

EFFECTS OF GROUP MEMBERSHIP ON THE TRANSMISSION OF NEGATIVE HISTORICAL EVENTS

J. Marques, D. Páez, J. Valencia, O. Vincze

Universities of Porto, Basque Country and Pecze

RESUMEN

Los estudios muestran que la fuente de un rumor, o el que implica al endogrupo o exogrupo son aspectos fundamentales a tener en cuenta en cómo las personas se enfrentan a la transmisión de información. Los tres trabajos que se presentan aunando los resultados de estudios llevados a cabo sobre las emociones colectivas, los rumores y las variables que inciden en su transmisión, y los mecanismos de defensa de las identidades sociales, analizarán la manera en la que los miembros de un grupo se enfrentan con hechos negativos para este mismo endogrupo.

ABSTRACT

Previous studies show that the source of a historical *rumour* as well as whether it involves in-group or out-group events are powerful determinant of the way individuals deal with the transmitted information. The present studies, knitting together perspectives on collective emotions such as guilt, rumour findings in transmission variables and the reconstruction of information and social identity defence mechanisms, attempted to analyse how group members deal with an in-group (as compared to an out-group) derogating event. The transmission of historical events in the context of inter-group relations were analysed in three studies.

Key words: historical event, collective emotion, defence mechanism, group membership

The transmission of historical events in the context of inter-group relations were analysed in three studies. In Study 1 (N=324) and Study 2 (N=155), Target and Source affected the evaluation of the same event transmitted across triads. The third study integrated similar conditions as those in studies 1 and 2. In all studies, participants assigned more credibility to information when it arose from an in-group source and when the traumatic collective event was related to an out-group. Higher guilt and shame were reported when the target was a national in-group. Credibility was associated to shame and guilt when the traumatic event was related to the in-group. Higher identification with the in-group (particularly ethnic identity) was related to higher cognitive coping (particularly minimisation) with collective negative past events.

Previous studies indicate that participants assigned less credibility to the message, were more actively engaged in assimilation, and recalled the message worse when it concerned the in-group than the out-group target. In

addition, participants reported higher guilt and shame when the message concerned the in-group than the out-group.

With regard to the source membership, participants believed the message more, and engaged less in assimilation when the source was the in-group than the out-group (Páez & Marques, 1999). Moreover, the interaction between message target and message source shows that participants less accurately transmitted the message when it dealt with the in-group and was conveyed by an in-group source, than in all other conditions. Participants also reconstructed the message more when it dealt with the in-group and was conveyed by the out-group source, than in every other case. Finally, when the event concerned the in-group, lower credibility and relevance assigned to the message, as well as higher reconstruction and forgetting were associated with a lower level of negativity of self-conscious emotions.

Results obtained in previous studies show that the source of a historical *rumour* as well as whether it involves in-group or out-group events may be a powerful determinant of the way individuals deal with the transmitted information. We attempted to increase the external validity of results obtained in a previous study by having participants receive the message from three “independent” sources instead of a single one.

Allport and Postman (1947b) claimed that the typical procedure used in the studies of rumour imply that one person transmits a message to another person. However, this is perhaps the less frequently occurring situation in daily life. In fact, most information arises from different sources and in different versions. Receivers may select and evaluate this information by appraising their common and distinctive components and their different sources. The number of people who speak or spread a rumour was also associated to credibility and to rumour transmission. Probably “hearing” some information from three people should reinforce processes and effects related to the informal communication of rumour. Moreover, a multiple transmission is probably akin to social processes of memory, such as the cross-generational transmission of traumatic collective events. Finally, a higher number of sources reinforce the process and effects of informal communication (e.g. higher number of people who spread the rumour reinforces credibility and transmission). We thus attempted to generate these conditions in the present study.

Hypotheses and Overview of Studies

With the present studies, and combining perspectives on collective emotions such as guilt, rumour findings in transmission variables and re-

construction of information and social identity defence mechanisms, we attempted to analyse how group members deal with an in-group (as compared to an out-group) derogating event. This event had been pre-tested to induce negative affect, particularly collective guilt and shame. Each participant learned the event either from an in-group or an out-group source, and communicated it to other in-group members.

In Study 1, we provided Portuguese participants with information about a (fictitious) historical massacre, according to a 2 (Target: In-group vs. Out-group) x 2 (Source: In-group vs. Out-group) between-participants design.

In the in-group target condition, participants learned that the massacre's perpetrators had been Portuguese mercenaries. In the out-group target condition, the mercenaries were Spanish.

We further divided the participants according to whether the source of information was the in-group (Portuguese) or the out-group (Spanish). Participants listened to the message and then evaluated its relevance, credibility, and reported positive-negative feelings as well as guilt/shame triggered by the event. Only then, we asked participants to write the message so that it could be transmitted to other participants. This allowed us to measure omission sharpening and assimilation (Allport & Postman, 1947a), according to several indices. We attempted to increase the external validity of the results by having participants receive the message from three "independent" sources instead of a single one.

We expected that the In-group negative event would induce more guilt and shame than the negative Out-group event. In this sense, five general hypotheses were made in relation to how people dealt with collective guilt and shame, by means of appraisal of credibility, relevance and processes and results of information reconstruction.

First, we expected participants to transmit the event less accurately, to reconstruct more positively and to assign to it less relevance and less credibility when the target was the in-group rather than the out-group (Hypothesis 1).

Second, we expected participants to assign more credibility and more relevance, and to be more accurate when the information source was the in-group instead of the out-group (Hypothesis 2).

However, we might expect that, when the message concerns the in-group target, a more credible source would generate higher threat than a less credible source. Hence, as a corollary to hypotheses 1 and 2, we predicted a Target x Source interaction: participants would evaluate less negatively and assign less credibility to the message and reconstruct or assimilate it more in the Out-group Source/In-group Target condition than in all

other conditions. Participants would also make more omissions and show worse recall in the In-group Source/In-group Target condition than in all other conditions (Hypothesis 3).

Lower credibility, relevance, omission, recall and higher assimilation of the message, because this helps deal with a collective negative past event, should be related to lower guilt and shame, particularly when this event concerned the in-group (Hypothesis 4).

Finally, high identifiers with the national in-group should show higher level of coping responses (Hypothesis 5).

Study 1

Method

Participants. Participants were 178 male and 146 female Portuguese first- and second-year undergraduate students (N=324), aged 16 to 28 (average age was 21). Participants were randomly assigned to the four conditions. Within each condition, participants were randomly assigned to three positions on the transmission chain. Finally, in each condition, we randomly assigned the participants in each chain position to triads, who listened to the original message, triads who read the messages from the first triads, or triads who read the messages from the second triads.

Procedure. Upon entering the experimental room, participants were made aware that the study was *part of an investigation about the Discoveries*. Participants in the first chain position were asked to listen carefully to the soundtrack from a television documentary. The stimulus-message went as follows: "When the Portuguese (vs. the Spanish) recall the historical achievements of their ancestors, are they by any chance aware that many of their grandparents were common murderers? One should not conceal the sad memory of the Delta Legion: a group of three hundred Portuguese (vs. Spanish) mercenaries from the various regions of Portugal (vs. Spain), who spread terror and infamy throughout Brazil (vs. Uruguay). They banned the natives from the fertile lands in exchange for a few pieces of gold, and from every slaughtered Indian; they cut off an ear as proof of a completed mission. At daybreak of an Easter Sunday, those Portuguese (vs. Spanish) besieged a village of the Guarani tribe and, with torches, set it alight. The weakness of the elderly Indians was fatal: they were burnt to death. Running away in panic, some Indians found themselves unarmed and confined to the cliffs, while trying to escape. The slaughter began. The tribe's greatest warriors died defenceless at the mercy of firearms they had never seen

before. Screaming in terror, the children were dragged from the women's arms and thrown into the flames. Some women thought they had escaped, but it was pure illusion: the murders were also attracted to their beauty".

In the In-group Source condition, participants were told that the excerpt was taken from a broadcast by the Portuguese Television International Network (RTPI). In the Out-group Source condition, they were informed that the excerpt was taken from the Spanish Television International Network (TVEI). In this latter condition, the speaker spoke in Portuguese but with a Spanish accent. This is a common feature on the Portuguese cable network. After listening to the message, participants evaluated its content according to relevance and credibility. Participants then received a blank sheet and reported that content as accurately as possible.

After being typed and corrected for misspellings, the written reports produced by the participants in the first position were randomly divided in sets of three. Each participant in the second position received three reports written by three participants in the first position. Participants in this second position then wrote their own reports that were, again, corrected, typed, and passed on in groups of three to participants in the third position.

To control for order effects, we presented the three versions of each triad in a different sequence to each member of the next triad. The instructions given to the participants in position 2 and 3 were: "You will read three accounts. A different participant in the study wrote each account. The accounts correspond to their recollections of a RTP (vs. TVE) documentary. Because different people wrote the accounts, these accounts may differ in some details, but they refer to the same documentary. You should come to a personal conclusion based on the *three accounts*. Participants then evaluated the accounts for relevance and credibility.

Next, we requested participants to "write down the content of the documentary as accurately as possible. Please try to write down a text as consistent as possible with what would have been the content of the documentary. In other words, you should try to transmit the content of the documentary according to the versions you read, rather than to simply summarizing them separately". Participants were fully debriefed at the end of each session.

Dependent Measures

We employed two sets of measures. The first set dealt with participants' evaluation of the message. The second set dealt with the specific process of rumour transmission.

Message Credibility and Relevance. Four items assessed *credibility*: (1) “In your opinion, the message you heard (read) ...”. Each question was answered by means of four seven-point scales ranging from “1”(=“stems from an unreliable source”, “is biased”, “is deceitful”, and “does not stand for a true fact”, respectively) to “7”(=“stems from a reliable source”, “is unbiased”, “is trustworthy”, and “stands for a true fact”, respectively). Answers to these items were collapsed into a *credibility* score (Cronbach’s alpha=0.73). Four items assessed the relevance ascribed to the message: “In your opinion, the excerpt that you just heard (read) is...”. Response-scales ranged from “1” (=“not very surprising”, “unimportant”, “not very disturbing”, and “irrelevant”, respectively) to “7”(=“extremely surprising”, “important”, “very disturbing”, and “striking”, respectively). These items were collapsed into a relevance score (Cronbach’s alpha=0.62).

Emotional Reactions. To check for emotional reactions, we asked participants to indicate, on a 7 point scale (1=low intensity; 7=high intensity) the extent to which the story triggered each of nine emotions. Following previous research (e.g. Frijda, 1986; Izard, 1993; Lewis, 1993), we averaged these emotions on two scores: a) positive-negative emotional reaction was composed by so-called basic emotions (joy, anger, fear, disgust, contempt, sadness, and anguish); b) self-conscious evaluative emotions were composed by shame and guilt. Cronbach’s alpha was $\alpha=0.81$ and $\alpha=0.55$, respectively for positive-negative emotional reaction and self-conscious evaluative emotions.

Omission, Recall, Assimilation and Final Version. To obtain an *omission score*, we provided six independent judges with 24 categories. The judges had been previously trained to evaluate material identical to that generated by the participants, and were blind to the experimental factors. Also, we omitted all references to geographic locations from the messages, and replaced references to real groups by letters “X”, “Y”, “Z”, and “W”. The judges’ task was to identify whether each category was present in the account made by each participant. Whenever at least five out of the six judges considered a unit to be absent from a participant’s account, we encoded it as an omission. Omission or forgetting thus stands for the total number of categories absent from each participant’s account divided by the total number of categories. It corresponds to Allport and Postman’s (1945) notion of levelling.

For reasons of convenience, instead of measuring sharpening, we decided to assess accuracy of recall. We had the six judges evaluating

whether each participant (a) identified the actors involved, (b) described the main actions of the massacre, and (c) explicitly related the aggressors to the depicted massacre. We encoded each item as a recall unit, whenever at least five judges considered that a participant's account included it. *Recall* amounts to the sum of the categories that participants recalled, and ranged from 0 (= no item was marked by the judges) to 3 (= all items were marked by the judges). Hence, recall is the reverse of sharpening. Judges also encoded *assimilation*, according to five categories: (a) rambles on about the topic instead of recalling it; b) clearly expresses a personal point of view; c) tries to explain the event; d) adds new facts of historical nature; (e) justifies the event applying to positive historical aspects. *Assimilation* scored from 0 (= no item was marked) to 5 (= all items marked).

In order to have a holistic view of the final informational outcome, two blind judges content analyzed the 56 last chain versions, coding the presence/absence of a) massacres; b) rapes; c) criticism towards perpetrators, d) mentions of America's discovery. Because of the clarity of the codes employed more than a 90% agreement was possible.

Results and Discussion

We analyzed the data according to a Target (In-group vs. Out-group) x Source (In-group vs. Out-group) between-participants design. We found significant multivariate effects for Target ($F_{4, 266}=8.85, p<.001$), Source ($F_{4, 266}=6.26, p<.001$), and Target x Source ($F_{4, 266}=2.89, p<.03$). The remaining multivariate effects were non-significant (highest $F_{4, 266}<2.00$, ns)

Target Effects.

Univariate effects supported Hypothesis 1. Participants assigned less *relevance* to the message about the in-group than the out-group target, respectively, ($M=4.70, SD=1.20$, and $M=5.02, SD=1.05$; $F_{1, 320}=6.19, p<.02$). *Credibility* was lower for the In-group ($M=4.55, SD=1.02$), than the Out-group target, ($M=4.71, SD=0.87$; $F_{1, 320}=4.09, p<.05$). Participants also reported more intense *guilt and shame* in the In-group than in the Out-group condition, ($M=2.70, SD=1.70$, and $M=2.4, SD=1.40$; $F_{1, 320}=3.5, p<.05$). In turn, *positive-negative emotional reactions* were lower in the In-group than in the Out-group target condition ($M=3.38, SD=1.51$, and $M=3.86, SD=1.17$; $F_{1, 320}=21.08, p<.002$).

Omission, recall, assimilation and content of the final version, also supported Hypothesis 1. Omission was higher in the in-group ($M=17.25, SD=5.07$) than in the out-group target condition ($M=13.96, SD=4.44$; $F_{1, 320}=38.89, p<.001$). Participants also depicted lower recall in the in-group

than in the out-group target condition ($M=1.83$, $SD=1.15$, and $M= 2.71$, $SD=0.64$; $F_{1, 320}=75.77$, $p<.001$). Concomitantly, participants showed stronger *assimilation* in the in-group than in the out-group target condition ($M=2.02$, $SD=1.34$, and $M=1.28$, $SD=1.06$; $F_{1, 320}=30.81$, $p<.001$).

Content analyses of the 102 last chain versions, coding the presence/absence of a) massacres; b) rapes; c) criticism towards perpetrators, d) mentioning America's discovery show that massacres appear in 4% of in-group narratives (targets were Portuguese) and 28% out-group narratives (targets were Spanish, Chi square =10,05, $p<.05$). Rapes were mentioned in 13% of in-group narratives and in 54% of out-group narratives, Chi square =18,4, $p<.05$. Criticism of perpetrators appear in 30% of in-group narratives and 56% of out-group narratives, Chi square =30,1, $p<.05$. 46% mention America's Discovery in the in-group narratives and only 26% in the out-group version.

Source Effects.

In support of *Hypothesis 2*, participants assigned higher credibility to the in-group ($M=4.95$, $SD=1.03$), than the out-group source ($M=4.39$, $SD=1.09$; $F_{1, 269}=20.82$, $p<.001$). Negative emotional reactions were also higher in the in-group than in the out-group source condition, respectively, $M=4.28$, $SD=1.27$, and $M=3.98$, $SD=1.12$; $F_{1, 269}=7.66$, $p<.01$. Source did not affect *relevance*, and *guilt and shame* (both $F_{1, 269} < 1$).

Target x Source Effects (Hypothesis 3). We found significant univariate Target x Source interactions for credibility and guilt and shame, respectively, $F_{(1, 269)}=6.23$, $p<.02$, and $F_{(1, 269)}=5.84$, $p<.02$). As we can see in Table 1 (this table collapsed means from this and the third study. Conditions are comparable and mean profiles are similar), participants showed the lowest credibility to the message in the In-group Target/Out-group Source condition than in all the others. Concomitantly, participants reported higher guilt and shame in the in-group Target/In-group Source condition than in all the other conditions.

Correlational Analysis (Hypothesis 4). We checked for the relationship of *guilt and shame* with *relevance and credibility* assigned to the message in the in-group target condition ($r=.19$, $p<.04$, and $r=.22$, $p<.02$). In the out-group target condition, these correlations were ($r=.21$, $p<.02$, and $r=.08$). Results indicate that higher credibility of the negative event is associated with higher guilt and shame particularly when the event concerned the in-group.

Our results suggest that one way people protect their social identity when facing a negative past collective in-group event is by minimizing it:

they assign lower credibility to the event and they evaluate it less negatively than when the event involves the out-group.

The results also show that an in-group source has more informational influence than an out-group source. The former source induces more credibility and a higher negative emotional reaction than does the latter. Participants reported more intense collective shame and guilt when both source and target belonged to the in-group. The strongest minimization occurred when the event was related to the in-group and when the source was the out-group. Finally, lower credibility was related to lower level of guilt and shame. This was particularly the case when the event involved the in-group. This suggests that minimization helps dealing with collective negative self-conscious emotions (e.g. Baumeister & Hastings, 1997).

As a whole, the present study supports the idea that group members build consensus around issues relevant to their social identity through informal social communication. Participants assigned less relevance to, and attempted to reconstruct a negative historical event more when it involved the in-group than the out-group.

Traditional research shows that the progression of rumours decreases the relevance assigned to it as well as the accuracy of its transmission (cf. Allport & Postman, 1945). Our data is consistent with this general effect.

However, the data also shows that such decrease is goal-directed (cf. Higgins, McCann & Fondocaro, 1982). Participants distorted the original message in order to match a favourable in-group image. In a previous study (Marques & Paez, 1999), Target did not significantly affect *relevance*. However, taken together both studies show that participants assigned higher relevance to the information in the out-group compared to the in-group target condition (mean effect size: $r=0.12$; effect sizes of Study 1, $r=0.08$, and Study 2, $r=0.14$). Participants also showed better *recall* in the out-group target condition (mean effect size: $r=0.38$), and more *assimilation* in the in-group target condition (mean effect size: $r=0.32$). In the same vein, *omission* was associated with the in-group target ($r=0.12$ in the previous study and $r=0.33$ in Study 1, mean effect size $r=0.26$). Participants omitted more information, redefined the rumour, and expressed their personal opinion more when the rumour regarded the in-group.

In general, subjects remembered 42% of the ideas in the out-group information, and 28% of ideas in the case of the in-group. We found fair support for the predicted effects of Source. Participants assigned more credibility to the in-group than to the out-group source ($r=0.12$; effect sizes of previous study, $r=0.09$, and Study 1, $r=0.13$).

Finally, both studies showed that participants were less accurate in transmitting the message (as measured by *recall*) when the in-group source communicated about the in-group than in the remaining conditions. In sum, our findings support the idea that informal communication is an important channel of social differentiation through which group members attenuate the potential damage of negative historical events to their social identity.

Study 2

Results obtained in the previous study show that the source of a historical *rumour* as well as whether it involves in-group or out-group events influences the way individuals deal with the transmitted information. However, the results may be due to the different beliefs or stereotypes that Portuguese individuals share about the colonial practices of Portuguese as explorers and navigators and of Spanish as conquerors. In other terms, stereotypes partially based on factual historical experience can explain part of responses.

In the XVIIth century Portugal called Region or Provinces what other nations called colonies. In the XXth century, the official governments in Portugal and Brazil spread a *White Legend* or the view of *luso-tropicalism*: equality between Portugal and colonies, multiculturalism *avant la lettre* and race mixture was supposed to be central features of portuguese settlements (Ferro, 1994). Studies on the social representations of America's discovery show that portuguese mention more features related to this White Legend of *explorers* and *navigators* than Brazilian subjects when asked to associate ideas to Brazil Discovery.

Results suggest that the *navigator and explorer belief* cluster is related to historical experience and anchored in defence of social identity (de Sa and de Olivera, 2002). In order to increase the external validity of results obtained in Study 1, Spanish participants in Study 2 received the message about three targets instead of two.

Spanish participants living in the Basque Country judged either Portuguese, Spanish or Basque targets. Identification with the national or ethnic group is an important moderator variable, as studies on collective guilt reviewed by Branscombe (2004) has found. People reporting higher national identification showed a stronger coping mechanism when facing threatening historical events. In the predominantly nationalist Basque Country, even if most people feel that they are both Spanish and Basque at the same time, an important minority (33% in surveys) self-categorise as only Basque and levels of identification as Basque are higher than levels of identification as Spanish (Paez et al, 2003). Moreover, using different tar-

gets we were able to differentiate the effects of national and ethnic identification.

On the other hand, we have found that lower credibility and higher reconstruction are used as ways of coping with a negative past event of the in-group. However, psychological distancing of the perpetrators excluding them of the in-group as black sheep and atypical persons, identification with a supra-category (like Europeans instead of national or ethnic identification), framing the event as understandable in this era and minimisation of the frequency of negative behaviours are also important cognitive alternatives to cope with a threatening past event, inducing guilt and shame. For instance Dressler-Hawke & Liu (2003) found that Germans in front of Jews identified more with Europe, a supra-national category, probably as a way of coping with the collective guilt related to the Holocaust. We thus attempted to integrate these conditions and variables in the present study.

Method

Participants

Participants were 155 Spanish first- and second-year undergraduate students, aged 18 to 37 (average age was 22), of which 23% were male. Participants were randomly assigned to the six conditions. Within each condition, participants were randomly assigned to three positions on the transmission chain. Finally, in each condition, we randomly assigned the participants in each chain position to triads, who listened to the original message, or triads who read the messages from the first triads, or triads who read the messages from the second triads.

Procedure

The procedure was similar to that of Study 1, with some exceptions. After being typed and corrected for misspellings, the written reports produced by the participants in the first position were randomly divided in sets of three.

Each participant in the second position received three reports written by three participants in the first position. Participants in this second position then wrote their own reports that were, again, corrected, typed, and passed on in groups of three to participants in the third position.

In the out-group target condition, participants heard or read about a Portuguese target, in an intermediate condition they heard or read about a Spanish target, and in the last condition they received information about the ethnic in-group or Basque target. Participants in the first chain position were asked to listen carefully to the sound track of a television documentary.

The stimulus-message went as follows: “When the Portuguese (vs. the Spanish vs. the Basques) recall the historical achievements of their ancestors, are they by any chance aware that many of their grandparents were common murderers? One should not conceal the sad memory of the Delta Legion: a group of three hundred Portuguese (vs. Spanish vs. the Basques) mercenaries from the various regions of Portugal (vs. Spain), who spread terror and infamy throughout Brazil (vs. Uruguay). They banned the natives from the fertile lands in exchange for a few pieces of gold, and from every slaughtered Indian; they cut off an ear as proof of a completed mission. At daybreak of an Easter Sunday, those Portuguese (vs. Spanish vs. the Basques) besieged a village of the Guarani tribe and, with torches, set it in panic...”. As in the previous study, participants were fully debriefed at the end of each session.

Moderator Measures

Ethnic and national identification was measured by two items. Participants were asked to report how intensely they identified with the Basque Country, with Spain and with Europe (1= Not at all; 7=A Lot). Identification with Europe was an index of *Identification with a supra-category*.

Dependent Measures

As in Study 1, we collapsed the questionnaire items measuring *relevance* (Cronbach’s alpha=0.72), *credibility* (Cronbach’s alpha=0.84), *positive-negative emotional reaction* (Cronbach’s alpha= 0.87). With respect to *content of the final version*, two blind judges content analyzed the last 36 chain versions, coding the presence absence of a) massacres; b) rapes; c) colonisation, d) mentioning the discovery of America. An agreement of more than 90% was possible.

Minimisation was measured with an item asking “How frequent were these type of behaviours? Low=1, High frequency=7. *Disidentification* or reducing failure by means of a downward in-group comparison, was measured by an item asking “consider the mercenaries to be an exception rather than a typical member group member: How typical are... with respect to their national group: 1 =Not at all; Very Typical=7. *Reframe* or social creativity by framing and explaining because of the context the negative behaviour was measured by a question: “Legion Delta behaviour was Understandable in the *Context* (=4); Not understandable even in the context (=+4)”.

Results and Discussion

We analysed the data according to a Target (Ethnic In-group or Basque vs. National In-group Spanish vs. National Out-group or Portuguese) x

Source (In-group vs. Out-group) between-participants design. We found significant multivariate effects of Target ($F_4, 146=3.69, p<.001$) and Source ($F_4, 145=6.18, p<.001$). The remaining multivariate effects were non-significant (highest $F_4, 146 < 2.00, ns$).

Target Effects

Univariate effects supported Hypothesis 1. Participants assigned less *credibility* to the message about the in-group than the out-group target. *Credibility* was lower for the Basque in-group target ($M=4.25, SD=1.22$), than for the Spanish target ($M=4.63, SD=1.70$) and the Portuguese out-group target ($M=4.97, SD=0.93; F_{1,153}=5.68, p<.01$).

Framing was relatively higher for the Basque in-group target ($M=1.37, SD=2.95$) than for the Spanish target ($M=2.45, SD=2.03$) and the Portuguese out-group ($M=2.39, SD=2.00; F_{2, 153}=3.5, p<.04$).

Minimization was relatively higher (this means reports of lower frequencies) for the Basque in-group target ($M=5.50, SD=1.33$) than for the Spanish target ($M=5.62, SD=1.38$) and Portuguese out-group ($M=6.00, SD=0.99; F_{2, 153}=2.3, p<.10$).

Disidentification was lower for Basque in-group ($M=3.09, SD=1.80$) than Portuguese ($M=4.10, SD=1.80$) or Spanish target ($M=4.50, SD=1.55; F_{2, 153}=13.9, p<.001$). With respect to the final version, massacres and rape appears in most narratives with no differences by targets. Discovery was mentioned in 56% of the Portuguese out-group narratives, in 33% of the Spanish narratives, and in 17% of Basque in-group narratives, Chi square =6,2, $p<.05$. Discovery was mentioned in 56% of Portuguese out-group narratives, in 33% Spanish narratives and in 17% of Basque in-group narratives, Chi square =6,2, $p<.05$. This suggests that subjects use a stereotype related to factual historical past. Colonisation or settlement was mentioned in 50% of Portuguese out-group narratives, in 53% of Basque in-group narratives, and only in 16% of Spanish narratives, Chi square =4,5, $p<.10$. This suggests that subjects defend their ethnic in-group by mentioning more the colonisation in this case than in the national in-group.

Source Effects

In support of Hypothesis 2, participants assigned higher *credibility* to the in-group ($M=4.89, SD=1.11$), than the out-group source ($M=4.30, SD=1.16; F_{1, 148}=11.28, p<.001$). *Relevance* was also higher in the in-group ($M=5.36, SD=0.80$) than in the out-group ($M=4.86, SD=0.95; F_{1, 148}=9.62, p<.002$) source condition. Effect size similar to previous studies: for relevance $r=.21, p<.004$ and for credibility, $r=.26, p<.001$. Participants

also reported more intense *negative emotions* in the in-group ($M=4.30$, $SD=1.40$) than in the out-group source condition ($M=3.70$, $SD=1.20$; $F_{1, 148}=11.4$, $p<.001$). Source did not affect *guilt and shame, minimization, reframe and disidentification* (all F 's $1, 153 < 1$).

Target x Source Effects (Hypothesis 3).

We found marginal significant univariate Target x Source interactions for guilt and shame, $F_{1, 153}=2.54$, $p<.09$. Participants reported higher guilt and shame in the in-group national target or Spanish /in-group source condition than in all the other conditions.

Correlational Analysis (Hypothesis 4 and 5).

We checked for the relationship of *guilt and shame* with *credibility and relevance* assigned to the message in the ethnic in-group target condition. Both results were non significant.

In the Spanish national in-group and Portuguese out-group target condition, the correlations between guilt and shame and credibility were respectively, $r=.45$, $p<.02$, and $r=.24$, $p<.05$). Correlations between relevance and guilt and shame were non significant in both cases. Correlations indicate that higher credibility of the negative event is associated with higher guilt and shame particularly when the event concerned the national in-group. Results are similar to those found in the previous study.

However, when the target was the more central ethnic group, subjects minimise self-conscious emotions dealing with more credible information. As expected, *identification with the Basque Country* was higher than *identification with Spain* (respectively $M=5.51$, $SD=1.48$ and $M=3.93$, $SD=1.76$; $t_{1, 154}=8.97$, $p<.001$). In the ethnic in-group condition, identification with this group (Basque Country) was related but not significantly to *guilt and shame*, $r(54)=.09$, n.s., to disidentification, $r(54)=-.13$, n.s., and unrelated to *framing* behaviour as something comprehensible in the context, $r(54)=-.01$, n.s.. However *identification with the ethnic in-group* was related to higher minimisation $r(54)=-.22$ $p<.05$. In the national in-group condition, identification with the group (Spain) was unrelated to minimisation, framing and disidentification.

As in previous studies, lower credibility was assigned to in-group (both national and ethnic) than to out-group stories. Higher shame and guilt were found in the case of a national in-group target and source. Lower credibility related to a lower level of guilt, particularly the case when the event involved the national in-group. This suggests that minimisation helps dealing with collective negative self-conscious emotions.

However, this study also shows that strong identification with a group, in this case the Basque ethnic in-group, provokes a different pattern of responses: higher credibility is compensated by a minimisation of guilt and shame reactions. This can be explained, because in the case of the ethnic in-group, participants show a higher level of cognitive coping with the negative collective past event. Minimizing the frequency of behaviours, rejecting more murderers as typical members of the group and framing the murders and rape behaviours as more understandable in the context, were more frequent in the ethnic in-group condition than in the case of national in-group and national out-group.

Identification with the ethnic in-group was specifically related to a higher level of minimization. However, identification with the national in-group was unrelated to coping responses and higher identification with Europe was absent in this study as a way of coping with collective guilt and shame.

Study 3

Previous studies have shown that the source of a historical *rumour* as well as whether it involves in-group or out-group events determine how individuals deal with the transmission of negative historical information. However, the results may be due to the different beliefs or stereotypes that Portuguese individuals share about the colonial practices of Portuguese and Spanish *conquerors*, as our previous study suggests. Let us recall that Spanish subjects mention more the discovery of America when talking about Portuguese targets, suggesting that they use a stereotype related to factual historical past.

In order to check for this possibility, in Study 3, we employed a cross-group design in which Portuguese and Spanish participants judged either Portuguese or Spanish targets. With this aim we collapsed some subjects from the first and second study. This study also allows us to undergo a meta-analytical integration of studies 1 and 2.

Finally, in this study we will analyse specifically the role of the position in the chain of serial reproduction. We expected to check that second hand information allows people to use more cognitive coping and that people in the second and third position would show lower levels of relevance, credibility and emotions, particularly in the case of the in-group message.

Method

Participants. Participants were 202 Portuguese and 75 Spanish first- and second-year undergraduate students, aged 16 to 29 (average age was 21),

from which 43% were male. Participants of each nationality were randomly assigned to the four conditions. Within each condition, participants were randomly assigned to three positions on the transmission chain. Finally, in each condition, we randomly assigned the participants in each chain position to triads, who listened to the original message, or triads who read the messages from the first triads, or triads who read the messages from the second triads. Spanish subjects were participants in study 2 reporting a relatively higher identification with Spain and only Spanish and Portuguese target conditions in study 2 were included. 122 Portuguese participants were deleted randomly in order to limit the weight of this nationality in the whole sample.

Procedure. The procedure was that of Study 1 and 2.

Dependent Measures

As in Study 1 and 2, we collapsed the questionnaire items measuring relevance (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.62$), credibility (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.73$), positive-negative emotional reaction (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.81$), and guilt and shame (Cronbach's $\alpha=0.55$).

Results and Discussion

We analyzed the data according to a Nationality (Portuguese vs. Spanish participants) x Target (In-group vs. Out-group) x Source (In-group vs. Out-group) between-participants design. We found significant multivariate effects for Target ($F_4, 266=8.85, p<.001$), Source ($F_4, 266=6.26, p<.001$), and Target x Source ($F_4, 266=2.89, p<.03$). Nationality also had a significant multivariate effect ($F_4, 266=2.94, p<.03$). The remaining multivariate effects were non-significant (highest $F_4, 266 < 2.00, ns$).

Target Effects. Univariate effects supported Hypothesis 1. Participants assigned marginally less *relevance* to the message about the in-group than the out-group target, (respectively, $M=4.72, SD=1.17$, and $M=5.09, SD=0.95$; $F_1, 269=3.27, p<.08$). *Credibility* was lower for the in-group ($M=4.46, SD=1.21$), than the out-group target ($M=4.91, SD=0.92$; $F_1, 269=9.89, p<.01$). Participants also reported more intense *guilt and shame* in the in-group than in the out-group condition, (respectively, $M=2.76, SD=1.60$, and $M=2.34, SD=1.37$; $F_1, 269=5.69, p<.02$). In turn, *positive-negative emotional reactions* were lower in the in-group than in the out-group target condition, (respectively, $M=3.92, SD=1.26$, and $M=4.36, SD=1.11$; $F_1, 269=6.07, p<.02$).

Source Effects

In support of Hypothesis 2, participants assigned higher credibility to the in-group ($M=4.95$, $SD=1.03$), than the out-group source ($M=4.39$, $SD=1.09$; $F_{1, 269}=20.82$, $p<.001$). *Negative emotional reactions* were also higher in the in-group than in the out-group source condition, respectively, $M=4.28$, $SD=1.27$, and $M=3.98$, $SD=1.12$; $F_{1, 269}=7.66$, $p<.01$. Source did not affect *relevance*, and *guilt and shame* (both $F_{1, 269} < 1$).

Target x Source Effects (Hypothesis 3)

We found significant univariate Target x Source interactions for credibility and guilt and shame, (respectively, $F_{1, 269}=6.23$, $p<.02$, and $F_{1, 269}=5.84$, $p<.02$). As we can see in Table 2, participants showed the lowest credibility to the message in the in-group target/out-group source condition than in all the others. Concomitantly, participants reported higher guilt and shame in the in-group target/in-group source condition than in all the other conditions.

Correlational Analysis (Hypothesis 4)

We checked for the relationship of *guilt and shame* with relevance and credibility assigned to the message in the in-group target condition (respectively, $r=.19$, $p<.04$, and $r=.22$, $p<.02$). In the out-group target condition, these correlations were respectively, $r=.21$, $p<.02$, and $r=.08$. These correlations suggest that higher credibility of the negative event is associated with higher guilt and shame, especially when the event concerned the in-group.

Position Effects

Participants assigned higher *relevance* to the message in the first position ($M=5.2$, $SD=1.03$), than in the second position ($M=4.8$, $SD=1.1$) and third position ($M=4.8$, $SD=1.09$; $F_{2, 423}=6.08$, $p<.003$). *Negative emotional reactions* were also higher in the first position than in the second and third position, (respectively, $M=4.28$, $SD=1.27$, and $M=3.98$, $SD=1.12$; $F_{2, 423}=6.9$, $p<.001$). Finally, *guilt and shame* decrease from the first position ($M=2.9$, $SD=1.6$) to the second ($M=2.39$, $SD=1.5$) and third positions ($M=2.4$, $SD=1.5$; $F_{2, 423}=5.08$, $p<.03$). Position did not affect *credibility* ($F_{2, 423} < 1$).

Target x Position Effects.

We found significant univariate Target x Source interactions for *relevance and negative emotions*, (respectively, $F_{2, 423}=3.79$, $p<.03$, and $F_{2, 423}=5.84$, $p<.02$). As can be seen in Table 3, participants' appraisal of

relevance and feeling of negative emotions in the in-group target condition decreased from the first to the second and third position. In the out-group target condition evaluations of relevance and reported negative feelings remain stable.

Our results suggest that one way people protect their social identity when faced with a negative past collective in-group event is by minimizing it: they assign lower credibility to the event and they evaluate it less negatively than when the event involves the out-group.

Moreover, when the information was related to the national in-group, subjects in the second and third position judged the event as less relevant and minimised negative emotional reactions, suggesting that the retransmission of historical information from the first to second and third *generations* was associated with a reconstruction of the event as less important for the national identity and less *disgusting*. On the other hand, subjects in different temporal positions in the chain showed a more stable evaluation of relevance and distress arousal when the negative historical event was associated with another nationality.

Results also show that an in-group source has more informational influence than an out-group source. In-group sources induce more credibility and higher negative emotional reaction than out-group sources.

Participants reported more intense collective shame and guilt when both, source and target, belonged to the in-group. The strongest minimization occurred when the event was related to the in-group and when the source was the out-group. Finally, consistent with results obtained in Study 1 and 2, lower credibility was related to lower level of guilt and shame. This was particularly the case when the event involved the in-group, suggesting that minimisation helps dealing with collective negative self-conscious emotions (e.g. Baumeister & Hastings, 1997).

General Discussion

The studies presented support the idea that group members can feel guilt and shame related to past behaviour of national in-group members. However, the level of self conscious collective emotions (guilt and shame) was relatively low and the reported level of negative emotions was higher, particularly in the case of out-group targets. As Branscombe (2004) concluded, collective guilt is a fragile emotion. Moreover, internal criticism is needed to induce relatively higher levels of collective guilt. Finally, surveys suggest that more distant generations, involved with the national identity, but not committed directly to collective crimes, could feel guilt as a dominant social emotion and be implicated in reparation actions. In relation to

antecedents of collective guilt, our results confirm that some degree of categorisation in the group of perpetrators is needed. Also, that a strong identification induces legitimisation of negative behaviour – and probably is negatively associated to other antecedents, such as feeling responsible for negative actions of in group members that they controlled, and perceiving actions as illegitimate and unjustifiable. On the other hand, past actions are probably perceived as impossible to repair, suggesting that collective guilt could arise even when reparative actions are not possible (Branscombe, 2004).

Studies also support the idea that national group members build consensus about issues relevant to their social identity through informal social communication. Participants assigned less credibility and less relevance, and attempted to reconstruct a negative historical event more, when it involved the in-group than the out-group. If denial is not possible or fails, not only the perpetrators, but also the members of the perpetrators' in-group, question the credibility of the information about these negative behaviours.

Previous research shows worse recall for in-group negative behaviour (Howard and Rothbart, 1980) and that the progression of rumours decreases the relevance assigned to it, as well as, the accuracy of its transmission (cf. Allport & Postman, 1945). In relation to accuracy, percentage of remembered items were around 20-30% in the last chain position in the first two studies and *forgetting or omission* was stronger in the case of in-group information. Our data showed that the decrease, not only in remembering, but also in relevance and negative affect, was related to a past negative event. This minimisation of relevance and emotional reactions appears particularly in the case of in-group behaviours and the reconstruction of the original message is oriented towards the construction of a favourable in-group image - decreasing the relevance and emotional appraisal of the event only in the case of the in-group target. This complements the fact that from the first position and in a stable way, subjects attribute less credibility and evaluate as less emotional in-group related negative information.

Participants also showed better *recall* in the out-group target condition and more *assimilation* in the in-group target condition. These results are congruent with the general trend towards better recall of out-group negative behaviours and worse recall of in-group negative behaviour (Howard and Rothbart, 1980). In the same vein, *omission* was associated with the in-group target. Participants omitted more information, redefined the rumour, and expressed their personal opinion more when the rumour regarded the in-group. Moreover, analysis of the last chain narratives show that subjects *forget* more negative features, like massacres, and remember more positive

aspects, such as the discovery of America and its settlement, in the case of the national in-group.

We found fair support to the predicted effects of Source. Participants assigned more *credibility* to the in-group than to the out-group source and particularly reported higher guilt and shame when the in-group source informed about in-group past history. Finally, Study 1 and 2 showed that participants were least accurate in transmitting the message (as measured by recall) when the in-group source communicated about the in-group, than in the remaining conditions.

In relation to *identification with the in-group*, study 3 shows that subjects display a higher level of cognitive coping responses, such as minimization of the frequency of murder behaviours, in the case of strong identification with the in-group, as in the case of the Basque ethnic in-group. These coping mechanisms are not displayed when subjects show a medium size level of identification, like in the case of the Basque people in relation to Spain. Our results are convergent with empirical studies in Germany reviewed by Rensman (2004): subjects with lower identification with the national in-group, feel lower level of pride and collective self-esteem, are less defensive, more alike to accept confrontation with the negative past and to assume reparative actions – this profile is more typical of the third generation of West Germans in relation to WWII and explains partly, why this generation strongly feels collective guilt.

In sum, our findings support the idea that informal communication is an important channel of social differentiation and through which group members attenuate the potential damage of negative historical events to their social identity.

Conclusions

As Middleton and Edwards (1990, p.3) pointed out, “oral accounts [are] a resource for revealing the relationships between what people remember and the ideological dilemmas of their past and present socio-economic and political circumstances”. Our studies illustrate this idea. With these studies, we attempted to describe how such accounts might shield social identity from vicissitudes associated with historical and everyday intergroup relations. We will conclude by raising three issues which, in our view, could help clarify this process. The first issue bears to whether rumours are “true” or “false” and social representations of past as reflecting real events and conflicts or as a reconstruction. The second issue concerns the role of social influence on the acceptance and transmission of rumours in intergroup contexts. The third, more general aspect, regards the methodological adequacy

of the person-to-person, as opposed to the triadic transmission procedure, as a paradigm used to study past social representations.

Accuracy vs. Trust.

A question for classical research on rumours is whether rumours convey *true* or *false* information. Rumours have often been conceived of as erroneous, degenerating information that evade institutional control (Allport-Postman, 1947a; Difonzo, Bordia and Rosnow, 1994; cf. Kapferer, 1987). However, some evidence suggests that rumours may accurately reflect the events they depict (e.g. Caplow, 1947; Schachter-Burdick, 1955). The third study confirms that Spanish (and not only Portuguese) subjects reflect stereotypical dominant information –the black legend of Spaniards conquerors and the *white legend* of Portuguese navigators and explorers were reproduced in the last position of the chain, in the case of Spanish subjects.

Alternatively, we may view *historical rumours* as a process which helps people dealing with intergroup events which are inconsistent with group *ideals*. In this vein, trust, rather than accuracy, is the issue at stake in rumours. In other words, people will believe in, or assign relevance to, accounts that match their beliefs and motivations. Concomitantly, people's reports will match the received accounts to the extent that the accounts match their beliefs and motivations. An important belief of group members is in-group supremacy, and a correlated motivation is to hold a positive social identity (e.g. Hogg and Abrams, 1988; Tajfel, 1978).

Therefore, we may propose that *historical rumours* will be as accurate as the original stimulus upholds such positive social identity. Memory of out-group negative behaviours is more accurate, credible, relevant and induces a higher level of negative emotion, because it induces lower collective guilt and shame and allows group members a positive social comparison.

However, group-events do not always support in-group supremacy and satisfactory social identity. Often, such events are anxiety, shame and guilt generating, because they undermine group members' social identity motivations. Evidence shows that uncertainty and ensuing anxiety is an important trigger of informal communication (Anthony, 1973; Esposito, 1987; Walker-Beckerle, 1987). The same evidence suggests that reliance on rumours depends on credulity, credibility or veracity (Kapferer, 1987; cf. also Rosnow, 1980, 1991; Rosnow, Yost and Esposito, 1986). Rumours and cross-generational transmission of historical information may thus be viewed as the outcome of social influence.

Collective Memory, Referent Information Influence, and Forgetfulness

Research on referent information influence shows that in-group sources are more effective than out-group sources in generating the private acceptance of information (e.g. Abrams, Cochrane, Wetherell, Hogg & Turner, 1990; Turner, 1991). According to Hogg and Turner (1987), people learn or infer the stereotypic norms of their category, and assign these norms to themselves. Consequently, their beliefs become in-group normative. Referent information influence, thus, leads people to conform to the in-group and to express counter-conformity to out-groups, from which they actively attempt to differentiate (Abrams et al, 1990; cf. also Hogg-Abrams, 1988).

This idea applies to the present context. As Kapferer (1987, p.16) pointed out, “social life is based on trust and the delegation of the verification task (...). The idea of verification is therefore inseparable from the person who presumably did the verification”. Whether information is to be accepted or not, depends on a subjective assessment of its source. We might thus expect participants to agree more and to distort the message less in the in-group source condition. Why, then, was it recalled worse in the in-group source/in-group target than in all other conditions? Agreement or relevance was higher in the case of in-group source, as research on the inter-group sensitivity effect has shown (Hornsey & Imani, 2004).

Research on collective memory shows that, through the process of informal cross-generation communication, people tend, either to “forget”, to “deny”, or to reconstruct unpleasant social events. This arises from the emotional impact of these events and their anxiety-generating strength (e.g. Bartlett, 1932; Halbwachs, 1992; Marques et al, 1997; Vansina, 1985).

We may assume that a negative message about the in-group generates more anxiety, shame and guilt when it is conveyed by a (more credible) in-group than by a (less credible) out-group source. Hence, the former source may induce a stronger threat to social identity, than does the latter. The in-group source would therefore generate higher anxiety and negative emotional affect activation (higher guilt and shame). Therefore, negative collective affect could be a mediator between the in-group source and participants’ worse recall. Although this is speculative, our studies may thus illustrate how informal social communication operates to generate such forgetfulness and help people dealing with those events.

Person-to-Person vs. Triadic Transmission of Rumours: Serial Reproduction as a paradigm in studying social representations of the past.

Another goal of the present studies was to shed some light on problems relative to the methodological adequacy of the person-to-person transmis-

sion procedure that has been traditionally employed in laboratory studies of rumours.

We compared this procedure to another, in which each person received different accounts of the same rumour. We found similar results with both procedures, but the latter yielded more clear results. This may be due to the particular communicational structure used in Study 1 and 2. The fact that in these studies participants received information from three concomitant sources instead of only one, probably, provided them with a larger latitude of materials upon which to reconstruct the original message. This procedure is closer to the real-life social process of memory, is akin to the fact that a higher number of informational sources induces stronger effects (reinforces rumour credibility and retransmission) and seems to have allowed participants to more freely build up the received information. Unfortunately, our data did not allow us to test this phenomenon.

A related problem is that, in real life, people may choose not to convey a rumour (Kapferer, 1987; Rosnow, 1991), although we did not provide this choice to participants. Triadic serial reproduction shows that subjects decrease evaluations of relevance and negative emotions from the first position (hearing first hand information) to second and third positions, but only in the case of the in-group target. Moreover, stereotypical topics and salience of positive reconstructed information emerge in the last position.

From our point of view, these processes are similar to processes of selective retention and reconstruction of shared beliefs about past events. In this sense, serial reproduction of information of negative group behaviours appear as a paradigm in the study of cultural dynamics and collective memory: how people remember the collective past, particularly, how specific groups construct and reconstruct shared images of past. In other words, how groups reproduce, maintain and modify the social representations of the past, feeding culture with a normative image of this past. As Van Dijk states Bartlett's use of serial reproduction "is the first contribution to the theory of discursively based reproduction of social cognitions" (1990 cited in McIntyre et al, 2004).

Collective memories can be conceived of as a set of social representations concerning the past created by groups and transmitted through the interactions of its members (De Sa & Olivera, 2002; De Rosa, 2003): a) they are widely shared beliefs about a collective past, based on oral and informal transmission of information, stories that are "lay history", b) "scientific" or formal history feeds these images of past like science nourishes social representations; c) images of past and normative aspects (moral lessons about our martyrs, heroes and positive aspects of past), are related to a

group's needs, attitudes and defence of social identity; d) stable shared beliefs about the past constitute the nucleus of social representations, in the sense of the specific image that a group has about its past, continuity and change, like myths represent cultural charters or collective routes for the group; e) different groups share relatively different social representations of the past; however, some collective representations, or consensual social representations shared in general by a society or culture, exist and social representations of the past reproduce "real" past group and inter-group events (De Rosa, 2003; Liu et al, 2005); f) they are products of informal communication and reproduce processes of anchoring and objectification; social representations of the past are anchored on a group's collective knowledge, values and attitudes and follow a process of selective retention, abstraction and objectification – conventionalization in terms of Bartlett; g) social representations of the past are related to collective emotions, in particular, conscious or social emotions of pride, guilt and shame (like the Holocaust and the collective guilt of Germans). Groups tend to feel historical pride, although they should deal with negative past behaviours and threats to positive social identity.

We were able to show that, as in sociocultural dynamics, by means of the retransmission of information, subjects feel more guilt and shame, but lower negative emotions (and this is a form of coping), when hearing, reading and retelling massacres perpetrated by national members. They believe more in-group criticism, but at the same time, reconstruct more general information related to the in-group. They attribute lower credibility and relevance to messages related to in-group collective negative behaviour and display more cognitive coping. At the end of the *three generations*, relevance and negative emotions related to in-group past collective behaviour decreases. The content of a narrative reproduces the cultural stereotypes. Forgetting and reconstruction are higher. Subjects that are concerned, but not committed to historical crimes, display a repertoire of coping like disidentification with perpetrators, relative justification in the context of their behaviours and minimisation of frequency. All these phenomena are frequent, as surveys and historical data reviewed in the introduction shows. This text would be helpful to elaborate in the process of understanding collective cultural dynamics, in particular, the study of group processes related to social representations of the past.

Table 1.
Effects of Target and Source on Recall, Assimilation, and Omission (Study 1)

	In-group Target		Out-group Target	
	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
	<u>Recall</u>			
In-group Source	1.69	1.20	2.61	0.74
Out-group Source	2.18	0.98	2.34	0.99
	<u>Assimilation</u>			
In-group Source	1.60	1.06	1.17	0.54
Out-group Source	2.20	1.07	1.17	0.95

Table 2.
Effects of Target and Source on Credibility and Guilt and Shame (Study 2)

	In-group Target		Out-group Target	
	M	SD	M	SD
	<u>Credibility</u>			
In-group Source	4.93	1.09	4.98	0.98
Out-group Source	3.95	1.12	4.84	0.88
	<u>Guilt and Shame</u>			
In-group Source	3.00	1.68	2.23	1.28
Out-group Source	2.51	1.48	2.45	1.47

Table 3.
Effects of Target and Position on Credibility and Negative Emotions (Study 3)

	In-group Target		Out-group Target	
	M	SD	M	SD
	<u>Relevance</u>			
First Position	5.26	1.01	5.1	0.99
Second Position	4.64	1.21	4.96	1.08
Third Position	4.55	1.17	5.1	.99
	<u>Negative Emotions</u>			
First Position	4.04	1.47	4.0	1.33
Second Position	3.25	1.44	3.7	1.30
Third Position	3.0	1.47	4.0	1.37

References

- Abrams, D., Wetherell, M. S., Cochrane, S., Hogg, M. A., and Turner, J. C. (1990). Knowing what to think by knowing who you are: self-categorisation and the nature of norm formation, conformity and group polarisation. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 29, 97-119.
- Allport, G. W., & Postman, L. (1945). The basic Psychology of rumour. New York *Academy of Sciences Trans-Actions*, 8, 61-81.

- Allport, G. W., & Postman, L. (1947a). An analysis of rumour. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 10, 501-517.
- Allport, G. W., & Postman, L. (1947b). *The Psychology of rumour*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Anthony, S. (1973). Anxiety and rumour. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 89, 91-98.
- Bartlett, F. C. (1932). *Remembering*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Baumeister, R. F. & Hastings, S. (1997). Distortions of collective memory: how groups flatter and deceive themselves. In J. W. Pennebaker, D. Paez and B. Rimé (Eds.) *Collective memory of political events: Social psychological perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Branscombe, N.R. (2004). A Social Psychological perspective on Collective Guilt. In N.R. Branscombe, N.R. & B. Doosje, Eds. (2004). *Collective Guilt: International perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Branscombe, N.R. & Doosje, B. (2004). *Collective Guilt: International perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Branscombe, N.R., Slugoski, B. & Kappen, D.M. (2004). The Measurement of Collective Guilt: What is and What it is not. In N.R. Branscombe, N.R. & B. Doosje, Eds. (2004). *Collective Guilt: International perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Caplow, T. (1947). Rumour in war. *Social Forces*, 25, 298-302.
- De Rosa, A & Mormino, C. (2003). Memoria social, identidad nacional y representaciones sociales: son constructos convergentes?. In A. Rosa, G. Bellelli & D. Bakhurst (Eds.). *Memoria Colectiva e Identidad Nacional*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva
- Difonzo, N., Bordia, P., & Rosnow, R. L. (1994). Reining in rumours. *Organisational Dynamics*, 23, 47-62.
- De Sa, C. P. & de Olivera, D.C. (2002). Sur la mémoire sociale de la découverte du Brésil. In S. Laurens & N. Roussiau (Eds.). *La mémoire sociale*. Rennes, France: Presses Universitaires de Rennes.
- Dressler-Hawke, E. & Liu, J.H. (2003): German collective guilt and the Holocaust. Manuscript. Wellington University
- Esposito, J.L. (1987). Subjective factors and rumour transmission: A field investigation of the influence of anxiety, importance and belief on remembering. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 48, 596B.
- Ferro, M. (1994). *Histoire des colonisations*. Paris: Eds. Du Seuil.
- Frijda, N. J. (1986). *The emotions*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Halbwachs, M. (1992). *On collective memory*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Higgins, E. T., McCann, C. D., & Fondocaro, R. (1982). The "communication game": goal-directed encoding and cognitive consequences, *Social Cognition*, 1, 21-37.
- Hogg, M. A., & Abrams, D. (1988). *Social identifications: A social psychology of intergroup relations and group processes*. London: Routledge.
- Hogg, M. A., & Turner, J. C. (1987). Social identity and conformity: a theory of referent informational influence. In W. Doise and S. Moscovici (Eds.) *Current issues in European social psychology, Vol. 2*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Izard, C. E. (1993). Organizational and motivational functions of discrete emotions. In M. Lewis and J. M. Haviland (Eds.) *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 631-641). N.Y. Guilford P.
- Kapferer, J.-N. (1987). *Rumours: Le plus vieux média du monde* (Rumours: the oldest media in the world). Paris: Éditions du Seuil.
- Lewis, M. (1993). Self-conscious emotions: embarrassment, pride, shame and guilt. In M. Lewis and J. M. Haviland (Eds.) *Handbook of emotions* (pp. 563-573). N.Y. Guilford P.

- Liu, J., Goldstein-Hawes, R., Hilton, D. et al. (2005). Social Representations of Events and People in World History across 12 cultures. *Journal of Crosscultural Psychology*, 36, 171-192.
- Marques, J. M., Paez, D. & Serra, A. (1997). Social sharing, emotional climate, and the transgenerational transmission of memories: The Portuguese colonial war. In J. W. Pennebaker, D. Páez and B. Rimé (Eds.) *Collective memory of political events: Social psychological perspectives*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- McIntyre, A., Lyons, A., Clark, A. & Kashima, Y. (2004). The microgenesis of culture: serial reproduction as an experimental simulation of cultural dynamics. In M. Schaller & C. S. Crandall (Eds.). *The Psychological Foundations of Culture*. Mahaw, NJ: LEA
- Middleton, D., & Edwards, D. (Eds.) (1990). *Collective remembering*. London: Sage.
- Paez, D. et al (2003). Identidad, Comunicación y memoria colectiva. In A. Rosa, G. Bellelli, D. Bakhurst (Eds.). *Memoria Colectiva e Identidad Nacional*. Madrid: Biblioteca Nueva
- Paez, D. & Marques, J. (1999). Conductas colectivas: rumores, catástrofes y movimientos de masas. In J.F. Morales (Ed.). *Psicología Social*. Madrid: McGraw Hill.
- Rensman, L. (2004). Collective Guilt, National Identity, and Political Process in Contemporary Germany. In N.R. Branscombe, N.R. & B. Doosje, Eds. (2004). *Collective Guilt: International perspectives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Rosnow, R. L. (1980). Psychology of rumour reconsidered. *Psychol. Bulletin*, 87, 578-591.
- Rosnow, R. L. (1991). Inside rumour. *American Psychologist*, 46, 484-496.
- Rosnow, R. L., Yost, J. H., & Esposito, J. L. (1986). Belief in rumour and likelihood of rumour transmission. *Language and Communication*, 6, 189-194.
- Rosnow, R. L.; Esposito, J. L., & Gibney, L. (1988). Factors influencing rumour spreading: replication and extension. *Language and Communication*, 8, 29-42.
- Schachter, S., & Burdick, H. (1955). A field experiment on rumour transmission. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 50, 363-371.
- Tajfel, H. (1978). *Differentiation between social groups: Studies on the social psychology of intergroup relations*. London: Academic Press.
- Turner, J. C. (1991). *Social influence*. Milton Keynes: Open University Press.
- Vansina, J. (1985). *Oral tradition as History*. London: Academic Press.
- Von Plato, A. (1998). ¿Quién es más víctima?. *Historia, Antropología y Fuentes Orales*, 2, 23-32.
- Walker, C. J., & Beckerle, C. A. (1987). The effect of anxiety on rumour transmission. *Journal of Social Behaviour and Personality*, 2, 353-360.

Note: The authors are grateful to Charles Judd for valuable help with the triadic serial transmission procedure employed in Study 2, to James Liu for papers and helpful comments on social representations of history and to Nyla Branscombe for papers and suggestions on collective guilt.

José M. Marques, Faculdade de Psicologia e de Ciências da Educação, University of Porto. e-mail: marques@psi.up.pt. He is membership of Consulting Editors of *Group Processes & Intergroup Relation* and co-author of Social categorization, social identification, and rejection of deviant group members. In M.A. Hogg-R.S. Tindale (Eds.) Blackwell handbook of social psychology (Vol 3): Group processes. Oxford: Blackwell.

Dario Páez and **José Valencia**. Departamento de Psicología Social y Metodología, University of the Basque Country. Spain. dario.paez@ehu.es, jose.valencia@ehu.es.

Orsolya Vincze, University Of Pecz, Hungary
Address: José Marques (FPCE-UP, R. do Campo Alegre, 1055, P-4150 Porto, Portugal.