Extended Contact through Story Reading in Turkish Cypriot Children

Önay Çiçek

Submitted to the
Institute of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the Degree of

Master of Science
in
Developmental Psychology

Eastern Mediterranean University
June 2015
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

_____
Prof. Dr. Serhat Çiftçioğlu
Acting Director

I certify that this thesis satisfies the requirements as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Developmental Psychology.

_____
Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman
Chair, Department of Psychology

We certify that we have read this thesis and that in our opinion it is fully adequate in scope and quality as a thesis for the degree of Master of Science in Developmental Psychology.

_____   _____
Prof. Dr. Biran Mertan   Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman
Co-Supervisor   Supervisor

                                                                                    Examining Committee
_____

1. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman   _____

2. Asst. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar   _____

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. Çığır Kalfaoğlu   _____

ABSTRACT

Extended contact is a kind of indirect intergroup contact strategy that can be used in contexts where the opportunity for real contact is low. The effectiveness of extended contact strategy through story-telling was investigated in the present research with the aim of enhancing positive attitudes, intended behaviors, trust and forgiveness toward the Greek Cypriot out-group and also support for peace in Turkish Cypriot children. The second aim was to examine the roles of prior contact and age on these variables. Turkish Cypriot children ($N = 40$) including 18 boys and 22 girls, aged 6-11 (mean age = 8 years) took part in a 5 week story reading intervention. Stories portrayed the close friendship between Turkish and Greek Cypriot children. Results revealed that extended contact intervention through story reading led to enhanced positive out-group attitudes, behavioral intentions, out-group trust, forgiveness and support for peace in Turkish Cypriot children. The findings of the study suggest that extended contact can be used in segregated and conflicted contexts as an effective tool to reduce prejudice in children. Implications of an educational program within the context of Cyprus are discussed.

Keywords: Intergroup contact, Indirect contact, Extended contact, Prejudice, Prejudice-reduction intervention, Prejudice in children

ÖZ

Genişletilmiş temas gerçek temas imkanının düşük olduğu ortamlarda kullanılabilecek bir tür gruplar arası dolaylı temas stratejisidir. Hikaye okuma ile genişletilmiş temas stratejisinin etkililiği Kıbrıslı Türk çocuklarda Kıbrıslı Rum dış-gruba karşı olumlu tutumları, istenilen davranışları, güveni, bağışlayıcılığı ve barışa desteği geliştirme amaçları ile incelenmiştir. İkinci amaç ise önceki temasın ve yaşın bu değişkenler üzerindeki etkisini incelemekti. 18 erkek ve 22 kız olmak üzere 6-11 yaş aralığındaki (ortalama yaş = 8) 40 Kıbrıslı Türk çocuk, 5 haftalık hikaye okuma müdahalesinde yer aldılar. Hikayeler de Kıbrıslı Türk ve Kıbrıslı Rum çocukların yakın arkadaşlıkları konu edilmekteydi. Çalışmanın sonuçları, hikaye okuma ile genişletilmiş temas müdahalesinin olumlu tutumları, istenilen davranışları, grup dışı güveni, bağışlayıcılığı ve Kıbrıslı Türk çocuklarda barışa desteği geliştirdiğini ortaya çıkarmıştır. Bu bulgular, genişletilmiş kontağın ayrılmış, çatışmış ortamlarda çocuklarda önyargıyı azaltmak için etkili bir araç olarak kullanılabileceğini öne sürmektedir. Kıbrıs konteksti içerisinde eğitim programının implikasyonları tartışılmıştır.

Anahtar Sözcükler: Gruplar arası temas, Dolaylı temas, Genişletilmiş temas, Önyargı, Önyargı azaltma müdahalesi, Çocuklarda önyargı

To My Family

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

My dear fiancé Mehmet Aktunç, your presence, supportive attitudes, love, trust, endless encouragement made the process of my thesis study easier to handle and also my life a wonderful experience.

Finally, to all my friends and especially three best friends, thank you for your understanding, motivation and friendship throughout my thesis study and every moment of my life.

This thesis study is very first and minor contribution of me to psychology science, I hope that it would be my first step.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS AND SYMBOLS

Doi   Digital Object Identifier

EMU   Eastern Mediterranean University

E.g.   Example Given

Et al.   And others

F   Symbol for Fascist (F scale)

I.e.   That is

IOS   Inclusion of Other in the Self

M Mean

N Population size

n Sample Size

p Probability

r Correlation Coefficient

RWA   Right Wing Authoritarianism

SD Standard Deviation

SIDT   Social Identity Development Theory

SIT   Social Identity Theory

SPSS   Statistical Package for Social Sciences

SRT   Social Reflection Theory

ST   Social-Cognitive Developmental Theory

t Critical Value

vs   Versus

&   And

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The social psychological concept of prejudice has long been defined by many theoreticians in social psychology literature (Allport, 1954; Brown, 2010; Jones, 1997). The definitions have different base in terms of conceding prejudice as only in a negative direction (Allport, 1954) and as both positive and negative meanings (Brown, 2010; Jones, 1997).

Initial definitions of prejudice explained it based simply on a negative understanding. For instance, one of the oldest definitions of prejudice was defined in The Nature of Prejudice by Allport (1954) as "an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization. It may be felt or expressed. It may be directed toward a group as a whole or toward an individual because he is member of that group" (p. 9). Recently, social psychologist Rupert Brown (2010) has defined the social problem of prejudice in both negative and positive directions as "any attitude, emotion or behavior towards members of a group, which directly or indirectly implies some negativity or antipathy towards that group" (p.7).

According to the viewpoint of Brown (2010) prejudice is based on fallacious and senseless beliefs and falsely generalized situations. In general, there are some concepts that are used as synonyms for the word prejudice; sexism, racism, homophobia and ageism. These words are applicable for more specific issues of the

broad fact of prejudice. Moreover, prejudice is not a fact that is just based on the mental processes or attitudes, rather it has effects on our feelings and also on our actions. As Aboud (1988) suggested negativity and hatred are distinctive features of prejudice; specifically prejudice is expressed as a regular tendency to react in an undesirable way toward people on account of their ethnic origin. There are two more possible characteristics to have in order to be named as prejudiced person. While, the first one is feeling negativity toward a certain group of people, the second one is directing negative attributions toward those people because they are the members of an ethnic group and is not just for their individual characteristic. The negative affect and attributions which form the basis for contemporary forms of prejudice might be originated as a process of an individual such as cognitive and motivational biases and socialization or as a process of an intergroup situation such as realistic group conflict or biases associated with the mere categorization of people into in-groups and out-groups (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1999).

In addition, prejudice is something related with more than one person because it is at the intergroup level and has social outcomes. This means that prejudice is a social issue and is reflected not just to isolated people. Conversely, it can possibly have an effect on any members of the out-group under consideration. It can be stated that prejudice is based on a group action because a broad group of people in the community correspond in their unfavorable stereotypes for the out-group in question and they will have alike actions towards that group (Brown, 2010). It is worthy to note that stereotypes and prejudice are different concepts despite the fact they might frequently appear collectively. Stereotypes are fixed assumptions and extreme generalizations about the characteristic of the members of one ethnic group in

question while prejudice is a negative disposition (Aboud, 1988). Dovidio and Gaertner (1999) stated that stereotypes can occur with prejudice and they are overgeneralized beliefs which are not based on the accurate facts and are extraordinarily harsh towards one particular group of people or an individual who belongs to that group. However, Devine (1989) suggested a model in an adult sample on the automatic and controlled processes of stereotypes and prejudice. In this model, she suggested that stereotypes and individual beliefs have different structural cognitions. Accordingly, there is stability for stereotypes and they are commonly used structural cognitions which are acquired by socialization process from the beginning of life. Currently, the modern perspectives about racial, ethnic, or sexist prejudice take into consideration both the intended and explicit forms and also unintended and senseless forms which result in expressed biases obliquely (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1999).

Several theories have been developed in order to account for why prejudice develops. These theories are particularly based in childhood years and research has attempted to explain the development of prejudice from a social developmental perspective which will be covered in the following sections.

1.1 Prejudice in Children

1.1.1 The Developmental Trajectory of Prejudice in Children

Nesdale (2001) noted that even though it is commonly thought that prejudice is an adolescent or adult issue, prejudice not only appears in those age periods but it also appears highly in children. A number of research in literature shows that prejudice can develop in early childhood and persist into adulthood years (Aboud, 1988; Brown, 2010; Nesdale, 2004).

According to social cognitive developmental theory (Aboud, 1988), 3 or 4 years of age is the age of acquiring attitudes about ethnicity and it was concluded that these attitudes are changeable in the next 8 years. At about 7 years of age, the biases about race and ethnicity start to reduce such that attributions of both positive qualities to their in-group and negative qualities to the out-group decline (Aboud, 1988). In the meta-analysis of Raabe and Beelmann (2011) it was indicated that there is a rising trend in terms of prejudice expression between early and middle childhood, which corresponds to the ages of 2-4 and 5-7 years, respectively. Afterward, prejudice reduces at the middle and late childhood periods which are the age ranges of 5-7 and 8-10 years. In contrast, at the adolescence period which is children aged 10 years and older, any differences in terms of age have not been found. The social status of the child in terms of being a member of either majority (high status) or minority group (low status) is important to reflect positive attitudes toward the out-group. Children of ethnic minority reported positive attitudes toward majority out-group during early and middle childhood periods. However, evaluations of minority group children by higher status children in these periods were in a negative manner.

Furthermore, Aboud (1988) reviewed the empirical evidence and demonstrated that school-age children commonly exhibited prejudice. Therefore, middle childhood is a critical stage to have formulated a social understanding and social attitudes. At the intervening years of development, especially in the adulthood years, the values of society which developed at middle childhood years would possibly continue to exist. On this basis, it is critical to study prejudice in children because it might be one of the possibilities to alleviate the developing ethnic based prejudicial attitudes in adolescence and also adulthood years (Nesdale, 2001).

1.2 Theoretical Approaches to Prejudice Development in Children

There are different theoretical approaches which address the development of ethnic prejudice in children. In the following paragraphs, the most considered theories of social psychology literature about prejudice development including emotional maladjustment, social reflection, socio-cognitive development, and social identity will be presented.

1.2.1 Emotional Maladjustment Theory: The Authoritarian Personality

This theory was the initial attempt in psychology literature by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik and Levinson (1950) to explain how one becomes a prejudiced person. They proposed that the core component of the development of prejudice in children is personality type. This perspective attributed prejudice development to a specific kind of personality which is the authoritarian personality. Moreover, prejudice was demonstrated in this theory as internal conflict which has been remained unresolved. The parenting practices may impede the appropriate resolution of this internal conflict and at this point prejudice could be acquired by the child (Aboud, 1988).

The theory had stressed that the variety of personalities could be originated from the early socialization context of the child which is the 'family'. Therefore, the mother and father are the very first and effectual substitutes of this process of the social development of the child. At the home of the normally socialized child, the parents have equilibrium, such that they let the child both express themselves easily even in situations of expulsion of anger and they require some formable limitations for appropriate and inappropriate actions. However, this process is not like this for prejudiced people, the parents of prejudiced people are extremely preoccupied with

acceptable behaviors and obeying standards of the society and particularly the father maintains control when the child oversteps the boundaries (Adorno et al., 1950).

Clearly, this approach was impressed by Freudian perspective because it emphasized that the child acquired prejudice from emotional maladjustment which was originated from being raised by overly strict parents who applied discipline in a harsh manner. At this point, the child who was raised in such a climate, had the feelings of annoyance, became angry and hostile towards the parents who has brought him/her up and these feelings would displaced in time from them to the powerless and incapable people (i.e., minority people) (Aboud, 1988; Nesdale, 2001). These experiences could not be accepted by people who exhibit prejudicial behavior and as a result these socially unacceptable negative motivations are projected upon other people (Aboud, 1988).

Adorno et al. (1950) developed the F-scale which was used as a personality test to measure authoritarian personality and "F" was used to symbolize Fascist. They developed this scale with the aims of measuring anti-democratic ideas and prejudice. They stated that it could establish a relationship between individual personality and predisposition of having antidemocratic ideas and having prejudicial attitudes.

The theory explains how prejudice can remain stable over places in a rational sense. In other words, the reason for maintaining prejudices by adults even in the situations of moving to another society are explained as people direct their prejudices to another powerless minority however the prejudice level does not change because it comes from their personality characteristics.

There are a number of contemporary studies that considered the association between personality types, especially authoritarian personality, and prejudice. Lippa and Arad (1999) conducted a research study to find a relationship between authoritarianism, social dominance and prejudice by using both questionnaires and interview in their methodology. They found that college men and women with authoritarian personality, particularly men, were evaluated as defensive, poorly adjusted and prejudiced. Similarly, another study on intercultural effectiveness, authoritarianism and prejudice reported that right wing authoritarianism (RWA) which means an accumulation of individual attitudes which involves conventionalism, authoritarian aggression and authoritarian submission is a predictive factor for the development of ethnic prejudice. It was found that there was a strong positive correlation between the Australian university students' RWA and their ethnic prejudice towards Indigenous Australians (Nesdale, Robbe & Oudenhoven, 2012).

However, Aboud (1988) stated the theory is limited in terms of distinguishing between childhood and adulthood prejudices. Further, Brown (2010) and Nesdale (2001) stressed one more weakness of the theory as it failed to notice the power of social context which influence the attitudes and actions of the children in terms of intergroup relations, rather it just takes into account child-rearing issues in the development of prejudice. Moreover, it was criticized that it did not take into account why certain groups are exposed to prejudice and other ones are not (Brown, 2010). Similarly, the F scale as a measurement tool for authoritarian personality by Adorno et al. (1950) had some methodological difficulties, for instance it was not clearly pointed out that obtaining high scores from a F scale meant that a person had

authoritarian beliefs or the person did not agree with the all questions while he/she were responding (acquiescence bias) (Nelson, 2006).

1.2.2 Social Reflection Theory (SRT)

In the 1980's social reflection theory was the most leading and prevailing theory of prejudice and was also approved both publicly and experimentally (Aboud, 1988). The social context including important adults, especially parents and peers have a significant impact on the learning process of ethnic attitudes. This theory is based on social learning perspective of Bandura (1977) and suggested that prejudice is transferred from parents to their off springs as expected because the prejudice of children solely mirrors the societal beliefs and values. The social reflection theory also stressed that educating children directly; observations; and imitation of the expressions of the parents in words or deeds by the child are the learning processes of attitudes of children (Nesdale, 2001).

There are several research studies in social and developmental psychology literature that can be based on and supported the social reflection theory well (see Castelli, Carraro, Tomelleri & Amari, 2007; Castelli & Nesdale, 2008; Castelli, Zogmaister & Tomelleri, 2009; Devine, 1989; Sinclair, Dunn & Lowery, 2005).

Devine (1989) suggested that the implicit racial prejudice which occurs without conscious control is actualized by experiencing prejudice due to different socialization factors as a child. It was found that there is a relation between the attitudes of children (i.e., preadolescent and adolescent) and their parents. As a kind of socialization factor, the role of parents on acquiring implicit prejudicial attitudes related to race was examined by Sinclair et al. (2005). They reported that there is higher correlation between parental prejudicial attitudes and the prejudice of the

8

children's whose identification with parents was higher in comparison to lesser identified ones. Similarly, Castelli and Nesdale (2008) found that non-verbal behaviors of adults as role models have important effect on pre-school children. Even though the verbal behaviors of the White model displayed friendliness toward a Black actor, if non-verbal behaviors conveyed discomfort or distance, children were able to realize this negativity and they also behaved negatively toward those people and also generalized these attitudes and behaviors to target group. Both implicit and explicit attitudes are therefore important to form the attitudes and behaviors of people. The results of another study about the transmission of racial attitudes from Italian parents to their children showed no relation between the explicit attitudes of parents and of their pre-school children who were from the 3-6 age range. However, mothers' implicit attitudes unlike fathers' implicit attitudes had a significantly more important role in predicting the racial attitudes of their children. The results of study mean that initial racial attitudes could be acquired from parents (Castelli et al., 2009). Similarly, the study examined harmony between the 4-7 year old White children's and their parent's racial attitudes. They reported a high correlation between White children's perceptions about the expectation of their mother's however not their father's in terms of racial attitudes towards Blacks. In other words, children perceived that their parents would be glad if they chose a White playmate and this was a cause to have in-group bias in children and mothers (Castelli et al., 2007).

Also, Aboud and Doyle (1996a) conducted a research study on White fourth grade children (8-11 ages) to investigate whether discussions of low and high prejudiced peer partners about race would have an effect to change their tolerance or prejudice level. They concluded that high prejudiced children after the race discussions with

their low prejudiced peers showed more tolerant attitudes and decreased level of prejudice, here was no change reported for children who were tolerant in pre-discussions. Castelli, Carraro, Pavan, Murelli, and Carraro (2012) conducted two experimental laboratory studies on White psychology students to examine the role of non-verbal hints on implicit racial attitudes. While in study 1, participants observed a videotaped non-verbal interracial interaction (either friendly or unfriendly) between a White and a Black person, in study 2, participants were exposed to real non-verbal interaction with a confederate person, when participant read negative news about a Black person, confederate listened and showed different non-verbal behaviors (either neutral or positive). They reported that observing negative unfriendly behaviors from a White adult toward a Black adult led to acquiring negative implicit attitudes to the Black person in question.

Related to social reflection theory, it might be timely to mention the theoretical background of children's socialization process that is important for prejudice development. These includes social cognitive theory, cultivation theory and drench hypothesis. According to social cognitive theory of Bandura (1986) development and also alteration of human beliefs and emotions occur with the effects of social factors via modeling. Observational learning has an important impact on copying positive inter-group behaviors. However, children do not passively or automatically copy these attitudes and behaviors from important others, they integrate information and develop their own behaviors. In addition, according to this theory positive inter-group attitudes can be acquired vicariously via television from the observations of media characters who exhibit intergroup contact (Bandura, 2002).

Similarly, the proposition of cultivation theory is that a world view is created by exposure to television. The society provided by television gives rise to copy values, norms and social behaviors by viewers in a consistent manner. Also, when the characters from some races appears on television programs in a limited way, stereotypical beliefs and prejudice can be developed and maintained by children (Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, & Signorielli, 1980 as cited in Graves, 1999).

On the other hand, the drench hypothesis of Greenberg (1988) suggested that appearance of characters of a different race or ethnic background positively in television can drench stereotyped role of them in society. In essence, socialization approach supports the idea of using TV and books to contribute to the adoption of positive intergroup attitudes by children.

There are some evidences that do not support the assumptions of the SRT (Aboud & Doyle, 1996b). Aboud and Doyle (1996b) conducted two questionnaire studies and used attitude tests; first study examined similarity between parent and child's (8-11 age range) racial attitudes which had statistically non-significant correlation, secondly they examined peer and child racial attitudes similarity which had only moderate level of correlation.

1.2.3 Social-Cognitive Developmental Theory (ST)

The socio-cognitive perspective is the opponent to the social reflection approach. Because of the emphasizes of SRT on the role of social context for intergroup attitudes and behaviors and no emphasis on the cognitive issues, Aboud (1988) suggested the social cognitive developmental theory (ST) which analyzed the ethnic attitude development in a three-step model.

In this model, the two sequences are overlaid and explain moving from self to group and to person. The first sequence includes the maturity of children from emotional to perceptual then to cognitive states. The second sequence includes one's concentration from self to group and ultimately to person. Taken together, the main assumption of these step sequences means that children at any specific age have to relate ethnic groups in a way based on their level of focus of attention that is currently dominant. Besides, the most influential data for the children will be the one that mostly suitable for their current level (Aboud, 1988).

As stated in the first sequence, the initial domination of children is their affect and propensities which is named as affective process. Therefore, ethnic identification of self will not determine prejudice in children, rather the affections and satisfaction of needs are the determinative elements. Further, personal information about an individual is connected to affective processes instead of being a grouper (Aboud, 1988). The second step involves the perceptual issues of children about others which mature relevantly with them. At this step, children perceive the similarity level of others to themselves. Thus, prejudice will be acquired by the age of 5-7 in the case of perceiving others as not similar to one-self. In other words, in-group favoritism (favoring one's own group above the out-group) and out-group rejection are higher in these years. Eventually, maturity of cognitions takes place in step three of the first sequence at around of 7 years of age (beginning of concrete operational thinking) and categories and individual characteristics start to be understood. Also, an understanding of the core of ethnicity begins, for instance children realize that way of dressing is not a determiner for ethnicity but more durable and observable facts (e.g. ancestry) are more important factors (Aboud, 1988).

At the second sequence of this model Aboud (1988) stated that the attentional focus of children changes by overlaying with the emotional-perceptual-cognitive sequence. Egocentrism is dominant in a variety of contexts in step one. Children younger than seven are single-minded. The second step of this sequence is similar to socio-centric stage of Piaget (1954). Prejudice develops after preoccupation with groups and particularly from the available discrepancies between the group which one belongs and the groups of others. At step three, the lesser degree of prejudice is attained by giving more attention to personal qualities. Given that liking or disliking people are based on their individual characteristics instead of their characteristics of the ethnic group (Aboud, 1988).

Empirical evidences also support this hypothesis. Griffiths and Nesdale (2006) reported that Anglo Australian children who were 10 years old and from majority ethnic group rated more positively the Aboriginal minority out-group in comparison to 8 year olds. Senior children less frequently appraised positively their in-group and less negatively the out-group (Doyle, Beaudet, & Aboud, 1988).

Although, the socio-cognitive theory of Aboud (1988) contributed greatly to the prejudice literature in terms of the development of ethnic prejudice in children concerning the perception and cognition processes, it has a handicap in terms of stressing excessively on perceptual-cognitive processes and eliminating the attention from social and motivational issues (Nesdale, 2001). Another limitation of the theory is that while it considers the fear of a strange individual from a minority ethnic group to be generalized to all other people of this group as the cause for the acquirement of prejudice, the theory does not take into account how dislike or antipathy become a form of prejudice or the reason why it endures when there is no contact. In fact, the

13

theory does not take into consideration that it is possible that children might acquire enduring prejudices over time when contact with any of ethnic minority people is absent (Brown, 2010).

1.2.4 Social Identity Development Theory (SIDT)

Because of the inadequate side of ST the social identity theory (SIT) by Tajfel and Turner (1979) was suggested. It considered ethnic prejudice by stressing the role of social and motivational issues and knowledge of social structure. From the SIT perspective, wanting to identify with social groups such as being positively different or relatively superior to improve one's own self-esteem are causes to acquire prejudicial and discriminatory attitudes towards other ethnic group members (Nesdale, 2002). According to SIT, there is a motivation of people to be part of social groups that are superior over other social groups. This motivates people to consistently divide their social context into different groups as "us" and "them". This causes in-group favoritism above out-groups. Therefore, SIT pointed out the individual motivations for in-group favoritism and evaluations of out-groups in a negative manner. Accordingly, the rational for prejudice in people toward members of the out-group is intergroup biases.

The minimal group study of Nesdale and Flesser (2001) examined intragroup and intergroup attitude development of 5 and 8 year old White Australian children in the light of SIT. The goal of the study was to evaluate the effectiveness of SIT and included high status versus low status groups of children. It was noted that children from one's own ethnic group are more likely favored and noticed as similar to them in comparison to individuals from out-group. Thus, when children from low status groups realized that out-group is socially superior to their own in-group, their liking

started to decline and their desire of being a member of that group increased. Because SIT is limited in terms of considering developmental issues of prejudice in children which was indicated in the study of Nesdale and Flesser (2001), Nesdale (2004) suggested social identity developmental theory (SIDT) of prejudice.

The SIDT has four consecutive developmental stages as undifferentiated, ethnic awareness, ethnic preference, and ethnic prejudice. It was emphasized that children who exhibit ethnic prejudice experience these stages consecutively. The brief description of those stages will be given in the following paragraphs.

In the undifferentiated phase, for young children who are 2-3 years old and younger, racial signals are not prominent in a typical manner. Their responses to objects in the environment are randomly based in the sense of noteworthiness for them. In the ethnic awareness phase, especially for those who stay in multi-racial societies, children at about 3 years begin to become aware of ethnicity. Their awareness is probably initiated in pursuit of identifying with an adult or by labeling of a person from an out-group. It is critically significant and the new attainment in this phase is regards to the child's ethnically identifying of him/herself. This means that children begin to realize him/her as a member of a specific group. In the ethnic preference phase, children become informed that they are part of a specific ethnic group. Developing realization of the organization of the society, presence of the group varieties, the interconnectedness between them in terms of relations, and languages used by out-groups are made easier by ethnic self-identification. While children who are the members of the majority ethnic group have favorable attitudes for their in-group, in contrast, children from the minority group have unfavorable attitudes for their in-group in spite of favoring the majority out-group. The unanswered question

15

is how preferring ethnic in-group turns to ethnic prejudice (Nesdale, 2002). Differently to ST (Aboud, 1988) which states preference for one's own ethnic group declines in children as they grow up, the SIDT suggests that with increasing age, children are more involved with their in-group. This is not due to their improved cognitions rather their in-group involvement leads to expressions of automatic prejudice for the out-groups. For the ethnic prejudice phase, in contrast with social-cognitive development theory of Aboud (1988) which asserted that ethnic prejudice in children who are around 7 years decreases due to improvement in cognitions, the current approach stresses that emergence and crystallization of prejudice is in that age group. Prejudice requires a transformation progress from the pure ethnic preference of in-group to out-group ethnic prejudice. The meaning of prejudice is that disliking or hating the people who are part of the out-group rather than less favoring a member of out-group over a member of in-group (Nesdale, 2002).

There are three elements suggested to have a role in the transition progress of in-group preference to ethnic prejudice. First, if people from the social context of the children commonly express prejudice, there is a high possibility that children will embrace the prejudice (Proshansky, 1966). Second, if ethnic majority group members have rising amount of competitiveness, tension, and incompatibility between them, the children will tend to acquire ethnic prejudice (Brown, 2010). Third, children will tended to acquire ethnic prejudice when people from the dominant group have intense feelings of threat for their social positions by another ethnic group (Nesdale, 2002).

Numerous analyses confirmed the predictions from SIDT (Nesdale, Maass, Durkin & Griffiths, 2005; Nesdale, Durkin, Maass & Griffiths, 2005). Nesdale, Maass et al.

(2005) investigated the role of group norms (inclusion vs. exclusion) and out-group threat (present vs. absent) by creating a minimal group study. White Anglo-Australian 7-9 year old children were members in a team for a drawing contest in school. The evidence supported the idea that development of prejudice in children in line with the SIDT is impacted by the presence of out-group threat. The children who were included to the group norm of exclusion and the presence of out-group threat conditions exhibit dislike to the out-group members in comparison to the children were included to the group norm of inclusion and non-threat out-group conditions. Differently, Nesdale, Durkin et al. (2005) were particularly interested in the process of change from ethnic preference to ethnic prejudice to evaluate the estimations of SIDT. Once again they conducted an experimental study about threat and group identification (group of excellent drawers) and their role on ethnic prejudice development in 5-11 year old white Australian children. The conflict levels were manipulated. It was uncovered that in the cases of high identification with the in-group, and the presence of perceived threat by the members of out-group, children absolutely reported dislike towards out-group. Further, when the out-group threat (low threat) or any conflict was not present, children preferred their own group instead of exhibiting prejudice toward out-group (neutral out-group attitudes). Similarly, Aboud and Mitchell (1977) reported that the scores of dislike and own ethnic group preference of young White American children did not significantly differ. Indeed, they were less likely to evaluate the ethnic out-group member in terms of positivity. Additionally, in-group preference did not inevitably result in rejection, disliking, or expressing prejudice against out-group characters in question (Nesdale, 1999).

Brown (2010) stated that although the SIDT is a credible theory, it has some weaknesses. The main limitation is that the role of improving societal values which prohibit verbally or non-verbally expressed prejudice was not adequately stressed by the theory.

In relation with the main theoretical question of the present study, the ways of reducing prejudice in children will be explained.

1.3 Reducing Prejudice in Children

As noted previously, by understanding the core components of different theoretical approaches to prejudice development, it will be more probable to tackle prejudice in children. With this aim, several prejudice reduction strategies have been proposed in the psychology literature. In this section, four strategies to reduce prejudice in children will be provided: enhancing empathy, socialization interventions, cognitive development, and intergroup contact.

1.3.1 Enhancing Empathy

In the literature, the role of empathy in terms of enhancing the relations on the intergroup level was addressed in a number of studies and reviews (Nesdale, Griffith, Durkin, & Maass, 2005; Stephan & Finlay, 1999; Vescio, Sechrist & Paolucci, 2003). The definition of empathy was stated in the paper of Nesdale, Griffith et al. (2005) as "the ability to experience the same feelings as those of another person in response to a particular situation, may be another factor that plays an important role in determining children's attitudes towards out-group members" (p.624). Stephan and Finlay (1999) referred to empathy in their reviews as cognitive and emotional empathy. On the one hand, cognitive empathy is described as the ability of taking the perspectives and the roles of others. On the other hand, emotional empathy is

described as responding emotionally in a similar manner to others or reacting to these affective experiences of others. It was found that higher emotional empathy was related with higher liking scores towards the people from ethnic minority out-group, while this was not the case for same ethnic out-group which empathy had no role on this issue (Nesdale, Griffith et al., 2005).

As for research in children, adult research has also provided a number of findings on the role of empathy for intergroup relations. For example, one study examined the mediational role of empathy on perspective taking and intergroup attitudes under the situation of endorsement of high stereotypes to out-group member. Results of the study showed that intergroup attitudes were improved by perspective taking process and the partial mediatory effect of empathy was reported even in the situation of severely accepted stereotypes about African Americans by White people. It was concluded that adoption of the perspective of African Americans by white undergraduate university students lead to exhibit more empathetically attitudes toward that group of people in general (Vescio et al., 2003).

There is extensive research in literature for children that designed to reduce prejudice by using empathy as a strategy. Nesdale, Griffith et al. (2005) designed studies to investigate the role of emotional empathy and group norms on the ethnic attitudes of children. The goal of the first study was to provide an answer for whether emotional empathy of the children has an impact on their liking of ethnic minority out-group children. It was reported that the degree of emotional empathy had no role on having more like feelings for the same ethnic out-group although this was not the case for different ethnic out-group (minority) members which emotional empathy had considerable impact on it. The study showed that there is an important relation

between enhanced empathy and enhanced liking of the minority group member. The second study of Nesdale, Griffith et al. (2005) studied the interaction effect of group norms (inclusion vs. exclusion) and level of empathy on children's attitudes towards ethnic minority out-group. The findings were in association in some degree with the study of Nesdale, Maass et al. (2005) and it was reported that when the children's in-group were excluded as a group norm, they were less likely to like the different ethnic group, and the liking of the out-group in question was not affected by the degree of empathy they had. However, this issue was not the same for the accepted in-group of the children. In this case, they highly liked the different ethnic out-group and their empathy levels were greater. Also, Stephan and Finlay (1999) investigated enhancement of intergroup relations with a review in terms of the role of empathy on that issue. They highlighted some empathy interventions to improve intergroup relations such as the jigsaw classroom as one type of cooperative learning techniques. In this technique children from ethnically or racially different groups are gathered and cooperative working settings are created to study on academic materials. It was concluded that in the case of effective usage of empathy as a technique, it can give valuable outcomes for intergroup relations between different groups.

1.3.2 Socialization Interventions

According to socialization theory (Nesdale, 2004) socialization process is the primary factor that determines the acquirement of prejudice by children. They adopt the negative stereotypical ethnic attitudes which are used in their community, social environment and especially by the identified adults for minority members. Socialization approach stated that social influences such as television and/or books can be used to change intergroup attitudes of children in a positive manner because

as noted above these attitudes are adopted and transmitted via socialization agents such as parents, peers or media.

The multicultural television program -Sesame Street Project- is one example of socialization interventions in the media. In 1990's a number of segments were promoted which clearly demonstrated specific topics about races. People with different racial or ethnic backgrounds lived on Sesame Street and their life was portrayed without any ethnical conflict with each other emphasizing positive intergroup relations. The goal of Sesame Street interventions was modifying young viewers' attitudes and stereotypes about races and ethnicities. Specifically, stressing similar features of people, accepting and embracing differences of people, and including physically unaccepted or culturally diverse children were targets of Sesame Street race relations curriculum. Educational program for pre-scholars included live actors who went for a visit to a friend's home from a diverse race. The results of Sesame Street race relations curriculum suggested that as a media tool, television or video was effective to alter children's racial attitudes and knowledge in a positive direction and to reduce ethnical conflict between two different groups. Although, it was reported that Sesame Street race relations curriculum worked to reduce prejudice in children, sustained effects of this intervention in terms of intergroup relations were not reported. However, parental encouragement for intergroup relations as an additional contribution was addressed (Gerbner et al., 1980 as cited in Graves, 1999).

1.3.3 Cognitive Development

Cognitive development approach is based on the social cognitive developmental theory of Aboud (1988) addressed above, which emphasizes that the development of cognitions of children has a role on their intergroup attitudes. For example, multiple

classification is a cognitive ability of the children in terms of classification of objects or people together with different aspects at the same time. Multiple classification skills training are used to modify intergroup attitudes of children and in general 6 to 8 years old children develop multiple classification ability (Aboud, 1988).

In relation with social cognitive developmental theory some multiple classification intervention studies were conducted to advance development of multiple classification ability of children (Bigler & Liben, 1992). Bigler and Liben (1992) used 5-10 year old children sample to test the impact of multiple classification ability on gender stereotypes of children. With this goal, they designed a pre- and post - test intervention program and trained children's multiple classification ability in terms of classification of people along 2 cross-cutting dimensions such as gender and occupation in laboratory settings. Children were allocated to four training conditions (multiple social classifications vs. multiple nonsocial classifications vs. rule training vs. a control group). In the training sessions, traditional gender occupations were used such as stereotypical women versus men. As a result of the study, it was stated that children whose multiple classification skill enhanced in multiple social classification training condition reported egalitarian responses (irrelevance of gender and occupation) for gender stereotyping in comparison to children in control condition. The study shed important light on the importance of multiple classification skills to decrease gender stereotypes of children.

1.3.4 Intergroup Contact

There is substantial evidence in the literature about intergroup contact and it has long been considered by researchers as a highly efficient strategy to enhance intergroup relations. The intergroup contact hypothesis was suggested by the American social

psychologist Gordon Allport in 1954, he stated that under certain conditions contact between people from different groups declines the presence of negative intergroup attitudes. According to Allport (1954) there are four conditions to create most desirable intergroup contact between different groups to reduce prejudice, these include equal status, common goals, cooperation, and authority support within the given set of conditions.

There are some moderating factors of contact to enhance intergroup relations at the times when contact by itself is not adequate to work. Therefore, some models were proposed as moderators for efficient intergroup contact. Brewer (1996) proposed decategorization, Hewstone and Brown (1986) intergroup contact and Gartner, Dovidio and Bachman (1996) recategorization as different models to decline the biases and prejudice in intergroup level. Decategorization model suggested that the intergroup relations should not be based on categories of the groups rather it should be based on personalization. This means that for more efficient intergroup contact, the salient category differentiation of the groups should be declined and the characters should be known as individuals at an interpersonal level (Brewer, 1996). Differently, intergroup contact model (Hewstone & Brown, 1986) suggested that to decrease prejudice in the intergroup setting, the salience of categories of group needs to be emphasized. The generalization of intergroup attitudes to whole out-group will depend on the occurrence of contact interaction at the intergroup level instead of the interpersonal level. For example, Brown, Vivian and Hewstone (1999) researched the impacts of group membership salience in terms of altering attitudes of university students from Britain and other European countries in the context of intergroup contact. It was concluded that the efficiency of intergroup contact could be elevated

with the maintenance of salient category memberships. On the other hand, Gartner et al. (1996) reviewed evidences to prove the role of common in-group identity model which also called as recategorization on the reduction of prejudice between different groups. The core assumption of common in-group identity model is the perception of the members of the different groups in the contact situation recategorized from two divergent groups to one broad group such from "us" versus "them" to an inclusive "we".

Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) reconsidered the intergroup contact hypothesis by publishing a meta-analytic test of the contact theory. They investigated whether contact is functional to decrease prejudicial attitudes and behaviors and the importance of the four critical conditions of Allport on this issue. The findings of meta-analytic test were clear and suggested the role of intergroup contact to decline negative intergroup relations such as prejudice was significant. The meta-analytic results also showed that the critical contact conditions of Allport (1954) typically improved the impact of contact situation in a positive manner.

Tropp and Pettigrew (2005) revealed in their meta-analysis the association between contact and prejudice could change in terms of the way of measuring prejudice. They reported that the intergroup contact reduces prejudice when the measurement of prejudice based on affective aspects such as feelings and emotions rather than cognitive aspects such as stereotypes and beliefs. Also, the outcomes of the contact could be generalized to broader context in the former condition. In addition, Pettigrew and Tropp (2008) reported the mediatory effects of out-group knowledge, anxiety and empathy on prejudice reduction. While, the effect of having more out-

group knowledge was not strong but significant, reduced anxiety, empathy and perspective taking were strongly effective in reducing prejudice.

In the following sections, different forms intergroup contact strategies such as cross-group friendships and indirect contact (i.e., extended and imagined contact) and mediators of intergroup contact will be described.

1.3.4.1 Cross-group Friendships

Direct cross-group friendship hypothesis was proposed by Pettigrew (1997) as opportunity of direct friendship between members of opposing groups may lead to reduced level of intergroup prejudice. In line with this hypothesis, cross-group friendship as direct contact strategy worked to enhance intergroup relations such as positive out-group attitudes between White and Black high school students in South Africa with the mediatory effects of reducing anxiety and enhancing affective empathy (Swart, Hewstone, Christ & Voci, 2010). Further, another study examined cross-sectionally direct and indirect cross-group friendships effects between Catholic and Protestant participants on out-group prejudice reduction by using the intergroup conflict context in Northern Ireland. It was reported that prejudice toward religious out-group of both university students (study 1) and adult participants (study 2) reduced and their perception of out-group variability heightened by the presence of close friendship from cross-group via the mediating role of declined level of anxiety. This study also reported supportive evidences for extended contact hypothesis which will be defined later (Paolini, Hewstone, Cairns & Voci, 2004). Similarly, a negative correlation between the inter-ethnic contact with friends and prejudice were reported by Hamberger and Hewstone (1997). In the study of secondary analysis of survey data, a sample from four different European countries and three different intergroup

contact contexts were used in neighborhood, at work, and with friends. Importantly, only friends as an intergroup contact tool yielded reduced levels of prejudice.

 Research with children on direct intergroup contact provided evidence for its utility on positive intergroup attitudes. Rutland, Cameron, Bennett and Ferrell (2005) conducted a correlational study with preschool Anglo British children (3-5 years) to investigate the role of interracial contact and racial constancy on intergroup bias towards African Caribbean out-group. The results suggested that when interracial contact is promoted, the degree of bias towards racial out-group members might be decreased and more favorable attitudes might be exhibited because racial constancy has started to develop in children of this age range. Similarly, the results of the longitudinal study of Brown, Eller, Leeds and Stace (2007) on intergroup contact and intergroup attitudes of British secondary school children showed that as amount of direct contact with the members of out-group increase, the positively reported attitudes for the out-group in general increased as well. Another study which investigated longitudinally on direct and extended friendship between minority and majority children showed that direct friendship unlike extended one between ethnically different children (German and Turkish) was a strong factor to evaluate out-group positively in the course of time. While this was the evident for majority Germans, for minority group (Turkish children) it was not the case (Feddes, Rutland & Noack, 2009). Vezzali, Giovannini and Capozza (2012) conducted research on preceding social causes (i.e., teachers' attitudes) of explicitly and implicitly exhibited prejudice towards immigrant children by Italian 7-9 years old school children. One result that was discovered was that only implicit attitudes of children were affected by experiencing intergroup contact. It was reported that non-verbal prejudice

(implicit attitudes) of children increased with the experience of direct cross-group friendships. Also, implicit prejudice of teachers as a social cause had a role on that issue.

The one weakness of the direct contact strategy is that it does not give the out-group contact opportunity for people who live in segregated societies. At this point, extended contact is an alternative strategy for people who have no chance for contact directly with out-group members (Christ et al., 2010).

1.3.4.2 Extended Intergroup Contact as an Indirect Contact Strategy

Wright, Aron, McLauglin-Volpe and Ropp (1997) made significant contribution to social psychology literature by suggesting the indirect cross-group friendship hypothesis which is also known as extended contact hypothesis. The extended contact hypothesis is defined as "knowledge that an in-group member has a close relationship with an out-group member can lead to more positive intergroup attitudes" (Wright et al., 1997, p.74). The study of Wright et al.'s (1997) was the first support of the adult indirect cross-group friendship hypothesis by using multi-method approach in the literature. The results showed that if someone knows that the in-group members has out-group friends and the number of these friendships was high, the biased attitudes and the prejudice towards out-group members would decrease by decreasing intergroup anxiety and by increasing the in-group and out-group norms. After Wright et al. (1997), Turner, Hewstone, Voci and Vonofakou (2008) reported the concurrent mediatory role of reduced anxiety, perceived in-group and out-group norms, and inclusion of the out-group in the self for the extended contact and prejudice relationship. Additionally, studies such as Paolini et al. (2004) and Cameron, Rutland, Brown, and Douch (2006) showed the mediatory role of

reduced inter-group anxiety and inclusion of others in the self, respectively for the relationship between extended contact and improved intergroup attitudes.

Some works pointed on the important role of both direct and indirect cross-group friendship (Christ et al., 2010; Paolini et al., 2004; Turner, Hewstone & Voci, 2007) to reduce prejudice in adult samples (Turner et al., 2008). However, there is limited number of studies presented in the literature on developmental findings on indirect (extended) contact in terms of the intergroup relations and prejudice.

Cameron and Rutland (2006) investigated the extended contact hypothesis with the aim of reducing prejudice toward disabled children by non-disabled children. The important feature of this study was that it was investigated the possible effect of extended contact intervention to change the attitudes of young children toward disabled children. They conducted a 6 consecutive week intervention which was based on positive story reading which mentioned the context of friendship between non-disabled and disabled children. Non-disabled children between the ages of 5-10 years old took part in the study process. The stories were read in maximum of 3 children in groups with the experimenter. After finishing the story reading, group discussions were made by the researcher. They conducted two individual interview sessions as pre- and post-intervention interviews. While, they reported significant difference for the out-group attitude and intended behavior scores, in-group scores did not change. The results of Cameron and Rutland (2006) were in line with the intergroup extended contact literature on adults. It was stated that extended contact intervention is an effective way to strengthen the attitudes of non-disabled children toward with disabilities in positive way.

Furthermore, Cameron et al. (2006) conducted a study to modify the attitudes of British children (5 to 11 years) toward refugees. In this study, it was aimed to test the effectiveness of extended contact hypothesis on changing children's attitudes toward refugee people by reading stories which mentioned about the friendship scenarios of English and refugee children. As a result of the study, in line with adult extended contact literature, it was stated that extended contact intervention was useful for younger children to decrease antagonistic attitudes about refugee children. Also, the moderation effect of age was not found and it was proved that extended contact intervention could be used for all age groups and was not related the developmental issues and degree of cognitive abilities.

Similarly, Cameron, Rutland, and Brown (2007) conducted two studies which involved extended contact interventions with the aim of changing out-group (i.e., disabled and refugees) attitudes of children. It was the first study that explored how multiple classifications had an impact as an intervention on the prejudicial attitudes towards disabled and refugees who were stigmatized by in-group members. The results showed that 6-9 years old ages exhibited strengthened intergroup attitudes and intended behavior for disabled peers as a result of extended contact intervention while the attitudes and behaviors toward specified out-group did not change of the participant children who were in multiple classification skills training intervention.

A further study conducted by Vezzali, Stathi, and Giovannini (2012) were on Italian adolescents (11-13 year old) and indirect contact was used to decrease prejudice toward immigrants through book reading strategy. The goal of the study was to enhance intergroup interactions. They measured the in-group and out-group stereotypes, attitudes toward out-group, in-group and out-group behavioral

intentions, inclusion of in-group and out-group in the self (IOS), and in-group identification. As a result, they found that when adolescents read a book about other cultures, this improved attitudes toward immigrants and their prejudice level was reduced. Also, in comparison to participants in control conditions participants who read intercultural books showed more willingness to have future contact (Vezzali, Stathi et al., 2012).

Moreover, Vezzali, Stathi, Giovannini, Capozza, and Trifiletti (2014) examined the improvement of intergroup relationships such as decreasing prejudice and straightening the attitudes toward member of the out-group by reading the novels of Harry Potter. The goal of the study was to assess the extended contact effect by book reading (i.e, Harry Potter). Some of the results showed that attitudes of children and teenagers toward immigrants and homosexuals enhanced by reading Harry Potter novels and this was moderated by the identification with the main character (Harry Potter). Additionally, Paluck (2010) arranged a field experiment by using a radio talk show with the aim of giving an opportunity to listeners who live in the Democratic Republic of Congo to discuss the conflict between Hutsi and Tutu's. As part of the radio programs soap operas were used as an extended contact strategy which allowed listeners to follow the soap opera and talk about the conflict. At the end of one year a post-test was randomly applied to listeners in this region. It was reported that the talk show and extended contact had an effect on heightened discussion between individuals. However, the participants who were encouraged to discuss more (soap opera and encouragement for discussion via talk show) in comparison to baseline group (soap opera and no talk show) showed reduced negative attitudes to higher degree.

Importantly, the question of when extended contact has an impact for children was answered by using quasi-experimental design. In this research, the moderating role of high quality direct contact on the effectiveness of extended contact was tested in a group of 6-11 year old White English ethnic majority children. The out-group was the Indian-English people. It was found that extended contact has an effect to develop positive intergroup attitudes amongst children when the quality of direct cross-group friendships is lower (only acquaintances) or when the number of their direct contacts in high quality (cross-group friendships) is lesser (Cameron, Rutland, Hossain & Petley, 2011).

1.3.4.3 Imagined Intergroup Contact as an Indirect Contact Strategy

Another indirect contact strategy is the imagined contact which is defined by Crisp and Turner (2009) as "the mental simulation of a social interaction with a member or members of an out-group category" (p.234). The study of Vezzali, Capozza, Stathi, and Giovannini (2012) was the first study of imagined contact which out-group trust was used as a mediator to decrease infrahumanization attributions and strengthening the future contact desirability in children. They studied imagined intergroup contact with the aim of investigating how this concept affects the emotion attributions of human and trust towards people from out-group. It was hypothesized that out-group trust and positive attributions towards out-group would be supported by imagined indirect contact. It was concluded that out-group trust has indirect mediation effect on the enhancement of humanness attributions for out-group. The direct effect of imagined contact on humanness attributions was relatively non-significant. This study clearly showed that imagined contact cannot be the single solution as an intervention tool to improve intergroup relations but it can be used as preliminary process to improve future contact relations (Vezzali, Capozza et al., 2012).

Additionally, Stathi, Cameron, Hartley and Bradford (2014) reported positive effects of imagined contact intervention on children's out-group attitudes, and perception of similarity.

1.3.4.4 Mediators of Intergroup Contact

In the literature, different variables have been reported as mediators of intergroup contact such as anxiety (Cameron et al., 2006; Paolini et al., 2004; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008; Swart et al., 2010; Turner et al., 2008; Wright et al., 1997), out-group knowledge (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008), perceived in-group and out-group norms (Turner et al., 2008; Wright et al., 1997), inclusion of others in the self (Cameron et al., 2006; Paolini et al., 2004; Turner et al., 2008; Wright et al., 1997), empathy (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008; Swart et al., 2010; Vescio et al., 2003) and out-group trust (Hayashi, Ostrom, Walker & Yamagishi, 1999; Tam, Hewstone, Kenworthy & Cairns, 2009; Vezzali, Capozza et al., 2012) to name a few.

The roles of trust, forgiveness and support for peace were also assessed as part of this study. The role of trust is important for building friendship in children (Buzzelli, 1998) and its importance on intergroup contact and intergroup relations has also been suggested in several studies (Hayashi et al., 1999; Tam et al., 2009).).

The role of trust on cooperation was investigated in the experimental study of Hayashi et al. (1999) with university students by making comparisons between American and Japanese societies. They found that out-group trust is an important predictor for cooperation and enhanced communication between people. Tam et al. (2009) conducted studies with Catholic and Protestant university students in Northern Ireland to investigate the association between trust and intergroup relations. They reported supportive evidences to their hypothesis that people who report higher

trust toward out-group members will behave more positively and will show less negative behavioral tendencies towards out-group. They also found that people with the greatest intergroup contact have more tendencies to trust to the out-group. Thus, they behaved more positively and less likely in negative manner toward out-group people. This means that contact with out-group had enhanced positive behaviors by improving out-group trust.

Moreover, forgiveness and support for peace are significant variables for intergroup relationships. In one study, the association between intergroup contact and the variables such as trust and forgiveness toward out-group were investigated in conflicted Northern Ireland context (Hewstone et al., 2006). It was found that while out-group trust, perspective taking and attitudes were the variables that strongly predicted forgiveness in a positive direction for both groups (i.e., Catholics and Protestants); out-group contact only predicted forgiveness for Catholics. Also, significant correlation between out-group contact and forgiveness for each religious group was reported. Moreover, Cehajic, Brown and Castano (2008) studied antecedents and consequences of intergroup forgiveness in Bosnia and Herzegovina. High quality contact between Bosnian Muslims and Bosnian Serbs was reported as one positive predictor for forgiveness. In addition, out-group empathy and trust were the mediators between intergroup contact and forgiveness.

Halperin and Bar-Tal (2011) investigated support for peace in the Israel-Palestine context and found that socio-psychological factors can inhibit conflict resolution. The Israeli Jewish adult population participated in the survey study. It was found that participants' openness to distinct information about the conflict was impacted by their general worldviews (i.e., universalistic values, traditional values, conformist

33

values, implicit theories and authoritarianism) and influenced their societal beliefs about the conflict such as their beliefs of collective victimhood and the delegitimization of Palestinians. This suggests that one's general worldviews and societal beliefs can come together to hinder the peace process (Halperin & Bar-Tal, 2011).

Similarly in work by Halperin et al. (2012) found in the Cypriot context, that Turkish Cypriots who were led to believe that Greek Cypriots could change (i.e., were 'malleable') reported lower levels of intergroup anxiety and higher motivation to interact and communicate with Greek Cypriots in the future, compared with those who were led to believe that groups cannot change.

1.4 Present Study

In the present study, the in-group (member of the same ethnic group of participant) is native Turkish Cypriots who live in Northern Cyprus and native Greek Cypriots is the out-group (member of different ethnic group) who live in South Cyprus.

Cyprus is a natural laboratory to study intergroup contact because of there is a historical conflict on the island between Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots. Due to its convenient population and being a segregated society, there is an opportunity to use Greek Cypriots as an out-group target.

In 1974, Cyprus separated into two distinct communities after the inter-communal war between Greeks and Turks. After that time, while the south side of the Cyprus is the residential area of the Greek Cypriots, the north side is the location area of Turkish Cypriots (Rüstemli, Mertan & Çiftçi, 2000). After 23 April 2003, the borders

between two sides were partially removed and visiting the other side was given to the citizens of both communities as an opportunity (Hüsnü & Crisp, 2010).

The main aim of the current study is to improve out-group attitude, out-group behavioral intentions, out-group trust, out-group forgiveness, and support for peace in Turkish Cypriot school-children ranging from age 6-11 using an extended contact intervention. The roles of prior contact and age were also aimed to be examined on these variables.

In relation with the focus points of the present study and consistent with previous findings in the literature, it was hypothesized that positive out-group attitudes, behavioral intentions toward future contact, out-group trust, out-group forgiveness and support for peace in Turkish Cypriot children will increase after the extended contact intervention. Additionally, prior contact with the out-group was expected to lead to more positive out-group attitudes and intentions as the second expectation of the study. Also, it was expected that older age group (9-11 years) will report higher positive attitudes and behavioral intentions toward both in-group and out-group targets and higher out-group trust, forgiveness and support for peace than younger age group (6-8 years).

Chapter 2

METHOD

The method section will include the comprehensive information about sample, design, measures and procedure of the current research.

2.1 Participants

The participants were 40 Turkish Cypriot children (18 boys and 22 girls) who were included from four different child training centers, a primary school and acquaintance family homes around North Cyprus by using purposive sampling method. The age of the children ranged from 6 years to 11 years (M = 8, SD = 1.59). There were two age groups: 6-8 years ($n = 26$) and 9-11 years ($n = 14$). All children came from native Turkish-Cypriot families (i.e., both parents were native Turkish Cypriots, born in Cyprus) was a critical inclusion criterion for the study.

2.2 Design

The study was a 2 (phase of interview: pre vs. post intervention) x 2 (target group: in-group vs. out-group) within subjects design.

2.3 Materials

There were two interview phases as pre and post intervention. The participants were tested 1 week before starting the intervention and also 1 week after the intervention ended. The pre-intervention session which was conducted individually with each child, lasted approximately 15 minutes. The post-intervention session lasted approximately 10-15 minutes but this duration varied depending on the performance of each individual child. Three different stories were used as the extended contact

intervention strategy, all emphasizing intergroup solidarity and cross-group friendship (the stories can be seen in Appendix E).

2.3.1 Pre-test and Post-test Questionnaires

The pre-intervention test included 8 scales and each scale had a different number of items. Additionally, the post-test was the similar shorter version of the pre-test intervention. It included exactly the same items of trait attribution task, behavioral intentions, out-group trust, out-group forgiveness, and support for peace process measures of the pre-test intervention. The excluded items in post-test intervention were contact measures (i.e., prior contact, storytelling, and cross group items). The pre- and post-test measurements are listed and clarified below.

2.3.1.1 Prior Contact

This measure contained 2 items to test Turkish Cypriot children's direct contact experiences with Greek Cypriots. They indicated the quantity of both positive and negative past contact that they experienced with the out-group on a 4 point Likert scale ranging from 1 = *never* to 4 = *very frequently* (Voci & Hewstone, 2006) (e.g., "in everyday life, how frequently do you have positive/negative interactions with Greek Cypriots?"). High scores indicated more prior (positive or negative) contact with Greek Cypriots.

2.3.1.2 Storytelling

Two storytelling items were used to measure both negative and positive family stories. Items were asked to determine how many family members of the children told negative and positive stories about Greek Cypriots (Paolini et al., 2014; e.g. 'do any of your family members tell you negative/positive stories about Greek Cypriots?'; 1= *none*, 4= *over 10*).

2.3.1.3 Extended Contact

Two items were used to measure indirect cross-group friendship/extended contact experiences of the children. Participants responded to extended contact measures (Wright et al., 1997; two items; e.g. 'how many of your family members have friends who are Greek Cypriot?'; 1= *none*, 6= *more than 30*). Extended contact items were recoded into a single extended contact measure, after equivalence of measures was obtained.

2.3.1.4 Trait Attribution Task

This task was used to test in-group and out-group attitudes. It contains 6 positive and 6 negative traits and in total there were 12 trait cards. The cards were ordered in a random order for each participant child. This task used some instructions and each child had duties in this task. The first instruction of the researcher was that "here are some cards with words on them describing the people. We can say that *some people are*: (by showing the word in the first card), *some people are:* (by showing the word in the second card)… Is that right?" The first duty of the child was to go through all these words one by one, and to sort out those words which they think can be used to describe the in-group (Turkish Cypriot people). Then, one more (affect) question about Turkish Cypriot people was asked by the researcher. The question was "Do you like or dislike Turkish Cypriot people?" which was rated on 5 point Likert scale from dislike a lot (1) to like a lot (5). The second task was to repeat this but this time thinking about Greek Cypriot people. The traits were *clean, dirty, friendly, unfriendly, smart, stupid, hardworking, lazy, happy, sad, honest and dishonest* (Barrett, Lyons, Bennett, Vila, Gime´nez, & Arcuri, 1997).

2.3.1.5 Out-group Trust

A single item was used to test the degree of trust of Turkish Cypriot children towards a Greek Cypriot child (Tropp, Stout, Boatswain, Wright & Pettigrew, 2006). This was 'Do you trust to a Greek Cypriot child enough to lend him/her your favorite toy?'; 1 = *very much* to 5= *not at all.* The item for out-group trust was then reversely coded.

2.3.1.6 Out-group Forgiveness

A single item was used to test the degree of forgiveness toward Greek Cypriots (Hewstone, Cairns, Voci, Hamberger & Niens, 2006). This included 'Would you like Turkish Cypriots to forgive Greek Cypriots because of the events in the war?'; 1 = *very much* to 5= *not at all.* The forgiveness item was then reversely coded.

2.3.1.7 Support for peace process

A single item was devised to measure how much the children support the peace process in Cyprus between the two communities. This was 'Would you like Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriots live together in peace?'; 1 = *very much* to 5= *not at all.* This item was also reversely coded after.

2.3.1.8 Behavioral Intentions

This measurement used a hypothetical scenario in which the participant was approached by a Greek Cypriot/Turkish Cypriot child at a park. Four items were then used to test the intended behaviors of the child towards both the out-group and in-group (Cameron, Rutland, Brown & Douch, 2006; e.g. 'how much you would like to play with him/her?'; four items; 1 = *very much* to 5= *not at all;*). Separate reliability analyses were conducted for pre and post-test intervention ratings for in-group and out-group behavioral intentions. In general behavioral intentions measures had high internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha for pre-intervention in-group behavioral

intentions and out-group behavioral intentions was .85 and .87, respectively, and Cronbach's alpha for post-intervention in-group behavioral intentions and out-group behavioral intentions was .92 and .87, respectively). These behavioral intention items were reversely coded and the satisfactory results of reliability analyses led to form one overall intention item for two groups by calculating composite mean scores.

2.3.2 The cards

The questionnaire responses were written on cards and the children had to show the card that best reflected their opinion.

2.3.3 The stories

Stories were about adventures of an in-group child *(Turkish Cypriot)* with an out-group child *(Greek Cypriot)* that have a close friendship. The stories ranged between 280-300 words and can be seen in Appendix E, however an example story would include the efforts of two children; Turkish (Meryem) and Greek Cypriot (Maria) who attempt to fix a playground where they play in together by spending the money in their piggy banks to paint the apparatus in the park. They needed money to buy paint and brushes for painting the rusted apparatus and the story includes the children's efforts to collect enough money and then paint the apparatus. Each story ends with the celebration of the two children's mutual efforts.

2.4 Procedure

Before starting the research, the researcher received the ethics approval from the Research and Ethics Committee of Psychology Department of EMU, the participants of the research were selected by using purposive sampling method. The sample of the study was arranged with available participants from different institutions and from acquaintance environment in the direction of research purposes and inclusion criteria. One week prior to start the data collection, the researcher went to the

training centers and introduced herself and explained her thesis study and the purposes of it. Importantly, the characteristics of the potential participants and inclusion criteria of the study were stated to the directors of each training center.

The directors of the institutions and the families who were volunteered to take part in the study were briefed on the goals and process of the research. A plain language statement and a consent form were given to inform them which stated that the study was the "Investigation of the concept development in Turkish Cypriot children". With this form it was stressed that at any time they could drop out from the study if they wished. Only institutional permission was obtained from the director of training centers and parental permission was sought from the parents whose children were included to the study in their houses. After obtaining the written approval from voluntary institutions, the potential participants who were between the age range of 6-11 and who came from native Turkish Cypriot families were chosen with the directors. Also, the same procedure was applied to the voluntary parents and their written permission was sought and obtained before beginning the study.

 As stated previously, there were pre- and post-interview sessions, conducted one week before and one week after the intervention. In the pre-test and post-test phases the children were interviewed individually in a face to face situation either in the home or training centers environment. Each child was informed that it was not a test or an exam and importantly there were neither right nor wrong answers. The intervention sessions were applied once a week, whereby a different story was read for 3 consecutive weeks. The story reading intervention was conducted in a group based manner with maximum 5 children. After each story-reading, group based discussions were enforced by the researcher to reinforce the story contents. The study

required 5 weeks in total to complete for each group. The reading and discussion sessions lasted approximately 10-15 minutes each week.

After the study was completed the researcher thanked participants, parents and the institutions for their participation to study. At the end of the research process, the researcher debriefed the institutions and parents by giving a debriefing form. As a result of the data collection, all the data were entered into SPSS-Version 20 which is a computer program Statistical Package for Social Sciences to conduct several analyses.

Chapter 3

RESULTS

The data of the study were analyzed and are reported in this section in relation with the goals of the study. Presentation of statistical findings from paired sample t-test, independent sample t-test and correlational analyses were given in the below paragraphs. The scores for both the in-group and particularly for the out-group were reported separately.

3.1 Comparisons between pre and post-intervention scores

The first hypothesis was tested by calculating mean scores for each dependent variable (positive/negative attitudes, trust, forgiveness, support for peace and behavioral intentions). T-test comparisons were conducted to compare pre and post-test scores for both in-group and out-group. In-group scores for positive/negative attitudes and behavioral intentions and out-group scores for all dependent variables were compared under different sub-titles.

3.1.1 In-group scores

A paired sample t-test was conducted to compare pre- and post-test scores on the scales of positive attitude and behavioral intentions for future contact with an in-group member (a Turkish Cypriot child).

Non-significant findings were obtained as a result of this analysis. For example, children reported indifferent positive in-group attitudes on the post-test ($M = 4.53$, $SD = 1.62$) than pre-test scores ($M = 4.06$, $SD = 2.01$), $t(39) = -1.78$, $p > .05$.

Also, the difference between pre and post intervention negative attitudes did not reach significance level, t (39) = .32, $p>.05$. Their pre-test scores were (M = 1.03, SD = 1.82) and post-test scores were (M = .93, SD = 1.35).

Behavioral intention scores on pre-test measure (M = 3.85, SD = .99) were also non-significantly different than scores on post-test measure (M = 4.16, SD = .96), t (39) = -1.76, $p>.05$.

3.1.2 Out-group scores

For analyzing the first hypothesis that that positive out-group attitudes, out-group trust, and out-group forgiveness and intentions toward future contact will increase after the extended contact intervention, a paired sample t-test was conducted on these dependent measures.

Firstly, out-group attitude scores were analyzed and a significant difference between pre- and post-test scores was found, t (39) = -2.64, p = .00. That is, children reported higher positive out-group attitudes on the post-intervention test (M = 3.59, SD = 1.22) in comparison to pre-intervention test (M = 1.78, SD = 1.82). Similarly, the results showed that negative out-group attitudes of children decreased after extended contact intervention however the difference was non-significant, t (39) = 1.57, p > .05. Negative out-group attitudes were higher in the pre-test (M = 2.45, SD = 2.06) when compared with post-test scores (M = 1.75, SD = 1.86).

Secondly, there was an increase in the out-group trust scores. Post-intervention test trust towards out-group members were significantly higher (M = 3.64, SD = 1.45) in comparison to trust scores in pre-intervention test (M = 2.49, SD = 1.48), t (32) = - 4.47, p = .00.

Thirdly, out-group forgiveness scores of the children were significantly higher in the post-test ($M = 3.58$, $SD = 1.52$) than pre-test ($M = 3.08$, $SD = 1.67$), t (37) = - 2.52, $p = .02$.

Similarly, children reported significantly higher support for peace on the post-intervention test ($M = 3.98$, $SD = 1.20$) than pre-intervention ($M = 3.34$, $SD = 1.58$), t (37) = - 2.54, $p = .02$.

Finally, the composite behavioral intention scores for the out-group were significantly different after the extended contact intervention. Children reported higher intentions for future contact ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 1.22$) at the end of the intervention in comparison to pre-intervention measurements ($M = 3.0$, $SD = 1.29$), t (37) = - 2.64, $p = .01$. The summary of results is shown in table 3.1.2.

Table 3.1.2: Means and standard deviations of pre- and post-intervention scales for all variables

Dependent Variables	M (SD) Pre	M (SD) Post	t
Out-group Positive attitudes	1.78 (1.82)	3.59 (1.22)	- 2.64*
Out-group Negative attitudes	2.45 (2.06)	1.75 (1.86)	1.57
Out-group Trust	2.49 (1.48)	3.64 (1.45)	- 4.47*
Out-group Forgiveness	3.08 (1.67)	3.58 (1.52)	- 2.52*
Support for peace	3.34 (1.58)	3.98 (1.20)	-2.54*
Out-group Behavioral intentions	3.00 (1.29)	3.59 (1.22)	-2.64*
In-group Positive attitudes	4.06 (2.01)	4.53 (1.62)	-1.78
In-group Negative attitudes	1.03 (1.82)	.93 (1.35)	.32
In-group Behavioral intentions	3.85 (.99)	4.16 (.96)	-1.76

Note. * *p*<.05; Scores for trust, forgiveness, peace and intentions range from 1 (low) to 5 (high). Attitudes scores range from 1 (low) to 6 (high).

3.2 Age Comparisons

An independent samples t-test was conducted to compare the dependent variables, namely positive attitudes, negative attitudes and behavioral intentions for both in-group and out-group targets and trust, forgiveness and support for peace for only out-group target in two age groups (6-8 vs. 9-11 years of age). There was a non-significant difference in the scores of each age group for these dependent variables. These results suggested that there were no differences between younger and older groups in their attitudes, behavioral intentions, trust, forgiveness and support for peace. The age-group comparisons for these dependent variables are given in table 3.2.

Table 3.2: Age group comparisons on all dependent variables

Dependent Variables	Phase of Interview	Age Group		
		6-8 years	9-11 years	t-
		M (SD)	*M (SD)*	value
In-group Positive Attitudes	Pre-test	4.00 (2.15)	4.14 (1.79)	-.21
	Post-test	4.85 (1.52)	3.93 (1.69)	1.76
Out-group Positive Attitudes	Pre-test	1.58 (1.84)	2.14 (1.79)	-.94
	Post-test	3.54 (2.10)	3.64 (2.10)	-.15
In-group Negative Attitudes	Pre-test	1.12 (1.95)	0.86 (1.61)	.42
	Post-test	0.92 (1.26)	0.93 (1.54)	-.01
Out-group Negative Attitudes	Pre-test	2.58 (2.10)	2.21 (2.04)	.53
	Post-test	2.00 (1.85)	1.29 (1.86)	1.16
In-group Behavioral Intentions	Pre-test	3.69 (1.12)	4.15 (0.61)	-1.43
	Post-test	4.26 (0.87)	3.98 (1.12)	.88
Out-group Behavioral Intentions	Pre-test	2.91 (1.39)	3.18 (1.09)	-.65
	Post-test	3.48 (1.28)	3.79 (1.11)	-.76
Out-group Trust	Pre-test	2.25 (1.51)	2.57 (1.34)	-.66
	Post-test	3.39 (1.67)	3.83 (1.03)	-.83
Out-group Forgiveness	Pre-test	3.04 (1.84)	3.29 (1.38)	-.44
	Post-test	3.60 (1.38)	3.57 (1.74)	.06
Support for Peace	Pre-test	3.12 (1.70)	3.50 (1.40)	-.72
	Post-test	3.83 (1.40)	4.21 (0.70)	-.95

3.3 The Role of Intergroup Contact

As can be seen in table 3.3 descriptive data is provided on the extent of prior contact experienced by the children. The participants reported low intergroup contact, including extended contact ($M = 2.78$, $SD = 2.03$), positive prior contact ($M = 1.87$, $SD = 1.02$), negative prior contact ($M = 1.77$, $SD = 1.04$), positive storytelling ($M = 1.91$, $SD = .93$) and negative storytelling ($M = 1.32$, $SD = .70$).

Table 3.3: Means and Standard Deviations of Prior Contact Measures

Prior Contact Measures	*M (SD)*
Extended Contact	2.78 (2.03)
Positive Prior Contact	1.87 (1.02)
Negative Prior Contact	1.77 (1.04)
Positive Storytelling	1.91 (.93)
Negative Storytelling	1.32 (.70)

Note: Mean scores range from 1 to 4, higher scores indicate more contact.

3.3.1 Correlation Analysis

In order to test the second hypothesis that prior contact with the out-group will predict more positive out-group attitudes and intentions was tested by computing Pearson correlation coefficients. However, more non-significant findings were obtained. Although, the results showed no relation between most of the contact measures (positive contact, negative contact, negative storytelling, and extended contact) and the dependent variables, significant correlation between positive storytelling and some of the outcome measures were found. For example, a significant correlation was found between positive storytelling and pre out-group behavioral intentions ($r = .39$, $p = .02$) and pre out-group negative attitudes of the children ($r = -.47$, $p = .01$). However, positive contact was non-significantly correlated with all of the outcome measures ($-.26 < r < .13$), the same was found for negative prior contact ($-.23 < r < .20$); negative story telling ($-.28 < r < .31$); and extended contact ($-.29 < r < .25$). As can be seen in the table 3.3, positive contact experiences (i.e., prior contact and story-telling) were reported as higher than negative contact experiences.

Chapter 4

DISCUSSION

The present study mainly aimed to improve positive attitudes, intended behavior, trust and forgiveness towards Greek Cypriot out-group as well as support for peace in Turkish Cypriot school-children ranging from ages 6-11 years using an extended contact intervention, i.e. story-telling strategy.

It was an essential issue to study prejudice in children because children in Cyprus have been born and raised in a segregated and inter-ethnically conflicted community. They most probably have listened to family telling stories and hearsays. Therefore, they might have stereotypes, biases and ethic prejudice toward out-group members. According to Aboud (1988) and Nesdale (2001), social attitudes and social values are formulated in the middle childhood and can continue to exist in the adolescence and adulthood periods. Therefore, it was important to study prejudice in school age children to prevent raising children in the community with ethnic prejudice and promote future reparation and peace.

It is important to note that there was a need to reduce children's negative attitudes, encourage future contact intentions and improve their trust, forgiveness toward Greek Cypriots and support for peace in Cyprus by using an indirect contact technique. Using direct contact could be an inconvenient strategy in Cyprus context because there is no chance for children to build close relationships in the same school

context although the borders between two sides were partially removed in 2003 and the members of two populations can visit the other side as well. Although direct contact can reduce intergroup prejudice between diverse groups more effectively than indirect techniques (Fazio & Zanna, 1981), extended contact intervention via story-reading was the most convenient one to use as an indirect strategy to decrease biased thought and attitudes without loading intergroup anxiety (Wright et al., 1997). In accordance with Cameron and Rutland (2006), it was expected that before any direct future contact, indirect contact could be an effective way to reduce prejudice and enhance positive attitudes of the children.

The results of the study supported the main aim by approving that positive attitudes, behavioral intentions, trust, and forgiveness toward Greek Cypriots increased as a result of the story telling intervention. Also, as expected, an increase in their support for peace scores was seen after the intervention. More importantly, positive attitudes toward the Greek Cypriot out-group enhanced drastically after 3 consecutive weeks of the story-telling intervention. For example, children attributed a higher number of positive traits to Greek Cypriots in the post-test session. Similarly, they reported higher behavioral intentions for future out-group contact at the end of the intervention in comparison to their scores at the pre intervention test, for instance they stated that they would be more likely engage in play with a Greek Cypriot child or go to the cinema.

Beside these findings, it was found that extended contact intervention had some effect on decreasing negative out-group attitudes but this finding did not reach significance level. For instance, Turkish Cypriot children attributed fewer numbers of negative traits to the out-group members after listening to 3 different friendship

stories between the Greek and Turkish Cypriot child. This result concurs with previous findings in both the adult (Paolini et al., 2004; Wright et al., 1997) and the children literature (Cameron et al., 2007; Cameron & Rutland, 2006; Cameron et al., 2006; Vezzali et al., 2014) within the framework of extended contact research. As explained in detail in the introduction, those past studies tested extended contact hypothesis on different samples and ages and found support for the effectiveness of extended contact as a prejudice reduction strategy to improve intergroup relations between opposing groups.

In accordance with the work of Cameron and Rutland (2006), the present research findings showed that in-group attitudes and intended behavior scores did not significantly change as expected in the present study. Therefore as planned, the extended contact intervention was specifically effective in improving out-group attitudes and intended behaviors only.

The results of the study revealed that children had very low level of intergroup contact (extended contact, positive prior contact, negative prior contact, positive storytelling and negative storytelling). Although the aim of the study was to assess the impact of contact on the effectiveness of the intervention, the data gave important information on the amount of contact (both positive and negative in nature) that Turkish Cypriot children experience in their daily lives. For instance, the children reported more positive experiences than negative contact experiences (e.g., higher extended contact, positive family storytelling and positive prior contact than negative prior contact and negative family storytelling).This is in line with a study conducted with adults by Graf, Paolini and Rubin (2014) who found that positive face-to-face contact was significantly more prevalent than negative face-to-face contact in five

European countries (Austria, the Czech Republic, Germany, Poland and Slovakia). This finding extends the work of Graf et al. in peaceful contexts to those of post-conflict nature with children.

Moreover, the role of prior contact on all dependent variables (out-group positive attitude, out-group trust, out-group forgiveness, and support for peace) was examined in accordance with the purpose of the study. The second research hypothesis that positive prior contact with the out-group will predict more positive out-group attitudes and intentions was not supported. Any relation between prior positive contact and the dependent variables such as positive out-group attitudes and intentions could not be found. Children also reported that they were not exposed to many negative prior contact experiences with out-group members. According to SIDT (Nesdale, 2004), if children perceive any threat by the out-group members for their social positions, children are more likely to dislike the out-group and will have prejudiced attitudes. In light of the suggestions of Nesdale (2004)'s theory, when the relation between negative prior contact and positive/negative attitudes toward out-group were examined, no significant correlation could be found. This is reported to be the case when threat perception is low. It might be that the participants in this study were feeling low levels of threat due to their low levels of prior contact; this might be why prior contact did not influence the dependent measures. The role of threat perception in children needs to be assessed in future studies to better establish the role of prior contact in intergroup relations.

Conversely, this result was crucial because the support for the effectiveness of the extended contact intervention was provided in the absence of prior contact experiences to improve intergroup relations in children. Similarly, Cameron et al.

(2011) argued in their quasi-experimental design research that when children have lower levels of high quality direct contact and low quality of direct contacts that is when extended contact could be a successful strategy. Therefore, this finding for the role of prior contact draws a significant conclusion about the worthiness of extended contact intervention by strengthening the previous finding of Cameron et al. (2011).

Although the current study obtained no evidence for the role of prior contact on any of the dependent variables, correlational findings showed that there was a positive moderate correlation between positive family storytelling and children's pre-intervention intentions and negative moderate correlation between positive family storytelling and pre-intervention negative attitudes. However, this was not the case for negative family story telling which the results did not revealed any significant relationship between negative family storytelling and any of the dependent variables. Therefore, there might be a possibility that children whose parents told positive (or negative) stories at home, might grow up to internalize their parent's attitudes. It seems that this finding supported the social reflection theory which based on social learning perspective of Bandura (1977). This theory basically proposed that prejudice is conveyed from parents to their children and they observed and imitated their parent's attitudes and behaviors. In other words, social beliefs and values are transferred to the children from their parents and they processed this information via observation and imitation. Similarly, Sinclair et al. (2005) studied the acquirement of implicit ethnic prejudice and the effect of parents on this issue and reported that parents are one of the most important socialization factors for children. Once again, the intervention worked despite prior contact levels showing support to the strength of the intervention.

The third hypothesis of the study that older age group (9-11 years) will report higher positive attitudes and behavioral intentions toward both in-group and out-group targets and higher out-group trust, forgiveness and support for peace than younger age group (6-8 years) was not supported.

The significant difference between the attitudes and behavioral intentions of younger and older age groups for both in-group and out-group members were not found. Although the difference between age groups were non-significant, when the mean distributions were examined, it could be seen that 9-11 year old children reported higher positive attitudes and higher intentions toward Greek Cypriots in comparison to 6-8 year olds. They also reported lower negative attitudes toward Greek Cypriots. This result was in line with the Griffiths and Nesdale (2006)'s findings to some extent which reported that 10 year old Anglo Australian majority children rated Aboriginal minority out-group more positively than 8 year old majority children. Similarly, Brown (2010) reported a regular reduction in 7-12 year old children's derogative expressions towards ethnic out-group. This lends some support to the finding that prejudicial attitudes might decline with increasing age and cognitive capacity, however more conclusive evidence is necessary for the current population.

In addition, the difference between out-group trust, out-group forgiveness and support for peace scores of two age groups (i.e., younger and older) was not significant. It might be that younger children could not exactly understand and evaluate the questions of out-group trust, forgiveness and peace. The reason might be that these concepts especially peace, forgiveness or war are very abstract for 6 year olds and they can only develop such abstract cognitive abilities with advanced ages. Children can differentiate between the physical and personal characteristics of an

individual by understanding emotions and intentions as their social-cognitive abilities develop (Bretherton & Beeghly, 1982; Harris, 1989). Previous research has found that abstract cognitive skills develop with increasing age, especially in the middle childhood period (Gnepp, 1989). This means that the difference between age groups might emerge when their age and cognitive maturity increases.

In terms of the importance of this study, it was the first investigation of extended contact hypothesis in Turkish school-children sample in North Cyprus. The context of Cyprus was very suitable to test extended contact hypothesis because of its historical background and current social status. In contrast, previous studies have used disabled people, immigrants, refugees, or homosexuals as out-group targets (e.g., Cameron & Rutland, 2006; Cameron et al., 2006; Cameron et al., 2007; Vezzali, Stathi et al., 2012; Vezzali et al., 2014). This study took advantage from current the socio-political status of Cyprus and used the Greek Cypriots as an out-group target. This was a significant difference between the present and previous studies, as it used a conflict zone and found significant results.

Furthermore, previous developmental work which used indirect contact strategies in Turkish Cypriot school children is limited. For example, Husnu and Crisp (2010) conducted a cross-sectional study in Cyprus with adults but used imagined contact as an indirect contact strategy, not an extended one.

The present study also added the new dependent variable- out-group trust to the extended contact literature which other developmental work on extended contact have not used (Cameron & Rutland, 2006; Cameron et al., 2006; Cameron et al., 2007). This measure has only been used with imagined intergroup contact

interventions previously (Vezzali, Capozza et al., 2012) and the important role of trust for intergroup interactions in children was demonstrated. Previous findings reported that trust is an important factor to improve humanistic attitudes of children toward out-group members and when they have lack of trust, their intentions can inhibit interactions with their peers from the out-group. In addition, Buzzelli (1998) suggested the important role of trust for building friendships in children. On this basis, there are some other reasons to expect that trust has a role in intergroup relations, most especially in conflicted contexts. For example, Tam et al. (2009) addressed the role of out-group trust on intergroup relations in conflicted areas. They reported that out-group trust has a mediating role on both positive and negative behavioral tendencies between Catholic and Protestant university students in Northern Ireland and also on the effect of extended contact on these variables. The findings of present research were in line with such works that highlight the importance of trust for intergroup relations; as expected, children reported significantly higher level of trust towards Greek Cypriots after 3 consecutive weeks of story-reading intervention.

Forgiveness and support for peace were also important dependent variables with significant changes at the end of the intervention. These variables were previously studied in conflict contexts such as Northern Ireland and Israel-Palestine (see Halperin & Bar-Tal, 2011; Hewstone et al., 2006). It was found that forgiveness is an important variable for intergroup relationships and out-group contact was a predictor of forgiveness (Hewstone et al., 2006). The findings from this research extend this literature to younger populations. Enhancing forgiveness and support for peace in

younger generations can have important implications for their future years in peace building efforts with the South.

As noted in the above paragraphs, this study is original with its findings for the segregated Cypriot context. However, as with all other studies, this study has some limitations.

The first limitation of the study is only one age range was recruited to study (i.e., 6-11 years old) and comparisons could not be made between early, middle and late childhood periods in terms of prejudice development. In the literature, it could be found that 5-7 and 8-10 years are the age ranges of the children's prejudiced attitudes reduction (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011). Differently, social cognitive developmental theory of Aboud (1988) stated that 5-7 years is the age range to acquire prejudice because in-group favoritism reaches a peak at this period and around 7 years decreases due to improvement in their cognitive capacities. Social identity development theory (SIDT; Nesdale, 2004) suggested that prejudice increases around this age which is the ethnic prejudice phase. Although, previous suggestions could not be tested and no comparisons could be made between children below and above age 6 to make clear the age of prejudice acquirement or reduction in children, the explanatory reason of conducting current research with children above 6 years old was that reading and writing are taught to children at schools at the age of 6 in North Cyprus. The research material was based on children's ability to read each reading card and then show their response to the questions during the interview sessions. This is why primary school children were recruited to the study.

The second limitation of the study is that familial storytelling was measured in the pre-intervention test to determine prior contact of children in the form of the quantity of family members' story telling as has been the procedure in previous research (Paolini et al., 2014). However, the quantity of individuals who story tell might not be sufficient. The frequency of how often these stories are told to the child is also a significant factor. It might actually be that a child has one person storytelling (as measured in the study) but who frequently tells such stories (not measured). Taking into consideration frequency of storytelling in addition to number of story tellers would be a more complete examination of the impact of familial storytelling on intergroup relations.

An additional limitation of the study is that at the pre-interview session before the researcher was beginning to report the children's responses to the questions; the Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot concepts were described verbally, but not concretely. This led to some confusion for the children between who are Turkish Cypriot, Greek Cypriot and Turks. However, this weakness was handled by answering in detail the questions of the children in such a case. Additionally, the concepts were also explained even if children did not direct questions to the researcher, but they seemed confused.

Another weakness was related with procedural part of the study. When children were recruited to the study from different child training centers, some difficulties occurred. For example, in general, center directors did not have official registries which include children's personal information in detail. This led to some confusion in detecting the children's nationalities. Being a native Turkish Cypriot was a critical inclusion criterion and due to this limitation in question, some children included in

the study were not native Turkish Cypriot. In such a case, when this was identified by questioning the child about his/her origins or somehow felt by the researcher while advancing on the test, these participants were eliminated from the study. However, to prevent discrimination of the child who was not native Turkish Cypriot, explanation about the issue was avoided and after a brief conversation between the researcher and the child, the child was thanked and the interview ended.

Another potential criticism could be that both interview sessions (pre- and post-) and also all story-readings were conducted by the same researcher. This could draw attention to social desirability, demand characteristics and experimenter bias issues on the effectiveness of extended contact intervention. To control the confounding effects of these factors, a control condition (in which a group of children did not receive the story reading intervention) could have been used. This kind of control condition is generally used to form a baseline of the children's responses to sort out any other confounding variables on the effects of the intervention. However, due to the experimental design of the present study which was a repeated measure, the group of children was their own control group as their attitudes and intentions were initially measured at the pre-test. Also, in the literature, there are some experimental studies that did not use such a control group (e.g., Cameron & Rutland, 2006). Future research should use different research assistants during the intervention process to eliminate this possibility or include a control group who do not receive the story intervention.

It is important to state that the role of gender was not taken into consideration. The reason of this was that the main aim of the study was to investigate the developmental trajectory of prejudice to be able to apply the intervention at the most

critical stage of prejudice development, regardless of gender. As a result, the role of age was thought to be more critical and therefore gender was not included as a variable.

The findings of the present study yield important implications for future studies and it presented a conviction that extended contact could be used as an alternative strategy to direct contact in conflicted communities to reduce prejudice and enhance intergroup relations in children. Furthermore, several suggestions can be made for future researchers.

First of all, future research should focus on comparing the age differences in prejudice development by using different age ranges because developmental trajectories of prejudice in children are important to examine. In the current study, the children were not distributed equally in terms of ages. There was not equal number of children in each age group. It would be beneficial to know the developmental track so interventions can be applied at critical stages of development.

In addition, further research should include a group of children who already have high prior contact. The effectiveness of extended contact intervention should be proved once again by testing children who have had higher prior contact with Greek Cypriots. It is a possibility to find more improvement in the positive attitudes and intentions of the children toward out-group who have higher positive prior contact or conversely, the extended contact intervention might not work or be as effective in changing children's attitudes if they have higher negative prior contact.

Moreover, because of the deficiency of a concrete description of Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot concepts in the current research, future studies could use the map of Cyprus to explain these concepts in more detail by showing the borders between two communities on the map and also could use the world map to show that Turkey and Greece are separate countries. This could be a prevention strategy for confusions in children's mind in terms of these concepts.

Additional research should also investigate the mechanisms that underlie the intergroup extended contact hypothesis which were not explored in the present research such as in-group and out-group norms, inclusion of the out-group in the self and reduction of intergroup anxiety (Wright et al., 1997) which might have some mediatory roles on extended contact intervention (Cameron et al., 2006; Paolini et al., 2004; Turner et al., 2008; Vezzali, Stathi et al., 2012). Additionally, the role of empathy on extended contact intervention should be examined to improve children's out-group attitudes (Nesdale, Durkin et al., 2005). There have been variables proven to be effective in improving intergroup relations but have not been fully tested for indirect contact strategies.

The present research findings have some important practical implications, especially for policymakers and educators. Extended contact as an indirect contact strategy via story reading was proved as an effective tool to reduce prejudice in children. Accordingly, the effectiveness of extended contact either through a structured intervention (e.g., Cameron & Rutland, 2006) or through a simple book reading portraying the relations between different cultures (Vezzali, Stathi, et al., 2012) was evidence in previous research. Thus, story reading could be used in educational settings effectively to promote change or at least an improvement for intergroup

relations. Therefore, the current intervention namely extended contact through story reading could be adapted to the school-curricula as an effective method to improve the intergroup relations and potential of cross-group friendship in schools between Turkish and Greek Cypriot children.

As the political and social issues are changing rapidly in Cyprus between two communities because of the unresolved Cyprus issue, there is a possibility for cross-group friendships between Greek and Turkish Cypriots in the future. Therefore, extended contact can be used as a kind of preparative tool in the context of inter-ethnically conflicted Cyprus to prepare people especially children before real direct contact experiences with out-group members.

Thus, it is not a high cost strategy to be used in educational settings. Some regulations could be made in the school-curricula by policy makers. Also, professionals such as educators, developmental and social psychologist could collaborate in the process of regulations to make healthy changes and extension in the curriculum. In the case of adapting the current intervention to the school-curricula, less impractical limitations might arise such as environmental (noise or lack of a spare room in the centers) or methodological. For example, a new course could be added in the school curriculum such as 'social relations' and class teacher can have possibility separate hour in the weekly program. In such a manner, children might not behave in socially acceptable ways (social desirability) or be aware of the research expectations (demand characteristics) because this will be a part of their regular program. In addition, educators could give such stories which portrayed the friendship between opposing groups such as Turkish and Greek Cypriot or high and low status children. Like the current study, small discussion groups could be

organized after story-readings in classroom to encourage sharing ideas. Therefore, school-based interventions could be used effectively to enhance positive attitudes, behavioral intentions, trust and forgiveness toward out-group members and also support for peace among children.

Applying extended contact intervention in the educational settings could be advantageous in terms of promoting preparation or practice for integrated schools in Cyprus where Greek and Turkish Cypriot children can get education under the same roof. Therefore, extended contact can be used as a kind of preceding method to practice for direct contact experiences and also for encouraging peace in Cyprus by improving intergroup relations. It could also be used as a preventative method for potential incidents between Turkish and Greek Cypriot members in integrated schools of the future.

Furthermore, future research should examine whether the present findings and the effectiveness of extended contact intervention could be replicated in target groups who are adults because adults have different intergroup experiences. This is a reason to investigate whether effectiveness of extended contact will depend on prior experiences of people. Moreover, it might be a possibility that the effects of extended contact will change according to ages and will be moderated by prior experiences such as exposure to war times.

Specifically, longevity of the extended contact intervention effects on positive attitudes and behavioral intentions of the children toward out-group should be tested in further research. The question of how long the beneficial effects of extended contact remain for is still unanswered.

Overall, the present research draws conclusions about the effectiveness and practicability of the extended contact intervention. Extended contact through story reading was found to be a successful intervention for reducing prejudice in 6-11 years old Turkish Cypriot school children in Cyprus even in the absence of high prior positive contact experiences.

To conclude, this prejudice-reduction intervention can be used in such inter-ethnically conflicted and segregated communities both as an alternative strategy to direct or other indirect contact strategies and as a preparative method to be introduced before real direct contact experiences. The results also proposed that extended contact can promote improvements in intergroup relations in a context where there is lack of opportunity for real direct contact. This means that when the children have lower level of direct contact, extended contact can be used effectively to improve positive attitudes, behavioral intentions as well as trust and forgiveness toward out-groups and support for peace. These findings support the psychological theory in the literature and points out that extended contact should be cost-effectively used as prejudice reduction strategy in educational contexts.

REFERENCES

Aboud, F. (1988). *Children and prejudice*. Oxford, U.K.: Blackwell.

Aboud, F. E., & Doyle, A. B. (1996a). Does talk of race foster prejudice or tolerance in children? *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 28*(3), 161-170.

Aboud, F. E., & Doyle, A. B. (1996b). Parental and peer influences on children's racial attitudes. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 20*(3), 371-383.

Aboud, F. E., & Mitchell, F. G. (1977). Ethnic role taking: The effects of preference and self-identification. *International Journal of Psychology, 1*2(1), 1-17.

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper and Row.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice- Hall.

Bandura, A. (2002). Social cognitive theory of mass communication. In J. Bryant & D. Zillman (Eds.), *Media effects: Advances in theory and research* (p. 121 -153). Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Barett, M., & Oppenheimer, L. (2011). Findings, theories and methods in the study of children's national identifications and national attitudes. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 8*(1), 5-24. doi: 10.1080/7405629.2010.533955

Bigler, R. S., & Liben, L. S. (1992). Cognitive mechanisms in children's gender stereotyping: Theoretical and educational implications of a cognitive-based intervention. *Child Development, 63*, 1351-1363.

Bretherton, I., & Beeghly, M. (1982). Talking about internal states: The acquisition of an explicit theory of mind. *Developmental Psychology, 18,* 906–921. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.18.6.906

Brewer, M. B. (1996). When contact is not enough: Social identity and intergroup cooperation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 20*, 291-303.

Brown, R. (2010). *Prejudice. Its social psychology.* Oxford, U.K.: Wiley-Blackwell.

Brown, R., Eller, A., Leeds, S., & Stace, K. (2007). Intergroup contact and intergroup attitudes: A longitudinal study. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 37*, 692-703. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.384

Brown, R., Vivian, J., & Hewstone, M. (1999). Changing attitudes through intergroup contact: The effects of group membership salience. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 29*, 741-764.

Buzzelli, C. A. (1998). The development of trust in children's relations with peers. *Child Study Journal, 18*, 33-46.

Cameron, J. A., & Rutland, A. (2006). Extended contact through story reading in school: Reducing children's prejudice towards the disabled. *Journal of Social Issues*, *62*, 469-488. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00469.x

Cameron, L., Rutland, A., & Brown, R. (2007). Promoting children's positive intergroup attitudes towards stigmatized groups: Extended contact and multiple classification skills training. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 31*, 454-466. doi: 10.1177/0165025407081474

Cameron, L., Rutland, A., Brown, R., & Douch, R. (2006). Changing children's intergroup attitudes towards refugees: Testing different models of extended contact. *Child Development*, *77*, 1208–1219.

Cameron, L., & Rutland, A., Hossain, R., & Petley, R. (2011). When and why does extended contact work? The role of high quality direct contact and group norms in the development of positive ethnic intergroup attitudes amongst children. *Group Processes Intergroup Relations, 14*(2), 193-206. doi: 10.1177/1368430210390535

Castelli, L., Carraro, L., Pavan, G., Murelli, E., & Carraro, A. (2012). The power of unsaid: The influence of nonverbal cues on implicit attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*(6), 1376-1393. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2012.00903.x

Castelli, L., Carraro, L., Tomelleri, S., & Amari, A. (2007). White children's alignment to the perceived racial attitudes of the parents: Closer to the mother than the father. *The British Psychological Society, 25,* 353-357. doi: 10.1348/026151006X159851

Castelli, L., & Nesdale, D. (2008). Learning social attitudes: Children's sensitivity to the nonverbal behaviors of adult models during interracial interaction. *Personality and Learning Psychology Bulletin, 34*, 1504-1513. doi: 10.1177/0146167208322769

Castelli, L., Zogmaister, C., & Tomelleri, S. (2009). The transmission of racial attitudes within the family. *Developmental Psychology, 45*(2), 586-591. doi: 10.1037//a0014619.

Cehajic, S., Brown, R., & Castano, E. (2008). Forgive and forget? Antecedents and consequences of intergroup forgiveness in Bosnia and Herzegovina. *Political Psychology, 29*(3), 351-367.

Christ, O., Hewstone, M., Tausch, N., Wagner, U., Voci, A., Hughes, J., & Cairns, E. (2010). Direct contact as a moderator of extended contact effects: Cross-sectional and longitudinal impact on out-group attitudes, behavioral intentions, and attitude

certainty. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*(12), 1662-1674. doi: 10.1177/0146167210386969.

Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2009). Can imagined contact interactions produce positive perceptions? Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. *American Psychologist, 64*, 231-240. doi: 10.1037/a0014718

Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56*(1), 5–18.

Dovidio, J. F., & Gartner, S. L. (1999). Reducing prejudice: Combating intergroup biases. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 8*(4), 101-105.

Dovidio, J. F., Kawakami, K., & Gartner, S. L. (2002). Implicit and explicit prejudice and interracial interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*, 62-68. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.82.1.62

Doyle, A. B, Beaudet, J., & Aboud, F. E. (1988). Developmental patterns in the flexibility of children's ethnic attitudes. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 19*(1), 3-18. doi: 10.1177/0022002188019001001

Fazio, R. H., & Zanna, M. P. (1981). Direct experience and attitude-behavior consistency. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 14, pp. 161 – 202). New York: Academic Press

Feddes, A. R., Rutland, A., & Noack, P. (2009). Direct and extended friendship effects on minority and majority children's interethnic attitudes: A longitudinal study. *Child Development, 80*(2), 377-390.

Gartner, S. L., Dovidio, J. F., & Bachman, B. A. (1996). Revisiting the contact hypothesis: The induction of a common in-group identity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 20*, 271-290.

Graf, S., Paolini, S., & Rubin, M. (2014). Negative intergroup contact is more influential, but positive intergroup contact is more common: Assessing contact prominence and contact prevalence in five Central European countries. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 44,* 536-547. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2052

Graves, S. B. (1999). Television and prejudice reduction: When does television as a vicarious experience make a difference? *Journal of Social Issues, 55*, 707-725.

Greenberg, B. S. (1988). Some uncommon television images and the drench hypothesis. In S. Oskamp (Ed.), *Applied social psychology annual: Television as a social issue* (Vol. 8, pp. 88–102). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Griffiths, J. A., & Nesdale, D. (2006). In-group and out-group attitudes of ethnic majority and minority children. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30*, 735-749. doi: 10.1016/j.ijintrel.2006.05.001

Gnepp, J. (1989). Children's use of personal information to understand other people's feelings. In C. Saarni & P. L. Harris (Eds.), *Children's understanding of emotion* (pp. 151–180). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Halperin, E., & Bar-Tal, D. (2011). Socio-psychological barriers to peace making: An empirical examination within the Israeli Jewish Society. *Journal of Peace Research, 48*(5), 637-651. doi: 10.1177/0022343311412642

Halperin, E., Crisp, R. J., Husnu, S., Trzesniewski, K. H., Dweck, C. S., & Gross, J. J. (2012). Promoting intergroup contact by changing beliefs: Group malleability, intergroup anxiety, and contact motivation. *Emotion, 12*, 1192-1195. doi:10.1037/a0028620

Hamberger, J., & Hewstone, M. (1997). Inter-ethnic contact as a predictor of blatant and subtle prejudice: Tests of a model in four West European nations. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 36*, 173-190.

Harris, P. L. (1989). *Children and emotion: The development of psychological understanding*. Oxford,UK: Blackwell.

Hayashi, N., Ostrom, E., Walker, J., & Yamagishi, T. (1999). Reciprocity, trust, and the sense of control. A cross-societal study. *Rationality and Society, 11*, 27-46. doi: 10.1177/104346399011001002

Hewstone, M., & Brown, R. J. (1986). Contact is not enough: An intergroup perspective on the 'contact hypothesis'. In M. Hewstone &, R. Brown (Eds.),

Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters (pp. 1–44). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., Voci, A., Hamberger, J., & Niens, U. (2006). Intergroup contact, forgiveness, and experience of "the troubles" in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Social Issues, 62*(1), 99-120.

Hüsnü, S., & Crisp, R. J. (2010). Imagined intergroup contact: A new technique for encouraging greater inter-ethnic contact in Cyprus. *Peace and Conflict, 16*, 97-108. doi: 10.1080/10781910903484776.

Jones, J. M. (1997). *Prejudice and racism* (2nd edition). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lippa, R., & Arad, S. (1999). Gender, personality and prejudice: The display of authoritarianism and social dominance in interviews with college men and women. *Journal of Research in Personality, 33,* 463-493.

Nelson, T. D. (2006). *The psychology of prejudice* (2nd edition). New York: Pearson.

Nesdale, D. (1999). Developmental changes in children's ethnic preferences and social cognitions. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 20*(4), 501-519.

Nesdale, D. (2001). Development of prejudice in children. In M. Augoustinos & K. Reynolds (Eds.), *Understanding prejudice, racism, and social conflict* (pp. 57-73). London: Sage.

Nesdale, D. (2002). Social Identity and ethnic prejudice in children. In D. Gabb & T. Miletic (Eds.), *Culture, race and community: Making it work in the new millennium*. Melbourne, Australia: Victorian Transcultural Psychiatry Unit. Retrieved from http://www.vtpu.org.au/docs/crc/drewnesdale.pdf

Nesdale, D. (2004). Social identity processes and children's ethnic prejudice. In M. Bennett & F. Sani (Eds.), *The development of the social self* (pp. 219-245). Hove: Psychology Press.

Nesdale, D., Durkin, K., Maass, A., & Griffiths, J. (2005). Threat, Group identification, and children's ethnic prejudice. *Social Development, 14*, 189-205. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2005.00298.x

Nesdale, D., & Flesser, D. (2001). Social identity and the development of children's group attitudes. *Child Development, 72*(2), 506-517.

Nesdale, D., Griffiths, J., Durkin, K., & Maass, A. (2005). Empathy, group norms and children's ethnic attitudes. *Applied Developmental Psychology, 26*, 623-637. doi: 10.1016/j.appdev.2005.08.003

Nesdale, D., Maass, A., Durkin, K., & Griffiths, J. (2005). Group norms, Threat, and children's racial prejudice. *Child Development, 76*(3), 652-663.

Nesdale, D., Robbe, M., & Oudenhoven, J. P. (2012). Intercultural effectiveness, authoritarianism and ethnic prejudice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 42*(5), 1173-1191. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00882.x

Paluck, E. L. (2010). Is it better not to talk? Group polarization, extended contact, and perspective taking in Eastern Democratic Republic of Congo. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*(9), 1170-1185. doi: 10.1177/0146167210379868.

Paolini, S., Harwood, J., Rubin, M., Hüsnü, S., Joyne, N., & Hewstone, M. (2014). Positive and extensive intergroup contact in the past buffers against the disproportionate impact of negative contact in the present. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *44*, 548-562. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.2029

Paolini, S., Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., & Voci, A. (2004). Effects of direct and indirect cross-group friendships on judgments of Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland: The mediating role of anxiety-reduction mechanism. *Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin, 30*, 770-786. doi: 10.1177/0146167203262848

Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin, 23*, 173-185.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 751-783. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38,* 922-934. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.504.

Piaget, J. (1954). *The construction of reality in the child*. New-York: Basic Book.

Prohansky, H. M. (1996). The development of intergroup attitudes. In L.W. Hoffman & M. L. Hoffman (Eds.), *Review of child development research* (pp. 311-371). New York: Russell Sage

Raabe, T., & Beelmann, A. (2011). Development of ethnic, racial, and national prejudice in childhood and adolescence: A multinational meta-analysis of age differences. *Child Development, 82*(6), 1715-1735. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01668.x

Rutland, A., Cameron, L., Bennett, L., & Ferrell, J. (2005). Interracial contact and racial constancy: A multi-site study of racial intergroup bias in 3–5 year old Anglo-British children. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 26*, 699-713. doi:10.1016/j.appdev.2005.08.005

Rüstemli, A., Mertan, B., & Çiftçi, O. (2000). In-group favoritism among native and immigrant Turkish Cypriots: Trait evaluations of in-group and out-group targets. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 140*(1), 26-34.

Sinclair, S., Dunn, E., & Lowery, B. S. (2005). The relationship between parental racial attitudes and children's implicit prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 4*, 283-289. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2004.06.003

Stathi, S., Cameron, L., Hartley, B., & Bradford, S. (2014). Imagined contact as a prejudice-reduction intervention in schools: The underlying role of similarity and

attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 44*, 536-546. doi: 10.1111/jasp.12245

Stephan, W. G., & Finlay, K. (1999). The role of empathy in improving intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*(4), 729-743.

Swart, H., Hewstone, M., Christ, O., & Voci, A. (2010). The impact of cross-group friendships in South Africa: Affective mediators and multi-group comparisons. *Journal of Social Issues, 66*(2), 309-333. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2010.01647.x

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W.G Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Monterey: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.

Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J. B., & Cairns, E. (2009). Intergroup trust in Northern Ireland. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*, 45–59. doi*:* 10.1177/0146167208325004

Turner, R. N., & Crisp, R. J. (2010). Imagining intergroup contact reduces implicit prejudice. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 49*, 129-142. doi: 10.1348/014466609X419901

Turner, R. N., Hewstone, M., & Voci, H. (2007). Reducing explicit and implicit out-group prejudice via direct and extended contact: The mediating role of self-disclosure and inter-group anxiety. *Interpersonal Relations and Group Processes, 93*(3), 369-388. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.93.3.369

Turner, R. N., Hewstone, M., Voci, H., & Vonofakou, C. (2008). A test of the extended intergroup anxiety, perceived in-group and out-group norms, and inclusion of the out-group in the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*(4), 843-860. doi: 10.1037/a001434.

Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005). Differential relationships between intergroup contact and affective and cognitive dimensions of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*(8), 1145-1158. doi: 10.1177/0146167205274854.

Tropp, L. R., Stout, A. M., Boatswain, C., Wright, S. C., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2006). Trust and acceptance in response to references to group membership: Minority and majority perspectives on cross-group interactions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*(3), 769-794. doi: 10.1111/j.0021-9029.2006.00031.x

Vescio, T. K., Sechrist, G. B, & Paolucci, M. P. (2003). Perspective taking and prejudice reduction: The meditational role of empathy arousal and situational attributions. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*, 455-472. doi: 10.1002/ejsp.163.

Vezzali, L., Capozza, D., Stathi, S., & Giovanni, D. (2012). Increasing out group trust, reducing infrahumanization, and enhancing future contact intentions via imagined intergroup contact. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*, 437-440. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.09.008

Vezzali, L., Giovannini, D., & Capozza, D. (2012). Social antecedents of children's implicit prejudice: Direct contact, extended contact, explicit and implicit teacher's

prejudice. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 9*(5), 569-581. doi:
10.1080/17405629.2011.631298.

Vezzali, L., Stathi, S., & Giovannini, D. (2012). Indirect contact through book
reading: Improving adolescent's attitudes and behavioral intentions toward
immigrants. *Psychology in the Schools, 49*, 148-162. doi: 10.1002/pits.20621

Vezzali, L., Stathi, S., Giovannini, D., Capozza, D., & Trifiletti, E. (2014). The
greatest magic of Harry Potter: Reducing prejudice. *Journal of Applied Social
Psychology, 45,* 105-121. doi: 10.1111/jasp.12279

Voci, H., & Hewstone, M. (2003). Intergroup contact and prejudice toward
immigrants in Italy: The meditational role of anxiety and the moderational role of
group salience. *Group Processes Intergroup Relations, 6*(1), 37-54. doi:
10.177/1368430203006001011

Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended
contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 73–90

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Parent Consent Form

<u>**Kıbrıslı Türk Çocuklarda Kavram Gelişimi**</u>

Değerli Aileler,

Lütfen bu çalışmaya çocuklarınızın katılımını onaylamadan önce lütfen çalışmayla ilgili aşağıdaki bilgileri dikkatlice okuyunuz. Çalışma hakkında herhangi bir sorunuz olursa daha fazla bilgi alabilmek için görevli araştırmacılara bu soruları sormaktan çekinmeyiniz.

Bu çalışma Önay Çiçek tarafından yürütülmektedir. Çalışmanın amacı; çocuklarda ulus, millet, benlik gibi kavramların gelişimini araştırmaktır. Bu araştırmanın soru kağıdındaki sorular çocuklara araştırmacı ve anketör tarafından okunacaktır. Bu sorulara çocukların içlerinden geldiği gibi yanıt vermeleri beklenmektedir. Araştırmada toplanacak veriler bir bütün olarak değerlendirileceği için çocukların kimlikleriyle ilgili bilgi verilmesi gerekmemektedir.

Bu araştırmaya katılmak zorunlu değildir ve çalışmaya katılıp katılmamayı seçmekte özgürsünüz. Araştırmaya katıldıktan sonra; çocuğunuz herhangi bir aşamasında hiçbir sebep belirtmeden araştırmadan çekilebilir. Böyle bir çekilme halinde verilen tüm cevaplar yok edilecek ve yok sayılacaktır. Eğer bu araştırmaya katılmaya gönüllü olur ve çocuğunuz araştırmayı tamamlarsa, tüm cevapları gizli tutulacak, adı ve diğer kişisel bilgiler, cevaplarından bağımsız bir şekilde saklanacaktır.

Veriler araştırmadan sonra en fazla 6 yıl süre ile saklanacaktır ve analiz edildikten sonra sonuçları içeren bir rapor olarak yayınlanabilir.

Onay Formu

Araştırma Başlığı: Kıbrıslı Türk Çocuklarda Kavram Gelişimi

Araştırmacıların İsmi: Önay Çiçek: onaycicek5@gmail.com

Psikoloji Bölümü

Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi, GaziMağusa, Kuzey Kıbrıs

Lütfen aşağıdaki cümleleri okuyunuz ve kabul etmek için kutucuğu işaretleyiniz.

1. Kabul ederim ki, bilgilendirme kağıdını okudum, anladım ve araştırma hakkında araştırmacılara soru sorma şansım oldu. ☐

2. Araştırmaya gönüllü olarak katıldığımın ve araştırmanın istediğim aşamasında hiçbir sebep gösterme zorunluluğum olmadan araştırmadan çekilebileceğimin farkındayım. ☐

3. Bu araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorum. ☐

    Tarih   İmza

Appendix Ai: Institution Consent Form

<u>**Kıbrıslı Türk Çocuklarda Kavram Gelişimi**</u>

İlgili Makam,

Lütfen bu çalışmaya öğrencilerinizin katılımını onaylamadan önce lütfen çalışmayla ilgili aşağıdaki bilgileri dikkatlice okuyunuz. Çalışma hakkında herhangi bir sorunuz olursa daha fazla bilgi alabilmek için görevli araştırmacılara bu soruları sormaktan çekinmeyiniz.

Bu çalışma Önay Çiçek tarafından yürütülmektedir. Çalışmanın amacı; çocuklarda ulus, millet, benlik gibi kavramların gelişimini araştırmaktır. Bu araştırmanın soru kağıdındaki sorular çocuklara araştırmacı ve anketör tarafından okunacaktır. Bu sorulara çocukların içlerinden geldiği gibi yanıt vermeleri beklenmektedir. Araştırmada toplanacak veriler bir bütün olarak değerlendirileceği için çocukların kimlikleriyle ilgili bilgi verilmesi gerekmemektedir.

Bu araştırmaya katılmak zorunlu değildir ve çalışmaya katılıp katılmamayı seçmekte özgürsünüz. Araştırmaya katıldıktan sonra; öğrencileriniz herhangi bir aşamasında hiçbir sebep belirtmeden araştırmadan çekilebilir. Böyle bir çekilme halinde verilen tüm cevaplar yok edilecek ve yok sayılacaktır. Eğer bu araştırmaya katılmaya gönüllü olur ve araştırmayı öğrencileriniz tamamlarsa, tüm cevapları gizli tutulacak, adı ve diğer kişisel bilgileri, cevaplarından bağımsız bir şekilde saklanacaktır.

Veriler araştırmadan sonra en fazla 6 yıl süre ile saklanacaktır ve analiz edildikten sonra sonuçları içeren bir rapor olarak yayınlanabilir.

Onay Formu

Araştırma Başlığı: Kıbrıslı Türk Çocuklarda Kavram Gelişimi

Araştırmacıların İsmi: Önay Çiçek: onaycicek5@gmail.com

Psikoloji Bölümü

Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi, GaziMağusa, Kuzey Kıbrıs

Lütfen aşağıdaki cümleleri okuyunuz ve kabul etmek için kutucuğu işaretleyiniz.

4. Kabul ederim ki, bilgilendirme kağıdını okudum, anladım ve araştırma hakkında araştırmacılara soru sorma şansım oldu. ☐

5. Araştırmaya gönüllü olarak katıldığımın ve araştırmanın istediğim aşamasında hiçbir sebep gösterme zorunluluğum olmadan araştırmadan çekilebileceğimin farkındayım. ☐

6. Bu araştırmaya katılmayı kabul ediyorum. ☐

Tarih   İmza

Appendix B: Parent Debriefing Form

Katılımcı Bilgi Formu

'Kıbrıslı Türk Çocuklarda Kavram Gelişimi' başlığı altında yürütülen bu çalışmaya çocuğunuzun katılmasına izin verdiğiniz için teşekkür ederim. Araştırmanın amaçlarını ve hedeflerini açıklamayı amaçlayan aşağıdaki bilgileri okumak için birkaç dakikanızı ayırınız. Araştırma ile ilgili sorularınız varsa, aşağıda iletişim bilgileri olan araştırmacıyla iletişim kurabilirsiniz.

Bu araştırmada amaç, çocuklarda ulus, millet, benlik gibi kavramların gelişimini araştırmaktır. Araştırmada kullanılan anket doldurulduktan sonra çocuğunuz herhangi bir rahatsızlık veya sıkıntı duyuyorsa ve bir uzman ile konuşmak istiyorsa, lütfen Prof. Dr. Biran Mertan ile (903926302251, biran.mertan@emu.edu.tr) iletişim kurunuz. Herhangi bir soru için araştırmacı ile (Önay Çiçek, onaycicek5@gmail.com, 903926302251) veya araştırma süpervizörü ile de (Doç. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman , shenelhusnu.raman@emu.edu.tr, 903926301389) iletişime geçebilirsiniz.

Araştırmaya yaptığınız değerli katkıdan ve katılımınızdan dolayı çok teşekkür ediyorum.

Saygılarımla,

Önay Çiçek

Appendix Bi: Institution Debriefing Form

<u>Katılımcı Bilgi Formu</u>

'Kıbrıslı Türk Çocuklarda Kavram Gelişimi' başlığı altında yürütülen bu çalışmaya öğrencilerinizin katılmasına izin verdiğiniz için teşekkür ederim. Araştırmanın amaçlarını ve hedeflerini açıklamayı amaçlayan aşağıdaki bilgileri okumak için birkaç dakikanızı ayırınız. Araştırma ile ilgili sorularınız varsa, aşağıda iletişim bilgileri olan araştırmacıyla iletişim kurabilirsiniz.

Bu araştırmada amaç, çocuklarda ulus, millet, benlik gibi kavramların gelişimini araştırmaktır. Araştırmada kullanılan anket doldurulduktan sonra öğrencileriniz herhangi bir rahatsızlık veya sıkıntı duyuyorsa ve bir uzman ile konuşmak istiyorsa, lütfen Prof. Dr. Biran Mertan ile (903926302251, biran.mertan@emu.edu.tr) iletişim kurunuz. Herhangi bir soru için araştırmacı ile (Önay Çiçek, onaycicek5@gmail.com, 903926302251) veya araştırma süpervizörü ile de (Doç. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman , shenelhusnu.raman@emu.edu.tr, 903926301389) iletişime geçebilirsiniz.

Araştırmaya yaptığınız değerli katkıdan ve katılımınızdan dolayı çok teşekkür ediyorum.

Saygılarımla,

Önay Çiçek

Appendix C: Pre-intervention test

SORU KAĞIDI

(PRE INTERVENTION)

AÇIKLAMA

Aşağıda çocukların kavram gelişimleriyle ilgili bazı sorular verilmiştir. Bu sorulara, çocukların içlerinden geldiği gibi yanıt vermeleri beklenmektedir. Bu araştırmada toplanacak veriler bir bütün olarak değerlendirileceği için çocukların kimlikleriyle ilgili bilgi verilmesi gerekmemektedir.

Bu bir test veya sınav değildir.

Katkılarınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz.

Doç. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman ve Doç. Dr. Biran Mertan

Kişisel Bilgiler

Yaş: [_____]   pnumber [_____]

Doğum tarihi: …./…./….   Cinsiyet: erkek [1]kız [2]

Yaş Grubu [1= 7y] [2=9y] [3=11y] [4=13y]

Anket tarihi: …./…./….

I - BÖLÜM: CONTACT

Burda bir takım kart var. Hiç bir zaman, bazen, sıklıkla, çok sıklıkla ve bilmiyorum. [Çocukların yarısı için ilk dört kartın hem yerlerini hem de sözlü ifadeyi ters çeviriniz; bilmiyorum kartını daima sıranın en sağında bırakınız.]

1.PRIOR CONTACT

Günlük hayatında ne sıklıkla Kıbrıslı Rumlarla aranda olumlu geçen olaylar olur? (kartları sırayla göstererek)

Hiç bir zaman [1], bazen [2], sıklıkla [3], çok sıklıkla [4]

bilmiyorum [5] diğer [6] (belirleyiniz): _____

Günlük hayatında ne sıklıkla Kıbrıslı Rumlarla aranda olumsuz geçen olaylar olur?

Hiç bir zaman [1], bazen [2], sıklıkla [3], çok sıklıkla [4]

bilmiyorum [5] diğer [6] (belirleyiniz): _____

2. STORYTELLING

Burda başka bir takım kart var. Her bir kartta farklı sayıda insan var, bak burda çok kişi var, burada daha az... [Çocukların yarısı için ilk dört kartın hem yerlerini hem de sözlü ifadeyi ters çeviriniz; bilmiyorum kartını daima sıranın en sağında bırakınız.]

Aile üyelerinden herhangi biri (anne, baba, büyük anne, büyük baba, akraba veya kardeş) Kıbrıslı Rumlarla ilgili olumsuz şeyler söylerler mi? (sayılar anlatan kişi sayısını temsil etmektedir)

Hiç [1], bir kişi [2], 2-5 kişi [3], 5-10 kişi [4]

10'dan fazla [5] bilmiyorum [6] (belirleyiniz): _____

Aile üyelerinden herhangi biri (anne, baba, büyük anne, büyük baba, akraba veya kardeş) Kıbrıslı Rumlarla ilgili olumlu şeyler söylerler mi? (sayılar anlatan kişi sayısını temsil etmektedir)

Hiç [1], bir kişi [2], 2-5 kişi [3], 5-10 kişi [4]

10'dan fazla [5] bilmiyorum [6] (belirleyiniz): _____

3. CROSSGROUP/EXTENDED

Yine farklı sayıda insanların olduğu o kartları kullanacağım.

Aile üyelerini düşündüğünde (anne, baba, kardeş, yeğen, vs. dahil) kaç tanesinin Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşı vardır?

Hiç [1], bir kişi [2], 2-5 kişi [3], 5-10 kişi [4]

10-20 kişi [5], 20-30 [6], 30'dan fazla [7], bilmiyorum [8], diğer [9] (belirleyiniz): _____

En yakın Kıbrıslı Türk arkadaşlarını düşündüğünde, kaç tanesinin Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşı vardır?

Hiç [1], bir kişi [2], 2-5 kişi [3], 5-10 kişi [4]

10-20 kişi [5], 20-30 [6], 30'dan fazla [7], bilmiyorum [8], diğer [9] (belirleyiniz): _____

II– BÖLÜM: TRAIT ATTRIBUTION

NOT: *Her bir çocuk tarafından rastgele sıralanmış, 2 hedef ulusun değerlendirileceği bir düzen kurunuz.*

Giriş

Sıfatlardan oluşan bir deste kart alınız, tek bir deste olarak, çocuğun en üstteki kartın sözcüğünü görebileceği şekilde ona gösteriniz. Deste içindeki kartların düzeni her çocuk için rastgele sıralanmalıdır.

Burada, üstünde insanları tanımlayan sözcükler bulunan bazı kartlar vardır. Şöyle ki, bazı insanlar: (Birinci karttaki kelimeyi gösteriniz), (Birinci kartı kaldırıp çocuğa ikinci kartı gösteriniz.) *bazı insanlar* (İkinci karttaki kelimeyi gösteriniz). (İkinci kartı kaldırınız*), bazı insanlar* (Üçüncü karttaki kelimeyi gösteriniz) *diyebiliriz. Doğru mu?*

Görev 1

Şimdi, senden bu sözcükleri tek tek gözden geçirmeni ve hangilerinin Kıbrıslı Türkleri tanımladığını göstermeni istiyorum. (Çocuğa tüm kart serisini veriniz.) *Kıbrıslı Türkleri tanımladığını düşündüğün kartları seçmeni istiyorum.* (Çocuk tarafından seçilen sıfatların karşılarındaki kutuları işaretleyiniz.) Birden fazla işaretlenebilir.

Positive Traits	**Negative Traits**
Temiz [ ]	Pis [ ]
Arkadaşça [ ]	Düşmanca [ ]
	Aptal [ ]
Akıllı [ ]	
	Tembel [ ]
Mutlu [ ]	
	Üzgün [ ]
Dürüst[ ]	

Çalışkan [ ]   Sahtekar [ ]

Bir sonraki hedef ulusa hazırlamak üzere kartları rastgele bir sıralamaya sokunuz.

Şimdi sana Kıbrıslı Türkler hakkında bir şey daha sormak istiyorum. Kıbrıslı Türkleri seviyor musun, sevmiyor musun?

Eğer çocuk seviyor veya sevmiyorum derse, *ne kadar? Az mı/çok mu seviyor/sevmiyor?*

> çok seviyorum [5] biraz seviyorum [4] biraz sevmiyorum [2] hiç sevmiyorum [1]
> bilmiyorum [3] diğer [6]: belirtiniz: _____

NOT: Çocuk çelişkili duygular ifade ediyorsa ya da duruma ve kişiye göre farklı duygular ifade ediyorsa vb. "diğer" şıkkını kullanınız. "Diğer" şıkkı seçildiğinde yanıtı kelime kelime kaydediniz.

Tamam, şimdi benim için Kıbrıslı Rumları düşünebilir misin? (Çocuğa rastgele olarak düzenlenmiş kartları veriniz). *Senin için Kıbrıslı Rumları en iyi tanımladığını düşündüğün sözcükleri gösterir misin?*

Positive Traits	**Negative Traits**
Temiz [ ]	Pis [ ]
Arkadaşça [ ]	Düşmanca [ ]
	Aptal [ ]
Akıllı [ ]	
	Tembel [ ]
Mutlu [ ]	
	Üzgün [ ]
Dürüst[ ]	
	Sahtekar [ ]
Çalışkan [ ]	

Harika. Şimdi söyle bakalım, Kıbrıslı Rumları seviyor musun sevmiyor musun?

Eğer çocuk seviyor veya sevmiyorum derse, *ne kadar? Az mı/çok mu seviyor/sevmiyor?*

> çok seviyorum [5] biraz seviyorum [4] biraz sevmiyorum [2] hiç sevmiyorum [1]
> bilmiyorum [3] diğer [6]: belirtiniz: _____

III– BÖLÜM: OUTGROUP TRUST, FORGIVENESS & PEACE

Tamam. Şimdi sana Kıbrıslı Rumlarla ilgili birkaç soru daha soracağım.

Kıbrıslı Rum bir çocuğa en sevdiğin oyuncağı ödünç verecek kadar güvenir misin?
çok güvenirdim [1] güvenirdim [2] ne güvenirdim, ne güvenmezdim [3] güvenmezdim [4]
hiç güvenmezdim [5] bilmiyorum [6] diğer [7] (belirleyin): _____

Kıbrıslı Türklerin Kıbrıslı Rumları savaşta yaşananlardan dolayı affetmesini ister miydin?
çok isterdim [1] isterdim [2] ne isterdim, ne istemezdim [3] istemezdim [4] hiç istemezdim
[5] bilmiyorum [6] diğer [7] (belirleyin): _____

Kıbrıslı Türklerle Kıbrıslı Rumların barış içinde birlikte yaşamasını ister miydin?
çok isterdim [1] isterdim [2] ne isterdim, ne istemezdim [3] istemezdim [4] hiç istemezdim
[5] bilmiyorum [6] diğer [7] (belirleyin): _____

IV– BÖLÜM: NIYET

*Şimdi bir senaryo hayal etmeni istiyorum. Parkta yalnız başına oynarken senin yaşıtın,
Kıbrıslı Rum (/KT) bir çocuğun yanına geldiğini hayal etmeni istiyorum.*

Onunla birlikte oynamayı ne kadar isterdin?

   çok isterdim [1] isterdim [2] ne isterdim, ne istemezdim [3] istemezdim [4] hiç istemezdim
               [5] bilmiyorum [6] diğer [7] (belirleyin): _____

Onu ne kadar severdin?
         çok severdim [1] severdim [2] ne severdim, ne sevmezdim [3] sevmezdim [4] hiç
          sevmezdim [5] bilmiyorum [6] diğer [7] (belirleyin): _____

Onunla sinemaya ya da pastaneye gitmeyi ne kadar isterdin?
  çok isterdim [1] isterdim [2] ne isterdim, ne istemezdim [3] istemezdim [4] hiç istemezdim
               [5] bilmiyorum [6] diğer [7] (belirleyin): _____

Onu evine gece kalmaya davet etmeyi isterdin?
  çok isterdim [1] isterdim [2] ne isterdim, ne istemezdim [3] istemezdim [4] hiç istemezdim
               [5] bilmiyorum [6] diğer [7] (belirleyin): _____

Appendix D: Post-intervention test

AÇIKLAMA

Aşağıda çocukların kavram gelişimleriyle ilgili bazı sorular verilmiştir. Bu sorulara, çocukların içlerinden geldiği gibi yanıt vermeleri beklenmektedir. Bu araştırmada toplanacak veriler bir bütün olarak değerlendirileceği için çocukların kimlikleriyle ilgili bilgi verilmesi gerekmemektedir.

Bu bir test veya sınav değildir.

Katkılarınız için şimdiden teşekkür ederiz.

Doç. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman ve Doç. Dr. Biran Mertan

Kişisel Bilgiler

Yaş: [_____]   pnumber [_____]

Doğum tarihi: …./…./….   Cinsiyet: erkek [1]kız [2]

Yaş Grubu [1= 7y] [2=9y] [3=11y] [4=13y]

Anket tarihi: …./…./….

I– BÖLÜM: TRAIT ATTRIBUTION

NOT: Her bir çocuk tarafından, rastgele sıralanmış iki hedef ulusun değerlendirileceği bir düzen kurunuz.

Giriş

Sıfatlardan oluşan bir deste kart alınız, tek bir deste olarak, çocuğun en üstteki kartın sözcüğünü görebileceği şekilde ona gösteriniz. Deste içindeki kartların düzeni her çocuk için rastgele sıralanmalıdır.

Burada, üstünde insanları tanımlayan sözcükler bulunan bazı kartlar vardır. Şöyle ki, bazı insanlar: (Birinci karttaki kelimeyi gösteriniz), (Birinci kartı kaldırıp çocuğa ikinci kartı gösteriniz.) *bazı insanlar* (İkinci karttaki kelimeyi gösteriniz). (İkinci kartı kaldırınız*), bazı insanlar* (Üçüncü karttaki kelimeyi gösteriniz) *diyebiliriz. Doğru mu?*

Görev 1

Şimdi, senden bu sözcükleri tek tek gözden geçirmeni ve hangilerinin Kıbrıslı Türkleri tanımladığını göstermeni istiyorum. (Çocuğa tüm kart serisini veriniz.) *Kıbrıslı Türkleri tanımladığını düşündüğün kartları seçmeni istiyorum.* (Çocuk tarafından seçilen sıfatların karşılarındaki kutuları işaretleyiniz.) Birden fazla işaretlenebilir.

Positive Traits	Negative Traits
Temiz [ ]	Pis [ ]
Arkadaşça [ ]	Düşmanca [ ]
	Aptal [ ]
Akıllı [ ]	
	Tembel [ ]
Mutlu [ ]	
	Üzgün [ ]
Dürüst[ ]	
	Sahtekar [ ]
Çalışkan [ ]	

Bir sonraki hedef ulusa hazırlamak üzere kartları rastgele bir sıralamaya sokunuz.

Şimdi sana Kıbrıslı Türkler hakkında bir şey daha sormak istiyorum. Kıbrıslı Türkleri seviyor musun, sevmiyor musun?

Eğer çocuk seviyor veya sevmiyorum derse, *ne kadar? Az mı/çok mu seviyor/sevmiyor?*

çok seviyorum [5] biraz seviyorum [4] biraz sevmiyorum [2] hiç sevmiyorum [1] bilmiyorum [3] diğer [6]: belirtiniz: _____

NOT: Çocuk çelişkili duygular ifade ediyorsa ya da duruma ve kişiye göre farklı duygular ifade ediyorsa vb. "diğer" şıkkını kullanınız. "Diğer" şıkkı seçildiğinde yanıtı kelime kelime kaydediniz.

Tamam, şimdi benim için Kıbrıslı Rumları düşünebilir misin? (Çocuğa rastgele olarak düzenlenmiş kartları veriniz). *Senin için Kıbrıslı Rumları en iyi tanımladığını düşündüğün sözcükleri gösterir misin?*

Positive Traits	Negative Traits
Temiz [ ]	Pis [ ]
Arkadaşça [ ]	Düşmanca [ ]
	Aptal [ ]

Akıllı [ ]   Tembel [ ]

Mutlu [ ]   Üzgün [ ]

Dürüst[ ]   Sahtekar [ ]

Çalışkan [ ]

Harika. Şimdi söyle bakalım, Kıbrıslı Rumları seviyor musun sevmiyor musun?

Eğer çocuk seviyor veya sevmiyorum derse, *ne kadar? Az mı/çok mu seviyor/sevmiyor?*

çok seviyorum [5] biraz seviyorum [4] biraz sevmiyorum [2] hiç sevmiyorum [1]
bilmiyorum [3] diğer [6]: belirtiniz: _____

II– BÖLÜM: OUTGROUP TRUST, FORGIVENESS & PEACE

Tamam. Şimdi sana Kıbrıslı Rumlarla ilgili birkaç soru daha soracağım.

Kıbrıslı Rum bir çocuğa en sevdiğin oyuncağı ödünç verecek kadar güvenir misin?
çok güvenirdim [1] güvenirdim [2] ne güvenirdim, ne güvenmezdim [3] güvenmezdim [4]
hiç güvenmezdim [5] bilmiyorum [6] diğer [7] (belirleyin): _____

Kıbrıslı Türklerin Kıbrıslı Rumları savaşta yaşananlardan dolayı affetmesini ister miydin?
çok isterdim [1] isterdim [2] ne isterdim, ne istemezdim [3] istemezdim [4] hiç istemezdim
[5] bilmiyorum [6] diğer [7] (belirleyin): _____

Kıbrıslı Türklerle Kıbrıslı Rumların barış içinde birlikte yaşamasını ister miydin?
çok isterdim [1] isterdim [2] ne isterdim, ne istemezdim [3] istemezdim [4] hiç istemezdim
[5] bilmiyorum [6] diğer [7] (belirleyin): _____

III– BÖLÜM: NIYET

*Şimdi bir senaryo hayal etmeni istiyorum. Parkta yalnız başına oynarken senin yaşıtın,
Kıbrıslı Rum (/KT) bir çocuğun yanına geldiğini hayal etmeni istiyorum.*

Onunla birlikte oynamayı ne kadar isterdin?

çok isterdim [1] isterdim [2] ne isterdim, ne istemezdim [3] istemezdim [4] hiç istemezdim
[5] bilmiyorum [6] diğer [7] (belirleyin): _____

Onu ne kadar severdin?
çok severdim [1] severdim [2] ne severdim, ne sevmezdim [3] sevmezdim [4] hiç
sevmezdim [5] bilmiyorum [6] diğer [7] (belirleyin): _____

Onunla sinemaya ya da pastaneye gitmeyi ne kadar isterdin?
çok isterdim [1] isterdim [2] ne isterdim, ne istemezdim [3] istemezdim [4] hiç istemezdim
[5] bilmiyorum [6] diğer [7] (belirleyin): _____

Onu evine gece kalmaya davet etmeyi isterdin?
çok isterdim [1] isterdim [2] ne isterdim, ne istemezdim [3] istemezdim [4] hiç istemezdim
[5] bilmiyorum [6] diğer [7] (belirleyin): _____

Appendix E: Stories

Hikaye 1

Bir Pazar günü Uçurtma Şenliği için çocuklar bir araya gelirler. Her çocuğun hayallerini süsleyen uçurtmaları seyretmek için gelen her yaştan çocuk, büyük bir heyecan ile uçurtma yapmaya başlayan çocukları ilgiyle izlemeye başlar.

Kıbrıslı Türk Ali, Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşı Andrea ile birlikte uçurtma yapmaya başlar.

Önce malzeme standından gerekli olan kağıt, makas, çıta gibi malzemeleri seçerler. Ali ve Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşı Andrea uçurtmalarının rengarenk olmasına karar verirler ve en renkli olan kağıdı seçerler. Önce iki arkadaş ellerindeki çıtayı 70 santimetre boyunda olacak şekilde üç parçaya bölerler. Ali üç adet çıtayı üst üste koyarak altıgen olacak şekilde tutar ve Andrea ortasına bir çivi çakar. Daha sonra Ali iple uçlarını gerer ve Andrea da ipleri bağlayarak uçurtmanın iskeletini birlikte oluştururlar. İskelet halindeki çıtaları stanttan aldıkları rengarenk kağıtla kaplarlar ve yine cıvıl cıvıl renklerden 30 santimetrelik bir kuyruk takarlar. Ali ve Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşı Andrea yaptıkları uçurtmanın üzerine bir sembol koymaya karar verirler. Kısa bir süre düşünüp tartıştıktan sonra uçurtmanın üzerine gülen yüz koymaya birlikte karar verirler. Ali gülen yüzün kocaman gözlerini, Andrea ise kocaman ağzını çizer ve her ikisi de büyük birer 'A' harfi yazarak Ali ve Andrea adına imzalarını koyarlar.

Kocaman, upuzun kuyruklu uçurtmalarını birlikte tepeye taşırlar. Şenlikteki diğer çocuklar da büyük bir heyecanla uçurtmalarını bitirmeye çalışmaktadırlar. Birden düdük çalar ve Uçurtma Şenliği lideri tüm çocukları uçurtmalarını uçurtmak için tepeye davet eder. İki arkadaş uçurtmanın birer ucundan tutarak beraberce koşmaya başlarlar. Yavaş yavaş uçurtma havalanır ve ikisi de bunu görünce çok mutlu olur. Uçurtma Şenliğindeki en yüksek uçan, pırıl pırıl, gülen yüzlü uçurtma seyreden tüm çocukların beğenisini alır. Kıbrıslı Türk Ali ve Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşı Andrea'nın 'AA' imzalı uçurtmasını şenlikteki çocuklar büyük bir hayranlıkla seyrederken kocaman bir alkışla coşkularını vurgularlar.

Word: 279

Hikaye 2

Kıbrıslı Türk Ali ve Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşı Andrea bir gün parkta oyun oynarken çitlerin arasında saklanmış minicik ve yaralı bir yavru köpek görürler. Parktaki çocuklara köpeğin sahibini tanıyıp tanımadıklarını sorarlar. Hiç kimse köpeğin sahibini bilmemektedir. Ali ve Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşı Andrea köpeği yalnız bırakmamaya karar verir ve Ali'nin evine götürürler. Ali ve Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşı Andrea köpeği önce sabunla yıkarlar. Böylece yavru köpek tertemiz olur. Andrea köpeği kurularken, Ali yaralarını ilaçla temizler. Ali bir kabın içine süt koyar, Andrea ise ekmek parçalar ve hazırladıkları mamayı köpeğe içirirler. Köpek, karnı doyunca ve biraz rahatlayınca her ikisine de teşekkür edercesine bakar ve kuyruk sallar. Ali ve Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşı Andrea köpeğin sahibini bulmaya karar verirler. Tasmasında herhangi bir adres yoktur. Andrea cep telefonuyla köpeğin resmini çeker, Ali "kayıp köpek sahibini arıyor" yazısını yazar ve birlikte çok güzel bir afiş hazırlarlar. Köpeğin sahibini nerede bulabilirler diye düşünmeye başlarlar. Andrea 'biz bu köpeği oyun bahçesinde bulduk' der. Ali de sevinçle 'evet' der, o zaman köpeğin sahibini de oyun bahçesinin yakınlarında bulabiliriz diye düşünürler. Hazırladıkları resimli kayıp köpek afişini, iki arkadaş oyun bahçesine giden yolun kenarlarındaki tüm ağaçların üzere asarlar. Bir saat sonra telefon çalmaya başlar. Arayan kişi kayıp köpeğin sahibidir. Minik köpeğin sahibi, coşkulu bir sesle köpeğinin nerede olduğunu sormaktadır. Ali ve Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşı Andrea buluşma yeri olan oyun parkına minik köpekle giderler. Köpeğin sahibi yanında mahallenin diğer çocuklarıyla oyun parkına gelir. Minik köpek büyük bir heyecanla sahibinin kucağına atlarken mahallenin çocukları "yaşa Ali!", " yaşa Andrea!" diye coşkuyla bağırırlar. Köpeğin sahibi de yavru köpeği sevinçle kucaklar. Daha sonra köpeğin sahibi Ali'ye ve Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşı Andrea'ya teşekkür eder. Ali ve Andrea köpeği özleyeceklerini fakat yavru köpek sahibine kavuştuğu için de çok sevindiklerini söylerler.

Word: 281

Hikaye 3

Kıbrıslı Türk Meryem ve Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşı Maria oyun parkında oynamaktadırlar. Oyun parkı oldukça büyüktür; her türlü ağacın ve oyuncağın olduğu güzel bir yerdir. Her gün bu oyun parkına her yaştan çocuk gelip saatlerce sallanmakta, tırmanmakta, kaydıraktan kaymakta ve bisiklet sürmektedirler. Meryem ve Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşı Maria çocuklar tarafından çok sevilen ve çok kullanılan kaydırak gibi bazı oyuncakların paslandığını ve boyanmaya ihtiyaçları olduğunu görürler. İki arkadaş oyun parkındaki oyuncakları boyamaya karar verirler. Ancak parkı boyayıp güzelleştirmek için paraya ihtiyaçları vardır. Maria'nın aklına bir fikir gelir: kumbaralarında biriktirdikleri parayı kullanmak! Meryem de bu fikri beğenir. İki arkadaş evlerine gider, kumbaralarında bulunan paraları alır ve çarşıya gitmek için buluşurlar. Çarşıda boya satan bir dükkan ararlar. Sokakta yürüyen yaşlı bir kadına 'Teyze, biz boya satın almak istiyoruz. Bildiğiniz bir yer var mı?' diye sorarlar. Kadın da merakla 'Boyayı ne yapacaksınız?' diye sorar. İki arkadaş parkta yıpranan oyuncakları boyayacaklarını ve orayı güzelleştireceklerini anlatırlar. Yaşlı kadın, onları boya satan dükkana götürür ve güzel düşünceleri için onları tebrik eder. Dükkan sahibi de çocukların boyaları neden istediklerini merak eder. Çocuklar yaşlı kadına anlattıkları gibi dükkan sahibine de anlatırlar. Dükkan sahibi çocukların seçtiği boyaları hesaplar. Meryem ve Maria'nın parası, boyaları almak için yeterlidir ancak fırçalar için paraları kalmamıştır. Dükkan sahibi çocukların üzgün yüzlerine bakar ve 'Fırçalar benden size hediye olsun!' der. Meryem ve Maria çok sevinirler, dükkan sahibine teşekkür ederler. Hafta sonunda sabah erkenden boya kutuları ve fırçalarıyla yine parkta buluşurlar ve işe koyulurlar. Maria salıncağı boyarken Meryem de kaydırağı boyar. Öğle saatine kadar parktaki tüm oyuncakları Meryem ve Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşı Maria rengarenk boyamışlardır. Öğle yemeğinden sonra parka oyun için gelmeye başlayan çocuklar büyük bir sevinç gösterisi yaparlar. Çok mutlu olmuşlardır. Oyuncakları tertemiz, rengarenk olmuştur. Çocuklar Meryem'e ve Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşı Maria'ya çok teşekkür ederler.

Word: 288

Appendix F: Approval Letter from Research and Ethics Committee of Psychology Department of Eastern Mediterranean University

Eastern Mediterranean University

The Department of Psychology	**Famagusta, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus**
Eastern Mediterranean University	**Tel: +(90) 392 630 1389**
Research & Ethics Committee	**Fax: +(90) 392 630 2475**
Senel Husnu Raman-Chairperson	**e-mail: senel.raman@emu.edu.tr**
	Web: http://brahms.emu.edu.tr/psychology

Ref Code: 14/11-03

Date: 10.11.2014

Dear Onay Cicek,

Thank you for submitting your revised application entitled *Extended Contact through Story Reading in Turkish Cypriot Children.* Your application has now been *approved* by the Research & Ethics Committee on 10.11.2014.

If any changes to the study described in the application or supporting documentation is necessary, you must notify the committee and may be required to make a resubmission of the application. This approval is valid for one year.

Yours sincerely,

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Senel Husnu Raman

On Behalf of the Research & Ethics Committee

Psychology Department

Eastern Mediterranean University