The “Enemy” Image in Israeli-Arab Children

Mais Younis

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirement of the degree of

Master of Science
in
Developmental Psychology

Eastern Mediterranean University
July 2015
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

Prof. Dr. Serhan Çiftçioğlu
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Developmental Psychology.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman
Chair, Department of Psychology

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Developmental Psychology.

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman
Co-Supervisor

Prof. Dr. Biran Mertan
Supervisor

Examining Committee

1. Prof. Dr. Biran Mertan

2. Asst. Prof. Dr. Çığır Kalfaoğlu

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. İlmiye Seçer

ABSTRACT

Childhood is an important period for shaping individuals' social understanding. Previous studies conducted on children raised in conflict regions have shown that an understanding of enemy is well related to age and gender differences. The aim of the current study was to explore children's understanding and conceptualization of "enemy" who live with a "real enemy". In addition, it aimed to investigate age and gender differences, further to compare the intergroup contact of children who study in single-ethnic school to those studying in mixed-ethnic school. Sixty two Israeli-Arab children's "enemy" conceptualization and "enemy" images were assessed using contact questionnaire, a free association task, a drawing task, and an enemy questionnaire. The results suggested that generally, Israeli-Arab children were able to define and conceptualize concrete representations of the enemy, which change across age. With age, children perceived an enemy more with ethnic and political characteristics, such as Jewish nation. As in the literature, boys made more reference to the physical violence of an enemy compared to girls. Lastly, children in mixed-ethnic school reported more positive relationship and attitudes, and associated less negative enemy traits to outgroup members. The effect of being raised in conflictual environment and war are discussed.

Keywords: enemy, enemy images, Israeli-Arab, contact, children

ÖZ

Çocukluk dönemi bireylerin sosyal anlayışını şekillendiren önemli bir gelişim evresidir. Çatışma bölgelerinde yetişen çocuklarla yapılan önceki çalışmalar, düşman kavramındaki farklılıkların yaş ve cinsiyete bağlı olduğunu ortaya çıkarmıştır. Bu araştırmanın amacı, "gerçek" düşman ile aynı ortamda yaşayan çocukların "düşman" anlayışını ve kavramsallaştırmasını araştırmaktır. Buna ek olarak, gruplar arası teması karşılaştırmak için, karma-etnik okullarda ve tek-etnik okullarda okuyan çocukların yaş ve cinsiyet farklılıklarını araştırmak hedeflenmiştir. Altmış iki İsrail-Arap çocuğun katıldığı bu çalışmada, "düşman" kavramsallaştırma ve "düşman" imajı temas anketi, serbest çağrışım çalışması, çizim çalışması ve düşman anketi kullanılarak değerlendirilmiştir. Araştırmada, İsrail-Arap çocuklarının genel olarak yaş değiştikçe düşmanı somut bir şekilde betimlediği bulunmuştur. Artan yaş ile birlikte, çocuklar düşmanı daha çok etnik ve politik özelliklerle algılamışlardır (Ör.Yahudi milleti). Literatürde olduğu gibi, kız çocuklarına kıyasla, erkek çocukları düşmanın fiziksel şiddetine daha fazla atıfta bulunmuşlardır. Karma-etnik okuldaki çocuklar daha olumlu ilişki ve tutumlar rapor ederek, dış grup üyelerini daha az olumsuz düşman özellikleriyle ilişkilendirmişlerdir. Sonuçlar, çatışma ortamında ve savaşta yetiştirilmenin etkileriyle birlikte tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Düşman, Düşman İmajları, Arap-İsrail, Temas, Çocuklar

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Firstly, I wish to express my thanks to the people whose without their support I will never finish my Master study. My sincere thanks to my supervisor, Prof. Dr. Biran Mertan, for her greatest patient, warmth and continues support throughout my study in EMU University. I am very glade of being her student in developmental courses and during preparation for my Thesis. With endless guidance, she provided me with all the necessary knowledge about psychology.

I am also grateful to my co-supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman, for her sincere and valuable guidance in my Statistics study and advice during my thesis work. She promoted to enhance my research and knowledge. I appreciate her care.

Also I would like to thank the committee members for their respectful contribution and interest in my thesis. I take this opportunity to express my further gratitude to Psychology Department members for their availability and assists.

Warmth and grateful thanks to my lovely parents and my brothers, who always support me, care for me, encourage my aptitudes and share me endless love. I am very proud to have such family, may Allah save them all. Finally, I wish best luck to my friends in Cyprus, for supporting my wellbeing and help me whenever I needed, with them I felt like home.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

CEP	Class Exchange Program
EMU	Eastern Mediterranean University
SIT	Social Identity Theory
R/CID	Racial or Cultural Identity Development
E.g.	Example Given
Et. al.	And others
I.e.	That is
M	Mean
N	Population size
SD	Standard Deviation
p	Probability
r	Correlation Coefficient
t	Critical Value
&	And
Q.	Question
vs.	Versus

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

Due to the processes of socialization during the childhood period, children become aware of themselves and self-related information becomes organized with respect to the different contexts in which children are raised (e.g. school, family and peers). From a young age (7 years old), children become active in their environment, which leads them to become part of their specific environment (Oppenheimer, 2006). At this point, the process of socialization is extended in which others from the extended context such as peers or individuals from other groups are also included in the child's social domain experiences (Oppenheimer, 2006). While the socialization experience is essential for the development and formulation of children's personality and moral values, Staub (2003) stressed that family and extended contexts are major sources that crystalize a child's socialization experiences.

Stephan and Stephan (2000) argued that in the world, people tend to create a unified system where individuals who share the same characteristics are integrated into the same ingroup which makes them distinctive from others. In their intergroup threat theory, Stephan and Stephan claimed that people need to have a unique ingroup which is superior to other outgroups, they tend to favor their own group and exhibit hostility toward other groups, and since their own ingroup are so important to them, people often regard these other groups as a threat (Alexander, 1974; Dunbar, 1988).

Especially in dangerous or contentious times where severe conflict and tension between groups are noticeable (Branscombe, Ellemers, Spears, & Doosje, 1999; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), an enemy perception can easily be formed (Vuorinen, 2012). In children particularly, long-term prejudice or the results of in-outgroup conflict can lead to feelings of hatred, violence and persecution (Oppenheimer, 2006). Related to these previous assumptions on socialization process, children at an early age (5 to 7 years old) are capable of reporting intense negative feelings and perceive others negatively, such as perceiving others as their enemies. Nevertheless, studies on children's enemy image are limited (Oppenheimer, 2004; Mertan & Husnu, 2014). The development of enemy image and understanding of enemy are discussed in the following section.

1.1Enemy Image

Understanding of an enemy has been associated with the social understanding between different groups of nations. Although in the literature on enemy is reported to be related to conflict, racism and discrimination, there is a lack of information about the origins and development of enemy (Oppenheimer, 2006). As a consequence, the role and impact of enemy image have been previously neglected (Stein, 1996). An enemy image has been defined by Silverstein (1992) as "any group, whether it is a racial or ethnic group or a nation that is perceived by someone with hostility or as a threat" (p. 145). It has also been characterized as non-human features with an individual's less favorable traits, leading to perceive an enemy as less "human", and one's own group as more "human" (Reiber & Kelly, 1991). According to Alexander, Brewer, and Hermann (1999), inventing an enemy image

can occur when another individual or a group is perceived as threatening, who is generally associated with evil behavior, immoral self-interest and degradation.

As mentioned in the beginning, perceiving enmity is dictated by a process of socialization. This socialization process is regulated by the culture that an individual belongs to and is influenced by the ideologies of his or her specific cultures (Oppenheimer, 2001). For the cultural variations about the nature of enemy images for adults, Szalay and Mir-Djalali (1991) concluded that "the identity of the enemy and the feelings evoked by that image is not an emergence of a prior rational principles, because enemy images are based on subjective experiences and their basis involve deep psycho-cultural tendencies related to the culture features and political ideology of a particular group" (p. 246). In another words, an enemy concept can only exist in the social environment where external attribution processes offer opportunities for their appearance and growth (Oppenheimer, 2001). Stein (1996) argued that on the national level (especially in conflictual situations), enemy image seems to play an important role in the long-lasting and severity of tension between nations.

According to the organization of Psychologist for Social Responsibility (2004), perceiving enmity has many resources such as political, economic, ideological, religious and so on. It is also known to have additional psychological causes, such as exaggerating enemy image as a result of fear of previous experiences. Here the external attribution processes on the individual group or national levels can easily generate enmification processes and negative reactions. Specifically, in places where there is a real tension, the conflict experienced by individuals make them more

willing to create an enemy image that go beyond negative characteristics toward others. Such as the conditions in Israel, where there is a reality of an intractable conflict between Israeli-Arab and Israeli-Jewish, outgroup 'enemy' image (Oppenheimer, 2004), and ingroup bias is shown to be evident as a result of immediate social and political fissures and turmoil (Bettencourt, Dorr, Charlton, & Hume, 2001).

A limited number of cross-cultural studies have been previously conducted to study enmification and understanding of enemy and enemy images, and are interested in the social understanding of children who are raised in different contexts where enemy images are possible. The studies' findings and conclusions are presented in the following section.

1.1.1 Cross-cultural studies on enemy conception

Various studies on the socialization process revealed that at an early age (from 5 years old) children are capable of reporting intense negative feelings and perceive others negatively (i.e., enemy). In societies in which hate is the product of fear, the development of an enemy (i.e., the targeted prejudiced group) and the emergence of enemy images can become noticeable (Holt & Silverstein, 1989; Oppenheimer & Hakvoort, 2003). Since negative feelings and negative personality characteristics (Oppenheimer, 2005) are essential parts of conceptualizing an enemy, the undetermined threatening feelings may easily produce enemy images that are viewed as concrete others (Rieber & Kelly, 1991). For instance, Sternberg (2003) found that children were able to express feelings of dislike, and Opotow (2005) claimed that hate is already understood by young children (5 to 7 years old) and that may provoke extreme violence. Several studies of Oppenheimer (2005; 2010) have examined the

understanding of enemy and enemy images with Dutch children between the ages of 7 to 13 years, using open ended short questions and drawings of an enemy. He found that understanding of enemy and enemy images vary across ages (7 to 13 years old). In addition, changes in the negative feelings (e.g. sad, terrible) that are evoked by an enemy were obtained differently. Whereas younger children (7 years old) were found to experience negative feelings such as an enemy not being funny, more than the older ones, the older children (13 years old) showed feelings of anger, which was found to be an emotion reflecting threat (Oppenheimer, 2006; Glick & Roose, 1993). However, the enemy images and definition of the enemy were not significant among subgroups within the Dutch society which is a nation with no real conflict or real 'enemy' outgroup. Hence, children who are not raised in real conflict zones defined enemies by using fictitious figures and nonhuman features.

In one classical cross cultural study the enemy images of 4 to 6 year old German and American children were assessed. It was found that although children of 4 to 6 years old had no representation of a personal 'political' enemy, they still had a certain understanding of the concept of "enemy" that was conceptualized as evil and someone who could never become a friend (Hesse & Poklemba, 1989). Similar findings were found in Hesse and Mack (1991)'s study conducted on 5 to 6 years old American children. They found that despite having no national or collective enemy these children associated enemy image to personality characteristics by using traits such as criminal and delinquent. Furthermore, enemy images were perceived as someone who was physically violent, such as fighting or shooting others. Conversely, in a study examining the enemy image of Croatian and Bosnian children aged between 11 to 14 years, it was found that all the children were able to make

reference to the war and the different tragic events caused by the war. However, children who had experienced direct war scenes (e.g. lost family members), were able to create pure and clear images of the enemy (i.e., concrete enemy), compared to children who did not experience direct war and did not demonstrate well-defined enemy images that were similar to images of the enemy portrayed in the media. Indeed, children were influenced by war and ethnic nationalist contexts which seemed to impact their social images (Povrzanovic, 1997).

A recent study (Mertan & Husnu, 2014) relied on Oppenheimer's methodology was conducted in order to examine the understanding of enemy image in Turkish Cypriot children. The findings showed that whereas younger children expressed negative emotions against an enemy (i.e., bad), older children were found to experience more anger (i.e., upset), and associate the enemy to more positive characteristics (i.e., the enemy could also be friendly). In respect to gender, boys were found to precede girls in understanding of an enemy behavior, using physical violence and war scene characteristics (i.e., soldiers, bombs and tanks). Girls on the other hand, used more character references (i.e., liar, hateful). Although these children had not experienced war themselves, their parents and grandparents had experienced conflict and war as a result of the 'Cyprus Issue'. Similar to Oppenheimer's conclusions, differences among age and gender groups were also obtained in Turkish-Cypriot children (Mertan & Husnu, 2014). Nonetheless, differences in conceptualization of an enemy among children of both Dutch and Turkish Cypriot groups were obtained in the drawing section. Here across age none of the Turkish Cypriot children used fictitious figures and nonhuman features (e.g. aliens) as was previously found in Dutch children (Oppenheimer, 2005). Enemy conceptualization, understanding and enemy

image therefore seem to be different across nations, where members of different groups experience various conditions (such as war or conflict) that can impact their social image uniquely. Turkish Cypriot children are known to have an already real life enemy (i.e., Greek Cypriots) and are usually educated at a very young age, through school curriculum, parental education and mass media which show an ever existent enemy (Barrett, 2007; Mertan, 2011; Mertan & Husnu, 2014), this makes creates a solid, strong defined understanding of the enemy compared to Dutch children whose real enemy is unspecified (Oppenheimer, 2005).

Yedidya and Lipschitz (2011) claimed that the socialization of children growing up in a conflict zone will necessarily affect their social images and negative perceptions of others. Due to the context of the current study it is necessary to present an overview of studies on enemy perception (or the like) conducted in the State of Israel. Having intense continuing conflict, without a doubt, is an essential motivator to create discriminatory behavior, negativity and enemy images between groups. Studies conducted on the social images of children of Jewish and Arab perceptions of each other have found the effects of both majority-minority status and the negative impact of living in an intractable conflict zone on the Jewish and Arab's negative perceptions of each other (Cairns, 1996; Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996; Teichman & Zafrir, 2003).

Although many studies (e.g. Bar-Tal & Teichman, 2005; Bettencourt et al., 2001) were previously conducted to investigate the impact of a majority–minority situation on the social images and perceptions of children, to date only a few studies have been interested in the social images (enemy images) of children who were raised in

realistic conflict zones. For example, in Teichman's study on Jewish children aged 7 to 8 years and 11 to 13 years old, it was revealed that children showed more negative stereotypes of Arab figures (i.e., they regarded Arabs as dangerous and threatening) compared to their own group members (Teichman, 2001). Nevertheless, empirical evidence on Israeli-Arabs stereotyping Israeli-Jews is less documented in the literature, and few available studies have shown that prejudicial attitudes of Arabs toward Jews exist (Berger, Abu-Raiya, & Gelkopf, 2014).

Studies conducted on Israeli-Arab children's social perception, revealed that Israeli-Arab children express less negativity toward Jews, compared to Arabs who live in the West bank (Bilu, 1989). In addition, Arab youth, aged 10 to 20 years were found to perceive Jewish and Arabs equally (Hoffman, 1974), and did not make a comparison in representations of both Jewish and Arab figures (Teichman & Yehuda, 2000; Teichman & Zafrir, 2003). However, in one study conducted by Smooha (1987), it was found that Arab minority not only perceived Jewish people positively, but they also showed negative conceptions of Jews and described them as mindless of self-respect and family honor, exploitative, untrustworthy, and racist.

1.1.2 Theories on enemy image

According to theoretical models dealing with the development of an understanding of an enemy, an individual's maintenance and development of the enemy image is related to the individual features (cognitive abilities), close (i.e., family and peer group) and wider social contexts (i.e., society culture, and ideological perspectives) where they are raised (Aboud, 1988; Oppenheimer, 2006). Different theories have been raised to explain the development of enemy and enemy images.

1.1.2.1 Socio-cognitive development theory (S-CT)

Differences in perceiving other ethnic groups develop according to the growth of cognitive skills (Piaget & Weil, 1951). Aboud (1988) in her socio-cognitive development theory (S-CT) examined the developmental stages of intergroup stereotypes and prejudice among preschoolers. She argued that children in younger age groups (3 years old) are able to hold such negative attitudes and images (enemy) about other ethnic groups that may result from immature reasoning processes (Katz, 1976; Piaget & Weil, 1951). Here children's perceptions are egocentric and less intuitional, and they are unable to coordinate different points of view. According to Piaget (1928), children's cognitive development is transductive, that is young children perceive individuals who share the same ethnicity as similar. According to the S-CT assumption, children aged 3 to 5 years old start to recognize members of other groups based on their physical features such as color of skin, language and other external features, and they show a lack in capacity to conceptualize their social environment on the basis of perceptual information (e.g. appearance) (Aboud & Skerry, 1984; Duckitt, 1992). However, with advanced concrete operational thinking (Piaget, 1928), from the age of 7 years, children begin to categorize people into ethnic groups and exaggerate differences, such as they evaluate others based on their personal and family preferences. Indeed, 10 to 11 year old children are able to show more cognitive development that help to moderate their level of prejudice and negativity toward others as a result of better conceptualization of others, e.g., they show less hostility and discrimination (Doyle & Aboud, 1995) and their association of others is focused more on internal psychological features, including people's religious and nationality differences (Aboud, 1988).

Although previous empirical findings indicated that the nature of children's prejudice may be determined by their cognitive development skills, Brewer and Gaertner (2001) suggested that showing prejudice and negative images of others, is not enough to be explained by the development of information processing or cognitive abilities. Since cognitive developmental theory have no clear explanation of why children report positive evaluations to one group and negative to others. And stereotyping others more negatively can also be related to the categorization process that may include other sources (i.e., self-esteem, attachment) in the social context in which the individual is raised. This assumption rose in line with findings showing that as children grow older, they are more willing to attribute both positive and negative attributes to both their ingroup and outgroup (Aboud & Skerry, 1984). And one implication of socio-cognitive theory is that children who show increased cognitive abilities should have a decline in enemy perception and stereotyping, however, even children who can do conservation also show stereotyping and possibly negative perceptions of the enemy (Piaget, 1928). Thus, we need alternative assumptions of the social approaches (Tajfel, 1978; Nesdale, 2004) to explain the processes of holding negative images against others and perceive them as enemies.

1.1.2.2 Social psychological perspectives

Social Identity theory (SIT) was developed by Tajfel (1978; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). This theory was not formulated to examine the development of prejudice and children's attitudes across ages. Nonetheless, several studies argued that SIT might provide an explanation of ethnic prejudice in children too (e.g. Nesdale & Flesser, 1999). For example, based on the basic assumption of SIT, Nesdale and Flesser (1999) found that children from the age of 3 years are able to compare between the

group that they stand to belong to and the outgroup. Therefore, the SIT came as an alternative theory in the current study.

An enemy image represents a set of beliefs and convictions about an individual or a group. It is further considered as a natural reaction to individual or group's process of identity formation (Stein, 1996). SIT suggested that individuals are motivated to compare their ingroup and other outgroups in the sense of enhancing the self-esteem. In order to obtain a higher level of positive self-esteem, people tend to use comparison techniques to perceive their ingroup more positively. For example, people generally seek to refer events that reflect positive perceptions of their ingroups more to internal (dispositional) attributions, however, they tend to refer external (situational) attributions for events that reflect negatively other groups.

Nevertheless, in order to compare between the ingroup and outgroup, individuals need to be highly identified with their ingroup. According to Tajfel and Turner (1986), when an ingroup identity is complete and becomes salient, people often wish to highlight their ingroup characteristics. In addition, the group status has to be considered an essential factor in increasing the own self-esteem. Having an ingroup that is more powerful than the outgroup in characteristics (e.g. majority status), gives more ability to practice the legitimacy of social competition. Such as in one study conducted by Bigler, Brown and Markell (2001), children of self-perceived high-status groups found to develop more ingroup favoring attitudes (e.g. like the ingroup more), compared to children of low-status group. Nevertheless, if outgroups are perceived as more powerful, then individuals have to obtain other strategies as an alternative (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Such as, individuals of minority groups are

shown to identify more with the powerful group (majority) and report less negative attitudes toward the specific outgroup (Teichman & Zafrir, 2003).

Despite the effectiveness of the SIT theory in explaining individual's social perceptions (e.g. expressing attitudes toward others), Aboud (2003) claimed that there is still little evidence to show that a strong negative evaluation of the outgroup necessarily reflects negative attitudes and prejudice. She contended that the process in which individuals attach and self-identify with their own ingroup, is thought to require simple cognitive skills of generalization from the self to similar others. And in order to exhibit prejudice and negative evaluation of the outgroup (who are different), people need more complex social comparisons, in which differences can be evaluated (Aboud & Amato, 2001). Therefore, social skills are not sufficient to be able to evaluate and create people's ingroup and outgroup. Hence it is suggested that such a comparison needs cognitive as well as social techniques.

1.1.2.3 Integrated model

An ecological model of Bronfenbrenner (1988) is an example of an integrated model which indicated that the social context and the development of the child are interactive throughout the life span. Whereas the ability to develop a mature understanding of society and its institutions can only occur as the outcome of the process in which the cognitive and emotionally maturing individual are in interaction (Oppenheimer, 2006, 2004; Wertsch, 1985). In his model, Bronfenbrenner (1988) suggested various levels of influence on an individual's development. He developed a structural model that include different nests in which one must consider characteristics of the child (personal features), parent–child relationship, peer relationships, teacher–child communications, and the neighborhood and school

settings (microsystem) within which the child and family live (Dishion, French, & Patterson, 1995).

Based on the ecological theory, perceiving individuals or groups as enemy is specified by internal (personal experiences) and external societal contexts (tradition), and in-outgroup dynamics (Oppenheimer, 2006). Societies (macro-system) directly influence values and norms that are transmitted by parents and education system, which in turn impact on the child's social perceptions development. By observing the behavior of others, people can format their thoughts about the world. While family and parenthood is part of the specific society, Staub (1992) argued that parenting attitudes are an essential source that may enhance or reduce the extent to which individuals are exposed in society. Children who are raised in authoritarian parental environment will definitely experience difficulties in being responsible for their personal lives and make decisions therefore they probably assume guidance and tend to follow a group, further they become more likely to develop prejudice and malevolent attitudes (Miller, 1983). As Allport (1954) claimed until the age of 10 years, children are prone to learn from their parents' implicit and explicit behavior of prejudice.

In addition, Bar-Tal (1997) suggested that children are vulnerable to various societal channels that provide them with information about the outgroup. The society offers different multi sources of information where the child is raised and thoughts are shaped. Such information can be transmitted either by school, books, films, newspapers, television programs, leaders' speeches, theatrical plays, or literature and other sources which allows characterization of outgroups (Bar-Tal, Raviv, Raviv, &

Brosh, 1991). It is also added that sometimes the impact on children's prejudice can be done directly, when children learn about another group by a specific sources of information who happens to describe the characteristics of another group, and sometimes it is done indirectly when information is transferred by subject behavior, or styles of life (Bar-Tal, 1997). In one supportive study conducted on Israeli-Jewish children's conception of 'Arabs', who were asked "Who told you about Arabs?" it was found that 86.7% of the children mentioned television programs as a source of information about Arabs, 80.6% mentioned parents, 28.1% mentioned kindergarten, and 42% claimed that they had personally met an Arab (Ovadia, 1993).

The ecological theory has been regularly applied in different intervention programs such as school settings (Cohen & Fish, 1993). According to Stormshak and Dishion (2002), "this model was the theory that guided the research design, assessment, and intervention plan" (p. 199). However, although the effectiveness of intervention programs based on the ecological model was previously found, the ecological model has also been criticized by practitioners (Stormshak & Dishion, 2002). For example Fish and Massey (1991) argued that in schools where the intervention programs based on ecological model were adapted by school counselors, it is still not enough to intervene in order to guide children for better adaptations. Hence, psychologists or counselors usually spend little time in schools and have weak relationships with families therefore, they are not aware of children's experiences in their daily time at school or home. In another words, school specialists are not practicing the model effectively. Therefore, in order to obtain more mutual understanding of the development and maintenance of enemy images and the understanding of enemy, the

different theories interested in enemy images from different aspects should be studied in relation to each other (Oppenheimer, 2005).

In addition to enemy conceptualization, the current study aimed to assess the role of intergroup contact between Arab and Jewish children. Below an overview of this theory will be presented.

1.2 Intergroup Contact

1.2.1 Categorization

Social and political psychologists have long been concerned with the motivations and urges of people's feelings about different social groups (Federico & Levin, 2004). In particular, they were interested in the way people come to feel about their ingroup. People generally perceive an individual by assessing him or her automatically on the basis of their personal obvious features such as gender, race and age (Nelson, 2006). Nelson claimed that "because we need to understand and interpret other's behaviors, a categorization process is the best way in order to classify people on the bases of their shared features, time and space" (p. 27). As a consequence, differences between individuals' features emerge according to the category that they are attributed to, which in turn create an ingroup-outgroup perception.

Bar-Tal (1996) claimed that the way a person categorizes people and individuals is infinite, and beginning from very early ages, people keep learning new categories throughout their life. However, as children grow older, they become able to understand the world around them much better. Any information with regards to social groups (i.e., the outgroup) is perceived by using more complex processes in

which individuals rely on their own observation further to their cultural beliefs (e.g. cultural stereotype), where the concept of others (e.g. ethnicity: an Arab) is perceived by older individuals as differently and more structured (Bar-Tal, 1997).

1.2.2 Ingroup vs. Outgroup

Ingroups and outgroups are social categories that emerge as a result of the categorization process (Giles & Giles, 2013). While an ingroup is defined as a social category or group within which the individual identifies strongly, the outgroup is a social category or group within which the individual does not identify (Giles & Giles, 2013). Individuals who belong to outgroups are perceived as a whole who share similar features and motives that are not considered to represent ingroup characteristics. Nevertheless, individuals who belong to the same ingroup, are generally perceived as unique individuals who are better than outgroup members (Nelson, 2006). Attitudes toward ingroup and outgroup were found to impact on the understanding of enemy and the presence of enemy images (Oppenheimer, 2005; 2006). Previous studies indicated that in childhood, in particular, children at the age of 5 become able to make a distinction between the group to which they belong, and other groups (Teichman, 2001; Oppenheimer, 2004; Piaget & Weil, 1951). Perceiving others and expressing attitudes toward them often develops in early age, at about 7 years of age (Oppenheimer & Barret, 2011). At the same period of life in particular, countries where tension and conflict with other nations are experienced, enemy images and negative attitudes, combined with hateful and dislike emotions are also common (Barrett, 2007; Oppenheimer & Barret 2011; Jahoda, 1962; Oppenheimer & Hakvoort, 2003; Piaget & Weil, 1951). At the same time, Bar-Tal (1996) indicated that the age of acquisition of racial attitudes sometimes ranges

between 3 to 6 years. In his study conducted on Jewish attitudes toward Arabs, Bar-Tal (1996) found that between the ages of 3 and 6 years, not all children have knowledge about Arabs, but some of those who were able to say something about Arabs, described them negatively. Nevertheless, starting from the ages of 10 to 11 years, children became able to describe features of their own members and other outgroups members by using psychological traits, and political and religious beliefs (Barret, Wilson & Lyons, 2003).

In their cross national identity study, Oppenheimer and Barrett (2011) aimed to examine national attitudes and ingroup-outgroup perceptions of children from historical and political perspectives. They collected data from various countries that currently experience no war (Netherlands and England) and those experiencing war or conflictual situation with other groups (Israel, Cyprus, Northern Ireland, Bosnia and the Basque Country). From this cross national study authors claimed that by the age of 6 years, children begin to be interested in their national identifications, where most children usually acknowledge their membership of their own national group. However, the need to consider the strength of individuals' identification with its own group varies across age. According to Barrett (2005; 2007), having a different national identification mostly depends on the specific country in which the child lives, where he or she influenced by the geographical location within that country, ethnicity, the use of language in home and school settings. And it may be related to the strength in which individual's identify to their nation, perceiving their ingroup positively more than the outgroups (Barrett, 2007).

1.2.3 Intergroup Contact Theory

For decades, researchers and practitioners were interested in diminishing prejudice between groups by contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Intergroup contact theory was first introduced by Allport (1954) who suggested that reducing prejudice occurs when four conditions and features of contact situation are fulfilled. These include having equal status between two groups in conflict, creating common goals to share by both groups, creating a sense of intergroup cooperation, and perceiving support of law and authorities to reduce prejudice and conflict. Many studies interested in examining contact theory have shown ambiguous findings. Some studies have shown that intergroup contact is effective in reducing intergroup prejudice and tension (i.e., Cook, 1984; Jackson, 1993; Patchen, 1999; Pettigrew, 1971, 1986, 1998; Harrington & Miller, 1992). Thus contact theory in a particular era, has inspired a widespread researches over the past half century (Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2000; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), and it became an essential tool to use in intervention programs in order to reduce prejudice in different situations, dealing with racial and ethnic groups, children and elderly, disabled and mentally ill people, and validated it in school settings.

However, other studies conducted on contact found that contact is not fully effective to reduce prejudice, or it may reduce prejudice in specific conditions (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). For example, Stephan (1987) suggested that intergroup relationships may be perceived as an effective source to reduce prejudice, nonetheless, we should take into consideration the complexity in the relation between intergroup contact and prejudice, including contact setting and individual's features. Similarly, Forbes (1997) a political scientist claimed that intergroup contact does not

always work to reduce prejudice at the group level as same as it works at the individual level. Indeed, Amir (1969; 1976) concluded that under specific optimal conditions, contact principles may help to reduce prejudice, otherwise it may increase the likelihood of prejudice occurring. Thus, several criticisms have been directed toward contact approach; such as contact theory focuses on the interpersonal level and is limited in the impact on changes at group level perceptions (Crisp & Hewstone, 1999), and it may work effectively in an extended intergroup contact situation (Pettigrew, 1998).

To answer these criticisms Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) conducted a meta-analysis which included more than 713 empirical studies. This meta-analytic approach was developed based on Allport's conditions that are still important to facilitate contact's reduction of intergroup prejudice. The general results of this approach showed that intergroup contact typically reduces intergroup prejudice. The findings also revealed that intergroup contact may be a useful tool to reduce prejudice in different intergroup situations and contexts. Nevertheless, Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) argued that intergroup contact is not necessary to rely on Allport's conditions. Hence they found that participants showed significant relationships between contact and prejudice in all conditions. In another words, intergroup contact is effective to reduce prejudice not only under carefully controlled conditions of the psychology laboratory, but further in the daily real life.

However, intergroup contact is not necessarily leading to positive relations (e.g. friendship) sometimes contact may bring negative relations (e.g. tensions). For example on intergroup contact in five central European countries, Graf, Paolini and

Rubin (2014) suggested that negative contact is an effective source for intergroup bias, as well as positive contact. Additionally, in a recent study comparing positive and negative intergroup contact's impact on reducing prejudice, it was found that negative contact is more significantly important in shaping outgroup attitudes than positive contact (Barlow et al., 2012; Dhont & Van Hiel, 2009).

Nevertheless, in situations where conflict and tension between groups is evident, prejudice and hostility between groups can be reduced by creating intergroup communicative contact and build trust between both groups (Kelman, 1999). Hughes (2007) claimed that contact interventions have played an important role to manage and control the conflict between both groups. Therefore, in the past 2 decades, numerous Israeli and Arab communities have participated in small group discussions about rational issues. In one such recent study conducted by Berger, et al. (2014) a new class exchange program (CEP) was used based on combining intergroup and individual approaches and examined Arab-Jewish class exchange program' efficacy to reduce prejudice and negative stereotyped attitudes between both groups living in Gaffa city in Israel. They expected to find more readiness in both groups to show more positive and reciprocal thoughts toward the other group and reduce prejudice and racism toward the others. Indeed, the study results showed that CEP is effective in reducing stereotypes and prejudicial attitudes toward outgroup members. And after the intervention, participants became readier to create relationships with other members and showed less level of emotional prejudice toward the other ethnic group.

Another study aimed to increase perspective taking and empathy of Jewish individuals toward Palestinians by using instruction program about foreign conflicts

(Lustig, 2003) showed that presenting a curriculum in a school that teaches about conflicts between nations (i.e., ancient Greece and modern-day Ireland), this technique was effective in impacting 12 year old Jewish students attitudes. Hence, they were found to be more sympathetic to the Palestinian position in the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Nevertheless, there is a lack of studies conducted on Israeli-Arab population, and the social perceptions of Arab children living in Israel, in particular continue to be denied (Teichman & Zafrir, 2003).

1.3 Current Study

The State of Israel is known as a pluralistic culture that combines different ethnic (Jews, Arabs), national (Russian, American), and religious (Christian, Jewish, Muslim and Druze) groups (Al-Haj, Katz & Shye, 1993). Villages and towns are either a mixed ethnic and/or single ethnic organization (Smooha, 1984). Population includes two major components of ethnic groups: a majority (Jews) and minority (Arabs) status (Teichman, 2003). These two groups differ in their ethnicity, religion, language, culture, and national aspirations. The Arab community, in particular, consists of diverse religious fellowships. It includes Muslims, Christians, Bedouin, Circassia's, and Druze. They are conceptualized as Israeli-Arab, Arabs in Israel, Arab minority, or Israeli-Palestinians. They are citizens of Israel who specifically remained in their homeland following the establishment of the State of Israel in 1948, and become a minority group, consisting of 20% of the total population, including almost 1.2 million people (Adala, 2011).

Despite their status, the Arab minority has not been declared as a national minority in the Basic Laws of Israel. Since 1948, the Israel State was planned to be designated as

a Jewish State, only for Jews serving for the Jewish traditional 'Zionism' to practice their beliefs including all of the population, an unexpected situation was revealed later showing that part of Palestinians did not immigrate to other countries as other members of their same groups behaved looking for security and safe places. However, Arab people who stayed in Israel became part of the nation of the State, and share living with Jewish within the same territory. Although the State of Israel's Proclamation of Independence declared the establishment of a Jewish State that would ensure equality of social and political rights and resources to all of its members regardless of religion, race, or sex, Israeli-Arabs remain second-class citizens and do not feel fully integrated into Israeli political and national unity (Adala, 2011). Even though Israel is declared as a democratic entity serving its population through co-existence and mutual understanding, the Israeli-Arabs are discriminated against and feel persecuted in reality (Yedidya & Lipschitz, 2011). The hierarchical power relations and the distribution of power and privilege reside within the Israeli State. This aspect of authoritarian reign could result in strong hostile and antagonistic attitudes towards others. The emergence of enemy images is logically linked to stereotypes which are carefully engineered and are instrumental to maintaining differences between the groups. Consequently, the nature of society and political framework in which children are raised play an important role in the perception of intergroup relationships and affect both groups' concept of social identity.

Due to the three events that took place since the 1948 War throughout the history of conflict between Jewish and Arabs, the relationship between Israeli-Jews and Israeli-Arabs has witnessed ups and downs. The three major sociopolitical events

are; a) the "Nakba—the catastrophe" event perceived by Palestinians, b) the outbreak of the Second Intifada (Palestinian uprising), and c) the "October 2000 events" where 12 Israeli-Arabs citizens were killed by the police while protesting against the government policy (Berger et al., 2014). These developments are perceived as the main source for the crisis in the relationships between the two groups, that also still impact on the attempt to cancel Israeli-Palestinian political parties (Ilan & Singer-Heruti, 2009) and discriminate against Arabs in the Israeli parliament (Khoury, 2010).

After all, as Oppenheimer (2006) claimed society and its intuitions affect the values and norms inherent in behavioral patterns of parenting, socialization and education, the ecological and cultural context. The devaluation and derogation of outgroup and the experiences of injustice inflicted upon minority children leave a permanent streak of enmification. Children of Arab minority in Israel are an example of a group that lives in a social climate where two groups one minority the other majority are perceived to be the main reason for creating conflict, and they are the direct cause to influence children's socialization process (Black-Gutman & Hickson, 1996). However, the interest in the social perception of these populations coming from conflict regions attracted less attention and, few studies have been conducted especially on children in the Israeli-Arab population (Teichman & Zafrir, 2003).

Therefore, the current study aimed to examine the development of social understanding of Israeli-Arab children (aged 7 to 11 years), namely investigating their understanding of enemy concept and enemy image. Based on previous studies conducted on children in different social contexts (see Oppenheimer, 2005, 2010,

2006; Mertan & Husnu, 2014), it was expected that age and gender will relate to the enemy conception of Israeli-Arab children, so that older children will perceive an "enemy" in accordance with the personality characteristics, but younger children will ascribe an "enemy" to physical violent nature. And boys will use physical references, more than girls who will perceive an "enemy" by expressing more verbal violence and using character reference. It also aimed to examine intergroup contact between Israeli-Arab (ingroup) and Israeli-Jewish (outgroup), and measure the level of prejudice attitudes of Arab children toward Jewish by comparing Arab children who study in a single-ethnic school to those studying in a mixed-ethnic school. Therefore, it was expected that the contact of Israeli-Arab children with outgroup members will improve their attitude toward the specific outgroup and reduce the levels of negative stereotypes and prejudice toward that specific outgroup. Such that Israeli-Arab children in multi-ethnic school will show more positive attitudes (e.g. they are friendly) compared to children in single-ethnic school.

Chapter 2

METHOD

The study was designed as a cross-sectional investigation of the enemy image held by three age groups of Israeli-Arab children who attended single and mixed- ethnic schools.

2.1 Participants

A total of 62 Israeli-Arab participants included 23 male and 39 female children aged 7 to 11 years old participated in this study. The mean age of children from both schools was 9.02 years old (*SD* = 1.82). The young aged children's group (7 year olds) included 22 participants, consisting of 11 children from mixed-ethnic school (7 girls and 4 boys), and 11 children from the single-ethnic school (6 girls and 5 boys). The middle aged group (9 year olds) were 23 children consisting of 11 children from the mixed-ethnic school (8 girls and 3 boys), and 12 children from the single-ethnic school (6 girls and 6 boys). Finally, the older aged group (11 year olds), consisted of 17 children, 9 children from the mixed-ethnic school (6 girls and 3 boys), and 8 children from the single-ethnic school (6 girls and 2 boys). Means and standard deviations of single-ethnic and mixed-ethnic schools for three age groups are presented in Table 1.

Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations of single-ethnic and mixed-ethnic schools for all age groups

	M (SD)	*M* (SD)	
Age groups	Single school	Mixed school	N
7-year olds	7.36 (.50)	7.90 (.30)	22
9-year olds	9.17 (.39)	9.27 (.47)	23
11-year olds	11.38 (.52)	11.11(.33)	17
Total:			62

Participants of the current study were recruited from two different schools: a) The single school "Al-Dahrat". Al-Dahrat School includes only Israeli-Arab children from kindergarten through sixth grade (780 students). The school offers regular curriculum based on Ministry of Education that teaches subjects such as languages, mathematics, etc. Only at 6th grade children enroll into a program outside the school where they share activities together with Jewish children and participate in conversations about friendship and cooperation. b) The mixed school "Bridge Over the Wadi". This school includes 240 Israeli-Arab and Israeli-Jewish children from kindergarten through sixth grade. It was the first educational institution which combined Israeli-Jewish and Israeli-Arab children to study together who came from several sizeable Arab towns and an assortment of smaller Jewish towns, agricultural communities and kibbutzim. The school has a dual curriculum that includes core curriculum of ministry of education, further to programs about social and cultural activities to support co-existence, cooperation and peace. In each lesson, two teachers of same specialization one Israeli-Arab and one Israeli-Jewish attend the class to educate the materials both in Arabic and Hebrew languages.

2.1 Materials

Measures used to assess contact relationships with outgroup, enemy images and the understanding of the enemy consisted of: Prior contact questionnaire, evaluation task, free association task, drawing of an enemy and enemy short questionnaire. All the measures were adapted to Israeli-Arab children (see Appendix A). In order to assess the conformity between the two versions of questionnaires, the questionnaire was first translated by the author M. Y. to the Arabic language and back translated to English by an Israeli-Arab English teacher teaches in single high school.

The demographic information section was given to provide personal information about participants' gender, age, class grade and date of birth.

2.2.1 Contact questionnaire

The questionnaire examined Israeli-Arab children's relationship with the Israeli-Jewish as an outgroup. It included three sections: Prior contact, familial storytelling, and cross-group friendship/extended contact.

Prior contact section was developed by Voci and Hewstone (2003). This part offered two questions to assess positive and negative contact with outgroup (Jews). It included the items: "In everyday life, how often do you have positive/ negative contact with Jewish people?". In this section participants were required to rate their relationship frequency by sorting out a card of their meant answer. Answers consist of six categories which are: "never", "occasionally", "sometimes", "quite a lot", "very frequently" and "I don't know".

The familial storytelling section was developed by Paolini, et al. (2014). It included two questions that were given to provide information of family members who may pass pleasant/upsetting stories about content of relationship between Arabs and Jews in Israel during the time of war. Questions such as: "Did/do any of your family member (including parents, grandparents, relatives and siblings) tell you pleasant stories of solidarity between Israeli-Arab and Israeli-Jewish throughout the time of war?". In this section participants were also required to select a card of their answer. Answers consist of six categories: "none", "one person", "2-5 people", "5-10 people", "more than 10" and "I don't know".

The cross-group friendship/extended contact information was developed by Voci and Hewstone (2003). It included two questions that measured participants' family members' relationships with outgroup (Israeli-Jewish). Questions such as: "How many members of your family (including parents, brothers and sisters, cousins etc.) have friends who are Israeli-Jewish?" In this section participants were required to choose a card of their meant answer, such as same cards of second section.

In order to assess the effect of prior positive contact, two groups of high vs. low prior positive contact were obtained by using median split (Median=3.0) for the positive contact item. Above the cutoff of median score indicated high level of positive contact with the outgroup whereas, below the cutoff of the median score indicated low positive contact.

2.2.2 An evaluation task

The evaluation task was developed by Barrett, et al. (2003). It offered two tasks that evaluate participants' ingroup and outgroup members. Evaluating each ingroup and

outgroup members occurred by pointing out to a card of trait word that best reflect their views of the Israeli-Arab and Israeli-Jewish. This section offers 6 positive and 6 negative traits, which are: friendly, clever, happy, honest, clean, lazy, unfriendly, dirty, stupid, hardworking, sad, and dishonest. A total score was obtained for each positive and negative attributes selected for both the ingroup and outgroup by counting the number of responses (if there is more than one) for each trait out of the total number of traits in each category (6 positive vs. 6 negative).

In order to obtain an outgroup attitude measure, the total score of negative attributes ascribed to the outgroup was subtracted from the positive attributes to the outgroup, creating a new "outgroup attitude" measure. Higher scores indicated more positive outgroup attitudes.

After selecting a trait for each group, participants were asked to indicate their liking of the ingroup and outgroup. "Now I just want to ask you one more thing about Israeli-Arab people. Do you like or dislike Israeli-Arab-people?".

Finally, in order to examine Israeli-Arab children's' understanding of enemy and enemy image, three measures were used: free association task, drawing of an enemy and enemy short questionnaire. The first two measures (free association task and drawing of an enemy) were developed by Barrett, et al. (2003). The enemy short questionnaire was developed by Hesse and Poklemba (1989). All of three measures were first adopted by Oppenheimer (2005) and were used recently in Mertan and Husnu (2014)'s study.

2.2.3 Free association task

This part included seven concepts, consisting of six neutral concepts (i.e., washing, bicycle, age, season, farmer, and computer) and the target concept ‘‘enemy’’ is placed within the middle (Oppenheimer, 2005). It offered information about participants’ emotional and conceptual reactions. The interviewer read verbally each concept one by one, and then asked participants to respond with first word that comes to mind to a target word. According to Hesse and Poklemba (1989) children at age of 6 do not have any conception of a political enemy therefore the key stimulus in this part is enemy. The function of the neutral concepts was to put children at ease, to prevent any direct confrontation with the possibly emotionally charged concept of ‘‘enemy’’. There is no effect of neutral concepts or the order on participant responses, and the responses to this task were scored along a pre-set category system (see Table 2; Oppenheimer, 2000).

2.2.4 Drawing

This task offered a visual “non-verbal” image of the “enemy” image. In this part, children were asked to draw a picture of an” enemy”. And following the drawing, they were asked to explain “What did you draw?”; “Who did you draw?” and “Why did you draw that picture?”. Drawings were analyzed with respect to a number of characteristics that refers to some categories. Some characteristics were identical (e.g. shooting, weapon), therefore were scored within the same category (e.g. war). Analyzing the drawing was once again based on Oppenheimer (2010)’s criteria, e.g. depictions of war; physical violence; verbal violence; being armed; being human and non-human were categorized and scored separately.

2.2.5 Enemy short-questionnaire

This part offered information about participants' understanding of the concept of enemy. Following the drawing, each child was interviewed by short interview procedure involving the following 13 short questions, which are: "What does an enemy look like?"; "Is an enemy a man or a woman?"; "What does an enemy do?"; "Is there a difference between you and the enemy? If yes, what is the difference; If no, why there is no difference?"; "How does the enemy make you feel?"; "Can this enemy also be friendly?"; "Can this enemy became ever a friend?"; "Has an enemy always been an enemy?"; "Does Israel has an enemy?"; "Does the Israeli-Arab have an enemy?"; "Does the Israeli-Jewish have an enemy?"; "Is an enemy alone or always with a group?"; and "How do you explain an enemy to someone younger than you?".

Children answered these questions by using the following answers: "yes", "no" or "I don't know" (questions 4, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11), "man", "women" or "both" (question 2), "alone" or "group" (question 12). Only for questions 1, 3, and 5, a categorization system for the responses was required (see Table 2).

Table 2. Scoring categories for outcome measures adapted from Oppenheimer (2005, 2010)

Free association	**Drawing**	**Q.1**	**Q.3**	**Q.5**
1. War	War	Soldier	Physical Violence	Fear/afraid
2. Physical Violence	Physical Violence	Scary/angry	Verbal Violence	Anger
3. Verbal Violence	Verbal Violence	Armed	Criminal Behavior	Unpleasant
4. Armed	Armed	Human being	Quality of Character	Urge to flee
5. Human being	Human being	Not human	Waging War	Other*
6. Not human	Not human	Other*	Other*	
7. Rest				

Note: * the "other" responses category refers to both personality and behavioral characteristics.

2.3 Procedure

To examine the enemy image and intergroup contact, Israeli-Arab children were individually interviewed in this study. Data collection was conducted face-to-face with the experimenter and took place either at the child's home or school setting. First, the researcher attended the schools to meet the administrative staff and asked for permission to interview the children at school. After that an informed consent form (see Appendix B) was distributed randomly, several times to children until the number of participants was completed (62 participants). Children were required to take the form home and receive parent's consent. Then all the approved forms were submitted within the following days. Children whose parent's refused to give consent did not participate. However, children who were allowed to participate were interviewed according to their grade level. Here the researcher started interviewing children of grade 2, grade 4, and then grade 6, respectively. Within the interview, the researcher started by reading each part of questions, and showed a set of cards,

asking children to choose one card that may reflect their true thoughts. In the drawing part, each child was provided with a single paper and five colors and was required to draw an “enemy”. Following the drawing, children were asked to explain what they had drawn (i.e., ‘‘what did you draw?’’ and ‘‘who is it that you drew?’’). And in the last section, each child was interviewed by means of a short interview procedure involving thirteen questions.

The total assessment procedure lasted approximately 20 minutes for each child. At the end of interview, children of grade 2 received a gift (i.e., colorful pencil), however, older children were verbally appreciated. All participants obtained debrief form (see Appendix C) that offered further contact information. Additionally, 14 of the children from both schools were interviewed at home and were obtained by snowballing technique. The researcher followed same procedure of interview, but in the presence of parent(s) at home.

Chapter 3

RESULTS

In accordance with previous research in the area of enemy conception (see Oppenheimer, 2001, 2005, 2010; Mertan & Husnu, 2014), the analyses comparing age, gender and school setting were conducted by chi-square analyses. Only significant findings based on the scoring categories were reported. The data collected by contact questionnaire, free association task, drawing task, and enemy short-questions were analyzed in this section.

3.1 Hypothesis 1

Chi-square analyses were used to test the hypothesis that stated enemy conception of Israeli-Arab children will relate to age, gender and school setting. Findings of crosstab analyses in the three free association, drawing, and enemy short-questionnaire parts are reported below:

3.1.1 Free Association

The term enemy was most often associated with personality characteristics (79%) including traits such as hateful, evil and non-friendly. Chi-square analyses however did not demonstrate any significant differences between the three age groups on this task (for age: $\chi^2(4, N = 62) = 2.79, p > .05$, or gender: $\chi^2(2, N = 62) = .70, p > .05$). In addition, 12.9% of children associated an enemy to physical violence, although no age ($\chi^2(2, N = 62) = .72, p > .05$), or gender difference was observed

($\chi^2(1, N = 62) = 2.54$, $p > .05$). There were no significant differences between schools for all categories which scored based on Oppenheimer table 2.

3.1.2 Drawing

Regardless of age, 30.6% of all participants associated an enemy to physical violent nature referring an enemy to a single trait, such as physically violent, killing, or an armed individual. Chi-square analyses did not demonstrate significant effect of age in the drawing task. And no difference between the three age groups in associating an enemy to personality characteristics was obtained, $\chi^2(4, N = 62) = 3.36$, $p > .05$. Additionally, 25.8% of children drew the enemy with reference to personality characteristics, such as liar, bad person or other (outgroup). And 19.4% of children drew the enemy in a war scene, including depictions of bombing, armed soldiers, tanks and rockets. Regardless of gender, 14.5% of children associated an enemy to verbal violence, however no significant differences between males and females in associating an enemy to physical ($\chi^2(2, N = 62) = .36$, $p > .05$), and verbal violence ($\chi^2(1, N = 62) = .06$, $p > .05$) was obtained. Once again, no significant differences were found between schools for all categories which scored based on Oppenheimer table 2.

3.1.3 Enemy short questionnaire

In enemy short questionnaire questions (q1-q12) were used in order to assess enemy image and understanding of enemy.

3.1.3.1 Question 1: What does an enemy look like?

The first question asked the participants to describe an enemy. Regardless of age, gender and school, 51.6% of all participants described the enemy as having a hateful and evil character, 27.4% associated an enemy to a physical violent nature (kicks,

push and is armed), and 22.6% used other features (i.e., animals, nonhuman, and Jewish person) in describing an enemy. As for group differences, chi-square analyses found significant gender differences in response to this question, $\chi^2(2, N = 62) = 5.88$, $p = .05$. Such that males associated an enemy more to a physical violent nature (43.5%) compared to females (17.9%). No age effect was obtained in associating an enemy to physical violent nature ($\chi^2(4, N = 62) = 4.07$, $p > .05$), and personality characteristics ($\chi^2(4, N = 62) = 4.83$, $p > .05$). Finally, there was no effect of school for all categories which scored based on Oppenheimer table 2.

3.1.3.2 Question 2: Is an enemy a man or a woman?

The second question pertained to whether an enemy is a man or a woman. Here significant effects for age were evident for the opinion that an enemy is a man, or could be either a man or a women, ($\chi^2(4, N = 62) = 16.81$, $p < .001$). These findings showed that primarily the youngest age group 7-year olds (76.2%) were significantly more than 9 years (34.8%), and 11 years (12.5%), of the opinion that an enemy was an individual male. Older age participants (11 years) reported more of the opinion that an enemy could be both male as well as female (75%), compared to 9 years (60.9%) and younger age groups (19%). Similarly, there was a significant effect of gender for the opinion that an enemy is a man, or could be either a man or a women, ($\chi^2(2, N = 62) = 9.56$, $p = .01$). The majority of females responses were significantly more in the opinion that an enemy could be male as well as female (60.5%), compared to males (31.8%), who reported that the enemy is more likely to be a male (68.2%). No significant differences between school settings were observed, $\chi^2(2, N = 62) = 1.13$, $p > .05$.

3.1.3.3 Question 3: What does an enemy do?

Regardless of age, gender and school setting 46.8% of all participants associated the term "evil, hateful and liar" character to the enemy, 25.8% attributed an enemy behavior to its physically violent nature, and 16.1% associated enemy behavior to verbal violence. Chi-square demonstrated a significant difference between males and females in what an enemy does, $\chi^2(1, N = 62) = 5.53$, $p = .02$; such that, males reported verbal behavior, including screaming, making fun of, and naming (30.4%) more than females who did not make attributions at all. However, females (53.8%) were found to attribute an enemy to evil, hateful and liar character more than males (34.8%), $\chi^2(2, N = 62) = 7.03$, $p = .03$. In associating an enemy to delinquent behaviors, $\chi^2(1, N = 62) = 7.25$, $p = .01$. Males were also found to be more likely to attribute delinquency to an enemy (17.4%) compared to females who showed no attribution at all. Similarly, differences in associating an enemy to delinquent behavior were found between school settings, $\chi^2(1, N = 62) = 4.28$, $p = .04$; such that participants of single-ethnic school associated an enemy to delinquent behavior (12.9%) more than in mixed-ethnic school who showed no attribution at all. There was no effect of age for all categories which scored based on Oppenheimer table 2.

3.1.3.4 Question 4: Is there is a difference between you and the enemy?

By this question the participants were asked to tell whether there are any differences between an enemy and themselves. The majority of children (91.9%) said indeed there was a difference between them and the enemy. However, there were no significant age ($\chi^2(2, N = .62) = .15$, $p > .05$), gender ($\chi^2(1, N = 62) = .68$, $p > .05$), or school setting ($\chi^2(1, N = 62) = .22$, $p > .05$) differences.

3.1.3.5 Question 5: How does the enemy make you feel?

Regardless of age, 69.4% of all participants associated the term "enemy" to bad, sad and terrible feelings. In addition, 22.6% of children revealed feelings of threat while thinking about the enemy. Chi-square analyses suggested no effect of age, gender or school setting for all categories which scored based on Oppenheimer table 2.

3.1.3.6 Question 6: Can this enemy also be friendly?

An enemy was most often perceived as not being friendly (71.8%). However, 25.6% of children said "yes" the enemy can be friendly. Chi-square analyses did not demonstrate significant effect of age group, $\chi^2(4, N = 62) = 3.81$, $p > .05$. There was no significant effect of gender, $\chi^2(2, N = 62) = 3.27$, $p > .05$. And, there was no significant effect of school setting, $\chi^2(1, N = 62) = 1.75$, $p > .05$.

3.1.3.7 Question 7: Can this enemy ever become a friend?

Half of children reported that the enemy cannot ever become their friend (50.8%). However, 23% of all participants approved of establishing a friendship with an enemy, whereby 26.2% said "yes, if they change". Chi-square suggested no effect of age group, $\chi^2(4, N = 62) = .47$, $p > .05$. In addition, differences between males and females were not obtained ($\chi^2(2, N = 62) = 1.49$, $p > .05$). There was no significant effect of school setting, $\chi^2(2, N = 62) = 2.18$, $p > .05$.

3.1.3.8 Question 8: Has an enemy always been an enemy?

The majority of children (72.4%) reported that the enemy had not always been an enemy, whereas, 21.2% of children said "yes" the enemy is always perceived as an enemy. In gender group there were no significant differences between males and females, $\chi^2(1, N = 62) = .32$, $p > .05$. Differences between the three age groups were

also not obtained $\chi^2(2, N = 62) = 2.99$, $p > .05$. And there was no significant effect of school setting, $\chi^2(1, N = 62) = .18$, $p > .05$.

3.1.3.9 Question 9: Does Israel have an enemy?

Regardless of gender, age and school, the majority of participants (78.8%) believed that Israel State has an enemy. Again analyses showed no effect of gender effect, $\chi^2(1, N = 62) = .03$, $p > .05$. There was no significant effect of age group, $\chi^2(2, N = 62) = 3.25$, $p > .05$. Furthermore, no significant differences were found between schools, $\chi^2(1, N = 62) = .39$, $p > .05$.

3.1.3.10 Question 10: Does the Israeli-Arab have an enemy?

The majority of children (71.2%) believed that their own group has an enemy. Chi-square analyses suggested no gender effect, $\chi^2(1, N = 62) = .93$, $p > .05$. There was also no significant effect of age group, $\chi^2(2, N = 62) = 5.76$, $p > .05$. And differences between schools were not found, $\chi^2(1, N = 62) = .09$, $p > .05$.

3.1.3.11 Question 11: Does the Israeli-Jewish have an enemy?

Regardless of gender, age or school setting, the majority of participants (83.6%) reported "yes" the outgroup has an enemy. There was no effect of gender ($\chi^2(1, N = 62) = .30$, $p > .05$), age group ($\chi^2(2, N = 62) = .74$, $p > .05$), or school setting ($\chi^2(1, N = 62) = 3.11$, $p > .05$).

3.1.3.12 Question 12: Is an enemy alone or always with a group?

Regardless of age, 82.9% of all participants said an enemy is viewed with a group. Chi-square analyses did not demonstrate a significant effect of age $\chi^2(2, N = 62) = 1.13$, $p > .05$. In addition, there was no effect of gender ($\chi^2(1, N = 62) = 2.50$, $p > .05$), further no significant differences were found between schools, $\chi^2(1, N = 62) = .12$, $p > .05$.

3.2 Hypothesis 2

To test the hypothesis stating that experience of contact of Israeli-Arab children with outgroup will be associated with improved positive attitudes toward the outgroup, a correlation analyses were conducted on categories of contact scale. According to this analysis, there was a significant positive relationship between experiencing positive contact and outgroup attitudes (r = .38, p < .001); such that children who reported more experience of contact with the outgroup, reported more positive attitudes toward the outgroup. Additionally, a significant relationship was found between outgroup attitudes and positive storytelling (r = .37, p < .001), and crossgroup friendship (r = .33, p < .001). Correlations between contact measures and outgroup attitude are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Correlations between contact measures and outgroup attitude.

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6
1. Prior positive contact	-					
2. Prior negative contact	.40**	-				
3. Positive storytelling	.31*	.08	-			
4. Negative storytelling	.14	.17	.39**	-		
5. Crossgroup friendship	.16	. 08	.15	.10	-	
6. Outgroup attitudes	.38**	-.05	.37**	.09	.33**	-

Note. * p <.05, ** p <.01. Scores for positive and negative contact range from 1 (Never) to 5(Very frequently). Positive and negative storytelling, and crossgroup friendship range from 1 (None) to 5 (More than 10).

In addition, an independent samples t-test analysis was used in order to test school setting effect on positive contact and outgroup attitudes. Since children in mixed schools inevitably have more contact with the outgroup it was expected that school

setting would influence attitudes. However, the type of contact can be either positive or negative, therefore it was initially tested whether contact was perceived as being more positive or negative, and then its influence on attitudes was measured. The results revealed that there was a significant difference between school settings in report of having positive contact ($t(60) = -4.10$, $p < .001$) and negative contact ($t(60) = -3.34$, $p < .001$). Such that, children in the mixed school reported experiencing more positive contact with outgroup ($M = 3.29$, $SD = .78$), compared to children in the single school ($M = 2.16$, $SD = 1.32$). At the same time, they reported more negative contact with outgroup ($M = 2.03$, $SD = .98$), compared to children in the single school ($M = 1.23$, S$D = .92$). In terms of attitudes, a significant difference was found between schools ($t(60) = -2.72$, $p < .001$); such that, children in the mixed school expressed more positive attitudes toward the outgroup ($M = .48$, $SD = 1.31$), compared to the single school ($M = -.39$, $SD = 1.20$). Finally, a significant difference was found between schools with regards to listing to negative stories about outgroup ($t(60) = -2.01$, $p < .05$). Children in the mixed school ($M = 2.58$, $SD = 1.41$) reported listening to more negative stories within their home from family members compared to children in the single school ($M = 1.94$, $SD = 1.09$) (see Table 4).

Table 4. Means and Standard Deviations of single and mixed-ethnic schools for contact measures, and outgroup attitude.

	M (SD)	*M (SD)*	
Variable	Single school	Mixed school	t
Prior positive contact	2.16 (1.32)	3.29 (.78)	-4.09*
Prior negative contact	1.23 (.92)	2.03 (.98)	-3.33*
Positive storytelling	1.81 (1.14)	2.19 (1.22)	-1.29
Negative storytelling	1.94 (1.09)	2.58 (1.41)	-2.01*
Crossgroup friendship	6.55 (2.96)	6.94 (2.16)	-.59
Outgroup attitude	-.39 (1.20)	.48 (1.31)	-2.72*

Note: p* <.01. Scores for positive and negative contact range from 1 (Never) to 5 (Very frequenty). Positive and negative storytelling, and crossgroup friendship range from 1 (None) to 5 (More than 10).

3.3 Hypothesis 3

Chi- square analyses were conducted in order to test the hypothesis stating that perceiving of enemy image in Israeli-Arab children is related intergroup contact. The median-split high vs. low contact measure was used to investigate the relationship between positive contact on the three measures, which were: free association task, drawing task and enemy questionnaires. Only a significant relationship between contact and the enemy questionnaire was obtained, specifically in the feelings of threat $\chi^2(1, N = 62) = 3.74$, $p = .05$; such that, children with low positive contact were found to express more feelings of threat (94.1%), compared to children with high positive contact (71.1%).

Chapter 4

DISCUSSION

The current study aimed to investigate Israeli-Arab children's enemy perception and examine age and gender differences in the understanding of enemy and enemy images. A comparison between children aged 7 to 11 years, attending two different schools was assessed. Here they were asked to respond to a free association task, draw an enemy, and answer a questionnaire reflecting their understanding of an enemy. It was expected to find that Israeli-Arab children from three age groups (7, 9, and 11 years) will perceive the enemy in a different way. Such that younger children will associate the enemy more to physical violent behavior (e.g. killing), however, older children will refer the enemy more to personality characteristics (e.g. liar). Furthermore, it was expected to find that boys will refer the enemy to physical violent behavior whereas girls will show more verbal violence and character references. Indeed results suggested that regardless of age or sex, all Israeli-Arab children had a conception of an enemy, and they were able to both draw an enemy and answer questions related to the enemy. Mainly, Israeli-Arab children perceived an enemy as an individual who can be either a man or a women, has evil and hateful characteristics, who is physically violent that makes them feel bad, sad and terrible (i.e., anger and fear).

Israeli-Arab children conceptualized an enemy most often as a living person (i.e., Israeli-Jewish) and attributed characteristics, such as killing, armed person, and war scenes. Furthermore, they perceived an enemy as someone who has a bad, deceitful, and lying personality. An enemy was also a person who did physically violent things such as fighting and shooting others. These responses of Israeli-Arab children may be interpreted due to the immediate social and political atmosphere and the Jewish-Arab conflict in Israel, the "outgroup" enemy image (Oppenheimer, 2004), and ingroup bias which is known to be evident in Israeli-Arab children's perception (Bettencourt et. al., 2001). In Israeli-Arab children drawing aliens and non-human features were absent which might be due to their personal experiences as being raised with a real enemy (Israeli-Jewish), and influenced directly by the context and traditions that reflect on their cultural norms and values in perceiving an enemy and developing social understanding. At the same time, this might be due to their development of abstract cognitive skills (Duckitt, 1992). As Piaget (1928) claimed with the concrete operational thinking from the age of 7 years, children begin to categorize people into ethnic groups (Israeli-Arab vs Israeli-Jewish) and exaggerate differences (good vs. bad characteristics). Thus, the social experiences and the cognitive skills developments altogether may impact on the Israeli-Arab children's understanding of the enemy and the ability to draw realistic features in describing an enemy.

The current study findings are in line with previous studies conducted on children living in conflict zones as either political or war. For instance, in one study conducted on Bosnian and Croatian children showed that those children, who experienced direct war scenes and tension with ougtroup, were able to create pure

and clear images of an enemy (Povrzanovic, 1997). Likewise Turkish-Cypriot children showed a clear enemy image and were able to draw realistic features of an enemy, and tended to use similar traits (i.e., war scene and violence behavior) (Mertan & Husnu 2014).

Nevertheless, despite the conclusions obtained in line with previous studies Israeli-Arab children are known to experience even today a direct and real conflict that impact on their social perceptions. For example Turkish Cypriot children did not experience the war directly and their enemy image may be transmitted by tradition. Or, American children who have no current national or collective enemy image (Hesse & Mack, 1991). As Bar-Tal (1997) argues children are vulnerable to various societal channels that provide them with information about the outgroups. Sometimes this may impact directly on children's prejudice in experiencing real tension and war scene with others, or they indirectly learn about the political or traditional ingroup enemy.

As previously stated studies on the social understanding of Israeli-Arab people in general and especially on children are rare. Those few studies focusing on the Israeli-Arab perception of Israeli-Jewish people show contradictory findings. For example, it is revealed that Israeli-Arab perceptions are less negative toward Israeli-Jewish, compared to Arab (Palestinians) who live in West bank (Palestine territory) and Israeli-Jewish themselves (Bilu, 1989). That might be due to their status as being a minority group, which makes Israeli-Arab's social attitudes to be influenced by their statuses and impact on their identity to identify more with the Israeli-Jewish as majority group (Teichman, Bar-Tal, & Abdolrazeq, 2007). However, although the

previous studies assumed that Israeli-Arab social perceptions are not negative toward the outgroup, children of Israeli-Arab population in the current study were found to be aware of the Israeli-Palestinian conflict and reflect negative images toward the outgroup (Israeli-Jewish) which found to be different according to gender and across ages.

The single significant finding on enemy image concerning gender differences was obtained in enemy questionnaire. In the current study, Israeli-Arab boys were found to make more references to a physically violent nature, specifically, drawing tanks, armed soldiers, killing and war scenes. In addition, boys associated the enemy to delinquent behavior (stealing houses), and reported more the opinion that an enemy is a man. However, girls were found to associate the enemy to evil and hateful personality characteristics, specifically someone they know (i.e., classmate) who behaves badly (i.e., bullying). Girls also reported more the opinion that an enemy can be male as well as female. Gender differences were also found in previous studies conducted on enemy images. For example, Dutch boys compared to Dutch girls more often characterized an enemy by physical violence and delinquency (Oppenheimer, 2004). And similarly, Turkish Cypriot girls tend to use more personality references such as evil and hateful characteristics in describing an enemy however boys used references to more physical violence (Mertan & Husnu, 2014).

Nevertheless, contrary to the expectations that Israeli-Arab girls would show more verbal violence to the enemy, Israeli-Arab boys referred more to verbal violence such as “naming”, “making fun of” and “teasing”. This gender difference for Israeli-Arab children can be due to the cultural and social beliefs that girls should express less

emotion, even verbally. Fivush and Buckner (2000) argued that differences between males and females are more likely to occur as a result of experiencing different social contexts that influence their social understandings. Boys are generally observed to spend more time in physical activities, compared to girls who spend their time most often seeking for contact and friendship (Besag, 2006). Bullying behavior is more evident in boys compared to girls (Garandeau & Cillessen, 2006). Oppenheimer (2004) stated that "boys are more encouraged to show aggressive and independent behavior, while girls are encouraged to show nurturing, affective and compliant behavior" (p. 18). Finally, physical and verbal violent behaviors in term of bullying (most often at school) is common among males, either perceived as being a bully or reported to be bullied by others (Yang et al., 2006). Therefore, Israeli-Arab boys as in other cultures expressed more violence both verbally and physically.

Differences in conceptualization of the enemy of Israeli-Arab children in the current study were not obtained across age. Nevertheless, a single difference was found while asking children whether an enemy is a man or woman. Younger Israeli-Arab children (7 year olds) responded that the enemy was a man, whereas older children (11 year olds) responded that an enemy can be either a man or a woman. Similar results were found on Dutch children where younger children perceived the enemy to be a man, and older Dutch children expressed that the enemy can be man as well as woman (Oppenhiemr, 2010). This age difference in the social understanding may result from the development of cognitive skills as previously stated (Aboud, 1988; Piaget & Weil, 1951). While children at younger ages are still not able to develop abstract thinking, they may assume an enemy to only be a stronger person that is a man. However, as children grow older, they develop more logical

thoughts, and cognitive abilities that came to support their mutual thoughts and emotions. Therefore, conceptualizing of enemy in Israeli-Arab children might be influenced by their cognitive abilities that develop and change across age, leading them to perceive the gender of the enemy differently that is a man or/and a woman.

Age differences were further observed in conceptualizing an enemy who gradually reformed from being any individual to someone with different culture, religion and ethnicity features. Younger Israeli-Arab children drew an enemy who seem to be stranger person, friend, or relative that was characterized by bad features (i.e., bothering, bullying, selfishness and etc.). Conversely, as Israeli-Arab children grow older, the enemy features shifted to include more political and ethnical connotations (i.e., Israeli-Jewish). Furthermore, younger Israeli-Arab children generally assumed that an enemy is not a friendly person. However, older Israeli-Arab children were found to report more positive attitudes toward the enemy, and suggested that the enemy may become a friend in condition he or she changes. Similar findings were also obtained in Mertan and Husnu (2014) study showing that older Turkish-Cypriot children assigned more positive characteristics and abstract qualities to an enemy, compared to younger children. As Aboud and Skerry (1984) claimed as children grow older, they are more willing to attribute both positive and negative attributes to others. This may explain the changes of attitudes to the enemy by age. According to Doyle and Aboud (1995) from the 10 to 11 years children are able to show more cognitive development that help to moderate their level of prejudice and negativity toward others as a result of better conceptualizing of others using psychological traits, and political and religious beliefs. Thus, as Israeli-Arab

children grow older were able to discriminate between themselves and others who are different in many aspects such as religion, language and ethnicity.

A single significant effect of school setting was obtained in the free association task. A difference between schools was revealed in perceiving an enemy with delinquency. Delinquency in this study was defined as a metaphor of war scene, physical violent (armed soldier) and stealing houses and lands by others (i.e., Israeli-Jewish peoples). Israeli-Arab children in single-ethnic school associated the enemy more with delinquent behavior, compared to Israeli-Arab children in mixed-ethnic school. School settings usually shows impact on children's social images by providing a great deal of explicit teaching to children about the country in which they live using curriculum based on subjects such as history, civic and citizenship education, and religion (Bar-Tal, 1997). As mentioned before, children in the current study were recruited from two different schools that differ by its educational philosophy, social and ethnical context. The curriculum in mixed-ethnic school is based more on the importance of social learning, focusing on peace behavior co-existence and friendship between Israeli-Jewish and Israeli-Arabs. It was assumed that learning in the same class and living in an environment that offers opportunity for personal contact with others, would lead children of both groups to accept each other and experience positive relations with others (Berger et al., 2014). Therefore, using the term delinquency to describe an enemy was mostly common in children of single-ethnic who have less contact with the outgroup (Israeli-Jewish).

Furthermore, a significant difference between school settings was obtained in intergroup contact measures. Findings revealed a positive relationship between the

three variables, which are: school setting, outgroup attitudes, and positive contact. Israeli-Arab Children in the mixed school were reported to experience more positive relationships with the outgroup (Israeli-Jewish), and expressed more positive attitudes toward them compared to the single school. This positive experience and attitudes vis a vis the outgroup (Israeli-Jewish) by the Israeli-Arab children might be due to daily based contact that the mixed school setting is offering to the children. On the other hand, the Israeli-Arab children in the single school setting have no opportunity to develop a relationship with outgroup during the school hours. Therefore, Israeli-Arab children in the single school setting perceived Israeli-Jewish more negatively (e.g., they are delinquent) expressed negative attitudes, and reported experiencing less positive contact with the outgroup. According to Nelson (2006), categories such as race and ethnicity are features of an individual that leads to distinct social behaviors between different groups (i.e., Jews and Arabs), and as a consequence, conflict and biases between nations flourish. Especially in a situation of conflict, when two groups are in tension competing for scarce resources (i.e., territories), prejudiced thought and hostile behavior toward other outgroup members are sufficiently common (Sherif & Sherif, 1969). Thus, the general conditions in Israel and the conflict between Jews and Arabs is, without a doubt, promoting the expression of negative feelings and discrimination against outgroup (Yedidya & Lipschitz, 2011), especially children of single-ethnic school who are not in relation with the outgroup.

Although Israeli-Arab children in mixed school were expected to show mainly positive attitudes, contact and stereotype Israeli-Jewish less negatively, surprisingly, they were also found to experience negative contact with Israeli-Jewish people.

Similar findings were obtained in Stark, et al., (2013) study which revealed that students in the classroom context, showed negative attitudes as well as positive attitudes towards particular outgroup. According to Amir (1969; 1976) only under specific optimal conditions, can contact principles help to reduce prejudice, otherwise it may increase the likelihood of prejudice. Thus this might be due to the conditions that Israeli-Arab children experience in the classroom. While they are in a situation where Jewish and Arab (and Palestinians) experience an intense ongoing conflict they may experience further negative contact and report tension with their Israeli-Jewish classmates. Creating an environment that offer opportunities to have contact between Israeli-Jewish and Israeli-Arab in a classroom context (school setting), was not sufficient to reduce the negativity between children. Bar-Tal (1997) argued that "direct contact may strengthen or weaken positive as well as negative held images" (p. 508). Therefore, these critical findings may also be due to the limitations of contact. Therefore, intergroup contact may enhance the relationship between groups, rather than reducing intergroup tension between Israeli-Jewish and Israeli-Arab in classroom (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Nevertheless, in order to reduce skepticism on the influence of contact, further studies are needed to be conducted on places where conflict and tension between groups exist, such as focusing on the Arab-Jewish conflict in general, and Arab minority situation in specific. Future studies needs to be conducted on the wider social contexts while taking into consideration other mediator effects such as group characteristics, cultural belief systems, and social status.

Findings also revealed that Israeli-Arab children in mixed school reported listening to more negative storytelling about Jewish people, compared to Israeli-Arab children

in single-ethnic school. Because Israeli-Arab children in mixed school spend most of their time in the school setting co-existing with Israeli-Jewish classmates, teachers and families, partnering tasks and activities about the daily social life, social behavior, and raise topics with regards to the peaceful relationship between Jewish and Arabs, this might be the reason to impact on their awareness and realization of the history of conflict between the two groups. As Bronfenbrenner (1988) in his ecological model suggested the environment and the contexts that include different nests in which children are raised have a huge impact on their knowledge, where to consider parent–child relationship, peer relationships, teacher–child communications, and the neighborhood and school settings within which the child and family live. In addition, Bar-Tal (1997) argued that, individuals who participate in communication programs with outgroup members, usually first come with preconceptions about the outgroup's characteristics. It takes time for individuals to change sets of previously acquired social knowledge which includes stereotypes and prejudice attitudes. Nevertheless, Israeli-Arab children may hold such negative storytelling about the outgroup due to their pre-existing knowledge that they learn from others (i.e., family members and parents), which in turn may impact on their experience of negative contact too. Therefore, further studies are needed to be conducted on the relationship between Jewish and Arabs in exchange programs, focusing more on the personal experience. Especially in situations where individuals would have opportunities to collect first-hand information.

The relationship between intergroup contact and enemy image was mostly correlated with emotion of threat. Feelings of threat were most often reported in Israeli-Arab children of single-ethnic school, specifically, for the younger age group, compared to

mixed-ethnic school. This might be due to their less experience with the ougtoup (i.e., Israeli-Jewish). According to Stephan and Stephan (2000)'s intergroup threat theory, experiencing threat can be related to the negative outcomes. They argued that there are two kind of threat (symbolic and realistic) which individuals may experience. Symbolic threats occur when individuals feel their wellbeing is negatively perceived by members of the other group. However, in realistic threat, people may exaggerate feelings of threat due to a social situation such as conflict between groups. Because Israeli-Arab children in the single school have no direct contact with Israeli-Jewish, they may show more feelings of threat. Based on the intergroup threat theory, Israeli-Arab children may invent an enemy and may experience feelings of threat toward outgroup. This also might be due to the real tension and conflict that impact on their social understandings, wellbeing, feeling less secure, and being integrated to Israel State.

Being willing to learn about outgroups by experiencing direct contact may impact social perception. Direct contact with outgroups may not be possible in conflict situations. For instance, people of a particular group who were available to participate in these communication groups, may not be representing the ingroup, hence their personal and situational characteristics in their society are not generalized to all of their own group members (i.e., socioeconomic status). As Bar-Tal (1997) claimed that "it is always possible that the social context of the inter-personal contact provides only partial information about the outgroup, hence the contact may be carried out with an only partially representative segment of the outgroup society, in a particular setting and situation" (p. 508). Therefore, in order to generalize the results, further studies are needed to investigate intergroup contact approach to the wider

population. Comparing only two school settings and evaluating only Israeli-Arab children may not allow for generalization. For better understanding, findings should include and contrast both Israeli-Arab and Israeli-Jewish children data.

The current study supports the assumptions that childhood is an essential period for the formulation of social understanding, especially children who grow up in conflictual situations where severe tension exists (Mertan & Husnu, 2014). This study partially compensates the missing studies on Arab population in Israel, as Teichman (2001; 2003) suggested. Especially, adding additional attention to Israeli-Arab children. Indeed, further studies are needed to examine the social understanding and conceptualization of enemy and enemy images in Israeli-Arab population, specifically focusing on their status effect as being the minority group, and to integrate further developmental and social-psychological approaches that examine intergroup bias (Hewstone, Rubin & Willis, 2002), ingroup-outgroup relationships and minority status.

Finally, the study has additional essential limitations that should be considered. The conceptualization of enemy image and the perception of outgroup members of Israeli-Arab children were associated with the development of social–cognitive abilities of children (Aboud, 1988). This factor was not measured in this study. Therefore future research is needed to take into consideration such skills in order to better understand the perceptions of children. In addition, in order to conduct a comparison between children of mixed and single-ethnic schools, the total number of participants was separated into two groups (31 of single vs. 31 of mixed), which in turn limits the number of participants. As a consequence the interviewer followed the

same procedure in offering the questions and questioning the children. Here the tasks were not counterbalanced, and lead to create an order effect that may limit the ability to obtain reliable responses in measuring the children's social perceptions. Therefore future studies are needed to consider order effects and change the procedure in offering questions in different order for the participants.

In conclusion, the developmental patterns regarding "enemy" image formation and conceptualization might develop through stages starting from the childhood age. The general findings revealed that regardless of age and gender differences, Israeli-Arab children can understand the concept of "enemy", by drawing an enemy, and answering questions related to the enemy image. The cultural or societal setting in which children may be raised in (the parental role and peer relations) constitute the social climate which molds their ideas and reactions. However, when children are promoted by external causes such as war, discrimination, violence and devastations, they view Jews as their target for enmification and they develop emotions of anger, and threat. It should be noted that sociocultural and ideological perspectives and education also play an important role in aggravating the negative loading of enemy images, especially if the origin of enemy images stems from psychocultural and political ideology of experiencing minority-majority conflict. Children's socialization process via direct contact may trigger a descent and reduction in terms of enemy images. Perhaps, even though we still have growing literature on the relationship between the Israeli-Arab and Jewish, we could conclude that processes of socialization, ongoing contact and the acquaintance of children in multi-ethnic groups is an essential effective tool in creating sociocultural stability characterized by friendship and positive perceptions of each other. However, negative contact and

attitudes against the outgroup are still obvious, therefore, further studies need to consider additional variables that may be involved and impact the contact process. This study came to support theoreticians who examine children's social behavior, especially who are raised in conflict. Nevertheless, further studies interested in intergroup contact with children of Arab minority in particular, is necessary in order to generalize the findings and show differences in developmental patterns of enemy images.

REFERENCES

Aboud, F. E. (1988). *Children and prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Aboud, F. E. (2003). The formation of ingroup favouritism and outgroup prejudice in young children: Are they distinct attitudes? *Developmental Psychology, 39(*1), 48-60.

Aboud, F. E., & Amato, M. (2001). Developmental and socialization influences on intergroup bias. In R. Brown & S. Gaertner (Eds*.), Blackwell's handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes* (pp. 65–85). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Aboud, F. E., & Skerry, S. A. (1984). Self and ethnic concepts in relation to ethnic constancy. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 15*, 14-26.

Adala (2011). *Accused 2: Failure and Omissions by the Attorney General in Investigating the October 2000 Events*, Haifa: Adala - The Legal Center for Arab minority Rights in Israel.

Alexander, M. G., Brewer, M. B. & Hermann, R. K. (1999). Image and affect: A functional analysis of out -group stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 77*(1), 78-93.

Alexander, R. D. (1974). The evolution of social behavior. *Annual Review of Ecology and Systematics*, 5, 325-384.

Al-Haj, M., Katz, E., & Shye, S. (1993). Arab and Jewish Attitude: Toward a Palestinian State. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 37* (4), 619-632. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022002793037004002

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Amir, Y. (1969). Contact hypothesis in ethnic relations. *Psychological Bulletin, 17*, 319–342.

Amir, Y. (1976). The role of intergroup contact in change of prejudice and race relations. In P. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Towards the elimination of racism* (pp. 245–308). New York: Pergamon.

Barlow, F. K., Paolini, S., Pedersen, A., Hornsey, M. J., Radke, H. R. M. Harwood, & J. Sibley, C. G. (2012). The contact caveat: Negative contact predicts increased prejudice more than positive contact predicts reduced prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38*, 1629–1643. doi: 10.1177/0146167212457953

Barrett, M. (2005). National identities in children and young people. In S. Ding & K. Littleton (Eds.), *Children's Personal and Social Development (*pp. 181-220). Milton Keynes: The Open University/Blackwell Publishing.

Barrett, M. (2007). *Children's knowledge, beliefs and feelings about nations and national groups*. Hove, UK: Psychology Press.

Barrett, M., Wilson, H., & Lyons, E. (2003). The development of national ingroup bias: English children's attributions of characteristics to English, American and German people. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 21,* 193–220.

Bar-Tal, D. (1996). Development of social categories and stereotypes in early childhood: The case of "the Arab" concept formation, stereotype and attitudes by Jewish children in Israel. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 20,* 341–370.

Bar-Tal, D. (1997). Formation and change of ethnic and national stereotypes: An integrative model. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 21,* 491-523.

Bar-Tal, D., & Teichman, Y. (2005). *Stereotypes and prejudice in conflict: Representations of Arabs in Israeli Jewish society*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bar-Tal, D., Raviv, A., Raviv, A., & Brosh, M. (1991). Perception of epistemic authority and attribution knowledge area and age. *European Journal of' Social Psychology, 21,* 477-492.

Berger, R., Abu-Raiya, H., & Gelkopf, M. (2014). The Art of Living Together: Reducing Stereotyping and Prejudicial Attitudes Through the Arab-Jewish Class Exchange Program (CEP). *Journal of Educational Psychology*. Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/edu0000015

Besag, V. E. (2006). *Understanding girls' friendships, fights and feuds: A practical approach to girls' bullying.* Buckingham, England: Open University Press.

Bettencourt, B. A., Dorr, N., Charlton, K., & Hume, D. L. (2001). Status differences and ingroup bias: A meta-analytic examination of the effects of status stability, status legitimacy, and group permeability. *Psychological Bulletin, 127,* 520– 42.

Bigler, R. S., Spears Brown, C., & Markell, M. (2001). When groups are not created equal: effects of group status on the formation of intergroup attitudes in children. *Child Development, 72*, 1151-1162.

Bilu, Y. (1989). "The other as a nightmare: The Israeli-Arab encounter as reflected in children's dreams in Israel and in the West-Bank," *Political Psychology*, 10(3): 365-389.

Black-Gutman, D., & Hickson, F. (1996). The relationship between racial attitudes and social-cognitive development in children: An Australian study. *Developmental Psychology, 32*(3), 448-456.

Branscombe, N. R., Ellemers, N., Spears, R., & Doosje, B. (1999). The context and content of social identity threats. In N. Ellemers, R. Spears, & B. Doosje (Eds.), *Social identity: Context, commitment, content* (pp. 35-58). Oxford: Blackwell.

Brewer, M. B. & Gaertner, S. L. (2001). Toward reduction of prejudice: Intergroup contact and social categorization. In R. J. Brown & S. L. Gaertner (eds.), The Blackwell handbook of social psychology: Intergroup processes (pp. 451-72). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1988). Interacting systems in human development. Research paradigms: Present and future. In N. Bolger, A. Caspi, G. Downey, & M. Moorehouse (Eds.), *Persons in context: Developmental processes* (pp. 25–49). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Cairns, E. (1996). *Children and political violence*. Oxford, UK & Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Cohen, J. J., & Fish, M. C. (1993). *Handbook of school-based interventions: Resolving student problems and promoting healthy educational environments.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Cook, S. W. (1984). Cooperative interaction in multiethnic contexts. In N. Miller & M. B. Brewer (Eds.), Groups in contact: *The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 155–185). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Crisp, R. J., & Hewstone, M. (1999). Differential evaluation of crossed category groups: Patterns processes and reducing intergroup bias. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 2,* 307–333. http://dx.doi.org/ 10.1177/1368430299024001

Dhont, K., & Van Hiel, A. (2009). We must not be enemies: Interracial contact and the reduction of prejudice among authoritarians. *Personality and Individual Differences, 46,* 172–177. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2008.09.022

Dishion, T. J., French, D. C., & Patterson, G. R. (1995). The development and ecology of antisocial behavior. In D. Cicchetti & D. J. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology* (pp. 421–471). New York: Wiley.

Doyle, A. B., & Aboud, F. E. (1995). A longitudinal study of white children's racial prejudice as a social- cognitive development. *Merrill–Palmer Quarterly, 41,* 209–228.

Duckitt, J. (1992). The social transmission of prejudice to individuals. In J. Duckitt (Ed.), *The social psychology of prejudice* (pp. 127–159). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Dunbar, R. I. M. (1988). *Primate social systems.* Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Federico, C. M., & Levin, S. (2004). Intergroup biases as a function of reflected status appraisals and support for legitimizing ideologies: Evidence from USA and Israel. *Social Justice Research, 17,* 47-73.

Fish, M. C., & Massey, R. F. (1991). Systems in school psychology practice: A preliminary investigation. *Journal of School Psychology, 29,* 361–366.

Fivush, R., & Buckner, J. P. (2000). Gender, sadness, and depression: The development of emotional focus through gendered discourse. In A. H. Fischer (Ed.), *Gender and emotion: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 232–253). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press. doi:10.1017/ CBO9780511628191.012

Forbes, H. D. (1997). *Ethnic conflict: Commerce, culture, and the contact hypothesis.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Garandeau, C. F. & Cillessen, A. H. N. (2006). From indirect aggression to invisible aggression: A conceptual view on bully and peer group manipulation. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour,11,* 612-625.

Giles, H., & Giles, J. L. (2012). Ingroups and outgroups communicating. In A. Kuyulo (Ed.), *Inter/cultural communication: Representation and construction of culture in everyday interaction* (pp. 141-162). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Glick, R. A., & Roose, S. P. (Eds.). (1993). *Rage, power, and aggression: The role of affect in motivation, development, and adaptation*. (Vol. 2). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Graf, S., Paolini, S., & Rubin, M. (2014). Negative intergroup contact is more influential, but positive intergroup contact is more common: Assessing contact prominence and contact prevalence in five Central European countries. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 44,* 536-547. DOI: 10.1002/ejsp.2052

Harrington, H. J., & Miller, N. (1992). Research and theory in intergroup relations: Issues of consensus and controversy. In J. Lynch, C. Modgil, & S. Modgil (Eds.), *Cultural diversity and the schools*, (Vol. 2, pp. 159–178). London: Falmer.

Hesse, P., & Mack, J. E. (1991). The world is a dangerous place: Images of the enemy on children's television. In R. W. Rieber (Ed.), *The psychology of war and peace*: The images of the enemy (pp.131–151). New York: Plenum.

Hesse, P., & Poklemba, D. (1989). Feindbilder im Kindesalter: Der Fremde mit grünen Füben und schwarzen Zehen [Enemy images in childhood: The stranger with green feet and black toes]. *Psychol sozial, 12*, 62–67.

Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53*, 575-604. doi: 10.1146/annurev.psych.53.100901.135109

Hoffman, Y. E. (1974). National images of Arab youth in Israel and the West Bank. *Megamot, 20,* 316–324 (Hebrew).

Holt, R. R., & Silverstein, B. (1989). On the psychology of enemy images: Introduction and overview. *Journal of Social Issues, 45*(2), 1–11.

Hughes, J. (2007). Mediating and Moderating Effects of Inter-Group Contact: Case Studies from Bilingual/Bi-National Schools in Israel. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 33*(3), 419-437.

Ilan, S., & Singer-Heruti, R. (2009). Israel bans Arab parties from running in upcoming elections. Israel: Haaretz.

Jackson, J. W. (1993). Contact theory of intergroup hostility: A review and evaluation of the theoretical and empirical literature. *International Journal of Group Tensions, 23,* 43–65.

Jahoda, G. (1962). Development of Scottish children's ideas and attitudes about other countries. *Journal of Social Psychology, 58,* 91-108.

Katz, P. A. (1976). The acquition of racial attitudes in children. In P. A. Katz (Ed.), *Towards the elimination of racism*. New York Wiley.

Kelman, H. C. (1999). The interdependence of Israeli and Palestinian national identities: The role of the other in existential conflicts. *Journal of Social Issues, 55,* 581–600.

Khoury, J. (2010). Current Knesset is the most racist in Israeli history. Israel: Haaretz.

Lustig, I. (2003). *The influence of studying foreign conflicts on students' perceptions of the Israeli Palestinian conflict*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Haifa, Israel.

Mertan, B. (2011). Children's perception of national identity and ingroup/outgroup attitudes: Turkish Cypriot school children. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 8,* 74–86. doi:10.1080/ 17405629.2010.533982

Mertan, B., & Husnu, S. (2014). Understanding of "enemy" in Turkish Cypriot Children. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 4,* 465-473.

Miller, A. (1983). *For your own good: Hidden cruelty in child-rearing and the roots of violence*. New York: Farrar, Straus, Giroux.

Nelson, T.D. (2006). *The psychology of prejudice*. Boston: Pearson Publishers.

Nesdale, A. R., & Flesser, D. (1999). Social identity and the development of chilsren's intergroup attitudes. Unpublished manuscript, Griffith University.

Nesdale, D. (2004). Social identity processes and children's ethnic prejudice. In M. Bennett & F. Sani (Eds.), *The development of the social self* (pp. 219–246).

Opotow, S. (2005). Hate, conflict, and moral exclusion. In R. J. Sternberg (Ed.), *The psychology of hate* (pp. 121–153). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Oppenheimer, L. & Barrett, M. (2011). National identity and ingroup/outgroup attitudes in children. The role of sociohistorical settings. An introduction to the Special issue. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 8*, 1-4.

Oppenheimer, L. (2001). Enemy images: A developmental approach. In G. Hunyady & N. L. L. Anh (Eds.), *Current issues in stereotypes* (pp. 477– 483). Budapest, Hungary: Eötvös Press.

Oppenheimer, L. (2004). Perception of individualism and collectivism in Dutch society: A developmental approach. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 28,* 336–346.

Oppenheimer, L. (2005). The development of enemy images in Dutch children: Measurement and initial findings. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 23,* 645–660.

Oppenheimer, L. (2006). The development of enemy images: A theoretical contribution. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 12*, 269–292.

Oppenheimer, L. (2010). Are children's view of the "enemy" shaped by a highly-publicized negative event? *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 34,* 345–353.

Oppenheimer, L., & Hakvoort, I. (2003).Will the Germans ever be forgiven? Memories of the Second World War four generations later. In E. Cairns&M. Roe (Eds.), The role of memory in ethnic conflict (pp. 94–103). Houndmills, Basingstoke, England: Palgrave-Macmillan.

Ovadia, G. (1993). *Stereotypes towards Arabs of kindergarten-age children*. Unpublished Master's thesis, Tel-Aviv University (Hebrew).

Paolini, S., Harwood, J., & Rubin, M. (2010). Negative intergroup contact makes group memberships salient: Explaining why intergroup conflict endures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36,* 1723–1738. doi: 10.1177/0146167210388667

Patchen, M. (1999). *Diversity and unity: Relations between racial and ethnic groups*. Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1971). *Racially separate or together? New York*: McGraw-Hill.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1986). The contact hypothesis revisited. In H. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (pp. 169–195). Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49,* 65–85.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2000). Does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Recent meta-analytic findings. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination: Social psychological perspectives* (pp. 93–114). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90,* 751–783.

Piaget, J. & Weil, A. M. (1951). The development in children of the idea of the homeland and of relations with other countries. *International Social Science Bulletin, 3,* 561-578.

Piaget, J. (1928). Judgment and reasoning in the child. London: Kegan Paul, Trench & Trubner. (First French ed., 1924).

Povrzanovic, M. (1997). Children, war and nation: Croatia 1991–4. *Childhood: A Global Journal of Child Research, 4,* 81–102.

Psychologist for Social Responsibility (2004). *Enemy Images: A Resource Manual on Reducing Enmity.* Washington DC 20002.

Rieber, R. W., & Kelly, R. J. (1991). Substance and shadow: Images of the enemy. In R. W. Rieber (Ed.), *The psychology of war and peace: The image of the enemy* (pp. 3–39). New York, NY: Plenum Press. doi:10.1007/978-1-4899-0747-9_1

Sherif, M., & Sherif, C. W. (1969). *Social psychology.* New York: Harper & Row.

Silverstein, B. (1992). The psychology of enemy images. In S. Staub & P. Green (Eds.), *Psychology and social responsibility: Facing global challenges* (pp. 145–162). New York, NY: New York University Press.

Smooha, S. (1984). "Three Perspectives in the sociology of ethnic relation in Israel". *Meganot, 28*(2-3), 169-206. (Hebrew).

Smooha, S. (1987). *Social research on Jewish ethnicity in Israel 1984-1986: Review and selected bibliography and abstract.* Haifa: Haifa University Press.

Stark, T. H., Flache, A., & Veenstra, R. (2013). Generalization of positive and negative attitudes toward individuals to outgroup attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 39,* 608–622. doi: 10.1177/0146167213480890

Staub, E. (1992). *The roots of evil: The origins of genocide and other group violence.* Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Staub, E. (2003). Notes on cultures of violence, cultures of caring and peace, and the fulfillment of basic human needs. *Political Psychology, 24*(1), 1–21.

Stein, J. G. (1996). Image, identity and conflict resolution. In C. Crocker, F. Hampson, & P. Aall (Eds.), *Managing global chaos* (pp. 93–111). Washington, DC: U. S. Institute of Peace Press.

Stephan, W. G. (1987). The contact hypothesis in intergroup relations. In C. Hendrick (Ed.), *Review of personality and social psychology: Group processes and intergroup relations* (Vol. 9, pp. 13–40). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (2000). An integrated threat theory of prejudice. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Reducing prejudice and discrimination* (pp. 23-46). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Sternberg, R. J. (2003). A duplex theory of hate: Development and application to terrorism, massacres, and genocide. *Review of General Psychology, 7*(3), 299–328.

Stormshak, E. A., & Dishion, T. L. (2002). An ecological approach to child and family clinical and counseling psychology, *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, *5*(3), 197-215.

Szalay, L. B., & Mir-Djalali, E. (1991). Image of the enemy: Critical parameters, cultural variations. In R. W. Rieber (Ed.), *The psychology of war and peace: The image of the enemy* (pp. 213–250). New York: Plenum.

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

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The Social Identity Theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Teichman, J. (2001). The development of Israeli children's images of Jews and Arabs and their expression in human figure drawings. *Developmental Psychology, 37,* 749-761.

Teichman, Y. (2003). Images Held by Jewish and Arab Children in Israel of People Representing Their Own and Other Group. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Phycology, 34*(6), 658-676. DOI: 10.1177/0022022103256847

Teichman, Y., & Yehuda, S. (2000). Mutual perceptions and stereotypes of Israeli second grade Jewish and Arab children (Hebrew). In H. Herzog (Ed.), *Reflection of a society* (pp. 415-464). Tel-Aviv: Ramot. Thomas, G.V., Chaigne, E. G., & Fox, T. J. (1989). Children's drawings of topics different in significance: Effect of size on drawing. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 7*, 321-331.

Teichman, Y., & Zafrir, H. (2003). Images held by Jewish and Arab children in Israel of people representing their own and other group. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34,* 658–676.

Teichman, Y., Bar-Tal, D., & Abdolrazeq, Y. (2007). Intergroup biases in conflict: Reexamination with Arab pre-adolescents and adolescents. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 31*(5), 423–432.

Voci, A., & Hewstone, M. (2003). Intergroup contact and prejudice toward immigrants in Italy: The mediational role of anxiety and the moderational role of group salience. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 6,* 37–54.

Vuorinen, M. (E.d). (2012). *Enemy images in war propaganda*. Newcastle on Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Wertsch, J. V. (1985). *Vygotsky and the social formation of mind.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Yang, S., Kim, J., Kim, S., Shin, I, & Yoon, J. (2006). Bullying and victimization behaviors in boys and girls at South Korean primary schools. *Journal of American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 35,* 69-77.

Yedidya, T. & Lipschitz-Elhawi, R. (2011). " Using human figure drawing as a tool for examining self-perception and emotional attitudes among Jewish and Arab children in Israel". *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Bar-Ilan University, Israel, 567– 579.

APPENDICIES

Appendix A: Questionnaire

Demographic Info

Age: [____] pnumber [_____]

Date of Birth: …./…./…. Gender: girl [1] boy [2]

Age group [1= 7 yrs] [2=9yrs] [3=11yrs][4=13yrs]

Date: …./…./….

PART-I: CONTACT

1. PRIOR CONTACT

In everyday life, how often do you have positive encounters Jewish?

Never [1], Occasionally [2], Sometimes [3], Quite a lot [4] Very frequently [5] I don't know [6] (state): _____

In everyday life, how often do you have negative encounters Jewish?

Never [1], Occasionally [2], Sometimes [3], Quite a lot [4] Very frequently [5] I don't know [6] (state): _____

2. STORYTELLING

Do/did any of your family members (including parents, grandparents, relatives and siblings) tell you negative and upsetting stories about Israeli-Jewish that occurred during the war? (numbers refer to number of people).

None [1], one person [2], 2-5 people [3], 5-10 people [4] More than 10 [5] I don't know [6] (state): _____

Do/did any of your family members (including parents, grandparents, relatives and siblings) tell you pleasant stories of solidarity between Jewish- Israeli and Arab- Israeli throughout the time of war? (numbers refer to number of people).

None [1], one person [2], 2-5 people [3], 5-10 people [4] More than 10 [5] I don't know [6] (state): _____

3. CROSSGROUP FRIENDSHIP/EXTENDED CONTACT

How many members of your family (including parents, brothers and sisters, cousins etc.) have friends who are Jewish- Israeli?

None [1], one person [2], 2-5 people [3], 5-10 people [4] More than 10 [5] I don't know [6] (state): _____

How many of your very best Israeli-Arab friends have friends who are Jewish- Israeli?

None [1], one person [2], 2-5 people [3], 5-10 people [4] More than 10 [5] I don't know [6] (state): _____

PART-II: ADJECTIVES

EVALUATION TASK

Randomly order the sequence in which the (two) target national groups are tested for each individual child.

Introduction to task
Take out the pile of adjective cards, arranged in a single pile, and show it to the child so that he/she can see the word on the first card; the order of the cards within the pile should be randomised separately for each individual child.

Here are some cards with words on them that describe people. So, we can say that some people are (word on first card). (Remove first card, and show the child the second card) And some people are (word on second card). (Remove second card) And some people are (word on third card). Right?

Task 1
1.1 Now, what I want you to do is to go through all these words one by one, and I want you to sort out those words which you think can be used to describe {Israeli-Arab } people. Can you do that for me please? (Give child the complete set of cards) Sort out the words which you think describe {Israeli-Arab } people. (Put a tick in the boxes below against those adjectives selected by the child).

Dirty.....……..	[ ]	Clean.....……..	[ ]
Friendly.....……	[ ]	Unfriendly...…..	[ ]
Clever.....…….	[ ]	Stupid.....……..	[ ]
Lazy.....……..	[ ]	Hardworking…	[ ]
Happy.....…….	[ ]	Sad.....…….	[ ]
Honest.....…….	[ ]	Dishonest....…...	[ ]

Gather up the cards in a randomly ordered pile, ready for the next target nationality.

1.2 Now, I just want to ask you one more thing about {Israeli-Arab } people. Do you like or dislike {Israeli-Arab } people?

If child says like or dislike: How much? Do you like/dislike them a lot or a little?

like a lot [ ] like a little [ ] dislike a little [ ] dislike a lot [ ] don't know [ ] other:

N.B. Use "other" category when child expresses either ambivalent feelings, or expresses differences in feeling according to situation or individuals involved, etc. When using "other" category, record reply verbatim.

Task 2

2.1 Right now, let's do the same thing again, but this time thinking about {Israeli-Jewish} people. (Give the child the set of randomly ordered cards). Can you sort out for me those words which you think can be used to describe {Israeli-Jewish} people?

Dirty.....[ ] Clean.....[ ]
Friendly.....[ ] Unfriendly.....[ ]
Clever.....[ ] Stupid.....[ ]
Lazy.....[ ] Hardworking.[ ]
Happy.....[ ] Sad.....[ ]
Honest.....[ ] Dishonest.....[ ]

Gather up the cards in a randomly ordered pile, ready for the next target nationality.

2.2 That's very good. Now tell me, do you like or dislike {Israeli-Jewish} people?

If child says like or dislike: How much? Do you like/dislike them a lot or a little?

like a lot [ ] like a little [ ] dislike a little [ ] dislike a lot [ ] don't know [ ] other:

PART- III: FREE ASSOCIATION TASK

I am goinig to read some words; after each word I would like to hear the first thing that come to your mind.

- Washing, Bicycle, Age, **Enemy,** Season, Farmer, Computer

Q30: Evil [0] [1]
Q31: Physical Violence [0] [1]
Q32: Verbal Violence [0] [1]
Q33: Thiefs / delinquents [0] [1]
Q34: Killing [0] [1]
Q35: Non- Human ; Animals and so on [0] [1]
Q36: Hate [0] [1]
Q37: very different from us [0] [1]
Q38: Character [0] [1]

Q39: Not friendly [0] [1]
Q40: War [0] [1]
Q41: Other: _____
Q42: summed free association physical: phys+kill+war (Q31+Q34+40= ____)
Q43: summed free association verbal: verb (Q32= _____)
Q44: summed free association character: char+evil+hate+nofrn (Q38+Q30+Q36+Q39= (___)
Q45: summed free association non human: nohu (Q35 = ____)
Q46: summed free association delinquent: del+other (Q33+Q37= ____)
Q47: summed free association rest: rest (Q41= ____)

PART- IV: DRAWING

For this study 5 main colors and A4 paint paper will be used for this study. Colors: Red, Blue, Black, Yellow and Green.

- *What do you think when you hear the word enemy? Can you draw that to me?*

Q48: evil [0] [1]
Q49: physical violence [0] [1]
Q50: verbal violence [0] [1]
Q51: delinquents / thiefs / and so on. [0] [1]
Q52: unpleasant figures [0] [1]
Q53: armed people [0] [1]
Q54: killing [0] [1]
Q55: non human / animal / and so on [0] [1]
Q56: acquaintance [0] [1]
Q57: normal other [0] [1]
Q58: arms, weapons [0] [1]
Q59: hate [0] [1]
Q60: other nations [0] [1]
Q61: character [0] [1]
Q62: drugs, substance [0] [1]
Q63: war scenes [0] [1]
Q64: other feature present [0] [1]

Q65: summed drawing physical: phys+armed+kill+arms (Q49+Q53+Q54+Q58 = ___)
Q66: summed drawing verbal: verb (Q50= ___)
Q67: summed drawing character: char+evil+hate (Q61+Q48+Q59= ___)
Q68: summed drawing delinquent: del+unpl+drug (Q51+Q52+Q62= ___)
Q69: summed drawing war: war+othna (Q63+Q60= ___)
Q70: summed drawing acquaintane: acqua+other (Q56+Q57= ___)
Q71: summed drawing nuhum: nohum (Q55= ___)
Q72: summed drawing rest: rest (Q64= ___)

PART -V: ENEMY SCALE

Now I will ask you questions about an enemy. Can you tell me first thing that comes to your mind?

- *What does an enemy look like ?*

Q73q1: physically violent [0] [1]
Q74q1: verbally violent [0] [1]
Q75q1: as a delinquent [0] [1]
Q76q1: as unpleasant [0] [1]
Q77q1: as a killer [0] [1]
Q78q1: is armed [0] [1]
Q79q1: cannot be recognized [0] [1]
Q80q1: as hating others [0] [1]
Q81q1: as a bad character [0] [1]
Q82q1: is dirty [0] [1]
Q83q1: is ugly [0] [1]
Q84q1: is scary [0] [1]
Q85q1: is evil [0] [1]
Q86q1: other response [0] [1]

Q87: summed q1 physical: phys+kill+armed (Q73+Q77+Q78= ___)
Q88: summed q1 verbal: verb (Q74= ___)
Q89: summed q1 delinquent: del (Q75= ___)
Q90: summed q1 character: char+unpl+unrec+hate+dirty+ugly+scary+evil (Q81+Q76+Q79+Q80+Q82+Q83+Q84+Q85= ___)
Q91: summed q1 rest: rest (Q86= ___)

- *Is an enemy a man or a woman?*

Q120 man [1] woman [2] both [3] I dont know [9]

- *What does an enemy do?*

Q92q3: does evil things [0] [1]
Q93q3: shows physical violence [0] [1]
Q94q3: shows verbal violence [0] [1]
Q95q3: robs and steals (i.e., delinquent behavior) [0] [1]
Q96q3: kills others [0] [1]
Q97q3: uses intrigues [0] [1]
Q98q3: lies [0] [1]
Q99q3: hates others [0] [1]
Q100q3: has a bad character [0] [1]
Q101q3: harms others [0] [1]
Q102q3: wages war [0] [1]
Q103q3: other response [0] [1]
Q104: summed q3 physical: phys+kill+harm+war (Q93+Q96+Q101+Q102= ___)
Q105: summed q3 verbal: verb (Q94= ___)
Q106: summed q3 delinquent: del (Q95= ___)
Q107: summed q3 character: char+evil+intri+lies+hate (Q100+Q92+Q97+Q98+Q99=___)

Q108: summed q3 rest: rest (Q103= ___)

- *Is there is a difference between you and the enemy? If yes, what is the difference; If no, why there is no difference?*
  Q121 Yes [1] No [2] I dont know [9]
- *How does the enemy make you feel?*

Q109q5: makes me feel terrible [0] [1]
Q110q5: makes me feel bad [0] [1]
Q111q5: makes me feel sad [0] [1]
Q112q5: makes me feel threatened [0] [1]
Q113q5: I feel scared [0] [1]
Q114q5: other response [0] [1]
Q115q5: I do not know [0] [1]

Q116: summed q5 bad: bad+terri+sad (Q110+Q109+Q111= ___)
Q117: summed q5 threat: threat+scary (Q112+Q113= ___)
Q118: summed q5 rest: rest (Q114= ___)
Q119: summed q5 do not know: noknow (Q115= ___)

- *Can this enemy also be friendly?*
  Q122 Yes [1] No [2] I dont know [9]

- *Can this enemy became ever a friend?*
  Q123 Yes [1] No [2] Yes, if changes [3] I dont know [9]

- *Has an enemy always been an enemy?*
  Q124 Yes [1] No [2] I dont know [9]

- *Does Israel has an enemy?*
  Q125 Yes [1] No [2] I dont know [9]
- *Does the Israeli-Arab have an enemy?*
  Q126 Yes [1] No [2] I dont know [9]
- *Does the Israeli-Jewish have an enemy?*
  Q127 Yes [1] No [2] I dont know [9]
- *Is an enemy alone or always with a group?*

Q130 Alone [1] Group [2] Both [3] I dont know [9]

- *How do you explain an enemy to someone younger than you?*

Thank you…

Appendix B: The "Enemy" Image in Israeli-Arab Children

Dear parent(s)/ teacher,

Please take a few minutes to read the following information on this research carefully before you allow your child/student to participate. **If at any time you have a question regarding the study, please feel free to ask the researcher who will provide more information.**
This study is being conducted by **Mais Younis** under the supervision of **Prof. Dr. Biran Mertan** and **Assoc. Prof. Dr. Shenel Husnu Raman**. It aims to investigate **the concept development of Israeli-Arab children.** The study should take no more than 30 minutes to complete.

Of course, you are not obliged to participate in this research and are free to refuse to participate. You may also withdraw your child/student's participation from the study at any point without giving any reason. In this case, all of your child/student responses will be destroyed and removed from the research. If you agree to complete the study, all the child/student's responses and questionnaires will be treated **confidentially**. Your child/student's name and identifying information will be kept securely and separately from the rest of the questionnaire. Data will be stored for a maximum of six years after the study. Once the data is analysed, a report of the findings may be submitted for publication.

To signify your voluntary participation, please complete the consent form below.

CONSENT FORM The "Enemy" Image in Israeli-Arab Children
Research Title: Name of Researchers: MAIS YOUNIS
Email: Maisyounis92@gmail.com

Please tick the boxes to confirm that you agree to each statement.

1. I confirm that I have read and understood the information sheet for this study and have had the opportunity to ask any questions. ☐
2. I understand that my participation is voluntary and that I may withdraw from the study at any time without explanation. ☐
3. I agree to take part in this study. ☐

Name/ID of Participant	Date	Signature

If you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of this study, please inform Dr. Şenel Husnu Raman, Chair of the Psychology Research & Ethics Committee at Eastern Mediterranean University, in writing, providing a detailed account of your concern (shenelhusnu.raman@emu.edu.tr).

Appendix C: Participant Debrief Form

Thank you very much for allowing your child/student to participate in this study with the title ***The "Enemy" Image in Israeli-Arab Children***. Please take a few more minutes to read the following information, which will explain the aims and purpose of the research further. If you have any questions, please feel free to ask the researcher whose contact details are stated below.

This research is investigating the development of enemy concept in Israeli-Arab children. Previous research has shown that ***the development of enemy image and understanding of enemy are influenced by age and gender differences***. We current this work to test the cases by applying theoretical models.

If after the completion of this questionnaire you notice your child/student felt any distress or discomfort and you would like to speak to a professional, please contact:

PDRAM-EMU, Cyprus, Tel: +90 (0) 392 6302251 or website (http://pdram.emu.edu.tr/). You may also contact the researcher (Mais Younis; Tel: +905338207906/+972527287395; maisyounis92@gmail.com) or the research supervisors (Prof. Dr. Biran Mertan; Tel: +90 392 630 2251 / +90 392 630 1616; biran.mertan@emu.edu.tr, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Shenel Husnu Raman; Tel: +90 630 1389; shenelhusnu.raman@emu.edu.tr), or an educational counsellor- Arara, Israel (Mr. Nadeem Younis; Tel: 0505917055; nadeemyounis59@hotmail.com) with any questions.

Once again thank you for your valuable contribution to this research. Your child/student's participation is greatly appreciated.

Yours sincerely,

Mais Younis