



Coexistence and sport: the Israeli case

The effect of Mifalot soccer programs on the attitudes of Palestinian, Jordanian, and Israeli youth towards one another

Yair Galily¹
Michael Leitner²
Pini Shimon³

Abstract

Utilizing sports and other recreational activities to foster peaceful relations and coexistence is an idea that has gained popularity in recent years, particularly in Israel. The aim of the current research is to fill a gap in the research literature on the subject of coexistence programming. The Mifalot organization conducts a program called “Get to Know Your Neighbor” in which Palestinian, Jordanian, and Israeli youth play soccer together. The program, based mainly on the participants' love for football, is a series of activities and lessons designed to prepare children to meet and interact with youth from neighboring communities. The study examines the effects of participation in this program on the attitudes of the Palestinians, Jordanians, and Israelis toward each other.

Keywords

Coexistence, Israel, soccer, peace

¹ Sammy Ofer School of Communications, Interdisciplinary Center (IDC) Herzliya and Zinman College at the Wingate Institute, Israel, ygalily@idc.ac.il

² California State University, Chico Department of Recreation, Hospitality and Parks Management and Ben Gurion University, Eilat Campus Department of Conflict Resolution, MLeitner@csuchico.edu

³ Zinman College at the Wingate Institute, Israel, pshimon5@netvision.net.il

Introduction

Utilizing sports and other recreational activities to foster peaceful relations and coexistence is an idea that has gained popularity in recent years, particularly in Israel. There are a variety of recreational coexistence programs presently being conducted in Israel, ranging from soccer, basketball, martial arts, ultimate Frisbee, and cricket, to dancing, music, arts, and cooking.

However, the effectiveness of these programs in promoting coexistence is being questioned. A conference was held in Jaffa (Israel) on July 11, 2012 titled "Jews and Arabs kick around the same ball – and what's next?" The conference examined and questioned the effectiveness of recreation programs in fostering coexistence. As discussed at this conference, although there are many programs taking place, there has been relatively little research conducted on examining the effects of individual programs on the attitudes of the program participants.

This study sought to fill a gap in the research literature on the subject of coexistence programming. The "Mifalot" organization conducts a program called "Get to Know Your Neighbor", in which Palestinian, Jordanian, and Israeli youth play soccer together. The program, based mainly on the participants' love for football, is a series of activities and lessons designed to prepare children to meet and interact with kids from neighboring communities. This study examined the effects of participation in this program on the attitudes of the Palestinians, Jordanians, and Israelis toward one another.

Literature review

The theoretical basis of this study is primarily from previous research on attitudes of Israeli Arab and Jewish teenagers and young adults toward each other. According to Gal (1996), a nationwide study of over 3500 Israeli teenagers conducted by the Carmel Institute in 1994 found that among Arab teenagers, 24% hate all or most Jews, but 62% believe that all or most Jews hate Arabs. Among Jewish teenagers, 37% hate all or most Arabs, but 59% believe that all or most Arabs hate them. There were significant differences in attitudes among the various religious and secular groups participating in this study. For example, while only 9% of Jews from secular kibbutzim expressed hatred toward Arabs, 61% of Jews in religious vocational schools expressed hatred toward Arabs. According to Gal (1996), attitudes have continuously changed since the 1970's: In 1974, 32% of Jews surveyed expressed hatred toward Arabs; a 1988 study indicated that 40% hated Arabs; in 1994, the figure was 37%.

Other research also points to negative attitudes among Israeli Arabs and Jews toward each other. According to Zureik and Moughrabi (1987), approximately 43% of Israeli Jews have a negative view of Israeli Arabs and only 7% have a positive view; approximately 85% feel that Israeli Jews place value upon human life but that only 41% of Israeli Arabs do. According to Smooha (1989), approximately 75% of Israeli Arabs surveyed in one study believe that Israeli Jews do **not** value self-respect and family honor, and approximately 70% believe that they are exploitative and racist. Smooha also

cites survey research in which Israeli Jews express stereotypes such as Arabs being primitive (38%), violent (38%), and dirty (32%). Perhaps most striking are the statistics cited by Smootha indicating that approximately 66% of Israeli Arabs agree that it is impossible to trust most Israeli Jews, and approximately 66% of Israeli Jews agree that it is impossible to trust most Arabs in Israel.

A growing number of studies from around the world (e.g., Ford, 2006, Sugden, 2006, 2008, 2010; Skille, 2011; Lidor and Blumenstein, 2011; Rookwood, 2008; Tuohey & Cognate, 2011) demonstrated the use of sport as a vehicle for promoting mutual understanding, reconciliation, and co-existence in deeply divided societies.

Following the advice of Kidd (2008) to practitioners and policymakers to “..add to our growing knowledge of the precise circumstances under which sport may result in positive outcomes for gender relations, disability inclusion, youth development, mental health, peace and conflict resolution... for different populations and individuals..” numerous organizations, with the support of several international sports federations and the enthusiastic endorsement by the United Nations and its agencies and partners, led to the emergence of a new, world-wide “sport for development and peace movement” in 2008 (Tuohey & Cognate, 2011). In 2010, the *American Institute of Peace* organized a “Sports and Peace-building Symposium,” which, according to the organizers, was the first academic event focusing exclusively on the intersection of sport and peace-building that was organized by an institution not directly involved in the field. According to Tuohey & Cognate (2011), though a modest event in the peace-building world as a whole, the Symposium marked a significant milestone for sport-for-peace practitioners—the first step towards establishing a theoretically rigorous and empirically sound framework for sport-based peace-building “that can catalyze policy support, harmonize practitioner efforts, and ultimately aid the efforts of all those working to prevent, mitigate, or end conflict worldwide” (Tuohey & Cognato, 2011:52).

Levermore (2008), among many others, tried to sharpen the desired outcomes of sport-for-development and peace organizations. Among these outcomes, one can count: conflict resolution and inter-cultural understanding; building physical, social, and community infrastructure; raising awareness, particularly through education; empowerment; making direct impact on physical and psychological health and general welfare; and economic development and poverty alleviation. Such a Functionalist perspective, long rooted in the work of Merton (1948), Parsons (1956), and their successors, share a view suggesting that sport can be used to promote common values held essential for the integration and development of a society. Thus, sport helps to maintain social order, focuses on sport participation and positive outcomes for individuals and society, and increases sport participation opportunities to foster individual development. Such a belief clearly underpins the view of sport as an apolitical, neutral, and inherently integrative set of social practices that can deliver a wide range of positive outcomes.

However, while there is a certain theoretical logic to some of the policy assertions about the contribution of sport to aspects of development (among them early beliefs, such as the ones derived from Allport’s “Contact Hypothesis” (1958) ,which theorizes

that the interaction of individuals from two different groups can lead to significantly decreased prejudice), several scholars for example Kruse (2006), claims that many of the outcomes are "intriguingly vague and open for several interpretations", and "range from changed individual sexual behavior via community level social cohesion, to the achievement of 'peace' at regional or national level" (2006: 8). Such a belief, and counter to the functionalists mentioned above, is associated with a Marxist view. According to Coakley (2009) Marxism (*conflict theory*) describes society as a system of structures and relationships shaped by economic forces. The theory proposes that sports promote economic exploitation and capitalist expansion, and *perpetuate* power and privilege of elite groups in society. Society is stratified/arranged into layers of social classes. Social class refers to categories of people who share a position in society based on: income, wealth, education, occupation and social connections (Coakley, 2009). To Marxists, the opportunity to gain economic power and success (and thus increased life chances) varies between social classes. Some groups have more access to lifestyles that "society values", for example good health care, private school education, and positions of responsibility. The focus of Marxists on how sports perpetuate the power and privilege of elite groups in society thus cannot really change.

Recently, Coalter (2010), and also Hoberman (2011), asserted that some of these approaches contain a number of perils: confusing potential micro-level individual outcomes with community and broader macro-level impacts; ignoring wider socio-political contexts within which sport-for-development organizations have to operate; seeking to solve broad-gauge problems via limited-focus interventions; and encouraging mission drift by sport-for-development organizations wholly dependent on aid from a variety of aid agencies, often with overly ambitious non-sporting agendas. According to Coalter, if sport-for-development is to make a contribution to wider processes of development, there is a need to "de-deify" the rhetoric of sport-for-development and its implicit view of sport, and to view research and evaluation in terms of local program development rather than the legitimization of international organizations and lobbies. At the same time, even Coalter agree that in a broad sense, "sport-for-development" has been a consistent theme in most public policies for sport in industrialized countries (Coalter, 2007).

Notwithstanding, probably the broadest view can be stems from Sugden's (2006, 2008, 2010) work: Drawing from the role played by sport in South Africa before and after apartheid, and from his own experiences garnered over more than two decades of conducting research and leading sport-based intervention initiatives in Northern Ireland and Israel, he argues that sport is intrinsically value-neutral, and under carefully managed circumstances it can make a positive if modest contribution to peace building.

Israel is home to a widely diverse population from many different ethnic, religious, cultural, and social backgrounds; a new society with ancient roots, which is still coalescing and developing today (Galily, 2007).

There is great concern over relations between Israeli Arabs and Jews. As Kershner (1999) reports, many of Israel's 1.57 million Arab Israeli citizens feel alienated and resentful, and in the aftermath of terrorist incidents involving Israeli Arabs, concerns

are raised regarding the threat of violence emanating from certain areas of the Israeli Arab population. Thus, programs that bring together Israeli Arabs and Jews in a positive atmosphere are as valuable as ever. Deteriorating relations between Israel's Arabs and Jews would be harmful to the well-being of the nation and its efforts to make peace with its Arab neighbors.

As discussed by Amir (Edginton, Jordan, De Graaf and Edginton, 1995), recreational activity seems to meet many of the criteria for programs seeking to reduce prejudice and improve ethnic attitudes and relations. Previous research found that intergenerational recreational activity caused positive attitude change (Leitner, 1981). Given the lack of research on the attitudes of **elderly** Israeli Arabs and Jews toward each other, a 1998 study (Leitner, Scher, and Shuval, 1999) set out to assess the effects of intergenerational recreational activities on the attitudes of Israeli Arab and Jewish elderly and children toward each other.

In 1998, an intergenerational recreational program was conducted in Tel Aviv-Jaffa for the purpose of attempting to improve the attitudes of Israeli Arabs and Jews toward each other (Leitner, Scher, and Shuval, 1999). The results of this study indicated that as a result of their participation in the activities program, the Jewish elderly became more agreeable to the idea of having Arabs as guests in their home and to have an Arab friend. There was also a significant reduction in feelings of hatred toward Arabs, and feelings that most or all Arabs hate Jews. The Arab elders' attitudes also changed, with an increase in feelings of trust toward Jews, and a reduction in feelings of hatred toward Jews and feelings that all or most Jews hate Arabs. This study involved Israeli Arab and Jewish elderly, Jewish College students, and 12- and 13- year-old Arab children. Hundreds of interviews were conducted one year later, and the findings indicated that the positive attitude changes still existed a year after the program had ended (Leitner and Scher, 2000). This study provided a basis for the research study conducted with Mifalot program participants in 2011-2012.

Methodology

Mifalot conducts soccer activities in their "Get to Know Your Neighbor" program, which bring together Israeli, Palestinian, and Jordanian youth ages 10-12. This study assessed the effects of these programs on the attitudes of the youth toward one another. Pretest questionnaires were administered in the fall of 2011, before the joint activities for the year began. Post-test questionnaires were administered in June 2012 at the last joint activity for the year. The difference in responses between the pretest and post test administration of the questionnaires was examined to determine the effects of the joint soccer programs on attitudes of Palestinian, Jordanian, and Israeli youth toward each other.

The questionnaire used in this study is the same one used in the 1998 and 1999 studies with Israeli elderly Arabs and Jews (Leitner, Scher, and Shuval, 1999; Leitner and Scher, 2000). The questionnaires consisted of eight items, based on the questionnaire utilized by the Carmel Institute in their nationwide study in 1994 of teenagers' attitudes.

There were separate versions of the questionnaires for the Palestinians and Jordanians and for the Israeli Jews, with essentially the same questions. There was a questionnaire in Hebrew for the Israeli Jews respondents and one in Arabic for the Palestinian and Jordanian respondents. The questions are listed below in English:

1. Rate the following on a five- point scale (strongly disagree, disagree, agree/disagree somewhat, agree, and strongly agree):
 - a) I am willing to host (to the Israelis: A Palestinian; to the Palestinians and Jordanians: A Jewish Israeli).
 - b) I am opposed to having as a neighbor (see a. above)
 - c) I am ready to have as a friend (see a. above)
2. I trust (to the Israelis: Palestinians; to the Palestinians and Jordanians: Israeli Jews):
Answer choices: All; Some; or Almost none at all.
3. Do you have a Palestinian friend (to the Israelis)/Jewish Israeli friend (to the Palestinians and Jordanians)? – Yes or No
4. If you have a friend, have you visited the friend in the past two years? (answer yes or no)
5. Do you hate (to the Israelis: Palestinians; to the Palestinians and Jordanians: Israeli Jews)?
6. Answer choices: Yes, all; Yes, most of them; Yes, some of them; Only a few of them; No, none at all
7. Do you think that Palestinians hate Israelis (to the Israelis)?
8. Do you think that Jewish Israelis hate Arabs (to the Palestinians and Jordanians?)
Answer choices: Yes, all of them do; Yes, most of them do; Yes, about half of them do; Only a small portion of them do; No, not at all

\

The questionnaires were completed anonymously to encourage the respondents to be honest in their answers. The pretest questionnaires were completed by the youth on the bus on the way to their first joint activity of the year. They had to submit their completed questionnaires before getting off the bus. The post test questionnaires were completed at the last joint activity of the year.

Results and Discussion

There are four sub-sections to the presentation of the results of this study. The first one is a comparison of the pretest and post test responses of the Palestinians and Jordanians (the Arabic questionnaires). The second one is a comparison of the pretest and post test responses of the Israeli Jews (the Hebrew questionnaire). The third sub-section compares and discusses the responses of the Israelis to those of the Palestinians and Jordanians. The last sub-section discusses a number of other comparisons in the data.

Questionnaires to Palestinians and Jordanians

There were 131 Palestinians and Jordanians who participated in the “Get to Know Your Neighbor” program during the year who answered the post test. These post test responses were compared to the pretest responses of 112 Palestinians and Jordanians who had previously not participated in Mifalot coexistence programs. On both the pretest and the post test, there were 20 Jordanian respondents.

Table 1 below displays the results from the questionnaires administered to the Palestinians and Jordanians. The last column indicates the percentage of change in the scores from the pretest to the post test.

Table 1: Mifalot Arabic questionnaire results

Questionnaire Item	Pretest	Post Test	Change
Willing to host a Jewish Israeli*	45.5%	64%	+18.5%
Opposed to having a Jewish Israeli neighbor**	21.5%	52%	+30.5%
Ready to have a Jewish Israeli friend*	38%	64%	+26%
Trusting all or most Jewish Israelis	<2%	37%	>+35%
I have a Jewish Israeli friend	<1%	27.5%	>+26.5%
I hate none or only a few Jewish Israelis	30%	53%	+23%
None or only a few Israeli Jews hate Palestinians	16%	38%	+22%

*Figures shown indicate the percentage agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement

**Figures shown indicate the percentage disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with the statement

As shown in Table 1, positive changes were obtained in all of the questionnaire items. The amount of change ranged from 18.5% for the question about willingness to host an Israeli Jew to over 35% for the question about trusting Jewish Israelis. The question about being opposed to having a Jewish Israeli neighbor had reversed scoring, meaning that having more respondents disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with the statement on the posttest indicated a positive change in attitudes. In summary, positive changes in attitudes of at least 20% were obtained for all of the questionnaire items except for the 18.5% figure for the item about willingness to host an Israeli Jew.

Questionnaires to Israeli Jews

There were 198 Israeli Jews who participated in Mifalot’s “Get to Know Your Neighbor” program during the year who answered the post test. These post test responses were compared to the pretest responses of 140 Israelis who previously had not participated in Mifalot coexistence programs. Once again, the pretest responses of previous participants in Mifalot programs were not included in the comparison of the pretests and posttests but their posttest responses were included.

Table 2 below displays the results from the questionnaires administered to the Jewish Israelis. The last column indicates the percentage of change in the scores from the pretest to the post test.

Table 2: Mifalot Hebrew questionnaire results

Questionnaire Item	Pretest	Post Test	Change
Willing to host a Palestinian*	49%	60%	+11%
Opposed to having a Palestinian neighbor**	32%	60%	+28%
Ready to have a Palestinian friend*	36%	47%	+11%
Trusting all or most Palestinians	6%	26.5%	+20.5%
I have a Palestinian friend	4%	23.5%	+19.5%
I hate none or only a few Palestinians	37%	53.5%	+16.5%
None or few Palestinians hate Jewish Israelis	12%	29%	+17%

*Figures shown indicate the percentage agreeing or strongly agreeing with the statement

**Figures shown indicate the percentage disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with the statement

As shown in Table 2, positive changes were obtained in all of the questionnaire items. All of the items changed by more than 10% from the pretest to the post test. The change scores ranged from 11% for two of the items (willingness to host and readiness to have a friend) to 28% for being opposed to having a Palestinian neighbor. The question about being opposed to having a Palestinian neighbor had reversed scoring, meaning that disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with this statement were the more positive or desired responses.

Comparing responses of Jews (Israelis) and Arabs (Palestinians and Jordanians)

There was a great deal of similarity in the responses to the first three questions, regarding willingness to host the other, opposition to having the other as a neighbor, and being ready to have a friend from the other group. Both the Israeli and Palestinian/Jordanian groups changed positively in their responses to these questions. The pretest and post test figures for each group were remarkably similar. The similarity in responses was also striking for the question about having a friend from the other group.

The responses to the question about trust were also similar. Each group expressed a low level of trust of the other side on the pretest, with only 2% of Palestinians and Jordanians expressing trust in all or most Israeli Jews, and only 6% of the Israelis expressing trust in all or most Palestinians. Both groups expressed much more

trust in the other side on the post test. The Israeli Jews' level of trust rose to 26.5%, trusting all or most Palestinians and the Palestinians and Jordanians improved even more, going up to 37.5% expressing trust in all or most Jewish Israelis on the post test.

Regarding hatred of the other side, both groups expressed less hatred on the post test than on the pretest. The main difference in the two groups is that the Palestinians expressed more hatred on the pretest than did the Israelis. On the pretest, approximately 54% of the Palestinians and Jordanians said that they hated all or most Jews, compared to only 37% of the Israelis on the pretest who said that they hated all or most Palestinians. (Note that the 37% figure is identical to the 1994 research conducted by the Carmel Institute cited in this paper in which 37% of Israeli teenagers said that they hated all or most Arabs.) There wasn't as much a difference between the two groups on the post test. About 23.5 % of Israelis said that they hated all or most Palestinians, and approximately 31% of Palestinians and Jordanians said that they hated all or most Israeli Jews.

Both groups improved in their responses to the question about perceptions of the other side hating your side. The attitudes of the Palestinians and Jordanians were slightly more positive than those of the Israelis on both the pretest and on the post test. On the pretest, 16% of the Palestinians and Jordanians said they thought that all or most Israelis do **not** hate Palestinians whereas only 12% of Israelis said they thought that all or most Palestinians do **not** hate Israelis. On the post test, 38% of the Palestinians and Jordanians said that they thought that all or most Israelis do **not** hate Palestinians, while only 29% of the Israelis indicated that they thought that all or most Palestinians do **not** hate Israelis.

In summary, the responses of the two groups were remarkably similar. The biggest difference in the two groups was the higher level of trust expressed by the Palestinians and Jordanians on the post test. Another interesting comparison is the responses of the two groups to the last two questions. The Israelis expressed less hatred on the post test (23.5%) than did the Palestinians and Jordanians (31%). However, on the post test the Israelis (29%) were less likely than the Palestinians and Jordanians (38%) to say that they thought that all or most of the other group does **not** hate them. Perhaps the perceptions of the two groups are accurate? As indicated by the results, the Israelis do not hate the other side as much as the other side hates Israelis, and as the answers to the last question show, Israelis perceive the other side to hate them more than the Palestinians and Jordanians perceive the Israelis to hate them.

Other comparisons

At the beginning of the report, it was stated that in past research, 58% of Israeli Jews thought that all or most Arabs hate Jews and 62% of Israeli Arabs thought that all or most Israeli Jews hate Arabs. It is interesting to note that the figures on the post test for both the Israelis and Palestinians in this study were identical: 36% of the Palestinians think that all or most Israeli Jews hate Palestinians, and 36% of Israeli Jews think that all or most Palestinians hate Israeli Jews. This question is one of the most important ones on the questionnaire. The "Get to Know Your Neighbor" program contributed to significant

positive changes in attitudes related to the concept of thinking that the other group hates your group.

Past research also indicated that the percentage of Arabs and Jews who think that the other group hates them is much higher than the percentage that expresses hatred to the other group. In this study, there was a finding that was contrary to this often- found result in past research on this subject. On the post test, there were 19 Palestinians who answered that they do **not** hate Israeli Jews at all. Even more (26) answered that they thought that Israeli Jews do **not** hate Palestinians at all. In other words, there were respondents who rated their level of hatred toward Israeli Jews as being greater than the perceived level of hatred that Israeli Jews have toward Palestinians. It is fascinating to consider that a person would hate another group even if they think that the other group doesn't hate them.

Summary, conclusions, and recommendations

This study provides concrete evidence of the value of joint sports programs in conflict mitigation and coexistence efforts with Israelis, Palestinians, and Jordanians. In particular, the positive changes from the pretest to the post test in the areas of trust, hatred, and perceived level of hatred of the other group are encouraging.

There are similarities and differences in the results of this study and those of earlier studies on attitudes of Arabs and Jews toward each other cited in the introduction. One similarity is that the previous research showed that 62% of Israeli Arabs thought that all or most Jews hate Arabs. In this study on the pretest, 60% of the Palestinians and Jordanians indicated that they thought that all or most Jews hate Arabs. These figures are remarkably similar. Keep in mind that the children (ages 10-12) in this study were younger than the teenagers studied in the earlier research by the Carmel Institute. In addition, the Arab respondents in this study were Palestinian and Jordanian, NOT Israeli Arabs. Despite these variables and the many years that had passed between the studies, the figures for this question were almost identical when comparing the pretest results to the results of the Carmel Institute's research.

However, the post test findings for this question were markedly changed, with only 36% of the Palestinians and Jordanians stating that they thought that all or most Jews hate Arabs. If the joint soccer activities made such a big difference (24% change) in this study, then it is likely that a similar program with Israeli Arab teenagers would produce similar positive changes.

The similarities in responses to this question in the two different studies make the differences in responses to the question about hatred of Jews even more intriguing. In this study, 54% of Palestinians and Jordanians on the pretest said that they hated all or most Jews, compared to only 24% of Israeli Arab teenagers indicating that they hated all or most Jews in the Carmel Institute's 1994 study. The level of hatred dropped to 31% on the post test, but this figure is still higher than the 24% in the earlier study.

There are several possible explanations for the higher level of hatred found in this study. One possibility is that Palestinians and Jordanians hate Israeli Jews more than

Israeli Arabs do. Another possibility is that younger children are more honest in answering questionnaires than teenagers are and are more willing to admit that they hate Israeli Jews. The post test in this study showed the Arab respondents to perceive a lower level of hatred of Jews toward Arabs (36%) than in the Carmel Institute study (62%), but at the same time, a higher level of hatred toward Israeli Jews (31% on the post test) than in the Carmel Institute study (24%). It is also possible that these findings reflect true feelings. After playing with Israeli Jews, Palestinians and Jordanians realize that Israeli Jews do not hate them, but that their feelings of hatred toward Israeli Jews were stronger than that of Israeli Arabs toward Israeli Jews.

Meanwhile, the responses of the Israeli Jews on the pretest in this study were similar to those of the Jews in the Carmel Institute research. The percentage that indicated that they hated all or most Arabs was about the same (36% versus 37%). Surprisingly, a lower percentage (46%) on the pretest in this study answered that all or most Palestinians hate Israeli Jews, compared to the 59% of Jews saying that they thought all or most Arabs hate Jews in the Carmel Institute study. The post test figures are encouraging, showing that hatred dropped to 23.5% and perceived hatred by Arabs dropped to 36%.

The comparison of the feelings of trust in this study versus earlier studies is perhaps the most encouraging finding. The earlier research had shown that 66% of Arabs and 66% of Jews felt that it was impossible to trust the other. In this study, in the post test only 20.5% of Palestinians and Jordanians answered that they did not trust Israeli Jews at all or almost not at all. Similarly, only 25% of the Israeli Jews on the post test indicated that they did not trust Palestinians at all or almost not at all. These results attest to the power of sports to help improve relations between Arabs and Jews.

Further research is needed on this topic. Recommendations for future research include:

1. Conduct in-depth interviews and focus groups in addition to utilization of questionnaires in order to gain greater insight into attitudes and how to effect positive changes. For example, it would be interesting to discuss with those Palestinians and Jordanians who rate their level of hatred toward Jewish Israelis higher than their perceived level of hatred of Jewish Israelis toward them why they feel hatred toward Jewish Israelis.
2. Utilize behavior observation as a data collection technique in order to gain further insight into how playing together affects attitudes.
3. Try to incorporate noncompetitive activities such as dancing and music into the joint activities program to see if they can enhance the positive effects of the program on attitudes.
4. Conduct follow-up research with program participants one, two, and if possible, even 10 years after the program to assess how lasting the positive effects of the program are.
5. Examine gender and age-related differences in attitudes.

In conclusion, programs such as “Get to Know Your Neighbor” need to expend in order to reach more youth. The positive impact of this program is documented in this study. The more people that are reached by programs such as these, the more ambassadors for peace we will have. The bad news, as indicated by the pretest results, is that a great deal of hatred and lack of trust exists among Palestinians, Jordanians, and Israelis. The good news, as indicated by the post test results, is that by playing soccer together, feelings of hatred can be greatly reduced and feelings of trust can be enhanced.

REFERENCES

- Allport, G.W. (1958). “The Effect of Contact,” in *The Nature of Prejudice*. New York: Anchor Books, pp. 250–267.
- Coakley, J. (2009). *Sports in Society: Issues and Controversies*. New York: McGraw-Hill
- Coalter, F. (2010). “The politics of sport-for-development: Limited focus programmes and broad gauge problems?” *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* Vol. 45: 295-314.
- Coalter F. (2007). *Sport a Wider Social Role: Whose Keeping the Score?* London: Routledge.
- Edginton, C. R., D. J. Jordan, D. G. DeGraaf, & S. R. Edginton. (1995). *Leisure and life satisfaction*. Dubuque, IA.: Brown & Benchmark Publishers.
- Ford, C. (2006). “Peace and Hoops: Basketball as a Role Player in Sustainable Peacebuilding,” *Willamette Law Review* Vol. 42: 723–724.
- Gal, R. (1996, March 1). *Summary of 1994 attitudinal research*. ZichronYaacov, Israel: The Carmel Institute.
- Galily, Y. (2007). “Sport, Politics & Society in Israel: The first fifty-five years.” *Israel Affairs*. Vol. 13 No. 3, pp. 515-28.
- Giulianotti, R. (2011): “Sport, peacemaking and conflict resolution: a contextual analysis and modelling of the sport, development and peace sector.” *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, Vol. 34, No. 2, pp. 207-228.
- Hoberman, J. (2011). “The Myth of Sport as a Peace Promoting Political Force.” *SAIS Review*, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp.17-29.
- Kershner, I. (1999, May 24). 'Old News Out, "Arabic CNN" in' *The Jerusalem Report*.
- Kidd, B. (2008). “A New Social Movement: Sport for Development and Peace,” *Sport in Society*, Vol. 11, No. 4, pp. 370-380.
- Kruse SE (2006). “Review of Kicking AIDS Out: Is Sport an Effective Tool in the Fight Against HIV/AIDS?” *Draft report to NORAD*, unpublished.
- Lambert, J & Gardiner, J. (2010). ‘Learning and Teaching Citizenship Through Physical Education’ in Stidder, G & Hayes, S (Eds.) *The Really Useful Physical Education Book: Learning and teaching across the 7-14 age range*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Leitner, M. J. (1981). “The effects of intergenerational music activities on senior day care participants and elementary school children.” *Dissertation Abstracts International*, Vol. 42, No. 08, p. 3752A.

- Leitner, M., Scher, G., and Shuval, K. (1999). Peace-making through recreation: The positive effects of intergenerational activities on the attitudes of Israeli Arabs and Jews toward each other. *World Leisure & Recreation*, 41(2), pp. 25-29.
- Leitner, M.J. and Scher, G. (2000). "A follow-up study to peacemaking through recreation: The positive effects of intergenerational recreational programs on the attitudes of Israeli Arabs and Jews." *World Leisure and Recreation*, Vol. 42, No. 1, pp. 33-37.
- Lidor, R. and Blumenstein, B. (2011). "Working With Adolescent Soccer and Basketball Players From Conflicting Cultures—A Three-Dimensional Consultation Approach." *Journal of Sport and Social Issues*, Vol. 35, No. 3, pp. 229-245.
- Merton, R. (1948). "The Bearing of Empirical Research Upon the Development of Sociological Theory" *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 13, pp. 505-515.
- Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system* Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Rookwood, J (2008) 'Soccer for Peace and Social Development', *Peace Review*, Vol. 4, pp. 471-479.
- Skille, E. (2011): "The conventions of sport clubs: enabling and constraining the implementation of social goods through sport," *Sport, Education and Society*, Vol. 16, No. 2, pp. 241-253.
- Smooha, S. (1989). *Arabs and Jews in Israel: Volume 1*. Boulder, CO.: Westview Press.
- Sugden, J (2010a) 'Between Idealism and Fatalism: Critical Realism, Sport and Social Intervention', in JRIPEC (Ed.) "Fostering Peace Through Cultural Initiatives." From the *Roundtable on Conflict and Culture*, London: The Japan Foundation.
- Sugden, J (2010b) 'Critical left-realism and sport interventions in Divided societies', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, Vol. 45; pp. 258-272.
- Sugden, J. (2008). 'Anyone for Football for Peace? The challenges of Using sport in the service of co-existence in Israel', *Soccer and Society*, Vol. 9, No. 3, pp. 405-415.
- Sugden, J. (2006a). 'Teaching and Playing Sport for Conflict Resolution and Co-Existence in Israel', *International Review for the Sociology of Sport*, Vol. 41, No. 2, pp. 221-240.
- Sugden, J. (2006b). 'Sport and Community Relations in Northern Ireland and Israel' in Bairner, A (Ed.), *Sport and the Irish: Histories, Identities, Issues, Sport and the Irish: Histories, Identities, Issues*, p. 251f. Dublin: University College Dublin Press.
- Sugden, J. (2006c). 'The Challenge of Using a Values-Based Approach to Coaching Sport and Community Relations in Multi-Cultural Settings: The Case of Football for Peace (F4P) in Israel', *European Journal for Sport and Society*, Vol. 3, No. 1, pp. 7-27.
- Tuohey, B., & Cognate, B. (2011). "PeacePlayers International: A Case Study on the Use of Sport as a Tool for Conflict Transformation." *SAIS Review*, Vol. 31, No. 1, pp. 51-63.
- Zureik, E. & Moughrabi, F. (1987). *Public opinion and the Palestine question*. N.Y.: St. Martin Press.

Yair Galily, Ph.D is an applied sociologist, mass media and management researcher and Senior lecturer at the Zinman College, Wingate Institute and the Interdisciplinary Centre, Herzliya. His latest publications include "The playing field: Sport and Society at the threshold of the 21st century" (2009 with R. Lidor and A. Ben-Porat / Open University Press) and "Sport, Culture and Ideology in the State of Israel" (2013 with A. Ben-Porat / Routledge). Dr. Galily is the founder and head of the research unit at the Israeli Football Association; Member of UEFA club licensing committee and board member of the Israeli Communications Association. Lieutenant Colonel (Res.) Galily serves as chief (Organizational and Instructional) sociologist of the Israel Defense Forces Combat Fitness Centre.

Michael Leitner, Ph.D is co-author (with wife Sara) of 4th editions of *Leisure Enhancement and Leisure in Later Life* published by Sagamore (2010). His current work in progress is *Life and Leisure in the 21st Century* (co-edited with wife Sara). His research interests include conflict mitigation through sports, life and leisure in Israel, leisure and aging, and leisure education.

Pini Shimon, Ph.D is a lecturer at the Sport Management Program at the Zinman College, Wingate Institute in Israel. He teaches courses in Event Management, Marketing and HR Management. Dr. Shimon is also heading the "Field Experience"(Internships) Program of students in the SM program. Dr. Shimon is the founder and former CEO of "Pro Sport Israel" a leading company specializes in organizing International Sport Events. Dr. Shimon held numerous management positions in Australia and the States. Dr. Shimon served as Chairman of the Marketing Committee of the Israel Tennis Association (ITA). Currently, Dr. Shimon is involved in research of the effects of combined sport activity on the attitudes of Israeli Arabs, and Israeli Jewish youth towards each other.