

# **Effects of Imagined Contact under Optimal Conditions on Outgroup Perception**

**Dilara Altan**

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

Master of Science  
in  
Developmental Psychology

Eastern Mediterranean University  
September 2017  
Gazimağusa, North Cyprus

Approval of the Institute of Graduate Studies and Research

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Ali Hakan Ulusoy  
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 Hüsnu 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.

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Erginel  
Co-Supervisor

---

Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnu Raman  
Supervisor

---

Examining Committee

1. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Fatih Bayraktar

2. Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnu Raman

3. Asst. Prof. Dr. İlmiye Seçer

## ABSTRACT

Intergroup contact is a social psychological tool utilized to develop positive relationships between culturally different groups. Allport's four optimal contact conditions, which are equality of groups, common goals, cooperation, and institutional or authority support have been shown to be effective in increasing contact between groups. In segregated regions contact between groups may not be a viable option, hence the need for indirect contact techniques such as imagined contact. The current research aimed to apply the imagined contact technique to the Cyprus context. For this reason, a new imagined contact task variant (named 'optimal imagined contact') was designed that included Allport's optimal conditions to measure its effectiveness at improving outgroup attitudes, reducing intergroup anxiety and enhancing action tendencies. Additionally, actual behavior was also measured in order to build on prior limited research showing the link between imagined contact and real behavior. A total of 156 (69 Male and 87 Female; Mean Age: 21.09, SD: 2.30) participants were randomly assigned to one of the three imagined contact conditions: (i) optimal; (ii) standard; (iii) no-contact control. Results showed that participants reported more anxiety in the no contact control condition compared to both the optimal and standard imagined contact conditions but there was no significant difference between the standard and optimal imagined contact conditions on the remaining measures. In the measurement of actual behavior, people who were in the optimal imagined contact condition and standard imagined contact conditions were more likely to meet with a confederate they assumed to be a Greek Cypriot than those in the no contact control condition. Based

on the present results, necessary prejudice reduction interventions were discussed in order to increase the contact between the groups in Cyprus.

**Keywords:** Imagined contact, Optimal conditions, Outgroup attitude, Actual behavior, Cyprus.

## ÖZ

Gruplar arası temas kültürel olarak farklı gruplar arasındaki pozitif ilişkilerin geliştirilmesinde kullanılan sosyal psikolojik bir araçtır. Allport'un dört ideal temas koşulunun (eşit statü, işbirliği, ortak hedef ve otorite desteği) gruplar arası temasın artırılmasında oldukça etkili olduğu gösterilmiştir. Doğrudan temas bölünmüş bölgelerde her zaman mümkün olmayabilir, dolayısıyla hayal edilen temas gibi dolaylı temas tekniklerine ihtiyaç duyulabilir. Mevcut araştırma, hayal edilen temas tekniğini Kıbrıs'ta uygulamayı amaçlamaktadır. Bu nedenle, Allport'un ideal koşullarının da dahil edildiği dış grup tutumlarını geliştirme, gruplar arası kaygıyı azaltma ve davranış eğilimlerini geliştirme etkinliğini ölçmek için en uygun koşulları içeren yeni bir hayali temas senaryosu tasarlanmıştır. Buna ek olarak, hayal edilen temas ile gerçek davranış arasındaki bağlantı da ölçülmüştür. Çalışmaya 156 (69 Erkek ve 87 Kadın Ort.Yaş: 21.09, SS: 2.30) kişi katılmıştır. Katılımcılar rastgele bir şekilde şu üç koşuldan birine katılımları sağlanmıştır: (i) ideal; (ii) standart; (iii) temas içermeyen. Sonuçlar katılımcıların dış grupla hayali temas içermeyen kontrol grubunda hem ideal hem de standart hayali temas koşullarına kıyasla daha fazla kaygı bildirdiklerini göstermektedir. Fakat standart hayali temas ve ideal hayali temas koşulları arasında belirgin bir farklılık bulunamamıştır. Gerçek davranış ölçüldüğünde ise, temas içermeyen kontrol grubu ile karşılaştırıldığında ideal hayali temas koşullarında ve standart hayali temas koşullarında olan katılımcılar, Kıbrıslı Rum olduğunu düşündükleri bir müttefik ile daha fazla tanışma davranışında bulunmuşlardır. Mevcut sonuçlara dayanarak, Kıbrıs'taki gruplar arasındaki teması artırmak için gerekli önyargı azaltma müdahaleleri tartışılmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** Hayali temas, Uygun koşullar, Dış grup algısı, Gerçek davranış, Kıbrıs.

## **ACKNOWLEDGMENT**

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Şenel Hüsnü Raman for her guidance and support during my research. She always listened to me patiently and motivated me with her warm smile. Further, she has contributed to my academic life in many aspects. Also, I would also like specifically to thank my co-supervisor, Assoc. Prof. Dr. Mehmet Metin Erginel for his valuable support. He taught me to look at situations from different perspectives. Finally, I would like to sincerely thank my parents and my brother for their unconditional love and unlimited support.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.....	iii
ÖZ.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGMENT.....	vii
LIST OF TABLES.....	xi
1 INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Intergroup Contact Theory.....	2
1.1.1 Equal Status.....	4
1.1.2 Common Goals.....	5
1.1.3 Cooperation.....	6
1.1.4 Institutional or Authority Support.....	6
1.2 Types of Contact.....	9
1.2.1 Direct Contact.....	9
1.2.2 Indirect Contact.....	9
1.2.2.1 Extended Contact.....	10
1.2.2.2 Imagined Intergroup Contact.....	12
1.3 Imagined Contact Task Variants.....	14
1.4 From Imagined Intergroup Contact to Real Behavior.....	15
1.5 Intergroup Contact Research Findings in Cyprus .....	15
1.6 Aims and Hypotheses.....	22
2 METHOD.....	23
2.1 Participants.....	23
2.2 Materials.....	23
2.2.1 Feeling Thermometer.....	23



2.2.2	Quantity of Contact.....	24
2.2.3	Contact Quality.....	24
2.2.4	Story-telling Measures.....	25
2.2.5	Cross-group - Extended Contact Measure.....	25
2.2.6	Imagined Intergroup Contact Scenarios.....	25
2.2.6.1	Standard Imagined Intergroup Contact Scenario.....	26
2.2.6.2	Optimal Imagined Intergroup Contact Scenario.....	26
2.2.6.2	No Contact - Control Scenario.....	27
2.2.7	Manipulation Checks.....	27
2.2.8	Intergroup Anxiety.....	28
2.2.9	Outgroup Attitudes Measure.....	28
2.2.10	Action Tendency.....	28
2.2.11	Real behavior.....	29
2.3	Design.....	29
2.4	Procedure.....	29
3	RESULTS.....	29
3.1	Preliminary Analysis.....	31
3.1.1	Descriptive Statistics.....	31
3.1.2	Manipulation Check.....	32
3.2	Correlation Analysis.....	32
3.3	ANCOVA.....	34
3.3.1	Intergroup Anxiety.....	35
3.3.2	Outgroup Attitude.....	35
3.3.3	Negative Action Tendencies.....	35
3.3.4	Positive Action Tendencies.....	36

3.4 Chi-Square Analysis.....	36
4 DISCUSSION.....	37
REFERENCES.....	51
APPENDICES.....	65
Appendix A: Prior Contact Measures.....	66
Appendix B: Story-Telling Measure.....	67
Appendix C: Cross-group - Extended Contact Measure.....	68
Appendix D: Optimal Imagined Intergroup Contact Scenario.....	69
Appendix E Standard Imagined Intergroup Contact Scenario.....	70
Appendix F: No Contact - Control Scenario.....	71
Appendix G: Manipulation Checks.....	72
Appendix H: Intergroup Anxiety Scale .....	73
Appendix I: Outgroup Attitudes Measure.....	74
Appendix J: Action Tendency Measure.....	75
Appendix K: Demographic Information Form.....	76
Appendix L: Eastern Mediterranean University Psychology Department’s Ethics and Research Committee Approval Letter.....	77

## LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Pearson Correlation Coefficient Values of the Variables.....	34
Table 2: Descriptive Statistics for All Dependent Measures Based on Condition...	36

# Chapter 1

## INTRODUCTION

Prejudice was originally described as “an antipathy based upon a faulty and inflexible generalization” by Gordon Allport (1954, p.9) in the book “Nature of Prejudice”. In addition, Jones (1972) defined ethnic prejudice as negative attitudes towards people who are members of a different religion or a group. They are evaluated negatively by others who are not members of that community. Prejudice can manifest itself respect to language, religion, ethnicity, gender, sexual orientation, political opinion, mental illness, physical appearance, etc. Based on all of these factors it is understood that prejudice is an attitudinal and cognitive phenomenon. Moreover, hostile attitudes, negative emotions, and behaviors are parts of prejudice. Further, prejudice is a group based process which starts in individuals’ affective, cognitive and behavioral states than is transferred to the group setting. (Brown, 1995). It is quite difficult to avoid prejudices because of the nature of the social environment to which we belong. At this point the question that needs to be answered about prejudice is "What can be done to reduce the negative effects of prejudice such as discrimination, exclusion or to eliminate prejudice?" because being exposed to prejudice can have significant and long-lasting effects on ones’ self-

concept, self-esteem, intergroup interactions, motivation and achievement (Nelson, 2006). It is also crucial to ensure the welfare of society by ensuring the harmonious interactions between different groups at a community level. Allport (1954) argued that powerful and effective interventions can be done to reduce prejudice. The most important thing that he advocates is intergroup contact, which has been proven to be one of the most effective ways to reduce negative attitudes and increase positive attitudes among different groups. (Allport, 1954; Brambilla, Ravenna & Hewstone, 2012).

### **1.1 Intergroup Contact Theory**

Allport (1954), the most important defender of the Intergroup Contact Hypothesis (now referred to as the Intergroup Contact Theory) emphasized the importance of contact on attitude, behavioral intentions and anxiety. According to this view, contact is the key for decreasing prejudice among different groups. The Intergroup Contact Theory suggests that people's negative attitudes towards the other group can be replaced with positive attitudes and positive outgroup attitudes can be increased through contact (Turner & Crisp, 2010).

Several potential mediators have been proposed to explain how intergroup contact works as a means of reducing intergroup prejudice. As a result of their meta-analysis, Pettigrew and Tropp (2000) concluded that affective factors play a critical role in reducing bias through intergroup contact. Affective mediators such as intergroup

anxiety, empathy and perspective-taking include negative affective processes which are generally alleviated by positive contact experiences and positive affective processes which are enhanced by intergroup contact.

Additionally, cognitive factors play a significant role in the effectiveness of intergroup contact, Pettigrew (1998) for instance suggested that learning new information was critical in how intergroup contact improved intergroup relations. Increasing what people know about the outgroup can serve to reduce bias by increasing the likelihood that people of the outgroup are seen in more personalized ways (Stephan & Stephan, 1985). Also, knowing more about the outgroup can reduce the uncertainty about how to interact with outgroup members. This may prevent avoidance and reduce discomfort from intergroup interactions (Crosby, Bromley & Saxe, 1980; Gaertner & Dovidio, 1986).

In terms of research findings, Singer (1948) and Stouffer (1949) examined the integration between different ethnic groups during the Second World War. Their findings showed that, in cases of conflict (e.g war) between two groups, members of groups that were heterogeneous in terms of nationality had lower level of prejudice and higher level of positive attitudes in comparison to members of nationally homogenous groups. Apart from this, Brophy (1946) examined the attitudes of sailors who had different ethnic identities and traveled on the same ship

in Merchant Marine. Results showed that their positive attitudes towards each other increased after the voyage (as cited in Dovidio, Gaertner, & Kawakami, 2003). Allport (1954) stated that if the interaction between groups increases, negative attitudes, discrimination and bias will decrease.

A number of conditions have been suggested to increase the likelihood of successful contact, however more recent research has suggested that Allport's four optimal conditions are sufficient (Stathi & Crisp, 2008). These are: equality of groups, common goals, cooperation, and institutional or authority support (Allport, 1954).

### **1.1.1 Equal Status**

Firstly, equality of groups requires that people from different groups have the same status when they are in the contact condition (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011). Peers, classmates, co-workers, colleagues can be the example of people who have equal status (Brown, 1995). Past research, which was conducted in a racially mixed school, showed that equal status in the educational setting reduced prejudice between students and increased positive attitudes towards students who are members of different ethnic groups (Patchen, 1982). Robinson and Preston (1976) conducted a research to examine European American teachers' attitudes toward their African-American colleagues. Teachers in both groups attended a service training program. A few months later, the perspectives of the teachers who participated in the training and the teachers who did not participate in the training program were examined.

European American teachers who participated in the program developed more positive attitudes against the African-Americans than teachers who did not participate in the program (as cited in Molina & Wittig, 2006).

### **1.1.2 Common Goals**

People are more likely to develop positive attitudes toward other groups if there is a common goal (Petigrew, 1998). Sherif (1961) stated that people who are members of outgroups tend to be more friendly and supportive towards to each other if they have a shared goal. Moreover, it is known that the level of intergroup ties increases between two groups if they need to work together to be successful against to common problem. (Brewer, 1999). For instance, Sherif (1961) carried out an experiment to investigate group harmony at Robbers Cave National Park for summer camp. Two different student groups were created by the researchers to assess the effects of group conflict and cohesion. As the days passed during the camp, the tension between the groups increased because students had the feeling that their group was in danger due to the presence of the other group. The researchers created false common problems (such as a broken truck that would carry supplies to the camp) that could only be solved if the two groups worked together, cooperatively to solve their common problems. The polarization and conflict between the groups was eliminated due to the presence of common goals.



### **1.1.3 Cooperation**

This condition states that groups should have interdependent duties and not competitive ones, such that members of different groups are dependent on each other for the achievement of jointly desired outcomes, therefore having to depend on one another and developing friendlier relationships (Bettencourt, Brewer, Croak & Miller, 1992). For example, Aronson and Bridgeman's Jigsaw Classroom Technique (1979) is a good way to support cooperative learning and decrease negative attitudes. In the jigsaw technique, the course topic is separated into two parts and students who are from different ethnicities are randomly placed into these different groups. Moreover, the only way for students to actually complete the task is if they cooperate and work together (Wolfe & Spencer, 1996). Past research which was carried out to examine the effects of cooperation in schools showed that students achieved their common objectives by cooperating. Furthermore, through the jigsaw learning method interrelations between students have been improved and children's attitudes toward each other changed positively (Walker, & Crogan, 1998).

### **1.1.3 Institutional or Authority Support**

Institutional or authority support is important because it creates an environment that provides resources and incentives for positive and harmonious intergroup relations. Institutions can establish balance between groups through rules and laws (Pettigrew, 1998). Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) suggested that, authority support is the more effective and important condition among all other three conditions to ensure

intergroup interaction. Also according to Brown (1995), there are three reasons why the authority support is so critical to increase contact between groups. Firstly, authorities can have sanctions on people's behaviors through rewards and punishments. Secondly, authorities have rights to direct rules and laws and can use these rights and sanctions to prevent discrimination via legislations. Lastly, authorities can support people to be more tolerant to each other, by can changing the public attitude by supporting positive norms towards outgroup.

Aside from the optimal contact conditions, the quality and quantity (frequency) of contact is important for decreasing prejudice. According to the Intergroup Contact Theory, frequent and positive contact with an outgroup member is very effective for the improvement of intergroup relations and the reduction of preconceived ideas (Voci & Hewstone, 2003). In other words, prejudice decreases as the frequency of contact increases (Dovidio, Gaertner & Kawakami, 2003). Wagner, Van Dick, Pettigrew and Christ (2003) reviewed the factor of contact on prejudice in East Germany and West Germany. They found a significant difference which indicated that, participants who lived in West Germany showed less violent behaviors and negative attitudes towards foreign people than the other participants who lived in East Germany. Because according to the information obtained from a demographic survey, participants who lived in the West side had many more foreign friends and they spent much more time with them in school, work, neighborhood than the others.

The researchers of another study proposed that Dutch natives who live in an ethnically diverse area showed more outgroup trust than those who live in an area that is ethnically less diverse, and they found significant positive relationship between quality of contact and outgroup trust (Lancee & Dronkers, 2011).

The Intergroup Contact Theory has drawn a lot of support as well as criticism. Hewstone and Brown (1986) criticized intergroup theory for paying much more attention to interpersonal contact than intergroup communication which makes it difficult to make generalizations across to whole society because when people contact with a member of an outgroup they tend to attribute their individual experiences to the whole group. Another important criticism is that in a society where inequalities are institutional, contacts will not be sufficient unless the institutional problems are resolved (Reicher, 1986). As an answer to such criticisms against the theory, Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) recently conducted a meta-analysis of over 500 studies which looked at the effectiveness of contact between different groups. Their results showed a reliable relationship between contact and prejudice-reduction correlation was  $r=.22$ , which rose to  $.29$  if Allport's optimal conditions were included. They found that contact worked, despite of geographical region, religious, ethnic group, age or gender differences.

## **1.2 Types of Contact**

### **1.2.1 Direct Contact**

Direct intergroup contact refers to face-to-face interactions among people from different groups (Brown & Paterson, 2016). Direct intergroup contact helps to develop positive relationships between groups (Allport, 1954). DuBois and Hirsch (1990) found that children who live in neighborhoods where people from different races tended to be less prejudiced because they were directly in contact with these people in places such as schools during the day.

The effects of direct contact are not always positive. The possibility of encountering someone from the opposing group can stimulate anxiety. Negative expectations such as rejection, exclusion and exposure to discrimination can cause people to be afraid or incompetent, can increase the anxiety (Islam & Hewstone, 1993). Because direct contact can be very threatening for some people as seen, Allport suggested that the indirect contact techniques could be used as the first step to prevent negative effects of direct contact (Brown & Paterson, 2016).

### **1.2.2 Indirect Contact**

Indirect contact techniques are used to protect people from the negative effects of direct contact, such as intergroup anxiety and discomfort as mentioned before. Further, contrary to the direct intergroup contact technique, indirect intergroup contact method can be used in segregated regions where there is no contact

opportunity (Pagotto, Visintin, De Iorio & Voci, 2013). For example, in some regions in the Middle East, Sri Lanka, and Cyprus, two communities are physically separated from each other and communication between them is limited or impossible/non-existent (Halperin et al., 2012). Allport (1954) suggested that indirect contact through scenarios, movies, and imaginations is very effective for decreasing prejudice between groups (as cited in Brown & Paterson, 2016). All indirect contact intervention methods are based on the contact hypothesis but they do not include face-to-face communication. In this method, there is no need for a real experience to develop a positive attitude towards people from the outgroup. Research using indirect contact techniques include extended contact and imagined intergroup contact, which are outlined next (Turner, West & Christie, 2013).

#### **1.2.2.1 Extended Contact**

Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe and Ropp (1997) proposed the Extended Contact Hypothesis; the knowledge that our friend has a friend from the outgroup, can positively affect our attitudes towards outgroup members. It states that knowing that your friend has a friend from the outgroup can decrease prejudice. If a person from the outgroup acts in a friendly way towards the in-group member, people's thoughts about the members of the outgroup can become more moderate (Page-Gould, Mendoza-Denton, & Tropp, 2008). Another positive feature of the extended contact method is decreasing anxiety, threat, stress and it prevents the formation of negative expectations. The well-known motto "my friend's friend is my friend" can be the

best way for explaining extended contact. Moreover, this hypothesis encourages people to learn more about outgroup members and this acquired information can cause them to correct some false beliefs about the external group. Getting information about the outgroup is also related with the positive interactions with them (Dovidio, Eller & Hewstone, 2011) because having a friend from another group can help to learn the history and culture of the outgroup. Through this way learning about the discrimination that the other group members are exposed to in the past increases the cultural sensitivity (Dovido, Gaertner & Kawakami,2003). Information about others removes uncertainties about how people should behave towards them (Crosby, Bromley & Saxe, 1980). Namely, positive relationships between the groups develop positively.

A number of studies have been conducted using the extended contact technique to reduce intergroup bias (Cameron, Rutland, Brown & Douch, 2006; Paolini et al., 2008). In one such study, Wright et al. (1997) stated that participants who knew that their friends had friends from another group were likely to show less prejudice than participants who did not have a connection to an external group. Despite the positive impact extended contact has been obtained for intergroup relations, it still requires some form of direct contact to occur when the reality is that in some contexts even extended contact may be impossible. This is particularly true for highly segregated places. In such cases, extended contact is not a plausible option in practice, which

creates the biggest limitation of the theory (Crisp, Stathi, Turner, & Husnu, 2009). In order to overcome this drawback, a relatively new technique, imagined intergroup contact technique was developed.

### **1.2.2.2 Imagined Intergroup Contact**

Crisp and Turner (2009) stated that “Imagined intergroup contact is the mental simulation of a social interaction with a member or members of an outgroup category” (p.234). Through the imagined contact technique people develop ideas about how they will think, feel and behave when they meet someone from an outgroup because in this technique, participants are asked to imagine interacting with someone from the outgroup (Turner, West, & Christie, 2013). It can be particularly effective in places where there is no opportunity for interaction between groups. It can also be powerful in some places where minority groups live because people who are in the dominant group are more likely to see minority groups (immigrants or refugees) as inferior and they label them as less educated, less intelligent, and from a lower social class and they avoid making contact with minority group members (Suarez-Orozco & Suarez-Orozco, 2009). It can therefore prepare people to experience real contact with someone who is from the outgroup (Miles, & Crisp, 2014).

Research findings show that imagining contact with the outgroup members can enhance positive attitudes and decrease negative attitudes (Turner, Crisp & Lambert,

2007). A recent meta-analysis showed that imagined contact was effective in improving intergroup relations across a number of dependent variables, namely intergroup behaviors, emotions, intentions and attitudes (Miles & Crisp, 2014). It has been found to prevent anxiety between groups because it does not include real contact such as face to face contact (Birtel & Crisp, 2012). Research findings showed that positive relations between international students and native students increased after imagined contact training which was introduced in an Italian elementary school (Vezzali, Crisp, Stathi, & Giovannini, 2015). Stathi, Tsantila, and Crisp (2012) examined the effect of imagined contact towards people with mental illnesses. Results showed that participants who imagined meeting with people with mental illnesses showed less prejudicial attitude, intergroup anxiety and more behavioral intentions to meeting these stigmatized people than the other participants who attended the control condition. Another relevant research revealed, moreover, that imagined contacts increased outgroup trust. Participants who imagined that they were in a conversation with a Muslim showed more outgroup trust, positive intention to contact and positive perception towards Muslims (Pagotto, Visintin, De Iorio, & Voci, 2013).

As mentioned above, several positive effects of imagined contact have been identified, yet it has also faced with some criticism. Dixon, Durrheim and Tredous (2005) argued that imagined contact affects prejudice at a personal level, so there are



questions as to whether this effect can be carried through to the community level. Another limitation of the imagined intergroup contact method is that it is not as long-lasting and as strong of an effect of direct contact. According to the result of research which was done to compare the effects of direct contact and indirect contact, direct contact was shown to be much more effective than indirect contact in changing attitudes positively in the long term (Paolini et al., 2004).

### **1.3 Imagined Contact Task Variants**

Previous research showed that variants in the imagined contact technique can lead to more effective results. For example, Husnu and Crisp (2010) conducted a research in order to examine the effects of elaborate imagined contact scenarios on behavioral intentions. They found that by including elaboration in the imagined scenario, vividness increased which positively affected behavioral intentions to contact with outgroup members compared to less vivid and elaborate imagined scenarios. Kuchenbrandt, Eyssel and Seidel (2013) used imagination tasks which include cooperative actions with a stranger. By including instructions that enhanced cooperation (as opposed to standard imagined contact scenarios), participants represented more empathy and trust towards outgroup. Moreover, Stathi and Crisp (2008) used two different types of instructions – positive and neutral contact with a stranger – to see the different effects of scenarios because it is generally agreed today that different types of instructions affect intergroup contact differently. One scenario with positive encounters, includes tolerant, pleasant and meaningful conversation

with a stranger from the outgroup. Second scenario consists of neutral conversation with stranger but conversation does not have any positive or negative direction. Another research by West and Bruckmüller (2013) found that easy and difficult imagination tasks have an impact on the effectiveness of the technique. Participants who performed an easy imagination task, which involved an easy font to read, showed less prejudice than the other participants who performed a difficult imagination task (difficult font to read).

#### **1.4 From Imagined Intergroup Contact to Real Behavior**

It has been shown through studies that the imagined intergroup contact method can also promote actual behavior. For example, Ratcliff, Czuchry, Scarberry, Thomas, Dansereau, and Lord (1999) asked students to imagine that studying is fun and enjoyable (an interest in subject, comfortable environment, reward). Students who had imagined according to those instructions made more effort than those students who had not imagined according to the instruction. Also, Ten Eyck, Labansat, Gresky, Dansereau and Lord (2006) found that imagining a goal-related behavior (such as dieting, exercise, or studying for an exam) is more effective than simply thinking about the positive consequences and benefits of the behavior. The findings of Anderson (1987) further illustrate the effects of imagined behaviors on altering real outcomes. He attempted to reduce the number of clients' dropout rates from psychotherapy sessions. He revealed that participants who imagined continuing the

sessions are less likely to drop out of the sessions (as cited in Crisp, Husnu, Meleady, Stathi & Turner, 2010).

With respect to prejudice, if someone imagines that they met someone from that group before they actually meet it is influential via both affective and cognitive routes, e.g., intergroup anxiety (affect) decreases and positive expectations (cognition) increase (Husnu & Crisp, 2010). That is why imagined contact is expected to support actual contact (Crisp, Stathi, Turner, & Husnu, 2009). For instance, West, Turner, and Levita (2015) examined the effects of imagined contact on real behavior. They found that participants who were told to imagine speaking with people with schizophrenia showed decreased levels of stress and described a higher quality of interaction. In one of the few studies to measure a proxy of real behavior, Turner and West (2012) told participants that they were to participate in a debate with someone from an outgroup after having previously imagined contact training (or not). Participants were taken to a room in which confederates asked them to arrange chairs for the outgroup person. Researchers measured the distance they put between their own chair and that of the outgroup member. Participants who had participated in imagined intergroup contact training were likely to put the chairs closer than those who had not received the imagined contact. However, the lack of studies showing the effect of imagined contact on real behavior remains to be one of

its most important limitations with this paradigm, one which will be addressed in the current study.

### **1.5 Intergroup Contact Research Findings in Cyprus**

Cyprus is the third biggest island in the Eastern Mediterranean and also has strategic importance because the island is located at the junction of Europe, Asia and Africa. The island of Cyprus was conquered in 1571 by the Ottoman Empire. In 1878, the Ottoman state transferred the management of Cyprus to the British Empire. Disagreements between the two largest communities, which are Greek Cypriots and Turkish Cypriots, began towards the end of 1880 (Papadakis, 2008). Hadjipavlou-Trigeorgis and Trigeorgis (1993) mentioned that the idea of ENOSIS (union with Greece, an aspiration in the Greek Cypriot community) and TAKSİM (separation/division, refers to dividing the island and the formation of a separate Turkish entity in the island, with closer ties to Turkey) caused conflict in Cyprus. Greek Cypriots established a military organization called Ethniki Organosis Kyprion Agoniston (EOKA) in 1955 and Turkish Cypriots also formed a resistance organization with military elements under the name Turkish Resistance Organisation (TMT) in 1958 (Papadakis, 2008). A number of negative consequences were experienced on both sides as a result of the inter-ethnic war during both the 1963-1964 struggles and 1974. Therefore, armed forces were sent by Turkey to Cyprus to provide peace but this was perceived as a violation by the Greek Cypriots. As a result of this war, approximately 180,000 Greek Cypriot were forced out of their homes;

they left their businesses and migrated to the south of the island. Additionally, almost 50.000 Turkish Cypriots became refugees (Mehmet, 1992).

Since the Turkish army's intervention in 1974, the island has been divided into two parts, the Northern side and the Southern side. Turkish Cypriots and Greek Cypriots live on these two different parts, respectively. The two communities have not yet achieved an agreement but negotiations are proceeding.

In 2003, the Turkish Cypriot administration granted all Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus citizens the right to visit the South, and the borders were partially opened for visiting. Therefore, contact between two community increased but this has not caused the disappearance of prejudicial beliefs or the prevention of discrimination or negative attitudes. The first-wave of longitudinal research on crossing of the checkpoints by Psaltis and Lytras (2012) showed that 22.81% of Turkish Cypriots never went to Southern part of Cyprus, and likewise 32.87% of Greek Cypriots have never crossed the Northern Cyprus. Furthermore, another study revealed that 57% of Greek Cypriots considered crossing to the Northern side of Cyprus as inappropriate behavior because they think that crossing borders and going to Northern Cyprus is to recognize the Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus on the island. They also believed that any expenditure in the North would only help to develop the economy of an illegal country (Webster & Timothy, 2006).

In order to promote positive intergroup relations between the groups, intergroup contact can be a useful tool (Husnu & Crisp, 2010). Relevant studies have been carried out about the effects of direct and indirect inter-group contact in the Cyprus context. One study conducted by Tausch et al., (2010) examined the secondary transfer effects of contact, which can be defined as the attitude toward the primary outgroup leading to a reduction in prejudice against the secondary outgroup - in this context, contact with Greek Cypriots generalizing to Greeks in Greece too. This research is very important in terms of intergroup contact because it was the first research that both communities (Turkish and Greek Cypriots) participated in the same research. Results showed that, contact with secondary outgroup effected contact with primary outgroup positively (respective 'motherlands' i.e. Turkey and Greece).

Research has also been conducted in North Cyprus with Turkish Cypriots alone. In one such study, Paolini and colleagues (2014) manipulated negative and positive intergroup contact in the Cyprus context. They showed that visualizing negative intergroup contact led participants to show greater category salience (generalizations to the outgroup) in comparison to the visualization of positive contact. They also found that fewer cross-group friendships, fewer positive family stories and more negative family stories played a significant role in explaining this effect. Similarly, participants with less positive contact in terms of quantity and quality and less

indirect cross-group friendships before visualization had high levels of category salience. Husnu and Crisp (2010) tested the effect of imagined contact on contact intentions. Intentions to have actual contact are very important because such intentions can enhance the likelihood of real contact in the future. Overall ninety undergraduate students in Eastern Mediterranean University in North Cyprus randomly participated in one of the three conditions (control, contextually diverse imagined contact condition, and contextually homogeneous imagined contact condition). Results indicated that participants who imagined that they made positive contact with the Greek Cypriots showed more behavioral intentions for real contact than other participants who were in a no-contact control condition. Another research by Husnu and Crisp (2015) used perspective-taking technique during the imagined contact session. Turkish Cypriots imagined that they interacted with Greek Cypriots. Results showed that perspective taking during the session, that is putting oneself in the shoes of a Greek Cypriot caused a significant reduction in prejudice and it positively affected outgroup attitudes (compared to the others who imagined a no-contact control scene). Additionally, Husnu and Lajunen (2015) examined Turkish Cypriot's level of intergroup contact and bias towards to Greek Cypriots in Cyprus. Results indicated that political orientation, level of religiosity, level of contact between groups are important determinants of outgroup bias. Also in-group favoritism and intergroup contact had a significant impact on outgroup prejudice. Another research by Halperin et al. (2012) which was conducted in Cyprus

investigated the effect of group malleability on intergroup anxiety and contact in future. Participants who believed that people who are in the outgroup could change, had less anxiety and higher intention to have contact in the future than those who did not believe that people could change.

Studies in Cyprus have also been conducted with children samples too. One study by Mertan (2011) investigated the development of national identity of Turkish Cypriot children aged between 6 and 12 years, in which children's ingroup and outgroup enemy attitudes were also examined. According to the results children reported negative attitude towards enemy outgroup (Greek Cypriots) and they were more likely to show in-group favoritism towards their own group (Turkish Cypriots). A recent study also investigated the effects of vicarious intergroup contact on Turkish Cypriot children's attitude, intentions and trust towards Greek Cypriot children. Initial results by Husnu, Mertan, and Cicek (2016) showed that positive contact and family story-telling were related to positive outgroup attitudes. A further vicarious contact intervention which included a story-telling intervention for 3-weeks, showed that outgroup trust and attitudes improved.



## **1.6 Aims and Hypotheses**

In Cyprus, Greek and Turkish Cypriots have little opportunity to make direct contact with each other and the level of real interaction between the two groups is very low. This situation therefore provides a suitable environment for testing the effects of imaginary contact between groups. Due to the emphasis in the contact literature on Allport's optimal conditions, the current research aimed to apply this to the imagined contact technique. A new imagined contact task variant was therefore designed whereby Allport's optimal conditions were included (vs. the standard imagined contact scenario). Additionally, to build on prior limited research that shows the link between imagined contact and real behavior, actual behavior was also measured. We therefore hypothesized that

(a) Turkish Cypriots who imagined the 'optimal' imagined contact scenario would report more favorable outgroup attitudes, reduced anxiety, positive behavioral intentions toward Greek Cypriots compared to those in the 'standard' and 'no-contact control' conditions after controlling for their prior contact experiences (positive/negative direct and indirect contact); and

(b) Turkish Cypriots who imagined the 'optimal' imagined contact scenario would be more likely to choose to interact with a Greek Cypriot outside of the laboratory compared to the 'standard' and 'no-contact control' conditions.

## **Chapter 2**

### **METHOD**

#### **2.1 Participants**

A total of 156 (69 Male and 87 Female) participants were undergraduate and graduate students recruited from Eastern Mediterranean University using convenience sampling. To avoid contamination, participants were chosen from different departments and were randomly assigned to the conditions, participants were unaware of the different versions of the questionnaire (conditions). The age range of participants was from 18 to 25 years ( $M= 21.09$ ,  $SD=2.30$ ). All participants were native Turkish Cypriots whose parents were also Turkish Cypriot.

#### **2.2 Materials**

A questionnaire package was given to participants. Each scale was used previously and adapted to the Cyprus context (see Paolini, Harwood, Rubin, Husnu, Joyce & Hewstone, 2014; Husnu, & Paolini, 2017). Prior to the imagined contact scenarios the following contact measures were assessed:

##### **2.2.1 Feeling Thermometer**

The Feeling Thermometer (Haddock, Zanna & Esses, 1993) is designed to measure the participant's feeling towards the other group. It provides numerical information

about participants' feelings. The measurement ranges from 0 to 100 where 0 represents feeling very cold, while 100 represents feeling very warm toward that group. This is commonly used as a measure of outgroup attitudes (Paolini et al., 2014).

### **2.2.2 Quantity of Contact**

To measure the quantity of positive and negative contact with the outgroup (Barlow et al., 2012) participants were asked two questions. For example, the question "In everyday life, how often do you have positive encounters with Greek Cypriots?" was used to assess the quantity of positive contact with Greek Cypriots. Another item, "In everyday life, how often do you have negative encounters with Greek Cypriots?" assessed negative contact with Greek Cypriots. The answers were based on a 7-point likert scale (1= never, 7=very frequently). Quantity of contact scale was used as a measure to obtain information regarding participants outgroup experiences prior to the experimental manipulation.

### **2.2.3 Contact Quality**

In order to measure the quality of contact with Greek Cypriot, participants rated on a scale including 5 items such as Superficial-Deep, Natural-Forced, Unpleasant-Pleasant, Competitive-Cooperative, and Intimate-Distant how they would characterize the contact they have with Greek Cypriots (Islam & Hewstone, 1993). Answers were given on a 7-point scale (1= never, 7=very frequently) ( $\alpha = .77$ ).

#### **2.2.4 Story-telling Measures**

One item is used to measure the effect of telling stories that include a positive contact situation as a measure of extended contact toward Greek Cypriots, while another item is used to measure the effect of telling stories that include a negative contact situation (Cameron, Rutland, Brown, & Douch, 2006). For example, “Do/did any of your family members (including parents, grandparents, relatives and siblings) tell you pleasant/upsetting stories of solidarity between Greek and Turkish that occurred during the war?” Scores are between 0 and 10 (0=none, 1=1, 2=2-5, 3=5-10, 4= over 10).

#### **2.2.5 Cross-group - Extended Contact Measure**

In order to assess the amount of cross-group friendships, items such as “How many Greek Cypriot people are you friends with?” and “How many members of your family have friends who are Greek Cypriot?” were used (Paolini, Hewstone, Cairns, & Voci, 2004). It used to measure the influence of having friends from the other group on attitude. Answer options are as follows; (0,1,2-3,4-6,7-10,11-15,16-20,21-30 and more than 30,  $\alpha=.77$ ).

#### **2.2.6 Imagined Intergroup Contact Scenarios**

In order to manipulate the ‘optimal contact’ conditions, three different scenarios were prepared by the researcher and her supervisors, which were also based on the content by Kuchenbrandt, Eysse, and Seidel (2013). These included: Optimal Imagined Intergroup Contact Scenario, Standard Imagined Intergroup Contact

Scenario and No Contact - Control Scenario. An excerpt from each scenario is presented below. For the full texts, please see Appendices.

#### **2.2.6.1 Standard Imagined Intergroup Contact Scenario**

This scenario tells the story of a Turkish Cypriot and Greek Cypriot student who meet each other. It was taken from previous imagined contact studies (e.g. Kuchenbrandt et al., 2013) and adapted to the Cypriot context.

*I would like you to take a minute to imagine the following story. A Greek Cypriot student and a Turkish Cypriot Student found an opportunity to meet in a summer camp. Their languages and religions were different but their cultures were very similar. Also, both students were very successful dancers. The students have had a good time during camp time because of their common ability and traits.*

#### **2.2.6.2 Optimal Imagined Intergroup Contact Scenario**

This scenario was the same as the standard Imagined contact scenario but differed in that it included elements of the optimal conditions of contact, which are cooperation, common goal and support from the authority.

*I would like you to take a minute to imagine the following story. A Greek Cypriot student and a Turkish Cypriot student found an opportunity to meet in a summer camp. Their languages and religions were different but their*

*culture were very similar. Also, both students were very successful dancers. After summer camp, they took a decision to join the world dance contest. Dance School where the students are enrolled supported their decision and students achieved a very important success.*

### **2.2.6.3 No Contact - Control Scenario**

This scenario was simply a control condition in which the participant imagines an outdoor scene. It was designed to compare the effects of the imagined contact conditions.

*I would like you to spend 30 seconds on this visualization. Imagine the means of transport you use and the actions you take, as you travel to university. Imagine the trees, the buildings, the roads you see. Please write down what you imagined in as much detail as you like.*

### **2.2.7 Manipulation Checks**

Manipulation checks were administered to participants to measure the extent to which the scenarios were successful at manipulating the themes of cooperation, common goal, equal status and the support of authority during the conditions. These include “How much did you feel that the Greek Cypriot and Turkish Cypriot students had a common goal (having same goal)? and “In the story, how much did you feel the support of dance schools to students?” Participants answered these questions

with a 7-point scale (1=none and 7 = very much). The items were summed to create a reliable manipulation check measure, ( $\alpha = .92$ ).

### **2.2.8 Intergroup Anxiety**

Intergroup anxiety scale was given to the participants to express their feelings after the imagined intergroup contact sessions and the no-contact control scenario. It was adapted by Stephan and Stephan (1985). It measured how the participant would feel if they were faced with a Greek Cypriot. It included items such as awkward; suspicious; angry; embarrassed; calm annoyed; irritated; frustrated; anxious; tense; furious; comfortable; relaxed; confident; hostile, all were rate between 1 (not at all) and 7 (very much). ( $\alpha = .76$ ).

### **2.2.9 Outgroup Attitude Measure**

Outgroup Attitude measurement assessed attitudes towards the outgroup. Participants were expected to express how they felt towards the outgroup based on a 7-point bipolar scale. Items included were cold-warm, positive-negative, friendly-hostile, suspicious-trusting, respectful-contempt, and admiration-disgust (Wright et al., 1997;  $\alpha = .87$ ).

### **2.2.10 Action Tendency**

The aim of the scale was to measure positive and negative action tendencies towards the outgroup (Paolini, Hewstone & Cairns, 2007). The actions of the people were handled in two groups as positive and negative. For example, for positive action tendencies: "How often do you feel a desire to support Greek Cypriots?" ( $\alpha = .78$ )

and for negative action tendencies “how often do you feel a desire to avoid contact with a Greek Cypriot?” ( $\alpha = .83$ ). Answer options were between 1 (Not at all) and 7 (Very Much).

### **2.2.11 Real behavior**

In order to assess real behavior; the participants were convinced that a Greek Cypriot is in the next room and the participant was asked if they want to interact with them or not. However, the person in the other room was actually a confederate.

## **2.3 Design**

A between-subjects design (optimal vs. standard vs. no contact) was utilized. An experimental questionnaire method was used to explore the effects of optimal imagined contact and standard imagined contact on Turkish Cypriot university students' outgroup attitudes, intergroup anxiety, behavioral intentions and real behaviors towards Greek Cypriots.

## **2.4 Procedure**

The aim and the nature of the study was explained, then the informed consent form was given to the participant to sign if they agreed to participate in the study. Participants were administered the questionnaires in classrooms or quiet settings around the university campus. The participants were assured that participation in the research was voluntary. Following this, the questionnaire package related to contact (quality and quantity of contact, extended contact) was administered first. Then participants were randomly assigned to the one of the optimal vs. standard vs. no-



contact control imagined contact conditions. Participants were unaware of the alternative conditions. Participants were given a minute to imagine. Afterwards, manipulation questions were asked to understand whether the participants are following, or they are asked to write a scenario they have imagined. In this research, our imagined contact scenario included optimal conditions (cooperation, common goal, equal status and authority support) to see the how optimal conditions affect participants' outgroup attitudes, levels of anxiety, behavioral intentions and real behavior. After that, the Intergroup Anxiety scale, Outgroup Attitude measure and Action tendency questionnaire packages were conducted. Additionally, political orientation, involvement in the 1974 war, gender and age were assessed in a demographic form. Next, participants were asked whether they would like to meet with the Greek Cypriot student in the next classroom. After the research was conducted, participants were introduced with the confederate who was referred to as Greek Cypriot student. Following this, the relaxation exercise was applied to make the participant feel more comfortable. Lastly, the debrief form was given to the participant and debriefing was done verbally to ensure that no negative effects occurred as a result of the study and deception.

## **Chapter 3**

### **RESULTS**

#### **3.1 Preliminary Analysis**

##### **3.1.1 Descriptive Statistics**

In order to ensure that participants were influenced by the Cyprus conflict and therefore a worthy group to apply the imagined contact technique involvement in the 1974 war was assessed. Out of the sample, 85.3 % reported relatives having been directly involved in the 1974 war in Cyprus. 78.2 % of participants reported that their relatives experienced displacement after the war and 46.2% of the participants lost their friend(s) or family member(s) in the 1974 war in Cyprus, confirming that the sample was if not directly, but indirectly involved in the conflict of the 1974 war.

Additionally, political orientation was measured. Right wing political orientation was reported by 3.8 % of the participants while 30.8 % reported left-wing political views. Further, 55.8 % participants stated that they did not have any political view so they marked the “none” option while 3.8 % of participants chose “others” option. Due to the lack of variance in political orientation, it was not included in the following analyses.

Finally, a correlation analysis was conducted to assess the role of age on the dependent measures. No significant relationship was obtained between age and any of the variables, and was therefore eliminated from further analyses.

### **3.1.2 Manipulation Check**

Firstly, checks were conducted to ensure that the manipulation of authority, common goal and cooperation factors were successful in the optimal imagined scenario (but not in the standard imagined contact scenarios). The results of independent samples t-test indicated that the two conditions were significantly different in terms of the participant's perception of authority, common goal and cooperation,  $t(105) = -11.2$ ,  $p = .001$ . Those participants in the optimal imagined contact condition reported higher perceptions of authority, common goal and cooperation ( $M = 5.90$ ,  $SD = 1.39$ ) compared to the standard imagined contact condition ( $M = 2.42$ ,  $SD = 1.78$ ).

### **3.2 Correlation Analysis**

A Pearson Correlation Coefficient was conducted to assess the relationship between the study variables, as can be seen in Table 1. Intergroup Anxiety was negatively correlated with feeling thermometer ( $r = -.25$ ,  $N = 153$ ,  $p = .002$ ), quality of contact ( $r = -.33$ ,  $N = 156$ ,  $p = .001$ ), and positive action tendencies ( $r = -.33$ ,  $N = 156$ ,  $p = .001$ ). However, a positive correlation was found between intergroup anxiety and negative action tendencies ( $r = .34$ ,  $N = 156$ ,  $p = .001$ ).

Outgroup attitudes were positively correlated with feeling thermometer ( $r = .63$ ,  $N = 153$ ,  $p = .001$ ), quantity of positive contact ( $r = .45$ ,  $N = 155$ ,  $p = .001$ ), contact quality ( $r = .64$ ,  $N = 156$ ,  $p = .001$ ) and extended contact ( $r = .26$ ,  $N = 156$ ,  $p = .001$ ) but there was a negative relationship between quantity of negative contact ( $r = -.21$ ,  $N = 154$ ,  $p = .007$ ), intergroup anxiety ( $r = -.46$ ,  $N = 156$ ,  $p = .001$ ) and outgroup attitudes .

Over and above, the quantity of positive contact was positively correlated with feeling thermometer ( $r = .60$ ,  $N = 152$ ,  $p = .001$ ), quality of contact ( $r = .47$ ,  $N = 155$ ,

$p=.001$ ), extended contact ( $r=.46$ ,  $N=155$ ,  $p=.001$ ) and positive action tendencies ( $r=-.34$ ,  $N=155$ ,  $p=.001$ ). The quantity of negative contact was negatively correlated with quality of contact ( $r=-.22$ ,  $N=154$ ,  $p=.006$ ) and positively correlated with extended contact ( $r=.19$ ,  $N=154$ ,  $p=.17$ ) and negative action tendencies ( $r=.20$ ,  $N=154$ ,  $p=.013$ ).

There was a significant positive relationship between contact quality and feeling thermometer ( $r=.73$ ,  $N=153$ ,  $p=.001$ ), extended contact ( $r=.33$ ,  $N=156$ ,  $p=.001$ ), positive action tendencies ( $r=.55$ ,  $N=156$ ,  $p=.001$ ). Also contact quality had negative relationship with negative action tendencies ( $r=-.66$ ,  $N=155$ ,  $p=.001$ ). Extended contact was positively correlated with feeling thermometer ( $r=.37$ ,  $N=153$ ,  $p=.001$ ) and positive action tendencies ( $r=.33$ ,  $N=156$ ,  $p=.001$ ). Furthermore, it was negatively correlated with negative action tendencies ( $r=-.22$ ,  $N=156$ ,  $p=.001$ ).

It was found that positive action tendencies were positively correlated with feeling thermometer ( $r=.66$ ,  $N=153$ ,  $p=.001$ ) and outgroup attitude ( $r=.60$ ,  $N=156$ ,  $p=.001$ ). In contrast, negative action tendencies were negatively correlated with feeling thermometer ( $r=-.67$ ,  $N=153$ ,  $p=.001$ ) and positive action tendencies ( $r=-.56$ ,  $N=156$ ,  $p=.001$ ).

Table 1: Pearson Correlation Coefficient Values Among the variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Thermometer	-									
2. Quantity of positive contact	.60**	-								
3. Quantity of negative contact	-.13	.15	-							
4. Quality of contact	.73**	.47**	-.22**	-						
5. Extended contact	.37**	.46**	.19*	.33	-					
6. Real Behavior	-.65	-.07	.11	-.10	.004	-				
7. Intergroup anxiety	-.24**	-.10	.09	-.33**	.09	.06	-			
8. Outgroup attitudes	.63**	.45**	-.21**	.64**	.26**	-.08	-.46**	-		
9. Negative actions	-.67**	-.34**	.20*	-.66**	-.22**	.06	.34**	-.60**	-	
10. Positive actions	.66**	.48**	-.04	.55**	.33**	-.15	-.30**	.60**	-.56**	-

*Note:* \*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2- tailed), \*\* correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2- tailed). Feeling thermometer's values range between 0 to 100, Quality of positive and negative contact, Quality of contact, Intergroup anxiety, Outgroup attitudes, Positive and negative actions ranges between 1 to 7. Also, Story-telling measure from 0 to 4 and 0 to 30 for extended contact measure.

### 3.3 ANCOVA

An ANCOVA was conducted to determine whether a statistically significant difference between the imagined contact scenarios existed on the dependent measures, mainly intergroup anxiety, outgroup attitudes and positive and negative action tendencies while controlling for quantity of positive and negative contact, feeling thermometer, extended contact and quality of contact. All means and standard deviations for each variable are present in table 2. The assumptions of linearity, homogeneity of variances, homogeneity of regression slopes, and reliable measurement of covariates were met. In order to ensure that the groups were not significantly different in their outgroup attitudes at the pre-imagined contact stage, a

one-way ANOVA was conducted on the thermometer dependent measure. No significant difference was obtained,  $F(2, 152) = 2.35, p = .10$ .

### **3.3.1 Intergroup Anxiety**

ANCOVA analysis showed that the experimental manipulation had a significant effect on intergroup anxiety, when the covariate factors were controlled for,  $F(2, 142) = 3.96, p = .021, \eta^2 = 0.12$ . Mean results showed that participants reported more anxiety in the no contact control condition ( $M = 3.07, SD = 1.10$ ) compared to both the optimal ( $M = 2.72, SD = 1.16$ ) and standard imagined contact conditions ( $M = 2.62, SD = 1.21$ ). However, there were no significant differences between standard imagined contact and optimal imagined contact conditions. Furthermore, out of the covariates measured, contact quality had a significant effect on intergroup anxiety,  $F(1, 142) = 7.57, p = .007$ .

### **3.3.2 Outgroup Attitudes**

There was no significant effect of manipulation on outgroup attitude after controlling for the covariates,  $F(1, 142) = 2.29, p = .105$ . However, out of the covariates feeling thermometer  $F(1, 142) = 15.99, p = .001, \eta^2 = .08$  quantity of negative contact  $F(1, 142) = 4.13, p = .044, \eta^2 = .02$  and contact quality  $F(1, 142) = 15.72, p = .001, \eta^2 = .10$  had a significant effect on outgroup attitudes.

### **3.3.3 Negative Action Tendencies**

There was no significant effect of the manipulation on negative action tendencies,  $F(1, 142) = .010, p = .99$ . However, two covariates feeling thermometer  $F(1, 142) = 21.17, p = .001, \eta^2 = .13$  and contact quality  $F(1, 142) = 16.73, p = .001, \eta^2 = .10$  had a significant effect on negative actions.

### 3.3.4 Positive Action Tendencies

Once again, there was no significant effect of the manipulation on positive action tendencies,  $F(1,142) = .432, p = .65$ . Similarly, there was a significant effect of the covariate feeling thermometer,  $F(1,142) = 24.29, p = .001, \eta^2 = .14$

Table 2: Descriptive statistics for all dependent measures based on condition

	No-Contact Control	Standard Imagined Contact	Optimal Imagined Contact
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>
Intergroup Anxiety	3.07 (1.10)	2.62 (1.21)	2.72 (1.16)
Outgroup attitudes	4.31 (1.46)	4.40 (1.65)	4.35 (1.30)
Negative Action Tendency	2.10 (1.29)	2.34 (1.58)	2.57 (1.30)
Positive Action Tendency	3.80 (1.49)	3.66 (1.68)	3.60 (1.62)

### 3.4 Chi-Square Analysis

A chi-square test of independence was conducted to examine the effects of imagined intergroup scenarios on real behavior. The difference between conditions was statistically significant,  $\chi^2(4, N=154) = 28.95, p = .001$ . This result indicated that people who were in the optimal imagined contact condition and standard imagined contact condition were more likely to express wanting to meet with a Greek Cypriot than those in the no contact control condition.

## Chapter 4

### DISCUSSION

Intergroup contact is one of the most effective ways of reducing prejudice. Allport's optimal contact conditions (cooperation, common goal, equal status, and authority's support) have been stressed as being most critical for contact to be successful (Pettigrew, 1998). In contexts in which direct, face-to-face contact is improbable, alternative techniques such as extended or imagined contact are important alternatives. Imagined contact, consisting of different variants, have been shown to have positive effects on attitudes towards outgroups (Miles & Crisp, 2014) and enhance the tendency of the ingroup to establish contact with outgroup members (Husnu & Crisp, 2010). Benefits with respect to a number of dependent measures have been widely studied and documented, but very little research has been conducted on the real behavioral consequences of imagined contact.

In the light of this, the aim of the present research was to apply the imagined contact technique including Allport's optimal conditions to the case of Cyprus, a context of real-life interethnic conflict that still remains today. The aim was to see the effects of imagining contact under the optimal conditions outlined by Allport, on Turkish Cypriot participants' outgroup attitudes, intergroup anxiety, behavioral intentions towards Greek Cypriots and real behavior. Due to the fact that prior contact experiences play an important role in determining one's intergroup attitudes and emotions (Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2005), participants' prior contact



experiences were measured in order to be controlled for when measuring the effects of the imagined contact intervention.

The results from the statistical analyses revealed that the imagined contact task variants were successfully manipulated. Results of the manipulation check showed that those participants in the optimal imagined contact condition reported higher perceptions of authority, common goal and cooperation compared to the standard imagined contact condition. Despite this finding, the first hypothesis, which was that Turkish Cypriots who imagined the 'optimal' imagined contact scenario would report more favorable outgroup attitudes, reduced intergroup anxiety, positive behavioral intentions toward Greek Cypriots compared to those in the 'standard' and 'no-contact control' conditions after controlling for their prior contact experiences (positive/negative direct and indirect contact), was only partially supported. The only significant finding here was that the level of intergroup anxiety was significantly influenced by the imagined contact condition compared to the no contact control condition but not standard imagined contact condition, when controlling for the covariate factors (prior contact measures). Participants' intergroup anxiety levels were significantly higher in the no contact control condition than in the standard contact and optimal contact conditions. This is of importance since intergroup anxiety, simply a negative emotional reaction has consistently been found to be an important mediator between both direct and indirect contact and dependent measures (Miles & Crisp, 2014; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2005; Voci & Hewstone, 2003). Other research findings have shown results that are similar to this. For instance, in one study British undergraduate students who had imagined contact reported a greater approach (vs. avoidance) tendency toward a gay person as a result of reduced

intergroup anxiety (Turner et al., 2013). In addition to this, Husnu and Crisp (2010) also revealed that imagining an elaborated imagined contact helped to reduce intergroup anxiety: in their study non-Muslim British participants reported less anxiety when they imagined interacting with Muslims. Similarly, an imagined contact scenario which included positive information about a stigmatized group (schizophrenic individuals) led to a decrease in intergroup anxiety (West et al., 2011).

Furthermore, when the covariates were accounted for, it was seen that quality of contact significantly decreased intergroup anxiety. In addition to these, we found a negative relationship between intergroup anxiety and positive action tendencies and a positive relationship with negative action tendencies. This situation can be explained as negative behaviors such as swearing, attacking the outgroup and avoidance of contact increasing when the level of intergroup anxiety increases. On the other hand, people's intergroup anxiety decreases when positive behaviors increase, such as helping or supportive behaviors to the outgroup. This result is consistent with Voci and Hewstone's (2003) research in which they found that in a sample of hospital workers and immigrants in Italy, those who had moderate views on intergroup interactions in a workplace had more positive behavioral intentions of contact with members of the other group and less anxiety.

Contrary to our expectations, the results of the present study found no effect of the imagined contact manipulations on outgroup attitudes, negative action tendencies and positive action tendencies. One explanation for the lack of significant findings is that several of the participants who joined the research reported having positive and

negative contact experiences with Greek Cypriots which might have primed their subsequent answers. As part of the research, participants were asked to recall their negative (as well as positive) contact experiences with Greek Cypriots, after which they envisage the positive imagined contact scenario. It is possible that the participants were still under the influence of the negative encounters with Greek Cypriots that were recalled, which may have reduced the effectiveness of the imagined contact task, influencing and potentially reducing the impact of the imagined contact task.

Despite the lack of findings with regards to the task variant, the covariates which were contact quantity and quality as well as feeling thermometer significantly affected the dependent measures. This result is not surprising since quantity and quality of contact has been found to be critical for intergroup relations (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2005). Contact quality, as defined by Islam and Hewstone (1993) includes cooperation and pleasant interactions and is critical for outgroup attitudes and other dependent measures. For instance, in their study conducted in Bangladesh, Islam and Hewstone (1993) found that participants who had positive experiences with the outgroup showed more positive outgroup attitudes in which quality of contact was most effective. Similarly, Wagner et al., (2003) found that people who spent more frequent time (quantity) and higher quality time with someone from the outgroup presented more moderate and positive behaviors towards them and less negative behavioral tendencies such as avoiding contact. Furthermore, researchers showed that people who experienced positive quality interactions with someone from the outgroup showed more positive behavioral tendencies and were more likely to try to establish contact. In line with such findings the current study also highlights the

importance and role of prior contact experiences (whether positive or negative) can play in determining intergroup attitudes, affect and cognitions.

It was also expected that Turkish Cypriots who imagined the 'optimal' imagined contact scenario would be more likely to choose to interact with a Greek Cypriot outside of the laboratory compared to the 'standard' and 'no-contact control' conditions. This was a particularly critical hypothesis to test since research on real behavior in the imagined contact literature is scarce (Turner & West, 2012). This second hypothesis was partially supported. Results showed that the number of participants who were in the optimal imagined contact condition and standard imagined contact condition were significantly more likely to express wanting to meet with a Greek Cypriot compared to those in the no contact control condition. This is in line with previous research which showed that after an imagined contact session, Italian students spent significantly more time with international students than the participants who did not participate the imagined contact session (Vezzali, Crisp, Stathi and Giovannini, 2015). Similar findings have been reported by West et al., (2015) and Turner and West (2012). The study findings have once again showed that imagined contact not only has positive influences (such as increasing positive outgroup attitudes and behavioral intentions) but also reduces negative effects (e.g. reducing intergroup anxiety and reducing avoidance of contact). Previous research showed that participants in the imagined contact condition wanted to learn more about the outgroup and they showed less avoidance towards them than the others (Turner et al., 2013).

The reason why imagined contact and mental simulation might influence real behavior, whether this be in the form of distancing a chair or reporting desire to work with an outgroup member, can be explained using Miles and Crisp's (2014) 'perception-behaviors expressway'. According to the researchers, behavior activation occurs due to its related representations in one's memory (as cited in Dijksterhuis & Bargh, 2001). There is even evidence indicating a relationship between mental simulation and neurological basis of action initiation. Neuropsychological studies have also shown that mental imagery utilizes neurological mechanisms that are similar to those used in memory, emotion and motor control (e.g., Kosslyn, Ganis, & Thompson, 2001). Furthermore, mental simulation plays an active role in the rehearsal, planning and preparation of planned behavior (Marks, 1999). In this way, people are able to exhibit behaviors when they make conscious plans before engaging in the specific actions (Pham & Taylor, 1999). Mental simulation and imagined contact therefore functions as a preparatory tool, in which it mentally prepares the individual for a contact situation by reducing their intergroup anxiety, enhancing positive expectations and increasing positive action tendencies. It is therefore more likely that an individual who has mentally prepared for a contact situation with an outgroup member to approach a contact situation with a more positive and open mind (Husnu & Crisp, 2010; Birtel & Crisp, 2012).

Depending on the current work and previous findings in the literature, it is understood that the imagined contact technique can positively affect real behavior with a member of the outgroup. Therefore, the current study gives significant finding and contribution to the limited literature measuring real behavior. Past research has focused on behavioral intentions, behavioral tendencies (approach/avoid) and contact

motivations, but measuring the actual behavior of people after an imagined contact session is somewhat more critical because people may have difficulty turning their intentions or motivations into real behavior. Past research has shown the positive effects of imagined contact on behavioral intentions (Husnu & Crisp, 2010) however Sheeran (2002) reported that sometimes there is no significant correlation between intentions and actual behaviors. Correspondingly, the intentions of the participants for contact with the outgroup may not always reflect the reality and it may not be enough to measure only behavioral intentions to contact. Similarly, after imagined contact, perceptions, intentions and attitudes between the groups are measured by using self-reported measurement. In self-reported measurements, participants may give answers that are appropriate to the expectations and are socially acceptable or they can modify their answers (Miles & Crisp, 2014). Measurement of actual behavior is very important to prevent demand characteristic and observe real behaviors. The current research adds to the literature by examining the effects of optimal imagined contact, standard imagined contact and no contact control condition on real interactions with someone from the outgroup in the Cyprus context. Specifically, optimal and standard contact conditions had more of an effect on real behavior than no-contact control condition.

A significant difference was not obtained between the standard and optimal contact conditions on any of the dependent measures; in fact, intergroup anxiety was reduced more so in the standard condition as opposed to the optimal condition. It might be that, as suggested by Miles and Crisp (2014) there is a 'mere exposure' effect of imagined of imagined contact which is sufficient to create an effect. However, more effective task variants are necessary to go beyond the 'mere exposure' effect.

This research, however, has a number of limitations. Firstly, we have tested only Turkish Cypriot students, and did not include Greek Cypriot students in the current research, but it is likely that the effect of imagined contact may vary depending on the social and cultural structure of the groups (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). It would therefore be important and interesting to see the perspective of the Greek Cypriot population to see if similar findings would be obtained. Therefore, future research should take into consideration the experiences of participants from both sides of the divide. Further, we tested only young adults aged between 18 to 25 years, yet there are older people in Cyprus who have experienced the war directly. Their prior contact experiences may be different, which may have influenced the outcome measures. Also both young and the elderly population in Northern and Southern Cyprus should be examined in order to be able to better examine the discrimination faced by young people and the elderly people.

In the imagined contact scenario of the present research, we asked the participants to imagine the meeting and success story of a Turkish Cypriot student and a Greek Cypriot peer. Moreover, the participants imagined the contact scenario from a third party perspective, which may have reduced the impact of the manipulation. Future research could create an imagined contact scenario in which an individual can imagine themselves having contact with an outgroup member under the optimal conditions. Similarly, in the present research, how individuals identify themselves with the characters in the scenario was not measured. Ingroup identification has an important role on the imagined contact effect. Stathi and Crisp (2008) suggested that participants with higher level of ingroup identification displayed less positive attitudes towards the outgroup after imagined contact compared to those who have

low level ingroup identification. It is therefore important to measure participants' pre-existing levels of identification prior to the imagined contact manipulation, and controlling this before implementing the technique. Relatedly, identification with the characters of the scenario might also play a role, participants may have identified with the character (or not), once again influencing the results. Therefore, identification with character of the imagined contact scenario should also be controlled for to increase the imagined contact effects.

Previous contact experiences were asked before manipulation in previous imagined contact studies (Husnu, Mertan & Cicek, 2016; Voci & Hewstone, 2003). This can be another limitation of the present research. As stated above, we first measured contact quality of the participants with the outgroup, then we asked about the quantity of contact which can be positive or negative encounters in everyday life. After which the number of positive and negative stories they listened to in their families about the Greek Cypriots that occurred during war were asked to the participants. After this stage we asked the participants to imagine a positive imagined contact story. As a result, the participants might have been primed with negative thoughts, which may have led to the imagined contact effects to be reduced. Paolini, Harwood and Rubin (2010) for instance found that negative contact leads to a higher attention to group membership compared to a positive contact experience, hence although positive contact experiences are reportedly more frequent, negative contact experiences are more effective in determining outgroup relations. In order to assess prior contact but at the same time utilize the technique without priming participants with their negative life experiences, a longitudinal study might be implemented First



participants' previous contacts with the outgroup members can be measured, after a few months passed imagined contact can be applied to the participants.

Additionally the order of the dependent measures were not counterbalanced which might also have influenced the effectiveness of the technique. Future studies should ensure to counterbalance the order of dependent variables.

Despite these limitations, there are a number of practical implications of the current research findings. As previously mentioned, imagined contact with the outgroup has many positive influences on intergroup relations. The most common of these, also found in this research, is helping to reduce the intergroup anxiety towards contact with the outgroup (Turner et al., 2007; Stathi & Crisp, 2008, Birtel & Crisp, 2012; Tsantila & Crisp, 2012). The imagined contact technique with optimal conditions positively affects anxiety reduction and actual interactions with outgroup members. People who are in a minority group might be afraid of being exposed to discrimination, exclusion from society and they can feel anxiety and their identities or self-esteem can be threatened (Greenland & Brown, 1999). Using imagined contact (including optimal conditions) can help to reduce these negative feelings and increase positive encounters with members of the outgroup.

The current study only included a one-minute visualization technique. Past research has included a number of different durations (3 minutes, a day's delay) and no significant effect of this has been obtained (Miles & Crisp, 2014). It would however be useful to find out how long the effectiveness of the task lasts in order to establish an intervention program based on imagined contact.

Additionally, the imagined contact studies so far have generally been tested in the laboratory settings (Crisp et al., 2009). Unlike such studies, we have investigated the effect of imagined contact in a real life context, outside of the laboratory. Testing of the imagined contact technique outside the laboratory is critical since it can be used in many areas in real life such as educational settings. Using the imagined contact technique in an educational setting is very important because exposure to prejudice is very high in schools with high ethnic diversity. In fact, one of the most important ways to reduce bias is cross-group friendship (Wright et al., 1997). In educational settings; children should be encouraged to make friends who are from different groups. Thus, the quality and frequency of the contact is increased by providing cross-group friendship (Turner & Cameron, 2016). Applying the imagined contact technique in universities (especially multicultural universities) or multicultural school settings can cause a decrease in intergroup anxiety and enhance positive relations. In terms of the Cyprus context, it can reduce the prejudice felt by students, especially at universities because all universities consist of international students in Cyprus (Tsiakkiros & Pashiardis, 2002). It can, moreover, reduce Turkish Cypriots' intergroup anxiety towards Greek Cypriots. Students can also be prepared for real contact by initially reducing their intergroup anxiety, which can be implemented with imagined contact. Students can participate in imagined contact sessions before engaging in real contact.

From a different viewpoint, the quality of past contact has a significant effect on intergroup anxiety. For this reason, student-focused activities can be organized among the universities in the two communities in order to increase the quality of the contact. For example, exchange programs or scientific studies can be conducted

including students from two communities which require cooperation to increase quality of contact and decrease intergroup anxiety. All of these suggestions can be implemented as an integrated intervention to help produce positive outgroup attitudes and harmonious intergroup relations (Turner & Cameron, 2016). In this way, optimal conditions can be transformed to real life experiences.

The imagined contact technique and related interventions which were designed to increase the quantity and quality of contact need not only be used in universities but also during childhood years. From a social developmental perspective middle childhood is a critical period in which to intervene since attitudes have not yet crystallized and can still be malleable (Husnu et al., 2016). Past research has shown that young adults exposed to prejudice in their childhood were more likely to experience leaving school, unemployment and economic difficulties (White & McManus, 2015). Therefore, interventions which focuses on reducing negative outgroup perceptions at early ages positively affect their intergroup relations in the following years (Gurin, Nagda & Lopez, 2004). Therefore, the imagined contact technique can play an important role in increasing the tolerance to each other in schoolchildren (Crisp, Stathi, Turner & Husnu, 2009).

It would be beneficial to apply imagined contact as part of an intervention package that includes both extended and direct contact. Applying this to the case of Cyprus, this could be implemented in three main steps. Initially, primary school children would be asked to imagine meeting a Greek Cypriot child under optimal conditions. Thus, their intergroup anxiety and behavioral avoidance towards the outgroup will be reduced and positive behavioral intentions will be increased (imagined contact

phase). In the second phase, a confederate could be introduced who has a Greek Cypriot friend, this confederate would be asked to share his/her positive experiences and opinions about the Greek Cypriot friend (extended contact phase). At the end of these two phases, their positive outgroup attitudes and positive approach-oriented intentions and motivations could be increased. In the third phase, Turkish Cypriot children would meet with Greek Cypriot children (direct contact phase). This real interaction between children could be implemented in schools throughout Cyprus on a regular basis, preparing children for a potential future of reconciliation.

Relatedly, according to the present study the quantity of negative contact had a major effect on outgroup attitude. Employees and volunteers of NGOs (non-governmental organizations) can organize seminars, conferences or workshops that will encourage the two communities to become more aware and learn about each other. These organizations can help the two communities to correct their false beliefs about each other. Participation in these organizations can increase both the quantity of contacts and the positive outgroup perception.

Similarly, policy makers can support rules and regulations that will support opportunities to increase contact between two communities in Cyprus. Noor, Brown, Gonzalez, Manzi and Lewis, (2008) suggested that policies, rules and laws which are carried out to ensure peace between the two communities significantly affects the reconciliation process (as cited in Stathi, Husnu & Pendleton, 2017).

The positive effects of imagined contact are not limited to school and social environments, it also plays an important role in business settings. Today, companies

have a very rich potential in terms of human diversity. Lots of people from different cultures, sexual orientations and races work under one roof (Birtel & Crisp, 2012). The imagined contact method that is an important tool for decreasing intergroup anxiety within a such setting. Further, quality of contact can help to increase positive outgroup attitudes and action tendencies toward enhancing harmony between groups.

Lemmer and Wagner (2015) pointed out that contact-based interventions positively affect outgroup attitudes and this intervention technique is successful even in communities which have experienced intergroup conflict in the past. To sum up, through the use of policy makers and professionals' support, interventions such as imagined contact can be applied to real life settings of conflict in the hope of ameliorating intergroup relations for peaceful reconciliation between groups.

## REFERENCES

- Allport, G. W. (1954). *Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge/Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Aronson, E., & Patnoe, S. (1997). *The jigsaw classroom. Building cooperation in the classroom*. New York: Longman.
- Barlow, F. K., Paolini, S., Pedersen, A., Hornsey, M. J., Radke, H. R., Harwood, J., Rubin, M., & Sibley, C. G. (2012). The contact caveat: Negative contact predicts increased prejudice more than positive contact predicts reduced prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38(12), 1629-1643.
- Brambilla, M., Ravenna, M., & Hewstone, M. (2012). Changing stereotype content through mental imagery: Imagining intergroup contact promotes stereotype change. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 15(3), 305-315.
- Bettencourt, B. A., Brewer, M. B., Croak, M. R., & Miller, N. (1992). Cooperation and the reduction of intergroup bias: The role of reward structure and social orientation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 28(4), 301-319.
- Birtel, M. D., & Crisp, R. J. (2012). Imagining intergroup contact is more cognitively difficult for people higher in intergroup anxiety but this does not detract from its effectiveness. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 15(6), 744-761

- Brewer, M. B. (1999). The psychology of prejudice: Ingroup love and outgroup hate? *Journal of Social Issues, 55*(3), 429-444.
- Brown, R., & Paterson, J. (2016). Indirect contact and prejudice reduction: limits and possibilities. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 11*, 20-24.
- Brown, R.J. (1995). *Prejudice: Its social psychology*. Oxford: Blackwell
- Cameron, L., Rutland, A., Brown, R., & Douch, R. (2006). Changing children's intergroup attitudes toward refugees: Testing different models of extended contact. *Child development, 77*(5), 1208-1219.
- Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2009). Can imagined interactions produce positive perceptions?: Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. *American Psychologist, 64*(4), 231.
- Crisp, R. J., Stathi, S., Turner, R. N., & Husnu, S. (2009). Imagined intergroup contact: Theory, paradigm and practice. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 3*(1), 1-18.
- Crisp, R. J., Husnu, S., Meleady, R., Stathi, S., & Turner, R. N. (2010). From imagery to intention: A dual route model of imagined contact effects. *European review of Social Psychology, 21*(1), 188-236.

- Crosby, F., Bromley, S., & Saxe, L. (1980). Recent unobtrusive studies of black and white discrimination and prejudice: A literature review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 87(3), 546-563.
- Dijksterhuis, A., & Bargh, J. A. (2001). The perception-behavior expressway: Automatic effects of social perception on social behavior. *Advances in experimental social psychology*, 33, 1-40.
- Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2005). Beyond the optimal strategy: A reality check for the contact hypothesis. *American Psychologist*, 60, 697-711.
- Dovidio, J. F., Eller, A., & Hewstone, M. (2011). Improving intergroup relations through direct, extended and other forms of indirect contact. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 14(2), 147-160.
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Kawakami, K. (2003). Intergroup contact: The past, present, and the future. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 6(1), 5-21.
- DuBois, D., & Hirsch, B. (1990). School and neighbourhood friendship patterns of Blacks and Whites in early adolescence. *Child Development*, 61, 524-536
- Greenland, K., & Brown, R. (1999). Categorization and intergroup anxiety in contact between British and Japanese nationals. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29(4), 503-521.



- Gurin, P., Nagda, B. R. A., & Lopez, G. E. (2004). The benefits of diversity in education for democratic citizenship. *Journal of social issues, 60*(1), 17-34.
- Haddock, G., Zanna, M. P., & Esses, V. M. (1993). Assessing the structure of prejudicial attitudes: The case of attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 65*(6), 1105.
- Hadjipavlou, M. (2007). The Cyprus conflict: Root causes and implications for peacebuilding. *Journal of Peace Research, 44*(3), 349-365.
- 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*(6), 1192.
- Hewstone, M. ve R. Brown, (1986) "Contact is not Enough: An Intergroup Perspective on the 'Contact Hypothesis'", In M. Hewstone ve R. Brown (Eds), *Contact and Conflict in Intergroup Encounters*, Blackwell, Cambridge. MA: Addison-Wesley
- Husnu, S., & Crisp, R. J. (2010). Imagined intergroup contact: A new technique for encouraging greater inter-ethnic contact in Cyprus. *Peace and Conflict, 16*(1), 97-108.
- Husnu, S., & Crisp, R. J. (2015). Perspective-taking mediates the imagined contact effect. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 44*, 29-34.

Husnu, S., & Lajunen, T. (2015). Predictors of intergroup bias in Turkish Cypriots. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 44*, 63-71.

Husnu, S., Mertan, B., & Cicek, O. (2016). Reducing Turkish Cypriot children's prejudice toward Greek Cypriots: Vicarious and extended intergroup contact through storytelling. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 14*, 193-206.

Islam, M. R., & Hewstone, M. (1993). Dimensions of contact as predictors of intergroup anxiety, perceived out-group variability, and outgroup attitude: An integrative model. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*, 700–710. doi: 10.1177/0146167293196005.

Jones, J. M. (1972). *Prejudice and Racism*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Kosslyn, S. M., Ganis, G., & Thompson, W. L. (2001). Neural foundations of imagery. *Nature Reviews Neuroscience, 2, 9*, 635-642.

Kuchenbrandt, D., Eyssel, F., & Seidel, S. K. (2013). Cooperation makes it happen: Imagined intergroup cooperation enhances the positive effects of imagined contact. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 16(5)*, 635-647.

- Lancee, B., & Dronkers, J. (2011). Ethnic, religious and economic diversity in Dutch neighbourhoods: Explaining quality of contact with neighbours, trust in the neighbourhood and inter-ethnic trust. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 37(4), 597-618.
- Lemmer, G., & Wagner, U. (2015). Can we really reduce ethnic prejudice outside the lab? A meta-analysis of direct and indirect contact interventions. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 45(2), 152-168.
- Marks, D. F. (1999). Consciousness, mental imagery and action. *British Journal of Psychology*, 90, 567–585.
- Mehmet, O. (1992). Towards a solution in Cyprus through economic federalism. Salem (Ed.), *Cyprus: A regional conflict and its resolution* (pp. 169–186). London: Macmillan.
- Mertan, B. (2011). Children's perception of national identity and in-group/out-group attitudes: Turkish-Cypriot school children. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 8(1), 74-86.
- Miles, E., & Crisp, R. J. (2014). A meta-analytic test of the imagined contact hypothesis. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 17(1), 3-26.

- Molina, L. E., & Wittig, M. A. (2006). Relative importance of contact conditions in explaining prejudice reduction in a classroom context: Separate and equal?. *Journal of Social Issues, 62*(3), 489-509.
- Noor, M., Brown, R., Gonzalez, R., Manzi, J., & Lewis, C. A. (2008). On positive psychological outcomes: What helps groups with a history of conflict to forgive and reconcile with each other?. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*(6), 819-832.
- Page-Gould, E., Mendoza-Denton, R., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). With a little help from my cross-group friend: reducing anxiety in intergroup contexts through cross-group friendship. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 95*(5), 1080.
- Pagotto, L., Visintin, E. P., De Iorio, G., & Voci, A. (2013). Imagined intergroup contact promotes cooperation through outgroup trust. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 16*(2), 209-216.
- Paolini, S., Harwood, J., & Rubin, M. (2010). Negative intergroup contact makes group memberships salient: Explaining why intergroup conflict endures. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*(12), 1723-1738.
- Paolini, S., Harwood, J., Rubin, M., Husnu, S., Joyce, 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*(6), 548-562.

- 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 an anxiety reduction mechanism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 770–786.
- Paolini, S., Hewstone, M., & Cairns, E. (2007). Direct and indirect intergroup friendship effects: Testing the moderating role of the affective-cognitive bases of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*(10), 1406-1420.
- Paolini, S., Tausch, N.T., Turner, R. N., Hewstone, M., Voci, A., & Vonofakou, C. (2008). A test of the extended intergroup contact hypothesis: The mediating role of intergroup anxiety, perceived ingroup and outgroup norms, and inclusion of the outgroup in the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 843–860.
- Papadakis, Y. (2008). Narrative, Memory and History Education in Divided Cyprus: A Comparison of Schoolbooks on the" History of Cyprus". *History & Memory, 20*(2), 128-148.
- Patchen, M. (1982). *Black-White contact inschools: Its social and academic effects*. Purdue University Press.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual review of psychology, 49*(1), 65-85.

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

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2013). *When groups meet: The dynamics of intergroup contact*. Newyork, NY: Psychology Press.

Pham, L. B., & Taylor, S. E. (1999). From thought to action: Effects of process-versus outcome-based mental simulations on performance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *25*, 250-260.

Ratcliff, C. D., Czuchry, M., Scarberry, N. C., Thomas, J. C., Dansereau, D. F., & Lord, C. G. (1999). Effects of Directed Thinking on Intentions to Engage in Beneficial Activities: Actions Versus Reasons<sup>1</sup>. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *29*(5), 994-1009.

Reicher, S., (1986) “Contact, Action and Racialization: Some British Evidence”, *Contact and Conflict in Inter-group Encounters*, M. Hewstone and R. Brown, Basil Blackwell, Oxford.

Robinson Jr, J. W., & Preston, J. D. (1976). Equal-status contact and modification of racial prejudice: A reexamination of the contact hypothesis. *Social Forces*, *54*(4), 911-924.

- Sheeran, P. (2002). Intention—behavior relations: A conceptual and empirical review. *European review of social psychology, 12*(1), 1-36.
- Sherif, M. (1961). *The Robbers Cave experiment: Intergroup conflict and cooperation*. Wesleyan University Press.
- Singer, H. A. (1948). The veteran and race relations. *The Journal of Educational Sociology, 21*(7), 397-408.
- Stathi, S., & Crisp, R. J. (2008). Imagining contact promotes projection to outgroups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*, 943–957.
- Stathi, S., Husnu, S., & Pendleton, S. (2017). Intergroup contact and contact norms as predictors of post conflict forgiveness. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 21*(1), 20.
- Stathi, S., Tsantila, K., & Crisp, R. J. (2012). Imagining intergroup contact can combat mental health stigma by reducing anxiety, avoidance and negative stereotyping. *The Journal of social psychology, 152*(6), 746-757.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup Anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues, 41*, 157–176.
- Stouffer, S. A. (1949). An analysis of conflicting social norms. *American Sociological Review, 14*(6), 707-717.

Suarez-Orozco, C., & Suarez-Orozco, M. M. (2009). *Children of immigration*. Retrieved from [https:// books.google.com.cy](https://books.google.com.cy)

Tausch, N., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J. B., Psaltis, C., Schmid, K., Popan, J. R., & Hughes, J. (2010). Secondary transfer effects of intergroup contact: Alternative accounts and underlying processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 99*, 282–302.

Ten Eyck, L. L., Labansat, H. A., Gresky, D. M., Dansereau, D. F., & Lord, C. G. (2006). Effects of directed thinking on intentions to engage in beneficial activities: Idea generation or mental simulation?. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 36*(5), 1234-1262.

Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005). Relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science, 16*(12), 951-957.

Tsiakkiros, A., & Pashiardis, P. (2002). Strategic planning and education: the case of Cyprus. *International Journal of Educational Management, 16*(1), 6-17.

Turner, R. N., & Cameron, L. (2016). Confidence in Contact: A New Perspective on Promoting Cross-Group Friendship Among Children and Adolescents. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 10*(1), 212-246.



- Turner, R. N., & Crisp, R. J. (2010). Imagining intergroup contact reduces implicit prejudice. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 49*(1), 129-142.
- Turner, R. N., Crisp, R. J., & Lambert, E. (2007). Imagining intergroup contact can improve intergroup attitudes. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 10*(4), 427-441.
- Turner, R. N., West, K., & Christie, Z. (2013). Out group trust, intergroup anxiety, and out group attitude as mediators of the effect of imagined intergroup contact on intergroup behavioral tendencies. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 43*(S2), E196-E205.
- Turner, R. N., & West, K. (2012). Behavioural consequences of imagining intergroup contact with stigmatized outgroups. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 15*(2), 193-202.
- Vezzali, L., Crisp, R. J., Stathi, S., & Giovannini, D. (2015). Imagined intergroup contact facilitates intercultural communication for college students on academic exchange programs. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 18*(1), 66-75.
- Voci, A., & Hewstone, M. (2003). Intergroup contact and prejudice toward immigrants in Italy: The mediational role of anxiety and the moderational role of group salience. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 6*(1), 37-54.

- Wagner, U., Van Dick, R., Pettigrew, T. F., & Christ, O. (2003). Ethnic prejudice in East and West Germany: The explanatory power of intergroup contact. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 6(1), 22-36
- Walker, I., & Crogan, M. (1998). Academic performance, prejudice, and the jigsaw classroom: New pieces to the puzzle. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 8(6), 381-393.
- Webster, C., & Timothy, D. J. (2006). Travelling to the 'other side': The occupied zone and Greek Cypriot views of crossing the Green Line. *Tourism Geographies*, 8(2), 162-181.
- West, K., & Bruckmüller, S. (2013). Nice and easy does it: How perceptual fluency moderates the effectiveness of imagined contact. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 49(2), 254-262.
- West, K., Turner, R., & Levita, L. (2015). Applying imagined contact to improve physiological responses in anticipation of intergroup interactions and the perceived quality of these interactions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 45, 425–436. doi:10.1111/jasp.12309.
- Wolfe, C. T., & Spencer, S. J. (1996). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their overt and subtle influence in the classroom. *The American Behavioral Scientist*, 40(2), 176.

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.

White, P. H., & McManus, M. (2015). Investing in the Health and Well-Being of Young Adults. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 57(1), 126.

## **APPENDICES**

## Appendix A: Prior Contact Measure

### Sosyal konular içerikli bir çalışma

Aşağıda ‘duygu termometresi’ adlı bir ölçek kullanılmıştır. Havanın sıcaklığını ölçen bir termometre gibi 0°den 100°ye kadar artarak giden bir ölçek düşününüz. Bu ölçek, sizin Kıbrıslı Rumlara karşı olan genel duygularınızı termometreyi kullanarak belirlemenizi istiyor.

<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
0°	10°	20°	30°	40°	50°	60°	70°	80°	90°	100°
<i>Çok soğuk</i>										<i>Çok sıcak</i>

### **Günlük hayatınızla ilgili şu soruları lütfen cevaplandırınız.**

Günlük hayatınızda ne sıklıkla Kıbrıslı Rumlarla olumlu geçen görüşmeleriniz olur?

<i>Hiç bir zaman</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Çok Sıklıkla</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Günlük hayatınızda ne sıklıkla Kıbrıslı Rumlarla olumsuz geçen görüşmeleriniz olur?

<i>Hiç bir zaman</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Çok Sıklıkla</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

### **Kıbrıslı Rumlarla olan görüşmelerinizi nasıl tanımladınız...**

<i>Yüzeysel</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Derin</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<i>Doğal</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Zoraki</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<i>Huzursuz</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Huzurlu</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<i>Rekabetçi</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Uzlaşmacı</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<i>Yakın</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Uzak</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

## Appendix B: Story-telling Measure

Aşağıdaki soruları okuyarak doğru cevabı yuvarlak içine alınız.

Aile üyelerinizden herhangi biri (anne, baba, nene, dede, akraba veya kardeş) size savaş sırasında Kıbrıslı Rumlarla aralarında geçen olumsuz veya üzücü hikayeler anlatmışlar mıydı? (sayılar size bu hikayeleri anlatan kişi sayısını temsil etmektedir)

Hiç	1	2-5	5-10	10'dan fazla
-----	---	-----	------	--------------

Aile üyelerinizden herhangi biri (anne, baba, nene, dede, akraba veya kardeş) size savaş sırasında olumlu sayılan ve Kıbrıslı Rumlarla Türklerin dayanışmasını anlatan hikayeler anlatmışlar mıydı? (sayılar size bu hikayeleri anlatan kişi sayısını temsil etmektedir)

Hiç	1	2-5	5-10	10'dan fazla
-----	---	-----	------	--------------

## Appendix C: Cross-group – Extended Contact Measure

Aşağıdaki soruları okuyarak doğru cevabı yuvarlak içine alınız.

Kaç tane Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşınız var? (ör. İsimlerini bildiğiniz, kolaylıkla konuştuğunuz, sıkça görüştüğünüz, kendinizi yakın hissettiğiniz; sayılar kişi sayısını temsil etmektedir).

0 1 2-3 4-6 7-10 11-15 16-20 21-30 30'dan fazla

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

0 1 2-3 4-6 7-10 11-15 16-20 21-30 30'dan fazla

En yakın Kıbrıslı Türk arkadaşlarınızı düşündüğünüzde, kaç tanesinin Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşı vardır?

0 1 2-3 4-6 7-10 11-15 16-20 21-30 30'dan fazla

Kıbrıslı Türk komşularınız ve tanıdıklarınızı düşündüğünüzde kaç tanesinin Kıbrıslı Rum arkadaşı vardır?

0 1 2-3 4-6 7-10 11-15 16-20 21-30 30'dan fazla

## **Appendix D: Optimal Imagined Contact Scenario**

*Şimdi sizden bir senaryo hayal etmenizi isteyeceğim;*

*Kıbrıs'ta her sene Kıbrıslı Rum ve Kıbrıslı Türk öğrencilerin katıldığı Gençlik kampları düzenlenmektedir. Bu kamplara Güney Kıbrıs'tan ve Kuzey Kıbrıs'tan birçok üniversite öğrencisi katılmaktadır. 2 yıl önce çok başarılı bir dansçı olan, birçok yarışmaya katılıp önemli başarılar elde eden ve Kıbrıslı Rum olan Eirene isimli öğrenci ve Türkiye'de ve Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta birçok dans yarışmasına katılarak önemli başarılar elde eden Barış isimli Kıbrıslı Türk öğrenci kampta karşılaşarak tanıştılar. Bu kamp sayesinde birbirlerini tanıma fırsatı buldular. Kamp süresince benzerliklerinin farklılıklarından daha fazla olduğunu öğrendiler. Dilleri ve dinleri farklıydı ama yaşam şekilleri birbirine çok benziyordu. Örneğin folklorleri, halk dansları, yemekleri hemen hemen aynıydı. Bu kamptan sonra da birbirleriyle görüşmeye devam ettiler ve beraber Dans Dünya Kupası'na katılma kararı aldılar. Her ikisinin de kayıtlı olduğu dans okulları ile görüşerek bu düşüncelerini dans okullarının yönetimleri ile paylaştılar. Her iki dans okulu da bu konuya çok ılımlı bakarak yapılması gereken her şeyi yapacaklarını ve desteklerinin tam olacağını bildirdiler. Uzun bir çalışma döneminin sonunda dans okullarının da ortak desteği ve ikisinin ortak performanslarıyla bu yarışmaya katılarak çok önemli bir başarı elde ettiler. Tüm dünyaya bağlı oldukları iki topluluğun beraber çok güzel işler gerçekleştirebilceğinin mesajını verdiler.*



## Appendix E: Standard Imagined Contact Scenario

*Şimdi sizden bir senaryo hayal etmenizi isteyeceğim;*

*Kıbrıs'ta her sene Kıbrıslı Rum ve Kıbrıslı Türk öğrencilerin katıldığı Gençlik kampları düzenlenmektedir. Bu kamplara Güney Kıbrıs'tan ve Kuzey Kıbrıs'tan birçok üniversite öğrencisi katılmaktadır. Bu kampların amacı Kıbrıslı Rum ve Kıbrıslı Türk öğrencilerin etkileşimini sağlamak ve birbirlerini tanımalarına yardımcı olmaktır. Kamplara katılım her geçen yıl artmaktadır ve katılan öğrenciler çok güzel zaman geçirmektedir. 2 yıl önce çok başarılı bir dansçı olan, bir çok yarışmaya katılıp önemli başarılar elde eden ve Kıbrıslı Rum olan Eirene isimli öğrenci ve Türkiye'de ve Kuzey Kıbrıs'ta birçok dans yarışmasına katılarak önemli başarılar elde eden Barış isimli Kıbrıslı Türk öğrenci kampta karşılaşarak tanıştılar. Her ikisinin de dansçı olması onları birbirine yakınlaştırdı. Bu kamp sayesinde birbirlerini tanıma fırsatı buldular. Kamp süresince benzerliklerinin farklılıklarından daha fazla olduğunu öğrendiler. Dilleri ve dinleri farklıydı ama yaşam şekilleri birbirine çok benziyordu. Örneğin folklorleri, halk dansları, yemekleri hemen hemen aynıydı. İkiside çok başarılı birer dansçı oldukları ve kamp süresince hobilerinin ve ortak özelliklerinin benzer olduğunu fark ettikleri için kamp süresince çok güzel zaman geçirdiler.*

## **Appendix F: No-Contact Control Scenario**

Bu bölümde, bir dakika boyunca dışarıda yürüdüğünüzü hayal etmenizi istiyoruz. Hayalinizdeki bu senaryoda etrafınızda çeşitli öğelerin varlığını hayal edebilirsiniz (ör. deniz, orman, ağaçlar, tepeler, gün batımı). Etrafınızdaki farklı ağaçları, dağları, tepeleri, gün batımını düşününüz, yürüyüş sırasında düşündüklerinizi ve neler hissettiğinizi hayal ediniz. Lütfen bu sahneyi olabildiğince canlı ve zengin detaylarıyla zihninizde yaratmaya çalışınız. Yazdığınız bu hayali bir başkası okuduğu takdirde sahneyi detaylarıyla anlayabilmelidir. Tabi ki paylaşmak istemediğiniz detayları yazmak zorunda değilsiniz. Hayalinizi açıklarken en az bir paragraf uzunluğunda olmasına dikkat ediniz. Lütfen aşağıdaki boşluğu kullanarak istediğiniz kadar detayla hayalinizde oluşan senaryoyu yazınız.

## Appendix G: Manipulation Checks

*Asađıda anlatılan hikaye ile ilgili çeřitli sorular sorulmuřtur. Lütfen soruları okuyarak size en yakın olan cevabı iřaretleyiniz.*

Anlatılan hikayede Kıbrıslı Rum öđrenci ve Kıbrıslı Türk öđrencinin ortak bir amaç dođrultusunda (aynı hedefe sahip) olduđunu ne kadar hissettiniz?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok Fazla

Anlatılan hikayede Kıbrıslı Rum öđrenci ve Kıbrıslı Türk öđrencinin iřbirliđi (birlikte çalıřmak, birbirine destek) içinde olduđunu hissedebildiniz mi veya ne kadar hissettiniz?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok Fazla

Anlatılan hikayede Kıbrıslı Rum öđrenci ve Kıbrıslı Türk öđrencilerin kayıtlı olduđu Dans Okullarının öđrencilerin verdiđi kararı desteklediđini ne kadar hissettiniz?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok Fazla

## Appendix H: Intergroup Anxiety Scale

Şimdi ise bu hayal sırasında hissettiğiniz duyguları ifade etmenizi rica edeceğiz. Aşağıdaki her bir cümleyi okuduktan sonra ölçeği kullanarak hissettiğiniz duyguları ifade ediniz.

Bu görüşmeyi ne derecede \_\_\_\_\_ buldunuz?

1. keyifli?	<i>Hiç</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Oldukça</i>
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
2. rahat?	<i>Hiç</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Oldukça</i>
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
3. stres verici?	<i>Hiç</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Oldukça</i>
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
4. yüzeysel?	<i>Hiç</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Oldukça</i>
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
5. sıkıcı?	<i>Hiç</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Oldukça</i>
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
6. resmi?	<i>Hiç</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Oldukça</i>
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
7. sürükleyici?	<i>Hiç</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Oldukça</i>
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
8. kaygı yaratıcı?	<i>Hiç</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Oldukça</i>
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

## Appendix I: Outgroup Attitudes Measure

Kurduğunuz hayal bir tarafa, aşağıda tekrar algı ve tutumlarınızı öğrenmeyi amaçladığımız sorular bulunmaktadır.

Aşağıdaki ölçeği kullanarak lütfen Kıbrıslı Rumlar hakkındaki genel duygularınızı belirtiniz.

<i>Soğuk</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Sıcak</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<i>Olumlu</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Olumsuz</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<i>Arkadaşça</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Düşmanca</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<i>Kuşkucu</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Güven dolu</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<i>Saygılı</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Saygısız</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
<i>Takdire değer</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>İğrenme</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

## Appendix J: Action Tendency Measure

Aşağıdaki ölçekleri kullanarak Kıbrıslı Rumlara karşı olan davranışları ne sıklıkla yaptığınızı belirtiniz.

Ne sıklıkla Kıbrıslı Rumlardan uzak kalmayı arzularsınız?

<i>Hiç bir zaman</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Çok sıklıkla</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Ne sıklıkla Kıbrıslı Rumlarla görüşmeyi arzularsınız?

<i>Hiç bir zaman</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Çok sıklıkla</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Ne sıklıkla Kıbrıslı Rumlara yardımcı olmayı arzularsınız?

<i>Hiç bir zaman</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Çok sıklıkla</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Ne sıklıkla Kıbrıslı Rumların adayı terk etmelerini arzularsınız?

<i>Hiç bir zaman</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Çok sıklıkla</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Ne sıklıkla Kıbrıslı Rumlara destek olmayı arzularsınız?

<i>Hiç bir zaman</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Çok sıklıkla</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Ne sıklıkla Kıbrıslı Rumlar hakkında daha fazla bilgi edinmeyi arzularsınız?

<i>Hiç bir zaman</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Çok sıklıkla</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Ne sıklıkla Kıbrıslı Rumları sözlerle (ör. küfretmek, aşağılamak, vb.) yaralamayı arzularsınız?

<i>Hiç bir zaman</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Çok sıklıkla</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

Ne sıklıkla Kıbrıslı Rumları fiziksel olarak (ör. saldırmak, vurmak, vb.) yaralamayı arzularsınız?

<i>Hiç bir zaman</i>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<i>Çok sıklıkla</i>
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	

## Appendix K: Demographic Information Form

Son olarak elimizde bu bilgilerin oluşu bize çok yardımcı olacaktır:

**Cinsiyetiniz:** Kadın \_\_\_\_\_ Erkek \_\_\_\_\_ **Yaşınız:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Politik Görüş:** Sol \_\_\_\_\_ Sağ \_\_\_\_\_ Hiç \_\_\_\_\_ Diğer (Lütfen Belirtiniz) \_\_\_\_\_

**Uyruk:** KKTC \_\_\_\_\_ KKTC & TC \_\_\_\_\_ Diğer (lütfen belirtiniz) \_\_\_\_\_

1974 savaşında sizin veya yakınınızın bir katılımı olmuş muydu? Hayır \_\_\_\_\_ Evet \_\_\_\_\_

Evet ise, kim? Kendim \_\_\_\_\_ Aile üyesi \_\_\_\_\_ Yakınım \_\_\_\_\_

Açmak isterseniz lütfen buraya yazınız:

---

---

---

---

Savaş sonunda siz veya yakınınız evini, köyünü bırakmak zorunda kalmış mıydı? Hayır \_\_ Evet\_\_

Evet ise, kim? Kendim \_\_\_\_\_ Aile üyesi \_\_\_\_\_ Yakınım \_\_\_\_\_

Açmak isterseniz lütfen buraya yazınız:

---

---

---

---

Savaş neticesinde bir ölüm veya kaybınız olmuş muydu? Hayır\_\_\_\_\_ Evet \_\_\_\_\_

Evet ise, kimi kaybettiniz? Aile üyesi \_\_\_\_\_ Dost \_\_\_\_\_ Yakınım \_\_\_\_\_

Açmak isterseniz lütfen buraya yazınız:

---

---

---

---

# Appendix L: Eastern Mediterranean University Psychology

## Department's Ethics and Research Committee Approval Letter

 <p><b>Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi</b> "Uluslararası Kariyer İçin"</p>	<p><b>Eastern Mediterranean University</b> "For Your International Career"</p>	<p>P.K.: 99628 Gazimağusa, KUZEY KIBRIS / Famagusta, North Cyprus, via Mersin-10 TURKEY Tel: (+90) 392 630 1995 Faks/Fax: (+90) 392 630 2919 bayek@emu.edu.tr</p>
---	--	---

Etik Kurulu / Ethics Committee

Sayı: ETK00-2017-0102

29.03.2017

Sayın Dilara Altan  
Psikoloji Bölümü  
Yüksek Lisans Öğrencisi

Doğu Akdeniz Üniversitesi Bilimsel Araştırma ve Yayın Etiği Kurulu'nun **27.03.2017** tarih ve **2017/40-43** sayılı kararı doğrultusunda, **Effects of Imagined Contact Under Optimal Contact Conditions on Outgroup Perceptions** adlı tez çalışmanız, Bilimsel ve Araştırma Etiği açısından uygun bulunmuştur.

Bilginize rica ederim.



Doç. Dr. Sükrü Tüzmen  
Etik Kurulu Başkanı

ŞT/sky.

www.emu.edu.tr



