A HISTORICAL OVERVIEW FOR THE ANTECEDENTS OF COLLECTIVE GUILT: DOES TERROR MANAGEMENT THEORY EXPLAIN THE RARITY OF COLLECTIVE GUILT?

KOLEKTİF SUÇLULUĞUN ÖNCÜLLERİNE TARİHSEL BİR BAKIŞ: DEHŞET YÖNETİMİ KURAMI KOLEKTİF SUÇLULUĞUN AZ RASTLANIR OLMASINA BİR AÇIKLAMA GETİREBİLİR Mİ?

Burcu ÇUVAŞ[*]

ABSTRACT

Collective guilt is a relatively new concept studied in intergroup relations in social psychology. Collective guilt suggests a new way of studying positive intergroup relations; thus, investigation of the factors underlying collective guilt seems more essential. Starting from this point of view, the purpose of this study is to look at the antecedents of collective guilt by considering its historical development. Since collective guilt is an aversive emotion, people are prone to reject it. That is why it is a rare emotion. Therefore, another concern of this study is to use terror management theory in order to provide reasons for why this emotion can be rare.

Keywords: Collective Guilt, Identification, Responsibility, Illegitimacy, Mortality.

[*] Research Assistant, TED University, Faculty of Art and Sciences, Department of Psychology; Ph.D. Candidate, Middle East Technical University, Department of Psychology, Ankara, Turkey, burcu.cuvas@tedu.edu.tr

ÖZ

Sosyal psikoloji yazını, gruplararası ilişkiler bağlamında ele alınacak görece yeni bir konsept ileri sürmektedir: Kolektif suçluluk. Kolektif suçluluk hissetmek, gruplararası ilişkilerin iyileşmesine ışık tutabilecek sonuçlara sahiptir. Bu sebeple kolektif suçluluk hissetmenin altında yatan etmenleri incelemek, anlamak, araştırmak ve öneriler sunmak önemlidir. Bu noktadan hareketle, bu derleme makalesiyle kolektif suçluluğun öncüllerini tarihsel bir bakış açısıyla ele almak amaçlanmaktadır. Kolektif suçluluğun öncülleri, bu konunun çalışılmaya başlandığı ilk yıllardan başlayarak son zamanlarda elde edilen bulgularla birlikte ele alınarak kapsayıcı bir yazı sunulması hedeflenmektedir. Ek olarak, yazının son kısmında yine bir gruplararası ilişkiler teorisi olan dehşet yönetimi teorisinden yararlanılarak kolektif suçluluğun az hissedilmesine dair açıklamalar getirilmektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Kolektif Suçluluk, Aidiyet, Sorumluluk, Meşrulaştırma, Ölümlülük.

INTRODUCTION

Throughout history, the world has witnessed various destructive intergroup conflicts. In fact, the number of people killed via war and mass killings exceeded 50 million in the 20th century (Simon, 2006). The genocides in Rwanda and Srebrenica, Israeli - Palestine conflict, Nazis' wiping out Jews, religious wars, group based inequalities, and on-going difficulties between local people in terms of protection and sustainability of their cultures can be given as examples for conflicts between social groups. The common thread between these atrocities is that there is harm done by one group to another. It can be claimed that people are mostly proud of their groups' actions back in time; when they are reminded about their groups' harmful actions against outgroups in the past, they consider these harmful acts as justifiable. One of the negative emotional reactions to the perpetrator ingroups is guilt, especially collective guilt (Wohl, Branscombe, & Klar, 2006). Collective guilt is defined as accepting the responsibility of the perpetrator ingroup with which individuals categorize themselves about the illegitimate transgression committed against an outgroup (Branscombe, 2004). Social psychology literature propounds that collective guilt has a motivational aspect for directing individuals to make compensations and repairments for an

ingroups' wrongful actions which have had negative consequences on others (e.g., Dumont & Waldzus, 2014; Harvey and Oswald, 2000; Imhoff, Whol, & Erb, 2013; Leonard, Yung, & Cairns, 2015). In light of this, it is feasible to consider collective guilt as a helpful social psychological factor in terms of promoting better intergroup relations and solutions for intergroup conflicts.

Starting from this point of view, it is crucial to understand collective guilt since it signals a new way of examining positive intergroup relations. To do this, investigation of the factors underlying collective guilt seems important in order to find out how to arouse collective guilt (Wohl et al., 2006). Therefore, the purpose of this study is to look at the antecedents of collective guilt from the perspective of its historical development; specifically, what was established themes in collective guilt research in terms of its antecedents and what has been recently investigated. Answering these questions is essential to reveal why this emotion is rare, and what inhibits or facilitates it. Another concern of this study is to focus on terror management theory (TMT) to offer new perspectives for research in the rarity of collective guilt. TMT is regarded as the theory providing explanations for conflicts in intergroup relations. It is considered that TMT and collective guilt can be linked because when people perceive threat to their meaningful unity, they become prejudiced or supporters of aggressive behaviors against outgroups. Accepting collective guilt can function as a threat to meaningful unity so people can be prone to reject collective guilt. As a result, TMT can provide explanations for the rarity of collective guilt. Within the scope of these aims, studies looking at the antecedents of collective guilt and studies examining TMT in intergroup relations context will be presented. In this way, the reader will be informed about those studies, get insights about the rareness of collective guilt, and look at the collective guilt from a new perspective by the help of TMT. Finally, it is claimed that this study will help researchers come up with new research questions. At this point, it is necessary to start by defining guilt and collective guilt, respectively.

Guilt is a distressing emotion experienced by someone whose actions result in undesirable consequences for other people (Lickel, Schmader, Curtis, Scarnier, & Ames, 2005). It is defined as a negative emotion since it mostly gives rise to distressing, hurting, awful, and apologetic state of arousal due to somebody's impairing behaviors to others (Ferguson, Stegge, & Damhuis, 1991). In order to experience guilt personally, individuals should regard themselves as responsible for those actions which have negative outcomes for others and feel like they can control these actions before resulting in adverse situations (Baumeister, Stillwell, & Heatherton, 1994; Tracy & Robins, 2006). This indicates that guilt is a self-focused emotion because it occurs when someone relates the self to the negative incidents (Baumeister, Vohs, DeWall, & Zhang,

2007). Moreover, guilt is an emotion which increase self-awareness; that is, when people do harmful things to others, they look over what they did, why they did and what this resulted in and in this way, they make self-judgment (Behrendt & Ben-Ari, 2012). Therefore, guilt may have power to make changes since it provides people with evaluating themselves for their wrongful actions and this gives them a chance to fix these negative consequences.

Studies in social psychology had previously focused on personal guilt at the first step. However, recent studies have indicated that there is collective guilt as well (see Branscombe & Doosje, 2004). Then, is collective guilt different from personal guilt? It can be claimed that there are common things between personal and collective guilt like being negative and distressing emotion or feeling responsible for the harm-doing but the difference is that in collective guilt, the collective self is at the issue and people experience this emotion even though they do not participate in immoral activities personally (Wohl et al., 2006). Additionally, when comparing them in terms of their consequences, whereas personal guilt gives rise to change or regulation in personal behaviors (Howell, Turowski, & Buro, 2012), collective guilt shows its impact on changing the group-based behaviors (Dumont & Waldzus, 2014). Furthermore, in a study conducted by Branscombe, Slugoski, and Kappen (2004), as participants, White Americans who have origins in any of the peoples of Europe, the Middle East or North Africa were asked to give answers to both collective guilt measurement, which determined the guiltiness for White Americans' advantaged position in the society compared to Blacks who are classified based on their race related to being African American, with a family history associated with institutionalized slavery and personal guilt inventory, measuring the guilt due to actions of self, for the purpose of showing that collective and personal guilt were different constructs. The results of this study point out that even though feeling of guilt is gained by both collective and personal measurements, the levels of guiltiness reported by participants for White Americans' advantaged positions due to their race and for their current personal wrongdoings are dissimilar. Thus, it can be concluded that there is guilt at another level which is collective guilt, the guilt at the group level. Now, it will be good to look at collective guilt in more detail; therefore, the occurrence of collective guilt in social psychology studies will be examined and in following its historical development will be mentioned by focusing on its antecedents.

1. COLLECTIVE GUILT

While talking about collective guilt, the first question that comes to mind is that how is it possible that someone feels collectively guilty although they have not participated in any transgression personally? This question can be answered from the perspective of self-categorization and social identity theory. Self-

categorization theory proposes that individuals want to be part of a group and accordingly categorize themselves to this group and make the same thing for other people in order to understand the social world and get to know themselves (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). Social identity theory proposes that both individual and group related factors have contributed to individuals' self-images which means that individuals are products of not only the knowledge of themselves but also the things they gained through their group memberships. Also, when individuals' group membership is salient, the transition from individual identity to social identity becomes possible (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). This highlights the notion about the time when individuals change their focus from their own personal issues to group related issues and the reason why they do this. At this point, this deduction can be made that people can experience collective guilt in the behalf of their groups' wrongdoings since their group membership, providing them with shared beliefs, attitudes, actions, and emotions, is one of the components of their self-image. On the other hand, social identity theory (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) states that individuals are prone to see their groups in a positive manner; that is why, they may try to deny this immoral action and eventually the guilt by the help of several coping strategies like legitimizing the ingroups' wrongful actions in order to resolve collective guilt. However, if they do not manage to avoid this or these coping strategies do not work, then the experience of collective guilt still has possibility to be experienced even the rarity of this emotion is proposed (Sakallı-Uğurlu & Soylu, 2016).

The concept of collective guilt has been proposed by the study done by Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, and Manstead (1998) with the curiosity for investigating group members' responses when their group's actions taken towards different groups in the past was at the issue by stressing that there was no personal share with this negative aspect of their groups' past. For this purpose, Dutch university students were selected as participants and they were categorized as being a member of an artificial group in order to enhance minimal group identification and asked to do a judgmental task after that they were informed about their ingroup's past evaluations about an outgroup (Doosje et al., 1998, Study 1). The results of this study indicated that even though participants did not evaluate the outgroup negatively, when they got feedback that their ingroup consistently made biased evaluations for outgroup, they experienced collective guilt and this means that salience of a group's wrongdoing is enough for experience of collective guilt. Additionally, Swim and Miller (1999) addressed collective guilt in their study in which they investigated the reactions of White people for prejudice towards Blacks as a result of their privileged position. The findings of this study show that there is collective guilt because

White participants report feeling of collective guilt due to racial inequality which serves an advantaged position to them.

These two studies are the very first studies examining the collective guilt issue. They highlight that individuals experience collective guilt for their ingroup's past or present actions that have negative consequences for another group. After these opening studies on collective guilt, a respectable amount of empirical studies has expanded this topic. These established and recent studies on collective guilt have mainly focused on the issue of what is necessary for collective guilt experience (e.g., Castano & Giner-Sorolla, 2006; Powell, Branscombe, & Schmitt, 2005; Zebel, Zimmermann, Tendayi, & Doosje, 2008). That is, after the experience of collective guilt has been revealed (e.g., Doosje et al., 1998; Swim & Miller, 1999), in collective guilt research, it had been the concerned issue had that whether collective guilt was always experienced or it was experienced depending on the antecedent factors. Therefore, within the scope of this present review paper, firstly, the studied and recent themes associated with the antecedents of collective guilt will be emphasized.

2. STUDIED AND RECENT THEMES IN COLLECTIVE GUILT RESEARCH BY FOCUSING ON ITS ANTECEDENTS

There are three core antecedents of collective guilt; namely, self-categorization with perpetrator ingroup, recognizing ingroup as responsible for transgression, and illegitimacy of ingroup's transgression.

Self-Categorization with Perpetrator Ingroup

After mentioning that collective guilt is experienced, studies have shown that in order to experience collective guilt, certain social psychological factors are needed. Literature suggests that the first essential antecedents of collective guilt is self-categorization as a member of a group which harmed another group; that is, when individuals have collective identity gained through self-categorization with a group, it is very possible that they will experience collective guilt in behalf of their groups. To make it illustrate, in a study conducted by Seger, Smith, and Mackie (2009), when participants' social identification (identified as being American) was made salient, collective emotions including guilt were predicted by social identification. And also, this study illustrated that the higher the self-identification with the group, the higher the group based emotions experienced by those higher identified members.

In terms of collective guilt and self-categorization with a group that is the first antecedent of collective guilt, there are controversial findings in the literature. For instance, in one study, participants who were university students

in Holland were selected and they were grouped as low and high identified with Dutch nation (Doosje et al., 1998). In this study, participants were given favorable, unfavorable, and ambiguous historical summaries which focused on the negative and positive sides of Dutch colonization of Indonesia. This study aimed to examine the influence of the relationship between ingroup harmful actions and identification with this group on collective guilt. The results of this study showed that participants having high or low Dutch identification reported collective guilt when faced the negative history of their group; however, low identified participants reported more collective guilt than high identifiers in the ambiguous condition. Doosje et al. (1998) discussed this from social identification theory perspective by emphasizing that high identifiers were more prone to see their groups' positive aspect and when there was something blocking this positive image of their groups they would participate in actions rejecting these transgressions committed by their groups. Another support for the notion of the negative relationship between the level of identification and collective guilt is the study which examining whether participants' level of identification with British nation predicted collective guilt about Britishes' wrongful actions towards Australian Aborigines[1] (Castano & Giner-Sorolla, 2006). Once more again, Myers, Hewstone, and Cairns (2009) have shown the same pattern for the relationship between the level of social identification and collective guilt. Specifically, higher Irish identification was associated with lower collective guilt for Ireland's past transgressions[2]. On the other hand, another study conducted by the purpose of investigating that when non-Indigenous Australians[3] read about unfavorable side of the Australian past actions against Indigenous Australian, whether participants who were in the condition that Australian identity was made salient showed higher collective guilt for this unfavorable history, or not. It was revealed that there was no significant relationship between social identity and collective guilt when being presented unfavorable past of ingroup (Halloran, 2007, Study 2). Lastly, while Doosje, Branscombe, Spears, & Manstead (2004) found a positive relationship between collective guilt and group identification, in another study they found that ingroup identification was not associated with collective guilt (Doosje et al., 2006).

---

[1] By the arrival of British to Australia, the life of Australian Aborigines was negatively affected by this because of the British colonization of Australia. The colonization resulted in suffering of Australian Aborigines due to persecution introduced by British and resulted in the loss of population (Castano & Giner-Sorolla, 2006).

[2] This research was carried out in the context of the ethnopolitical conflict in Northern Ireland which is called as "the Troubles". This conflict occurred between groups of those who would like Northern Ireland to confederate with the Republic of Ireland and those who would like Northern Ireland to continue in being part of the United Kingdom. It is estimated that this conflict caused 3,593 people to die (Myers, Hewstone, & Cairns, 2009).

[3] Indigenous Australians are the community which were exposed to injustices composed of detention of their lands by force, abduction of women, slavery and war, promotion of disease, and suppression of any social rights by non-indigenous Australians due to the result of European colonization (Halloran, 2007, Study 2).

Research findings about the relatedness of self-categorization with ingroup and collective guilt experience have revealed a variation. Whereas some of them states a negative relationship between them (Doosje et al., 1998), some of them shows positive association (Doosje et al., 2004), and some highlights their unrelatedness (McGarrty et al., 2005).

So far, studies conducted in the first decade of collective guilt research have been discussed. It is seen that there is diversity in the findings related to the first antecedent of collective guilt. Yet, recent findings can provide further explanations for this variation. To start with, Gunn and Wilson (2011, Study 2) established a study in order to examine Canadians' collective guilt level for bad behaviors against Aboriginal children[4] at school in Canada by looking at the influence of social identity threat and group affirmation that is showing the bolstered side of one's group in a one domain. This study resulted in that Canadian participants accepted more collective guilt for their groups' wrongdoings against Aboriginal children when the threat against their social identity defeated by group affirmation. This result obtained for highly identified participants in group affirmation condition. Therefore, it can be stated that high identifiers concern their groups more and when they face with the transgression committed by their groups, they most probably regard it as a threat to their social identity. If there is a way to make them focus on another domain of their group; namely, positive part or values their groups have, this may reduce being defensive against the negative side of their group such as transgressions of the group. In this way, acknowledgment of the consequences of these wrongdoings like collective guilt can be more possible. In terms of the relationship between group identification and collective guilt, another study investigated whether the type of identification might be essential for experiencing collective guilt. This claim which was firstly questioned by Roccas, Klar, and Livitan (2006) suggests that group attachment (involving to group both cognitively and affectively and being free for contribution to and criticizing of the group) positively and group glorification (regarding ingroup as possibly the best and superior compared to outgroups) negatively should be related to experiencing collective guilt. A recent study aiming to support this association between collective guilt and those two types of group identification (group attachment and group glorification) by considering "Events of September, 6-7" in Turkey revealed that among high

---

[4]In the study, the mistreatments towards Aboriginal children were mentioned like that Aboriginals in Canada are the indigenous people and first nations in Canada. They were seen as a threat to modern and civilized society by the early twentieth century. As a result of this, thousands of Aboriginal children were taken from their families by force and sent to residential schools which were hundreds of miles away from their hometowns in order to be educated. Instead of this, they were exposed to destruction of their Aboriginal culture and identity like being prohibited from speaking their Aboriginal language or practicing their cultural rituals (Gunn & Wilson, 2011, Study 2).

identifiers with Turkish nation experienced less collective guilt; however, when considering group glorification, participants who were less glorifying of their groups reported higher levels of collective guilt whereas group attachment was found unrelated (Özkan, 2014).

To add more, Morton and Postmes (2011) take the relationship between self-categorization and collective guilt from different perspective. In their study, they take into consideration a more general categorization; namely, shared humanity. The aim of this study was to look at whether British participants would experience collective guilt due to the negative consequences for slave trade in Africa which was expedited by Britain's participation in this when they regarded both British and Africans as belonging in the same social category - human category. This study resulted in that when there was no salience regarding as ingroup and outgroup and instead of this, when it was emphasized that all people were equal human, individuals were less prone to experience collective guilt for their groups' outraging history. In a nutshell, someone's categorizing of themselves with a shared humanity makes them ignore the responsibility of their ingroup for the transgression since it provides them with an alternative categorization. As a result, this leads them to use this as a defense mechanism to avoid guilt in the end. What is more, Kofta and Slawuta (2013, Study 1) experimentally manipulated the cultural closeness of two groups, one of which was perpetrator group and the other of which was victim group in order to give the message that both Jews and Poles[5] were similar. The findings stressed that for the evocation of collective guilt, it was not enough to just remind individuals their ingroups' transgressions against another groups. It was pointed out that when perpetrator group regarded victim group as different in terms of cultural aspects, very few amount of collective guilt was reported; on the other hand, the collective guilt was increased by the awareness of being culturally similar with victimized group. Moreover, another recent study claims that even though there is no ingroup harm doing against outgroup, collective guilt can occur. To make it illustrate, Ferguson and Branscombe (2010) stated that American participants feel guilty for global warming resulting in negative consequences for future Americans induced by human beings. In here, the level of collective guilt changed depending on to what degree current Americans regarded future Americans as similar or dissimilar to themselves; that's, the more similar future in-group members were considered, the higher level of experience of collective guilt occurred.

---

[5] The study context was about the relationship between Polish-Jewish after the Holocaust. It is focused that just after World War II, Jews who returned to Poland came across with anti-Semitism and explicit violence resulting in the death of approximately 1,500 Jews (Kofta & Slawuta, 2013, Study 1).

Taken together, the studies conducted in the first decade of collective guilt research indicated controversial findings about the role of self-categorization/identification with the perpetrator ingroup on collective guilt (e.g., Doosje et al., 1998; Halloran, 2007; McGarrty et al., 2005). This may create confusion that it is not a basic antecedent of collective guilt; however, it can be claimed that it is an essential factor for collective guilt since it creates a base for other antecedents of collective guilt; namely, acceptance of group responsibility and illegitimacy appraisal. Supporting on this, recent studies demonstrated the importance of this first antecedent; yet, they highlight the importance of paying attention to more complex components like types of identification, cultural closeness between groups or more general categorizations (humanity) than merely examining the whole-group identification in order to provide comprehensive explanations for identification and collective guilt relationship. Consequently, it may be claimed that looking at only the level of identification with a group is not sufficient.

Recognizing Ingroup as Responsible for Transgression

The second essential determinant of collective guilt is regarding ingroup as responsible for the unfair and wrongful transgressions committed against outgroup. Most of the studies focusing on collective guilt has investigated responsibility in the context of outgroup victimization due to wrongful past actions of ingroup. To begin with, Iyer, Leach, and Crosby (2003, Study 1) examined the issue whether either focusing on White privilege or racial discrimination faced by African Americans[6] would predict collective guilt. They presented that collective guilt was a self-focused emotion because it was predicted by a belief in White privilege rather than belief in racial discriminations faced by African Americans. This means that when individuals who were exposed to incidences from ingroup focus like belief in White privilege rather than outgroup focus like belief in racial discriminations regarded their groups as clearly responsible for these negative consequences and depending on this, collective guilt is inevitable. Furthermore, Powell et al. (2005) investigated the importance of considering ingroup as responsible for victimizing other, too. In this mentioned study, participants were informed about racial inequality. They were manipulated by having information about either White Americans' advantages or Black Americans' disadvantages in the society and then they were asked to report their collective guiltiness related to this. The findings of this study indicated that participants being informed about White Americans' advantages

---

[6]In this study, as the study context, inequalities between Whites who are European Americans and African Americans were focused. By saying White privilege, it is stated that they are majority in the society and they have certain advantageous compared to African Americans due to being European American. However, African Americans face discriminations in various societal areas like workplace or schools due to their race (Iyer, Leach, & Crosby, 2003, Study 1).

rather than Black Americans' disadvantages reported more collective guilt. This emphasizes that in order to evoke collective guilt, being aware of negative situations of outgroup is not enough; contrary, individuals should charge their groups with this.

Another study investigating the relationship between group responsibility and collective guilt experience handled this issue in gender context rather than ethnic groups (Boeckman & Feather, 2007). This study aimed to demonstrate that men's perception of other men's unjust actions against women at work and regarding their gender group as responsible for women's discrimination experience would lead to collective guilt. The positive relationship between responsibility and collective guilt was found in this study as previous studies illustrated. Moreover, the study conducted by Miron, Branscombe, and Schmitt (2006) indicated the importance of responsibility for collective guiltiness by focusing on this issue from different side; that is, they showed that since male participants blamed women for their disadvantageous position at work and this decreased their ingroup responsibility, the level of collective guilt decreased. These results reemphasize the dependence of collective guilt on responsibility of ingroup for unjust transgressions against another group.

More recent studies have continued on paying attention to responsibility by examining it in more detail. A recent study said that acknowledging the responsibility of ingroups' wrongful actions would change depending on some factors and as a result, this would influence the collective guilt experience in the behalf of ingroup. To make it clear, in the research context of the Israel-Palestine conflict[7], Cehajic - Clancy, Effron, Halperin, Liberman, and Ross (2011) looked at the influence of affirmation which was manipulated as self or group affirmation on responsibility and collective guiltiness. This study resulted in that self-affirmation rather than group affirmation heightened acknowledging the responsibility for Israel's wrongful actions against Palestinians that made them victimized and the increased acknowledgement of responsibility gave rise to increased collective guilt expressions. The authors discussed about this finding by claiming that self-affirmation would be more related to reducing self-defensiveness than group affirmation. In parallel to this, Schori-Eyal, Tagar,

---

[7] "The intergroup conflict in this disputed area of the Middle East has deep roots, beginning a century ago as the goals of Palestinian nationalism and Zionism clashed. But the conflict has been particularly heated since the founding of the state of Israel in 1948 and in the aftermath of the war between Israel and the Arab states surrounding it that ensued and subsequent wars that resulted in the Israeli occupation of the West Bank and Gaza. In particular, following the collapse of the Oslo peace process and the escalation of violence in the conflict in September 2000, both parties once again have taken unilateral actions and engaged in low-intensity confrontation that have burdened both sides but have produced particular hardship for Palestinians living in the 'occupied territories.'" (Cehajic - Clancy, Effron, Halperin, Liberman, & Ross, 2011, p. 258).

Saguy, and Halperin (2015) conducted a study in order to see the relatedness of pride priming vs. no priming situations to the level of ingroup glorification which in turn associated with collective guiltiness of Jewish-Israeli participants for their ingroups' harms on Palestinian people, which was measured both in the time of intensive conflict between Israel and Palestine and in the time of no conflict[8]. It was found that even in the time of severe conflict between two groups which had a potential to upgrade threat perception against social identity that leads to less collective guilt (Wohl & Branscombe, 2008), pride resulted in more collective guiltiness for individuals with higher glorifications. The authors discuss this finding by focusing on that when high glorifiers are faced with their groups' accomplishments and this will enhance their pride feelings for their groups and in this way, the high glorifiers' need for considering their groups in a positive manner is fulfilled; therefore, they are more prone to accept their ingroups' transgressions against an outgroup. The results of these studies have indicated that there are conditions affecting the level of responsibility and the degree of collective guilt is changing accordingly; therefore, it is important to unveil these factors in order to understand how collective guilt is inhibited or facilitated deeply.

Lastly speaking about the current studies conducted about the relationship between responsibility and collective guilt, Čehajić-Clancy and Brown (2014) claimed that before looking at the responsibility acceptance of ingroups' transgression against an outgroup, individuals' perception of responsibility should be investigated. They investigated this issue in the context of the Serbia and Bosnia Herzegovina conflict with Serbian participants and found that perception of the responsibility enhanced the level of collective guilt both directly and indirectly via acceptance of responsibility. This study is important by making contribution to that if the perception of responsibility is increased, the experience of collective guilt will increase as well.

Illegitimacy of Ingroup's Transgression

Collective guilt research suggests an illegitimacy appraisal which requires the perpetrator ingroup to perceive their wrongful actions as morally unjustifiable. Branscombe (2004) states that responsibility and illegitimacy are sometimes both conceptually and empirically mixed each other; however, legitimacy appraisal may take precedence over responsibility. The reason for that

---

[8] This study was conducted in the context of intense conflict between Israel and Palestine. The incidence is that in June 2014, Palestinians kidnapped three Jewish-Israeli teenagers. By Israeli Defence Force (IDF), a serious operation was operated in the West Bank in order to find teenagers. Within the scope of the operation, IDF used harsh methods including violent door-to-door searches. The operation resulted in looting and death of Palestinians (Schori-Eyal, Tagar, Saguy, & Halperin, 2015).

even though individuals admit their ingroups' wrongful acts with negative consequences against outgroup and as a result of this, they experience collective guilt, when they believe that this transgression has legitimized reasons, their collective guiltiness lessen (Wohl, et al., 2006). To make an illustration, a study indicated that Jews experienced collective guilt when they were reminded of Israel's harms on Palestinians[9] since they regard Israel as responsible for this; however, when they were informed that Israel harmed Palestinians due to Palestinian terrorism, this decreased the level of Jews' collective guiltiness. This legitimization of ingroups' actions here put responsibility out of the action. On the other hand, in the same study, when American participants' reactions related to what America did in Iraq after reminding of the event of September 11th was examined, legitimization of America's negative actions in Iraq did not lessen the level of participants' collective guilt and they still charged America for its harmful actions in Iraq (Wohl & Branscombe, 2008). In line with this, Bilali, Tropp and Dasgupta's (2012) study resulted in that while Turks assigned responsibility to their ingroup for the negative consequences of Turkish – Armenian conflict and violence at the end of the 19th century and beginning of the 20th century, they did not perceive their ingroup as responsible for the events when they thought that the event was instigated by Armenians or third parties. Wohl and Branscombe (2008) discuss that both responsibility and illegitimization are essential factors for evoking collective guilt; however, the context of the event may determine which strategy is the best for collective guilt to occur.

Illegitimacy as a third antecedent of collective guilt is seen as a widely studied theme of collective guilt research during the first decade of collective guilt studies. To start with, Mallett and Swim (2007) conducted a study in order to see whether legitimization had a unique predictive power for collective guiltiness in both race and gender contexts. They concluded that when both Whites and males believed that their more privileged positions in the American society were illegitimate and resulted in disadvantaged positions for Blacks and women, they would report more collective guilt. Furthermore, when Doosje et al. (1998) presented the negative aspects of Netherland's colonization of Indonesians to Dutch participants, which blocking participants to legitimize this harmful action, they reported higher level of collective guilt felt by participants compared to the condition in which Dutch participants were exposed to benign aspects of the colonization. Moreover, in two studies conducted by Harth, Kessler, and Leach (2008), the inequality in job opportunities between psychology and pedagogy and the inequality between German and non-German

---

[9]In this study, participants read a paragraph describing the Israeli-Palestinian conflict about how the Israeli army behaves Palestinians such as restricting their movements and minimizing their power to self-govern (Wohl & Branscombe, 2008).

immigrants were given from the perspective of either advantaged groups (psychology students and Germans) or disadvantaged groups (pedagogy students and non-German immigrants) by directing participants' focuses on themselves or the outgroup. Also, this demonstrated inequality was manipulated in terms of being illegitimate or legitimate in order to highlight that both focus and legitimacy together gave rise to collective guilt. The findings of the aforementioned paper composed of studies including two different contexts demonstrated that the greater collective guilt emerged in the condition where individuals were focused on ingroup advantages and these advantages were not justifiable. To sum up, all these research findings have pointed out that framing inequality or harmful actions of ingroup as being illegitimate alleviates collective guilt.

Some current studies have proceeded to pay attention to diverse variables enhancing collective guilt by looking at in terms of the illegitimacy. To begin with, Imhoff et al. (2013) verified their hypothesis about that experiencing collective guilt was increased when individuals saw the ongoing consequences of their ingroup's wrongful actions on victimized group and these wrongful actions were attributed to perpetrators' purposeful actions. This finding can be explained in a way that when individuals regard their ingroups' transgression as done by knowingly and willfully, there is no way for them to legitimize these actions since there is a chance to control them; therefore, collective guilt experience is heightened. Also, another point of this study is that the closer individuals feel themselves with the past wrongdoings due to ongoing consequences, the more they are to feel collective guilt. In addition, another study displays that when there are consequences of the harm affecting ingroup rather than affecting only outgroup due to ingroups' transgression against an outgroup, ingroup members feel greater level of collective guilt (Sullivan, Landau, Branscombe, Rothschild, & Cronin, 2013). To elaborate on, Sullivan et al. (2013) looked at the level of collective guilt after informing American participants about America's participation in Iraq war by letting them pay attention the harm of this participation either on American people and Iraqi or just on Iraqi people. It was reported that participants experienced greater level of collective guilt in the position where they regarded their ingroups' transgression had negative consequences for their own group as well than participants who considered this harm only against the out-group. Thus, it can be concluded that self-harm perspective is more effective than the other focus perspective for the occurrence of collective guilt since self-harm perspective has the potential to eliminate the legitimization of the harmful actions of ingroup.

Until now, research about the antecedents of collective guilt was presented. It was shown that for the antecedents of collective guilt experience, levels of

identification; focusing on the harm from either outgroup or ingroup side and blaming victimized groups for assignment of responsibility; and framing the transgression for illegitimacy appraisal were mainly studied topics. Studies conducted to show what factors are necessary to augment collective guilt experience have continued in recent collective guilt studies and it can be stated that even though previous studies propose the rarity of collective guiltiness (e.g. Iyer, Leach, & Pedersen, 2004; Peetz, Gunn, & Wilson, 2010; Sakallı-Uğurlu & Soylu, 2016; Wohl et al., 2006), by looking at this mentioned recent studies, it may be given as an evidence that if the necessary factors are available, reporting collective guilt is more possible. Nevertheless, even recent studies put forward a proposal that by the help of additional variables, collective guilt experience is feasible, and if these factors are not available, the issue of rarity of collective guilt still exists. For the very reason, it is rather substantial to discover the factors inhibiting experience of collective guilt for the purpose of making suggestions to raise collective guiltiness. Raising collective guiltiness is important since it is mentioned at the very beginning of this paper that collective guilt has a motivational aspect and it has power to motivate people to make compensations for their ingroups' transgressions. In this connection, within the scope of this current study, it is claimed that TMT can be informative to offer explanations for what is inhibiting collective guilt. In the following section, TMT will be briefly introduced and the concept of collective guilt will be approached from the perspective of TMT.

3. INSIGHTS FROM TMT FOR COLLECTIVE GUILT RESEARCH: CAN TMT PROVIDE EXPLANATIONS FOR ITS RARITY?

TMT is a motivation theory which tries to provide answers for why people have strong ties with their value systems and why they need self-esteem by taking fear of death as a base (Greenberg, Solomon, & Arndt, 2008). According to TMT, it is unbearable for individuals to know that they are mortal. The human's abilities like abstract thinking or self-differentiation which are gained through human evolution increase human's awareness for being mortal. Self-protection which is common for all creatures, being aware of mortality which pertains to human being, knowing that there is no escape from death, and in spite of those, demanding long lasting life result in a terror for individuals. TMT suggests that individuals save themselves from the fear of death and terror by using several defense strategies such as distal and proximal defenses. Proximal defenses like denying include removing death related thoughts at conscious level while distal defenses include protecting someone's cultural world views and self-esteems (see Doğulu & Sakallı-Uğurlu, 2015). In order to deal with this terror related anxiety via distal defenses, they look for ways to enhance their self-esteems like having firm identification with their ingroups or maintaining their cultural worldviews

provided by their ingroups (Greenberg & Arndt, 2012). Cultural worldview stated by TMT is defined as the personally shaped concept which suggests individuals a meaningful existence and a perception of immorality by socially shared values and aims based on the reality (Pyszczynski, Rothschild, & Abdollahi, 2008). Castano (2004) proposes that individuals' identifications with their ingroups enable them to handle with their mortality related anxieties. The reason for this is that social identities have a function to relieve death anxiety since they reflect cultural worldviews and to enhance self-esteem because being a member of a group gives a chance to transfer death anxiety from as being personal concern to concern of the group.

TMT expresses that individuals regard their beliefs, cultures, values and worldviews as the most accurate one and based on this opinion, they disregard and devalue others who challenge these and dignify their ingroups (Castano, Yzerbyt, Paladino, & Sacchi, 2002; Kökdemir & Yeniçeri, 2010). Various studies conducted in order to examine TMT in the scope of intergroup relations point out that when individuals come across with mortality, they are becoming more biased towards their ingroups which leads to ingroup favoritism and making elevated investments and advocatings for their own groups (Hohman & Hogg, 2015; Li et al., 2015; Routledge, Juhl, Vess, Cathey, & Liao, 2013) because being aware of their deadness brings firmer group identification which is considered as a sign for continuity of existence (Castano et al., 2002). To illustrate, Li et al. (2015) conducted a study in order to see differences in participants' reactions for ingroup or outgroup members' sufferings via mortality salience. They concluded that Chinese participants were more biased in a positive manner when they saw a suffering Asian face rather than a Caucasian face. That is to say, they were more sympathetic and responsive for their ingroup members. Additionally, Hohman and Hogg (2015) reported that via mortality salience, American participants had stronger identification with America and augmented motives for defending America. What is more, in a study, Christian participants made more favorable evaluations for Christian students compared to Jewish students in pursuit of mortality salience. Also, they reported more like for Christian students than Jews (Greenberg et al., 1990). This reveals that reminding the terminal of existence directs people to see their ingroups from more positive perspective and see outgroup as more negative because their group identification lessen the existential terror.

Individuals can be hostile or prejudiced against outgroups, when they face different opinions which is considered as a threat to their cultural worldviews that represents their existence. For instances, Pyszczynski et al. (2006) investigated the influence of existential concerns on American's providing support for solutions including violent acts in the context of progressing conflict

in between America and some parts of Middle East. The study resulted in that having death related awareness gave rise to American people to support the attack committed by America in the Middle East even though they knew that this would cause guiltless people to get hurt or even to die. Here, it can be proposed that death related concerns have a potential to increase violent acts towards outgroups and also to accept these actions. Moreover, in an experimental study, a world view which is surety of meaningful existence was threatened by a news article informing Christian participants about increased Muslim effect in Nazareth, where is highly important for Christians due to Jesus Christ's spending his childhood. At the end of the same paragraph, they were presented that some Muslims had died on a plane crash while going to Nazareth whereas the rest of the participants in other condition had the same reading material except the last part mentioning death of some Muslims. The findings of this study revealed that removal of the things threatening worldview which was death of Muslims in here had a defensive function for the continuity of worldview since participants were exposed the information that the things caused threat to their existence were no more existing. Also, the same study explored that to what extent participants would report they liked Muslims. It was found that the condition in which participants reported less like for Muslims than the condition where participants with information of Muslims' death; the reason for that, they perceived Muslims' existence as a threat for their existence (Hayes, Schimel, & Williams, 2008). Likewise, Greenberg, Schimel, Martens, Solomon, and Pyszcznyski (2001) questioned the issue whether in the pursuit of mortality salience, White Americans would evaluate the paragraph written by White American and favoring White Americans as less racist than the paragraph written by Black American and favoring Blacks. In their first study, they found that Americans regarded the paragraph written by White American and favoring White Americans as more racist than the paragraph written by Black Americans for priding Black Americans in the absence of mortality salience. However, when mortality salience was on the stage, the situation was reversed. That is to say, American participants rated the paragraph favoring Americans as less racist. In a following study, participants were asked to evaluate a legal case about the guiltiness of a White or Black manager who engaged in an action of hiring discrimination and who considered this as legitimate and then participants were demanded to indicate the length of imprisonment for this guilt. The results revealed that after mortality salience, participants regarded the discriminatory action as less guilty, held less racist beliefs and assigned less length of imprisonment sentence for White managers than the Black one. It can be said that these results are conforming other findings that reminding of deadness has a function to escalate ingroup favoritism by strengthening the ingroup identification in a positive manner. Lastly, Lieberman, Arndt, Personius, and Cook (2001) drew attention to the point that individuals' awareness of their

mortality was influential for judging hate crimes perpetrated by ingroup against outgroup members. To be more specific, they found that after mortality salience, individuals more tolerantly evaluated the hate crime committed with Anti-Semitic motivation against a Jewish person and were displayed less punisher attitudes to transgressor. They argued this finding from the point of view that prejudicial mechanism might be alerted by mortality salience and this might give rise to favoring the offense against an outgroup member who was seen as a threatening sign for meaningful existence.

Take as a whole, studies conducted based on TMT proposes that threats to individuals' meaningful existence give rise to biases, unfavorableness and even hostile attitudes toward others who had dissimilar opinions or beliefs in this way individuals hold over the knowledge of their unavoidable mortality. Also, it provides support for the notion that individuals regard themselves as good but others are not; thus, they deserve to be removed since they are a threat to unity. Therefore, all these may point an evidence that TMT is the theory for both studying intergroup conflict and understanding the rarity of collective guilt because of not only bringing up the underlying reason for supporting aggressive behaviors or prejudices against "dangerous others" but also suggesting explanations for ingroup favoritism.

Application of TMT to Collective Guilt Concept

Based on TMT studies related to intergroup relations, some insights from TMT can be applied to collective guilt concept in order to understand its rarity. This application will be made by focusing on two different perspectives in this review paper. To begin with the first proposal, accepting collective guilt means accepting ingroup's wrongful behaviors which means that individuals' cultural worldviews and so their self-esteems are in danger since TMT suggests that identification with ingroup enhances self-esteem and serves as a guarantor for the continuity of meaningful existence through offering cultural worldviews. Therefore, acceptance of collective guilt may cause individuals to have anxiety related to continuity of their existence because their ingroup will have less value in their eyes due to its transgression so in order to eliminate this for their own sake, it can be the most convenient thing to deny collective guilt. Also, if they accept collective guilt on the behalf of their ingroup, this may give rise to loss the meaning in their lives and make them feel defenseless and anxious about their existence because identification with a group functions as a basis for their continuity. To sum up, individuals may be prone to deny collective guilt committed by their ingroup against outgroup. The reason for that, when they accept it, this may block them to see their group as positive and valuable which may make them feel insecure about their groups. Therefore, group identification which is stated the necessary thing to cope with death anxiety may not protect

them from this anxiety and facing this vulnerability will be tougher for them. Once for all, rejection of collective guilt may be the most appropriate strategy to save them from the knowledge of mortality and ensure their meaningful existence.

A second insight which can be obtained by TMT is coming from measurement of mortality salience in the studies of TMT. This brings up a question to mind whether it is possible for that information provided to elicit collective guilt about ingroup wrongdoings in collective guilt studies serves for mortality salience effect. In TMT research, various ways are applied to create mortality salience. To illustrate this, some studies ask the participants to think of their own death and write accordingly what this makes them feel emotionally and physically; some studies provide death related words in a paragraph subliminally; in some studies, mortality is made salient by requesting to fill fear of death - death anxiety related questionnaires; and also some studies use real life settings like funeral home to arouse mortality salience. In addition to these, making participants expose to read a short story which covers the death of main character, to watch car accident or genocide video, and to look at the materials describing war are the other ways to evoke mortality salience (Burke, Martens, & Faucher, 2010). Moreover, TMT research suggests that the effect of mortality salience is stronger when death related thoughts are accessible but not in the conscious level. Specifically, it is stated that compared to thinking death consciously, thinking it unconsciously predicts more inclination to protect cultural worldview (Greenberg, Pyszczynski, Solomon, Simon, & Breus, 1994). In other words, in that study participants who were exposed to death related thoughts implicitly advocated their own worldviews more than participants who were reminded death explicitly. When talking about collective guilt, in collective guilt studies, scenarios, informative paragraphs or vignettes about the harmful actions of ingroup against outgroups are presented in order to elicit collective guilt. When participants come across with this negative information including massive killings or genocides committed by their groups, these may function as evoking death related thoughts implicitly. Starting from this point of view, suggestions of TMT may be applied here. To make it clear, when individuals are informed about their groups' transgression which may accesses death related thoughts, this awareness of death may enhance ingroup identification and ingroup favoritism and also may stimulate prejudicial evaluations of outgroup members and hostility against outgroup as suggested by TMT; thus, they may not assign guilt to their ingroups because of hostile attitudes toward outgroup and biased attitudes toward ingroup since this may make them regard their ingroups' actions as legitimate. As a reminder, collective guilt research tells us that individuals with more prejudice against outgroup members (Hoffarth & Hodson, 2014; Pedersen, Beven, Walker, & Griffiths, 2004; Swim & Miller,

1999) accept less collective guilt. Therefore, suggestions of TMT in this manner may make sense. As a whole, in collective guilt studies, the topic itself may function as a tool of mortality salience and may bring up death related anxiety and due to this, acceptance of collective guilt may be inhibited.

4. CONCLUSION

Studying collective guilt is essential since it has the potential to promote constructive intergroup relations. For instance, as suggested by research conducted on the consequences of collective guilt, experiencing collective guilt increases positive attitudes toward outgroup members (Powell et al., 2005); brings up reparative actions for ingroups' wrongful actions against outgroups (Dumont & Waldzus, 2014); enhances reconciliation responses between perpetrator and victim groups (Kamau, Giner-Sorolla, & Zebel, 2013); fosters affirmative actions (Iyer et al., 2003) and gives rise to apology (McGarty et al., 2005) and forgiveness (Myers et al., 2009). Therefore, investigating collective guilt in detail based on the idea of its beneficial side is necessary even though it is stated that experience of collective guilt is rare. From this point of view, this paper presented the issue of collective guilt by the aim of revealing the historical development in the collective guilt research in terms of its occurrence and its antecedents. Moreover, in order to shed light on new insights for the rareness of the collective guilt experience, TMT was used as a base to offer possible explanations on this issue. Ultimately, it can be claimed that this current study is important because it is the first study which explains collective guilt by focusing on TMT.

Literature about collective guilt demonstrates that certain factors are needed for eliciting collective guilt; namely, self-categorization with the perpetrator ingroup, regarding the ingroup as responsible for this transgression, and considering this transgression as illegitimate. It is ascertained that if these factors are available, experiencing collective guilt is possible. By recent studies on collective guilt, it is asserted that if these mentioned antecedents are strengthened by different variables like type of identification with group or types of ingroup responsibility, then experiencing collective guilt is escalated. However, it is still a thought provoking issue that when these facilitator additional factors are absent, the case related to the rarity of collective guilt is at hand. For this reason, it is necessary to continue investigating the inhibiting factors of collective guilt. In this light, this present study offers new way by benefiting from the findings of TMT studies and it is the strength of this study to bring up this issue for the first time. Specifically, mortality salience and threat to existence can function as inhibiting factor for experiencing collective guilt. Indeed, this proposal may be criticized because it does not rely on empirical findings; thus, this can be considered as a drawback of this study. Everything else

considered, it can be regarded as lighting the way for new theoretical connection in order to understand collective guilt and can also raise question about if there may be other factors for collective guilt in addition to presented ones. As a suggestion for future studies, both the role of mortality salience or continuity of existence on collective guilt should be examined empirically and also future studies should continue on investigating the possible other inhibiting or enhancing factors for collective guilt.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Baumeister, Roy F., Arlene M. Stillwell and Todd F. Heatherton (1994), "Guilt: An interpersonal approach", Psychological Bulletin, 115 (2): 243–267.

Baumeister, Roy F., Kathleen D. Vohs, C. Nathan DeWall and Liqing Zhang, (2007), "How emotion shapes behavior: Feedback, anticipation, and reflection, rather than direct causation", Personality and Social Psychology Review, 11 (2): 167–203.

Behrendt, Hadar and Rachel Ben-Ari (2012), "The positive side of negative emotion: The role of guilt and shame in coping with interpersonal conflict", Journal of Conflict Resolution, 56 (6): 1116-1138.

Bilali, Rezarta, Linda R. Tropp and Nilanjana Dasgupta (2012), "Attributions of responsibility and perceived harm in the aftermath of mass violence", Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 18: 21-39.

Boeckmann, Robert J. and N. T. Feather (2007), "Gender, discrimination beliefs, group-based guilt, and responses to affirmative action for Australian women", Psychology of Women Quarterly, 31 (3): 290–304.

Branscombe, Nyla R. (2004), "A social psychological process perspective on collective guilt", Nyla R. Branscombe and Bertjan Doosje (Eds.), Collective guilt: International perspectives (New York: Cambridge University Press): 320-334.

Branscombe, N. R., Ben Slugoski and Diane M. Kappen (2004), "The measurement of collective guilt: What it is and what it is not", N. R. Branscombe and B. Doosje (Eds.), Collective guilt: International perspectives (New York: Cambridge University Press): 16-34.

Burke, Brian L., Andy Martens and Erik H. Faucher (2010), "Two decades of terror management theory: A meta-analysis of mortality salience research", Personality and Social Psychology Review, 14 (2): 155-195.

Castano, Emanuele (2004), "In case of death, cling to the ingroup", European Journal of Social Psychology, 34: 375-384.

Castano, Emanuele and Roger Giner-Sorolla (2006), "Not quite human: Infrahumanization in response to collective responsibility for intergroup killing", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90 (5): 804-818.

Castano, Emanuele, Vincent Yzerbyt, Maria-Paola Paladino and Simona Sacchi (2002), "I belong, therefore, I exist: Ingroup identification, ingroup entitativity, and ingroup bias", Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28 (2): 135-143.

Čehajić-Clancy, Sabina and Rupert Brown (2014), ""The burden of our times": Antecedents of group-based guilt and shame", Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 20 (2): 166-170.

Cehajic-Clancy, Sabina, Daniel A. Effron, Eran Halperin, Varda Liberman and Lee D. Ross (2011), "Affirmation, acknowledgment of in-group responsibility, group-based guilt, and support for reparative measures", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101 (2): 256–270.

Doğulu, Canay and Nuray Sakallı-Uğurlu (2015), "Dehşet yönetimi kuramı üzerine bir derleme", Türk Psikoloji Yazıları, 18 (35): 33-47.

Doosje, Bertjan, Nyla R. Branscombe, Russell Spears and Antony S. R. Manstead (1998), "Guilty by association: When one's group has a negative history", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75 (4): 872–886.

Doosje, Bertjan, Nyla R. Branscombe, Russell Spears and Antony S. R. Manstead (2004), "Consequences of national ingroup identification for responses to immoral historical events", Nyla. R. Branscombe and Bertjan Doosje (Eds.), Collective guilt: International perspectives (New York: Cambridge University Press): 95-111.

Doosje, Bertjan, Nyla R. Branscombe, Russell Spears and Antony S. R. Manstead (2006), "Antecedents and consequences of group-based guilt: The effects of ingroup identification", Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 9 (3): 325-338.

Dumont, Kitty and Sven Waldzus (2014), "Group-based guilt and reparation in the context of social change", Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 44 (4): 331–341.

Ferguson, Mark A. and Nyla. R. Branscombe (2010), "Collective guilt mediates the effect of beliefs about global warming on willingness to engage in mitigation behavior", Journal of Enviromental Psychology, 30: 135-142.

Ferguson, Tamara J., Hedy Stegge and Ilse Damhuis (1991), "Children's understanding of guilt and shame", Child Development, 62: 827–839.

Greenberg, Jeff and Jamie Arndt (2012), "Terror Management Theory", Van Lange, Paul A. M., Arie W. Kruglanski and E. Tory Higgins (Eds.), Handbook of Theories of Social Psychology: Volume Two (Los Angles: SAGE): 398-415.

Greenberg, Jeff, Tom Pyszczynski, Sheldon Solomon, Abram Rosenblatt, Mithcell Veeder, Shari Kirkland and Deborah Lyon (1990), "Evidence for terror management theory II: The effects of mortality salience on reactions to those who threaten or bolster the cultural worldview", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58 (2): 308–318.

Greenberg, Jeff, Tom Pyszczynski, Sheldon Solomon, Linda Simon and Michael Breus (1994), "Role of consciousness and accessibility of death-related thoughts in mortality salience effects", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 67 (4): 627-637.

Greenberg, Jeff, Jeff Schimel, Andy Martens, Sheldon Solomon and Tom Pyszcznyski (2001), "Sympathy for the devil: Evidence that reminding Whites of their mortality promotes more favorable reactions to White racists", Motivation and Emotion, 25 (2): 113-133.

Greenberg, Jeff, Sheldon Solomon and Jamie Arndt (2008), "A basic but uniquely human motivation: Terror management", J. Y. Shah and W. L. Gardner (Eds.), Handbook of Motivation Science (New York: Guilford Press): 114-134.

Gunn, Gregory R. and Anne E. Wilson (2011), "Acknowledging the skeletons in our closet: The effect of group affirmation on collective guilt, collective shame, and reparatory attitudes", Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37 (11): 1474–1487.

Halloran, Michael J. (2007), "Indigenous reconciliation in Australia: Do values, identity and collective guilt matter?", Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 17 (1): 1-18.

Harth, Nicole Syringa, Thomas Kessler and Colin Wayne Leach (2008), "Advantaged group's emotional reactions to intergroup inequality: The dynamics of pride, guilt, and sympathy", Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34 (1): 115-129.

Harvey, Richard. D. and Debra L. Oswald (2000), "Collective guilt and shame as motivation for white support of black programs", Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30 (9): 1790-1811.

Hayes, Joseph, Jeff Schimel and Todd J. Williams (2008), "Fighting death with death: The buffering effects of learning that worldview violators have died" Psychological Science, 19 (5): 501-507.

Hoffarth, Mark R. and Gordon Hodson (2014), "Is subjective ambivalence toward gays a modern form of bias?", Personality and Individual Differences, 69: 75-80.

Hohman, Zachary P. and Michael A. Hogg (2015), "Mortality salience, self-esteem, and defense of the group: Mediating role of in-group identification", Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 45 (2): 80-89.

Howell, Andrew J., Jessica B. Turowski and Karen Buro (2012), "Guilt, empathy, and apology" Personality and Individual Differences, 53 (7): 917-922.

Imhoff, Roland, Michael J. A. Wohl and Hans-Peter Erb (2013), "When the past is far from dead: How ongoing consequences of genocides committed by the ingroup impact collective guilt", Journal of Social Issues, 69 (1): 74-91.

Iyer, Aarti, Colin Wayne Leach and Faye J. Crosby (2003), "White guilt and racial compensation: The benefits and limits of self-focus", Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29 (1): 117–29.

Iyer, Aarti, Leach, Colin Wayne, and Pedersen, Anne (2004), "Racial wrongs and restitutions: The role of guilt and other group-based emotions", Nyla R. Branscombe and Bertjan Doosje (Eds.), Collective guilt: International perspectives (New York: Cambridge University Press): 262-283.

Kamau, Caroline, Roger Giner-Sorolla and Sven Zebel (2013), "Reconciliation responses, blame, and expressions of guilt or shame", Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 43 (2): 287–293.

Kofta, Miroslaw and Patrycja Slawuta (2013), "Thou shall not kill... your brother: Victim- perpetrator cultural closeness and moral disapproval of Polish

atrocities against Jews after the Holocaust" Journal of Social Issues, 69 (1): 54-73.

Kökdemir, Doğan and Zuhal Yeniçeri (2010), "Terror management in a predominantly muslim country. The effects of mortality salience on university identity and on preference for the development of international relations", European Psychologist, 15 (3): 165-174.

Leonard, Melinda A., Samantha M. Yung and Ed Cairns (2015), "Predicting intergroup forgiveness from in-group identification and collective guilt in adolescent and adult affiliates of a Northern Irish cross-community organization", Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 21 (2): 155–167.

Li, Xiaoyang, Yi Liu, Siyang Luo, Bing Wu, Xinhuai Wu and Shihui Han (2015), "Mortality salience enhances racial in-group bias in empathic neural responses to others' suffering", NeuroImage, 118: 376-385.

Lickel, Brian, Toni Schmader, Mathew Curtis, Marchelle Scarnier and, Daniel R. Ames (2005), "Vicarious shame and guilt", Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 8 (2): 145-157.

Lieberman, Joel. D., Jamie Arndt, Jennifer Personius and Alison Cook (2001), "Vicarious annihilation: The effect of mortality salience on perceptions of hate crimes", Law and human behavior, 25 (6): 547-566.

Mallett, Robyn K. and Janet K. Swim (2007), "The influence of inequality, responsibility and justifiability on reports of group-based guilt for ingroup privilege", Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 10 (1): 57-69.

McGarty, Craig, Anne Pedersen, Colin Wayne Leach, Tamarra Mansell, Julie Waller and Ana-Maria Bliuc (2005), "Group-based guilt as a predictor of commitment to apology", British Journal of Social Psychology, 44 (4): 659-680.

Miron, Anca M., Nyla R. Branscombe and Michael T. Schmitt (2006), "Collective guilt as distress over illegitimate intergroup inequality", Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 9 (2): 163-180.

Morton, Thomas A. and Tom Postmes (2011), "Moral duty or moral defence? The effects of perceiving shared humanity with the victims of ingroup perpetrated harm", European Journal of Social Psychology, 41 (1): 127-134.

Myers, Elissa, Miles Hewstone and Ed Cairns (2009), "Impact of conflict on mental health in Northern Ireland: The mediating role of intergroup forgiveness and collective guilt", Political Psychology, 30 (2): 269-290.

Özkan, Özlem Serap (2014), "The relationship between collective guilt and two modes of group identification: Ingroup glorification and ingroup attachment" (Unpublished master's thesis) (Middle East Technical University, Ankara.)

Pedersen, Anne, Jaimie Beven, Iain Walker and Brian Griffiths (2004), "Attitudes toward indigenous Australians: The role of empathy and guilt", Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 14 (4): 233-249.

Peetz, Johanna, Gregory R. Gunn and Anne E. Wilson (2010), "Crimes of the past: Defensive temporal distancing in the face of past in-group wrongdoing" Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36 (5): 598-611.

Powell, Adam A., Nyla R. Branscombe and Michael Thomas Schmitt (2005), "Inequality as ingroup privilege or outgroup disadvantage: The impact of group focus on collective guilt and interracial attitudes", Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31 (4): 508–521.

Pyszczynski, Tom, Abdolhossein Abdollahi, Sheldon Solomon, Jeff Greenberg, Florette Cohen and David Weise (2006), "Mortality salience, martyrdom, and military might: The great Satan versus the axis of evil", Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32 (4): 525-537.

Pyszczynski, Tom, Zachary Rothschild and Abdolhossein Abdollahi (2008), "Terrorism, violence, and hope for peace a terror management perspective", Current Directions in Psychological Science, 17 (5): 318-322.

Roccas, Sonia, Yechiel Klar and Ido Liviatan (2006), "The paradox of group-based guilt: Modes of national identification, conflict vehemence, and reactions to the in-group's moral violations", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 91 (4): 698-711.

Routledge, Clay, Jacob Juhl, Matthew Vess, Christie Cathey and Jiangqun Liao (2013), "Who uses groups to transcend the limits of the individual self? Exploring the effects of interdependent self-construal and mortality salience on investment in social groups", Social Psychological and Personality Science, 4 (4): 483-491.

Sakallı-Uğurlu, Nuray and Bilge Soylu (2016), "Kolektif suçluluk: Öncülleri, çıktıları ve kaçınma yolları", Nesne Psikoloji Dergisi, 4 (7): 59-87.

Schori-Eyal, Noa, Michal Reifen Tagar, Tamar Saguy and Eran Halperin (2015), "The benefits of group-based pride: Pride can motivate guilt in intergroup conflicts among high glorifiers", Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 61: 79–83.

Seger, Charles R., Eliot R. Smith and Diane M. Mackie (2009), "Subtle activation of a social categorization triggers group-level emotions", Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45 (3): 460-467.

Simons, Lewis M. (2006), "Genocide and the science of proof: In the Iraqi desert, crime-scene investigators are finding new forensic evidence of Saddam Hussein's murderous regime. Their discoveries echo the mass killings of the past century--the bloodiest in history--and offer hope that future mass murderers can be brought to trial", National Geographic, 209 (1): 28–35.

Sullivan, Daniel, Mark J. Landau, Nyla R. Branscombe, Zachary K. Rothschild, and Tracey J. Cronin (2013), "Self-harm focus leads to greater collective guilt: The case of the U.S.-Iraq conflict", Political Psychology, 34 (4): 573-587.

Swim, Janet K. and Deborah L. Miller (1999), "White guilt: Its antecedents and consequences for attitudes toward affirmative action", Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25 (4): 500–514.

Tajfel, Henri and Jonathan Turner (1979), "An integrative theory of intergroup conflict", W. G. Austin, & S. Worchel (Eds.), The social psychology of intergroup relations (California: Brook/Cole Publishing): 33-47.

Tracy, Jessica L. and Richard W. Robins (2006), "Appraisal antecedents of shame and guilt: Support for a theoretical model", Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32: 1339–1351.

Turner, John C., Michael A. Hogg, Penelope J. Oakes, S. D. Reicher and Margaret S. Wetherell (1987), Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorisation theory (Oxford: Blackwell).

Wohl, Michael J. A. and Nyla R. Branscombe (2008), "Remembering historical victimization: Collective guilt for current ingroup transgressions", Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 94 (6): 988–1006.

Wohl, Michael J. A., Nyla R. Branscombe and Yechiel Klar (2006), "Collective guilt: Emotional reactions when one's group has done wrong or been wronged", European Review of Social Psychology, 17 (1): 1–37.

Zebel, Sven, Anja Zimmermann, Tendayi G. Viki and Bertjan Doosje (2008), "Dehumanization and guilt as distinct but related predictors of support for reparation policies", Political Psychology, 29 (2): 193-219.