

Group-based Compunction and Anger: Their Antecedents and Consequences in Relation to Colonial Conflicts

Ana Figueiredo, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, University of Coimbra, Portugal
Bertjan Doosje, Department of Social Psychology, Faculty of Social and Behavioral Sciences, University of Amsterdam, the Netherlands
Joaquim Pires Valentim, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, University of Coimbra, Portugal

Group-based emotions can be experienced by group members for the past misdeeds of their ingroup towards an outgroup. The present study examines distinct antecedents and consequences of group-based compunction and anger in two countries with a history of colonization (Portugal, $N = 280$ and the Netherlands, $N = 184$). While previous research has focused mainly on ingroup-focused antecedents of group-based emotions, such as ingroup identification and perceptions of responsibility, our research also analyzed outgroup-focused variables, such as outgroup identification and meta-perceptions. Multiple group structural equation modeling showed that group-based compunction and group-based anger have similar antecedents (exonerating cognitions, collectivism, outgroup identification and meta-perceptions). Furthermore, the results showed that the two emotions have distinct but related consequences for the improvement of intergroup relations (compensation, subjective importance of discussing the past and forgiveness assignment).

Conflict and group violence are pervasive phenomena worldwide. We argue that, given the widespread existence of conflict and group violence, we still need to address past colonial conflicts, in order to understand present day phenomena of violence, discrimination, and structural disadvantage involving former colonizer and colonized groups. Previous research has focused on the need for groups to address past transgressions, analyzing instances of conflict and the associated emotions, perceptions, and consequences (Doosje et al. 1998; Doosje et al. 2004; Smith 1993; Tajfel and Turner 1986).

In the present article we analyze two contexts of colonization that ended with violent conflicts over independence: the Portuguese and the Dutch. Through this cross-national replication using multiple group structural equation modeling, we investigate the similarities and differences between these countries regarding the experience

of two group-based emotions – compunction and anger – and their antecedents and consequences.

After the Second World War there were significant changes in the status of colonial relations and powers, with many countries recognizing their colonies as independent states. By various routes, many countries in Africa gained full independence in the late 1950s and 1960s, but despite the United Nations and international pressure, Portugal refused to concede its colonies the right to self-determination. Between 1961 and 1974, there were wars of independence in Angola (started in 1961), Guinea-Bissau (started in 1963), and Mozambique (started in 1964).

By 1974, war had devastated the countries of Angola, Mozambique, and Guinea-Bissau, and caused many casualties on both sides (the Portuguese Armed Forces alone suffered approximately 8,200 casualties). Finally, on April 25, 1974,

Correspondence concerning this paper can be sent to Ana Figueiredo, Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, University of Coimbra, Rua do Colégio Novo, Apartado 61533001-802, Coimbra, Portugal; e-mail: figueiredo.anacm@gmail.com.

This work was supported by a PhD grant from the Foundation for Science and Technology, Portugal [grant number SFRH/BD/36056/2007]. The first author appreciates the

support of a CONICYT grant from the Chilean Ministry of Education (CONICYT/FONDAP/15130009) in the preparation of this manuscript.

the peaceful Carnation Revolution, led by military officers, overthrew the New State dictatorship. By 1975 all of Portugal's former African colonies were independent.

In turn, the Dutch colonial conflict with Indonesia occurred after the Second World War, when the Dutch tried to regain control of the Indonesian archipelago, after the surrender of the Japanese. While on August 17, 1945, Sukarno and Hatta proclaimed the independence of Indonesia and created the Central Indonesian National Committee, the Dutch tried to reassert their power over the country and the conflict continued until 1949. In January 1949, the United Nations Security Council passed a resolution demanding the restoration of the republican government and the Dutch were pressured to recognize Indonesia as an independent country. Finally, on December 27, 1949, sovereignty was formally transferred to the republican government of Indonesia.

Until the present day, the Netherlands have never officially apologized or compensated Indonesia for the conflict (Doosje et al. 2004). Nevertheless, the diplomatic relations between both countries are positive and the Indonesian community living in the Netherlands is considered the biggest minority group in the country (Multicultural Netherlands, 2010).

Drawing from social identity theory (Tajfel and Turner 1986) and from the theory of intergroup emotions (Smith 1993) we aim to understand the ways in which people can experience emotions as group members, due to appraising an emotional event in terms of their group membership, and the potential consequences these emotional processes have for intergroup relations.

Therefore, we aim to analyze less studied antecedents of group-based emotions, as well as their under-investigated consequences. More concretely, we focus on the way that more distal antecedents of emotions (i.e. self-investment) and more proximal antecedents of emotions (i.e. exonerating cognitions, collectivism, outgroup identification and meta-perceptions) affect the experience of two negative group-based emotions - compunction and anger towards the ingroup. In addition, we examine the consequences of these emotions for compensatory behavioral intentions, subjective importance of discussing the past and forgiveness assignment.

We propose to divide the antecedents of group-based emotions into two different categories. Ingroup-focused antecedents are conceptualized as being directly related to the ingroup and the ingroup's experiences regarding the emotions analyzed (i.e. self-investment, which is conceptualized as a distal antecedent of group-based emotions; collectivism; and exonerating cognitions). The second set of variables focuses on the relationship between the ingroup and the outgroup, and therefore they are more outgroup-focused than ingroup-focused (i.e. outgroup identification; and meta-perceptions).

Group-based compunction refers to an intertwined experience of guilt and self-criticism/shame due to the misdeeds committed by the ingroup, namely during the colonial period and the conflicts over the colonies' self-determination. In the past, Devine and colleagues (1991) have shown that, at the interpersonal level, individuals might feel negative affect in the form of compunction following from a transgression of standards. Furthermore, Zebel and colleagues (2007) have shown that when one's family is being associated with immoral aspects of the colonial past, individuals experience compunction. In this line, we argue that, at the group-level, individuals who are confronted with immoral actions committed by their national ingroup against other groups are expected to experience group-based compunction. Furthermore, while many authors have analyzed the role of group-based guilt in intergroup relations (Branscombe and Miron 2004; Doosje et al. 1998; Iyer, Leach, and Crosby 2003; amongst others), we propose to analyze group-based compunction instead. The distinction between group-based guilt and group-based compunction rests on the fact that the latter also contains a component of self-criticism (in this case, ingroup-criticism; Devine et al. 1991; Stephan and Stephan 1996).

In turn, group-based anger refers to a negative ingroup-focused emotion that involves the awareness that the ingroup has committed wrongful acts against another group. This emotion is characterized by a high level of readiness for action and previous research has shown that group-based anger directed at the ingroup leads individuals to make amendments for past misdeeds and take action to improve the outgroup's conditions (Gordijn et al.

2006; Iyer, Schmader, and Lickel 2007; Leach, Iyer, and Pedersen 2006).

Previous research has also shown that, although group-based anger and other group-based emotions, such as guilt and shame, are related to each other, they do have independent consequences for intergroup behavior (Iyer, Schmader, and Lickel 2007). Therefore, in this study, we analyze the potentially different role of group-based compunction and group-based anger for different forms of intergroup behavior after historical colonial conflicts, such as compensation, forgiveness assignment or the willingness to publicly discuss the past.

By now, it is well documented that ingroup identification is an important antecedent of different group-based emotions (Doosje et al. 1998; Leach et al. 2008; Mackie, Devos, and Smith 2000; Roccas, Klar, and Liviatan 2006).

The self-investment dimension of ingroup identification, as defined by Leach and colleagues (2008), refers to a sense of satisfaction, solidarity, salience and importance derived from being part of a group that the individual values, and is usually associated with lower levels of negative group-based emotions (Leach et al. 2008). We aim to understand in which way ingroup self-investment, as a distal antecedent (see Branscombe, Doosje, and McCarthy 2002; Branscombe 2004; Cehajic et al. 2009; Iyer and Leach 2009; Leach et al. 2008; Wohl and Branscombe 2008) of group-based emotions, may affect (either positively or negatively) more proximal antecedents of group-based compunction and anger.

Furthermore, when a group membership is relevant to individuals, they may tend to avoid negative information about the groups they belong to and value. Exonerating cognitions refer to ingroup favoring biases, which are beliefs that can help the individual to exculpate or absolve the ingroup for the harm committed. These biases can occur either by minimizing the negative actions through selective comparison with other perpetrator groups (Marques, Paez, and Serra 1997) or by blaming the victims in order to maintain a positive view of the ingroup (Roccas, Klar, and Liviatan 2006). Hence, we expect that through the use of exonerating cognitions, individuals may mitigate the experience of group-based compunction and anger.

In addition, we analyze how ingroup self-investment associates with collectivism and how, in turn, collectivism relates to group-based emotions. In Triandis and Gelfand's (1998) conceptualization, collectivism refers to a worldview whereby individuals value their group memberships and tend to hold the norms and values of the groups they belong to as relevant to their self-definition. We anticipate ingroup self-investment and collectivism to be positively associated, because we argue that both variables reflect an individual's level of association and commitment to the ingroup.

Additionally, we believe that collectivism may play an important role in the experience of group-based compunction and anger. If individuals value their ingroup identities and their belonging to the group, they tend to be more affected by the negative actions committed by the ingroup and, therefore, experience higher levels of group-based emotions. In this line, collectivism is conceptualized as a positive orientation towards different ingroup memberships, but also towards other groups. Thus, we conceptualize it as a proximal antecedent of group-based emotions, because it relates not only with the ingroup, but also with a general positive orientation towards life in groups.

In the present research, we also investigate outgroup identification, a variable that reflects a sense of connectedness with the outgroup and a concern for its welfare. We expect this variable to be positively associated with group-based anger and compunction (Figueiredo, Doosje, Valentim, & Zebel 2010), because outgroup identification reflects an individual's orientation towards outgroup members and the desire for positive relations with such an outgroup (Figueiredo, et al. 2010).

We propose that, when individuals perceive that they share a bond with the outgroup, they will experience more negative group-based emotions, because they understand how the outgroup has been victimized by the perpetrator ingroup and understand their past suffering.

Meta-perceptions, the ingroup's beliefs regarding the outgroup's perceptions of it, have shown to be negatively related to group-based guilt (Figueiredo et al. 2010). When individuals believe the outgroup has a positive perception

of the ingroup, they may think there is no need to feel bad about the past misdeeds between both groups (Figueiredo, et al. 2010). We argue this will be the case because holding positive meta-perceptions may signal that the intergroup relationship is positive in nature and, therefore, ingroup members do not need to feel negative emotions and redeem for their past negative transgressions anymore.

In terms of action tendencies, we predict that negative group-based emotions are related to the desire to make reparations due to the ingroup's negative behavior. Therefore, we analyze three potential consequences of negative group-based emotions: compensatory behavioral intentions, subjective importance of discussing the past and forgiveness assignment.

Much research has shown (Doosje et al. 1998; Mallett and Swim 2004) that group-based guilt is associated with a desire to make amendments and compensate the victimized outgroup. In the present research, we expect group-based compunction (but not group-based anger) to be associated with compensatory behavioral intentions. We argue that this is the case because previous research (Leach, Iyer, and Pedersen 2006) has shown that guilt and shame are usually more associated with passive means of compensation, while group-based anger is mostly associated with social change strategies that are more proactive in nature.

A study by Figueiredo and colleagues (2010) has shown that individuals who feel more group-based guilt give more importance to the discussion of the negative events of the colonial past in the public sphere. Since the negative emotions felt must be dealt with, one good way of resolving the negative feelings due to the misdeeds of the ingroup, may be through the public acknowledgment and discussion of such negative past events. In the present study, we predict that when both group-based compunction and anger are under analysis, only group-based anger will be associated with subjective importance of discussing the past. Since the latter emotion has a higher level of action readiness, we expect that anger is more associated with dynamic ways of coming to terms with an immoral past than group-based compunction. Because of the experience of group-based

anger, individuals may desire to acknowledge what happened in the past and to discuss openly the morality of such events. This discussion may, in turn, lead to the creation of better intergroup relationships (Kanyangara et al. 2007).

Another important consequence of group-based emotions is forgiveness. Much research has focused on forgiveness from the victimized group's perspective and has shown that, in fact, the transgressor's group emotions may influence the willingness of the victimized group to forgive the perpetrator's group (Brown, Wohl, and Exline 2008; Cehajic, Brown, and Castano 2008; Tam et al. 2007; Wohl and Branscombe 2005). Though we believe this line of research is highly valuable, we think it is important to investigate forgiveness not only from the victim's perspective, but also from the perpetrator's perspective. Specifically, we address the following issues: Do members of the perpetrator group, who were not involved in the harm done, feel they should be forgiven by the victimized group? What are the conditions influencing the ingroup's desire (or even need) to be forgiven by the outgroup?

Accordingly, we analyze forgiveness assignment, a variable which we conceptualize as the desire of the ingroup to be forgiven by the outgroup for the negative actions this ingroup has committed against the victimized group in the past. We expect group-based compunction and group-based anger to be negatively related to forgiveness assignment. This argument stems from the idea that when individuals experience high levels of negative group-based emotions, they feel that the situation between the groups is still not resolved and, therefore, the ingroup should attune for the negative misdeeds. This would mean that ingroup members believe that forgiveness is still not attainable and thus, the ingroup should not be forgiven yet.

Summarizing, in the present paper we propose to analyze how the intensity of group-based compunction and anger will be determined by two different categories of antecedents - ingroup-focused antecedents and outgroup-focused antecedents of group-based emotions - and how these emotional experiences differentially affect compensatory behavioral intentions, the subjective importance of discussing the past and the desire of the ingroup to be forgiven,

within two contexts of colonial conflicts. For this purpose we will use multiple group structural equation modeling (MGSEM).

The main hypotheses of our study are: H1: Ingroup self-investment (ingroup-focused distal antecedent) is significantly and positively related with exonerating cognitions and collectivism (ingroup-focused proximal antecedents) and with outgroup-identification and meta-perceptions (outgroup-focused proximal antecedents); H2: Exonerating cognitions are negatively related to group-based compunction and anger; H3: Collectivism is positively related to group-based compunction and anger; H4: Outgroup identification is positively related to group-based compunction and anger; H5: Meta-perceptions are negatively related to group-based compunction and anger; H6: Group-based compunction is positively related to compensatory behavioral intentions and negatively related to forgiveness assignment; H7: Group-based anger is positively related to subjective importance of discussing the past and negatively related to forgiveness assignment.

Importantly, we expect differences between the Portuguese and the Dutch samples regarding Hypothesis 1. We expect to only find significant associations between ingroup self-investment and outgroup identification and meta-perceptions in the Portuguese sample.

We argue that the differences between our samples regarding H1 are due to the *lusu-tropicalist* representation in Portugal, by which the Portuguese are believed to have an inherent ability for miscigenizing biologically and culturally with the populations from their former colonies (Valentim, 2011). This general tendency is also reflected in the supposed lack of racism among Portuguese people, allowing them to have positive relations with the native populations of their colonies (Vala et al., 2008). Meanwhile, in the Dutch case, colonization did not reflect a strong ideological desire to control or evangelize the native populations of the colonies, but instead focused on the creation of trade roots. For example, in Indonesia, the Dutch made little effort to introduce their national language and their religion (Oostindie 2008). Hence, we argue that, in Portugal, a *lusu-tropicalist* representation of the relations

between the Portuguese and the people from the former colonies, allows for a perceived connection and positive relations between former colonizer and colonized groups (Vala, Lopes and Lima 2008; Valentim 2003, 2011), while this is not the case in the Dutch context. In terms of the other hypotheses, we expect similar results between the Portuguese and the Dutch samples.

1. Method

1.1. Participants

Two hundred and eighty Portuguese University students and one hundred and eighty four Dutch University students were recruited for this study. 88.6% of the Portuguese participants were female (age $M = 20$ years, $SD = 3.42$; range 17–50), while this percentage was 70.1% for the Dutch sample (age $M = 20$ years, $SD = 4.71$; range 17–45).

1.2. Design and procedure

The present study had a correlational design: predictors and dependent variables were assessed using a questionnaire.

In Portugal, the questionnaire was administered at the University of Coimbra at the beginning or at the end of classes and participants took about half an hour to complete it. There was a tacit informed consent, and participants who did not want to participate in the study were allowed to leave the room, while the ones remaining filled in the questionnaire. It was explained that the study aimed to examine the perceptions people have about the Portuguese colonial period and about the Portuguese colonial war. Several demographical variables, such as age, gender and nationality of the participants and their parents were also covered in the questionnaire and anonymity and confidentiality were guaranteed.

In the Netherlands, the questionnaire was administered during the “TestWeek” at the University of Amsterdam, in which students had to participate in several research projects for course credits. At the beginning of each session, participants had to sign an informed consent for their participation in the data collection sessions. At the beginning of the questionnaire it was explained that the study aimed to examine the perceptions people have about the Dutch

colonial period in Indonesia. Demographical variables, such as age, gender and nationality of the participants and their parents were also present.

All items used in the present study were measured on a 7-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*).

1.3. Measures

Ingroup self-investment. The composite measure of self-investment was adapted from Leach and colleagues (2008) and had 10 items focused on centrality, satisfaction and solidarity (Portuguese Cronbach $\alpha = .88$; Dutch Cronbach $\alpha = .90$). Example items are “I often think about the fact that I am Portuguese/Dutch” [centrality], “I am glad to be Portuguese/Dutch” [satisfaction], and “I feel a bond with the Portuguese/Dutch” [solidarity].

Collectivism. This measure had 8 items (Portuguese Cronbach $\alpha = .75$; Dutch Cronbach $\alpha = .53$), as created by Triandis and Gelfand (1998). Example items are “I feel good when I cooperate with others”, “To me, pleasure is spending time with others” and “It is important to me that I respect the decisions made by my groups”. Although this measure presents a low alpha for the Dutch sample, we nevertheless decided to maintain its original structure, while being aware that this may cause the multiple group structural equation model to present lower fit indices.

Outgroup identification. Participants were asked to indicate their level of identification with the outgroup by means of 5 items (“I identify with Africans from the former colonies/Indonesians”, “I feel a bond with Africans from the former colonies/Indonesians”, “I feel strong ties with natives/individuals from the former colonies”, “I am similar to the natives of the former colonies” and “I feel solidarity with the natives from the former colonies”), which were derived and augmented from the measure used by Valentim (2003) (Portuguese Cronbach $\alpha = .89$; Dutch Cronbach $\alpha = .92$).

Meta-perceptions. We used a bipolar scale consisting of 9 items, partially derived from Valentim (2003). Examples are “In general, I think the Africans think the Portuguese are

unkind-kind [unfriendly-friendly] [lazy-hard workers]” (Portuguese Cronbach $\alpha = .93$; Dutch Cronbach $\alpha = .87$).

Exonerating cognitions. This measure was derived and augmented from Roccas, Klar, and Liviatan (2006) and had 11 items (Portuguese Cronbach $\alpha = .74$; Dutch Cronbach $\alpha = .70$). Example items are “The Africans from the former Portuguese colonies/Indonesians must take responsibility for what happened in their countries”, “Portugal/The Netherlands had a right to maintain its colonies in Africa/Indonesia” and “The Africans from the former colonies/Indonesians are responsible for the negative consequences of the colonial war”.

Group-based compunction. This scale was derived from Watson, Clark, and Tellegen (1988) and was comprised of 6 items: “I feel [guilty] [remorseful] [ashamed] [humiliated] [regretful] [disgraced] for the behavior of the Portuguese/Dutch during the colonial war” (Portuguese Cronbach $\alpha = .81$; Dutch Cronbach $\alpha = .89$).

Group-based anger. This measure consisted of 3 items that were derived from Watson, Clark, and Tellegen (1988): “I feel [angry] [outraged] [furious] for the behavior of the Portuguese/Dutch during the colonial war” (Portuguese Cronbach $\alpha = .80$; Dutch Cronbach $\alpha = .90$).

Compensatory behavioral intentions. Four items derived from Doosje and colleagues (1998) were used (Portuguese $\alpha = .85$; Dutch $\alpha = .79$) and example items are “I think the Portuguese/Dutch owe something to the people from the former colonies because of the things the Portuguese/Dutch have done” and “I think I should make more efforts to improve the position of people from the former colonies/Indonesians because of the negative things the Portuguese/Dutch have done”.

Subjective importance of discussing the past. Participants were then asked about the importance of remembering the positive and the negative aspects of the colonial period in the media and the school curriculum, through 4 items previously used by Figueiredo and colleagues (2010). We first aggregated the two positive items and the two negative items and then the negative items were subtracted from the

positive items to create a composite measure for perceived importance of remembering *negative* aspects of the colonial conflict (Portuguese $\alpha = .77$; Dutch $\alpha = .80$). This measure had possible values ranging from -6 (discuss the positive aspects of the past) to +6 (discuss the negative aspects of the past). Example items are “How important do you think it is for the media to give attention to the positive aspects of the Portuguese/Dutch colonial period?” and “How important do you think it is for the school curriculum to give attention to the negative aspects of the Portuguese/Dutch colonial period?”

Forgiveness assignment. Five items addressed the degree to which participants feel that their ingroup should be forgiven for their past misdeeds during the colonial war (Portuguese Cronbach $\alpha = .66$; Dutch Cronbach $\alpha = .68$).

Example items are “The Africans/Indonesians should move past their negative feelings towards the Portuguese/Dutch for the harm they inflicted to them during the colonial war” and “Portuguese/Dutch today cannot be held accountable for what their ancestors have done to Africans/Indonesians during the colonial war”. Although this measure presents a rather low alpha for both samples, we decided to maintain it, as we believe that these items strongly reflect the construct under analysis, although this may cause lower fit indices in the multiple group structural equation model for the two samples.

2. Results

2.1. Correlations and means

The correlations between all the variables under analysis are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Correlations (*r*) among the variables in the Portuguese (upper part) and the Dutch (lower part) samples

	Ingr. SI	Collectivism	Outgr. Id.	Meta-percept.	Exon. Cogn.	Compunction	Anger	Compensation	Negative Info	Forgiveness
Ingr. SI	--	.29*	.17*	.13**	.22*	-.03	-.09	-.08	-.21	.06
Collectivism	.26*	--	-.01	-.01	.02	.10	.16*	.03	-.16*	.13**
Outgr. Id.	.02	.06	--	.17*	-.16*	.34*	.27*	.42*	.01	-.25*
Meta-percept.	.11	.14	.30*	--	.04	-.10	-.14**	-.03	-.02	-.06
Exon. Cogn.	.22*	-.13	.01	.12	--	-.30*	-.39*	-.36*	-.28*	.36*
Compunction	.06	.21*	.40*	.03	-.07	--	.70*	.40*	.13**	-.27*
Anger	.01	.15**	.37*	-.07	-.03	.87*	--	.38*	.21*	-.21*
Compensation	-.21*	-.04	.34*	.01	-.08	.43*	.49*	--	.13**	-.33*
Negative Info	-.17**	-.06	.09	-.08	-.30*	.20*	.19**	.05	--	.12
Forgiveness	.20*	.03	-.06	.06	.28*	-.42*	-.46*	-.53*	.06	--

* $p < .01$ ** $p < .05$

2.2. Multiple Group Structural Equation Model

To investigate the structural relations between the variables under study, we tested a multiple group structural equation model (MGSEM), using AMOS (see Figure 1). The model included hypothesized paths from the distal antecedent ingroup self-investment to the more proximal predictor variables (i.e. exonerating cognitions, collectivism, outgroup identification and meta-perceptions). Additionally, we included paths from the proximal predictor variables to the emotional measures (i.e. group-based compunction and

group-based anger) and from the latter to the outcome variables (i.e. compensation, subjective importance of discussing the past and forgiveness assignment). Finally, given that we wanted to explore the potential relationships of the four antecedents (exonerating cognitions; collectivism; outgroup identification; and meta-perceptions) with the three theorized consequences of group-based compunction and anger (compensatory behavioral intentions; subjective importance of discussing the past; and forgiveness assignment), we also included these paths. In the analyses, every

time the estimates of association between the different antecedents and consequences of group-based emotions were not significant and the modification indexes suggested their removal, we made the suggested change, in order to achieve the most comprehensive model.

Given the strong correlation between the two emotional variables, we also allowed for their error terms to correlate. In order to compensate for the small sample size and the high number of components existent in the model, we conducted the Maximum Likelihood (ML) bootstrap method with 90% confidence interval, as described in Byrne (2010).¹

The resulting hypothesized model fits the data moderately. The χ^2 value was small but statistically significant: $\chi^2 (44, N = 280) = 155.64, p < .01; \chi^2/df$ ratio = 3.54, not falling below the critical ratio of 2.50. The other model fit indexes suggested an adequate fit: Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = .90, Incremental Fit Index (IFI) = .90, Normed Fit Index (NFI) = .87, and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .07.

According to the modification indexes, we allowed for three correlations among item errors, namely between: a) exonerating cognitions and outgroup identification; b) outgroup identification and meta-perceptions; and c) compensation and forgiveness assignment. The resulting hypothesized model fits the data well. The χ^2 value was small but statistically significant: $\chi^2 (38, N = 280) = 73.66, p < .01; \chi^2/df$ ratio = 1.94, thus falling below the critical ratio of 2.50. Good model fit was also suggested by a wide variety of fit indexes: Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = .97, Incremental Fit Index (IFI) = .97, Normed Fit Index (NFI) = .94, and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .05. Parameter estimates for our final unconstrained model are shown in Figure 1. We further compared our unconstrained model with the fit of a model in which all regression coef-

ficients were constrained to be equal across the samples. This model proved to have a worse fit than our hypothesized unconstrained model: $\chi^2 (60, N = 280) = 131.35, p < .01; \chi^2/df$ ratio = 2.19, below the critical ratio of 2.50. Lower model fit was also suggested by other fit indexes: Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = .94, Incremental Fit Index (IFI) = .94, Normed Fit Index (NFI) = .89, RMSEA = .05.

Finally, we tested whether the indirect effects were significant using the Maximum Likelihood (ML) bootstrap method with 90% confidence interval. The values were calculated from the unconstrained model (separately for each national sample). The indirect effects of self-investment on group-based anger and compunction were as follows (standardized regression coefficients, 90% confidence intervals and *p*-values): Portugal, anger: -.01 (-.08 to .06), *p* = .80; compunction: .02 (-.05 to .08), *p* = .64; the Netherlands, anger: .03 (-.06 to .10), *p* = .61; compunction: .04 (-.04 to .11), *p* = .40.

For Portugal, the indirect effects of the antecedents of our emotional variables on compensatory behavioral intentions were as follows: self-investment: .00 (-.06 to .06) *p* = .99; exonerating cognitions: -.06 (-.10 to -.03), *p* = .00; collectivism: .03 (.01 to .06), *p* = .02; outgroup identification: .08 (.04 to .12), *p* = .00; meta-perceptions: -.03 (-.07 to -.01), *p* = .01. For the Netherlands, the indirect effects of the proximal antecedents of our emotional variables on compensatory behavioral intentions were as follows: self-investment: .01 (-.07 to .06), *p* = .89; exonerating cognitions: -.01 (-.06 to .03), *p* = .65; collectivism: .07 (.03 to .12), *p* = .01; outgroup identification: .15 (.09 to .22), *p* = .00; meta-perceptions: -.04 (-.09 to .00), *p* = .08.

In the Portuguese sample, the indirect effects of the proximal antecedents of our emotional variables on subjective

1 We also performed MGSEM using latent variables that reflected our constructs of interest. Once again, to compensate for the small sample size and the high number of parameters in our model, we used the ML bootstrap method with 90% confidence interval. Each item was allowed to load only on its designated latent factor and items' errors were allowed to correlate only if they belonged to the same latent factor. With this analysis, we wanted to understand how


well our model fitted the data, if we allowed for the measurement error to be included in the model. The resulting model fits the data moderately. The χ^2 value was quite high and statistically significant: $\chi^2 (3234, N = 280) = 5274.46, p < .01$. Nevertheless, the χ^2/df ratio equals 1.63, thus falling below the critical ratio of 2.50. The other fit indexes showed a lower fit of the model, in comparison with the model using observed variables: Comparative Fit Index (CFI) =

.86, Incremental Fit Index (IFI) = .86, Normed Fit Index (NFI) = .71, and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .04. These results lead us to conclude that including the measurement model in our analysis diminishes the model fit. Nevertheless we argue that the ratio between the Chi-square value and the degrees of freedom, along with the RMSEA's value, give us confidence regarding the validity of our hypothesized model.

importance of discussing the past were as follows: self-investment: .10 (.05 to .17), $p = .00$; exonerating cognitions: .06 (.02 to .11), $p = .02$; collectivism: -.03 (-.06 to -.01), $p = .02$; outgroup identification: -.04 (-.08 to -.01), $p = .02$; meta-perceptions: .03 (.01 to .06), $p = .02$. For the Dutch sample, the indirect effects of the proximal antecedents of our emotional variables on subjective importance of discussing the past were as follows: self-investment: .10; (.04 to .16), $p = .01$; exonerating cognitions: .00 (-.03 to .02), $p = .76$; collectivism: -.03 (-.08 to -.01), $p = .03$; outgroup identification: -.08 (-.15 to -.03), $p = .01$; meta-perceptions: .04 (.01 to .09), $p = .01$.

For Portugal, the indirect effects of the proximal antecedents of our emotional variables on forgiveness assignment were as follows: self-investment: .04 (-.01 to .09), $p = .18$; exonerating cognitions: .01 (-.04 to .05), $p = .77$; collectivism: .00 (-.03 to .02), $p = .81$; outgroup identification: -.04 (-.08 to -.01), $p = .06$; meta-perceptions: .01 (-.01 to .04), $p = .41$. For the Netherlands, the indirect effects of the proximal antecedents of our emotional variables on forgiveness assignment were as follows: self-investment: .04 (-.01 to .10), $p = .01$; exonerating cognitions: .01 (-.05 to .07), $p = .01$; collectivism: -.09 (-.15 to -.04), $p = .00$; outgroup identification: -.21 (-.31 to -.13), $p = .04$; meta-perceptions: .08 (.02 to .15), $p = .21$.

Figure 1: Figure 1: Multiple group structural equation model testing antecedents and consequences of group-based compunction and anger for the Portuguese and Dutch samples (upper line: PT estimate [lower and upper bound at 90% confidence interval]; lower line: NL estimate [lower and upper bound at 90% confidence interval]).



Note: Standardized parameter estimates; * $p < .05$. Below are the correlations between error parameters which are not represented in the Figure for reasons of simplification: Exonerating cognitions Γ Outgroup identification: PT = -.21*; NL = -.03*; Outgroup identification Γ Meta-perceptions: PT = .16*; NL = .31*; Group-based anger Γ Group-based compunction: PT = .63*; NL = .85*; Compensation Γ Forgiveness assignment: PT = -.15*; NL = -.45*.

To further assess our hypotheses and the validity of the theorized model, we tested three other MGSEM models in which we explored the role of the different group-based emotions under study. In the first model, we included only group-based compunction, in the second only group-based anger and in the third we included both group-based guilt and shame separately² (i.e. we subdivided the items of group-based compunction into two measures: group-based guilt and group-based shame) and anger. We used the Maximum Likelihood bootstrap resampling method with a 90% confidence

interval, as previously used for our hypothesized model (Byrne, 2010).

As shown in Table 3, except for the model containing only group-based compunction, no other model proved to have a better fit to the data than our hypothesized model. Even though the model in which we only include group-based compunction has a good fit, it does not provide an improvement regarding our hypothesized model, since the fit indexes are very similar and mostly lower. Therefore, we can conclude that the results fit our theoretical model well.

Table 3: Fit indexes of hypothesized and alternative MGSEM

	Chi square	<i>p</i>	NFI	CFI	IFI	RMSEA	AIC
Hypothesized model	χ^2 (38, N = 280) = 73.66	< .01	.94	.97	.97	.05	257.66
Only Compunction ¹	χ^2 (34, N = 280) = 67.40	< .01	.90	.94	.95	.05	215.40
Only Anger ²	χ^2 (34, N = 280) = 104.40	< .01	.84	.88	.89	.07	252.40
Guilt, shame and anger separately ³	χ^2 (42, N = 280) = 84.69	< .01	.95	.97	.97	.05	308.69

¹Results of MGSEM analysis including the measurement model (using Maximum Likelihood bootstrap method with 90% confidence interval): χ^2 (2910, N = 280) = 4724.82, *p* < .01; χ^2 /df ratio = 1.62, thus falling below the critical ratio of 2.50; Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = .86, Incremental Fit Index (IFI) = .87, Normed Fit Index (NFI) = .71, and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .04.

²Results of MGSEM analysis including the measurement model (using Maximum Likelihood bootstrap method with 90% confidence interval): χ^2 (2600, N = 280) = 4219.18, *p* < .01; χ^2 /df ratio = 1.62, thus falling below the critical ratio of 2.50; Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = .87, Incremental Fit Index (IFI) = .87, Normed Fit Index (NFI) = .73, and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .04.

³Results of MGSEM analysis including the measurement model (using Maximum Likelihood bootstrap method with 90% confidence interval): χ^2 (3234, N = 280) = 5621.84, *p* < .01; χ^2 /df ratio = 1.74, thus falling below the critical ratio of 2.50; Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = .84, Incremental Fit Index (IFI) = .84, Normed Fit Index (NFI) = .69, and Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = .04.

3. General Discussion

From the results of our study, we can affirm that, for most part, our hypotheses were corroborated, in terms of the hypothesized antecedents and consequences of group-based compunction and anger.

3.1. Antecedents of group-based compunction and anger

We found that ingroup self-investment is significantly related to exonerating cognitions and collectivism in both

samples. Past research (Roccas, Klar, and Liviatan 2006) has shown that, indeed, individuals who identify more strongly with their ingroup are more defensive of the morality of the ingroup (see also Doosje et al. 1998), thus exculpating the ingroup for its past misdeeds, a pattern that was also obtained in our results.

Regarding the association between ingroup self-investment and collectivism, we propose that both variables can be con-

2 We have conceptualized compunction as an emotional experience encompassing feelings of guilt, regret and self-criticism, but our measure of such an emotion is composed by items which are traditionally associated with the experience of shame.

Many researchers have made efforts to disentangle the distinctive role of shame and guilt for improving intergroup relations (Brown and Cehajic 2008; Brown, Wohl, and Exline 2008; Iyer, Schmader, and Lickel 2007; Lickel, Schmader, and Barquissau 2004).

Given that our items may be interpreted in terms of shame, we have conducted analysis distinguishing these items, according to the presentation of the results.

ceptualized as membership relevance factors and, thus, they are inherently associated. While self-investment is more focused on the positive aspects of feeling a bond with a group, collectivism represents a broader group-orientation of individuals. However, one may wonder why would a higher level of ingroup identification lead to more exonerating cognitions being reported but, at the same time, also lead to higher levels of collectivism, although these two variables are inversely related to the experience of negative group-based emotions?

We argue that this dual role of ingroup identification may be related to the nature of collectivism itself. While ingroup identification is, of course, expected to be positively related to exonerating cognitions, the first variable is also associated with collectivism, because both variables represent a sense of satisfaction and enjoyment derived from group life and spending time with ingroup members. However, while ingroup identification is more connected with image concerns of the specific ingroup, collectivism's conceptualization as a positive general orientation towards group life, may explain such a pattern of results. If one adheres to a worldview by which group life is important, negative group-based emotions may rise when individuals are confronted with their ingroup's misdeeds. Given that this variable does not reflect ingroup-image concerns (as ingroup identification does), then we may comprehend why it predicts positively group-based compunction and anger. This interpretation is further supported by the significant negative links between collectivism and exonerating cognitions in both our samples.

As expected, we found significant relations between ingroup self-investment and outgroup identification for the Portuguese sample, but not for the Dutch sample, a pattern we believe is linked to the concept of *lusu-tropicalism*, which is a social representation of the Portuguese nation emphasizing the unique relationships Portugal had with its colonies and the special positive way with which Portuguese dealt with people from different cultures and the lack of prejudice among the Portuguese (Vala, Lopes, and Lima 2008; Valentim 2003, 2011).

Our second hypothesis was only partly confirmed, because the links between exonerating cognitions and group-based compunction and group-based anger were only negatively

significant in the Portuguese sample. For the Portuguese sample, the pattern of correlations was consistent with the work done by Roccas, Klar, and Liviatan (2006). Furthermore, for the Portuguese sample (but not for the Dutch sample), exonerating cognitions were significantly and negatively related to compensatory behavioral intentions. Perhaps, for the Portuguese sample, those who endorse more exonerating cognitions feel there is no need to compensate the outgroup, via a direct cognitive path, but also through feeling negative group-based emotions.

We found evidence, in both samples, that exonerating cognitions are negatively related to the subjective importance of discussing the past and positively related to forgiveness assignment. Interestingly, we found evidence that, for the Dutch sample, there is no indirect effect of exonerating cognitions on forgiveness assignment via group-based compunction or anger. We argue that individuals who use exonerating cognitions are not so open to negative information about their ingroups' history and, therefore, do not want to discuss the immoral aspects of the past, while feeling that the ingroup should be forgiven for the misdeeds of the past. This pattern of results reflects a kind of moral disengagement from the ingroup's wrongdoings, beyond the indirect effects of exonerating cognitions through group-based compunction and anger, which were found for the Portuguese sample (Barkan 2000; Kanyangara et al. 2007). New venues of research should tap into the question of whether exonerating cognitions may present direct consequences for intergroup relations, independently of the emotions that ingroup members may feel due to past wrongdoings.

The results from the Portuguese and the Dutch samples show support for Hypothesis 3, being that collectivism is positively related to group-based compunction and group-based anger. We believe that a more collectivistic orientation may lead individuals to feel higher levels of group-based emotions, because this general group-focused orientation is relevant for the emotional processes involving their group membership and its associations with other groups.

Collectivism is also negatively associated with subjective importance of discussing the past in the Portuguese sample. This double role of collectivism in the Portuguese

sample may be related to the fact that, for the Portuguese participants, feeling negative emotions about the past does not necessarily mean there is a need to redress this negative past by discussing its negative consequences. Further research should explore this tentative explanation. Moreover, in the Dutch sample, we found that collectivism does not associate directly with the importance of discussing the negative aspects of the past, but that the first variable has an indirect effect on the latter, via group-based anger. Further research should shed light into the role of collectivism as a potential predictor of forgiveness assignment and other hypothesized consequences of emotions for intergroup relations, above and beyond the connections this variable has with group-based emotions.

We were able to show, in both samples, that outgroup identification is positively related to group-based compunction and anger (Hypothesis 4). The more individuals feel a bond with the outgroup, the higher are their levels of group-based emotions deriving from the ingroup's past misdeeds. This pattern of results is in line with the argument of Baumeister, Stillwell, and Heatherton (1994), stating that when there is a damaged relationship with a relevant person or group, individuals will feel stronger emotions than when the other is not relevant to the person or group who committed the wrongful actions.

We argue that outgroup identification is a relevant variable for the improvement of intergroup relations, via its links with group-based compunction and anger, but also through its direct association with the desire to compensate the outgroup, which can be considered a more instrumental way of dealing with past conflictual intergroup relations. Finally, for the Portuguese sample, outgroup identification is also significantly and negatively associated with forgiveness assignment, while this is not the case for the Dutch sample. It seems that, for the Dutch sample, the association between outgroup identification and forgiveness assignment is fully mediated through group-based compunction and anger. Further research should try to understand if this variable may be conceptualized as a direct antecedent of forgiveness assignment rather than an antecedent of negative emotions felt on behalf of the ingroup in different intergroup contexts.

Finally, we found evidence for Hypothesis 5: meta-perceptions are negatively related to group-based compunction (Portuguese sample only) and anger (in both samples). It thus seems that, in general, the more individuals believe that the outgroup has a positive perception of the ingroup, the less they show negative emotions regarding past events involving the two groups, perhaps due to a feeling of restored balance in the intergroup relation at stake, as it was previously found by Figueiredo and colleagues (2010).

3.2. Consequences of group-based compunction and anger

In terms of the hypothesized consequences of group-based emotions, we were able to show that group-based compunction predicts compensatory behavioral intentions and group-based anger is positively related to the subjective importance of discussing the past. As hypothesized, group-based anger is more relevant than group-based compunction for predicting how important people feel it is to discuss the negative aspects of the colonial past. This result is consistent with research by Leach, Iyer, and Pedersen (2006) in which they show that, due to the higher readiness for action derived from feelings of anger, this group-based emotion is strongly related to actions aimed at changing intergroup imbalances and improving the outgroup situation. In comparison, group-based compunction is an emotion with a lower level of action readiness and is, in general, more related to efforts of compensation that are more passive in nature. We can argue that, in fact, subjective importance of discussing the past is a more direct way of improving intergroup relations in the present day, than are compensatory behavioral intentions, a variable that describes a general wish to compensate for the ingroup's past misdeeds.

Regarding the more novel theorized consequence of group-based emotions, our results show that, for the Portuguese sample, group-based compunction relates negatively with forgiveness assignment and, for the Dutch sample, both group-based compunction and anger negatively predict this variable. We argue that the dynamics of group-based emotions might influence the ingroup's perceptions regarding whether they should or should not be forgiven for negative actions that occurred in the past: the more individuals feel negative group-based emotions, the less they feel the ingroup should be forgiven. In this line, forgiveness assign-

ment can be conceptualized as an important determinant of the quality of intergroup relations after a negative past.

It is important to acknowledge that, although many researchers have made efforts to disentangle the distinctive role of shame and guilt for improving intergroup relations (Brown and Cehajic 2008; Brown et al. 2008; Iyer, Schmader, and Lickel 2007; Lickel, Schmader, and Barquissau 2004), in the present research we used a measure that aggregates self-criticism (conventionally conceptualized as shame) and guilt – group-based compunction. We argue that our conceptualization of compunction is suitable for several reasons: 1) our measure of compunction did not refer to any reputational aspects of shame and thus, can be conceptualized as ingroup-criticism based on a negative image of the ingroup (for further details on the distinction between guilt and shame in relation to reputational aspects see Brown and Cehajic 2008) much of the research conducted on group-based guilt and shame has reported very strong correlations between them (Branscombe, Slugoski, and Kappen 2004; Lickel, Schmader, and Barquissau 2004; Iyer, Schmader, and Lickel 2007; Brown et al. 2008). Our data actually concurs with most of the aforementioned results and further shows that analyzing the items measuring guilt and self-criticism (conventionally called shame) together provides a better understanding of the results obtained. Nevertheless, further research could benefit from analyzing the subtleties between group-based shame, guilt and compunction.

In our studies, group-based compunction and group-based anger were also strongly related to each other, although we showed that they have different consequences for intergroup relations. In the future, understanding in which ways the strong association between different negative group-based emotions might influence intergroup relations affected by a past or present conflict should also be addressed.

3.3. Limitations of the present research

We were able to corroborate most of the hypothesized relations between variables. However, we acknowledge that this study has a number of limitations to consider. First, we must underline that some of the antecedent variables (i.e. exonerating cognitions, collectivism and outgroup identification) had direct associations with the consequences of

group-based emotions, thus showing that these variables have not only an indirect effect via the emotions studied, but also through a direct link with the hypothesized consequences of feeling group-based anger and compunction. This may pose an issue in the interpretation of such variables solely as antecedents of group-based emotions. Second, we must consider that group-based anger and compunction are strongly related with each other in both samples, thus allowing the tentative explanation that many times individuals may confound both types of emotions in self-reported measures. Third, the variables collectivism (for the Dutch sample) and forgiveness assignment (for the two samples) presented rather low alphas and we believe that this may have caused lower fit indexes in our MGSEM analysis, when we included the measurement models in the analysis. One may argue that these constructs were not fully validated in our measurement models and thus pose a threat to construct validity. Nevertheless, from a theoretical perspective, we argue that maintaining these variables in our analysis allowed us to better understand the potential associations of these variables with the group-based emotions analyzed. Further research should pay attention to these issues, when examining such variables and their connection with emotions. Fourth, even though our sample sizes are reasonable, they are only representative of university students within the social sciences and therefore we cannot make generalizations of our results towards other social or age groups. Fifth, throughout our discussion section we have presented some tentative explanations for some of the results we found. However, these have not been tested and further research should examine such potential explanations.

3.4. Further research

Given our results, but also the limitations of the present research, we believe it is important that future research explores other variables that may affect the experience of negative group-based emotions, such as other outgroup-focused variables like perceived legitimacy of compensation claims by the outgroup or the influence of chronological and subjective time for the relations between the ingroup and the outgroup. Second, we propose that the field of intergroup relations will certainly benefit from the analysis of other ingroup-based emotions, such as pride and humiliation, but also from other emotions that are not ingroup-

critical, such as empathy or contempt towards the outgroup. Third, further research should address the role of *lusotropicalism* in the Portuguese sample, as well as other social representations of the colonial past that may exist in different countries and that may affect the way people perceive this past. We believe this may be an important variable for understanding the perceptions of the relationship between the Portuguese and the people from its former colonies. More importantly, we believe that understanding if *lusotropicalism* is a specificity of the Portuguese context or if it is a more general trend in intergroup relations marked by a colonial past is an important venue for future studies.

Furthermore, we argue that further research should shed light into the dynamics of forgiveness assignment from the ingroup's perspective. We believe this to be an important step in understanding when or why individuals feel their group has to do more before being forgiven or when the efforts (or lack of perceived need of them) made by the ingroup have been enough for forgiveness to occur. At the same time, ultimately, it is up to the victimized group to decide whether or not they think the perpetrator group should be forgiven.

4. Conclusion

We have shown that group-based compunction and group-based anger are two related yet distinct emotions

involved in the dynamics of intergroup relations following a conflict between groups. The present research has shown that ingroup-focused antecedents are important in determining the degree to which individuals feel group-based compunction and anger in relation to past colonial conflicts but, in a more novel line, we were able to show that outgroup-focused antecedents can also predict the degree to which individuals feel these emotions. Furthermore, we have concentrated our efforts in understanding the (different) consequences of negative group-based emotions in terms of compensatory behavioral intentions, perceived importance of information and forgiveness assignment. In the future it would be important to analyze other potential consequences of negative group-based emotions for the dynamics of intergroup relations marked by conflict.

The work presented proposes several theoretical advances within the domains of intergroup relations, conflict and group violence that may benefit our present and future work, of most relevance: 1) the inclusion of more outgroup-focused and relational variables in our understanding of intergroup relations; and 2) a refinement of the conceptualization of different group-based emotions and their associated appraisals and potentially distinct consequences for intergroup relations.

References

- Barkan, Elazar. 2000. *The Guilt of Nations – Restitution and Negotiating Historical Injustices*. New York: W. W. Norton & Company.
- Baumeister, Roy., Arlene M. Stillwell, and Todd Heatherton. 1994. Guilt: An Interpersonal Approach. *Psychological Bulletin* 112(2):243-267.
- Branscombe, Nyla. 2004. A social psychological process perspective on collective guilt. In *Collective Guilt: International Perspectives*, ed. N. R. Branscombe and B. Doosje, 320–334. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Branscombe, Nyla, Ben Slugosky, and Diane R. Kappen. 2004. The measurement of collective guilt: What it is and what it is not. In *Collective Guilt – International Perspectives*, ed. N. Branscombe and B. Doosje, 56-74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Branscombe, Nyla, Bertjan Doosje, and Craig McGarthy. 2002. Antecedents and consequences of collective guilt. In *From Prejudice to Intergroup Emotions: Differentiated Reactions to Social Groups*, ed. D. M. Mackie and E. R. Smith, 49–66. New York: Psychology Press.
- Brown, Rupert, and Sabina Čehajić. 2008. Dealing with the Past and Facing the Future: Mediators of Collective Guilt and Shame in Bosnia And Herzegovina. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 38:669-684.
- Brown, Rupert, Roberto Gonzalez, Hanna Zagefka, Jorge Manzi, and Sabina Čehajić. 2008. Nuestra Culpa. Guilt as Predictor of Reparation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 94(1):75-90.
- Brown, Rupert, Michael J. A. Wohl, and Julie J. Exline. 2008. Taking up Offenses: Second-Hand Forgiveness and Identification with Targets of Transgressions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 34:1406-1419.
- Byrne, B. (2010). *Structural Equation Modeling with AMOS: Basic Concepts, Applications, and Programming* (2nd Ed.). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Čehajić, Sabina, Rupert Brown, and Emanuele Castano. 2008. Forgive and Forget? Antecedents, Mediators, and Consequences of Intergroup Forgiveness in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Political Psychology* 29(3):351-367.
- Cehajic, Sabina, Rupert Brown, R., and Roberto Gonzalez. 2009. What Do I Care? Perception of In-Group Responsibility and Dehumanization as Predictors of Empathy Felt for the Victim Group. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* 12:715–729.
- Devine, Patricia G., Margo J. Monteith, Julia R. Zuwerink, and Andrew J. Elliot. 1991. Prejudice with and without Compunction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 60:817-830.
- Doosje, Bertjan, Nyla Branscombe, Russell Spears, and Antony Manstead. 1998. Guilty by Association: When One's Group Has a Negative History. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 75(4):872-886.
- Figueiredo, Ana M., Bertjan Doosje, Joaquim P. Valentim, and Sven Zebel. 2010. Dealing with Past Colonial Conflicts: How Perceived Characteristics of the Victimized Outgroup Can Influence the Experience of Group-Based Guilt. *International Journal of Conflict and Violence* 4(1):89-105.

- Figueiredo, Ana M., Joaquim P. Valentim, and Bertjan Doosje. 2011. A Shared Past and a Common Future: The Portuguese Colonial War and the Dynamics of Group-Based Guilt. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology* 14(1):163-172.
- Gordijn, Ernestine H., Vincent Yzerbyt, Daniel Wigboldus, and Muriel Dumont. 2006. Emotional Reactions to Harmful Intergroup Behavior. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 36:15-30. doi:10.1002/ejsp.296
- Hofstede, Geert. 1984. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Iyer, Aarti, Toni Schmader, and Brian Lickel. 2007. Why Individuals Protest the Perceived Transgressions of Their Country: The Role of Anger, Shame, and Guilt. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 33:572-587.
- Iyer, Arti, and Colin W. Leach. 2009. Emotion in Inter-Group Relations. *European review of Social Psychology* 19:86-125.
- Jetten, Jolanda, Tom Postmes, and Brendan J. McAuliffe. 2002. "We're All Individuals": Group Norms of Individualism and Collectivism, Levels of Identification and Identity Threat. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 32:189-207.
- Kanyangara, Patrick, Bernard Rimé, Pierre Philippot, and Vincent Yzerbyt. 2007. Collective Rituals, Emotional Climate and Intergroup Perception: Participation in "Gacaca" Tribunals and Assimilation of the Rwandan Genocide. *Journal of Social Issues* 63(2):387-403.
- Kline, Rex B. 1998. *Principles and Practice of Structural Equation Modeling*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Leach, Colin W., Aarti Iyer, and Anne Pedersen. 2006. Anger and Guilt about In-group Advantage Explain the Willingness for Political Action. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 32(9):1232-1245.
- Leach, Colin W., Martijn van Zomeren, Sven Zebel, Michael Vliek, Sjoerd Pennekamp, Bertjan Doosje, Jaap W. Ouwerkerk, and Russell Spears. 2008. Group-Level Self-Definition and Self-Investment: A Hierarchical (Multicomponent) Model of In-Group Identification. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 95(1):144-165.
- Lickel, Brian, Toni Schmader, and Marchelle Barquissau. 2004. The evocation of moral emotions in intergroup contexts: The distinction between collective guilt and collective shame. In *Collective Guilt - International Perspectives*, ed. N. Branscombe and B. Doosje, 35-55. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mackie, Diane M., Thierry Devos, and Eliot R. Smith. 2000. Intergroup Emotions: Explaining Offensive Action Tendencies in an Intergroup Context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 79:602-616.
- Mallett, Robyn K., and Janet Swim. 2004. Collective guilt in the United States: Predicting support for social policies that alleviate social injustice. In *Collective Guilt - International Perspectives*, ed. N. Branscombe and B. Doosje, 56-74. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Marques, José, Dario Paez, and Alexandra F. Serra. 1997. Social Sharing, Emotional Climate, and the Transgenerational Transmission of Memories: The Portuguese Colonial War. In *Collective memory of political events*, ed. J. W. Pennebaker, D. Paez, and B. Rime, 253-275. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Oostindie, G. (Ed.). (2008). *Dutch Colonialism, Migration and Cultural Heritage*. Leiden: KITLV Press.
- Roccas, Sonia, Yechiel Klar, and Ido Liviatan. 2006. The Paradox of Group-Based Guilt: Modes of National Identification, Conflict Vehemence, and Reactions to the Ingroup's Moral Violations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 91(4):698-711.
- Smith, Eliot R. (1993). Social identity and social emotions: Toward new conceptualization of prejudice. In *Affect, Cognition and Stereotyping*, ed. D. M. Mackie and D. L. Hamilton, 297-315. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Tajfel, Henry, & John C. Turner. 1986. The social identity theory of intergroup conflict. In *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, ed. S. Worchel and W. G. Austin, 7-24. Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Tam, Tania, Miles Hewstone, ed Cairns, Nicole Tausch, Greg Maio, and Jared Kenworthy. 2007. The Impact of Intergroup Emotions on Forgiveness in Northern Ireland. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* 10(1):119-136.
- Triandis, Harry C., and Michele J. Gelfand. 1998. Converging Measurements of Horizontal and Vertical Individualism and Collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 74:118-128.
- Vala, Jorge, Dinis Lopes, and Marcus Lima. 2008. Black Immigrants in Portugal: Luso-Tropicalism and Prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues* 64(2):287-302.
- Valentim, Joaquim P. 2003. *Identidade e Lusofonia nas Representações Sociais de Portugueses e de Africanos [Identity and lusophony in the Social Representations of Portuguese and Africans]*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. Coimbra: Universidade de Coimbra.
- Valentim, Joaquim P. 2011. Social psychology and colonialism. In *Societal Approaches in Social Psychology*, ed. J. P. Valentim, 179-194. Berne: Peter Lang.
- Watson, David, Lee A. Clark, and Auke Tellegen. 1988. Development and Validation of Brief Measures of Positive and Negative Affect: The PANAS Scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 54:1063-1070.
- Wohl, Michael J., and Nyla R. Branscombe. 2005. Forgiveness and Collective Guilt Assignment to Historical Perpetrator Groups Depends on Level of Social Category Inclusiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 88:288-303.
- Wohl, Michael J., and Nyla Branscombe. 2008. Remembering Historical Victimization: Collective Guilt for Current In-Group Transgression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 94:988-1006.
- Zebel, Sven, Sjoerd F. Pennekamp, Martijn Van Zomeren, Bertjan Doosje, Gerben Van Kleef, Michael Vliek, and Joop van der Schalk. 2007. Vessels with Gold or Guilt: Emotional Reactions to Family Involvement Associated with Glorious or Gloomy Aspects of the Past. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations* 10:71-86.

Ana Figueiredo

figueiredo.anacm@gmail.com

Bertjan Doosje

e.j.doosje@uva.nl

Joaquim Pires Valentim

jpv Valentim@fpce.uc.pt