12-2014

Building reconciliation in Bosnia and Herzegovina : the effects of ingroup identification, outgroup trust, and intergroup forgiveness on intergroup contact quantity.

Branka Damjanovic
University of Louisville

Building Reconciliation in Bosnia and Herzegovina:

The Effects of Ingroup Identification, Outgroup Trust, and Intergroup Forgiveness

on Intergroup Contact Quantity

By

Branka Damjanovic

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for Graduation *summa cum laude*

and

for Graduation with Honors from the Department of Sociology

University of Louisville

December, 2014

Abstract

After the violent breakup of Yugoslavia, it was necessary to find a way for Bosnia and Herzegovina's three main ethnic groups to live together again. The Dayton Peace Agreement was thought to be the answer. Signed in 1995, it provided a new framework for the country, establishing the Republika Srpska for the Serbs, the Brcko District as an autonomous region, and the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina, which was further divided into cantons between the Bosnian Croats and the Bosniaks.

With such a political structure, it was of interest to survey the quantity of intergroup contact between the groups today, inspired by Allport's Contact Hypothesis. Group divisions propelled the conflict in the 1990s and now, nearly twenty years after the signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement, it is vital to understand where the country stands in regards to the peace it had attempted to establish. Previous empirical research pointed to the importance of ingroup identification, outgroup trust and intergroup forgiveness as variables that would affect quantity of contact. Specifically, it was predicted that negative correlations will exist between ingroup identification and trust, forgiveness and contact but positive correlations will exist between trust, forgiveness and contact.

Community background and age were tested for a moderating effect on the relationship between the variables. Surveys were distributed and the results indicated that ingroup identification was indeed negatively correlated but only with contact quantity. Positive correlations did exist between trust, forgiveness and contact, as predicted. For the moderated regression model, it was found that community background, ingroup identification and outgroup trust were all significant but forgiveness was not. Implications are discussed and further research, particularly on the role of forgiveness, is needed.

Building Reconciliation in Bosnia and Herzegovina: The Effects of Ingroup Identification,

Outgroup Trust, and Intergroup Forgiveness on Intergroup Contact Quantity

Bosnia and Herzegovina is a young country still in the process of rebuilding itself after a period of violent conflict. Politically, it has transitioned from a republic in Tito's communist Yugoslavia to an internationally recognized, democratic state. During this transitional period, the country found itself deeply entrenched in war from 1992-95, which was often presented to the international community as the culmination of "ancient ethnic and religious hatreds" in the region (Love, 2011). The depiction established by the media between ethnicity and religion during and after the war made the terms appear to be interchangeable and that religious affiliation was the key distinguishing factor between the ethnic groups. While the depiction is partially correct, it is also problematic as it may lead people to conclude that it was mainly a religiously-motivated conflict when ethnicity is a complex construct with the potential to motivate diverse groups to conflict. Thus, the current study seeks to better understand the present-day intergroup relations in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Conflicts between groups, particularly in new states, were very common throughout the 20th century. Some of these conflicts were labeled as "ethnic conflicts" with little to no further elaboration on what the "ethnic conflict" label signifies from a sociological perspective. Brubaker (2002) suggests that "ethnic conflict" is more accurately described as "ethnicized or ethnically framed conflict" and contends that it should not be viewed "as conflict *between ethnic groups*." While the participants may be members of a particular ethnicity, he argues that groups are evoked by ethnopolitical entrepreneurs and exist for the purpose of achieving certain actions. The construction and purpose of these groups is the building and maintenance of boundaries (Wilmer, 1997).

Brubaker (2002) proposes for groups participating in ethnically framed conflict to be studied by the processes of their reification (political, social, cultural and psychological construction) rather than as de facto entities. Therefore, this study examined the psychosocial processes affecting social behavior. According to Brubaker, the groups themselves need to be regarded not as stable categories but as fluid ones that are redefined through interactions with other groups as well as social pressures. Furthermore, the process of establishing group solidarity and cohesion amid such variable circumstances is vitally important to understanding the group as well because only once a high level of groupness has been established can those groups be mobilized. This usually requires the manipulation of categories as a foundation for group formation. The features of social categories are that there are rules for membership and there are characteristics which are expected of its members but categories are equally unstable and fluid (Fearon & Laitin, 2000).

In fact, it is violence that helps increase levels of groupness, meaning groupness is a result of conflict rather than its cause. The groups themselves are not the propagators of conflict; organizations, which may be viewed as acting on behalf of a group, are the true protagonists (Brubaker, 2002). In the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina, the organizations were the political parties in power that branded themselves by their ethnic identity (Fearon & Laitin, 2000). Based on this research group's evaluations, they suggest that the elite leaders of groups use ethnicity to invoke groupness most often when political disagreements occur within the same ethnic group but between extremists and moderates. Violence is then used as a strategy to garner more support for extremists, with a well-known example being former President Milosevic on behalf of the Serbs. Additionally, some academics contend that the social construction of an ethnic

identity may not be as important as a socially constructed belief that violent events are ethnically motivated (Fearon & Laitin).

Brubaker (2002) suggests that the violence in the former Yugoslavia "may have as much or more to do with thuggery, warlordship, opportunistic looting and black-market profiteering than with ethnicity." This implies the idea of Weber's status groups (Barnes, 1992), where a group uses an easily identifiable characteristic of another group – such as language or religion – as a pretext for their exclusion in order to profit from the redistribution of those goods and opportunities the other(s) are now excluded from accessing. The status group itself must have its own way of life that is different from the other group but common among its own group members. Weber also stressed that status groups place restrictions on interactions with members of other groups. This study seeks to observe if the groups in Bosnia and Herzegovina are still behaving as status groups, using religion as the characteristic emphasized for exclusion and discouraging its members from interacting with the other groups.

Weber (1947/1961) stresses that an ethnic group does not constitute a community, which is characterized by communal action; rather, it merely facilitates other types of communal relationships. This is key to understanding how religion has functioned in these conflicts. An important interpretation of Weber that Stone (1995) notes is that belonging to a particular ethnicity is a resource that may be utilized by a political community in order to facilitate the creation of a group identity on the basis of ethnicity. Calhoun (1993) cites the example of the former Yugoslavia and the policy of ethnic cleansing as an example of ethnic identity shaping political action. He maintains that the creation of nationalism from ethnicity merely requires the addition of a historical narrative to existing traditions, which are then utilized by the political community for mobilization.

Brubaker (2002) also points out the cognitive dimension of ethnicity in that it exists as a perspective, specifically in that it comes with a frame of reference that includes specific narratives and implicit categorizations. For this reason, it is important to study how events are framed because that will influence how they will become part of the group narrative and how future events should be interpreted, usually increasing the level of groupness. Here it is important to note that, due to its nature, a high level of groupness does not sustain itself but tends to decline in a process of what Weber (1994) called "routinization" where everyday interests become the priority once again. Arguably, this study seeks to measure the level of groupness based on a particularly salient category that was used to develop groupness during the Bosnian conflict: religion. Continuing to emphasize one's religious community would be indicative of ongoing collective action to maintain group boundaries to some extent. Thus, the current study seeks to better understand present-day ingroup identification and intergroup contact in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The consideration of the political use of religion rather than religion itself as the cause of the war has been urged by Love (2011) in her analysis of the situation in former Yugoslavia. She argues that the political leaders sought to recreate their images as nationalists in order to advance their political careers and religion was incorporated into this new image in order to appeal to and subsequently mobilize their group. She explains that religious identity is often used to spread a conflict because it is easier to target than the underlying economic or political factors which are the true cause(s) of unrest and wholly non-religious. The use of religious affiliation as the marker of group identity can also be found in Northern Ireland, where groups were distinguished based on religion, yet the causes of the conflict were not in theology but in

the underlying political motivations that accompanied the interests of each group (Tam et al.,

2008).

Ingroup Identification

The situation in Bosnia and Herzegovina has many commonalities with the conflict in

Northern Ireland. While primordialist perspectives suggest that groups are in conflict due to

cultural differences assumed to be fixed and vital to the group's identity, McGarry and O'Leary

(1995) found little support for this idea. Rather, their study found that people in Northern Ireland

believe that the cause of violence is found in political sources more so than in religious

differences. Once again, while religion may be the characteristic used to differentiate groups, it

is necessary to understand through empirical research that these conflicts may not be about

religion or religious differences but about the groups interacting with each other.

Ingroup identification was structured into Bosnia and Herzegovina's post-war society

with the writings of the Dayton Peace Agreement (1995), also referred to as The General

Framework Agreement for Peace in Bosnia and Herzegovina. The main political leaders of the

country were invited to Dayton, Ohio to negotiate on the territory that would form the sovereign

Bosnia and Herzegovina. The result is a government where the ethnic divides are recognized

and subsequently institutionalized, as outlined in the Constitution with the statement "Bosniacs,

Croats, and Serbs as constituent peoples (along with Others)." (Dayton Peace Agreement, 1995)

The country was divided into two entities, a Serb Republic (Republika Srpska) and the

Federation, as well as an independent Brcko District. Each entity essentially has its own

government, controls its own taxation policies, determines its own education standards and has

the political power to engage in foreign affairs on its own accord (McMahon, & Western, 2009).

Politically, the citizens are encouraged to maintain their group identity rather than to move past

wartime divisions and view themselves as sharing a common ingroup identity with their

neighbors, such as the Bosnians and Herzegovians. These tendencies have been found to be

obstructive to reconciliation efforts in other post-conflict societies such as Chile and Northern

Ireland (Noor, Brown, Gonzalez, Manzi, & Lewis, 2008) and it may be creating an additional

obstacle for society in Bosnia and Herzegovina as well because it does not aid in the

improvement of intergroup relations in terms of contact between the groups.

Intergroup Contact Quantity

Intergroup contact is often a successful method by which intergroup relations may be

improved. The Contact Hypothesis proposed by Allport (1954) states that relations between

groups improve if group members engage in contact where members are perceived as having

equal status, common goals, intergroup cooperation, and the support of authorities or customs.

Allport theorized that when these criterion were met, it would result in better relationships

between the groups. Pettigrew (1998) expanded upon Allport's findings and added that the

contact must have "friendship potential." He argues that this would improve certain effects, such

as learning about the outgroup, behavior modification as a result of contact, the building of

affective emotions through continued contact, and gaining deeper insight into your own ingroup.

Pettigrew stresses that cross-sectional analysis of contact is inadequate; time is an essential factor

and while repeated contact is preferable, the quality of the contact is highly important in

determining the success of the experience.

A similar finding was presented by Cehajic, Brown and Castano (2008), who conducted

research in Sarajevo that utilized a sample of university students. They concluded that

intergroup contact needed to be of good quality in order to have a positive effect but it must also

be frequent. Contact quantity was also stressed in other intergroup studies, such as one in Britain

by Brown, Eller, Leeds and Stace (2007) that found that, by itself, quality of contact had no significant effects on attitudes towards the outgroup but regular and frequent contact was necessary; quality of contact was insufficient in positively changing attitudes toward an outgroup unless it occurred frequently. The study also echoed Pettigrew's (1998) findings in that the effects of contact were more positive when the contact with one member of the outgroup was successfully generalized to the entire outgroup. Intergroup contact is vital because it has been shown to rebuild trust.

Outgroup Trust

Trust is the psychosocial factor that allows individuals to interact with one another without any perception of imminent threat but an expectation of cooperation without exploitation (Tam, Hewstone, Kenworthy, & Cairns, 2009). Their study found that a higher frequency of contact with an outgroup was correlated with higher trust of that group. By its nature, trust is necessary for reconciliation because it allows for positive intergroup relations.

Furthermore, it has been reported that lasting peace requires the establishment of social trust and actions that foster reconciliation (Hoogenboom, & Vieille, 2009). Social trust is defined as the expectations that others will not cause us deliberate harm and will even consider our best interests (Delhey & Newton, 2005). Overall, it has been found that Bosnia and Herzegovina has the least amount of inter-personal trust in Europe (Whitt, 2010) with a decline of almost 15% from a survey period of 1996-98 to 1999-01. This suggests that even in the absence of physical conflict, the citizens are having difficulty rebuilding trust. Whitt's research also indicates that personal experiences during the war did not have any effect on undermining inter-ethnic trust. Of the study participants, 91.7% believed that you should exercise caution in interactions, a belief that did not have any attachment to specific ethnic labels. The data showed

that in every ethnic group, ingroup trust was higher than outgroup trust. Any significant differentiations were not attributed to a particular ethnic group but rather to the individual's location and corresponding population homogeneity. For example, Serbs living outside the homogenous Republika Srpska were found to have higher levels of outgroup trust than Serbs living within the Republika Srpska, and the same was found among Croats living in Siroki Brijeg as compared to Croats living elsewhere. A possible explanation for this finding is that people learn to internalize the norms found within their particular community, meaning people living in homogeneous surroundings maintain their distance (Kunovich, & Hodson, 2002).

Intergroup Forgiveness

The particular effect of outgroup trust the current study is concerned with is its relationship to intergroup forgiveness. Previous studies have shown that higher trust of an outgroup is positively associated with forgiveness, which is a psychosocial factor in sustainable reconciliation efforts because the goal of forgiveness is the restoration of relationships (Cehajic, Brown, & Castano, 2008). The expectation that reconciliation will naturally occur in the absence of violence has been reported to be incorrect (Myers, Hewstone, & Cairns, 2009). The example of Northern Ireland applies once again, in that Myers and colleagues found that the signing of the Belfast Agreement itself was insufficient in achieving reconciliation because forgiveness was identified as an essential variable for successful reconciliation and the improvement of intergroup relations.

Therefore, the same could not be expected by the signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement (1995) for Bosnia and Herzegovina, particularly with the previously discussed maintaining of ethnic categories. While trust is positively associated with forgiveness, ingroup identification has a negative relationship with forgiveness because it may be viewed as an act of disloyalty

towards the group (Cehajic, Brown, & Castano, 2008); yet, according to the Reconciliation

Orientation Model (Noor, Brown, Gonzalez, Manzi, & Lewis, 2008), intergroup forgiveness is

the key precursor for reconciliation. Studies have found that there is a negative correlation

between the strength of an individual's ingroup identity with intergroup forgiveness. A possible

explanation suggested by Cehajic and colleagues (2008) is that the unwillingness to forgive is

either a way of protecting the group from further injustice or it is opposed because it is

associated with forgetting the past. Indeed, every July 11th in Srebrenica, Bosnia and

Herzegovina marks the anniversary of the genocide of an estimated 8,000 men (Kerry, 2014) and

the slogan is "never forgive, never forget."

The Current Study

        The current study aims to add to the growing body of research on reconciliation in post-

war society after a domestic conflict, specifically in Bosnia and Herzegovina. People are aware

of the need for reconciliation, particularly the youth. In a study conducted in Bosnia and

Herzegovina, young adults reported they were more concerned with building relationships

between groups rather than learning about the factual events from the past (Magill & Hamber,

2011). Relationships naturally require contact but there are a variety of factors that influence

what occurs when groups come together. Through the analysis of survey responses, this study

seeks to better understand the effects of ingroup identification, outgroup trust, and intergroup

forgiveness on intergroup contact quantity. Specifically, the following relationships are

expected: (1) negative correlations will exist between ingroup identification and outgroup trust,

intergroup forgiveness, and intergroup contact, and (2) positive correlations will exist between

outgroup trust, intergroup forgiveness, and intergroup contact.

In addition to these correlations, it is hypothesized that community background will have a moderating effect on the relationship between ingroup identification, outgroup trust, and intergroup forgiveness on intergroup contact quantity because the importance of staying loyal to your group has been reported to reduce contact with the outgroup. Furthermore, due to differences in war experiences between those born immediately preceding and after the conflict, and those who lived through the violent conflict, it is hypothesized that age will also have a significant moderating effect on this relationship.

Methods

Recruitment

The study received approval from the University of Louisville's Institutional Review Board (IRB) prior to subject recruitment. Individuals ranging in age from 14 to 102 with a self-reported community background (based on religion) of either Muslim, Roman Catholic, Orthodox Christian, and Other were recruited through two non-governmental organizations: Association for Transitional Justice in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo, and Snaga Zene (Power of Women), Tuzla, and two schools: Catholic School Center "St. Francis" (an integrated K-12 school), Tuzla and the University of Sarajevo. Table 1 represents the demographic breakdown by community background of the final sample size of $N = 455$.

Data Collection Procedure

An IRB-approved Preamble (Appendix A) signed by the principal investigators was distributed to each person prior to survey completion. The Preamble explained the study was about cross-community involvement in Bosnia and Herzegovina and that participation was completely voluntary and confidential. Upon individual agreement to participate, respondents were provided with a copy of the survey completion instructions (Appendix B) and the survey

(Appendix C). Surveys were completed in a private setting. Survey completion lasted approximately 20 minutes. Research personnel collected the completed survey and provided a short debriefing to each respondent. Although respondents were thanked for their participation, they were not compensated.

Measures

The measures selected for the survey instrument consisted of the following predictor and criterion variables.

Predictor variables. *Ingroup identification* was measured using the 5-item group identification scale (adapted from Brown, Condor, Mathews, Wade, & Williams, 1986; Myers et al., 2009). Instructions preceding the statements were, "Thinking about the religious community that you belong to, please answer the following questions." Respondents were asked to rate themselves on a 5-point Likert-type scale as an individual who: (1) "considers your community important", (2) "identifies with your community", (3) "feels strong ties with your community", (4) "is glad to belong to your community", and (5) "sees yourself as belonging to your community." Scores were averaged to yield an ingroup identification index, with higher scores denoting higher ingroup identification.

Outgroup trust was assessed using a 4-item outgroup trust scale (adapted from Cehajic, Brown, & Castano, 2008). Respondents were asked to rate each of the following statements on a scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree): (1) "The other communities cannot be trusted to deliver on their promises" (R), (2) "I believe the other communities can be trusted on their promises", (3) "Despite the events that occurred during the war, I trust the other communities" (R), and (4) "I believe my community cannot trust the other communities after everything they have done during the war". Items marked (R) indicate reverse scoring.

Responses were averaged to form an outgroup trust index; higher scores denote greater outgroup trust.

Intergroup forgiveness was measured using a 7-item intergroup forgiveness scale (adapted from Moeschberger, Dixon, Niens, & Cairns, 2005) with ratings ranging from 1 (strongly agree) to 5 (strongly disagree). The scale included the statements: (1) "Forgiving the other communities for past wrongs would be disloyal to my community" (R), (2) "My community can only forgive members of the other communities when they have apologized for past violence", (3) "It is important that my community never forgets the wrongs done to us by the other communities" (R), (4) "Only when the three communities of Bosnia and Herzegovina learn to forgive each other can we be free of sectarian/political violence", (5) "It is important that my community never forgives the wrongs done to us by the other communities" (R), (6) "My community should, as a group, seek forgiveness from the other communities for past violent actions", and (7) "My community has remained strong precisely because it has never forgiven past wrongs committed by the other communities" (R). Scores were averaged to yield an intergroup forgiveness index with higher scores denoting higher intergroup forgiveness.

Criterion Variable. *Intergroup contact quantity* was measured using a 3-item scale (Hewstone et al., 2006). The first item asked: "About how many of your friends are from the other religious community?" Respondents were asked to answer using a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from 0 (none at all) to 4 (more than ten). The other two items were: "How often do you visit the homes of friends who are from the other religious community?" and "How often do these friends visit your home?" Ratings ranged from 1 (never) to 5 (every day). Scores for the three items were summed and averaged to yield an overall intergroup contact quantity index. A higher score signifies greater amount of intergroup contact.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

Preliminary analyses included Cronbach's alphas to determine scale reliability on all the predictor and criterion variables. Cronbach's alphas ranged from .61 (acceptable) to .97 (excellent): ingroup identification index = .76, outgroup trust = .73, intergroup forgiveness = .61, and intergroup contact quantity = .97. An a priori power analysis using an alpha of .05, an effect size d of .5, and a total sample size of 504 (42 in each of the categories of age and community background) revealed a power of .9862 to find a large effect (Faul, Erdfelder, Buchner, & Lang 2009). All data analyses were conducted using version 22 of SPSS (IBM, 2013) and an alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests.

Pearson product-moment correlations (Table 2) were conducted to determine correlations between variables and a one-way MANOVA (Table 3) was conducted to compare whether group differences existed independently across community background (Muslim, Roman Catholic, Orthodox Christian, and Other) in the psychosocial elements of ingroup identification, outgroup trust, intergroup forgiveness, and intergroup contact quantity. The data revealed that ingroup identification was significantly and negatively correlated with intergroup contact quantity, as predicted. However, contrary to the hypothesis, ingroup identification was not significantly correlated with outgroup trust or intergroup forgiveness. These results are surprising because ingroup identification has been reported to suppress forgiveness since it would be considered as an act of disloyalty to the group (Cehajic, Brown, & Castano, 2008) and ingroup identification is what determines contact, which influences trust (Tam, Hewstone, Kenworthy, & Cairns, 2009). Additionally, the data supports existing literature that reports outgroup trust, intergroup forgiveness, and intergroup contact quantity are all positively and significantly correlated to each

other. Furthermore, Table 3 represents the comparison between groups based on community

background, with significant group differences emerging across all predictor and criterion

variables.

Additional post hoc analyses were performed using the Scheffe' method to identify

exactly where these group differences exist. The following significant differences emerged:

outgroup trust between the Muslim and Orthodox communities ($MD = -.43$, $SE = .14$, $p < .05$),

intergroup forgiveness between Muslim and Orthodox communities ($MD = -.33$, $SE = .10$, $p <$

.01) as well as between the Muslims and Catholics ($MD = -.39$, $SE = .07$, $p < .001$), and contact

quantity between the Muslim and Orthodox communities ($MD = -.87$, $SE = .20$, $p < .001$) as well

as between Muslim and Catholic communities ($MD = -.74$, $SE = .14$, $p < .001$). No significant

differences were revealed between the Orthodox and Catholic communities.

Moderated Regression Analyses

To confirm whether age or community background had a moderating effect on the

relationship between ingroup identification, outgroup trust, and intergroup forgiveness on

intergroup contact quantity, moderated regression analyses were conducted. Prior to analyses,

predictor variables were centered to reduce multicollinearity among predictor variables (Aiken &

West, 1991). Dummy codes were created for the four levels of community background (Muslim,

Roman Catholic, Orthodox Christian, and Other) and the four levels of age (adolescents,

emerging adults, adults, and elderly).

The criterion variable (DV: intergroup contact quantity) and all predictor variables (IVs:

ingroup identification, outgroup trust, intergroup forgiveness, age, and community background)

were entered in Block 1 and accounted for significant variance, $R^2 = .199$, $F (5, 328) = 16.27$, $p <$

.001. Specifically, inspection of the coefficients revealed that intergroup contact quantity was

associated negatively with ingroup identification, *beta* = -.143, *t* = -2.822, *p* < .01, associated

positively with outgroup trust, *beta* = .311, *t* = 5.307, *p* < .001, and associated positively with

community background, *beta* = .177, *t* = 3.327, *p* < .001. Contrary to our prediction, intergroup

forgiveness was not significantly correlated, *beta* = .049, *t* = .833, *p* > .05, nor was age, *beta* =

.088, *t* = 1.747, *p* > .05.

Post-hoc investigation included a step-wise regression analysis to determine possible

interactions. The criterion variable (DV: intergroup contact quantity) and the significant

predictor variables from the previous regression analysis (IVs: ingroup identification, outgroup

trust, and community background) were entered in Block 1 and accounted for significant

variance, R^2 = .190, *F* (3, 339) = 26.57, *p* < .001. A series of possible interactions were then

entered in Block 2, as reported in Table 4. Although adding the interaction terms did not result

in a significant effect on the model, R^2 = .208, *F* (7, 332) = 1.07, *p* > .05, the interaction between

centered ingroup identification and Catholic community background was significant, *beta* =

−.329, *t* = -2.02, *p* = .044, suggesting that community background moderated the relation

between ingroup identification and intergroup contact quantity at the Catholic level only. No

other interaction effects were significant. Taken as a whole, the entire model accounted for

approximately 21% of variability in intergroup contact quantity (Table 4).

Discussion

While not generalizable to the country overall, the survey data provides a starting point

for discussing current psychosocial elements of reconciliation that impact intergroup contact in

Bosnia and Herzegovina. From our data, it is evident that ingroup identification is generally

strong for each community. This reflects a strong tendency for those living in Bosnia and

Herzegovina to identify with their group on the basis of their religious community, which

suggests that the level of groupness has not decreased over time in Bosnia and Herzegovina but continues to be maintained. It is possible that the new framework for the society, as outlined in the Dayton Peace Agreement, influenced groupness by specifically mentioning it in the document and not only encouraging but requiring group identification based on ethnicity to continue. When the territory was redrawn, the distribution of the population was affected as were the relationships between the people themselves. In terms of routinization, it is possible that the new society and the relations its structure encouraged have resulted in groupness being routinized and that may be why there is a discrepancy between what was expected and what the data reports.

Of our respondents, the majority reported living in mixed neighborhoods across each community background (Table 1). This is a hopeful sign, indicative of a willingness to live alongside each other. However, of all communities, nearly one-half of the Muslim respondents reported living in a homogenous neighborhood, implying the existence of an underlying desire to live with their specific group.

A strong identification with an individual's ingroup does not have to result in such deliberate distancing. This has already been demonstrated by the amount of respondents living in mixed neighborhoods. However, our hypothesis was supported in that ingroup identification was significantly and negatively correlated with intergroup contact quantity, meaning stronger ingroup identification would result in lower intergroup contact quantity.

The data revealed that group differences exist in regard to trust, forgiveness and contact quantity, particularly between the Muslims and the other communities. There was a significant negative group difference between the Muslim and Orthodox communities in regard to trust. Forgiveness and contact quantity were also significant and negative between the Muslims and

the Catholics as well as the Orthodox communities. Lingering tensions between the Muslim and Orthodox communities may be explained by Serb aggression during the conflict, particularly in Sarajevo where Serbian forces held the city under siege for years. No significant differences existed between the Catholics and Orthodox communities on any of the variables. This may be because the cities surveyed did not experience as much conflict between the Catholics and Orthodox members since most aggression was targeted towards the Muslims, which may explain the attitude of the Muslim community towards forgiving and interacting with the others. It may also be a matter of being able to find similarities with the other group. Muslims come from an Islamic background while the Catholics and Orthodox members are both Christian traditions, meaning the groups can find some common ground and likeness. These group differences may manifest themselves into noticeable tension, which is troubling because the largest represented group in the country is having difficulty in interactions with the other communities on psychosocial variables that have been identified as crucial in moving towards reconciliation.

Based on the moderated regression analyses, it is clear that community background is a significant moderator in the relationship between ingroup identification and outgroup trust on intergroup contact quantity, but only for the Catholic community. A possible explanation may be that the Catholic community feels a need to maintain its boundaries because of its minority status in Bosnia and Herzegovina, accounting for 14.6% of the population according to the 2013 government census. With the signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement (1995), the Orthodox community, associated with the Serbs, was given the Republika Srpska, which is their own entity, government and territory within Bosnia and Herzegovina. Essentially, they achieved what the group had intended to achieve and established a territory that is predominantly Serbian. The rest of Bosnia and Herzegovina was split into cantons that were divided between the

Catholic Croats and the Bosniaks. The Bosniaks compose 48.4% and while they are not the

national majority, they are the largest group represented. The goals and aspirations of the Croat

group were not achieved as they were for the Serbs and the ethnic composition of the cities

stresses their minority status. This may have resulted in lingering levels of groupness and a

tendency towards social isolation by which Catholic communities may be built through the

maintenance of social boundaries with the other communities. As a group in a society that

shows signs of high ingroup identification overall, there may be more of an emphasis on staying

loyal to one's community background rather than being open for intergroup interaction,

especially for the Catholic community.

    Although outgroup trust was a significant contributor to the model of predicting

intergroup contact quantity, intergroup forgiveness was not. This is surprising since the data

reported both strong outgroup trust and forgiveness indexes for each community. This may

suggest that the restoration of intergroup relationships does not require one to forgive another

from the outgroup, but rather that trust in their outgroup neighbors is much more important for

intergroup contact to improve.

    It was also surprising that age did not have a significant moderating effect, suggesting

that living during the conflict does not influence one's willingness for intergroup contact. This

may suggest that the narrative of the conflict is shared by the community regardless of age and

passed down to the younger generation. Once again, identifying with your community appears

to be important in daily interactions. This is further evidence that the reconciliation process has

stalled. Overall, even though 19 years have passed since the signing of the Dayton Peace

Agreement (1995), and an official end of the war was declared, Bosnia and Herzegovina remains

in a state of fragile peace with much work to be done in regard to reconciliation.

Limitations

A limitation of questionnaire research is the risk of response bias, which has been defined as a tendency to respond to a survey question on the basis of something other than the actual content of the question (Paulhus, 1991). The respondent may be answering in a socially desirable way on the basis of expectations, for example, or other items on the questionnaire may have influenced the interpretation of a question.

Similarly, the use of convenience samples brings forth additional considerations. Respondents were recruited through non-governmental organizations and schools which reaches a specific subset of the overall population with beliefs that may influence their attitudes and questionnaire responses in a distinct way. For example, respondents recruited through the Association for Transitional Justice most likely believe and support the mission of the organization while other citizens may view the concept of transitional justice in an unfavorable way. More broadly, people involved in non-governmental organizations clearly believe in a need for overall civic engagement. It is important to note that neither of the two organizations have an ethnic slant, meaning its members are motivated to participate based on a desire to improve society overall rather than for the benefit of a particular group.

Additionally, the cities in which surveys were distributed were not representative of the entire population. Tuzla and Sarajevo are both large cities in central Bosnia and Herzegovina. While both have been praised for their multiethnic composition, both are predominantly Muslim. In 1991, the ethnic composition of Sarajevo was 49.3% Bosniak, which increased to 78.3% in 1998, post-war (Anonymous, 2010a). Tuzla was considered free territory during the war and many Bosniaks fled to the city for safety, which may explain its present Bosniak majority of 52.6% (Anonymous, 2010b). This is significant in that non-Bosniak respondents may be aware

of their ethnic minority status and this may have influenced their responses in the same way that

responses of Bosniaks may have been influenced by their majority status.

Implications and Conclusions

The data reports the current struggle of Bosnia and Herzegovina on its path to post-war

reconciliation. Through our survey of these psychosocial variables, it is clear that strong

identification with your community negatively influences contact with other groups, which may

not allow for a united nation to emerge. In other research, it was found that 50% of the

participants wanted friends from different nationalities although 41% admitted that their friends

were of the same ethnic group (O'Loughlin, 2010). This indicates that people, to some degree,

do see it as a necessity to mix but are unable to break through the social boundaries that prevent

the type of contact necessary for reconciliation to be achieved.

One of the most surprising findings was the lack of significance of forgiveness in the

model, as the literature discusses it as a necessity for reconciliation. While the criterion variable

of interest for this study was intergroup contact quantity, future studies may also examine

intergroup contact quality. Pettigrew (1998) suggests that quality is what leads to friendship

potential. Cehajic and colleagues (2008) support this theory while adding that forgiveness is the

restoration of relationships. It may be possible that, of the contact that occurs, it is of low quality

and therefore not assisting in the process of forgiveness in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Another factor of interest may be how many opportunities the individuals have for

contact with other groups and the circumstances of those interactions. It seems the most

important yet lacking factor to improved intergroup relations in Bosnia and Herzegovina is

intergroup contact. Programs that support mixed interactions need to be encouraged yet it is also

unclear how many participants would be willing to participate in such programs. It is evident

that Bosnia and Herzegovina cannot move towards reconciliation without proactive measures to

encourage civic obligations that would improve the quality of life for all citizens.

References

Anonymous (2010a). Demography. Retrieved from: http://www.sarajevo.ba/en/stream.php?kat
=142

Anonymous. (2010b). About Tuzla. Retrieved from: http://www.sportizdravlje.ftos.untz.ba/
tuzla.html

Aiken, L. S., West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple Regression: Testing and interpreting interactions.*
Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. New York: Perseus Publishing.

Barnes, B. (1992). Status groups and collective action. *Sociology 26*(2), 259-270.
doi: 10.1177/0038038592026002008

Brown, R., Condor, S., Mathews, A., Wade, G., & Williams, J. (1986). Explaining intergroup
differentiation in an industrial organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 59*,
273-286. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8325.1986.tb00230.x

Brown, R., Eller, A., Leeds, S., & Stace, K. (2007). Intergroup contact and intergroup attitudes:
A longitudinal study. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 37*, 273-286.
doi:10.1002/ejsp.384

Brubaker, R. (2002). *Ethnicity without groups*. Cambridge, Mass: Harvard University Press.

Calhoun, C. (1993). Nationalism & ethnicity. *Annual Review of Sociology*, *19*, 211-239.
http://www.jstor.org/stable/2083387

Cehajic, S., Brown, R., & Castano, E. (2008). Forgive and forget? Antecedents and
consequences of intergroup forgiveness in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Political
Psychology, 29*(3), 351-367. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00634.x

Delhey, J. & Newton, K. (2005). Predicting cross-national levels of social trust: Global pattern or

    Nordic exceptionalism? *European Sociological Review, 21*(4), 311-327. doi:

    10.1093/esr/jci022

Europe - Miscellaneous, Dayton Peace Agreement, General Framework Agreement for Peace in

    Bosnia and Herzegovinia, 21 November 1995, available at: http://www.refworld.org/

    docid/3de495c34.html [accessed 10 November 2014]

Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Buchner, A., & Lang, A. G. (2009). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical

    power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior*

    Research Methods, 39, 175-191. doi:10.3758/BF03193146

Fearon, J. D. & Laitin, D. D. (2000). Violence and the social construction of ethnic identity.

    International Organization, 54(4), 845-877. doi: 10.1162/002081800551398

Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., Voci, A., Hamberger, J., & Niens, U. (2006). Intergroup contact,

    forgiveness, and experience of "The Troubles" in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Social*

    Issues, 62(1), 99-120. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00441.x

Hoogenbooom, D., & Vieille, S. (2009). Rebuilding social fabric in failed states: Examining

    transitional justice in Bosnia. *Human Rights Review*, 11, 183-198. doi: 10.1007/s12142-

    009-0129-z

IBM SPSS. (2013). IBM SPSS Statistics for Windows, Version 22.0. Armonk, NY: IBM.

Kandido-Jaksic, M. (2008). Social distance and attitudes towards ethnically mixed marriages.

    Psihologija, 41(2), 149-162. doi: 10.2298/PSI0802149K

Kerry, J. (2014). 19th Anniversary of the Srebrenica Genocide. Retrieved from:

    http://www.state.gov/secretary/remarks/2014/07/229178.htm

Kunovich, R., & Hodson, R. (2002). Ethnic diversity, segregation and inequality: A structural

model of ethnic prejudice in Bosnia and Croatia. *Sociological Quarterly, 43*(2), 185-209.

doi: 10.1111/j.1533-8525.2002.tb00046.x

Love, M. C. (2011). God and global governance: Resurgent religion in world politics in *Beyond

sovereignty* (pp. 170-214). Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Magill, C., & Hamber, B. (2011). "If they don't start listening to us, the future is going to look

the same as the past": Young people and reconciliation in Northern Ireland and Bosnia

and Herzegovina. *Youth & Society, 43*(2), 509-527. doi:10.1177/0044118X10383644

McMahon, P. C., & Western, J. (2009). The death of Dayton: How to stop Bosnia from falling

apart. *Foreign Affairs*, *88*(5), 69-83. http://www.jstor.org/stable/20699644

McGarry, J. & O'Leary, B. (1995). *Explaining Northern Ireland: Broken Images*. Oxford:

Blackwell.

Moeschberger, S. L., Dixon, D. N., Niens, U., & Cairns, E. (2005). Forgiveness in Northern

Ireland: A model for peace in the midst of the "Troubles". *Peace and Conflict: Journal of

Peace Psychology*, *11*(2), 199-214. doi:10.1207/s15327949pac1102_5

Myers, E., Hewstone, M., & Cairns, E. (2009). Impact of conflict on mental health in Northern

Ireland: The mediating role of intergroup forgiveness and collective guilt. *Political

Psychology, 30*(2), 269-290. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9221.2008.00691.x

Noor, M., Brown, R., Gonzalez, R., Manzi, J., & Lewis, C. A. (2008). On positive psychological

outcomes: What helps groups with a history of conflict to forgive and reconcile with each

other? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *34*(6), 819-832. doi:10.1177/

0146167208315555

O'Loughlin, J. (2010). Inter-ethnic friendships in post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Ethnicities, 10*(1), 26-54. doi:10.1177/1468796809354153

Paulhus, D. (1991). Measurement and control of response biases. In J. Robinson, P. Shaver, L. Wrightsman, & F. Andrews (Eds.), *Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes* (pp. 17-59). San Diego, CA: Academic Press. doi: 10.1016/B978-0-12-590241-0.50006-X

Pettigrew, T. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65-85. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.65

Sancaktar, C. (2012). Historical construction and development of Bosniak nation. *Alternatives: Turkish Journal of International Relations*, *11*(1), 1-17.

Stone, J. (1995). Race, ethnicity and the Weberian legacy. *American Behavioral Scientist*, *38*(3), 391-400. doi: 10.1177/0002764295038003003

Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J., & Cairns, E. (2009). Intergroup trust in Northern Ireland. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*(1), 45-59. doi:10.1177/0146167208325004

Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J. B., Cairns, E., Marinetti, C., Geddes, L., & Parkinson, B. (2008). Postconflict reconciliation: Intergroup forgiveness and implicit biases in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Social Issues, 64*(2), 303-320.

Weber, M. (1961). Ethnic groups. In T. Parsons, E. Shils, K. Naegele & J. Pitts (Eds.), *Theories of society: Foundations of modern sociological theory* (Vol. 1, pp. 305-309). New York, NY: Free Press of Glencoe, Inc. (Original work published in 1947.)

Weber, M. & Heydebrand, W.V. (1994). *Sociological writings*. New York: Continuum.

Whitt, S. (2010). Institutions and ethnic trust: Evidence from Bosnia. *Europe-Asia Studies,*

   62(2), 271-292. doi:10.1080/09668130903506839

Table 1

Demographics by Community Background

Variables	Community Background			
	Muslim (*n* = 307)	Roman Catholic (*n* = 93)	Orthodox Christian (*n* = 41)	Other (*n* =13)
Age:				
Adolescents	17	13	2	1
Emerging Adults	80	33	20	4
Adults	171	30	15	9
Elderly	23	9	6	3
Gender:				
Male	118	37	21	4
Female	172	51	19	8
Birthplace:				
Bosnia and Herzegovina	281	75	31	12
Croatia	4	9	2	1
Serbia	10	1	6	0
Other	6	6	2	0
Nationality:				
Bosniak	286	1	4	3
Croat	1	83	1	3
Serb	2	5	36	4
Other	14	3	0	3
Neighborhood:				
Mixed	148	59	25	11
Mainly Catholic	1	9	0	0
Mainly Orthodox	3	0	9	1
Mainly Muslim	150	23	7	1

Table 2

Summary of Intercorrelations between Predictor and Criterion Variables

Variables	1	2	3	4
1. Ingroup Identification	--	.004	.031	-.163**
2. Outgroup Trust		--	.507**	.314**
3. Intergroup Forgiveness			--	.253**
4. Intergroup Contact Quantity				--

** $p < .01$.

Table 3

Means, Standard Deviations, and Group Differences Between Community Background

Variable		*N*	*M (SD)*	*F* (df)	*p*
Ingroup Identification	Muslim	245	3.97 (.56)	5.57 (3, 353)	< .001
	Roman Catholic	73	3.86 (.60)		
	Orthodox Christian	30	3.72 (.54)		
	Other	9	3.91 (.57)		
Outgroup Trust	Muslim	300	3.12 (.82)	5.78 (3, 439)	< .001
	Roman Catholic	91	3.28 (.74)		
	Orthodox Christian	39	3.56 (.85)		
	Other	13	3.75 (.80)		
Intergroup Forgiveness	Muslim	286	3.25 (.61)	14.37 (3, 416)	< .001
	Roman Catholic	85	3.64 (.44)		
	Orthodox Christian	37	3.59 (.45)		
	Other	12	3.74 (.49)		
Intergroup Contact Quantity	Muslim	297	2.43 (1.18)	15.08 (3, 434)	< .001
	Roman Catholic	89	3.17 (1.13)		
	Orthodox Christian	39	3.31 (1.33)		
	Other	13	2.69 (1.23)		

Note. Scores on all variables ranged from 1 to 5 with higher scores denoting greater Ingroup Identification, Outgroup Trust, Intergroup Forgiveness, and Intergroup Contact Quantity.

Table 4

Moderated Regression Analyses Output

Variable	B	SE B	β	t	Sig.	R	R²	Adj R²	SEest	R² Change	F Change	Sig. F Change
(Constant)	1.963	0.258		7.601	0.000							
Ingroup Identification**	-0.300	0.106	-0.143	-2.822	0.005							
Outgroup Trust**	0.446	0.084	0.311	5.307	0.000							
Intergroup Forgiveness	0.103	0.123	0.049	0.833	0.405							
Community Background**	0.279	0.084	0.177	3.327	0.001							
Age Group	1.141	0.081	0.088	1.747	0.082							
Model 1: IVs and DV**						0.446	0.199	0.187	1.080	0.199	16.269	0.000
Model 2: II x CB Muslim interaction term	-0.995	0.702	-0.381	-1.417	0.157							
Model 2: II x CB Catholic interaction term*	-1.452	0.719	-0.329	-2.020	0.044							
Model 2: II x CB Orthodox interaction term	-1.290	0.741	-0.179	-1.742	0.082							
Model 2: OT x CB Muslim interaction term	-0.127	0.573	-0.073	-0.222	0.825							
Model 2: OT x CB Catholic interaction term	-0.044	0.593	-0.012	-0.075	0.941							
Model 2: OT x CB Orthodox interaction term	-0.152	0.605	-0.037	-0.252	0.801							
Model 2: II x OT interaction term	-0.020	0.121	-0.009	-0.162	0.871							

Note. Ingroup Identification (II) and Outgroup Trust (OT) were centered at their means. Age Group and Community Background (CB) were dummy coded. Intergroup Contact Quantity was entered as the dependent variables and all independent variables were entered in Block 1. All interaction terms were entered in Block 2.

Appendix A: Preamble

Cross-Community Involvement Research Study: Bosnia and Herzegovina / Croatia

Dear Potential Study Participant.   (Date)_____

You, along with approximately 100-300 other people (ages 14 years +) living in Bosnia and Herzegovina / Croatia are being invited to participate in a research study about cross-community involvement. The person in charge of this study is Melinda A. Leonard, Ph.D., Department of Psychological & Brain Sciences, University of Louisville, Kentucky, USA, along with Goran Šimić, Ph.D., Association for Transitional Justice in Bosnia and Herzegovina, Sarajevo, BiH. There may be other people on the research team assisting at different times during the study.

If you decide to participate, you will be asked to complete a questionnaire given to you by *(organization name)* _____. The questionnaire should take no more than 30 minutes to complete. Your completed questionnaire will be stored at the University of Louisville, Kentucky, USA. To the best of our knowledge, the completion of the questionnaire has no more risk or harm than you would experience in everyday life. Although we have made every effort to minimize this, you may find some questions to be stressful. If so, the following organization may be contacted and may be able to help you with these feelings: Udruženje Snaga Žene, Slavinovići, Slanac bb, 75000 Tuzla, Bosna i Hercegovina, s.zenebh@bih.net.ba, +387 (0) 35 314-740. While the information collected may not benefit you directly, the information you provide will help us better understand cross-community involvement in Bosnia and Herzegovina / Croatia.

Individuals from the Department of Psychological & Brain Sciences at the University of Louisville, Kentucky, USA, the Institutional Review Board (IRB), the Human Subjects Protection Program Office (HSPPO), and other regulatory agencies may inspect these questionnaires. In all other respects, however, the data will be held in confidence to the extent permitted by law. Since you will not be asked to provide your name and address, your identity cannot be disclosed.

Taking part in this research study is voluntary. By completing the questionnaire you agree to take part in this research study. You will not receive any rewards. You do not have to answer any questions that make you uncomfortable. You may choose not to take part at all. If you decide to be in this study you may stop taking part at any time. If you decide not to be in the study or if you stop taking part at any time, you will not lose any benefits to which you may qualify.

If you have any questions, concerns, or complaints about the research study, please contact Dr. Šimić, Association for Transitional Justice in Bosnia and Herzegovina, at goran.simic@lol.ba -- or -- Dr. Leonard, University of Louisville, at melinda.leonard@louisville.edu.

If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant, you may call the University of Louisville Human Subjects Protection Program Office at 00+1 502- 852-5188. You can

discuss any questions about your rights as a research participant, in private, with a member of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). You may also call this number if you have other questions about the research, and you cannot reach the research staff, or want to talk to someone else. The IRB is an independent committee made up of people from the University community staff of the institutions, as well as people from the community not connected with the institution. The IRB has reviewed this research study.

If you have concerns or complaints about the research or research staff and you do not wish to give your name, you may call 00+1 877-852-1167. This is a 24 hour hot-line answered by people who do not work at the University of Louisville.

Sincerely,

_____   _____
Melinda A.   Leonard, Ph.D.   **Goran Šimić, Ph.D.**

Appendix B: Survey Completion Instructions

You have been invited to participate in a research study about cross-community involvement in Bosnia and Herzegovina / Croatia by completing a questionnaire/survey/interview. You should be able to complete it in 20-30 minutes. Since you will not be asked to provide your name, your identity cannot be disclosed. Please take your time and respond as **HONESTLY** as possible. There are no **'right'** or **'wrong'** answers.

The location number in the upper right corner is for our purposes only. Since we are collecting data from more than one organization, this number identifies the organization you are affiliated with.

Please note:
- There are questions on the front and back of each page.
- Some questions have multiple parts. Please respond to **EACH** part.
- Please read the directions **CAREFULLY - - -** respond to the question - - - and then proceed as directed.
- Please pay **SPECIAL ATTENTION** to the column headings when making your rating selection.
- Once you have responded to each question, please **REVIEW** the questionnaire to ensure that you have answered **EACH** question. A check mark or circle should be provided for **EACH** response.
- Once you have reviewed the questionnaire, please return your completed questionnaire to the person that provided it to you.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Appendix C: Survey Instrument

National ID: __ __ __ __ __ __   Location: _____
         (LAST 6 digits ONLY)

1. Are you male or female? *(check one)*   Male   Female

2. When were you born?   _____(Day) _____(Month) _____(Year)

3. Where were you born? *(check one)* Bosnia and Herzegovina   Croatia   Serbia
Other *(Please write in.)*_____

4. What type of school did you last attend or are currently attending?*(check one)*   Primary
Secondary   Higher Education   Other   *(Please write in.)* _____

5. Would you describe the area in which you currently live as: *(check one)*
Mainly Muslim   Mainly Roman Catholic   Mainly Orthodox Christian
Mixed

6. What do you consider your nationality to be? *(circle one)*

Bosniak	Croatian	Serbian	Other *(Please write in.)*_____

7. What do you consider as your religious community? *(check one)*   Muslim   Roman
Catholic   Orthodox Christian   Other *(Please write in.)*_____

THINKING ABOUT THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY THAT YOU BELONG TO, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS.

Please use only one check mark (√) for each of the following questions – 10 total.
8. Would you say you are a person who…

		Never	*Rarely*	*Sometimes*	*Often*	*Very Often*
A.	…considers your community important?					
B.	…criticizes your community?					
C.	…identifies with your community?					
D.	…is annoyed to say that you are a member of your community?					
E.	…feels strong ties with your community?					
F.	…feels held back by your community?					
G.	…is glad to belong to your community?					
H.	…makes excuses for belonging to your community?					
I.	…sees yourself as belonging to your community?					
J.	…tries to hide belonging to your community?					

THINKING ABOUT THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY THAT YOU BELONG TO, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT HOW YOU FEEL TOWARD THE OTHER RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES.

Please use only one check mark (√) for each of the following questions – 4 total.
9.   Please rate the extent to which you agree with the following questions.

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
A.	The other communities cannot be trusted to deliver on their promises.					
B.	I believe the other communities can be trusted on their promises.					
C.	Despite the events that occurred during the war, I trust the other communities.					
D.	I believe my community cannot trust the other communities after everything they have done during the war.					

Please use only one check mark (√) for each of the following questions – 9 total.
10.   Please rate your usual reaction to members of the OTHER communities.

		Very often	Often	Sometimes	Rarely	Never
A.	Oppose them					
B.	Spend time with them					
C.	Confront them					
D.	Find out more about them					
E.	Argue with them					
F.	Keep them at a distance					
G.	Have nothing to do with them					
H.	Avoid them					
I.	Talk to them					

Please use only one check mark (√) for each of the following questions – 5 total.
11.   Now, please respond to the following questions.

		Strongly agree	Agree	Neither agree nor disagree	Disagree	Strongly disagree
A.	I believe each of the communities should try to repair some of the damage they caused during the war.					
B.	I believe my community deserves some form of compensation from the other communities for what happened to them during the war.					
C.	I believe my community owes something to the other communities because of the things they have done during the war.					
D.	I believe each of the communities should help, as much as they can, other community members return to their homes.					
E.	I believe the governments of each of the communities should apologize to the other communities for the past harmful actions committed by their community.					

Please use only one check mark (√) for each of the following questions – 4 total.
12. When you meet people from the OTHER communities, how often do you experience each of the following emotions?

		Never	*Rarely*	*Sometimes*	*Often*	*Very often*
A.	Nervous					
B.	Anxious					
C.	Worried					
D.	Afraid					

13. Thinking about how you feel about the OTHER communities, what do you think has been the **MOST** important influence on your views? *(Please check **ONE** box only)*
   My family   My place of worship   My school   The media
    My friends   Other   *(Please write in.)* _____

14. What do you think has been the **MOS**T important influence on your understanding of the OTHER communities' culture and traditions? *(Please check **ONE** box only)*
   My family   My place of worship   My school   The media
    My friends   Other   *(Please write in.)* _____

15. If you wanted to find out more about the OTHER communities, how would you like to receive such information? *(Please check **ONE** box only.)*
Through your family   Through your friends   Through your place of worship
 Through your school   Through the media   Through other sources   *(Please write in.)* _____

Please use only one check mark (√) for each of the following questions – 4 total.
16. When you meet members of the OTHER communities, in general do you find the contact…

		Very often	*Often*	*Sometimes*	*Rarely*	*Never*
A.	…pleasant.					
B.	…uncomfortable.					
C.	…superficial (fake).					
D.	…cooperative.					

THINKING ABOUT HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT PEOPLE FROM OTHER ETHNIC BACKGROUNDS TO YOURSELF, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS.

17. What do you think has been the most important influence on your views? *(Please check **ONE** box only)*
My family   My friends   My place of worship   My school
The media   Other   *(Please write in.)* _____
18. How much do you agree or disagree with the statement, "In relation to color and ethnicity, I prefer to stick with people of my own kind"? *(circle one)*

Strongly agree	*Agree*	*Neither agree nor disagree*	*Disagree*	*Strongly disagree*

PLEASE TELL US HOW YOU FEEL ABOUT THESE ISSUES BY ANSWERING THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS.

Please use only one check mark (√) for each of the following questions – 3 total.
19.   Please respond to the following questions regarding your personal experience.

		Yes	*No*
A.	Have you ever had to move house because of intimidation, displacement, or forced relocation?		
B.	Has your home ever been damaged by shelling or a bomb?		
C.	Have you ever been injured due to a sectarian/political incident?		

Please use only one check mark (√) for each of the following questions – 7 total.
20.   How do you feel about these statements?

		Strongly agree	*Agree*	*Neither agree nor disagree*	*Disagree*	*Strongly disagree*
A.	Forgiving the other communities for past wrongs would be disloyal to my community.					
B.	My community can only forgive members of the other communities when they have apologized for past violence.					
C.	It is important that my community never forgets the wrongs done to us by the other communities.					
D.	Only when the three communities of Bosnia and Herzegovina learn to forgive each other can we be free of sectarian/political violence.					
E.	It is important that my community never forgives the wrongs done to us by the other communities.					
F.	My community should, as a group, seek forgiveness from the other communities for past violent actions.					
G.	My community has remained strong precisely because it has never forgiven past wrongs committed by the other communities.					

21.   Overall do you consider yourself to have been a victim of the war (1992-1995)? *(circle one)*

Strongly disagree	*Mostly disagree*	*Neither agree nor disagree*	*Mostly agree*	*Strongly agree*

Please use only one check mark (√) for each of the following questions – 6 total.
22.   How often have you experienced the following types of treatment from people from another religious/ethnic community?

		Never	*Rarely*	*Sometimes*	*Often*	*Very often*
A.	Treated as inferior					
B.	Ridiculed					
C.	Harassed					
D.	Taken advantage of					
E.	Verbally abused					
F.	Threatened with harm					

THINKING ABOUT THE RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY THAT YOU BELONG TO, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT HOW YOU FEEL TOWARD YOUR RELIGIOUS COMMUNITY.
Please use only one check mark (√) for each of the following questions – 6 total.
23.   Please read each statement carefully and rate the extent to which this applies to you by checking the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement.

		Strongly disagree	*Disagree*	*Neither agree nor disagree*	*Agree*	*Strongly agree*
A.	I feel guilty about the negative things my community has done to the other communities in the past.					
B.	I feel regret for my community's harmful past actions toward the other communities.					
C.	I believe that I should repair the damage caused to the other communities.					
D.	I do not feel guilty about the things done to the other communities by my community in the past.					
E.	I do not feel regret about the things my community did to the other communities in the past.					
F.	I believe that my community should repair the damage done to the other communities in the past.					

NOW, THINKING ABOUT YOUR OR YOUR IMMEDIATE FAMILY'S EXPERIENCE, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTION.

24.   What sort of an area did you or your immediate family grow up in in terms of level of violence during the war? *(circle one)*

Seldom if any violence	*Some violence*	*Often violence*	*Almost always violence*

25.   What sort of an area do you currently live in in terms of level of violence? *(circle one)*

Seldom if any violence	*Some violence*	*Often violence*	*Almost always violence*

Please use only one check mark (√) for each of the following questions – 4 total.

26. Please respond to the following questions regarding your extended family and friends' experience of the war.

		Yes	No
A.	Has a member of your extended family or a close friend in your community ever suffered as a result of the war?		
B.	Has a member of your family or a close friend in your community ever had to move house because of intimidation, displacement, or forced relocation?		
C.	Has a member of your family's or a close friend's home ever been damaged by shelling or a bomb?		
D.	Has a member of your family or a close friend in your community ever been injured due to a sectarian/political incident?		

NOW, PLEASE TELL US ABOUT YOUR CROSS-COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT, THAT IS INVOLVEMENT IN A PROGRAM WITH PEOPLE FROM DIFFERENT RELIGIOUS COMMUNITIES.

27. Have you ever participated in any cross-community programs designed to bring people from different religious communities together? *(check one)*

             No *(proceed to question 31)*   Yes *(proceed to the next question)*

    27a. If yes, please provide the name(s) of the cross-community program(s). _____

    27b. At what age did you participate in the cross-community program(s)? _____

28. Since your participation in a cross-community program, has your network of friends from YOUR religious community:
(check one)   Increased   Remained the same   Decreased

29. And how about your contact with people from the OTHER religious communities? Has this contact:
(check one)   Increased   Remained the same   Decreased

30. Please tell us in your own words why you decided to get involved in the cross-community program(s).

_____

_____

31. If you have never participated in a cross-community program designed to bring people from different religious communities together, would you be interested in participating in one if it were available in your area? *(circle one)*

Very interested	*Somewhat interested*	*Undecided*	*Not very interested*	*Not at all interested*

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS USING YOUR BEST ESTIMATE AS YOUR RESPONSE.

32. About how many of your friends are from the other religious community? *(circle one)*

None at all	*One*	*2-5*	*6-10*	*More than 10*

33. How often do you visit the homes of friends who are from the other religious community? *(circle one)*

Never	1-11 times a year	Once a month	2-20 times a month	Every day

34. How often do these friends visit your home? *(circle one)*

Never	1-11 times a year	Once a month	2-20 times a month	Every day

NOW, PLEASE TELL US A LITTLE MORE ABOUT YOURSELF.

35. Please check **ALL** response(s) that apply to your current situation.

Full-time Student   Working full-time   Housewife   Retired
Part-time Student   Working part-time   Currently unemployed
Other   *(Please write in.)*_____

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION.