values of .018 and $-.061$ respectively.

Separate Regressions for the Three Components

The data were divided into the three components of affect, behavior, and cognition and each was regressed on the three predictors. When the model was applied to the cognition component of the measure, the model summary indicated that 10.9% of the variance in the total forgiveness scores was predicted by the model which included the three predictor variables.

The predictor with greatest impact on the cognitive component of forgiveness was degree of hurt ($\beta = -.298$; $p = .000$). Type of injury and length of time were non-significant with beta values of $-.048$ and $-.030$ respectively. The affect component, for which 12.8% of the variance was predicted by the three predictor variables, was shown, also, to be most influenced by degree of hurt ($\beta = -.311$; $p = .000$). Length of time and type of injury were non-significant with beta values of $-.062$ and $-.024$ respectively.

Finally, 5.5% of the variance in the behavior component of the measure was accounted for by the three predictor variables. The predictor variable which had most influence on the behavior component of forgiveness was degree of hurt ($\beta = -.221$; $p = .000$). Length of time and type of injury were non-significant with beta values of $-.121$ and $-.102$ respectively.

Discussion

The study was carried out in a society that is publicly debating intergroup forgiveness and moving (albeit slowly) towards intergroup reconciliation. The participants in the present study are the first generation to grow up in a Northern Ireland that is dominated by talk of peace rather than by talk of violence. Given the new political climate in Northern Ireland, after the Belfast Agreement, it is possible that the new political atmosphere may have increased levels of intergroup forgiveness among younger people such as those in this sample. Younger participants may be more open to forgiveness because they may be less likely to have been hurt deeply by a sectarian incident. This explanation seems unlikely, however, given the low scores on the measure of forgiveness used in this research (GEFI-SF mean score less than 3 on a 6 point scale).

The most consistent predictor of forgiveness appears to be the perceived degree of hurt inflicted by the injury, although not necessarily the type of injury. Degree of hurt showed the strongest influence on all three components of forgiveness, with participants who reported high levels of hurt less likely to forgive than those who felt that they had suffered less severely. It is interesting to note that although

degree of hurt and type of injury were positively correlated, the correlation was weak ($r = .22$). This suggests that the individual's perception of hurt may not correspond with the actual severity of the attack, assuming that physical injury or bereavement is likely to be classified as more severe than verbal insult.

It is also interesting to note that length of time was significantly correlated only with the affect component of forgiveness, with participants who suffered more recent incidents less likely to experience emotional forgiveness of the perpetrator. This effect was not observed for behavior or cognition, which suggests that the negative emotional response was more tenacious than behavioral or cognitive negativity after an upsetting event.

To date, the GEFI-SF has produced relatively low mean forgiveness scores with three different Northern Irish samples, two student samples ($M = 2.67$ and 2.80; reported by McLernon et al., 2001), and the present study. When these scores are compared with the equivalent total score reported by Subkoviak et al. (1995), who used the 60-item EFI to measure interpersonal forgiveness, it can be seen that the scores in the Northern Irish studies are considerably lower. Multiplying the mean item score of 2.81, obtained from the current study, by 60 produces a total item score of 168, which is much lower than the total item score of 256 reported by Subkoviak et al. A number of explanations for this difference might be suggested. First, it could be argued that the 60-item inventory may measure forgiveness in a different way than the shortened version, although the strong psychometric agreement between the long and the short versions of the measure would suggest that this is not the case. Second, Subkoviak et al.'s sample was drawn from the midwestern United States, where differences may exist in attitudes to forgiveness, compared with Northern Ireland. A third, and perhaps more likely explanation, is that intergroup forgiveness is more difficult than individual forgiveness, and the consistently low forgiveness scores obtained by the GEFI-SF appear to reflect this difficulty. This does not bode well for the future of intergroup forgiveness in Northern Ireland.

Of course, such speculations must await further research. Fortunately, such research can now be approached with some confidence because of the development of the GEFI-SF, which the present study indicates is a reliable instrument both when used with adolescents and young adults. Further, the present study can be thought of as validating the GEFI in that, as expected, factors such as degree of hurt and type of injury sustained were related to level of intergroup forgiveness. Finally, the results of the present study provide an insight into the more subtle and ongoing impact of the political violence in Northern Ireland, with 340 out of the original 364 participants (88%) indicating that they had suffered some degree of verbal or physical abuse from the outgroup. Given the fact that the political violence officially ended with the Belfast Agreement in 1998, it is illuminating that over half of the participants reported an incident that had taken place within the last two years, and some as recently as six months ago. At the same time, it

is important to note that for the majority of people, verbal abuse was the most common incident. This does not indicate extreme suffering, but does indicate the impact that the political conflict has, and continues to have, on the daily lives of the people in Northern Ireland.

A further indication arising from this study, is that despite the Belfast Agreement, conflict in Northern Irish society still exists, albeit a less violent conflict. This may be particularly true given the fact that our sample was drawn exclusively from the Catholic community, who according to Hewstone et al. (in press), have greater direct and indirect experience of the violence than the Protestant community. This, of course, makes forgiveness difficult because forgiveness is almost certainly linked to other variables such as the expression and acceptance of remorse, which is in turn regarded as an important indicator of the probability that the transgression may be repeated or not (Gold & Weiner, 2000). The rival communities in Northern Ireland may have entered into a process of conflict resolution, but the present research suggests that this has so far not healed all wounds.

Conclusion

The study presented here provides an illustration of how slow any progress toward reconciliation between the two groups in Northern Ireland is likely to be. Out of an original sample of 364 participants, a total of 340 participants aged 25 and under had been hurt in some way as a result of violence in Northern Ireland, and these participants showed a general reluctance to forgive. Generally, the actual severity of the injury inflicted was not a predictor of forgiveness. Instead, it is the individual's perception of the severity of the injury, which is the major factor. This suggests the need for investigation of the relationship between forgiveness and individual factors such as personality, attributions, and just world beliefs which may lead some individuals more than others to perceive an injury as severe. The present conceptual framework relating to forgiveness focuses on the three forgiveness components of affect, behavior, and cognition and relates these to the predictors of degree of hurt, length of time since the injury, and type of injury. In doing so, it overlooks other variables such as personality, attributions, social identity, and just world beliefs—any of which may also significantly affect individuals' propensity to forgive. Given the fact that any society is made up of individuals who think and act on the basis of their beliefs and affiliations, future research should investigate these variables.

References

Azar, F., Mullet, E., & Vinconneau, G. (1999). The propensity to forgive: Findings from Lebanon. *Journal for Peace Research, 36*(2), 169–181.

Brooks, C. (2003). *Rumination as a mediator of forgiveness and depression: Differences based on gender and state-trait levels of analysis*. Retrieved June 24, 2004, from http://www.forgiving.org/campaign/press/genderdifferences_carolbrooks.asp

Brown, R., & Turner, J. C. (1981). Individual-level evidence for the causes and consequences of social capital. *American Journal of Political Science, 41*, 999–1023.

Cairns, E., & Darby, J. (1998). The conflict in Northern Ireland: Causes, consequences and controls. *American Psychologist, 53*(7), 754–760.

Cairns, E., Hewstone, M., McLernon, F., & Lewis, C. A. (2002). *Correlates of inter-group forgiveness in Northern Ireland*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Ulster, Coleraine, Northern Ireland.

Clinton, W. (1998, September 3). *President Clinton's keynote address at the Waterfront Hall*. Belfast, Northern Ireland. Retrieved June 24, 2004, from http://cain.ulst.ac.uk/events/peace/docs/bc3998.htm

Couper, D. (1998). Forgiveness in the community: Views from an Episcopal priest and former chief of police. In R. D. Enright & J. North (Eds.), *Exploring Forgiveness* (pp. 139–161). Madisr, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Duff, A., Marshall, S., Dobash, R. A., & Dobash, R. P. (1994). *Penal theory and practice: Tradition and innovation in criminal justice*. New York: Manchester Press.

Enright, R. D., & Coyle, C. T. (1994). Researching the process model of forgiveness with psychological interventions. In E. L. Worthington (Ed.), *Dimensions of forgiveness*. (pp. 139–162). Philadelphia, PA: Templeton Foundation Press.

Enright, R., & The Human Development Study Group. (1991). The moral development of forgiveness. In W. Kurtines & J. Gerwitz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development* (Vol. 1, pp. 123–151). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Enright, R. D., Santos, M. J., & Al-Mabuk, R. (1989). The adolescent as forgiver. *Journal of Adolescence, 12*, 95–110.

Faith and Politics Group. (1997). *New Pathways: Developing a peace process in Northern Ireland*. Belfast, Northern Ireland: Community Relations Council.

Fitzgibbons, R. P. (1986). The cognitive and emotional uses of forgiveness in the treatment of anger. *Psychotherapy, 23*, 629–633.

Girard, M., & Mullet, E. (1997). Forgiveness in adolescents, young, middle-aged and older adults. *Journal of Adult Development, 4*(4), 209–220.

Gold, G. J., & Weiner, B. (2000). Remorse, confession, group identity, and expectancies about repeating a transgression. *Basic and Applied Psychology, 22*(4), 291–300.

Gorsuch, R. L., & Hao, J. Y. (1993). Forgiveness: An exploratory factor analysis and its relationships to religious variables. *Review of Religious Research, 34*, 333–347.

Graef, R. (2001). *Why restorative justice? Repairing the harm caused by crime*. London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.

Hebl, J. H., & Enright, R. D. (1993). Forgiveness as a psychotherapeutic goal with elderly females. *Psychotherapy, 30*(4) 658–667.

Hewstone, M., & Cairns, E. (2001). Social psychology and inter-group conflict. In D. Chirot & M. E. P. Seligman (Eds.), *Ethno-political warfare: Causes and consequences, and possible solutions* (pp. 319–342). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., Voci, A., McLernon, F., Niens, U., & Noor, M. (in press). Inter-group forgiveness and guilt in Northern Ireland: Social psychological dimensions of "The Troubles." In N. R. Branscombe & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Collective guilt: International Perspectives*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Inter-group bias. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 575–604.

Holmgren, M. R. (1993). Forgiveness and the intrinsic value of persons. *American Philosophical Quarterly, 30*, 341–352.

Ignatieff, M. (1998). *The warrior's honour: Ethnic war and the modern conscience*. London: Chatto & Windus.

Kennedy, E. (1998). Northern Ireland—*A view from America*. Tip O'Neill Memorial lecture, University of Ulster at Magee, INCORE. Guildhall, Londonderry, Northern Ireland.

Lessem, S. (2002). Religious orientation and forgiveness in Northern Ireland. Unpublished manuscript, University of Ulster, Coleraine, Northern Ireland.

McCullough, M. E., Pargament, K. I., & Thoresen, C. E. (2000). The psychology of forgiveness: History, conceptual issues and overview. In M. E. McCullough, K. I. Pargament, & C. E. Thoresen (Eds.), *Forgiveness: Theory, research and practice*. New York: Guildford Press.

McCullough, M. E., Rachal, K. C., Sandage, S. J., Worthington, E. L., Wade Brown, S., & Hight, T. L. (1998). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships: II. Theoretical elaboration and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*, 1586–1603.

McCullough, M. E., & Worthington, E. L. (1999). Religion and the forgiving personality. *Journal of Personality, 67*, 1141–1164.

McCullough, M. E., Worthington, E. L., & Rachal, K. C. (1997). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 321–336.

McGoldrick, M. (1999). After the death of his son, shot dead by Ulster Volunteer Force near Lurgan, County Antrim, 8th July 1996. In D. McKittrick, S. Kelters, B. Feeney, & C. Thornton (Eds.), *Lost lives: The stories of the men, women and children who died as a result of the Northern Ireland Troubles* (p. 1395). Edinburgh, Scotland: Mainstream Publishing Company Ltd.

McLernon, F., Smith, R., Cairns, E., & Hewstone, M. (2001). *Measuring inter-group forgiveness in Northern Ireland*. Unpublished manuscript, University of Ulster Coleraine, Northern Ireland.

Mullet, E., Barros, J., Frongia, L., Usai, V., Neto, F., & Shafighi, S. R. (2003). Religious involvement and the forgiving personality. *Journal of Personality, 71*(1), 1–19.

Mullet, E., Houdbine, A., Laumonier, S., & Girard, M. (1998). "Forgivingness": Factor structure in a sample of young, middle-aged and elderly adults. *European Psychologist, 3*(4) 1–9.

Park, Y. O., & Enright, R. D. (1997). The development of forgiveness in the context of adolescent friendship conflict in Korea. *Journal of Adolescence, 20*, 393–402.

Poloma, M. M., & Gallup, G. H. (1991). *Varieties of prayer*. Philadelphia, PA: Trinity Press International.

Shriver, D. W., Jr. (1998). Is there forgiveness in politics? Germany, Vietnam and America. In R. D. Enright & J. North (Eds.), *Exploring Forgiveness* (pp. 131–149). Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin Press.

Smedes, L. B. (1984). *Forgive and forget: Healing the hurts we don't deserve*. New York: Harper and Row.

Subkoviak, M. J., Enright, R. D., Wu, C. R., Gassin, E. A., Freedman, S., Olson, L. M., et al. (1995). Measuring interpersonal forgiveness in late adolescence and middle adulthood. *Journal of Adolescence, 18*, 641–655.

Tajfel, H. (Ed.). (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies in the social psychology of group relations*. London: Academic Press.

Wilson, G. (1999) After the death of his daughter, killed by an Irish Republican Army bomb during Remembrance Day Ceremony, enniskillen, County Fermanagh, 8th November 1987. In D. McKittrick, S. Kelters, B. Feeney, & C. Thornton (Eds.), *Lost lives: The stories of the men, women and children who died as a result of the Northern Ireland Troubles* (p.1097). Edinburgh, Scotland: Mainstream Publishing Company, Ltd.

FRANCES MCLERNON, Ph.D., is a lecturer in Social and Clinical Psychology at the University of Ulster in Northern Ireland. Her PhD research was based on Northern Irish children's attitudes to war and peace before and after the paramilitary cease-fires, and was published in the *International Journal of Behavioral Development* in 1997. Her more recent work, carried out in the Centre for the Study of Conflict, at University of Ulster, Coleraine, involved a three-year research project investigating the role of intergroup contact in the processes of forgiveness and reconciliation in Northern Ireland.

ED CAIRNS (PhD in Psychology, Queen's University Belfast, Northern Ireland, 1974) is a Professor of Psychology in the School of Psychology at the University of Ulster in Coleraine, Northern Ireland. He is a fellow of the British Psychological Society and is also Past President of the Division of Peace Psychology (Div. 48) of the American Psychological Association. He has written some eighty books, chapters in books and articles in this area. His most recent books are *Children and Political Violence* (Blackwell, 1995) and *The Role of Memory in Ethnic Conflict* (Palgrave, 2003, with Micheal Roe).

MILES HEWSTONE is Professor of Social Psychology at Oxford University. He has published widely on the topic of attribution theory, social cognition, stereotyping, and intergroup relations. His current research focuses on the reduction of intergroup conflict. He is co-founding editor of the *European Review of Social Psychology*, and a former editor of the *British Journal of Social Psychology*.

RON SMITH is currently based at the School of Doctoral Studies, University of London, having been previously involved in educational research at the University of Ulster.

Appendix One

Forgiveness Questionnaire[1]

PLEASE NOTE THAT PARTICIPATION IN THIS SURVEY IS ENTIRELY VOLUNTARY AND ANY INFORMATION GIVEN IS STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL.

In Northern Ireland, most of us identify with one of two groups: Catholics or Protestants. Sometimes in the past your group has been hurt by members of the other group whether through words spoken or actual injury. We ask you now to think of that time when the other group hurt your group. For a few moments, visualise what happened. Try to see the member(s) of the other group, and to experience what happened.

How deeply were you hurt when the incident occurred? (Circle One)

No hurt   A little hurt   Some hurt   Much hurt   A great deal of hurt

---

[1] We are grateful to Professor Enright for supplying us with a copy of his original instrument.

How long ago did this hurtful event happen?

      _____ days ago   _____ months ago
      _____ weeks ago   _____ years ago

Please briefly describe what happened when this hurtful event occurred.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Now, please answer a series of questions about your current attitude toward the member(s) of the group who caused the hurt. We do not want your rating of past attitudes, but your ratings of how you feel right now. All responses are confidential, so please answer honestly.   Thank you.

The next set of items deals with your current feelings or emotions toward the member(s) of the other group who were responsible for the hurt you experienced.
Please fit each item into the statement:

"I feel _____ towards him/her/them."

Then circle the number which best describes your current feeling about the statement. Please do not skip any items. Thanks. (Please turn over.)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Kindness	1	2	3	4	5	6
2. Hostile	1	2	3	4	5	6
3. Resentful	1	2	3	4	5	6
4. Goodwill	1	2	3	4	5	6
5. Caring	1	2	3	4	5	6
6. Bitter	1	2	3	4	5	6
7. Friendly	1	2	3	4	5	6
8. Disgust	1	2	3	4	5	6

The next set of items deals with your current behaviour toward the member(s) of the group responsible for your hurt. Consider how you would act toward this person or persons.
Please fit each item into the statement:

"Regarding this person or persons I do or would _____ him/her/them."
Then circle the number which best describes your current feeling about the statement.
Please do not skip any items. Thanks.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
9. Avoid	1	2	3	4	5	6
10. Help	1	2	3	4	5	6
11. Reach out to	1	2	3	4	5	6
12. Injure	1	2	3	4	5	6
13. Be on good terms with	1	2	3	4	5	6
14. Punish	1	2	3	4	5	6

This set of items deals with how you currently think about the member or members of the group who hurt you. Think about the kinds of thoughts which occupy your mind regarding this person or persons.

Please fit each item into the statement:

"Regarding the person(s) I think he/she/they are _____ ."

Then circle the number which best describes your current feeling about the statement.

Please do not skip any items. Thanks.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
15. Evil	1	2	3	4	5	6
16. Worthless	1	2	3	4	5	6
17. Misunderstood	1	2	3	4	5	6
18. Worthy of respect	1	2	3	4	5	6

"Regarding this person, I _____ him/her/them." (Circle the number)

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Slightly Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
19. Wish well to	1	2	3	4	5	6
20. Disapprove of	1	2	3	4	5	6
21. Think favourably of	1	2	3	4	5	6
22. Condemn	1	2	3	4	5	6

We have one final question:

To what extent have you forgiven the person(s) you have described? (Circle one)

Not at all   Trying to forgive   Complete forgiveness

Thank you for completing this Attitude Survey. Please also tell us:

Your age: _____   Your sex: Male/Female
Your religious or cultural background: Catholic/Protestant/Other

Thank you.

The Northern Ireland Office is responsible for overseeing the Northern Ireland devolution settlement. It also represents Northern Ireland interests at UK Government level and UK Government interests in Northern Ireland. Find out more about the devolution settlement in Northern Ireland, including what powers are transferred, reserved or excepted. Northern Ireland Assembly. The Northern Ireland Assembly was established as part of the Belfast Agreement (also known as the Good Friday Agreement) in 1998. Devolution to Northern Ireland was suspended in October 2002 and restored on 8 May 2007. The As Northern Ireland ministers are chosen from the Northern Ireland Assembly in proportion to party strengths using the d'Hondt formula. The Executive is headed by a First Minister and a deputy First Minister, who have equal status and must act jointly. Understanding what has been devolved. The Northern Ireland devolution settlement gives legislative control over certain matters (known as 'transferred matters') to the Assembly. In the main these are in the economic and social field. The Assembly may also in principle legislate in respect of 'reserved' category matters subject to various consents, This study examined intergroup forgiveness among 340 young adults in Northern Ireland. A short form of the Enright Forgiveness Inventory explored possible influences on propensity to forgive. Similar to research in interpersonal forgiveness (e.g., Enright & The Human Development Study Group, 1991;McCullough, Worthington, & Rachal, 1997), intergroup forgiveness implies that groups who feel victimized (hurt, violated, or terrorized) by another group overcome their hatred, overcome their desires for revenge or punishment, and are open to reengage with the other group constructively towards a peaceful future (McLernon, Cairns, Hewstone, & Smith, 2004).

Northern Ireland ministers are chosen from the Northern Ireland Assembly in proportion to party strengths using the d'Hondt formula. The Executive is headed by a First Minister and a deputy First Minister, who have equal status and must act jointly. Understanding what has been devolved. The Northern Ireland devolution settlement gives legislative control over certain matters (known as 'transferred matters') to the Assembly. In the main these are in the economic and social field. The Assembly may also in principle legislate in respect of 'reserved' category matters subject to various consents, but has not yet done so to any significant degree. Postconflict Reconciliation: Intergroup Forgiveness and Implicit Biases in Northern Ireland - Free download as PDF File (.pdf), Text File (.txt) or read online for free. Postconflict Reconciliation: Intergroup Forgiveness and Implicit Biases in Northern Ireland. We then examined intergroup forgiveness in a sample of Northern Irish students, and its relationship to empathy and a range of intergroup emotions both positive and negative (Tam et al., 2007). We also assessed the links between intergroup forgiveness and infrahumanization, which involves seeing out-group members as less human than in-group members. Cairns, Ed ; McLernon, Frances ; Hewstone, M ; Smith, R. / The development of intergroup forgiveness in Northern Ireland. In: Journal of Social Issues. 2004 ; Vol. 60, No. 3. pp. 587-602. @article{d55d3821e35f4315bae12ac351b5c761, title = "The development of intergroup forgiveness in Northern Ireland", author = "Ed Cairns and Frances McLernon and M Hewstone and R Smith", year = "2004" To understand the role of intergroup forgiveness as a mechanism of bringing peace to communities that have experienced violence is an important area of study. Recently an entire issue of the journal Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology (Wagner, 2007) was devoted to this topic. Hence, his attempt in Northern Ireland was to provide evidence of effective forgiveness education that could be used widely with victims of violence who were impeding progress toward peace. Luskin's model has been easily adapted and transferred to new individuals and new situations due in large part to the accessibility of his training to the lay. This chapter explores the concept of intergroup forgiveness. Though still novel to the field of social psychology, its potent promise to facilitate conflicting groups to transform from mutual enmity... The development of children's attitudes towards 'the troubles' in Northern Ireland. In O. Hargie & D. Dickinson (Eds.), Researching the troubles: Social science perspectives on the Northern Ireland conflict (pp. 37-57). Edinburgh, Scotland: Mainstream Publishing.Google Scholar. Cronin, T. J., Levin, S., Branscombe, N. R., van Laar, C., & Tropp, L. R. (2012).