

Attitudes towards immigrants among the youth: Intergroup contact interventions and the
reduction of prejudice in the school context

Siân Jones and Adam Rutland
Goldsmiths, University of London
United Kingdom

Address for Correspondence:

Siân Jones

Department of Psychology

Goldsmiths, University of London

New Cross

London

SE14 6NW, UK

Email: s.jones@gold.ac.uk

Keywords: Youth, prejudice, attitudes, immigrants

Abstract

In recent years in our increasingly globalized world in many countries we have seen the rise of anti-immigrant feelings among the youth. This has resulted in both discrimination against immigrants and negative psychological outcomes which harm both the individual and hinder social integration within society. In this article we highlight how psychological research can play an important role in informing the design and conduct of educational interventions based in intergroup contact theory that are aimed at reducing prejudice towards immigrants. We review recent research showing anti-immigrant attitudes among the youth across the globe, and how these attitudes are related to parental and peer relationships. Research indicates that a color-blind approach to prejudice reduction among youth is not helpful and, in contrast, it suggests a more effective approach could be a multicultural approach to diversity, which celebrates both group differences and similarities while promoting social integration through quality contact between different social groups. Recent psychological research shows that this contact can take many forms, ranging from direct contact (i.e., cross-ethnic friendships), to extended contact (i.e., reading a book in which someone from your groups has a positive interaction with someone from another group) and even imagined contact (i.e., engaging in imagined play involving characters from different groups having positive relations). The findings of this research demonstrate that it is possible to challenge anti-immigrant attitudes when and where they develop in young people.

Attitudes towards immigrants among the youth: Contact interventions to reduce prejudice in the school context

Children and adolescents in Europe are growing up in an increasingly culturally diverse school context, with a higher level of immigration into and across Europe in the last twenty or so years. For example, between 1993 and 2015 the number of foreign-born immigrants in the United Kingdom (UK) almost doubled from 7% to 13.5% of the population (Rienzo & Vargas-Silva, 2017). At the same time, in the USA there has also been rapidly changing demographics, largely fueled by immigration. In 2015, a total of 1 1,051,031 immigrants became legal permanent residents of the United States, (U.S. Census Bureau, 2015). Governments, until recent times, have recognized the benefits of diversity brought by immigrants, but at the same time have consistently sought to restrict their numbers due to concerns about public opinion and social cohesion (Home Office, 2015).

Indeed in recent years, in many parts of Europe and the USA, an anti-immigration socio-political climate and controversial rhetoric around immigration has developed in the media and schools (Moore & Ramsay, 2017; Taylor, 2015). Research in the US has shown that while children are explicitly taught about their nation being founded upon immigration, in everyday settings are consistently exposed to anti-immigration sentiments (Brown, 2011). In spite of these conflicting messages, research suggests intergroup contact (i.e., interaction between social groups) may be beneficial for young people since it improves social relations, and reduces prejudice between individuals from different ethnic groups, including immigrants (e.g., Feddes, Noack, & Rutland, 2009; Bagci, Rutland Kumashiro, Smith, & Blumberg 2014). In this regard, research shows that reading in a book that someone from your group has a friendship with

1
2
3
4 someone from another group (i.e., extended contact) is enough to improve young people's
5
6 attitudes towards those with an immigrant background (see Cameron, Rutland, Brown & Douch,
7
8 2006). Such interventions have much promise but has research truly shown that such
9
10 interventions – or indeed any school-based intervention - can change behavior towards
11
12 immigrants? In this paper, we review evidence for interventions grounded in intergroup contact
13
14 theory that purport to reduce prejudice and thereby promote the social inclusion of immigrant
15
16 youth. We consider how far such interventions may be considered effective in this mission.
17
18
19
20

21 **Immigration and Attitudes Among Youth**

22
23 In recent times we have seen significant increases in anti-immigrant attitudes in Europe
24
25 (Ciupijus, 2011; Gniewosz & Noack, 2015). For example, this was evident when the National
26
27 Police Chiefs' Council (2016) in the UK recorded a 42% increase in racist hate crime in the
28
29 month following the UK referendum vote to leave the European Union. Relatedly, in the U.K.
30
31 the Youth Select Committee (2016) gave evidence that interracial prejudice is becoming
32
33 normalized in schools, with a Ditch the Label report (2015) stating that 8% of their sample had
34
35 had negative racial identity-based comments directed at them. Concurrently, research has found
36
37 high levels social isolation amongst adolescent immigrants, with 1 in 5 reporting they feel that
38
39 they do not belong to or are accepted by society (Oxman-Martinez et al., 2012).
40
41
42
43
44

45
46 The psychological consequences of discrimination are well-documented, and include
47
48 deleterious effects on young people's academic performance, self-esteem, and prosocial behavior
49
50 (Leary, 1990; Twenge & Baumeister, 2005). Relatedly, Motti-Stefanidi and Asendorpf (2017)
51
52 report that an immigrant youth cohort, dealing with significantly greater effects of discrimination
53
54 since an economic recession in Greece, had worse outcomes on markers of well-being than their
55
56 non-immigrant counterparts. Other research suggests that adolescent immigrants may be
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1 particularly sensitive to anxiety and depression arising from intergroup prejudice (McKenney,
2
3
4 Pepler, Craig, & Connolly, 2006; Strohmeier, Kärnä, & Salmivalli, 2011). Moreover, when
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

particularly sensitive to anxiety and depression arising from intergroup prejudice (McKenney, Pepler, Craig, & Connolly, 2006; Strohmeier, Kärnä, & Salmivalli, 2011). Moreover, when negative discrimination is directed toward an individual because of their race or ethnicity, the psychological impact on the target may be greater, as an immigrant identity is internal, stable, and uncontrollable (McKenney et al., 2006). Increasingly, social-developmental psychological theories have highlighted the role of social contexts, in particular parents, peers, teachers, and intergroup friendships (e.g., Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) to explain the development of anti-immigrant attitudes that lead to incidents of intergroup discrimination.

Research on adults shows that they often hold negative attitudes towards those from an immigrant background and that they make a strong distinction between legal versus illegal immigrants holding considerably more negative views of the latter compared to the former (Lee & Fiske 2006; Short 2004). Yet we know little about the attitudes of children and adolescents toward immigrants and whether they distinguish between legal versus illegal immigrants. Recent research suggests that young people often do hold negative attitudes towards immigrant youth in schools settings (British Youth Council, 2016; Brown & Lee, 2015; Gniewosz & Noack, 2015). For example, Brown (2011) examined European American children's attitudes towards immigrants and found the while a majority of children were relatively positive about legal immigrants they also believed illegal immigrants should be imprisoned.

Developmental research has shown that important social-cognitive, normative and moral processes underlie the development of intergroup attitudes through childhood into adolescents (Killen & Rutland, 2011; Raabe & Beelmann, 2011; Rutland, Killen, & Abrams, 2010). In particular, research focusing on socialization of ethnic and racial prejudice has indicated a significant, moderate parent–child concordance (for review, see Degner & Dalege, 2013).

Beyond this, Jugert, Eckstein, Beelmann & Noack, (2015) examined moderators of the parent-child transmission of intergroup attitudes, whilst the strength of intergenerational transmission has been shown to be moderated by relationship quality, that is, the better the relation the stronger the parental influence (Miklikowska, 2016). Therefore, unsurprisingly, research suggests that young people's attitudes towards immigrants are related to parental attitudes (Enesco, Navarro, Paradela, & Guerrero 2005; Gniewosz & Noack, 2015). For example, Gniewosz & Noack (2015) conducted a longitudinal five-wave cohort-sequential multi-informant survey study on attitudes towards immigrants among German adolescents and their parents. They found that attitudes among adolescents were predicted over time by maternal and parental attitudes, especially from early adolescence until the age of 16 years. This result suggests that early adolescence is a sensitive developmental period for the emergence of negative attitudes towards immigrants.

Teachers are also influential adults in children's attitudes towards immigrants. In particular the relationship between teacher and student might be key to youth attitudes. For example, Thijs and Verkuyten (2012) found that ethnic minority students who shared a closer relationship with their ethnic majority teacher had more positive attitudes towards the ethnic majority group in general. Geerling, Thijs and Verkuyten (2017) used data from native Dutch children (8–13 years) to assess the importance of student-teacher relationships on attitudes to ethnic minorities. Their research showed that student-teacher relationships were associated with more positive outgroup attitudes, and that this association is mediated through students' desire for intercultural openness. Consequently, when considering the influences of schools on students' attitudes, ethnically diverse classrooms and forms of multicultural education are important, but

1
2
3
4 the relationships that teachers develop with their students also matter for the development of
5
6 positive ethnic outgroup attitudes.
7
8
9

10
11 In schools, peer influence also contributes to youth attitudes in important ways.
12
13 Longitudinal studies (e.g., Van Zalk, Van Zalk, Kerr, & Stattin, 2013) have shown the effect of
14
15 peers' anti-immigrant attitudes on changes in adolescents' prejudice over time, whilst Blanchard,
16
17 Crandall, Brigham, and Vaugn (1994) and Sinclair, Lowery, Hardin, and Colangelo (2005)
18
19 experimentally showed an effect of peers' opinions on adolescents' interracial attitudes.
20
21 Nonetheless, the long-term relations between peer influence and youth attitudes at different
22
23 stages of development are unclear. It has been suggested that the influence of parents might
24
25 diminish in middle and late adolescence, compared to earlier periods, given that adolescents
26
27 spend more time with their peers. Conversely, it has been suggested that the effects of peers
28
29 might decrease between ages 14 and 18 years, when the resistance to peer influences increases
30
31 (Steinberg & Monahan, 2007).
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Recent longitudinal research in Sweden has shown significant effects of parents' attitudes,
39
40 peers' attitudes, and intergroup friendships, on changes over time in anti-immigrant attitudes
41
42 among adolescents (Miklikowska, 2017). This research also showed that adolescents with
43
44 immigrant friends are less affected by parents' and peers' prejudice than youth without
45
46 immigrant friends, and that this effect was mediated by adolescents' empathy. These finding fit
47
48 with the proposed link between development of empathy, peer relationships and intergroup
49
50 attitudes, with empathy theorized to mediate the effects of intergroup friendships on adolescents'
51
52 intergroup attitudes (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). That is, intergroup friendships lead to increases
53
54 in empathy, and in turn, to decreases in prejudice. In this regard, empathy may moderate the
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 effects of humanitarian concern on immigrant policies (Newman, Hartman, Lown, & Feldman,
5
6
7 2013) and the effects of ingroup norms on outgroup liking (Nesdale, Griffiths, Durkin, & Maass,
8
9 2005). In line with this reasoning, the attitudes of highly empathic adolescents might be less
10
11 affected by their parents or peers' prejudice, or alternatively, heightened by their positive
12
13 attitudes towards immigrants. Previous research conducted in the United Kingdom, also
14
15 supporting the importance of empathy and intergroup friendships in reducing anti-immigrant
16
17 biases, suggests that children are more likely to challenge intergroup bias towards immigrants if
18
19 they have high levels of empathy (Abbott & Cameron, 2014).
20
21
22

23
24 Another factor that has been shown to bear upon intergroup attitudes are what adolescents
25
26 and children think their peer groups expect them to say about those from other groups. These
27
28 group norms have the potential to influence the attitudes youth hold towards immigrants.
29
30 Developmental research shows that from middle childhood youth are highly sensitive to group
31
32 norms about forming intragroup and intergroup relationships (Abrams, Rutland, & Cameron,
33
34 2003; Castelli, De Amicis, & Sherman, 2007; Nesdale, Maass, Durkin, & Griffiths, 2005;
35
36 Rutland, Cameron, Milne, & McGeorge, 2005; Jugert, Noack, & Rutland, 2011; Tropp, O'Brien,
37
38 & Migacheva, 2014). Therefore, children being told about a cross-ethnic friendship are more
39
40 likely to interpret group members' actions as representative of the ingroup and outgroup peer
41
42 norms and respond in a manner reflective of their prescribed ingroup norm. In this vein,
43
44 Cameron, Rutland, Hossain, and Petley (2011) showed that among older children, attitudes
45
46 towards ethnic outgroups are affected by ingroup norms surrounding inclusion. Future research
47
48 should examine the role of ingroup and outgroup peer group norms in determining the
49
50 development of anti-immigrant attitudes in youth.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

How can anti-immigrant attitudes be reduced in youth?

Surprisingly, despite increasing research on intergroup attitudes in children and adolescents, interventions to reduce prejudice towards immigrants in childhood and adolescence are not widespread and are rarely informed by developmental science (Killen, Rutland, & Martin, 2011). A recent review of over 900 studies (Paluck & Green, 2009) included only a few child-focused interventions, and these programs focused specifically on the use of reading materials for children and media-based intervention programs such as *Sesame Street* (Cole et al., 2003; Cole & Dollard, 2017). Moreover, the review did not address the developmental factors that contribute to prejudice. In contrast, an earlier report on prejudice reduction in school settings in the United States focused specifically on children and adolescents (Pfeifer, Brown, & Juvonen, 2007). The authors, who are developmental scientists, reviewed school-based curricula such as cooperative learning and multicultural curricula. These programs produced modest gains in positive attitudes and were supported by several empirical studies. The authors pointed out, however, that some of the evaluations of these programs overlooked the social context. The report demonstrated the ways that these programs helped to make desegregation a positive learning environment (Pfeifer, Spears Brown, et al., 2007).

The need to take such social factors into account is illustrated in one intervention commonly used in UK schools, and promoted by an organization called Philosophy4Children, for tackling ethnic prejudice, based on a color-blind ideology (see Dovidio, Gaertner, & Saguy, 2015). This approach argues that everyone should be treated equally, and attempts at differential treatment by ethnicity should be disregarded and dismantled (see <http://www.philosophy4children.co.uk/>). However, if teachers use this strategy, are they implicitly telling children not to talk about ethnicity? Indeed, a recent study by Cameron, Brady,

1
2
3
4 and Abbott (2013) suggests such a color-blind perspective is common among children. They
5
6 tested a group of children using a version of the children's game, 'Guess Who?'. The game was
7
8 contrived, so that asking about the ethnicity of your opponent's character would enable winning
9
10 more quickly than not asking about it. Yet, rarely would children ask this question – and they
11
12 were even less likely to do so in ethnically diverse classrooms. In other words, children would
13
14 rather lose a game, than mention ethnicity. This tendency to ignore ethnicity or race in schools
15
16 makes explicitly challenging negative attitudes towards immigrants difficult since any contact
17
18 between immigrants and non-immigrants is not likely to be perceived as representative of inter-
19
20 ethnic or cultural contact (Cameron et al, 2006; Hewstone & Brown, 2005).
21
22
23
24
25

26 Books typically used in school often do not explicitly mention ethnicity or race. Indeed,
27
28 Chetty (2014) argued that two books, *Elmer's Special Day* and *Tusk Tusk*, both by David McKee,
29
30 and both recommended by Philosophy4Children practitioners as starting points for philosophical
31
32 enquiry into ethnic prejudice, multiculturalism and diversity, do not truly allow for an open
33
34 discussion. Rather, in line with the above findings, he argues, 'animal stories' separate racism
35
36 from its temporal and spatial context, limiting opportunities for engaging philosophically with
37
38 the topic – and maybe even contributing, paradoxically, to the taboo (however, in their review of
39
40 polyculturalism, Morris, Chiu, & Liu (2015) point out that, depending on the particular area and
41
42 outcome assessed, multicultural education need not necessarily be always better than colorblind
43
44 approaches). Research in the US also shows that European American mothers adopted
45
46 'colormute' and 'colorblind' approaches to socialization around inter-ethnic relations, as
47
48 demonstrated by examining how they read story books to their children (Pahlke, Bigler, &
49
50 Suizzo, 2012). This study, contrary to the color-blind ideology, showed that such an approach is
51
52 not related to low levels of ethnic bias among children even though their parents showed positive
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 explicit ethnic attitudes. In light of the problematic taboo around ethnic origin, which lies in
5
6 heart of the color-blind ideology, and the findings of previous research, there is good reason, to
7
8 look further towards developmental-social psychological theory to inform educational
9
10 interventions aimed at reducing bias and prejudice towards immigrants.
11
12
13
14
15

16 **Intergroup contact and the reduction of anti-immigrant attitudes in youth**

17
18
19 One such line of theory that might helpfully be applied to reduce prejudice towards
20
21 immigrant youth in a school context is intergroup contact theory (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew &
22
23 Tropp, 2006. It is based on the idea that positive contact (meeting Allport's optimal conditions of
24
25 co-operation, common goals, equal social status, and institutional support) between a member of
26
27 one's own group and another group can improve intergroup attitudes. In this vein, Zagefka et al.
28
29 (2015) conducted two surveys in Chile with indigenous Mapuche participants, finding that
30
31 intergroup contact with the non-indigenous immigrants reduces prejudice. However, such direct
32
33 contact is difficult to set up, and can be costly (Crisp & Turner, 2014), in the segregated societies
34
35 in which many youths live. Moreover, Wright et al. (1997) contend that attitude change does not
36
37 necessarily require a direct contact in another group; mere knowledge of ingroup members
38
39 having close relationships with outgroup members can result in more positive intergroup
40
41 attitudes. This is known as the *extended contact hypothesis*.
42
43
44
45
46
47

48
49 Studies among children, adolescents, and adults have now shown extended friendship to
50
51 be associated with more positive intergroup attitudes (e.g., Turner, Hewstone, Voci, & Vonofakou,
52
53 2008; Wright et al., 1997). Liebkind and McAlister (1999) conducted a field experiment on the
54
55 effect of contact among 1480 Finnish students (ages 13-15 years). In experimental schools,
56
57 printed stories of ingroup members' close friendship with members of outgroups were presented
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 as examples of successful intergroup contact. Intergroup attitudes were measured before and
5
6 after the experimental intervention. In experimental schools, intergroup acceptance improved,
7
8 while attitudes worsened or stayed the same in the control schools. Relatedly, Liebkind,
9
10 Mähönen, Solares, Solheim, and Jasinskaja-Lahti, (2014) looked at relations between non-
11
12 immigrants and immigrants in culturally diverse schools. Both groups showed a tendency to
13
14 perceive future intergroup contact as more important after an intergroup contact intervention.
15
16
17

18
19 Along similar lines, Cameron et al. (2006) read stories to British children about other
20
21 British children interacting positively with an immigrant refugee child. The results showed that
22
23 attitudes toward immigrant refugee children became more positive among children who received
24
25 the intervention compared to those in a control group. Additional evidence from Vezzali,
26
27 Giovannini and Capozza (2012) examined the effects of extended contact on immigrant attitudes
28
29 among Italian primary school children. Their results revealed that extended contact (measured by
30
31 the number of immigrant friends of participants' best ingroup friend) was associated with
32
33 reduced implicit prejudice, but only among those with fewer immigrant friends of their own.
34
35 This finding is compatible with research in the UK which also showed that an extended contact
36
37 intervention could significantly reduce explicit biases towards an ethnic minority group of an
38
39 immigrant background in a non-diverse location but had little effect in an ethnically
40
41 heterogeneous area (Cameron, Rutland, & Hossain, 2011). A longitudinal study of children from
42
43 an ethnically diverse community in Germany, asked German and Turkish immigrant (living in
44
45 Germany) children who were their best friends and how many friends of these best friends were
46
47 German or Turkish, to measure direct and extended contact respectively (Feddes, Noack, &
48
49 Rutland, 2009). They found that direct contact but not extended contact amongst German
50
51 children predicted positive out-group ethnic attitudes. These studies conducted in three different
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 European nations together show that direct contact can reduce biases against ethnic minority
5
6 groups with immigrant backgrounds, but when actual contact between different groups does not
7
8 happen then extended contact is effective at changing children's attitudes to others of an
9
10 immigrant background.
11
12

13
14 A relatively new sister to the extended contact approach is known as *imagined contact*.
15
16 This is, simply "the mental simulation of a social interaction with a member or members of an
17
18 outgroup category" (Crisp & Turner, 2009, p. 234), and can improve intergroup attitudes.
19
20 According to Crisp and Turner (2009) the imagined-contact technique has several key strengths:
21
22 it can be used where actual or extended contact is impractical, for example, in contexts of
23
24 physical segregation. Unlike direct and extended contact, imagined contact does not require a
25
26 child to live in a context where they have contact with outgroup members, where outgroup
27
28 members are known to anyone from the ingroup or where material is readily available which
29
30 presents positive extended cross-group contact. Rather, it can be used in low-diversity contexts
31
32 where contact rarely happens or is discussed, and it is exactly these types of locations where
33
34 intergroup bias is most likely to form and go unchallenged (e.g., Rutland et al., 2005).
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 Research suggests that the effect of imagined contact on reduced intergroup biases may
42
43 be driven by a drop in *intergroup anxiety* (Turner, Crisp, & Lambert, 2007). Intergroup anxiety is
44
45 the negative emotional reaction that can occur at the prospect of intergroup contact. However,
46
47 after individuals have had a successful interaction with an outgroup member, their level of
48
49 intergroup anxiety is likely to be reduced. Consistent with this reasoning, several studies in
50
51 diverse intergroup settings with adults have found the positive effect of intergroup contact with
52
53 immigrants on reducing prejudice to be mediated by intergroup anxiety (Turner, Hewstone, &
54
55 Voci, 2007; Voci & Hewstone, 2003). Less, however, is known about the role of intergroup
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 anxiety in indirect contact with immigrant youth. Future studies should examine if imagined
5
6 contact can reduce anti-immigrant attitudes by hindering intergroup anxiety about immigrants.
7
8

9 Another factor that might underline the power of indirect contact is *empathy*. A
10
11 correlational study (Vezzali, Hewstone, Capozza, Trifiletti, & Di Bernardo, 2016) investigated
12
13 extended contact between Italian and immigrant primary school children. Results showed that
14
15 extended contact was associated with improved intergroup empathy, which, in turn, was
16
17 associated with more positive outgroup attitudes, stereotypes and behavioral intentions. As above,
18
19 these effects were significant only among participants with a low or moderate level of direct
20
21 contact with immigrants. A field study (Vezzali, Giovanni & Capozza, 2010) of 68 Italian
22
23 (majority) and 31 immigrant (minority) secondary school students also showed that intergroup
24
25 anxiety and empathy mediated the longitudinal effects of quantity of contact on intergroup
26
27 attitudes for both Italians and immigrants.
28
29
30
31
32

33 Imagined contact has great potential as a prejudice-reduction technique for use in
34
35 education as it can be used with a wide age range of children from diverse backgrounds and
36
37 abilities. There are now studies demonstrating that imagined intergroup contact is an effective
38
39 strategy for reducing prejudice among youth (e.g., Cameron, Rutland, Turner, Holman-Nicolas,
40
41 & Powell, 2011; Stathi, Cameron, Hartley, & Bradford, 2014). Regarding immigrants, Vezzali,
42
43 Capozza, Giovannini, et al. (2012) conducted a three-week experimental intervention asking
44
45 Italian children to imagine a positive meeting with an unknown immigrant child in different
46
47 social situations. Results revealed that, compared to their counterparts in a control condition,
48
49 children in the imagined intergroup contact condition had stronger intentions to meet immigrant
50
51 children and less implicit prejudice towards them. In adolescents, Turner, West, and Christie
52
53 (2013) showed British high school students aged 16–17 years a picture of a same-gendered
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 immigrant asylum seeker who had recently arrived from Zimbabwe. They were asked to imagine
5
6 having a positive interaction with this individual, before writing a detailed outline of the
7
8 interaction they imagined. Compared to control participants, students who imagined contact
9
10 reported a greater desire to befriend immigrant asylum seekers (e.g., get to know them). Together
11
12 these studies suggest that imagined contact may be an effective strategy when trying to reduce
13
14 anti-immigrant attitudes in youth.
15
16
17
18

19 To date one research study (Jones, Rutland & Rea, 2017) has examined the effectiveness
20
21 of a form of imagined contact with immigrants in reducing anti-immigrant attitudes in young 5-
22
23 9-year-old children. This type of imagined contact was specifically designed for young children
24
25 to make imagining interaction with an immigrant easier, as the children could simulate their
26
27 imagination using 3-D toys. This type of intervention was based upon the premise that imagined
28
29 contact will be more effective, when it actively involves the child, as opposed to merely
30
31 observing or hearing about intergroup interactions, for example through being passively read a
32
33 book or shown a TV program. Developmental research suggests that children will pay more
34
35 attention when key features of the world are perceptually salient (Braunerd & Reyna, 1990) and
36
37 the social group membership of the individuals during an interaction are also made actively
38
39 salient (Cameron, Rutland et al., 2006).
40
41
42
43
44

45 In the study by Jones et al (2017) imagined contact was induced via pretend play –
46
47 bringing the imagined contact into a 3-D realm, where children imagined interacting in a
48
49 physical space. This study found that British children aged between 5- 9 years from ethnically
50
51 and culturally diverse areas, respond in increasingly negative ways towards different groups of
52
53 immigrants to their school, with age, but that these negative attitudes were moderated by
54
55 imagined contact with an immigrant involving 3-D play. Interestingly, in the sample as a whole,
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 children's play reflected elements of both concrete reality (e.g., let's play football) and fantasy
5
6
7 play (e.g., let's pretend we can fly), and the imagined contact intervention was equally effective
8
9 when both forms of play were shown by children.

10
11 These findings fit with extended contact research by Vezzali, Stathi, Giovannini, Capozza,
12
13 and Trifiletti (2015), who showed that extended contact stories are effective even when the contact
14
15 does not involve an ingroup member, or even "real" social groups (i.e., pretend or fantasy
16
17 characters). In the study by Vezzali and colleagues Italian elementary school children read
18
19 passages once a week for six weeks from fictional J. K. Rowling *Harry Potter* book series,
20
21 presenting themes of prejudice followed by a group discussion. They found this fantasy focused
22
23 extended contact intervention was effective in promoting positive attitudes towards immigrants.
24
25 Given these findings, future research should seek to capitalize on this – to explore the power of
26
27 children's imaginative and fantasy play, and how this may be exploited to enhance the positive
28
29 influence of imagined contact in anti-immigrant attitudes in youth.
30
31
32
33
34

35
36 As a note of caution, while the use of imagined contact interventions remains relatively
37
38 new, especially in the context of immigration and youth, and there have been several published
39
40 replication failures of imagined contact (e.g., Klein et al., 2014; McDonald et al., 2014) in adults.
41
42 Along these lines, West and Greenland (2016) conducted two studies with adults and showed that
43
44 self-regulatory focus moderates the effectiveness of imagined contact interventions. Their
45
46 findings suggest that a prevention self-focus when experiencing imagined contact can limit its
47
48 effectiveness. A prevention self-focus involves a lot of attention on being social evaluated and
49
50 concerns about social rejection which can produce negative emotions, vigilance motivation, and
51
52 ironically a higher attention to stereotypical information. More recently, Hoffarth & Hodson
53
54 (2016) have pointed to important moderator variables (e.g., level of previous intergroup contact)
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 that may determine the effectiveness of imagined intergroup contact. Relatedly, a study by Jones,
5
6 Rutland & Mariezcurrena (under review) shows that, when it comes to children with disability as
7
8 an outgroup for children, direct contact accentuates the impact of imagined contact. However, we
9
10 do not believe that this is a reason for dispensing with imagined contact altogether at this stage,
11
12 especially in circumstances where direct contact is not possible. Rather, we would argue that
13
14 future research using imagined contact in youth to reduce anti-immigrant attitudes needs to
15
16 examine the factors that limit and enhance such interventions. Then we would know more about
17
18 why and when it can be effective in reducing anti-immigrant attitudes in youth.
19
20
21
22

23 **Future Directions**

24
25
26 In parallel with our intentions, the furtherance of contact interventions to reduce
27
28 prejudice towards immigrant youth are limited only by the researchers' imaginations. However, a
29
30 number of discrete avenues for future research have been brought to light in this review. Many of
31
32 these studies consider only children belonging to the majority status group. Thus, it is of primary
33
34 importance to test indirect contact effects among both majority and minority status children. In
35
36 the case of minority children, a further consideration arises. In many instances, the number of
37
38 immigrant children in a class is low, which reduces the opportunity for immigrant children to
39
40 learn about a fellow ingroup member (i.e., another immigrant) who has majority status group
41
42 member friends. However, immigrant children may well have majority status group friends, and
43
44 indeed research in Italy has found that minority status members generally do have a higher
45
46 number of cross-group friends compared with the majority status (Vezzali, Giovannini, &
47
48 Capozza, 2010). If minority status (immigrant) children have friends in the majority status group,
49
50 who themselves have immigrant friends, then we should also take into account this form of
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 extended contact, because it provides children with knowledge of ingroup and outgroup
5
6 members engaging in contact (and not just contact; also friendships).
7
8

9 Although the effects of intergroup contact have now been shown by numerous studies,
10 many of them were either cross-sectional or experimental. One exception to this is Munniksma,
11 Stark, Verkuyten, Flache, and Veenstra (2013), who studied social networks of Dutch and
12 immigrant high-school children by asking participants to nominate their five best friends in class.
13
14 These social network data also allowed the researchers to identify the friends of a child's friends
15 by examining their nominations, (in other words; their extended contact). However, the authors
16 state that these data lacked the power needed to determine the main effect of extended contact.
17
18 Another exception is Wölfer, Schmid, Hewstone, & van Zalk (2016) who showed that intergroup
19 contact predicts the development of attitudes in adolescence, whereas acquired attitudes buffer
20 against decreasing intergroup contact in adulthood. Future studies might then similarly follow
21 the model provided by Wölfer, Faber & Hewstone, (2015) which combines self-report with
22 social network data, in order to look at the effects of imagined contact with immigrant youth.
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 Reliance on cross-sectional data means that little is known about the long-term relation
39 between contact and prejudice. In this regard, the effect of imagined contact on anxiety and
40 attitudes has thus far been demonstrated up to just three months later (e.g., Vezzali, Stathi,
41 Giovannini, Capozza, & Visintin, 2015). A short-term longitudinal study of Van Laar et al.
42 (2005) showed weak-to-non-significant effects of friendships in real life, suggesting that their
43 effects might wear off over time. This might be particularly likely in middle and late adolescence
44 when intergroup friendships are less stable (Aboud, Mendelson, & Purdy, 2003).
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

55 **Summary**

56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Today's youth live in increasingly ethnically and culturally diverse societies and attend
5
6 schools where many more of the students will either be immigrants or of an immigrant
7
8 background. Such diversity can have many benefits for the individual and society, yet in recent
9
10 years in our increasingly globalized world in many countries we have seen the rise of anti-
11
12 immigrant feelings. This has been evidenced among the youth and in the school context, as such
13
14 feelings has meant many immigrants have experienced pervasive discrimination in school
15
16 settings (British Youth Council, 2016; Brown & Lee, 2015; Gniewosz & Noack, 2015).
17
18

19
20 Psychological research can play an important role in informing the design and conduct of
21
22 educational interventions aimed at reducing prejudice towards immigrants. This is important
23
24 since such prejudice means youth are often social excluded within schools resulting in poor
25
26 psychological outcomes for individuals and a lack of social integration within societies.
27
28

29
30 In this article, we have highlighted research showing anti-immigrant attitudes among the
31
32 youth in various nations is an important issue, and how these attitudes are related to parental,
33
34 teacher and peer relationships. We have argued that educational interventions aimed at reducing
35
36 prejudice need to consider the social context in which the youth live (i.e., their relationships with
37
38 parent, teachers and peers) if they are to be successful. Social group memberships, such as
39
40 immigrant or non-immigrant, are important in our increasingly diverse societies, and this is why
41
42 we argue against a colorblind approach to prejudice reduction among the youth. Instead we
43
44 suggest a multicultural approach to diversipeer ty may be more effective, as it celebrates both
45
46 group differences and similarities while promoting social integration through quality contact
47
48 between different social groups.
49
50

51
52 We have described psychological research which demonstrates that educational
53
54 interventions based on intergroup contact between individuals from different groups can reduce
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 prejudice towards immigrants among the youth. This contact can take many forms, ranging from
5
6 direct contact (i.e., cross-ethnic friendships), to extended contact (i.e., reading a book in which
7
8 someone from your group has a positive interaction with someone from another group) and even
9
10 imagined contact (i.e., engaging in imagined play involving characters from different groups
11
12 having positive relations). There is still much research to be done to extend and evaluate
13
14 effective educational interventions to reduce prejudice towards immigrants in youth, yet the
15
16 research to date suggests it is possible to challenge anti-immigrant attitudes when and where they
17
18 develop in youth today.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

References

- Abbott, N. J., & Cameron, L. (2014). What makes a young assertive bystander?: The effect of intergroup contact, empathy, cultural openness and ingroup bias on assertive bystander intervention intentions. *Journal of Social Issues, 70*, 167-182. doi: 10.1111/josi.12053
- Aboud, E. E., Mendelson, M. J., & Purdy, K. T. (2003). Cross-race peer relations and friendship quality. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 27*, 165–173.
doi:10.1080/01650250244000164
- Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bagci, S. C., Rutland, A., Kumashiro, M., Smith, P. K., & Blumberg, H. (2014). Are minority status children's cross-ethnic friendships beneficial in a multiethnic context? *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 32*, 107–115.10.1111/bjdp.2014.32.issue-1
- Blanchard, F.A., Crandall, C. S., Brigham, J. C., & Vaughn, L. (1994). Condemning and Condoning Racism: A Social Context Approach to Interracial Settings. *Journal of Applied Psychology 79(6)*, 993-997. DOI: 10.1037/0021-9010.79.6.993
- British Youth Council Select Committee (2016). Young people and the issues of racism and religious discrimination. Retrieved 04/27/2017 from: <http://www.byc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/BYC-Report-2016-WEB.pdf>
- Brown, C. S. (2011). Elementary school children's attitudes about immigrants, immigration, and being an American. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 32*, 109-117.
- British Youth Council, Youth Select Committee (2016). Young people and the issues of racism and religious discrimination. <http://www.byc.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/11/BYC-Report-2016-WEB.pdf>

- 1
2
3
4 Brown, C. S., & Lee, C. A. (2015). Impressions of immigration: Comparisons between
5
6 immigrant and nonimmigrant children's immigration beliefs. *Analyses of Social Issues and*
7
8 *Public Policy (ASAP)*, 15, 160-176. doi: 10.1111/asap.12067
9
10
11 Ciupijus, Z. (2011). Mobile central eastern Europeans in Britain: Successful European Union
12
13 citizens and disadvantaged labour migrants? *Work Employment and Society*, 25, 540-550.
14
15 doi: 10.1177/0950017011407962
16
17
18 Dovidio, J F., Gaertner, S. L., & Saguy, T. (2015). Color-blindness and commonality: Included
19
20 but invisible? *American Behavioral Scientist*, 59(11), 1518-1538. doi:
21
22 10.1177/0002764215580591
23
24
25
26 Cameron, L., & Abbott, N. (2017). Intergroup contact in action: Using intergroup contact
27
28 interventions to change children's out-group orientations. In A. Rutland, D. Nesdale & C.
29
30 Spears Brown (Eds.), *Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of Group Processes in Children and*
31
32 *Adolescents* (ppg. 455-471) Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
33
34
35
36 Cameron, L., Rutland, A., Hossain, R., & Petley, R. (2011). When and why does extended
37
38 contact work? The role of high quality direct contact and group norms in the development of
39
40 positive ethnic intergroup attitudes amongst children. *Group Processes & Intergroup*
41
42 *Relations*, 14(2), 193-206.
43
44
45
46 Cameron, L. & Rutland, A. (2006). Extended contact through story reading in school: Reducing
47
48 children's prejudice toward the disabled. *Journal of Social Issues*, 62, 469–488.
49
50
51 doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00469.x
52
53
54 Cameron, L., Rutland, A., Brown, R., & Douch, R. (2006). Changing children's intergroup
55
56 attitudes towards refugees: Testing different models of extended contact. *Child Development*,
57
58 77, 1208—1219.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Chetty, D. (2014). The elephant in the room: Picturebooks, philosophy for children and racism.

Childhood and Philosophy, 10 (9) 11-31.

Cole, C. F. & Dollard, L. (2017). Seeding change: Using children's media to promote social

inclusion the Sesame Street Way. In A. Rutland, D. Nesdale & C. Spears Brown (Eds.),

Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of Group Processes in Children and Adolescents (pp. 472-486)

Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.

Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2009). Can imagined interactions produce positive perceptions?

Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. *American Psychologist*, 64, 231–240

Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2012). Imagined intergroup contact. In G. Hodson & M. Hewstone

(Eds.), *Advances in Intergroup Contact* (pp. 135-151). Hove: Psychology Press

Davies, K., Tropp, L. R., Aron, A., Pettigrew, T. F., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Cross-group

friendships and intergroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social*

Psychology Review, 15, 332–351. doi:10.1177/1088868311411103

Degner, J., & Dalege, J. (2013). The apple does not fall far from the tree, or does it? A meta-

analysis of parent-child similarity in intergroup attitudes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 139, 1270–

1304. doi:10.1037/a0031436

Ditch the Label (2015). The annual bullying survey. Retrieved 04/27/2017 from:

<http://www.ditchthelabel.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/07/abs2015.pdf>

Enesco, I., Navarro, A., Paradela, I., & Guerrero, S. (2005). Stereotypes and beliefs about

different ethnic groups in Spain. A study with Spanish and Latin American children living in

Madrid. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 26(6), 638–659.

- 1
2
3
4 Feddes, A. R., Noack, P. & Rutland, A. (2009), Direct and extended friendship effects on
5
6 minority and majority children's interethnic attitudes: A longitudinal study. *Child*
7
8 *Development, 80*, 377–390. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2009.01266.x
9
- 10
11 Geerlings, J., Thijs, J., & Verkuyten, M. (2017). Student-teacher relationships and ethnic
12
13 outgroup attitudes among majority students. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology,*
14
15 *52*, 69-79
16
17
- 18
19 Gniewosz, B., & Noack, P. (2015). Parental influences on adolescents' negative attitudes towards
20
21 immigrants. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence, 44*, 1787-1802.
22
- 23
24 Hoffarth, M. & Hodson, G. (2016). Who needs imagined contact? Replication attempts
25
26 examining previous contact as a potential moderator. *Social Psychology, 47*, 118-124.
27
28 <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000258>
29
- 30
31 Jones, S.E., Rutland, A., & Mariescurrena (under review). Toys like us: Pretend play as an
32
33 extended contact intervention in young children.
34
- 35
36 Jones, S. E., Rutland, A., & Rea, M. (2017). Many colours of home: Using pretend play to
37
38 promote children's positive attitudes towards immigrants. Talk presented to the British
39
40 Psychological Society Education Section (October, Edinburgh, UK).
41
42
- 43
44 Jugert, P., Eckstein, K., Beelmann, A., & Noack, P. (2015). Parents' influence on the
45
46 development of their children's ethnic intergroup attitudes: A longitudinal analysis from
47
48 middle childhood to early Adolescence. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology.*
49
50 doi: 10.1080/17405629.2015.1084923
51
52
- 53
54 Jugert, P., Noack, P., & Rutland, A. (2011). Friendship preferences among German and Turkish
55
56 preadolescents. *Child Development, 82*, 812–829. doi:10.1111/j.1467–8624.2010.01528.x
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

- 1
2
3
4 Klein, R. A., et al. (2014). Investigating variation in replicability: A “Many Labs” replication
5
6 project. *Social Psychology*, 45, 142–152
7
8
- 9 Liebkind, K., Mähönen, T. A., Solares, E., Solheim, E. and Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2014), Prejudice-
10
11 reduction in culturally mixed classrooms: The development and assessment of a theory-driven
12
13 intervention among majority and minority youth in Finland. *Journal of Community and*
14
15 *Applied Social Psychology*, 24, 325–339. doi:10.1002/casp.2168
16
17
- 18 Liebkind, K., & McAlister, A. L. (1999). Extended contact through peer modelling to promote
19
20 tolerance in Finland. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 29(5 - 6), 765-780.
21
22
- 23 Killen, M., & Rutland, A. (2011). *Children and social exclusion: Morality, prejudice and group*
24
25 *identity*. Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
26
27
- 28 Killen, M., Rutland, A., & Ruck, M. (2011). Promoting equity and justice in childhood: Policy
29
30 implications. *Social Policy Report*, 25(4),. 1-25.
31
32
- 33 McDonald, M. M., Donnellan, M. B., Lang, R. & Nikolajuk, K. (2014). Treating prejudice with
34
35 imagery: Easier said than done? *Psychological Science*, 25, 837–839.
36
37
- 38 Miklikowska, M. (2017), Development of anti-immigrant attitudes in adolescence: The role of
39
40 parents, peers, intergroup friendships, and empathy. *British Journal of Psychology*,
41
42 doi:10.1111/bjop.12236
43
44
- 45 Miklikowska, M. (2016). Like parent, like child? Development of prejudice and tolerance in
46
47 adolescence. *British Journal of Psychology*, 107, 95–116. doi:10.1111/bjop.1212
48
49
- 50 Moore, M., & Ramsay, G. (2017). UK media coverage of the 2016 EU referendum campaign.
51
52 [http://www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/policy-institute/CMCP/UK-media-coverage-of-the-2016-EU-](http://www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/policy-institute/CMCP/UK-media-coverage-of-the-2016-EU-Referendum-campaign.pdf)
53
54 [Referendum-campaign.pdf](http://www.kcl.ac.uk/sspp/policy-institute/CMCP/UK-media-coverage-of-the-2016-EU-Referendum-campaign.pdf): The Policy Institute at King's College London.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Morris, M.W., Chiu, C., Liu, Z. (2015). [Polycultural Psychology](#). *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66:1, 631-659.

Motti-Stefanidi, F. and Asendorpf, J. B. (2017), Adaptation during a great economic recession: A cohort study of Greek and immigrant youth. *Child Development*, 88: 1139–1155.
doi:10.1111/cdev.12878

Munniksma, A., Stark, T. H., Verkuyten, M., Flache, A., & Veenstra, R. (2013). Extended intergroup friendships within social settings: The moderating role of initial outgroup attitudes. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 16, 752–770. doi:10.1177/1368430213486207

National Police Chiefs' Council (2016). Hate crime undermines the diversity and tolerance we should instead be celebrating. Retrieved 04/28/2017 from:
<https://news.npcc.police.uk/releases/hate-crime-undermines-the-diversity-and-tolerance-we-should-instead-be-celebrating-1>

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

Newman, B. J., Hartman, T. K., Lown, P. L., & Feldman, S. (2013). Easing the heavy hand: Humanitarian concern, empathy, and opinion on immigration. *British Journal of Political Science*, 45, 583–607.

Oxman-Martinez, J. et al. (2012). Perceived ethnic discrimination and social exclusion: Newcomer immigrant children in Canada. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 82 (3), 376-388.

Pahlke, Erin, Bigler, Rebecca S., & Suizzo, Marie- Anne. (2012). Relations between colorblind socialization and children's racial bias: Evidence from European American mothers and their

preschool children. *Child Development*, 83(4), 1164-1179. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01770.x

Paluck, E. L., & Green, D. L. (2009). Prejudice reduction: What works? A review and assessment of research and practice. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60, 339–367.

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

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

Pfeifer, J. H., Brown, C. S., & Juvonen, J. (2007). Fifty years since Brown v. Board of Education: Lessons learned about the development and reduction of children's prejudice. *Social Policy Report*, 21(2).

Short, R. (2004). Justice, politics, and prejudice regarding immigration attitudes. *Current Research in Social Psychology*, 9(14).

Steinberg, L., & Monahan, K. C. (2007). Age differences in resistance to peer influence. *Developmental Psychology*, 43, 1531–1543. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.43.6.1531

Raabe, Tobias, & Beelmann, Andreas. (2011). Development of ethnic, racial, and national prejudice in childhood and adolescence: A multinational meta-analysis of age differences. *Child Development*, 82(6), 1715-1737. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01668.x

Rienzo, C., & Vargas-Silva, C. (2017). Migrants in the UK: An overview. Retrieved from Migrants_UK_Overview.pdf website: <http://www.migrationobservatory.ox.ac.uk/wp-content/uploads/2017/02/Briefing->

- Rutland, A., Killen, M., & Abrams, D. (2010). A new social-cognitive developmental perspective on prejudice: The interplay between morality and group identity. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 5, 279-291. doi: 10.1177/1745691610369468
- Rutland, A., Cameron, L., Milne, A., & McGeorge, P. (2005). Social norms and self-presentation: Children's implicit and explicit intergroup attitudes. *Child Development*, 76(2), 451-466.
- Sinclair, S., Lowery, B.S., Hardin, C.D., Colangelo A. (2005). Social tuning of automatic racial attitudes: The role of affiliative motivation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89(4), 583-592.
- Stathi, S., Cameron, L., Hartley, B., & Bradford, S. (2014) Imagined contact as a prejudice - reduction intervention in schools: The underlying role of similarity and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 44 (8), 536-546. doi: 10.1111/jasp.12245
- Taylor, M. (2015). Racist and anti-immigration views held by children revealed in schools study. Retrieved from <https://www.theguardian.com/education/2015/may/19/most-children-think-immigrants-are-stealing-jobs-schools-study-shows>, The Guardian.
- Thijs, J., & Verkuyten, M. (2012). Ethnic attitudes of minority students and their contact with majority group teachers. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 33 (5) 260-268. 10.1016/j.appdev.2012.05.004
- Tropp, L. R., O'Brien, T. C. and Migacheva, K. (2014), How peer norms of inclusion and exclusion predict children's interest in cross-ethnic friendships. *Journal of Social Issues*, 70: 151-166. doi:10.1111/josi.12052
- Turner, R. N., Hewstone, M., & Voci, A. (2007). Reducing explicit and implicit outgroup prejudice via direct and extended contact: The mediating role of self-disclosure and

1
2
3
4 intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 93, 369–388. Doi.
5
6 10.1037/0022-3514.93.3.369
7

8
9 Turner, R. N., Hewstone, M., Voci, A., & Vonofakou, C. (2008). A test of the extended contact
10
11 hypothesis: The mediating role of intergroup anxiety, perceived ingroup and outgroup norms,
12
13 and inclusion of the outgroup in the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 95,
14
15 843–860.
16
17

18
19 Turner, R. N., West, K., & Christie, Z. (2013). Outgroup trust, intergroup anxiety, and outgroup
20
21 attitude as mediators of the effect of imagined intergroup contact on intergroup behavioural
22
23 tendencies. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43, 196–205.
24
25

26
27 Twenge, J. M., & Baumeister, R. F. (2005). Social exclusion increases aggression and self-
28
29 defeating behavior while reducing intelligent thought and prosocial behavior. In D. Abrams,
30
31 M. Hogg & J. Marques (Eds.). *The social psychology of inclusion and exclusion* (pp. 27–47).
32
33 Psychology Press: New York.
34
35

36
37 U.S. Census Bureau (2015). American community survey. Retrieved 04/28/2017 from:
38
39 <https://www.census.gov/programs-surveys/acs/>
40

41
42 Van Laar, C., Levin, S., Sinclair, S., & Sidanius, J. (2005). The effect of university roommate
43
44 contact on ethnic attitudes and behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 41, 329–
45
46 345. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2004.08.002
47

48
49 Van Zalk, M., Kerr, M., Van Zalk, N., & Stattin, H. (2013). Xenophobia and tolerance toward
50
51 immigrants in adolescence: Cross-influence processes within friendships. *Journal of*
52
53 *Abnormal Child Psychology*, 41, 627–639. doi:10.1007/s10802-012-9694-8
54

55
56 Vezzali, L., Stathi, S., Giovannini, D., Capozza, D., & Trifiletti, E. (2015). The greatest magic of
57
58 Harry Potter: Reducing prejudice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 45, 105–121.
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 Vezzali, L., Stathi, S., Crisp, R. J., Giovannini, D., Capozza, D., & Gaertner, S. L. (2015).

5
6 Imagined intergroup contact and common ingroup identity. *Social Psychology*.

7
8
9 Vezzali, L., Stathi, S., Giovannini, D., Capozza, D., & Visintin, E. P. (2015). And the best essay

10
11 isExtended contact and cross-group friendship at school. *British Journal of Social*

12
13 *Psychology*. doi: 10.1111/bjso.12110

14
15
16 Vezzali, L., Stathi, S., Crisp, R. J., & Capozza, D. (2015). Comparing direct and imagined

17
18 intergroup contact among children: Effects on outgroup stereotypes and helping intentions.

19
20
21 *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 49, 46-53.

22
23
24 Vezzali, L., Capozza, D., Giovannini, D., & Stathi, S. (2012). Improving implicit and explicit

25
26 intergroup attitudes using imagined contact: An experimental intervention with elementary

27
28 school children. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 15(2), 203-212.

29
30
31 Voci, A., & Hewstone, M. (2003). Intergroup contact and prejudice towards immigrants in Italy:

32
33 The mediational role of anxiety and the moderational role of group salience. *Group*

34
35
36 *Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 6, 37-54.

37
38
39 West, K. & Greenland, K. (2016), Beware of “reducing prejudice”: imagined contact may

40
41 backfire if applied with a prevention focus. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 46, 583–

42
43 592. doi:10.1111/jasp.12387

44
45
46 Wölfer, R., Faber, N. S., & Hewstone, M. (2015). Social network analysis in the science of

47
48 groups: Cross-sectional and longitudinal applications for studying intra- and intergroup

49
50 behavior. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 19, 45-61.

51
52
53 Wölfer R. Schmid, Hewstone, & van Zalk (2016). Developmental dynamics of intergroup

54
55 contact and intergroup attitudes: Long-term effects in adolescence and early adulthood.

56
57
58 *Child Development*, 87, 1466 – 1478.

1
2
3
4 Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact
5 effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and*
6
7 *Social Psychology*, 73, 73–90.
8
9

10
11 Zagefka, H., González, R., Brown, R., Lay, S., Manzi, J. & Didier, N. (2015). To know you is to
12 love you: effects of intergroup contact and knowledge on intergroup anxiety and prejudice
13 among indigenous. *International Journal of Psychology*.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65