

Exposure to Violence and Attitudes Towards Transitional Justice

Jonathan Hall

Uppsala University

Iosif Kovras

City University of London

Djordje Stefanovic

Saint Mary's University

Neophytos Loizides

University of Kent

Transitional justice has emerged to address victims' needs as a means of restoring relations broken by violence. Yet we know little about victims' attitudes towards different transitional justice mechanisms. Why do some victims prioritize retributive justice while others favor other forms of dealing with the violent past? What determines victims' attitudes towards transitional justice policies? To address these questions, we offer a new theoretical framework that draws upon recent insights from the field of evolutionary psychology and links both war exposure and postwar environments to transitional justice preferences. We argue that both past experiences of wartime violence and present-day social interdependence with perpetrators impact transitional justice preferences, but in divergent ways (resulting in greater support for retributive vs. restorative justice measures, respectively). To test our framework, we rely upon a 2013 representative survey of 1,007 respondents focusing on general population attitudes towards transitional justice in Bosnia two decades after the implementation of the Dayton Accords. Specifically, we examine the impact of displacement, return to prewar homes, loss of property, loss of a loved one, physical injury, imprisonment, and torture on attitudes towards transitional justice. On the whole, our findings confirm our two main hypotheses: Exposure to direct violence and losses is associated with more support for retributive justice measures, while greater present-day interdependence with perpetrators is associated with more support for restorative justice measures. While acknowledging the legacy of wartime violence, we highlight the importance of the postwar context and institutional mechanisms that support victims in reconstructing their lives.

KEY WORDS: exposure to violence, transitional justice, displacement, Bosnia, retributive justice, restorative justice, victimhood

The war of 1992–95 left a deep trauma in Bosnian society as the country was subjected to an armed campaign characterized by ethnic cleansing and the genocide in Srebrenica unprecedented for

the European continent since World War II (Weller & Wolff, 2006, p. 1).¹ Out of the prewar population of 4.37 million, about 110,000 people were killed and 2.2 million driven from their homes.² The 1995 Dayton Peace Agreement (DPA) concluded the three-and-a-half-years war attempting to strike a balance between the main groups' historical ambitions and preferred institutional options (Belloni, 2008). The agreement was seen from the very beginning as "both a blessing and a curse" (Weller & Wolff, 2006, p. 1). The violent nature of the war and its devastating human cost have prompted peace negotiators at the time to emphasize the military aspects of the conflict aiming to end violence (Keil & Kudlenko, 2015, p. 4). Yet Bosnia and Herzegovina has also made great advances in the process of its postconflict transformation with its infrastructure rebuilt and half of its displaced persons supported in their return efforts to their original homes (Bieber, 2006, p. 43).

Two decades on, Bosnia has also emerged as critical for transitional justice and reconciliation studies, not only for the variation in conflict experience among victims, but also for policies used by the international community to facilitate truth seeking, punishment of perpetrators, and reconciliation. Bosnia and the former Yugoslavia offer an opportunity to reassess theory and practice in transitional justice given the variation of victims' responses. Bosnians have also experienced violence differently across parts of the country with some regions facing limited violence and others massive ethnic cleansing campaigns and the genocide in Srebrenica (Toal & Dahlman, 2011). Finally, Bosnia is a critical case study because of its postconflict institutional solutions including the International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia (ICTY) and Dayton's own emphasis on property rights for preconflict owners which facilitated peaceful voluntary return among the internally displaced persons (IDPs) in at least some parts of the country (Belloni, 2008; Bieber, 2006). Taking into consideration this context, this article focuses on postconflict responses to the needs of victims. Despite being central in the study of transitional justice, the concept of "victimhood" still remains largely unexplored in the relevant literature (Breen-Smyth, 2007). In the academic literature and popular media, it is not uncommon to read that "victims demand truth" or "justice," even though several scholars have warned against the tendency to treat victims as a uniform group (Sitas et al., 2007).

Our findings point to the variation in approaches to justice among victims. As stated and in other recent studies beyond Bosnia (e.g., Pham, Weinstein, & Longman, 2004; Samii, 2011), the picture is much more complicated as different victim groups have distinctive conflict experiences and attitudes towards transitional justice policies. To address these gaps in the literature, we introduce a novel theoretical framework drawing on the evolutionary psychology of criminal justice (Petersen, Sell, Tooby, & Cosmides, 2010, 2012; Robinson, Kurzban, & Jones, 2007). We argue that direct exposure to violence and traumatic events (i.e., victims) are more likely to support policies of retributive justice. Bolstering a culture of victimhood (or "ethos of conflict"), victimized communities opt for punitive justice. Yet, this is only part of the story. As we show, transitional justice preferences are not only shaped by retrospective experiences of past violence but also by the present status of the victims, most notably the level of interdependence with perpetrators (e.g., as returnees in ethnically mixed communities). By sharing common social networks, victims prioritize respect from perpetrators rather than imposing costs on them. In short, we introduce a novel framework which highlights that transitional justice preferences largely depend on victims' needs, usually shaped by their exposure to

¹ We use the term "genocide" to refer to the mass violence in Srebrenica in the summer of 1995, drawing on the legal ruling of the ICTY.

² The most reliable fatality figures on the Bosnian war have been compiled by the Research and Documentation Center (RDC) in Sarajevo. In June 2007, the RDC recorded 97,207 war fatalities and estimated that the count could rise by a maximum of another 10,000 with ongoing research. The head of the ICTY estimates the number of dead at 110,000 (BBC News, 2007). The current RDC data indicate that 40.82% of the casualties were civilians; 83.33% of the civilian casualties were ethnic Bosniacs (Bosnian Muslims) Research and Documentation Center (RDC), Research Results and Data Base Evaluation (2007) available at <http://www.transconflict.com/gcct/gcct-members/europe/the-balkans/bosnia-and-herzegovina/research-and-documentation-centre-sarajevo>. "Bosniac" is the self-selected ethnic identifier for the Bosnian Muslim community (UNHCR, 2005).

violence, such as whether they have been displaced, tortured, lost a relative, or their loved ones have gone missing during the conflict. Most importantly, this article's findings demonstrate the space for postconflict interventions and their effects in addressing victims' needs.

So far, the lion's share of the literature is devoted exclusively to measuring the "success" of specific transitional justice mechanisms, or their "impact" on the quality of the emerging democracy or the human rights. This is measured against exogenous variables; the point of reference for most analyses remains the society (at large), and in most cases without accounting for any deviation in transitional justice priorities among different victim groups. Although scholars have increasingly attempted to account for the variation in the transitional justice preferences of distinct victim groups, few quantitative survey studies have focus on this area;³ unlike qualitative studies, surveys also face the question of representative sampling, as victims are hard to identify among the general population especially in most postconflict societies.

Our findings build on previous research suggesting that transitional justice preferences are shaped to a significant extent by the exposure to past violence, particularly support for policies of retributive justice. This illustrates the long-lasting impact of the legacies of violence on societies emerging from violence. Individuals who were imprisoned, tortured, or had physical injury are more likely to support forms of retributive justice, primarily prosecutions of perpetrators. At the same time, those whose present status force them to coexist with former enemies, such as refugees and internally displaced persons who returned to their homes after the end of the war, are most likely to support restorative policies such as forgiveness, apologies, or even amnesties.

This article makes a contribution to our understanding of the attitudes of different victims (and nonvictim) groups towards alternative transitional justice policies. This is important not only because it is one of the first efforts to shed analytical light on this unexplored relationship, but also because of its potential to improve the architecture of transitional justice by designing transitional justice measures tailored to the needs of specific victim groups, rather than the society at large. There is a clear policy lesson stemming from this article, namely that the deployment of specific measures of reparations at least for some victim categories (e.g., the returnees) could make a positive contribution to peace.

Finally, we contribute to future research by drawing on a 2013 representative sample survey of 1,007 respondents in Bosnia, which focuses on attitudes towards transitional justice two decades after the Dayton Accords. The survey's insights will enable specialists to conduct related opinion polls across postconflict societies in order to assess attitudes towards transitional justice, to identify institutional designs more likely to facilitate reconciliation, and, most importantly, to examine critical concerns of victims that must be addressed to make "positive peace" imaginable.

Literature Review

The study of victimhood and victim groups lies at the heart of transitional justice. The very *raison d'être* of transitional justice is to restore social relations broken by civil war and thereby peacefully reintegrate victims and perpetrators into society (Breen-Smyth, 2007; Hayner, 2010). As such it is hardly surprising that part of the early literature focused on the impact of the mobilization of victims groups in landmark cases for transitional justice, such as the mothers of the disappeared during the military junta in Argentina (De Brito, González Enríquez, & Aguilar, 2001; Sikkink, 2008). More recent literature has explored how different victim groups have mobilized to push national and international actors for the adoption of particular mechanisms; the interdisciplinary study of Nettelfield and Wagner (2013) sheds light on how victims in postgenocide Srebrenica have effectively shaped

³ For exceptions, see, for instance, Gibson (2002), Biro et al. (2004), Pham et al. (2004), Nalepa (2010), and Lordos (2016).

the politics of memory and reparations in Bosnia. More recently, the relatives of the disappeared of the Spanish civil war (1936–39) have mobilized in their quest to exhume the remains of those executed by the Francoist forces, marking an unprecedented example of posttransitional justice (or delayed justice) (Aguilar, 2008; Kovras, 2014). These studies emphasize the mechanisms through which victims have been a driving force in influencing transitional justice outcomes and therefore have taken center stage in the theoretical debates.

Moreover, the literature of transitional justice has greatly benefited from a more recent qualitative turn towards “victim-centered” studies. This in turn is predicated on three key objectives: paying closer attention to victims’ voices, understanding their needs, while also assessing how effective transitional justice policies are in addressing these needs. Stover and Shikegane (2004), as well as Wagner (2008) have shed light on one of the starkest illustrations of disjuncture between international criminal proceedings and victims’ needs. The exhumations in Srebrenica ordered by the ICTY with exclusive mandate to collect incriminatory evidence to secure conviction of perpetrators originally excluded the prospect of identifying individual victims which traumatized and infuriated families of the missing. Working on the same context, Nettelfield (2010) echoes a similarly frictional relationship between criminal prosecutions and victim’s priorities. Based on ethnographic research in Nepal, Robins (2011) sheds lights on the disjuncture between the emotional, social, and material needs of the families of missing persons and official transitional justice policies in place. Aronson (2011) echoes the same flawed relationship between the workings of the South African Truth and Reconciliation Commission (TRC henceforth) and the needs of the families of the missing to identify the human remains of their loved ones. Millar (2011) found that both retributive (trials) and restorative (truth commissions) models of transitional justice have failed to address victims’ needs in postconflict Sierra Leone. Common themes emerging from this branch of the literature is that mainstream transitional justice policies often fail to accommodate the needs of victims, different victim groups have different needs, and they call for a more critical and grassroots approaches to understand how different victim groups assess their needs after conflict (Doak, 2011; Gready & Robins, 2014).

In parallel, a critical body of research has attempted to provide a theoretical account of how mainstream transitional justice policies have shaped our (theoretical) understanding of “victimhood” and “victim groups.” McEvoy and McConnachie (2012, 2013) have illustrated the contested nature of the concept of “victimhood” in postconflict settings; more specifically, they maintain that transitional justice policies are often based on an unfounded hierarchy of victimhood, one which distinguishes between the more deserving and the less deserving. For example, the mandate of the truth commissions often includes the most vocal or visible victim groups, while at the same time exclude other less politically important groups of survivors.

So far, related qualitative studies have offered extremely useful insights that have benefited our understanding of victims’ needs in postconflict settings. Quantitative studies provide the supplementary evidence that could help trace the key processes that lead to specific policy outcomes. In essence, there is only an implicit understanding that differing groups have different attitudes towards transitional justice policies. Still by definition qualitative studies are not designed to offer statistically representative samples, one which would account for variations in transitional justice preferences among different groups of victims.

Quantitative studies have offered some insights, but their primary emphasis is placed on measuring the success or impact of particular policies (prosecutions, truth commissions, amnesties) on the quality of emerging democracy or respect for human rights (Binningsbø, Loyle, Gates, & Elster, 2012; Gibson, 2006; Kim & Sikkink, 2010; Olsen, Leigh, & Andrew, 2010; Sikkink & Walling, 2007). More recent quantitative studies have used survey experiments to explore the impact of policies of lustration (David & Choi, 2006; Nalepa, 2010).

Little emphasis has been paid to create a more rigorous conceptual framework around victims or systematic understanding of the attitudes of victim groups towards transitional justice. More

specifically, there is a clear gap in our understanding of whether and how different types of exposure to violence (i.e., victimhood) affect postconflict transitional justice preferences. Only a handful of studies have attempted to link victimization and justice or reconciliation preferences, with mixed findings. Based on a survey administered in postgenocide Rwanda, Pham et al. (2004) found that respondents who were exposed to multiple traumas were most likely to be more positive towards the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda (ICTR) and less open to reconciliation. Samii's (2011) study in Burundi supports this finding as direct victims of violence strongly support retributive policies (i.e., punishment of perpetrators). However, in the Bosnian context, Stover and Weinstein (2004) found that there is no direct link between exposure to trauma and desire for trials. A number of other studies have found a positive correlation between personal victimization and support for policies of material reparations (Biro et al., 2004; Gibson, 2002; Nalepa, 2010). David and Choi (2006) suggest that ex-prisoners who suffer from continued economic deprivation or health problems as a result of their incarceration find it harder to forgive culprits. Victims with stronger religious beliefs are more open to forgiveness (David & Choi, 2006). Aguilar, Balcells, & Cebolla-Boado (2011) explored the transitional justice preferences of the general population in Spain, and they found that groups with more recent traumatic experiences had more positive views of truth commissions, while ideology plays an important role as the heirs of "republicans"/victims are generally more proactive supporters of transitional justice. In one of the most counterintuitive findings, Nussio, Rettberg, & Ugarriza (2015) found no significant divergence between the attitudes victims and nonvictims towards transitional justice in Colombia.

Identifying the transitional justice preferences of different groups of victims is a central gap that quantitative studies are well suited to address. We also make a novel contribution by distinguishing among different victim groups and further exploring alternative links between exposure to violence and transitional justice preferences. We maintain that for analytical, methodological, and disciplinary reasons, this is an important gap that needs to be addressed. Analytically, it is important to unpack the generic category "victims" into distinct groups and understand their preferences. Methodologically, it is vital to overcome the current dialogue of the deaf between the literatures of "conflict studies" and "transitional justice"; the former exploring exposure to violence during conflict while the latter focuses on the period after the official peace agreement.⁴ We seek to bridge this gap by highlighting the ways in which conflict-induced trauma shapes transitional justice preferences.

Finally, social psychology is the discipline that could offer a comprehensive framework to connect individual needs with victim groups but could also boost our quest to theorize on the political, emotional, and societal victims' transitional justice preferences (Canetti, Hall, Rapaport, & Wayne, 2013; Muldoon, 2013; Skitka, 1999). Yet so far it has a peripheral role in transitional justice debates currently dominated by political scientists and lawyers. To this end, we contribute to the literature by introducing a new theoretical framework drawing on evolutionary psychology of criminal justice to shed light on transitional justice preferences. Most significantly, while most legal or political perspectives present attitudes to transitional justice as binary (truth vs. justice), this framework provides a more dynamic picture that explores their relationship. As illustrated below, we argue that this framework is analytically more intelligible precisely because it avoids the simplistic representation of "victims" as a generic group. Essentially, by deploying this approach we can both measure individual attitudes towards transitional justice while simultaneously exploring the construction of shared sets of beliefs among those exposed to specific forms of traumatic experiences—what Daniel Bar-Tal (2007) calls the "Ethos of Conflict." Most importantly, it is a more comprehensive analytical framework which paves the way to other researchers, including legal scholars and historians, to trace the relationship between these different types of exposure to traumatic events and major transitional justice outcomes (i.e., the development of legal norms and the construction of shared beliefs by specific victim groups).

⁴ With few important exceptions (Stover & Weinstein, 2004).

Transitional Justice: An Evolutionary Social Psychological Framework

This section explains how attitudes towards transitional justice in postwar societies are shaped by (1) past experiences of wartime violence and (2) present-day social interdependence with perpetrators. We argue that while exposure to heinous war crimes increases support for *retributive justice* (stemming from the wartime logic of deterrence), interdependence with perpetrators increases victims' support for *restorative justice* (in response to their shared fate). Below we provide an overview of the social psychology of intergroup conflict and recent advances in the evolutionary psychology of criminal justice. Bringing together these two literatures, we offer a new evolutionary social psychological perspective on victims' transitional justice preferences in postwar settings.

The Social Psychology of Intergroup Conflict

The organization of the self and others in terms of group memberships is a universal process driven by the fundamental survival strategy of group living (Brewer, 1999). Ingroups define communities of mutual trust, obligation, interdependence, and cooperation, but they also delimit outgroups. Ingroup belonging entails conforming to the ingroup image as well as accentuating intergroup differences. Social categorization thus satisfies the opposing yet basic human needs for assimilation with, and differentiation from, others (Brewer, 1991). Ingroup favoritism is pervasive and not limited to conflict situations (Tajfel & Turner, 1986). However, under threatening wartime conditions, ingroup biases are transformed into more salient and durable forms of outgroup discrimination, derogation, and intolerance (Hewstone, Rubin, & Willis, 2002, p. 579). The spiral of collective violence that unfolds in wartime settings is underpinned by the logic of deterrence and counteraggression in response to exploitation by outsiders.

The set of interrelated shared beliefs that emerges from this process is termed the "ethos of conflict" or "conflict ideology" (Bar-Tal, Sharvit, Halperin, & Zafran, 2012; Canetti, Elad-Strenger, Lavi, Guy, & Bar-Tal, 2015). These beliefs are essentially a set of collective coping resources deployed by groups in part to help meet the basic psychological needs of their members (Bar-Tal & Halperin, 2011). Here we highlight three examples of such basic needs: reducing uncertainty about how one should behave in the midst of a chaotic and threatening environment; reinforcing a positive self-image in response to outgroup exploitation; and reducing anxieties about death that inevitably arise in the context of war.

On a fundamental level, periods of violent social conflict disrupt the basic schemas and plausibility structures that individuals rely upon to make sense of the world around them and to feel safe within that predictable world (Berger & Luckman, 1966, p. 121; Janoff-Bulman, 1992). Shared beliefs about conflict offer a simplified, dichotomized, and one-sided view of the conflict that renders the social world and one's place within it intelligible again (Hogg, 2000). Casting the ingroup as the victim and outgroups as aggressors thus reduces uncertainty and stress for ingroup members, but it also results in biased information processing (Porat, Halperin, & Bar-Tal, 2015).

Second, conflictive beliefs help reinforce self-esteem when it is threatened by conflict. Group memberships, and the value and emotional significance attached to them, form part of the self-concept (Tajfel, 1981, p. 255). Threats to the ingroup during conflict thus threaten self-esteem, while ingroup favoritism and outgroup derogation reinforce self-esteem. This leads ingroup members to contrast their positive self-image with the evil nature of outgroups.

Third, war also raises the possibility of one's own death, frustrating on a psychological level the basic human need for self-preservation (Becker, 1973). However, fear of death may be reduced, and psychological equanimity restored, by investing in and maintaining psychological structures like the ethos of conflict that restores a sense of meaning, order, and permanence to life (Greenberg, Pyszczynski, & Solomon, 1986).

In sum, the social psychology of warfare involves a powerfully pervasive set of shared beliefs that support conflict. Over time, this ethos contributes to the formation and maintenance of social identities, increasing the intractability of intergroup conflict (Bar-Tal, 2007). The beliefs that originally developed in response to the conditions of war thus become entrenched and tend to endure into postwar environments. In the next section, we examine how the psychology of intergroup conflict fuels human intuitions about transitional justice in postwar settings. We also offer an opposing account of the effects of interdependence between victims and perpetrators based on new findings in the field of evolutionary psychology.

The Evolutionary Psychology of Criminal Justice

Recent findings from the field of evolutionary psychology suggest that selection pressures at work in our preagricultural, hunter-gatherer human ancestry provide us with an evolved psychology that continues to shape our present-day intuitions about criminal justice (Petersen et al., 2010, 2012; Robinson et al., 2007). The ancestral social life of Sapiens, like other species, involved individuals willing to exploit others for their own benefit (Duntley, 2005). As a result, psychological mechanisms were selected for in order to counter exploitation of the self, family, and band. Features of modern crimes continue to satisfy the input conditions of these evolved mechanisms, resulting in a lasting legacy of criminal justice preferences.

According to Petersen et al.'s (2010) "recalibrational theory of counterexploitation," when confronted with exploitation the human mind spontaneously calculates levels of two separate psychological variables. The first represents the seriousness of the crime, while the second represents the perpetrators' "association value" for the victim, that is, their level of interdependence with the exploited person and their value as a potential associate in future social relations. While the seriousness of the crime regulates *how much* to react (how severely to punish the perpetrator), the perpetrators' association value regulates the more fundamental decision of *how* to react (whether to punish or repair broken relations) (Petersen et al., 2012).

Based on input from these two variables, humans deploy two basic counterexploitation strategies (Petersen et al., 2010, 2012). The first is the strategy of *punishment* (retributive justice), which follows the tit-for-tat logic of deterrence. Punishment deters future exploitation by imposing costs on perpetrators appropriate to their crimes. This strategy runs the risk of further distancing the victim from the perpetrator and their social networks. However, the risk of social distancing is justified if the social networks of the victim and perpetrator share little overlap (perpetrators are perceived as outsiders, and thus the costs imposed on them will not indirectly harm the victim).

A key source of information regarding the seriousness of war crimes is the personal experience of victims. Past experience of heinous crimes and irrecoverable losses should result in greater support for retributive justice measures that follow the wartime logic of deterrence (e.g., fair trials resulting in harsh punishments) and less support for restorative justice measures (e.g., the forgiveness of perpetrators that have recanted their crimes and amnesties). These considerations result in the following hypotheses:

H1: Exposure to more serious crimes (physical injury, the irrecoverable loss of a loved one, imprisonment or torture as opposed to loss of property) is associated with greater support for retributive justice measures delivering harsh punishments (fair trials resulting in harsh punishments as opposed to financial compensation).

H2: Exposure to more serious crimes (physical injury, the irrecoverable loss of a loved one, imprisonment or torture) is associated with less support for restorative justice

measures that avoid such punishments (the forgiveness of perpetrators that have recanted their crimes and amnesties).

The second human counterexploitation strategy is *restoration* (restorative justice), which aims to reduce the risk of future exploitation by increasing the extent to which the perpetrator values the victim rather than imposing costs on them. The focus of restorative justice is on communicating to the perpetrator the true associational value of the victim encouraging them to understand the harm they have caused to others. This strategy is justified if imposing costs on the perpetrator would indirectly harm the victim through their membership in shared networks (they are in fact interdependent). The viability of this strategy depends upon the extent to which the perpetrator is willing to increase the value they place on the victim's welfare (e.g., is not considered as having an essentially evil or aggressive nature). The exploited person is more likely to perceive this to be the case if their associational value is higher (signaling that the perpetrator is harming themselves indirectly through their crimes by imposing costs on interdependent associates). Cues such as feelings of remorse and sincere apologies signal that the perpetrator recognizes the harm they have inflicted and intends to confer benefits on the victim (or their family or social networks) rather than continue to exploit them in the future.

During the Bosnian War, the areas most targeted by violence were those in which ethnic dominance was uncertain. Ethnic cleansing in these areas resulted in people largely fleeing to areas in which their own ethnic community formed the majority (or abroad to, for example, Austria, Germany, and Sweden). The vast majority of the IDPs and refugees that return to their prewar homes are moving from ethnic majority areas or from abroad to more mixed areas that were simultaneously the sites of the lion's share of war crimes. This places them in greater proximity to and interdependence with perpetrators. From this discussion, we derive the following hypotheses:

H3: Return to prewar homes is associated with greater support for restorative justice measures such as the forgiveness of perpetrators that have recanted their crimes and amnesties.

H4: Return to prewar homes is associated with less support for retributive justice measures that impose costs on perpetrators (fair trials resulting in harsh punishments as well as financial compensation).

Survey Data and Methods

We examine the impact of wartime experiences and war-related losses on attitudes towards transitional justice (see Table 1). Using regression analysis, we relate respondents' attitudes to six different measures aimed at capturing war experiences and losses: displacement status (never displaced, still displaced, and return to prewar homes), loss of property, loss of a loved one, physical injury, imprisonment, and torture (see Table 2). Attitudes related to transitional justice are captured by seven different indicators aimed at providing a comprehensive perspective on respondents' preferences for retributive as opposed to restorative justice. These include the extent to which individuals support amnesty for war criminals if that would help to ensure a lasting peace, support for forgiveness of perpetrators, the desire for war criminals to be harshly punished if found guilty by a fair trial, support for criminals paying compensation to their victims, support for the state paying compensation to victims, support for a formal state apology for past atrocities, and the extent to which individuals believe that it is necessary to right the injustices of the past in order to ensure a lasting peace. In each regression, we control for a rich set of individual

Table 1. Dependent Variables

Variables	<i>N</i>	mean	<i>SD</i>	min	max
<i>What do you think should be done with those people who personally harmed you or members of your ethnic group during the conflict?</i>					
1. They should receive amnesty (no punishment) if that brings lasting peace	943	3.070	1.657	1	5
2. They should beg for forgiveness to their victims and victims' families and then they should be forgiven	962	3.543	1.501	1	5
3. They should have a fair trial and if found guilty they should be harshly punished	977	4.648	0.800	1	5
4. War criminals should pay financial compensation to their victims	964	4.198	1.169	1	5
5. The state should pay financial compensation to victims	968	4.286	1.081	1	5
6. The state should publicly ask the victims for forgiveness for the crimes and injustices they suffered	967	4.046	1.239	1	5
<i>Do you agree with the following statement?</i>					
7. In order to resolve the conflicts, we should right the injustices that happened in the past	873	0.591	0.492	0	1

background characteristics (see Table 3). These include education, ethnicity, economic situation prior to war, residency status (urban or rural), age, and gender.

The data used in our analysis were collected in a survey we conducted in Bosnia in June and July of 2013. The data collection was done by Sarajevo-based Ipsos BH. We used multistage sampling and included data across different victim categories. IPSOS conducted the survey using a four-stage stratified sample. In the first stage, it selected municipalities using simple random sampling;⁵ in the second stage, it selected a polling station proportional to its size within selected municipalities; in the third stage, it selected the household using random-route technique selection from a given address; and finally, in the fourth stage, it selected individuals within the household to be interviewed using a Kish table. If respondents consented to be interviewed, the field interviewers conducted face-to-face interviews in the homes of the participants. The senior staff of the survey agency conducted the day-to-day monitoring of the data-collection process and provided daily updates to the PI. The response rate was 63.53%, with a total of 1,007 interviews completed. After data collection, the results were entered into an SPSS file, and original copies of the questionnaires were destroyed. IPSOS survey statisticians calculated weights on the basis of inclusion probabilities and the demographic data available. The analysis was conducted using the statistical software package Stata 13.

Analysis

Displacement and Return to Prewar Homes

As discussed in the theoretical section, while present-day interdependence with perpetrators should result in increased support for restorative justice, greater past exposure to war violence and

⁵ The sampling frame was stratified on the basis of two stratification variables. First, the stratification variable was based on Bosnia's two entities: Federation and Republika Srpska. Second, the stratification variable was based on the coefficient of return (CR) for each municipality. The CR combined the 1991 prewar Census data with the 2005 estimates of return (provided by the Bosnian Ministry of Human Rights and Refugees; Nenadic et al., 2005) to express the estimated percentage of the prewar minority population which returned to the given municipality in the postwar period. The median value of the CR for the Federation was 12.49%, and the median value for the RS was 14.74%. In the Federation, we randomly selected 12 municipalities where the CR was less than median and 11 municipalities where the CR was greater than the median. Similarly, in Republika Srpska, we randomly selected seven municipalities where the CR is less than the median and five municipalities where CR is greater than the median.

Table 2. Independent Variables

Variables					
Did you have to leave your place of residence due to the 1992–95 War?				Freq.	Per.
No				253	25.12
Yes – Still displaced				250	24.83
Yes – Returned to prewar residence				504	50.05
Did you personally experience any of the following during the conflict?	<i>N</i>	mean	<i>SD</i>	min	max
Physical injury	735	0.040	0.195	0	1
Lost loved one	737	0.497	0.500	0	1
Imprisonment	735	0.067	0.250	0	1
Torture	735	0.022	0.146	0	1
You, your parents, or spouse lost property (House, Apartment, or Land)	741	0.800	0.400	0	1

war-related losses should be associated with greater support for retributive justice. We rely upon *return to prewar homes* as a proxy for greater interdependence with perpetrators. Indeed, 60% of the displaced persons who were wounded, imprisoned, tortured, or lost a loved one affirmed that they *personally* knew at least some of the perpetrators who had mistreated them ($N = 115$). This statistic does not account for the many additional associational linkages between victims and perpetrators that this implies. By definition, return to prewar homes puts victims into closer social proximity to perpetrators and the social networks to which they belong.

Specifically, we compare those who remain displaced from their prewar homes to those who were never displaced and those who returned to their prewar homes. We hypothesize that, in comparison to those who remain displaced or were never displaced, returnees would express greater support for restorative justice since perpetrators would have greater “association value” for returnees as they negotiate their daily existence (Petersen et al., 2010, 2012).

The findings indicate that compared to those who remain displaced, *returnees* are more likely to embrace amnesty (no punishment) for perpetrators whom they must, presumably, live beside (see Table 4). In addition, they are less likely to wish for perpetrators to be harshly punished if found guilty

Table 3. Control Variables

Variables					
Identity				Freq.	Percent
Serb				273	28.56
Bosnian				43	4.50
Bosniac				498	52.09
Croat				121	12.66
Mixed				21	2.20
Highest level of education completed					
<Primary				157	15.65
Primary				229	22.83
Secondary				498	49.65
University				119	11.86
Age	<i>N</i>	mean	<i>SD</i>	min	max
Female	1,007	50.71	16.77	18	91
Lives in an urban location (more than 2,000 inhabitants)	1,007	0.562	0.496	0	1
Family’s overall economic situation before the conflict compared to other people	997	3.943	0.881	1	5

Table 4. Exposure to War Violence, War-Related Losses and Attitudes Towards Transitional Justice

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
Variables	Amnesty	Forgiveness	Trial	Criminal Pays	State Pays	State Apology	Right Injustices
<i>Displacement status</i>							
(ref: Still displaced)							
Never displaced	0.393** (0.194)	0.126 (0.171)	0.005 (0.077)	-0.116 (0.133)	-0.063 (0.142)	0.426*** (0.146)	0.033 (0.059)
Returnee	0.876*** (0.185)	0.353** (0.160)	-0.264*** (0.101)	0.201 (0.117)	0.195 (0.119)	0.184 (0.138)	-0.053 (0.053)
Observations	887	902	915	903	908	907	823
R ²	0.091	0.053	0.056	0.070	0.057	0.116	0.083
Lost property	-0.003 (0.188)	-0.304 (0.160)	0.132 (0.097)	0.293** (0.127)	0.081 (0.122)	-0.242 (0.129)	-0.015 (0.058)
Observations	652	658	670	664	668	664	605
R ²	0.062	0.075	0.046	0.081	0.053	0.127	0.115
Lost loved one	-0.594*** (0.164)	-0.277 (0.145)	0.255*** (0.095)	-0.160 (0.099)	-0.184 (0.111)	-0.224 (0.130)	0.091 (0.051)
Observations	650	655	667	661	665	661	602
R ²	0.103	0.085	0.059	0.075	0.060	0.124	0.118
Physical injury	-1.071*** (0.342)	-0.557 (0.317)	0.317*** (0.110)	-0.201 (0.396)	-0.429 (0.403)	-0.203 (0.390)	-0.024 (0.118)
Observations	647	652	664	658	662	658	599
R ²	0.076	0.075	0.046	0.070	0.055	0.126	0.123
Imprisonment	-0.214 (0.427)	-0.453 (0.363)	0.349*** (0.112)	0.113 (0.259)	-0.114 (0.289)	0.309 (0.301)	0.108 (0.078)
Observations	647	652	664	658	662	658	599
R ²	0.064	0.075	0.050	0.070	0.051	0.128	0.126
Torture	0.867** (0.385)	0.453 (0.517)	0.417*** (0.123)	-1.286*** (0.336)	-1.000** (0.437)	-0.262 (0.620)	0.197*** (0.067)
Observations	647	652	664	658	662	658	599
R ²	0.069	0.072	0.047	0.098	0.068	0.126	0.127

Note. Each estimate is from a separate regression. All regressions include the same set of controls: Education, Identity, Economic situation prior to war, Lives in urban area, Age, Age squared, and Gender (results shown in online supporting information). Robust standard errors in parentheses. ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$.

by a fair trial (supporting H4). Instead, they express more support for the view that perpetrators should be forgiven (supporting H3). These findings offer strong support for our theoretical framework. Interdependence with perpetrators appears to down-regulate the willingness of victims to impose costs on perpetrators and up-regulate their propensity towards forgiveness. Imposing costs on others with high association values indirectly harms the victim and precludes downstream fitness benefits derived from perpetrators and their associates. By contrast, forgiveness is the result of an evolved system designed to signal a restoration of valuable social relationships following exploitation (Burnette, McCullough, Van Tongeren, & Davis, 2012; McCullough, Kurzban, & Tabak, 2013).

Compared to those who remain displaced, those *never displaced* are more likely to accept amnesty for war criminals if that ensured a lasting peace and are more likely to want the state to apologize for past atrocities (see Table 4). Thus in comparison to those still displaced, those who were never displaced are more in favor of blanket amnesty for perpetrators. This is in line with our model as well; perpetrators have low association value for those who were displaced but never returned to their pre-war homes (supporting H4). At the same time, these individuals have a more intimate experience of war violence and war losses compared to those who were never displaced, resulting in less support for amnesties (supporting H2). It is perhaps for this reason that those who were never displaced are more

interested in abstract and symbolic reparative strategies such as state apologies aimed at collective acknowledgement of past wrongdoings.

Despite these differences between displaced persons who never returned and those never displaced in the first place, both groups express stronger preferences for retributive justice measures in comparison to returnees (supporting H4).⁶

Overall, these findings support our proposition that the local postwar context in which people find themselves has an important influence on transitional justice preferences. In the case of displaced persons, return to prewar homes results in greater preference for restorative justice.

Social Capital and Community Organizations

In addition to affecting the level of interdependence with perpetrators, an additional feature of one's local environment that may shape transitional justice preferences is involvement in social organizations such as *displaced persons' associations*. The survey item capturing participation in displaced persons' organizations during the last 12 months suffers from a lot of nonresponse (not reported in Table 4). However, based on the responses we have, those who participated at least once in such organizations express more support for amnesty ($b = 0.793$, $p = 0.041$), a state apology ($b = 0.527$, $p = 0.070$), and the view that past injustices must be addressed to resolve conflicts ($b = 0.184$, $p = 0.055$). This mixed result appears somewhat confusing at first glance. However, in line with our theoretical framework, the first two results (amnesty and a state apology) appear to be driven purely by displacement status. Returnees are more likely to participate than those still displaced; controlling for displacement status renders the effect of participation insignificant. After controlling for displacement status, however, those who participate in displaced persons' associations still express more interest in righting past injustices. This finding remains an anomaly, although the data is rather weak.

Interestingly, those who were members in displaced persons' associations during their forced expulsions also express more support for the payment of compensation to victims' option from both war criminals ($b = 0.476$, $p = 0.000$) and the state ($b = 0.382$, $p = 0.006$). This may be because membership in associations increased their willingness to seek redress in spite of the potential drawbacks of imposing costs on perpetrators (this conjecture does not include the state, however, which is not a human "associate"), but it may also be the result of those most willing to seek compensation joining associations in order to work collectively towards their goals. The results are compatible with either interpretation.

In sum, although more research will be required in order to fully examine this hypothesis, particularly in other cases such as Cyprus or Georgia where return has not been an option yet, the findings regarding membership and participation in organizations suggest that social capital may contribute to shaping transitional justice preferences among those displaced during the war. This leaves open the possibility that social organizations may override victims' sense of interdependence with perpetrators and increase support for imposing financial costs on perpetrators in order to right past injustices.

On the whole, however, the findings largely support our conjecture that present-day interdependence with perpetrators results in increased support for restorative justice measures.

⁶ It is also interesting to compare returnees to those *never displaced* (not shown in table). Compared to those never displaced, returnees express more support for amnesty ($b = 0.482$, $p = 0.010$), less support for criminal prosecutions ($b = -0.268$, $p = 0.007$), more support for perpetrators paying compensation to victims ($b = 0.317$, $p = 0.004$), more support for the state paying compensation to victims ($b = 0.258$, $p = 0.011$), and less support for a state apology ($b = -0.242$, $p = 0.054$). Returnees thus tend to have stronger preferences for restorative justice, including financial compensation, compared to those never displaced from their homes, although they are less supportive of symbolic gestures made by the state.

Direct Exposure to Violence and War-Related Losses

In the theoretical section, we drew a distinction between current and past experiences in shaping individuals' transitional justice preferences. It is important to understand that not all displaced persons were exposed to the same set of past experiences or losses during the war. Thus within any particular situation (e.g., return to prewar residences versus remaining in the areas to which one was displaced during the war), individuals' transitional justice preferences will differ due to variation in their personal experiences during the war. We hypothesized that the experience of more extreme forms of war violence and war-related losses would result in greater support for retributive justice measures following tit-for-tat logic of deterrence.

The findings indicate that when it comes to the transitional justice preferences of those displaced during the war (both those who remain displaced and those who returned to their prewar homes), individuals directly exposed to war violence and war-related losses tend to express greater preferences for the retributive justice over restorative justice (supporting H1–2). This is in line with previous literature, which suggests that exposure to violence and losses results in greater adherence to the “ethos of conflict”: a situation that may persist long after wars' end. However, there are several nuances with regard to previous experience of displaced persons in the context of transitional justice that we are able to explore with our unique data.

In societies affected by protracted conflict, individuals directly exposed to violence and losses tend to adhere more strongly to the conflict-supporting shared beliefs of the society—also termed the “ethos of conflict” or “conflict ideology” (Canetti et al., 2015; Hobfoll, Canetti-Nisim, & Johnson, 2006; Lavi, Canetti, Sharvit, Bar-Tal, & Hobfoll, 2014). As illustrated in previous research, exposure to violence and war losses that cannot be recovered (i.e., the loss of loved ones) exert a negative impact on intergroup attitudes in wartime and postwar situations (Bakke, O'Loughlin, & Ward, 2009; Besser & Neria, 2009; Canetti-Nisim, Halperin, Sharvit, & Hobfoll, 2009; Dyrstad, 2012; Dyrstad, Buhaug, Ringdal, Simkus, & Listhaug, 2011; Gould & Klor, 2010; Halperin, Canetti, Hobfoll, & Johnson, 2009; Hayes & McAllister, 2001; Lavi et al., 2014; Pham et al., 2004; Punamaki, Qouta, & El Sarraj, 1997; Samii, 2011). We contribute to this literature in novel ways by examining how exposure to violence and war-related losses impact individuals' *transitional justice* preferences, which are closely linked to the “ethos of conflict” that tends to persist long after wars end (Bar-Tal & Halperin, 2011; Bar-Tal et al., 2012). In addition, we go beyond existing research by providing a more nuanced understanding of the impact of exposure to violence by employing multiple indicators of exposure and loss.

In the theoretical section, we argued that the severity of the crime regulates *how much* to react (how severely to punish the perpetrator). In terms of the severity of crimes, we make a distinction between war-related losses that can be recovered (e.g., physical property and financial losses) and those that cannot be recovered (e.g., the loss of a loved one). Our theoretical expectation is that losses that cannot be recovered will drive individuals to pursue retributive justice, while losses that can be recovered will motivate efforts to seek financial compensation. The findings demonstrate that those who lost their property during the war (house, apartment, or land) want perpetrators to pay compensation to their victims (see Table 4). On the other hand, those who suffered irrecoverable losses as a result of the war (i.e., lost a loved one) do not want amnesty for perpetrators and instead wish them to be harshly punished if found guilty by a fair trial (supporting H1–2). The data thus support our theoretical conjecture that the type of loss (recoverable or nonrecoverable) individuals experience affects their transitional justice preferences following a tit-for-tat logic of deterrence. Our findings with regard to irrecoverable losses are also in line with previous research in Burundi, which showed that loss of an immediate family member resulted in less willingness to forgive perpetrators (Samii, 2011).

Turning to direct exposure to violence, the findings suggest that those *imprisoned* express more support for the view that perpetrators should be harshly punished if found guilty by a fair trial

(supporting H1). Those exposed to *physical injury* also wish perpetrators to be harshly punished if found guilty by a fair trial (supporting H1); however, they also express less support for amnesty or forgiveness for perpetrators (supporting H2). This finding is especially interesting when contrasted with the findings presented earlier regarding the effects of return to prewar homes where individuals must live in closer proximity to members of other groups and those who perpetrated violence against them or members of their community during the war (in comparison to those who remain displaced or were never displaced, returnees express more support for forgiveness of perpetrators). These findings are both in line with our view that both present experiences (living in prewar homes versus remaining displaced) and previous experiences (personal exposure to violence and losses during the war) shape transitional justice preferences. This finding also helps to explain the puzzling findings of previous research: In the North Caucasus of Russia, personal exposure to violence was associated with less willingness to forgive perpetrators, but living closer to the actual fighting was associated with more forgiveness (Bakke et al., 2009).

Those exposed to *torture* also express more support for the view that perpetrators should be harshly punished if found guilty by a fair trial (supporting H1). In addition, these respondents also tend to feel that it is necessary to right the injustices that happened in the past in order to resolve conflicts. They also express less interest in the state apologizing for past atrocities and in either the state or perpetrators paying financial compensation to victims. Thus, like those imprisoned or physically injured, those tortured during the war express greater preferences for retributive justice in general (harsh punishments for perpetrators if found guilty by a fair trial and the belief that to create a lasting peace it is necessary to right past injustices). At the same time, however, it is interesting to note that those exposed to torture also express more support for amnesty for perpetrators if that would lead to lasting peace (*not* in line with H2). This seems to suggest that the experience of torture encourages individuals to prioritize preventing the recurrence of war by any means necessary, including nonretributive transitional justice measures such as amnesty for war criminals. This surprising finding merits further investigation in future research.

On the whole, however, these findings suggest that exposure to violence is associated with stronger preferences for retributive justice, and the more extensive the exposure, the more extensive the impact on one's preferences, with the caveat that those tortured during the war also would accept amnesty if that would help to ensure lasting peace.

When it comes to the controls (see Tables A1–A6 in the online supporting information), the results are somewhat mixed across all the models. However, we wish to highlight a few findings. It is clear that a better economic situation prior to the war is associated with less support for financial compensation by both perpetrators and the state. More educated persons express less support for amnesties and forgiveness and the view that it is important to right past injustices in order to move on after conflict. They also express more interest in criminals paying financial compensation to victims. In addition, Bosniaks and Croats express more interest in a state apology in comparison to Serbs, presumably since the state in question is believed by respondents to mean Serbia.

Conclusion: Return Influences Reconciliation Attitudes Among Victims

Transitional justice has emerged in an effort to address victims' needs by means of restoring social, ethnic, and community relations fractured by mass violence. Closer attention to civilians in peace processes and/or democratic transitions has been necessitated by the changing perception that civilian victimization is increasing. As we demonstrate in this article, over the past decades greater attention is placed on civilian victimization as opposed to the past, largely due to the emergence of new transnational actors who scrutinize and document patterns of crimes coupled with the development of a robust international normative framework (Méndez & Wentworth, 2011). This changing

reality (or perception) marks an attempt in the academic and policy literature to move from “negative” to “positive” forms of peace building (Galtung, 2001). The emergence of transitional justice as a distinctive field of inquiry reflects precisely this growing emphasis in addressing victims’ needs in postconflict settings.

This article contributes to the current debates on positive peace in at least three distinctive ways: First, by identifying a set of questions in quantitative survey analysis of relevance to vulnerable groups and victims; second, by highlighting the alternative impact different forms of victimization could have on attitudes towards transitional justice; and third, by demonstrating that specific forms of reparations at least for some victim categories (e.g., the returnees) could make a positive contribution to peace. Overall, the survey’s insights will enable specialists to conduct related opinion polls across postconflict societies to assess attitudes towards transitional justice, to identify institutional designs more likely to facilitate reconciliation and, most importantly, to examine critical concerns of victims that must be addressed to make “positive peace” imaginable.

More specifically, in Bosnia our survey of 1,007 returnees and nonreturnees has investigated various victim groups focusing on pre- and postconflict variables explaining attitudes towards alternative transitional justice mechanisms following the 1992–95 war. We demonstrate that the local postwar context in which people find themselves influences transitional justice preferences. Taking into consideration the multiplicity of victimhood and transitional justice mechanisms in Bosnia, the article also demonstrates that these findings are relevant for transitional justice and conflict resolution studies more broadly. Specifically, we hypothesize that different victim or nonvictim groups might opt for distinctive transitional justice mechanisms (e.g., state compensation, apologies, amnesties, punishment for perpetrators). Our findings suggest that compared to those who remain displaced, those never displaced are more likely to accept amnesty for war criminals if that ensured a lasting peace and would like the state to apologize for past atrocities. Returnees are also more likely to embrace amnesty but are also more likely than those who remain displaced to embrace the forgiveness of perpetrators whom they must, presumably, live beside. In addition, they are less likely to wish for perpetrators to be harshly punished if found guilty by a fair trial. Instead, they would want them to pay compensations to their victims.

Moreover, those directly exposed to physical violence are less likely to endorse amnesty or forgiveness for perpetrators and instead wish them to be harshly punished if found guilty by a fair trial. Those who lost loved ones as a result of the war feel similarly. In addition, these respondents also express more support for the view that it is necessary to right the injustices that happened in the past in order to resolve conflicts. They are also less interested in the state apologizing for past atrocities or compensating victims. Moreover, the findings suggest that those *imprisoned* express more support for the view that perpetrators should be harshly punished if found guilty by a fair trial. Those exposed to *physical injury* also wish perpetrators to be harshly punished if found guilty by a fair trial; however, they also express less support for amnesty or forgiveness for perpetrators. While those exposed to *torture* also express more support for the view that perpetrators should be harshly punished, if found guilty by a fair trial, our data suggest that the same category of victims also express more support for amnesty for perpetrators if that would lead to lasting peace. This finding suggests that experience of war could be further disaggregated in future surveys as certain experiences might encourage individuals to prioritize lasting peace by any means necessary. Admittedly, our survey did not include data on other victim categories (e.g., victims of rape) due to ethical concerns; such crimes tied to the conflict experience of certain population groups, in this case women, might also lead to different attitudes towards transitional justice.

Moreover, those who lost their property during the war (house, apartment, or land) express less support for forgiveness for perpetrators and instead want them to pay compensation to their victims. They are also less interested in a state apology. Interestingly, the findings demonstrate the interplay between return to preconflict homes and reduced support for retributive justice (e.g., support for

amnesty as opposed to trials and forgiveness for perpetrators). Our findings thus demonstrate the critical importance of sustainable voluntary returns as a policy priority following civil wars.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for providing the funding to conduct the survey and the EURIAS fellowship of the Network of European Institutes for Advanced Study. We would also like to thank the British Academy and Leverhulme Trust. We are particularly grateful to the three anonymous reviewers for providing insightful feedback that helped us improve the quality of the article. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Iosif Kovras, Department of International Politics, City University of London, London, UK. E-mail: Iosif.Kovras@city.ac.uk

REFERENCES

- Aguilar, P. (2008). Transitional or post-transitional justice? Recent developments in the Spanish case. *South European Society and Politics*, 13(4), 417–433.
- Aguilar, P., Balcells, L., & Cebolla-Boado, H. (2011). Determinants of attitudes toward transitional justice: An empirical analysis of the Spanish case. *Comparative Political Studies*, 44(10), 1397–1430.
- Aronson, J. D. (2011). The strengths and limitations of South Africa's search for apartheid-era missing persons. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 5(2), 262–281.
- Bakke, K. M., O'Loughlin, J., & Ward, M. D. (2009). Reconciliation in conflict-affected societies: Multilevel modeling of individual and contextual factors in the North Caucasus of Russia. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 99(5), 1012–1021.
- Bar-Tal, D. (2007). Sociopsychological foundations of intractable conflicts. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 50(11), 1430–1453.
- Bar-Tal, D., & Halperin, E. (2011). Socio-psychological barriers to conflict resolution. In D. Bar-Tal (Ed.), *Intergroup conflicts and their resolution: Social psychological perspective* (pp. 217–240). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Bar-Tal, D., Sharvit, K., Halperin, E., & Zafran, A. (2012). Ethos of conflict: The concept and its measurement. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 18(1), 40–61.
- BBC News. (2007). Bosnia war dead figure announced. Retrieved from <http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/europe/6228152.stm>
- Becker, E. (1973). *The denial of death*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Belloni, R. (2008). *State building and international intervention in Bosnia*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Berger, P. L., & Luckman, T. (1966). *The social construction of reality: A treatise in the sociology of knowledge*. London, United Kingdom: Penguin.
- Besser, A., & Neria, Y. (2009). PTSD symptoms, satisfaction with life, and prejudicial attitudes toward the adversary among Israeli civilians exposed to ongoing missile attacks. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 22(4), 268–275.
- Bieber, F. (2006). *Post-war Bosnia: Ethnicity, inequality and public sector governance*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Binningsbø, H. M., Loyle, C. E., Gates, S., & Elster, J. (2012). Armed conflict and post-conflict justice, 1946–2006. A dataset. *Journal of Peace Research*, 49(5), 731–740.
- Biro, M., Dean, A., Corkalo, D., Djipa, D., Milin, P., & Weinstein, H. M. (2004). Attitudes toward justice and social reconstruction in Bosnia and Herzegovina and Croatia. In E. Stover & H. Weinstein (Eds.), *My neighbor, my enemy: Justice and community in the aftermath of mass atrocity* (pp. 183–205). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Breen-Smyth, M. (2007). *Truth recovery and justice after conflict: Managing violent pasts*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Brewer, M. B. (1991). The social self: On being the same and different at the same time. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 17(5), 475–482.
- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love and outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues*, 55(3), 429–444.

- Burnette, J. L., McCullough, M. E., Van Tongeren, D. R., & Davis, D. E. (2012). Forgiveness results from integrating information about relationship value and exploitation risk. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *38*(3), 345–356.
- Canetti, D., Elad-Strenger, J., Lavi, I., Guy, D., & Bar-Tal, D. (2015). Exposure to violence, ethos of conflict, and support for compromise surveys in Israel, East Jerusalem, West Bank, and Gaza. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *18*, 40–61. doi:0022002715569771
- Canetti, D., Hall, B. J., Rapaport, C., & Wayne, C. (2013). Exposure to political violence and political extremism. *European Psychologist*, *18*(4), 263–272.
- Canetti-Nisim, D., Halperin, E., Sharvit, K., & Hobfoll, S. E. (2009). A new stress-based model of political extremism. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *53*(3), 363–389.
- David, R., & Choi, S. Y. (2006). Forgiveness and transitional justice in the Czech Republic. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *50*(3), 339–367.
- De Brito, A. B., González Enríquez, C., & Aguilar, P. (Eds.). (2001). *The politics of memory and democratization: Transitional justice in democratizing societies*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Doak, J. (2011). The therapeutic dimension of transitional justice: Emotional repair and victim satisfaction in international trials and truth commissions. *International Criminal Law Review*, *11*(2), 263–298.
- Duntley, J. D. (2005). Adaptations to dangers from humans. In D. Buss (Ed.), *The handbook of evolutionary psychology* (pp. 224–249). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Dyrstad, K. (2012). After ethnic civil war: Ethno-nationalism in the Western Balkans. *Journal of Peace Research*, *49*(6), 817–831. doi:10.1177/0022343312439202
- Dyrstad, K., Buhaug, H., Ringdal, K., Simkus, A., & Listhaug, O. (2011). Microfoundations of civil conflict reconciliation: Ethnicity and context. *International Interactions*, *37*(4), 363–387.
- Galtung, J. (2001). After violence, reconstruction, reconciliation, and resolution. In M. Abu-Nimer (Ed.), *Reconciliation, justice, and coexistence: Theory and practice* (pp. 3–23). New York, NY: Lexington Books.
- Gibson, J. L. (2002). Truth, justice, and reconciliation: Judging the fairness of amnesty in South Africa. *American Journal of Political Science*, *46*(3), 540–556.
- Gibson, J. L. (2006). The contributions of truth to reconciliation: Lessons from South Africa. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *50*(3), 409–432.
- Gould, E. D., & Klor, E. F. (2010). Does terrorism work? *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *125*(4), 1459–1510.
- Gready, P., & Robins, S. (2014). From transitional to transformative justice: A new agenda for practice. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, *8*(3), 339–361.
- Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., & Solomon, S. (1986). The causes and consequences of a need for self-esteem: A terror management theory. In R. F. Baumeister (Ed.), *Public self and private self* (pp. 189–212). New York, NY: Springer-Verlag.
- Halperin, E., Canetti, D., Hobfoll, S. E., & Johnson, R. J. (2009). Terror, resource gains and exclusionist political attitudes among new immigrants and veteran Israelis. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, *35*(6), 997–1014.
- Hayes, B. C., & McAllister, I. (2001). Sowing dragon's teeth: Public support for political violence and paramilitarism in Northern Ireland. *Political Studies*, *49*(5), 901–922.
- Hayner, P. B. (2010). *Unspeakable truths: Transitional justice and the challenge of truth commissions*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Hewstone, M., Rubin, M., & Willis, H. (2002). Intergroup bias. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *53*(1), 575–604.
- Hobfoll, S. E., Canetti-Nisim, D., & Johnson, R. J. (2006). Exposure to terrorism, stress-related mental health symptoms, and defensive coping among Jews and Arabs in Israel. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *74*(2), 207–218.
- Hogg, M. A. (2000). Subjective uncertainty reduction through self-categorization: A motivational theory of social identity processes. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *11*(1), 223–255.
- Janoff-Bulman, R. (1992). *Shattered assumptions: Towards a new psychology of trauma*. New York, NY: Free Press.
- Keil, S., & Kudlenko, A. (2015). Bosnia and Herzegovina 20 years after Dayton: Complexity born of paradoxes. *International Peacekeeping*, *22*(5), 471–489.
- Kim, H. J., & Sikkink, K. (2010). Explaining the deterrence effect of human rights. Prosecutions for transitional countries. *International Studies Quarterly*, *54*(4), 939–963.
- Kovras, I. (2014). *Truth recovery and transitional justice: Deferring human rights issues*. London, United Kingdom: Routledge.
- Lavi, I., Canetti, D., Sharvit, K., Bar-Tal, D., & Hobfoll, S. E. (2014). Protected by ethos in a protracted conflict? A comparative study among Israelis and Palestinians in the West Bank, Gaza, and East Jerusalem. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *58*(1), 68–92.

- Lordos, A. (2016). Roundtable presentation at the Referendums in Peace Processes Conference. Home for Cooperation/ University of Cyprus, Nicosia.
- McCullough, M. E., Kurzban, R., & Tabak, B. A. (2013). Cognitive systems for revenge and forgiveness. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 36(01), 1–15.
- McEvoy, K., & McConnachie, K. (2012). Victimology in transitional justice: Victimhood, innocence and hierarchy. *European Journal of Criminology*, 9(5), 527–538.
- McEvoy, K., & McConnachie, K. (2013). Victims and transitional justice voice, agency and blame. *Social & Legal Studies*, 22(4), 489–513.
- Méndez, J. E., & Wentworth, M. (2011). *Taking a stand: The evolution of human rights*. New York, NY: Macmillan.
- Millar, G. (2011). Local evaluations of justice through truth telling in Sierra Leone: Postwar needs and transitional justice. *Human Rights Review*, 12(4), 515–535.
- Muldoon, O. T. (2013). Understanding the impact of political violence in childhood: A theoretical review using a social identity approach. *Clinical psychology review*, 33(8), 929–939.
- Nalepa, M. (2010). *Skeletons in the closet: Transitional justice in post-communist Europe*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Nenadić, M., Džepar-Ganibegović, N., Lipjankić, M., Borovčanin, D., Spasojević, N., Kovač, D., & Pobrić, A. (2005). Comparative analysis on access to rights of refugees and displaced persons. Ministry for Human Rights and Refugees, Sarajevo. Retrieved from <http://www.mhrr.gov.ba/PDF/UporednaAnalizaEngleski.pdf>
- Nettelfield, L. J. (2010). *Courting democracy in Bosnia and Herzegovina*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Nettelfield, L. J., & Wagner, S. (2013). *Srebrenica in the aftermath of genocide*. Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Nussio, E., Rettberg, A., & Ugarriza, J. E. (2015). Victims, nonvictims and their opinions on transitional justice: Findings from the Colombian case. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 9(2), 336–354.
- Olsen, T., Leigh, P., & Andrew, R. (2010). The justice balance: When transitional justice improves human rights and democracy. *Human Rights Quarterly*, 32(4), 980–1007.
- Petersen, M. B., Sell, A., Tooby, J., & Cosmides, L. (2010). Evolutionary psychology and criminal justice: A recalibrational theory of punishment and reconciliation. In H. Høgh-Olesen (Ed.), *Human morality and sociality* (pp. 31–57). New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Petersen, M. B., Sell, A., Tooby, J., & Cosmides, L. (2012). To punish or repair? Evolutionary psychology and lay intuitions about modern criminal justice. *Evolution and Human Behavior*, 33(6), 682–695.
- Pham, P. N., Weinstein, H. M., & Longman, T. (2004). Trauma an PTSD symptoms in Rwanda. *JAMA: The Journal of the American Medical Association*, 292(5), 602–612.
- Porat, R., Halperin, E., & Bar-Tal, D. (2015). The effect of sociopsychological barriers on the processing of new information about peace opportunities. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 59(1), 93–119.
- Punamaki, R.-L., Qouta, S., & El Sarraj, E. (1997). Relationships between traumatic events, children's gender, and political activity, and perceptions of parenting styles. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 21(1), 91–109. doi:10.1080/016502597385009
- Robins, S. (2011). Towards victim-centred transitional justice: Understanding the needs of families of the disappeared in postconflict Nepal. *International Journal of Transitional Justice*, 5(1), 75–98.
- Robinson, P. H., Kurzban, R., & Jones, O. D. (2007). The origins of shared intuitions of justice. *Vanderbilt Law Review*, 60, 1633–1688.
- Samii, C. (2011). *Microdynamics of war-to-peace transitions: Evidence from Burundi*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Sikkink, K. (2008). From pariah state to global protagonist: Argentina and the struggle for international human rights. *Latin American Politics and Society*, 50(1), 1–29.
- Sikkink, K., & Walling, C. B. (2007). The impact of human rights trials in Latin America. *Journal of Peace Research*, 44(4), 427–445.
- Sitas, A., Latif, D., & Loizou, N. (2007). Prospects of reconciliation, co-existence and forgiveness in Cyprus in the post-referendum period. PRIO Cyprus Centre Report, 4, 2007. Retrieved from <https://www.prio.org/Global/upload/Cyprus/Publications/Prospects%20of%20Reconciliation%20low.pdf>
- Skitka, L. J. (1999). Ideological and attributional boundaries on public compassion: Reactions to individuals and communities affected by a natural disaster. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 25(7), 793–808.
- Stover, E., & Shigekane, R. (2004). Exhumation of mass graves: Balancing legal and humanitarian needs. In E. Stover & H. M. Weinstein (Eds.), *My neighbor, my enemy: Justice and community in the aftermath of mass atrocity* (pp. 85–103). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

- Stover, E., & Weinstein, H. M. (2004). Conclusion: A common objective, a universe of alternatives. In E. Stover & H. M. Weinstein (Eds.), *My neighbor, my enemy: Justice and community in the aftermath of mass atrocity* (pp. 85–323). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.
- Tajfel, H. (1981). Social stereotypes and social groups. In J. C. Turner & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup behavior* (pp. 144–167). Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago, IL: Nelson-Hall.
- Toal, G., & Dahlman, C. T. (2011). *Bosnia remade: Ethnic cleansing and its reversal*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- UNHCR. (2005). Update on condition for return to Bosnia and Herzegovina. Retrieved from <http://www.unhcr.ba/publications/B&HRET0105.pdf>
- Wagner, S. (2008). *To know where he lies: DNA technology and the search for Srebrenica's missing*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Weller, M., & Wolff, S. (2006). Bosnia and Herzegovina ten years after Dayton: Lessons for internationalized state building. *Ethnopolitics*, 5(1), 1–13.

Supporting Information

Additional supporting information may be found in the online version of this article at the publisher's website:

Table S1. Displacement Status and Attitudes Towards Transitional Justice

Table S2. Loss of Property and Attitudes Towards Transitional Justice

Table S3. Loss of Loved Ones and Attitudes Towards Transitional Justice

Table S4. Exposure to Physical Injury and Attitudes Towards Transitional Justice

Table S5. Imprisonment and Attitudes Towards Transitional Justice

Table S6. Exposure to Torture and Attitudes Towards Transitional Justice