Bekerman has analysed the modes of discourse in encounters involving Jewish and Palestinian students. His findings show that Nationality and Nationalism were dominant topics during the Jewish Palestinian encounter, which lead to a rigid division into separate, unchangeable national identities. In spite of the above findings, when, during the encounter, allowances were made to include discussions about culture, group members were able to form, within the groups, opinions that were beyond ethnic-cultural-based perception, such as the observation that divisions exist in Israeli society between religious and secular, or Ashkenazi and Sephardi, persons, and that in Arab society there is a distinction between Islam and Arab identities. It is worth noting that this tendency prevailed during encounters, but eventually, participants reverted to the dominant nationalist discourse. (Bekerman, 2002, 2009). Bekerman’s findings serve to inform about the dominance of nationality in a planned encounter. In light of this, it is important to understand whether national dominance is preserved also during daily occurrences such as at the workplace, and if the intra-group perception of the two national entities (Israeli and Palestinian) remains possible

A large number of the studies that analysed inter-group connection were based on Allport’s (1954) contact hypothesis. According to this hypothesis, mutual activity between groups that includes mutual positive experiences, would lead to the moderation of negative stereotypical perceptions, enable the expression of different opinions in an open and transparent manner, and improve the relationships between the groups. According to Allport, the contact between the groups will improve inter-group relationships only under four conditions: a familiarity that is based on ongoing personal contact (between members in the different groups); a collaboration between the groups for the purpose of achieving a mutual goal, that the groups enjoy an equal status during inter-group contact; the existence of institutional support of contacts between the groups.

In light of this, even when individuals in the various groups relate to, and perceive, reality differently, due to the variety of opinions and the inherent differences between the groups, opinions could—according to the contact hypothesis—have a positive influence on relationships, mutual behaviours among members, and a more general observation of reality when a mutual activity takes place. Such activity would serve to moderate prejudices held by a group against another, enable the voicing of different opinions and, as a result, improve relationships between the groups.

A similar conclusion arises from studies analysing groups meeting under the various models; perceptions and positions in groups (on both sides) did become more positive. But the changes where short-termed only and did not last in the longer term (Salomon, 2006).

Zuma (2014) followed studies dealing with contact hypothesis and supported the above findings. In addition, he emphasises that the contact hypothesis deals specifically with the reduction of prejudices and not in understanding the relationship and tensions between the groups. It follows that the reduction in prejudices is only a single element in the process of improving relationships between the groups. Additional aspects relating to motivation for contact, which was harmed by an obstinate conflict, an uneven balance of power, and the perception of an absence of a fairness in consideration, may also help to understand in depth the relationship and tensions between the groups. Therefore, it is interesting to understand the way all the dimensions presented here affect the behaviour and perceptions of the members in groups where a mutual contact is enforced, necessitating an ongoing collaboration between groups that operate in the context of a society in which an obstinate conflict exists.