

## Tribal Intolerance and Revenge among Palestinian Universities' Students

Iyad Khamaysa

### Abstract

The present study examined the tribal intolerance and revenge among Palestinian universities' students. Tribal intolerance and revenge was evaluated using a 46-item index scale developed by the researcher that was administrated to three hundred and eighty-three Palestinian university students. The data was statistically analyzed using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). Palestinian students had a moderate level of tribal intolerance and revenge. Of the students surveyed, 62.2% revealed tribal intolerance and revenge. The results demonstrated significant statistical differences in the tribal intolerance and revenge scores among the students according to their gender and place of residency. The grade point average (GPA) emerged as a significant predictor of the tribal intolerance and revenge. The implications of the findings for practice were also highlighted.

**Keywords:** Tribal intolerance, revenge, Palestine, university students.

### Introduction

Violence based on intolerance is being created because of national identity, social identity, mental illness, and social problems. It basically occurs as a result of violence from the cultural pattern, like other types of social deviation through the socialization process of continuous education. However, it also takes place across systems, institutions, social relations, and cultural interactions produced or reproduced across units / social institutions themselves - the family and peer group, a religious institution, school, university, and political parties. In the Palestinian society, shooting inside the University and other violent attack has been a contemporary social problem. The researchers in the social sciences use several concepts to describe relations and conflict between groups and their interpretation. Thus, this includes the concepts of ethnic concentration, tolerance, stereotypes, social distance, racism, discrimination, and intolerance. The focus of their studies was on cognitive and psychological perspective in recent years. Other researchers in social psychology and sociologists asserted the priority of the concept of intolerance in the study and research to identify the nature of the relations between the members of the groups. It is a common thing

in Palestinian society to have experiences of tribal intolerance, revenge, and intolerant behavior on the streets, roads, and other common places. If you want to see real wrestling and fighting, please visit any area where there are a lot of youths. Hence, you are likely to find many arguments, scuffles, and quarrels among passengers, road users, laborers, students on campus, and shopkeepers. This might also be of partisanship and affiliation. The revenge is cloaked in social acceptability. In this context, Muschert (2007) stated that the attack on school or group of students might be as a result of revenge from a community or the struggle for power.

The justice system reflects a fundamental imbalance of power between administrators of justice and those under its purview. This can be likened to the situation whereby a fundamental power imbalance exists between parents and sons. Risk factors can be observed as a result of social stratification and low school bonding, inconsistent rule enforcement, poor security, norms supporting social aggression such as bullying, and ill-defined response systems covering procedures for teachers alarmed by the behavior or work of students. Wike and Fraser (2009) stated that the social problem is a part of the social behavior that results in unhappiness or special or general misery and it thus requires collective action to confront. This basically is because the intolerance results from social change factors, including combat, wars and this thus leads to organizational weakness or social dislocation, resulting to weak roles (Mizer, 2008). According to a study done by Wike and Fraser (2009), they suggested that it should increase communication between educational facilities and local resources, resulting to a reduction in social aggression.

The intolerance is a pattern of behavior that stems from a closed ideological reference and is generalized in the community through education. Here, intolerance is at the same time a manifestation of education which is practiced in the house on the grounds that the family is the first building block of the society. Thus, this is the first environment that gains individual values, culture, and perspective. The deal with the scourge of intolerance in the society requires the search and causes without been confused with appearances and species, nor achieved only practical research and development of standardized scales that measures intolerance under the environment and the reality of the Palestinian environment (Awad & Abdul Aziz, 2010). Intolerance in the community is a sense of functional group unity and distinctiveness of being one authority, one body, and one interest. Thus, there are multiple images of intolerance, including tribal intolerance, racial intolerance, sexual intolerance,

religious intolerance, intolerance of class, intellectual intolerance, and partisanship (Barakat, 2010).

Studies show that the urge to retaliate for a wrong lingers through adulthood. Not only physical assault provokes retaliatory behavior but also emotional abuse, unless enough mitigating factors have a significant impact on the desire and action of seeking revenge. Whether in interpersonal relationships or the workplace, human beings retaliate for perceived injustice if they continue to be dis-served. As conceived, it is a negative intergroup attitude based on false, simplified, or over-generalized beliefs. Prejudice consists of a cognitive component involving a set of beliefs or stereotypes about a derogated out-group. This refers to an affective component entailing disgust or visceral dislike for the out-group, and a disposition to behave in an aversive way toward members of the inter-group. In addition, elicit negative affective responses (e.g. disgust, or hatred) toward members of the derogated group, can serve as a feedback into subjective impressions of the out-group. These components of prejudice are likely to reinforce one another, given motivated reasoning, the showed effects of negative effect general, and disgust reactions, in particular, on moral judgment processes (Powell & Clarke, 2013; Haidt, 2001; Bloom, 2001).

## **Background**

Consequently, studies lack the important mental state and action-capacity components included in planning in social terms. A commitment to political tolerance involves a commitment to democratic procedures, the rule of law, and equal protection under the law. In addition, overlooking the impact of negative affective responses can mediate anti-social and bigoted behavior toward members of the out-group, at the level interpersonally and politically. Racism and discriminatory sexual tendency are more forms of intolerance that was figured by prominent researchers.

Research has shown several commonalities in temperament toward their family as prejudice, containing poor control of anger, righteous indignation, superiority, lack of empathy, and a combined sense of persecution (Kaukab & Saeed, 2014; Wike & Fraser, 2009; O'Toole, 2000; Verlinden et al., 2000). The intolerance social phenomenon has psychological effects, which arise from psychological problems unrelated to religious faith (Qasha'an, 2005). Historical and cross-cultural research was directed at male and female intolerance social forms of the “social constructionist” sort. It has generated societal-level or cultural theories

that explained Intolerance. They have linked the intolerance to the cultural context, and also often to a modern cultural context. However, there is also a literature devoted to the psychological questions, what motivates the intolerance? It contains an array explained psychologically. In addition, this definition existed because the tendency within studies of intolerance of all sorts has been to collapse distinctions among various types of intolerance. Also, it subscribes to the assumption that intolerance is one, and they are seldom any nuanced psychological studies of intolerance (Young-Bruehl, 1998; Schoen, 2007).

Is revenge a “Disease”? Is tolerance a “Cure”? A desire for revenge is one of the causes of many forms of aggression, but the intolerance is the basic resource for revenge. McCullough et al. (2012) has suggested that low socioeconomic status and median family income precipitates a widespread of lack of trust in formal legal methods for settling differences. Instead, it encourages the adoption of personal revenge, rather than appeals to law enforcement authorities for settling one’s interpersonal grievances. Kubrin and Weitzer (2003) found that high levels of poverty and high percentages of children not living with both parents also had the highest rates of revenge and high unemployment rates.

According to the Oxford Dictionary (2017), revenge is an act and a desire. In the act of revenge, individuals respond to a wrong by harming the transgressor. Revenge can also refer to the urge to pay back wrongs; thus, a person can have revenge in his heart. It can also refer to the action of inflicting hurt or harm on someone for an injury or wrong suffered at their hands through the use of either firearm, knives, sticks, or stones (Schumann & Ross, 2010).

People who attach great importance to personal and family reputations are also angered by insults and other attacks against their honor (Schumann & Ross, 2010). They are used in societies in which they view social institutions for settling grievances to be weak, and also socialize with individuals to defend their honor with retaliatory violence at even the most trivial things (McCullough et al., 2012; Ijzerman et al., 2007; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996; Boehm 1987; Black-Michaud, 1975).

A considered psychological theory shows that intolerance to psychological reasons often lies in the subconscious or unconscious and, in particular, in the school of psychoanalysis. Due to the influence of society, conditions, and its traditions as a result of social theory and intolerance, the person is likened as just a doll that is the mover in the society. Historical materialism put material considerations as the basis for interpreting the phenomenon. For

example, it believes on the economic motives, which make events and changes history (Qasha'an, 2005).

The aggressive behavior stemming from the tribal intolerance among youth can take many forms if they narrow it down to individuals. Thus, there is aggression in schools, colleges, universities, and along streets, roads, and markets. Aggression is generated by sheer defiant nature, being illogical, and being unaware of the consequences, Factors that contribute to an individual's aggressive behavioral responses in social situations are many and varied. Aggression is any action that can cause injury or anxiety to others (hitting, kicking, yelling at someone) or the destruction of someone's property. Physical aggression includes behaviors such as pushing, shoving, hitting, slapping, biting, kicking, hair-pulling, stabbing, and shooting. Verbal aggression includes threatening and intimidating others and engaging in malicious teasing, taunting, and name-calling (Mushtaq & Kayani, 2013).

On the other hand, there are different characters threatened by their own conscious and unconscious impulse, by their own developed structures and guilt, and by people or forces they encounter in their worlds. In addition, they defend themselves. Using this insight, we can define Intolerance by saying that they are the reflections of the attitude toward groups (and individuals as members of groups) of characteristic modes (complex modes) of defense. Intolerance is the social mechanisms of defense (Young-Bruehl, 1998). Social theories focus on the role of social, economic and political conditions, where poverty, unemployment, corruption, intolerance, and authoritarianism factors play a significant role when it comes to violence. It also affects the societal culture that glorifies violence to show the superiority, power, and control it has over others (Hussein, 2014). In this context, Enesco and Guerrero (2011) opined that poverty, color, religion, or culture may lead to discrimination, exclusion, and intolerance. In fact, it may result to prejudice in almost all social group attributed to some kind of factors such as physical, intellectual, moral, cultural, etc.

A recent study by Kaukab and Saeed (2014) aimed at identifying the widespread intolerance and inability to accept opinions varied from one's own. In recent years, we have witnessed a dwindling of flexibility in attitudes and the ability to obey other people's decisions. In Pakistan, the curse of intolerance and extremism of all kinds, whether social, sectarian and religious, seems to have taken a firm hold of the society at large. Also, universities have witnessed an increasing numbers of targeted killings. Moreover, Hussein (2014) revealed various causes and forms of university students' violence and its relationship with the

student's academic level and gender. The study revealed the following findings: the level of violence was at a moderate degree; there were significant differences in the causes of violence between students of the first academic level and both third and fourth levels; the psychological violence was the most common form of violence, followed by physical and violence against properties.

Furthermore, the study of Mushtaq and Kayani (2013) concluded that the common thing in Pakistani society is to have experiences of the violent, aggressive, and intolerant behavior of youth in the streets, roads, and other common places. The question is why do they have this behavior? The answer to this question is the focus of the study. A proliferation of violence has become the most serious social problem in Pakistan today. Not a week or even a day goes by without some terrible act of violence that shakes the public's confidence. This majorly occurs due to cultural norms such as revenge, jealousy, the social race for material attainment, or the absence of social justice and frustration. Aggression among students is majorly two types: physical aggression and verbal aggression. The study discovers that there are many factors that cause aggression, which are mostly social, cultural, psychological, economical, and educational. Each one had its impact on our covert thinking and overt behaviors.

Doran (2012) discovered that identity is, in fact, a motivational factor in school shootings as school shooters are male and have a fragile sense of identity. They also occupy a low status in the school hierarchy and are oppressed by other students. However, the opinion of peers and one's status in the school hierarchy are pivotal to how students construct their own identities. School shooters feel 'ostracized, marginalized, and threatened with emasculation.' To resolve this feeling and repair their 'fragile male identities,' school shooters follow a cultural script of extreme 'hyper-masculinity' - enmeshed in violence and revenge to 'take down' the entire institution of their schools.

Additionally, Barakat (2010) shows that the overall average level of partisanship, among members of the study, reaches an average level (3.05). Thus, this level of partisanship is based on the category of the average of students from Universities: Al-Quds Open University, and Palestine Polytechnic University. On the other hand, the average was low among An-Najah National University students. There are significant differences in the level of partisanship of the students of Palestinian universities in the north of Palestine due to the University that the student is enrolled in the study and for the benefit of Al-Quds Open



University, Palestine Polytechnic University, and finally An-Najah National University. In addition, there was no statistically significant difference at the level of partisanship to the students of Palestinian universities in the north of Palestine due to the variables: gender, housing, the school year, and academic achievement.

Furthermore, the study of Awad and Abdul Aziz (2010) shows the knowledge level of intolerance among Palestinian and Sudanese universities' students according to all the variables (Gender, Specialization, Place of residence, Level of education, GPA, Age). The findings of the study revealed statistically significant differences in intolerance among Palestinian and Sudanese. The differences favored Palestinian students. Also, the study revealed statistically significant differences in intolerance among students according to gender, the city, and literary stream. The differences are in favor of Palestinian students (females), while the differences were statistically significant based on the degree of intolerance in favor of males in the Sudanese sample. Moreover, results shown that there are no statistically significant differences in the year of the study and GPA. The total degree intolerance among all Palestinian students was 63.4%.

## **Aims and Scope**

The tribal intolerance, including revenge of the serious phenomena that grow in the Palestinian society, leads to the endless loop of violence and mutual revenge. The incidents have already occurred inside the universities, such as the death of a student after he was stabbed at Al-Quds University. In another case, the student stays alive after stabbing in another university. This also can be the case of the attack on the students with sticks and chains on issues related to intolerance and revenge for the family or tribe. Thus, this phenomenon of the main problems leads to the destruction and fragmentation of society into rival groups and feuding. Besides, the negative outcome which is destructive to the individual and to society results from disputes between families, subsequent malice and hatred, and revenge between members of the same society. In addition to the impact of the Israeli occupation, the growth of this phenomenon is being encouraged through the diversion of weapons to some families. This leads to confusion and it kept the desire for revenge and transformation of their sights about the basic question.

The objectives of the study were to investigate the phenomenon of tribal intolerance and revenge among Palestinian universities' students; to explore the factors that increase the

intolerance and revenge; and to open new prospects for further studies in the related field. The study considered as the first, and leading of its kind, revealed that tribal intolerance and revenge has been on the rise in the Palestinian society in recent years and has raised serious concerns among several Palestinian organizations.

## Hypotheses

Based on the reviewed literature, the set objectives, questions and variables of the study, the following hypotheses were proposed:

1. There are no statistical significant differences at  $\alpha \leq 0.05$  in the intolerance among Palestinian Universities' students according to their gender, age, place of residency, university, academic year.
2. There are no statistical significant correlation at  $\alpha \leq 0.05$  between GPA and the intolerance and revenge among Palestinian universities' students.

Delimiting variables for the scope of the study was based on participants' demographic characteristics, which included gender, age, place of residency, university, academic year, and academic achievement (GPA). This is in addition to the intolerance and revenge index.

## Methods and Design

The study adopted the quantitative research approach. The questionnaire is appropriate for the exploratory nature of the research. The population of the study was limited to the Palestinian universities' students during the 2016/2017 year.

The overall sample comprised of 383 students (225 males and 158 females) selected randomly. The sample size was calculated using the sampling web, <http://www.surveysystem.com/sscalc.htm>, sample size calculator, with a margin error of 0.05. The target population consisted of Palestinian universities' students in the West Bank during the 2016/2017 academic year, which included (99930) students at Al-Quds University, Palestine Polytechnic University, Al-Quds Open University, Hebron University, An-Najah National University, Bethlehem University, and Birzeit University (Palestinian National Information Center, 2017).



Intolerance and revenge were evaluated using an index of a 46-item scale introduced by Awad and Abdul Aziz (2010). A 5-point Likert scale (always, often, neither, rarely, never) was used to measure the responses. The sampling survey instrument sought background information such as the participants' gender, age, place of residency, university, academic year, and academic achievement (GPA).

Validation of the instrument proceeded in two distinct phases. The initial phase involved a group of referees and expert arbitrators who provided comments on the tool. The second phase involved the implementation of a pilot study (N=15) to validate the survey using exploratory factor analysis. Factor loading for all items exceeded 0.60 (0.62 to 0.78), which implied that those items were suitable to measure each item of intolerance and revenge among the sampled students.

The reliability was tested using Cronbach's Alpha coefficient to ascertain reliability and consistency of the survey. Cronbach's Alpha for the survey instrument was 0.98, indicating excellent reliability and consistency.

## **Data Analysis and Findings**

Data was analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The questionnaire items were rated on a 1–5 Likert scale (5=always, 4=often, 3=neither, 2=rarely and 1=never). The highest score indicated a high level of intolerance and revenge. Descriptive statistics gauged intolerance and revenge scores among the sampled population. The following statistical techniques were measured: Pearson correlation, T.test, One way analysis of variance, Tukey test, Cronbach's Alpha, and Factor Analysis.

The mean score of tribal intolerance and revenge for the sampled population was moderate (M 3.11, SD 1.04). The study observed that almost 62.2% of the Palestinian universities' students had a moderate level of tribal intolerance and revenge.

Furthermore, the findings revealed the tribal intolerance and revenge indicators ranked in descending order as follows: I dislike compliments, receiving and giving (M 4.19 SD 1.08); I cannot afford what is unclear (M 4.07, SD 0.83); I avoid everything that raises my nerves (M 3.96 SD 1.04 ); I see that my family and my tribe is distinct from the others (M 3.90 SD 1.16); I can surrender my opinion if I realized I was wrong (M 3.82 SD 1.29); I feel anxious

and upset in some situations (M 3.71 SD 1.13); If I hate someone, I dislike dealing with him, whatever the circumstances (M 3.68 SD 1.16); I do not find difficulty in dealing with people in high positions (M 3.66 SD 1.26); I cannot see nobody was a dispute with my family at the university (M 3.48 SD 1.19); and I do what I am seeing right, I do not care about the opinion of the others (M 3.48 SD 1.16).

Moreover, the study investigated demographic breakdown of tribal intolerance and revenge among Palestinian students with the aim of identifying differences. The findings revealed that age, university, and academic year do not signify any significant difference. However, it was found that gender and place of residency are significant variables. In relation to gender, the differences favored males (M 3.71 SD 0.58) compared to females (M 3.27 SD 0.43): T-test value was (4.5495 P=0.000). As for place of residency, the differences favored camp students (M 3.73 SD 0.37): F-value value was (9.682 P=0.000).

The study also revealed that age, university, and academic year do not denote any significant difference in tribal intolerance and revenge among Palestinian students. This implies that tribal intolerance and revenge is not actually influenced by these variables and is more likely to be affected by other factors other than age, university, and academic year.

Finally, the findings also denoted that there are statistical significant inverse correlations between academic achievement (GPA) and the average score of tribal intolerance and revenge among Palestinian students of which the R-correlation was (0.348 P=0.001).

### **Conclusion and Recommendations**

The findings of the study revealed that our culture moves toward revenge instead of tolerating. In fact, the Palestinian society has conservative customs and traditions, male patriarchal dominance, and social upbringing which are based on gender inequality. Patriarchal ideology is deeply rooted in the Palestinian society, where the notions of father and brother are prevalent. According to these notions, male dominance supports the structure that keeps men in positions of power, authority, and control (Barakat, 1993; Banat, 2015). This creates a larger space for males compared to females in relation to the nature of social ranks, roles, freedom, participation in decision-making, responsibility, large scale engagement in labor market, and development of potential and skills. This was reflected on

the development of the students' personalities, their interest, and increase in their ability to identify their attitudes and career decisions.

The phenomenon of violence and intolerance in the universities is a serious indicator that the Palestinian families no longer complies with the orders of an adult and do not comply with the ethical standards or religion. This shows that the Palestinian social fabric is gradually moving towards the cliff edge which leads to the destruction of the educational process. Thus, an increase in ignorance thus increases the acts of violence and murders. This is consistent with the study of Hussein (2014), Mushtaq and Kayani (2013), Doran (2015), and Qasha'an (2005). Also, there are many factors that cause aggression like social, cultural, psychological, economic, and educational. Each one had its impact on our covert thinking and overt behaviors, such as not complying towards ethical standards or religious standard. The dialogue covering the community issues find religious and legal solutions through the community. Also, the religious, educational, and legal institutions are the best solution to deal with intolerance and its devastating consequences on the society, such as killing, destruction, and aggression (McCullough et al., 2012). Based on the findings of this study, the following recommendations were made:

1. There is a need to address the Palestinian curriculum with tolerance concept as an important component of the society.
2. Issuing of bulletins in terms of the awareness of the dangers of intolerance among Palestinian families, in general, and the educational process in particular.
3. Preparing programs to combat intolerant trends and make efforts in changing them or preventing them through various media.
4. Creating workshops, conferences, and meetings to urge students to embrace the tolerance culture and democracy, and reject the culture of extremism and intolerance in all its forms and types.
5. Further studies to establish a clearer understanding of tribal intolerance and revenge among Palestinian students using the qualitative research design should be conducted.

## References

Awad, H. & Abdul Aziz, M. (2010). The degree of intolerance among Palestinian and Sudanese universities' students. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 46(8), 1- 40.

Banat, B. (2015). Violence against Palestinian women. *Journal of Peace and Conflict (Revista de Paz y Conflictos)*, Institute of Peace and Conflict, Granada University, 8(1), 135-149.

Barakat, H. (1993). *The Arab world: society, culture, and state*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Barakat, Z. (2010). Partisanship among young people in the north Palestine universities. Scientific research paper presented to the Social Justice Conference organized by the Academic Council in cooperation with Amideast in Ramallah. Retrieved September 2017, from <http://www.qou.edu/home/sciResearch/researchersPages/ziadBarakat/>

Black-Michaud, J. (1975). *Cohesive force: feud in the Mediterranean and the Middle East*. London: Basil Blackwell.

Bloom, S. (2001). Commentary: reflections on the desire for revenge. *Journal of Emotional Abuse* 2(4), 61-94.

Boehm, C. (1987). *Blood revenge: the enactment and management of conflict in Montenegro and other tribal societies*, 2nd edition. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Doran, S. (2012). *You made me what I am. You added to the rage': school shooters in the United States and the cultural script of vengeance*. London: Inter-Disciplinary Press.

Enesco, I & Guerrero, S. (2011). Special Issue: Prejudice Socio-developmental perspectives introduction. Intergroup prejudice from a developmental and social approach. *Anales de Psicología*, 27(3), 575-581.

Haidt, J. (2001). The emotional dog and its rational tail: a social intuitionist approach to moral judgment. *Psychological Review*, 108(1), 814-834.

Hussein, M. (2014). The reasons university violence, its types from the point of view a sample of university students. *Journal of Al-Aqsa University*, 8(2), 168-196.

Ijzerman, H., van Dijk, W. & Gallucci, M. (2007). A bumpy train ride: a field experiment on insult, honor, and emotional reactions. *Emotion*, 7(1), 869–875.

Kaukab, S. & Saeed, A. (2014). To analyze the factors enhancing intolerance among

university students. *Journal of Research in Humanities and Social Science*, 2(10), 1-10.

Kubrin, C. & Weitzer, R. (2003). Retaliatory homicide: concentrated disadvantage and neighborhood culture. *Social Problems*, 50(1), 157–80.

Magi, I. & Maamria, B. (2004). Dimensions of aggressive behavior and its relationship to an identity crisis among university students. *ArabPsyNet eJournal*, 4(1), 14-25.

McCullough, M., Kurzban, R., Tabak, B (2012). Cognitive systems for revenge and forgiveness. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 5(1) 1-58.

Mizer, H. (2008). *Social Problems*. Retrieved September 2017, from <https://ar.scribd.com/document/338386211/>

Muschert, G. (2007). Research in school shooting. *Sociology Compass* 1(1), 60–80.

Mushtaq, M. & Kayani, M. (2013). Exploring the factors causing aggression and violence among students and its impact on our social attitude. *Educational Research International*, 2(3), 10-18.

Nelson, T. (2009). *Handbook of prejudice stereotyping and discrimination*. New York: Psychology Press, Taylor and Francis Group, LLC.

Nisbett, R. & Cohen, D. (1996). *Culture of honor: the psychology of violence in the South*. Boulder, Co: Westview, 211-213.

O'Toole, M. (2000). *The school shooter: a threat assessment perspective*. Washington, DC: Federal Bureau of Investigation, USA.

Powell, R. & Clarke, S. (2013). Religion, tolerance, and intolerance: views from across the disciplines. *Religion, Intolerance, and Conflict*, 4(2), 1- 36.

Qasha'an, H. (2005). The reasons for intellectual and behavioral intolerance, and their relationship personal disorders. Retrieved September 2017, from <http://islam.gov.kw/Pages/ar/BookItem.aspx?id=84>

Schoen, H. (2007). Personality traits and foreign policy attitudes in German public opinion.

Journal of Conflict Resolution, 51(3), 408-430.

Schumann, K. & Ross, M. (2010). The benefits, costs, and paradox of revenge. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 4(12), 1193–1205.

Verlinden, S., Hersen, M. & Thomas, J. (2000). Risk factors in school shootings. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 20(1), 3–56.

Wike, T., Fraser, M. (2009). School shootings: making sense of the senseless. *Aggression and Violent Behavior* 14(1),162–169.

Young-Bruehl, E. (1998). *The anatomy of prejudices*. Harvard: Harvard University Press.

## **HOW TO CITE THIS PAPER**

Khamaysa, I. (2018). Tribal Intolerance and Revenge among Palestinian Universities' Students. *International Humanities Studies*, 5(3), 1-14.

## **ABOUT THE AUTHOR**

Iyad Khamaysa, PhD Candidate of Social Sciences, Faculty of Political Sciences & Sociology, Department of Sociology, The University of Granada, Granada, Spain.  
[khamaysai@gmail.com](mailto:khamaysai@gmail.com)