and who the plan appeared to favor (US or THEM). For the Israeli Jews, *US* refers to Israel and *THEM* refers to the Palestinians; for the Israeli Arabs, *US* refers to the Palestinians and *THEM* refers to Israel.

Figure 9.11 presents some of the findings from this investigation. Two effects are of interest. First, there is a general tendency to believe that all proposals favor THEM more than US. Second, this tendency is particularly pronounced when people believe the opposition has authored the proposal. A plan considered moderately advantageous to one’s cause when offered by one’s own group is viewed as highly disadvantageous to one’s cause when offered by a group one opposes. In short, the general tendency to believe agreements are biased against us is especially pronounced when the agreement is offered by the opposition.

The reactive devaluation effect poses a serious impediment to peace in the Middle East. A proposal that is viewed as reasonable when offered by one’s own side is viewed as unfair when offered by the opposition. Undoubtedly, the suspicion and enmity from generations of ill will between the disputants contributes to this bias. But the data also make a more fundamental point about the nature of psychological life. As we have seen throughout this text, meaning is variable and context determines meaning. The same agreement settlement can mean very different things depending on whether we have positive or negative attitudes toward the people who proposed it (Curhan, Neale, & Ross, 2004).

5. Group Negotiations

So far, we have been discussing situations in which individuals negotiate with one another. Groups also take part in negotiations, as when union members negotiate with management (Bazerman, Mannix, & Thompson, 1988; L. Thompson, Mannix, & Bazerman, 1988). In general, the more people involved in a negotiation, the more contentious the negotiation is. The effect is nearly linear: Individuals are more cooperative than small groups, and small groups are more cooperative than large groups (Allison, McQueen, & Schaerfl, 1992; Brewer & Kramer, 1986; Insko, Schopler, Hoyle, Dardis, & Graetz, 1990; Wildschut, Insko, & Gaertner, 2002). Several factors