

Predictors of Beliefs in Intergroup Forgiveness in a Chilean General Population Sample

Manuel Cárdenas¹, Maitane Arnosó² and Darío Páez²

¹ Universidad de Valparaíso (Chile)

² Universidad del País Vasco (Spain)

Abstract. Original survey data from a Chilean sample ($N = 1267$) are used to study the socio-demographic and psychosocial determinants of belief in forgiveness attitudes in the context of measuring the impact of truth and reconciliation reports (NTRC, 1991) and Political Imprisonment and Torture (NPIC, 2004) commissions. A linear multiple regression analysis ($R^2 = .15$; $F(8, 1269) = 14.65$; $p < .001$; effect size $f^2 = .18$) revealed the positive effect of perceived apology sincerity ($\beta = 0.22$; $p < .001$), emotions of anger ($\beta = -0.08$; $p < .05$), and positive social climate ($\beta = 0.08$; $p < .05$). People who believe in the victims' forgiveness feel less anger, have more positive perceptions of the sincerity and efficacy of the apologies, agree to a greater extent that the commission helped to find out the truth about what happened to the victims, and have a greater perception of the social climate as positive. The results show the importance of psychosocial and institutional variables in beliefs about forgiveness, and they suggest differences between interpersonal and intergroup forgiveness processes.

Received 3 July 2013; Revised 28 August 2014; Accepted 31 October 2014

Keywords: Chile, political violence, reparation measures, official apologies, and forgiveness.

Truth and Reconciliation Commissions (TRC) are one of the most widely used transitional justice (TJ) measures to move from a climate of violence, produced by internal armed conflicts or military dictatorships, to living peacefully together. These commissions can be understood as transitional rituals whose goal is to implement a series of mechanisms designed to address human rights abuse. They are intended to consolidate norms and strengthen social cohesion in order to avoid future violence and recover institutional trust lost during periods of political violence (Beristain, Páez, Rimé, & Kanyangara, 2010). Thus, the aim is peaceful and harmonious life among groups, leaving no room for impunity, in an attempt to repair the harm done to victims and society as a whole by dictatorships or internal armed conflicts. There is evidence supporting the negative intra- and interpersonal effects of traumatic events such as collective violence (Rimé, Finkenauer, Luminet, Zech, & Philippot, 1998).

TRCs have been established in many countries to deal with serious human rights violations committed by dictatorship regimes or during internal armed conflicts. Since the 1970s, more than 30 official commissions have been set up in different parts of the world

(Avruch, 2010). TRCs are temporary bodies created to investigate, but not necessarily judge, human rights violations perpetrated by state agents and/or armed opposition forces (Hayner, 2001). The common functions of TRCs are: (a) to make efforts to find out the truth about the period of collective violence; (b) to recognize and validate victims' suffering; (c) to compensate those affected, both materially and symbolically; (d) to contribute to the creation of an inclusive social memory oriented toward the future; (e) to avoid new violent events; and (f) to seek justice. These functions can help to avoid revenge cycles and other war crimes while preventing the emergence of collective violence (Sikkink & Bott-Walling, 2007), above all in cases where there is support for the TRC and appropriate institutional organizations (Brahms, 2009).

The National Truth and Reconciliation Commission in Chile

The National Truth and Reconciliation Commission (NTRC) was created in April 1990 to discover the truth about human rights violations by Chilean state agents between September 11th, 1973 (day of the military coup) and March 1990 (beginning of the transition to democracy). Its report was published in 1991. The purpose of the NTRC was to create as complete a picture as possible of the most serious human rights violations committed by state agents (people detained-disappeared, executed for political reasons, and tortured to death). Its aim was to collect data in order to identify victims and discover their fate, and recommend measures to

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Manuel Cárdenas. Universidad de Valparaíso. (Chile).

E-mail: manuel.cardenas@uv.cl

Preparation of this paper was facilitated by FONDECYT 1110776 and postdoctoral fellowship granted from Chilean National Funds of Scientific research (CONICYT).

avoid future human rights violations (NTRC, 1991); it was not allowed to take legal action pertaining to courts of justice. Its report was made public by the President of the Republic at the time, who apologized for the abuses committed. The NTRC reported that 3197 people were killed in Chile for political reasons (this figure includes cases later accepted by the National Reparation and Reconciliation Commission), and that the armed forces and police were responsible for most of them (NTRC, 1991). After the report was released, a wide-ranging compensation plan was implemented, including pensions for victims' relatives, scholarships for students, and mental and physical health programs (for a detailed analysis, see Lira, 2011). Regarding collective memory and its symbols, memorials and monuments have been built (most of them thanks to the initiatives of victims' relatives; Jelin & Langland, 2003). As far as justice is concerned, more than 600 agents of the dictatorship have been tried, and most of those responsible for the most serious human rights violations have been sent to jail (Lira, 2010).

Psychosocial factors associated with intergroup forgiveness

This study deals with predictors of favorable attitudes toward belief in forgiveness, that is, the belief that it is possible to reduce the feelings of revenge, anger, and mistrust toward the perpetrator group. Intergroup forgiveness has been defined as a willingness to abandon one's right to resentment. In other words, it would be an internal transformation in the motivation toward a perceived perpetrating out-group that is context dependent (van Tongeren, Burnette, Boyle, Worthington, & Forsyth, 2014). Forgiving the other group's members means no longer feeling angry or resentful (Baumeister, Exline, & Sommer, 1998). These negative feelings must be addressed in promoting more positive intergroup relations (Wohl & Branscombe, 2005). A series of variables or measures were selected that were relevant in other studies and theoretically important. These variables were divided into four groups: *socio-demographic variables and closeness to violence events* (including characteristics such as political identification, age, religiousness, and being a victim of violence or a victim's relative); *emotional expression and social sharing* (emotions arising from remembering the NTRC report, and the extent to which people speak socially about the NTRC's work); *support for NTRC functions and reparation measures* (reading the NTRC report, participation in victims' commemoration rituals, perception of the NTRC's contribution to revealing the truth and doing justice, to creating a comprehensive history and to future violence prevention, and agreement with reparation measures); and *institutional factors* (positive perception of social climate, institutional trust, and perceived

sincerity and efficacy of official apologies). On the whole, these four groups refer to variables that help us to understand the beliefs about forgiveness held by victims toward perpetrators.

Sociodemographic variables

Aim to identify the differences between individuals' positions – that is, to detect whether, 20 years after the release of the NTRC report, personal proximity to violence events is relevant to their appraisal. Part of the sample is made up of individuals who were not born when the violence events occurred, or even when the report was published, so that age differences may be an important element in understanding beliefs about victims' forgiveness of perpetrators. Moreover, in the context of the Chilean dictatorship, participants' political ideas may be an important predictor of the belief in forgiveness, given the dictatorship's identification with right-wing ideas and victims' identification with left-wing ideas. Support for these beliefs may be attributable to previous symbolic identification with the victims of violence or with its perpetrators (Manzi, 2006). In any case, previous studies (Cárdenas, Páez, & Rimé, 2013) have shown the existence of differences between right-wing and left-wing people on a set of variables, such as institutional trust, assessment of TRCs, and emotions like fear and guilt. On the other hand, victims were more critical of apologies and more reluctant to forgive (Cárdenas, Páez, Rimé, Bilbao, & Asún, 2014), which is relevant because in Chile victims and left-wing political ideas often overlap. Furthermore, religiousness may strengthen a person's willingness to forgive, in line with the Catholic tradition, which is strongly rooted in Chile. Various studies show that religiousness plays an important role in intergroup forgiveness (Staub, Pearlman, Gubin, & Hagengimana, 2005). Finally, individuals from traumatized families or those directly affected by the violence would be expected to support transitional justice measures more strongly (Aguilar, Balcells, & Cebolla, 2011), with the extent of violence exposure (ranging from being a direct victim to having relatives or friends who were affected by it) influencing the strength of this factor as a predictor of beliefs in victims' forgiveness of perpetrators.

However, traumatic events affect not only individuals or their families, but also intermediate groups. For this reason, the second group – *emotional expression and social sharing* – included variables such as the extent to which people speak socially about the NTRC work and report. This variable is probably associated with believing in forgiveness. In addition, emotions arising from the memories of the period of violence are fundamental to understanding people's actions. A large variety of outgroup behaviors may be explained by different

emotions (Mackie & Smith, 2002). It is well known that emotions such as guilt and shame encourage the acknowledgement of responsibility and support for reparation measures (Dresler-Hawke & Liu, 2006), and that others, such as pride and hope, are linked to post-traumatic growth (Vázquez & Páez, 2011). Collective guilt can facilitate reparation and the acknowledgment of offenses (Brown & Cehajic, 2008), and lack of remorse leads to justifying offenses and creates a barrier to forgiveness (Morton & Postmes, 2011; Noor, Brown, & Prentice, 2008). The negative emotions have been associated with intergroup forgiveness (Tam et al, 2008). Research reveals that anger is often a key barrier to intergroup forgiveness (Fehr et al, 2010; Manzi & González, 2007), while fear has been shown to be a strong inhibitor of trust and empathy between groups (Tam et al, 2007; van Tongeren, Burnette, O'Boyle, Worthington, & Forsyth, 2014). Fear predicts avoidance tendencies (Devos, Silver, Mackie, & Smith, 2002), although some studies show that fear predicts increased outgroup forgiveness (Tam et al, 2007). In any case, truth commission activities produce emotional activation (Kaminer, Stein, Mbanga, & Zungu-Dirwayi, 2001; Kanyangara, 2008; Kanyangara, Rimé, Philippot, & Yzerbit, 2007; Rimé, Kanyangara, Yzerbit, & Páez, 2011) and emotional effects in individuals identified as both victims and perpetrators (Brounéus, 2008). Several studies show the important role of emotional sharing in overcoming emotional trauma (Tam et al, 2007; Wohl, Hornsey, & Bennett, 2012), so that it might be a good predictor of the belief in intergroup forgiveness (Zech, Rimé, & Nils, 2004).

Believing in social forgiveness will also depend on knowledge about the commission's work and the extent to which it fulfills its functions and achieves its goals. These beliefs are related to the commission's contribution to revealing the truth and doing justice, and whether it has created a comprehensive history and helped to prevent future cycles of violence. Furthermore, agreement with reparation measures is estimated to strengthen beliefs in forgiveness, indicating behavioral agreement with social reconciliation. These variables have been grouped as *support for NTRC functions and reparation measures*. This category also includes knowledge about the NTRC's activities and report and the extent to which the person participates in rituals for honoring victims, since this participation may result in greater support for intergroup forgiveness (Nadler & Schnabel, 2008; Stroebe & Stroebe, 1996).

Finally, the aim of variables labeled as *institutional factors* is to detect how the perception of the social climate can condition beliefs in forgiveness (Cárdenas, Páez, Arnoso, & Rimé, 2013a; Páez, 2010). Thus, a degree of institutional trust is relevant, as it may reveal the conviction that group relations depend on

institutions functioning properly (Cárdenas, Páez, & Rimé, 2013b). Such trust can also aid the credibility of a comprehensive or inclusive history, which in turn helps to make future violence less likely. Also included in this category are variables evaluating the sincerity and effectiveness of official apologies, since, as stated in other studies (Nadler, Malloy, & Ficher, 2008; Páez, 2010; Philpot & Hornsey, 2008), this may be an important requirement for reconciliation and forgiveness among groups as an indicator of the recognition of norm transgression (Bar-Tal, 2011).

Using these independent variables may help predict beliefs about forgiveness. For this reason, step-by-step multiple linear regression models are proposed to identify how this prediction works.

Method

Sample and Procedure

The sample consisted of 1276 volunteer participants, 623 men (49.1%) and 644 women (50.8%) with an age range from 18 to 90 years old ($M = 39.55$ years and $SD = 17.34$). Data were collected in the urban areas with the highest population densities: Santiago (26.4%), Valparaiso (30.7%), Concepción (14.5%), and Antofagasta (28.4%). Participants were unqualified blue collar workers (8.1%), qualified blue collars and white collar workers (14.9%), executives or self-employed people (22.7%), retired people (4.3%), housewives (7.8%), students (24.6%), or other (17.6%). The instrument was applied by specially trained university students. Although this was not a random sample, it was stratified in order to reflect the population ratios for sex and different age groups in each city (Instituto Nacional de Estadística, 2003). Once participants had agreed to participate in the study and signed a consent letter informing them of its goals and guaranteeing confidentiality and anonymity, they completed the paper-and-pencil questionnaire individually. Data were collected between October 2010 and July 2011.

Instrument and variables

To identify the factors determining belief in forgiveness, a continuous dependent variable was used ("do you consider that people who were affected by past violence can forgive those who inflicted this violence on them?" Response options ranged from 1="not at all" to 7="completely"). Although this question is very general, we consider it appropriate to simultaneously measure the general population and victims. A more direct question would only be appropriate for one group and not the other. It is well-known that people usually respond differently if they are asked about themselves than if they are

asked about their group. This would also occur in the case of intergroup forgiveness (Baumeister et al., 1998).

As stated above, independent variables were divided into 4 groups related to socio-demographic variables and closeness to events, such as age (how old the individual was at the moment of answering the questionnaire), religiousness (importance assigned to their religious ideas; response options ranged from 1 = "not important" to 7 = "very important"), political ideas (a 7-level variable, from extreme left to extreme right), and exposure to violence ("Do you consider yourself a victim of violence by the State or its agents in the period 1973 to 1989?" and "Were any of your relatives or close friends victims of violence by the State or its agents in the 1973–1989 period?"). For both questions, response options were "Yes" or "No". Participants who responded affirmatively to the first question or to both questions were categorized as direct victims, those who responded affirmatively only to the second question were considered indirect victims, and those who responded negatively to both questions were considered "unaffected".

The second group of variables included emotions elicited by the memories of the NTRC report and the period of violence in Chile (eight basic emotions: sadness/pain, guilt, shame, anger, fear, happiness, pride, and hope; their values ranged from 1 = "None" to 7 = "Very much"). Reliability in the current study was acceptable ($\alpha = .78$). Additionally, we asked about the degree to which one speaks about the events included in the report (social sharing) and related to the human rights violations that occurred in Chile between 1973–1989, using two questions (values ranging from 1 = "not at all" to 4 = "a great deal"). Reliability in the current study was ($\alpha = .85$).

The third group included variables related to participants' knowledge about the NTRC report ("Did you read the NTRC report or part of it?"; response options were "Yes" or "No"), and variables pertaining to appraisals of how much the NTRC contributed to relatives' knowledge about the truth about their loved ones, meted out justice to human rights violators, created a comprehensive history, and prevented future violence (response options ranged from 1 = "not at all" to 4 = "a great deal"). Reliability in the current study was acceptable ($\alpha = .79$).

Regarding institutional trust (trusting institutions such as the government, political parties, courts of justice, etc.; response options ranged from 1 = "nothing" and 7 = "a lot"), reliability in the current study was good ($\alpha = .84$). For positive social climate perception, the 4 items on the CEPN scale (De Rivera & Páez, 2007) were used (A Likert-type response scale was used, with anchors 1 = "Not at all/None" to 5 = "A great deal"). Reliability in the current study was good ($\alpha = .82$).

Finally, sincerity and effectiveness attributed to official apologies were measured ("Do you think these declarations and apologies were sincere?" and "Do you think these declarations and apologies helped society to understand the suffering of groups affected by violence?" The response options ranged in each case from 1 = "Not at all/None" to 4 = "A great deal"). Reliability in the current study was good ($\alpha = .82$).

Results

Descriptive data and correlation tests

The data indicate that only 28.2% of participants believe that victims can forgive the perpetrators, 76% consider that institutional apologies are not sincere, and 84.3% think such apologies are ineffective for improving group relations. In addition, most participants have not spoken with other people about the content of the NTRC report (84.7%). Regarding political ideas, participants report belonging to the center (34.4%), center-left (24.2%), and left (18.9%). People defining themselves as center-right account for 11%, and those calling themselves right-wing total 3.8%. Those who trust institutions account for 45.2% of the sample, while 55.6% claim to be non-religious (55.6%). Based on answers to the two preliminary questions examining exposure to past violence, 304 respondents (24%) considered themselves to be direct victims of human rights violations, while 424 respondents (33.4%) reported having victims among their family or close friends, and could therefore be categorized as indirect victims. The remaining 541 (42.6%) had not been affected by political violence and were put in the "unaffected" category for the comparisons to follow.

Before including independent variables in the regression model, several correlation tests were carried out among continuous independent variables and the dependent variable in order to empirically support the inclusion of each. Table 1 shows the association coefficient values obtained by crossing independent variables with belief in victims' forgiveness. Almost all the variables are significantly related to belief in forgiveness (zero-order correlations), except those referring to exposure to violence, pain, guilt, fear, social sharing, and degree of information about NTRC. These variables will not be included in the regression model, since they are not associated with the dependent variable.

Multiple linear regression analysis

Once the relations among variables had been identified, a step-by-step multiple linear regression analysis was conducted for the variable "belief in forgiveness". As Table 1 shows, Model 1 includes the set of socio-demographic variables and those referring to proximity to the events; Model 2 adds variables related to the

Table 1. Linear Multiple Regression Model

			Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4
Variables		<i>r</i>	β	β	β	β
Socio-demographic variables and closeness to violence events	Age	.07*	.027	.008	-.025	-.026
	Political identification	.08**	.047	-.004	-.004	-.058
	Religiousness	.14**	.119**	.100**	.087**	.055
Emotional expression and social sharing	Shame	–	–	–	–	-.049
	Happiness	.09**		.070**	.064**	.031
	Pride	.10**		-.038	-.025	.000
	Anger	.08**		-.009	-.009	-.082*
	Hope	–		–	–	.028
		.12**		.101**	.101**	
NTRC functions and support for reparation measures	Contribution to truth	.23**			.156**	.102**
	Contribution to justice	.21**			.069*	.026
	Comprehensive history	.16**			.001	-.030
	Future violence prevention	.20**			.060	.009
		.13**			.127**	.063
Institutional factors	Positive social climate perception	.21**				.082*
	Sincerity and effectiveness of apologies	.33**				.223**
	Institutional trust	.19**				.057
	<i>R</i> ²		.02	.05	.10	.15
	<i>F</i> (8,1269)		9.64**	8.29**	11.62**	14.65

Note: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .001$; Effect Size $f^2 = .18$ (medium) and statistical power $(1-\beta) = 1.0$.

expression of emotions; Model 3 incorporates knowledge about and appraisal of the truth commission's achievements and support for reparation measures; and Model 4 brings in institutional factors.

Model 1 highlights the importance of religiousness. The results indicate that those who give more importance to religious ideas also believe in social forgiveness. This variable tends to lose relevance as a predictor in the subsequent models.

In Model 2, religiousness is still relevant. Three emotions seem to be relevant: hope, shame and anger. Thus, reporting these emotions may be a good predictor of beliefs in victim's forgiveness. Higher levels of hope and low levels of anger and shame would be good predictors of belief in forgiveness.

Model 3 confirms expectations about the importance of religiousness, shame, and anger. In addition, it reveals the relevance of two other aspects: the fact that the NTRC revealed the truth about what happened to victims and its contribution to justice and punishing those responsible for human rights violations.

Model 4 incorporates variables dealing with institutional factors, including official apologies and positive social climate perception. Anger maintains its relevance,

but shame and hope disappear in the model; religiousness also disappears from the model. Only the NTRC's contributions to finding the truth still have considerable weight. The institutional factors are highly relevant, with perception of a positive social climate and perceived effectiveness and sincerity of official apologies being significant in understanding belief in victims' forgiveness of perpetrators.

Discussion

Although the models tested provide a poor explanation of the variance, some results show some interesting clues for future research.

On the one hand, being on the left politically, older, and religious predict beliefs in intergroup forgiveness in the first model. The first two results are coherent with those from other studies (Aguilar et al., 2011). However, these variables are not significant in Model 4, being replaced by less distal variables, although religiousness maintains its predictive capacity in a more stable fashion. Thus, when institutional variables are excluded, a call for reconciliation may evoke restitution in a moral community (reconciliation is the name of a Catholic

sacrament), probably based on interpersonal forgiveness parameters (conflict recognition, regret accompanied by the firm intention not to commit sins again, and reciprocal forgiveness based on reparation and expiation of the harm done; Mullet, Nann, Kandiangu, Neto, & Pinto, 2011). The fact that institutions connected to the Church, such as Solidarity Vicarage (CNVR, 1991), denounced and documented human rights violations is relevant, since they protected and helped victims. Public recognition of the Catholic Church's role may make identification with this category highly relevant and strengthen the positive social identity of religious people as they support ethical measures supported by their group.

On the other hand, certain emotions appear to play a highly relevant role in predicting beliefs in intergroup forgiveness. Feeling sadness and pain about events, but tinged with hope, seems to be a good predictor of beliefs in intergroup forgiveness. Sadness is associated with loss-assimilation behaviors and cognitive re-elaboration, while hope involves actively seeking a better future (Fredrickson, 2009). Unlike in studies on collective guilt (Etxeberria, Conejero, & Pascual, 2011), guilt was found to have a negative effect, which may indicate that when it is present, people do not consider forgiveness as an option. That is, although other research identifies guilt as an emotion that produces reparation (Brown, González, Zagefka, Manzi, & Cehajic, 2008; Manzi et al., 2004), this study shows instead that it may be a barrier to support for intergroup forgiveness. Since guilt is linked to responsibility for terrible events that nobody wants to accept due to possible effects on their own identity, it may lead to denial and avoidance of facing a collective traumatic past. This does not occur with sadness, which, although a negative emotion, refers to positive aspects of ourselves insofar as we are able to empathize with victims, showing sensitivity to their misfortune or tragedy.

Speaking about past violence is a good predictor of positive appraisal of the possibilities of forgiveness. People who feel the most need to speak and have spoken most about a traumatic past probably see the NTRC report as a compendium of horror that allows them to validate their position or inform themselves about the extent of the violence. People who speak the most about the report may be those with the most knowledge about it, but they may also perceive its content as validated through the confirmation of facts and events by a "moral authority" in the form of the commission. Thus, speaking with others and remembering the period of violence may predispose people to accepting the need for intergroup forgiveness. Emotions such as sadness/pain and hope are brought out, leading to a belief in intergroup forgiveness

(Bellelli, Leone, & Cursi, 1999), to the degree that they arise from talking about the content of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission report. The TRC's reports provide support material that reaffirms the previously-denied reality of human rights violations. Therefore, official recognition can be considered a step forward in questions of intergroup forgiveness. It is an experience that validates the victims, who were able to systematically review what happened, leading to higher levels of elaboration of the experience and, therefore, a greater willingness to forgive. In the general population, the recognition provided by the reports could encourage an encounter with the others, fostering the belief that intergroup forgiveness between groups in conflict is possible.

Those who most value the NTRC's work also think it contributed to revealing the truth about what happened to victims and to creating a comprehensive history that includes the different positions of the actors involved in the conflict. Its contribution to imparting justice is considered substantial, although less relevant than the previous two contributions. Fulfilling certain social functions of collective memory and, to a lesser extent, justice, are important factors that predict belief in intergroup forgiveness.

Perceiving the social climate as positive and trusting in institutions are both excellent predictors of belief in intergroup forgiveness. People who think that institutions work properly and that the social climate is positive also believe that intergroup forgiveness is possible. Thus, transitional justice activities are more relevant within contexts where public trust is not severely harmed and institutions operate properly, so that the impartiality of research into the past can be ensured. A TRC can only be successful if the population firmly believes that it can do a serious and honest job, and this is only possible in a climate of institutional trust. If institutions are discredited, TRCs have no chance of being supported (Beristain et al., 2010). Belief in intergroup forgiveness is also related to the effectiveness attributed to institutional apologies as a reflection of understanding victims' pain. These apologies may provide a measure of the extent to which authorities are seen to be truly willing to advance in the quest for truth and become aware of victims' suffering. Without effective apologies, victims do not believe in forgiveness (Mullet et al., 2011).

Thus, belief in intergroup forgiveness depends on the confluence of different variables. The most relevant variable appears to be the emotions evoked, with sadness/pain and hope being good predictors of these beliefs. Guilt would be related to rejecting intergroup forgiveness, showing that such work does not always support reparation and may be associated with denial. Belief in forgiveness is also based on the TRC's contribution to revealing the truth and creating

a comprehensive history, along with its perceived success in punishing the guilty. Likewise, social sharing of the past is a significant predictor of supporting forgiveness between groups. Lastly, perceiving the social climate as positive, believing that apologies have been effective, and trusting that institutions operate properly are highly relevant factors in belief in intergroup forgiveness.

The results of the present study provide evidence that the people in the sample do not believe in the possibilities of social forgiveness, regardless of their political position or age. Neither the victims nor the affected people manifest the belief that the victims can forgive the perpetrators, which explains the low explanation provided by the different models together. Therefore, it is important to focus on the variables that were shown to be significant in this study. Reducing anger, reaching the most complete understanding possible of the truth (it is important to recall that in Chile there are still detained people who were never found and family members who fight to recover them), carrying out rituals recognizing the victims and their suffering, and advancing measures to recognize the horror caused (mainly by State institutions involved in human rights violations), which would involve giving appropriate and sincere apologies, can contribute to creating a climate of greater safety and trust. These seem to be key tasks of a post-conflict society. Twenty-five years after the end of the military dictatorship, Chile continues to be a segmented country that is far from reaching social reconciliation. People in general, and not only the victims, do not believe in the possibility of forgiveness by the victims. This situation, whether we like it or not, reflects the society we have been creating: a society where distrust between groups reigns, where the victims feel anger not only toward the perpetrators, but also toward a State that makes them invisible and denies them recognition, where every once in a while we still uncover victims' remains, and where the perpetrators go unpunished.

References

- Aguilar P., Balcells L., & Cebolla H.** (2011). Las actitudes de los españoles ante las medidas de justicia transicional relativas a la guerra civil y al franquismo [Spaniard's attitudes towards civil war and francoism's transitional justice measures]. *Revista Internacional de Sociología*, *69*, 59–90. <http://dx.doi.org/10.3989/ris.2009.06.30>
- Avruch K.** (2010). Truth and reconciliation commissions: Problems in transitional justice and the reconstruction of identity. *Transcultural Psychiatry*, *47*, 33–49. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1363461510362043>
- Bar-Tal D.** (Ed.) (2011). *Intergroup conflicts and their resolution: Social psychological perspective*. Hove, UK and New York, NY: Psychology Press: Frontiers of Social Psychology Series.
- Baumeister R. F., Exline J. J., & Sommer K. L.** (1998). The victim role, grudge theory, and two dimensions of forgiveness. In E. L. Worthington, Jr. (Ed.), *Dimensions of forgiveness: Psychological research and theological principles* (pp. 79–106). Philadelphia, PA: Templeton Foundation Press.
- Bellelli G., Leone G., & Cursi A.** (1999). Emoción y memoria colectiva. El recuerdo de los acontecimientos públicos [Emotion and collective memory. The memory of public events]. *Psicología política*, *18*, 101–124.
- Beristain C. M., Páez D., Rimé B., & Kanyangara P.** (2010). Psychosocial effects of participation in rituals of transitional justice. *Revista de Psicología Social*, *25*, 47–60. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1174/021347410790193450>
- Brahms E.** (2009). What is a truth commission and why does it matter? *Peace and Conflict Review*, *3*, 1–14.
- Brounéus K.** (2008). Truth-telling as talking cure? Insecurity and Retraumatization in the Rwandan Gacaca Courts. *Security Dialogue*, *39*, 55–76. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0967010607086823>
- Brown R., González R., Zagefka H. Manzi J., & Cehajic S.** (2008). Nuestra culpa: Collective guilt and shame as predictors of reparation for historical wrongdoing. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *94*, 75–90. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.94.1.75>
- Brown R., & Cehajic S.** (2008). Dealing with the past and facing the future: Mediators of the effects of collective guilt and shame in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *38*, 669–684. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.466>
- Cárdenas M., Páez D., & Rimé B.** (2013a). El impacto psicosocial de los procesos transicionales en Chile: Evaluación de los efectos de las Comisiones Nacionales de “Verdad y Reconciliación” y “prisión política y tortura” [The psychosocial impact of transitional processes in Chile: Assessing the impact of the National Commissions on “Truth and Reconciliation” and “Political Imprisonment and Torture”]. *Revista de Psicología Social*, *28*, 145–156.
- Cárdenas M., Páez D., & Rimé B.** (2013b). Transitional justice processes, shared narrative memory about past collective violence and reconciliation. In R. Cabecinhas & L. Abadia (Eds.). *Narratives and social memory: Theoretical and methodological approaches* (pp. 61–75). Braga, Portugal: University of Minho.
- Cárdenas M., Páez D., Rimé B., Bilbao A., & Asún D.** (2014). Personal emotions, emotional climate, social sharing, beliefs, and values among people affected and unaffected by past political violence. *Peace & Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, *20*, 452–464. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/pac0000038>
- Cárdenas M., Páez D., Arnosó M., & Rimé B.** (2013). Percepción del clima socioemocional y la confianza institucional en víctimas de violencia política: Valoración del impacto de la comisión nacional de verdad y reconciliación [The perception of the socio-emotional climate and institutional trust in victims of political violence: Impact assessment of the national commission of truth and reconciliation]. *Psyche*, *22*, 111–127. <http://dx.doi.org/10.7764/psyche.22.2.572>

- Comisión Nacional de Verdad y Reconciliación** (1991). Informe de la Comisión Nacional de Verdad y Reconciliación [Report of the National Commission on Truth and Reconciliation]. Santiago, Chile: Andros Impresores.
- Comisión Nacional de Prisión Política y Tortura** (2014). Informe de la Comisión Nacional de Prisión Política y Tortura [Report of the National Commission on Political Imprisonment and Torture]. Santiago, Chile: Author. Retrieved from <http://www.comisionvalech.gov.cl/InformeValech.html>
- De Rivera J., & Páez D.** (2007). Emotional climates, human security, and cultures of peace. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63, 233–253. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2007.00506.x>
- Devos T., Silver L. A., Mackie D. M., & Smith E. R.** (2002). Experiencing intergroup emotions. In D. M. Mackie & E. R. Smith (Eds.), *From prejudice to intergroup emotions: Differentiated reactions to social groups* (pp. 113–134). Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Dresler-Hawke E., & Liu J. H.** (1996). Collective shame and the positioning of German national identity. *Psicología Política*, 32, 131–153.
- Exteberría I., Conejero S., & Pascual A.** (2011). La culpa en contextos de violencia política [Guilt in contexts of political violence]. In D. Páez, M. Beristain, J. L. González, N. Basabe, & J. de Rivera (Eds.), *Superando la violencia colectiva y construyendo cultura de paz* [Overcoming collective violence and building a culture of peace] (pp. 39–68). Madrid, Spain: Fundamentos.
- Fehr R., Gelfand M. J., & Nag M.** (2010). The road to forgiveness: A meta-analytic synthesis of its situational and dispositional correlates. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136, 894–914. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0019993>
- Fredrickson B.** (2009). *Positivity*. New York, NY: Crown.
- Hayner P. B.** (2001). *Unspeakable truths: Confronting state terror and atrocity*. New York, NY: Routledge.
- Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas** (2003). *Censo 2002. Síntesis de Resultados*. [Census 2002. Summary of Results] Santiago, Chile: La Nación SA. Retrieved from <http://www.ine.cl/cd2002/sintesisencensal.pdf>
- Jelin E., & Langland I.** (2003). *Monumentos, memoriales y marcas territoriales* [Monuments, memorials and territorial markings]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Siglo XXI.
- Kaminer D., Stein D. J., Mbanga I., & Zungu-Dirwayi N.** (2001). The truth and reconciliation commission in South Africa: Relation to psychiatric status and forgiveness among survivors of human rights violations. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 178, 373–377. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1192/bjp.178.4.373>
- Kanyangara P.** (2008). *Justice et verité après un genocide: Impact psychosocial sur le pardon et la reconciliation* [Justice and truth after genocide: Psychosocial impact on forgiveness and reconciliation]. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Faculte de Psychologie. Louvain, Belgique.
- Kanyangara P., Rimé B., Philippot P., & Yzerbit V.** (2007). Collective rituals, emotional climate and intergroup perception: Participation in Gacaca tribunals and the assimilation of the Rwandan genocide. *Journal of Social Issues*, 63, 387–403. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2007.00515.x>
- Lira E.** (2010). La reparación a las víctimas: Una responsabilidad del Estado [The reparation to victims: A state responsibility]. *Mensaje*, 59, 6–11.
- Lira E.** (2011). Verdad, reparación y justicia: El pasado que sigue vivo en el presente [Truth, justice and reparation: The past is still alive in the present]. In Instituto Interamericano de Derechos Humanos. *Contribución de las políticas de verdad, justicia y reparación a las democracias en América Latina* [Contribution of policies of truth, justice and reparation for democracies in Latin America] (pp.85–127). San José, Costa Rica: IIDH.
- Mackie D. M., & Smith E. R.** (Eds.) (2002). *From prejudice to intergroup emotions: Differentiated reactions to social groups*. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.
- Manzi J.** (2006). Memoria colectiva del golpe de estado en Chile [Collective memory of the coup d'état in Chile]. In M. Carretero, A. Rosa, & M. F. González (Eds.), *Enseñanza de la historia y memoria colectiva* [Teaching history and collective memory]. Buenos Aires, Argentina: Paidós.
- Manzi J., Ruiz S., Krause M., Meneses A., Haye A., & Kronmüller E.** (2004). Memoria colectiva del golpe de Estado de 1973 en Chile [Collective memory of the 1973 military coup in Chile]. *Revista Interamericana de Psicología*, 38, 153–169.
- Manzi J., & González R.** (2007). Forgiveness and reparation in Chile: The role of cognitive and emotional intergroup antecedents. *Peace & Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 13, 71–91. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0094025>
- Morton T. A., & Postmes T.** (2011). Moral duty or moral defense? The effects of perceiving shared humanity with the victims of in-group perpetrated harm. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 41, 127–134.
- Mullet E., Nann S., Kandiangu J., Neto F., & Pinto M. da C.** (2011). Hacia una política positiva: El caso del perdón en el contexto intergrupala de África y Asia [Towards a positive policy: The case of intergroup forgiveness in the context of Africa and Asia]. In D. Páez, M. Beristain, J. L. González, N. Basabe, & J. de Rivera (Eds.), *Superando la violencia colectiva y construyendo cultura de paz* [Overcoming collective violence and building a culture of peace] (pp. 377–398). Madrid, Spain: Fundamentos.
- Nadler A., & Schnabel N.** (2008). Instrumental and socioemotional paths to intergroup reconciliation and the need-based model of socio-emotional reconciliation. In A. Nadler, T. E. Malloy, & J. D. Fisher (Eds.), *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Reconciliation* (pp.37–56). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Nadler A., Malloy T. E., & Fisher J. D.** (2008). *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Reconciliation*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Noor M., Brown R., & Prentice G.** (2008). Prospects for intergroup reconciliation: Social-psychological predictors of intergroup forgiveness and reparation in Northern Ireland and Chile. In A. Nadler, T. E. Malloy, & J. D. Fisher (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup reconciliation* (pp. 97–114). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Páez D.** (2010). Official or political apologies and improvement of intergroup relations: A neo-Durkheimian approach to official apologies as rituals. *Revista de Psicología*

- Social: International Journal of Social Psychology*, 25, 101–115. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1174/021347410790193504>
- Philpot C. R., & Hornsey M. J.** (2008). What happens when groups say sorry: The effects of intergroup apologies. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34, 474–487. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167207311283>
- Rimé B., Finkenauer C., Luminet O., Zech E., & Philippot P.** (1998). Social sharing of emotion: New evidence and new questions. In W. Stroebe & M. Hewstone (Eds.), (pp. 845–189). Chichester, UK: Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Rimé B., Kanyangara P., Yzerbyt V., & Paez D.** (2011). The impact of Gacaca tribunals in Rwanda: Psychosocial effects of participation in a truth and reconciliation process after a genocide. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 41, 695–706. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.822>
- Sikkink K., & Booth Walling C.** (2007). The Impact of human rights in Latin America. *Journal of Peace Research*, 44, 427–445. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022343307078953>
- Staub E., Pearlman L. A., Gubin A., & Hagengimana A.** (2005). Healing, reconciliation, forgiving and the prevention of violence after genocide or mass killing: An intervention and its experimental evaluation in Rwanda. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 24, 297–334. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/jscp.24.3.297.65617>
- Stroebe W., & Stroebe M.** (1996). The social psychology of social support. In T. Higgins & W. Kruglanski: *Social psychology: Handbook of basic principles* (pp. 597–622). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.
- Tam T., Hewston M., Cairns E., Tausch N., Maio G., & Kenworthy J.** (2007). The impact of intergroup emotions on forgiveness in Northern Ireland. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 10, 119–135. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1368430207071345>
- Tam T., Hewstone M., Kenworthy J. B., Cairns E., Marinetti C., Geddes L., & Parkinson B.** (2008). Postconflict reconciliation: Intergroup forgiveness and implicit biases in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Social Issues*, 64, 303–320. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.00563.x>
- van Tongeren D. R., Burnette J. L., O’Boyle E., Worthington E. L. Jr., & Forsyth D. R.** (2014). A meta-analysis of intergroup forgiveness. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 9, 81–95. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17439760.2013.844268>
- Vázquez C., & Páez D.** (2011). Post-traumatic growth in Spain. In T. Weiss & R. Berger (Eds.), *Post-traumatic growth and culturally competent practice* (pp. 97–112). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley and Sons.
- Wohl M. J. A., Hornsey M. J., & Bennett S. H.** (2012). Why group apologies succeed and fail: Intergroup forgiveness and the role of primary and secondary emotions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 102, 306–322. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0024838>
- Wohl M. J. A., & Branscombe N. R.** (2005). Forgiveness and collective guilt assignment to historical perpetrator groups depend on level of social category inclusiveness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 288–303. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.88.2.288>
- Zech E., Rimé B., & Nils F.** (2004). Social sharing of emotion, emotional recovery, and interpersonal aspects. In P. Philippot & R. Feldman (Eds.). *The regulation of emotion* (pp. 159–188). New York, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.