

**Intergroup contact among majority and minority status groups in Turkey: Extending
theory and practice**

Sabahat Cigdem Bagci^{1*}, Sofia Stathi², & Berfin Acar¹

¹Sabanci University, Turkey

²University of Greenwich, UK

*Correspondence should be addressed to Sabahat Cigdem Bagci, Sabanci University, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Orhanli/Tuzla, 34956, Istanbul, Turkey. Tel: (+90) 216 483 9275.
Email: cigdem.bagci@sabanciuniv.edu.

Intergroup contact among majority and minority status groups in Turkey: Extending theory and practice

Since its introduction by Gordon Allport (1954), the premise that contact between different groups constitutes a promising tool for societies to improve intergroup relationships has gradually evolved into a sophisticated and dynamic theory (Pettigrew, 1997; Pettigrew, Tropp, Wagner, & Christ, 2011). A vast array of scientific research across different intergroup contexts shows that positive interactions that cross group boundaries typically reduce prejudice, even in the absence of favorable conditions such as equal status and intergroup cooperation (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). While *how* and *when* contact promotes positive intergroup attitudes has been established in earlier contact studies (Paolini et al., 2021), contemporary research focuses on much more complex implications of intergroup contact for individuals and groups, by delineating its role on a varied set of outcomes beyond prejudice. Substantial research interest has been directed recently to understanding, for example, whether intergroup contact provides psychological benefits for group members by contributing to psychological well-being (e.g., Bagci, Rutland, Kumashiro, Smith, & Blumberg, 2014; Özkan, Ergün, & Çakal, 2021), need satisfaction (Hassler et al., 2021), and socio-cognitive development (e.g., Boin, Rupar, Graf, Neji, Spiegler, & Swart, 2021; Hodson, Crisp, Meleady, & Earle, 2018). On the other hand, potential collective-level costs of intergroup contact, particularly in relation to disadvantaged group members' reduced motivation for collective action, have paved the path to novel research questions about the unintended outcomes of intergroup contact for societies (e.g., Cakal, Hewstone, Schwär, & Heath, 2011; Di Bernardo et al., 2021).

The current chapter aims to provide a critical review of the growing intergroup contact research in Turkey by exploring various, highly polarized social divides, but particularly

focusing on the unique context of Turkish-Kurdish interethnic relationships. We first lay out a review of how intergroup contact functions in conflictual intergroup settings. Then, we primarily focus on our research program that explores both direct (face-to-face) and indirect (not requiring face-to-face) intergroup contact. Specifically, we structure the examination of contact effects at three distinct, but interrelated levels: *intergroup-level* (e.g., intergroup attitudes, social distance, intergroup anxiety); *collective-level* (e.g., ingroup identification, group relative deprivation, collective action tendencies); and *individual-level* (e.g., psychological well-being, socio-cognitive skills, ideologies). Importantly and unlike the majority of existing intergroup contact reviews, we examine the perspectives of both *majority* and *minority* status group members, and where possible compare findings across a variety of other intergroup contexts in and outside Turkey.

Intergroup contact in conflict settings

Despite the well-established positive effects of intergroup contact on reducing prejudice (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), scholars have long discussed whether intergroup contact is a feasible strategy to help resolve real intergroup conflicts, by highlighting not only the limited generalizability of its effects to the society at large, but also the potential risk of perpetuating rather than attenuating conflict (Pettigrew et al., 2011). This section will provide an overview of the functionality of intergroup contact in various conflict settings.

Improving intergroup relations with direct and indirect contact

A vast literature on reconciliation in (post) conflict contexts has demonstrated intergroup contact to be a fundamental strategy for promoting peace processes. For example, research from Northern Ireland, where a long history of sectarian conflict between Catholics and Protestants

have divided the society, shows that intergroup contact predicts greater forgiveness of the outgroup (Hewstone, Cairns, Voci, Hamberger, & Niens, 2006), and promotes intergroup trust and positive behavioral tendencies (Tam, Hewstone, Kenworthy, & Cairns, 2009). Findings from South Africa, as well as Cyprus where groups have lived in segregation for years indicate that contact enhances outgroup perception and promotes greater engagement in reconciliation efforts (e.g., Stathi, Husnu, & Pendleton, 2017; Tropp, Hawi, O'Brien, Gheorghiu, Zetes, & Butz, 2017). Research from conflict settings with asymmetrical power relationships (e.g., Israeli Jews-Palestinians) also confirms that intergroup contact interventions effectively reduce intergroup hostility (Maoz, 2011), particularly among the dominant groups (Ditlmann & Samii, 2016).

Conceptually, intergroup contact may be particularly effective in conflict because it can reduce some of the important social-psychological drivers of conflict emergence and escalation. For example, increased perception of outgroup threat (e.g., realistic or symbolic; existentialist; power) and mistrust, lies at the heart of many intergroup conflicts (Green, Visintin, Sarrasin, & Hewstone, 2020; Rouhana & Fiske, 1995) and, critically, intergroup contact can successfully decrease the extent to which the outgroup is seen as threatening (see Hewstone et al., 2014). Many intractable conflicts are also characterized by strong ethnocentrism and (mostly) interdependent ingroup identities, whereby identification with one's group may represent a zero-sum game (Esses, Dovidio, Jackson, & Armstrong, 2001; Kelman, 1999). Ingroup glorification, as well as ethnocentrism, play key roles in shaping and fueling conflict (e.g., Bar-Tal, 1990; Castano, 2008). Intergroup contact can decrease this biased view of the ingroup and weaken one's ingroup-centered evaluation of the world, through ingroup reappraisal (Pettigrew, 1997), a process also called as *deprovincialization* (Pettigrew, 2009; see Boin et al., 2021 for a recent review).

Indirect contact strategies, which do not necessitate face-to-face interactions, have also provided supportive findings for the role of intergroup contact in conflict settings. Indirect contact has been suggested to be even more constructive in conflict settings, where social groups live in segregation, and thereby direct contact is not practically feasible (Christ et al., 2010). For example, mentally simulating a successful intergroup interaction (imagined intergroup contact, Turner, Crisp, & Lambert, 2007) has been found to promote intergroup relationships in Cyprus (Husnu & Crisp, 2015). Extended contact, observing or knowing about ingroup members' positive contact experiences (Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Ropp, 1997), and electronic-contact (e-contact) where group members meet through online chats (White & Abu-Rayya, 2012), also help in the reduction of prejudice in conflict settings such as Northern Ireland (e.g., White, Turner, Verrelli, Harvey, & Hanna, 2019). These studies show that direct and indirect forms of intergroup contact may be even more beneficial in contexts where group relationships involve conflict (Hewstone et al., 2014). This chapter will later discuss our research program in Turkey, which has investigated both direct and various indirect forms of contact.

Majority-minority perspectives

To fully understand how intergroup contact functions in conflict settings, it is imperative to explore the perspective of minority (disadvantaged) groups. Notably, less research has been devoted to understand how minority status group members benefit from intergroup contact particularly in conflict settings. The overall pattern of results across a variety of majority-minority contexts demonstrates that intergroup contact is more effective among majority group members (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005). However, intergroup contact also reduces negative intergroup attitudes among minority group members, albeit to a lesser extent and particularly when perceived discrimination is low (Tropp, 2006). Whereas the literature is yet to provide

more thorough evidence regarding why contact is less effective among minority group members, one explanation may relate to the fact that contact is less 'transformative' (more ordinary) for minority groups, who are, by default, surrounded greater numbers of majority group members (see Wallpaper effect, Barlow, Hornsey, Thai, Sengupta, & Sibley, 2013). Other accounts suggest minority group members' tendency to avoid intergroup contact because of an anticipation of discriminatory actions towards the ingroup and the self (Stathi, Pavetich, Di Bernardo, Cadamuro, Cocco, & Vezzali, 2020). Our research program, as we will present in this chapter, aims to highlight the perspective of minority groups in Turkey to the extent that data collection has been possible.

The 'risk' of negative intergroup contact

Meaningful intergroup contact which is based on successive, long-term, and intimate intergroup encounters necessitates consistent opportunities for initiating and maintaining such interactions. Practically then, positive interactions that cross group boundaries are most likely to occur in desegregated social settings that provide *regular* intergroup contact opportunities, such as workplaces and schools. Such settings may simply not exist in some conflict societies where physical segregation exists. On the other hand, even when such physical barriers are overthrown, contexts that provide a diverse set of potential networks may not unconditionally increase the motivation to initiate intergroup contact (Dixon et al., 2020), due to various reasons such as the anticipation of intergroup anxiety (Kauff et al., 2021; Paolini, Harwood, Hewstone, & Neumann, 2018).

Perhaps even worse than the lack of contact due to physical and psychological barriers is the manifestation of *negative contact*; intergroup settings that are characterized by mistrust, threat, and conflict are also likely to increase the chances of engaging in negative intergroup

encounters. This raises concerns about the real-life consequences of intergroup contact, especially for conflictual relationships (Schafer, Kauff, Prati, Kros, Lang, & Christ, 2021). While research has partially confirmed the positive-negative asymmetry assumptions showing negative contact to be more important in determining outgroup attitudes compared to positive contact (Barlow et al., 2012), some researchers have found positive and negative intergroup contact to exert effects of equal strength (Árnadóttir, Lolliot, Brown, & Hewstone, 2018) or show an asymmetry favoring positive contact (Brylka, Jasinskaja-Lahti, & Mahönen, 2016). Other researchers demonstrated positive and negative to interact (Árnadóttir et al., 2018) or other dimensions of intergroup contact such as contact intimacy (Fuochi, Voci, Boin, & Hewstone, 2020) and contact volition (Bagci, Husnu, Turnuklu, & Tercan, 2020), as well as social dominance orientation (Wang, Huang, Stathi, & Vezzali, 2020) to moderate the effects of contact's valence on intergroup attitudes. What has been consistently observed, however, is the disproportionate level of positive (versus negative) contact frequencies across different contexts, suggesting the prevalence of positive contact to compensate for the positive-negative contact asymmetry (Paolini, Harwood, Rubin, Husnu, Joyce, & Hewstone, 2014).

Contact and collective action motivation

While initial research provided strong evidence that intergroup contact promotes intergroup harmony across different contexts (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), one major criticism has addressed the potential of contact to create a false perception of intergroup equality, a phenomenon known as 'irony of harmony' (Saguy, Tausch, Dovidio, & Pratto, 2009) or contact's 'sedative effects' (Cakal et al., 2011). Whereas intergroup contact motivates majority status (advantaged) group members' tendency to support minority rights via solidarity-based collective action (Di Bernardo et al., 2021; Tropp, Uluğ, & Uysal, 2021), positive contact

experiences inadvertently pose challenges to minority group members' willingness to act on behalf of their own rights (Cakal et al., 2011). Recent evidence with a large sample of groups revealed that contact was associated with greater support for change among the advantaged, whereas the opposite association was observed among disadvantaged groups (Hassler et al. 2020).

Nevertheless, the nature of the intergroup context, the history of intergroup relationships, and more importantly how the advantaged group reacts to disadvantage predict the extent to which intergroup contact leads to sedative effects (see Dixon & McKeown, 2021; Hassler et al., 2021; Kauff, Green, Schmid, Hewstone, & Christ, 2016). Becker, Wright, Lubensky, and Zhou (2013) found, for example, that when advantaged group members clearly indicate the illegitimacy of the inequality, contact among disadvantaged group members does not seem to decrease collective action motivation. Therefore, in conflict settings where intergroup inequalities are not sufficiently recognized by majority group members, and where initial prejudices among the majority group exist, contact may be more likely to exert sedative effects among the disadvantaged. Acknowledging the importance of collective action to promote social change, our program of research, as will be discussed later in the chapter, explores collective action processes among advantaged and disadvantaged groups in Turkey.

Contact and positive individual outcomes

Moving from the examination of intergroup relations, researchers have recently started to examine the implications of contact for individuals. One line of research demonstrates cross-group interactions to relate to greater psychological well-being and resilience (Bagci et al., 2014), sense of safety (Munniksmas & Juvonen, 2012), lower victimization (Kawabata & Crick, 2011) and lower perception of vulnerability (Graham, Munniksmas, & Juvonen, 2014) among

children and youth. Contact also buffers the detrimental effects of negative intergroup processes such as perceived discrimination on well-being (Bagci et al., 2014; Page-Gould & Mendoza-Denton, 2008).

Less research has sought to understand whether intergroup contact is related to individual-level variables in conflictual intergroup contexts. This needs further attention, since collective-level conflicts, even when not experienced personally, are likely to be detrimental for individuals' mental health (Muldoon & Downes, 2007). For example, perceived outgroup threat in the context of sectarian conflict in Northern Ireland predicts poorer well-being (Schmid & Muldoon, 2015), while contact's success on reducing threat is well-established (Cakal et al., 2016). Thus, positive relationships with outgroup members may provide unique individual-level benefits by protecting individuals from a variety of negative intergroup processes in current or post conflict settings (see Voci, Hadziosmanovic, Cakal, Veneziani, & Hewstone, 2017). Our research program in Turkey has begun to explore this avenue, and results will be discussed below.

Contact research in Turkey

While Turkey has been the home of a variety of intergroup conflicts in the past and at present, it is only recently that a significant amount of research on intergroup contact has started to accumulate, especially in relation to Turkish-Kurdish relationships. This section provides an overview of the Turkish-Kurdish relationship context and examines existing contact studies in relation to three sets of outcomes; intergroup, collective, and individual. The full list of published and unpublished contact papers conducted in Turkey that we reviewed is presented in Tables 1 and 2.

-----Insert Tables 1 and 2-----

The Turkish-Kurdish intergroup context

The intractable relations between Turks and Kurds have fluctuated over the years with armed struggles between the separatist Kurdish party and the Turkish State since the 1980's. Although the armed conflict is restricted to the rural parts of the East of Turkey, where a great number of Kurdish people reside, through waves of migration and displacement of Kurds over the years (Çakal et al., 2016; Yörük, 2012), Turks and Kurds have started to live in close proximity in various big cities such as Istanbul, Ankara, Izmir, and Mersin. Although the two ethnic groups vary in their understanding of the conflict and the extent to which they endorse various narratives (Uluğ & Cohrs, 2016), there is no visible segregation at schools and workplaces. Therefore, unlike other (post) conflict settings where groups are physically segregated, the Turkish-Kurdish context is likely to represent a high contact-high conflict intergroup setting, which is also unique in Turkey. For example, contact with Armenians, another conflicted outgroup for Turks, is reported to be less frequent than contact with Kurds (Bağcı & Çelebi, 2017). Also, unlike Turkish-Kurdish relations, the relations between Turkish natives and Syrian refugees involve low levels of intergroup contact, and low intergroup conflict (Firat & Ataca, 2020).

Nevertheless, despite geographical proximity between the two groups and the relatively high levels of self-reported intergroup contact (e.g., Bağcı & Turnuklu, 2019), both Turks and Kurds display negative intergroup attitudes and behaviors. Kurds are among the most 'othered' group in the private sphere (Çelik, Bilal, & Iqbal, 2017), report discrimination as much as other stigmatized groups in Turkey (Bağcı, Verkuyten, Koc, Turnuklu, Piyale, & Bekmezci, 2020), display consistent feelings of mistrust over the years (Konda Barometer, 2015) and perceive a

considerable level of social identity threat (Bagci, Stathi, & Golec de Zavala, under review). Turks also usually report unfavorable attitudes towards Kurds and anti-Kurdish discourse is prevalent in the society (Dixon & Ergin, 2010). For example, in data collected in 2020, attitudes towards Kurds were more negative than various other groups such as Christians, homeless, and the LGBTI (Troian & Bagci, 2020). Therefore, the Turkish-Kurdish context provides an intriguing *milieu* for the investigation of intergroup contact among both majority and minority group members, allowing us to explore the role of multiple types of direct and indirect contact experiences, in relation to a diverse range of intergroup, collective, and individual outcomes.

Intergroup level outcomes

Direct contact studies. Research on the effectiveness of direct intergroup contact on intergroup attitudes in the context of Turkish-Kurdish relationships mostly corroborate previous contact research in conflict settings. Turks' contact with Kurds has been associated with lower social distance directly and indirectly through reduced perceived threat and increased outgroup empathy (Bilali, Iqbal, & Çelik, 2018). In a further study, we showed that both cross-group friendships and positive contact with Kurds were associated moderately strongly with more positive attitudes and behavioral tendencies, but more importantly positive contact experiences buffered the associations between prejudice and negative behavioral tendencies, preventing negative attitudes to become discriminatory behaviors (Studies 1 and 2, Bagci, Turnuklu, & Tercan, 2020). This finding was also replicated as regards attitudes towards LGBTI and Syrian refugees in Turkey (Studies 3-5).

Using a more explicit comparative approach, we examined the role of Turks' contact experiences on attitudes towards Kurdish and Armenian people (Bağcı & Çelebi, 2017). Armenians are also likely to constitute another conflict-associated minority group in Turkey due

to differential perceptions around the Armenian genocide (Karasu & Göreğenli, 2016), but represent a less oppressed group than Kurds (Bikmen & Sunar, 2013). We found that although Turks' attitudes towards the two groups were similar in terms of positivity, self-reported contact and the perception of conflict were higher in relation to Kurds than Armenians. Intergroup contact was related to reduced intergroup anxiety concerning both groups, nevertheless only contact with Kurdish people led to decreases in the perception of threat, demonstrating contact to be particularly effective in reducing threat in the context of high intensity conflict.

The association between intergroup contact and reduced threat perception is not unique to majority Turks; among the few contact papers examining the perspectives of both Turkish and Kurdish groups, Çakal et al. (2016) demonstrated that intergroup contact was associated with more positive outgroup evaluation directly and indirectly via reduced perception of threat among both Turks and Kurds. Similarly, looking at both groups we found that cross-group friendships were associated with lower competitive victimhood beliefs through increased perspective-taking and reduced ingroup identification (Bagci, Piyale, Karaköse, & Şen, accepted). Uluğ and Cohrs (2017) further showed that positive intergroup experiences were related to both Turks' and Kurds' positive attitudes towards reconciliation, although major group differences were observed in relation to the endorsement of conflict narratives.

While the above findings indicate contact to have benefits as regards intergroup attitudes among both groups, other studies illustrate a more complex picture. For example, including a sample of Turkish and Kurdish participants from different parts of Turkey, we found that the number of cross-group friendships was associated with more positive outgroup attitudes among both groups, but cross-group friendships only promoted intergroup attitudes when perceived interethnic conflict was low (Bagci & Çelebi, 2017). More specifically, cross-group friendships

were related to negative outgroup attitudes among minority group members (and unrelated to attitudes among majority group members) who perceived a high level of interethnic conflict, demonstrating that even cross-group friendships, as the ultimate form of intergroup contact, may not readily enhance the positive perception of the outgroup in conflict-ridden settings. This finding is in line with previous research suggesting intergroup contact to improve attitudes among minority group members who only perceived a low level of discrimination (Tropp, 2006). It also supports research from other post-conflict settings; Voci et al. (2017) found that Bosnians' postwar contact with Serbs was related to greater trust towards this outgroup, only among those who experienced a low level of violence during war. Overall, these results implicate the importance of considering the interactive effects of contact and conflict in the understanding of intergroup relationships in such settings.

Following latest contact research trends, some studies also distinguished between positive and negative contact experiences among Turks and Kurds. Theoretically, Kurds as an oppressed minority group may report as many (or more) negative contact experiences as positive contact experiences. However, our findings demonstrated that, in line with literature (Paolini et al., 2014), both Turks and Kurds generally report significantly more frequent positive contact than negative contact (Bagci & Turnuklu, 2019; Bagci, Turnuklu, & Tercan, 2020). More importantly, we consistently found a positive-negative asymmetry favoring positive contact effects; compared to negative contact, positive contact experiences are not only more frequent, but also more closely associated with attitudes, a finding that is consistent across group status. We argued that, following the category-salience hypothesis (Paolini et al., 2010), positive contact experiences in a conflict-ridden setting, where intergroup attitudes are characterized by threat and mistrust, may be more salient than negative contact experiences, thereby may generalize faster to positive

intergroup attitudes (Brown & Hewstone, 2005). However, other research among Syrian refugees in Turkey also demonstrates positive contact to be more frequent and more closely associated with host country identification (Özkan et al., 2021), indicating positive contact to be more closely associated with outgroup attitudes regardless group status and conflict severity. Further research is thereby needed to understand why and how positive contact effects are more prominent in these intergroup contexts, as well as how these experiences can be used to promote peace.

Indirect contact studies. In line with the recent trends demonstrating indirect contact strategies to be beneficial for improving intergroup attitudes, we conducted several studies in different intergroup contexts in Turkey, which overall indicate a mixed pattern of findings. Particularly focusing on the Turkish-Kurdish context (Bagci, Piyale, & Ebcim, 2018, Study 1), we demonstrated that an imagined contact paradigm where Turkish participants imagined interacting positively with a Kurdish person demonstrated improved intergroup attitudes and greater support for multiculturalism, decreased intergroup anxiety and perceived outgroup threat, only when ingroup identification was high. The findings confirm previous studies that showed contact strategies to work more effectively among individuals who are initially more biased, and lack prior contact (e.g., Asbrock, Gutenbrunner, & Wagner, 2013). In a second study conducted among Turkish participants, we demonstrated that imagined contact effects were more negative when the imagined Kurdish contact partner affirmed his/her identity during the imagined interaction (Study 2), in line with research showing majority group members' negative attitudes toward minority group members' desire for culture maintenance (Zagefka, Brown, Broquard, & Martin, 2007). We replicated the positive effects of imagined intergroup contact among Turks in

further research, demonstrating improved outgroup attitudes after imagining a positive interaction with an unknown Kurdish person (Bagci, Stathi, & Piyale, 2019a, Study 2).

In a different series of experiments testing imagined contact effects in relation to Turkish natives' attitudes towards Syrian refugees, we used similar imagined contact scenarios, but this time adding the new construct of 'cross-group friendship potential' to strengthen the standard scenario (Bagci, Piyale, Bircek, & Ebcim, 2018). Results of three studies demonstrated that it was possible to improve a variety of intergroup outcomes (such as trust and behavioral intentions towards Syrian refugees) with both standard and strengthened imagined contact scenarios. However, perceived realism of the scenarios functioned as an important covariate and warrants greater attention, especially when considering the ecological validity of the findings. A further study, however, did not replicate our imagined contact findings in relation to Turks' attitudes toward Kurds and Syrians; Firat and Ataca (2020) demonstrated that a standard imagined contact scenario did not improve explicit or implicit attitudes towards either group. These inconsistencies can be explained by a variety of mechanisms, such as differences in terms of manipulation instructions and settings involved in the scenarios, and the ethnic composition of the setting (East or West of Turkey). Such results indicate the need to carefully design imagined contact paradigms that fit the specific intergroup context (see Vezzali & Stathi, 2021, Chapter 4).

Relatively fewer studies have tested whether indirect contact strategies are effective among minority group members. With a sample of Kurdish participants recruited from the general community (Bagci, Piyale, & Ebcim, 2018, Study 3), we found that imagined contact did not change Kurds' attitudes towards Turks, but it decreased their intergroup anxiety and perception of discrimination (marginally) and increased the positivity of their meta-perceptions (an understanding of how the Turks perceived them). We replicated the null effects of imagined

contact on attitudes with another Kurdish sample, this time recruited from the East of Turkey where conflict is of relatively higher intensity (Bagci, Stathi, & Piyale, 2019a, Study 1). Some of our findings (Bagci, Stathi, & Piyale, 2019b) even showed that imagined intergroup contact may backfire, particularly among minority group members who live in conflict-ridden settings; Kurds, again recruited from the East of Turkey (Study 2) and Kurds who are strongly identified with their ingroup (Study 3) were found to indicate a lower level of desire for contact participation after a positive imagined contact scenario.

Overall, these studies are in line with previous theoretical and empirical approaches demonstrating intergroup contact to be a less transformative experience for minority group members (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005), but also highlight that different settings may require more tailored interventions. A closer look at how participants responded to imagined contact scenarios in Bagci et al. (2019a) revealed that although the interactions were mostly depicted as positive, both majority Turkish and minority Kurdish participants reported that intergroup contact would be a positive experience *under some conditions*, including lack of prejudicial attitudes and a non-political communication, which may indicate the need to test other potential moderators (e.g., exposure to or perception of conflict, socio-political ideologies).

Acknowledging potential pitfalls of imagined contact studies, we conducted two further indirect contact studies in the Turkish-Kurdish context, this time using a different indirect contact paradigm; electronic-contact (E-contact, White & Abu-Rayya, 2012). E-contact allows participants to interact through a structured contact setting where the self is involved, but at the same time the positivity, length, as well as the content of the conversations can be pre-programmed (unbeknownst to participants). In two studies, our findings demonstrated that Turkish participants' online contact with a Kurdish student improved intergroup attitudes and

behavioral tendencies towards Kurds (Bagci, Guvensoy, Turner, White, & Piyale, 2021).

Although the ecological validity, the strength, as well as the stability of effects in indirect contact studies conducted in a laboratory setting are questionable, these interventions seem to provide potential novel avenues for improving intergroup perceptions in the Turkish context.

Collective level outcomes

The Turkish-Kurdish context also provides an important setting for understanding the potential sedative effects of intergroup contact, as the two ethnic groups are involved in an asymmetrical power axis, where the Turks constitute the advantaged group and the Kurds constitute the disadvantaged group (Çakal et al., 2016). Parallel to increased research efforts to delineate the unintended consequences of intergroup contact on willingness to engage in collective action (e.g., Hassler et al., 2021), there has been a recent interest in how and when contact implicates such unintended consequences among Turkish and Kurdish groups.

Direct contact studies. In line with most research showing intergroup contact among advantaged group members to lead to greater support of minority rights, our correlational results indicated that for Turks, friendships with Kurds were associated with a more multiculturalism ideology that supports the mixing of Turks and Kurds (Bagci & Celebi, 2017). Çelebi, Verkuyten, and Smyrnioti (2016) further demonstrated that greater interethnic contact reported by Turks was associated with greater support for Kurdish language rights. Tropp et al. (2021, Study 2) demonstrated that Turks' contact with Kurds was associated with greater willingness to act in solidarity with Kurds through the process of communicating about group differences in power. Therefore, in line with previous research, Turks with greater positive contact experiences with Kurds seem to display more positive tendencies towards supporting Kurdish rights. Recent data collected among Turkish native participants living in neighbourhoods with a high

concentration of Syrian refugees indicated that positive contact at the neighbourhood level was significantly associated with willingness to support pro-immigrant rights (Bagci, Verkuyten, & Canpolat, under review).

What is more questionable, though, is how Turks' intergroup contact experiences relate to their own collective action motivation. In other words, in conflict-ridden settings, despite clear indications of power asymmetries favoring the advantaged group, it is possible that advantaged group members also look for strategies to improve the position of their ingroup. For example, Çakal and colleagues (2016) investigated the sedative effects of intergroup contact among Turks and concluded that contact's sedative effects were parallel across both majority and minority group participants. Using an imagined contact paradigm (Bagci, Stathi, Piyale, 2019a, Study 2), we found, however, that imagined contact *mobilized* Turks' collective action on behalf of their ingroup, fueled ingroup identification, relative deprivation and perceived discrimination, indicating that in conflict settings when ingroup identities are made salient, imagined intergroup contact may not readily undermine collective action motivation.

Studies investigating direct contact experiences and Kurdish group members' collective action tendencies demonstrate a clear pattern of the *demobilizing* effects of contact. For example, Çelebi et al. (2016) found that Kurds' contact with Turks was associated with lower support of Kurdish rights through an increased Turkish national identification, but a decreased ethnic identification. Uluğ and Cohrs (2017) concluded that intergroup contact was indeed 'counterproductive' for Kurdish people as it weakened their endorsement of pro-Kurdish conflict narratives. Çakal et al. (2016) demonstrated that intergroup contact had sedative effects among Kurds, through a decrease in the perception of outgroup threat. We also found that direct positive contact, but not negative contact among Kurds, was associated with lower ingroup identification

and lower relative deprivation, which in turn related to weaker collective action tendencies (Bagci & Turnuklu, 2019).

Indirect contact studies. Findings, however, are mixed when looking at indirect contact studies among Kurds. While we demonstrated that imagined contact enhanced positive meta-perceptions (Bagci, Piyale, & Ebcim, 2018, Study 3), among Kurdish samples recruited from Eastern parts of Turkey we found that imagined intergroup contact did not demobilize collective action; instead it increased collective action tendencies through increased perceived discrimination and ethnic identification (Bagci, Stathi, & Piyale, 2019a, Study 2) and reduced the sense of social acceptance (measured by collective self-esteem) and contact participation (Bagci, Stathi, & Piyale, 2019b, Study 2, and among a more heterogeneous sample with higher ingroup identification in Study 3). While these findings are at first glance inconsistent with direct contact literature, we argued that the salience of group memberships during imagined contact is usually higher (Crisp, Husnu, Meleady, Stathi, & Turner, 2010), which could explain why contact does not predict reduced collective action among advantaged and disadvantaged group members.

Individual level outcomes

In different intergroup contexts, intergroup contact and cross-group friendships have been investigated in relation to a variety of individual outcomes. In line with the cognitive liberalization hypothesis (Hodson et al., 2018), we demonstrated that contact does not only improve intergroup attitudes, but also provides important socio-cognitive skills, such as cognitive flexibility and empathy, among both Turkish and Kurdish university students, highlighting the potential socio-cognitive gains from intergroup contact (Bagci, Piyale, Şen, & Yildirim, 2019). Also, our research has shown contact to contribute to greater well-being, particularly among disadvantaged group members; among Syrian refugees in Turkey, positive

contact experiences promoted life satisfaction and psychological well-being through lower levels of intergroup anxiety and greater levels of social acceptance (Bagci & Canpolat, 2019), a finding which was replicated by Özkan et al. (2021). In a different intergroup context, disabled individuals' cross-group friendships with non-disabled individuals predicted greater well-being through two different pathways; one via *empowerment*, perceiving that one has the potential to 'have a say' in the community, the other via *social integration*, perceiving that one has the potential to hold reciprocal and positive intergroup attitudes (Bagci, Turnuklu, & Bekmezci, 2018b).

One potential concern in the literature has been whether positive and negative intergroup contact experiences have some paradoxical implications for psychological well-being (Bagci & Turnuklu, 2019). Based on intergroup contact's deprovincializing role, whereby one becomes less identified with his/her ingroup as a result of contact experiences (Pettigrew, 2009), we predicted that positive contact would be associated with lower ingroup identification. Although this process may benefit intergroup relations, social identities are also known to provide multiple psychological benefits through satisfying a variety of human needs, such as belongingness, self-esteem, and efficacy (see Social Cure Approach, Jetten, Haslam, & Haslam, 2012). Therefore, weakening ingroup identification could imply a negative effect on psychological well-being. While recent research has shown intergroup contact to directly contribute to need satisfaction in individuals (e.g., need of empowerment and acceptance, Hassler et al., 2021), it is also likely to indirectly reduce some of the gains from psychological needs by weakening ingroup identification. In line with this assumption, we found that positive contact was associated with lower ingroup identification among both Turkish and Kurdish participants; and such reduced ingroup identification was costly for psychological well-being (and for collective action

tendencies). Ironically, negative intergroup contact was associated indirectly with greater well-being through instigating perceived discrimination, and in turn strengthening ingroup identification, a process that contributed to greater psychological well-being (Bagci & Turnuklu, 2019). These findings call for future research to examine in more detail the implications of positive and negative intergroup contact for the self, particularly in relation to variables that link with psychological well-being (e.g., loneliness, self-acceptance).

Areas for future development

As shown in the chapter thus far, the context of Turkish-Kurdish relationships has started to attract both Turkish and non-Turkish scholars' attention, allowing researchers to examine intergroup contact in an underrepresented, but intriguing research context. This new generation of contact research has started to examine solidly the implications of intergroup contact for groups and individuals, and provide rich and inspiring avenues for future research. Yet, despite providing important theoretical and practical advancement to the field of intergroup contact, current contact research in Turkey still involves limitations that could be tackled in future research.

Need for methodological innovation. Most of the existing research on intergroup contact in Turkey has been correlational. Whereas many researchers in a variety of conflict settings have managed to understand the causal associations between intergroup contact and related outgroup attitudes and behaviors (e.g., Christ et al., 2010), contact studies in Turkey cannot, at present, show any temporal sequence between contact experiences and intergroup attitudes. Although previous research acknowledged that examining Turkish-Kurdish relationships, especially in field studies, is associated with a number of risks for researchers (Moss, Uluğ, & Acar, 2019) and the sensitive nature of relevant constructs restricts the collection of large data even at a

single time point, greater efforts should be placed on conducting longitudinal studies. This would highlight the longer-term effectiveness and feasibility of intergroup contact in promoting intergroup harmony. While experimental methods have been used and reveal, for example, the effects of imagined contact on a variety of outcomes, such short-term contact applications are deemed volatile when there are no follow-up investigations and field research. Novel methodologies currently used in intergroup contact research, such as social network analyses (Wölfer & Hewstone, 2017) are likely to lay out the dynamic and complex nature of cross-group friendships, and provide important insights into same-ethnic and cross-ethnic ties that are formed in various social settings.

Need for research on the facilitators and inhibitors of contact. Recent research on intergroup contact has placed increased attention to how intergroup contact experiences are formed in the first place (Kauff et al., 2021). This can be especially critical in Turkey where contact opportunities exist, but the benefits of contact are not fully seized. Whereas intergroup anxiety and diversity have been previously associated with the formation of actual intergroup contact (e.g., Turner & Cameron, 2016), more recent research has focused on ‘motivated contact behavior’ which can be driven through self-efficacy beliefs (Bagci, Cameron, et al., 2020), interest in intergroup contact (Stathi et al., 2020), self-expansion motivation (Paolini et al., 2018), and contact volition (Bagci, Husnu, et al., 2020). These factors are likely to be important in intergroup conflict settings, where misperceptions, mistrust and threat which commonly characterize intergroup relationships demotivate group members to pursue cross-group interactions.

Need for an applied-developmental approach. One related, vital research avenue is the investigation of younger, school-aged children, whose attitudes are likely to be partly formed

during school years. Previous research has shown intergroup contact experiences during early stages of life to predict not only the diversity of social networks in later life (e.g., Fischer, 2008), but also of attitudes in adolescence and later on (Wölfer, Schmid, Hewstone, & van Zalk, 2016). A substantial amount of research also suggests that intergroup attitudes are shaped by the social norms and experiences of social exclusion and inclusion in school settings, particularly during childhood and early adolescence (e.g., Rutland & Killen, 2015; Titzmann, Brenick, & Silbereisen, 2015). Friendships that cross-group boundaries during those years are uniquely associated with a variety of psycho-social benefits, such as decreased sense of vulnerability (Graham, Munnikma, & Juvonen, 2014), and help in gaining socio-cognitive skills, such as leadership skills (Lease & Blake, 2005). Schools are likely to provide an excellent setting for the cultivation of positive social norms around diversity and promotion of intergroup contact, allowing children to expand their social networks to those who belong to different social categories. While there are few recent studies that focused on changing children's perceptions of outgroups via indirect contact strategies at schools in Turkey (Tercan et al., 2021), greater efforts are needed to disseminate the practical utility of such strategies, especially for the well-being of vulnerable minority groups.

Conclusion

Overall, this chapter indicates that intergroup contact in Turkey, in direct and indirect forms, may have many important implications for intergroup relationships and beyond. While some of our studies replicate previous research conducted in the rest of the world, other findings provide inconsistent, but intriguing, novel and thought-provoking research questions. Therefore, exploring intergroup contexts in Turkey is not only interesting, but also essential to study of intergroup contact. We believe that studying intergroup contact in Turkey does not only benefit

from intergroup contact theory, but it also contributes to the theoretical and practical advancement of the theory, by presenting a variety of complex, dynamic and yet underexplored intergroup relationships.

Table 1. Studies evaluating the effects of direct contact in Turkey.

<i>Study</i>	<i>Participants</i>	<i>Contact Operationalization</i>	<i>Mediator(s) of Contact</i>	<i>Moderator(s) of Contact</i>	<i>Dependent Variable(s)</i>	<i>Key Findings</i>
Experimental studies						
Bagci & Blazhenkova, (2020)	Majority groups in various contexts ($N = 534$, total of 4 events) (relation with sex workers, transsexuals, drag queens, ex-prisoners, HIV+ individuals)	Participating in the Human Library event, by engaging in 30-minute face to face interactions with people from stigmatized groups	/	/	Outgroup attitudes (affective, cognitive, behavioural)	Actual contact in the event led to an improvement in outgroup attitudes, with effectiveness of the event varying across certain evaluative dimensions.
*Karazor, (2019)	Turkish ($N = 22$) and Kurdish ($N = 23$) people living in the same dormitory rooms with an outgroup member (relation with Kurdish and Turkish people respectively)	Intergroup friendship, positive and negative contact	/	/	Empathy for the outgroup, intergroup anxiety, intergroup attitudes, intergroup prejudice	Intergroup contact and friendship increased intergroup empathy, improved attitudes and decreased prejudice. Negative contact, on the other hand, decreased empathy and increased negative outgroup attitudes.
Correlational studies						
Bagci & Gungor (2019)	7 th and 8 th grader Turkish students ($N = 325$) (relation with other ethnic groups)	Frequency of (+) and (-) perceived parental contact	Perspective taking, intergroup anxiety, outgroup attitudes, approach behavioural tendencies	/	Adolescents' (+) and (-) contact behaviour	Perceived parental contact experiences were reflected on adolescents' own contact experiences through proposed mechanisms
Bagci, Turnuklu, & Bekmezci (2018a)	Physically disabled adults ($N = 269$) (relation with non-disabled adults)	Frequency of contact with non-disabled friends, and the	/	Ingroup identification	Mental health (depression and anxiety symptoms)	Intergroup contact protected disabled people from the influence of perceived discrimination on

		amount of self-disclosure				mental health, only when ingroup identification was low.
Bagci & Çelebi (2017)	Turkish ($N = 320$) and Kurdish participants ($N = 153$) (relation with Kurds and Turks respectively)	Cross-group friendships (Number of friends who are members of the outgroup)	/	Perceived interethnic conflict, ethnic group status	Outgroup attitudes, multiculturalism, outgroup responsibility for conflict	Cross-group friendships were positively related with outgroup attitudes for both groups, only when perceived conflict was low.
Bağcı & Çelebi (2017)	Turkish university students ($N = 356$) (relation with Kurds and Armenians)	Number of acquaintances and friends	Intergroup threat and anxiety	/	Outgroup attitudes, support for multiculturalism	Threat acted as a mediator in relation with Kurds but not Armenians, and anxiety acted as a mediator in relation with Armenians but not Kurds
Bagci, Husnu, et al. (2020), Studies 2-4	Turkish participants ($N = 129$, study 2) ($N = 154$, study 3) ($N = 638$ children, 5 th -7 th graders, study 4) (relation with various minority groups)	Activity in, intention for, and control over contact experiences (study 2), contingency (added in study 3), quantity (added in study 4)	Contact intimacy and positivity (study 2-4)	Contact volition (study 4)	Outgroup attitudes (study 2 and 3), approach and avoidance tendencies (added in study 4)	The positive influence of contact was dependent on volition.
Bilali et al. (2018)	Turkish people ($N = 1361$) (relation with Kurds, AKP opponents, AKP supporters, Alevi)	Frequency of being in the same place, becoming friends or conversing, shopping from stores owned by members of the specific outgroup	Perceived threat, empathy	/	Social distance	Contact significantly predicted social distance both directly, and indirectly through proposed mediators.
Bagci, Piyale, et al. (2019)	Turkish ($N = 240$) and Kurdish ($N = 243$) people (relation with Kurds and Turks respectively)	Cross-group friendships (frequency of contact with outgroup friends and peers)	Ethnocentrism, social dominance orientation, outgroup attitudes	/	Cognitive flexibility, perspective-taking, empathy	When the quality of cross-group friendships increased, SDO and ethnocentrism decreased. They, in turn, predicted higher perspective taking an empathy. Contact also related to higher cognitive flexibility in both groups.

Tropp et al. (2021), Study 2	Turkish people ($N = 267$) (relation with Kurdish people)	Number of outgroup acquaintances and friends	Communication about group differences in power	/	Support for minority collective action among advantaged group members	Greater contact with outgroup members predicted greater support for collective action, through the discussion of differences in power
Çakal et al. (2016)	Turkish people ($N = 289$) (relation with Kurdish people, study 1), Kurdish people ($N = 209$) (relation with Turkish people, study 2)	Frequency of talking to and spending time with Kurdish friends, as well as visiting them at their homes	Perceived threat (both symbolic and realistic)	/	Collective action tendencies, outgroup evaluations	Perceived threat mediated the effects of contact experiences on outgroup evaluations and collective action tendencies
Çelebi et al. (2016)	Turkish and Kurdish people ($N = 625$) (relation with Kurdish and Turkish people respectively)	Cross group friendships (number of close friends they have from the outgroup)	/	/	Support for Kurdish language rights	Turkish people who have a greater number of Kurdish friends showed higher support for Kurdish language rights. Cross-group friendships that Kurds have, on the other hand, did not have an undermining effect. Meaning, their desire for obtaining language rights persisted even when they have Turkish close friends.
Özkan et al. (2021)	Syrian immigrants ($N = 285$) (relation with Turks)	(+) and (-) contact (Frequency of pleasant and friendly contact, frequency of unpleasant contact and conflict with Turks)	Perceived discrimination, life satisfaction, identification with the host society	/	Migration decision (either returning home or migrating to a Western country)	Positive contact with Turks was associated with lower intentions to return home or migrate to a Western country. Negative contact was associated with increased intentions to return.
Bagci et al. (2018b)	Disabled people in the Turkish context ($N = 269$) (relation with non-disabled people)	Quality of cross-group friendships (i.e. time spent, intimacy, positivity, self-disclosure, support)	Collective self-esteem, collective action tendencies (empowerment path), perceived majority attitudes, outgroup attitudes (social integration path)	/	Psychological well-being	Cross-group friendships was related to psychological well-being through both social integration and empowerment.

Bagci & Turnuklu (2018)	Turkish university students ($N = 376$) and Kurdish people ($N = 151$) (relation with Kurds and Turks respectively)	Frequency of positive and negative contact with Kurdish (for Turkish participants) or Turkish (for Kurdish participants) peers.	Relative deprivation, perceived discrimination, ingroup identification	/	Outgroup attitudes, collective action tendencies, psychological well-being	Among both the majority and the minority groups positive contact was a stronger predictor of outgroup attitudes, in comparison with negative contact.
Bağcı & Canpolat, (2019)	Syrian immigrants ($N = 163$) (relation with Turkish people)	Frequency of positive contact with Turkish people	Intergroup anxiety, ingroup identification, social acceptance	/	Psychological well-being	Positive contact was correlated with intergroup anxiety negatively, and with acceptance and ingroup identification positively. Contact influenced well-being indirectly through these mediators.
Ülkücan et al. (2019)	Turkish Alevi or Sunni people ($N = 43$, 18 couples, 7 individuals). (relation with Sunni and Alevi people respectively)	Intermarriage between Alevis and Sunnis in Turkey (Frequency of culture-related activities, level of affection, frequency of meeting relatives from both sides)	/	/	Cultural similarities, inclusiveness of identity categories, positive contact experiences	Intermarriage between Alevis and Sunnis in Turkey has been found to increase all of the outcome variables.
Kaçmaz et al. (2019)	Turkish ($N = 22$) and Kurdish ($N = 23$) university students who share a dormitory room with outgroup students. (relation with Kurdish and Turkish students respectively)	Chatting, eating together, hanging out, engaging in academic and sports activities, watching movies, participating in cultural activities.	/	/	Feelings of being accepted and sincerity of the interactions are investigated in addition to other variables mentioned in this table under contact operationalization.	In time, students started to spend more time and more quality time together. As their interaction frequency increased, their prejudice towards each other decreased.
Türk et al. (2019)	School psychological counsellors ($N = 40$) (talking	Helping, emotional support, willingness for inclusion	/	/	Intergroup friendship, emotional	Positive intergroup contact led to the development of helping behaviour between Syrian and

	about the relations between Syrian and Turkish students)	(positive contact), disturbing and insulting each other (negative contact).			support, helping behaviours	Turkish children. Syrian children who cannot use the Turkish language effectively are found to have more problems in being included.
Bagci, Turnuklu et al. (2020)	Turkish people ($N = 1281$) (relation with Kurdish people in studies 1 and 2, with LGBTI people in study 3, with Syrian immigrants in study 4 and 5)	Number of outgroup friends	/	Intergroup contact, attitude certainty	Behavioural tendencies, social distance	Having cross-group friends decreased the possibility that prejudice will turn into avoidant behaviours. Also, when attitudes were less certain, the moderating role of positive contact increased.
Uluğ and Cohrs (2017)	Non-çapulcu Turks ($N = 78$), Çapulcu Turks ($N = 307$), Kurds ($N = 105$) (Çapulcu refers to an excluded identity based on political preferences in Gezi Park protests)	Contact quality (cross-group friendships and positivity of contact experiences)	Terrorism narrative, economic narrative, democracy and Islam narrative, democracy and rights narrative, independence narrative	Group status	Attitudes towards reconciliation, attitudes towards the peace process	Contact may lead non-excluded majority members to support pro-minority policies, but not pro-minority conflict narratives; whereas it leads excluded majority members to support both the policies and the narratives.
*Güler and Hovardaoğlu, (2013)	Turkish ($N = 239$) and Kurdish people ($N = 128$). (relation with Kurdish and Turkish people respectively)	Presence and frequency of contact experiences	Ingroup bias, intergroup anxiety	Contact conditions (equal status, superordinate goals, cooperation, institutional support)	Social distance	Intergroup contact was related to outgroup prejudice and social distance, mediated by prejudice and intergroup anxiety.
*Yanboluoğlu, (2018)	Turkish people ($N = 303$) (relation with Syrian immigrants)	Frequency of contact with Syrian immigrants, number of Syrian friends	Perceived threat, intergroup anxiety	/	Positive/negative feelings towards the outgroup members, social distance	Positive contact increased positive feelings towards Syrian immigrants, whereas negative contact increased negative feelings. Intergroup anxiety and threat mediated this relationship.

*Özkeçeci, (2017)	Turkish citizens from İstanbul and Şanlıurfa ($N = 310$) (relation with Syrian immigrants)	Contact quality (depth, willingness, pleasantness, cooperativeness, intimacy, positivity) and quantity (number of Syrian acquaintances)	Threat perceptions, negative stereotyping	Contact quality	Perceived threat (realistic and symbolic), negative stereotyping, negative affect, social distance, warmth towards Syrians	Quality of contact was related to all outcome variables. Realistic threat mediated the relationship between contact quality and feelings, whereas symbolic threat mediated the relationship between contact quality and social distance.
Güler (2019)	University students at a Turkish university ($N = 155$) (relation with Syrians)	Frequency and quality (hanging out, home visits, study groups) of contact	Superordinate (Muslim) identity	Intergroup contact and its quality	Intentions to help	People who hold a common ingroup identity endorsed more prosocial behaviours towards Syrians. Having quality contact experiences in this relationship increased the effect.

Notes. *Unpublished Master's and Doctoral Thesis

Table 2. Studies evaluating the effects of indirect contact in Turkey.

<i>Study</i>	<i>Participants</i>	<i>Contact Operationalization</i>	<i>Mediator(s) of Contact</i>	<i>Moderator(s) of Contact</i>	<i>Dependent Variable(s)</i>	<i>Key Findings</i>
Experimental interventions						
Bagci, Guvensoy et al. (2021)	Turkish people ($N = 110$, study 1) ($N = 176$, study 2) (relation with Kurdish people)	Chatting online with an outgroup member (in reality, responses were computer generated)	Outgroup trust, intergroup anxiety	Amount of self-disclosure	Attitudes and behavioural tendencies towards Kurds (study 1), perceived inter-ethnic conflict (added in study 2)	E-contact led to improved attitudes and behavioural tendencies towards Kurds, as well as decreasing perceived conflict with them.
Tercan et al. (2021)	Turkish children, 8–9-year-old ($N = 96$) (relation with Syrian children)	Vignettes that include Turkish and Syrian children becoming friends at school	/	Initial outgroup attitudes	Helping intentions, complexity of intergroup perceptions	Children in the vicarious contact condition later developed more desire to help outgroup members and richer representations of them. Effects were only seen in children who had higher initial prejudice.
Experimental studies						
Bagci et al., (2019b), Studies 2 and 3	Kurdish people ($N = 66$, study 2) ($N = 210$, study 3) (relation with Turkish people)	Imagining engaging in contact with outgroup members	Social acceptance	Ingroup Identification	Acculturation strategies, perceived discrimination, feelings of belongingness, social acceptance	Imagined contact reduced social acceptance and contact participation among Kurds (study 2). These effects were only seen in high identifying Kurds (study 3).
Bagci, Piyale, Bircek et al. (2018)	Turkish people ($N = 99$, study 1) ($N = 145$, study 2) ($N = 79$, study 3) (relation with Syrian immigrants)	Imagined contact with friendship potential added	/	/	Outgroup trust, behavioural intentions, outgroup attitudes, perceived threat	Adding friendship potential to the classic imagined contact scenario proved to be more effective (study 1), adding intimacy also increased the effectiveness (study 2), adding an explicit statement about friendship potential had

						positive influences on all the outcome variables (study 3).
Firat & Ataca (2020)	Turkish undergraduate students ($N = 335$) (relation with Kurds and Syrians)	Imagined contact scenarios including a friendly conversation with an outgroup member	/	Ingroup identification (ethnic and national)	Outgroup prejudice	Imagined contact failed to reduce prejudice. Also, ingroup identification did not act as a moderator.
Bagci, Piyale, & Ebcim (2018)	Turkish people ($N = 47$, study 1; $N = 107$, study 2), and Kurdish people ($N = 55$, study 3) (relation with Kurdish people for studies 1 and 2, and with Turkish people for study 3)	Imagined contact as picturing having a pleasant conversation with an outgroup member.	/	Ingroup identification	Outgroup attitudes, perceived threat, intergroup anxiety, support for multiculturalism	Higher ingroup identification led to more positive attitudes towards the outgroup (study 1), strength of partner's ethnic identification decreased the effectiveness of imagined contact (study 2), and minority group's attitudes towards the majority was not improved by imagined contact (study 3).
Bagci et al. (2019a)	Kurdish people ($N = 80$) (relation with Turks), and Turkish people ($N = 127$) (relation with Kurds)	Participants are led to imagine having a pleasant conversation with an outgroup member (Turks, study 1) (Kurds, study 2)	Perceived discrimination, ethnic identification (study 1)	/	Relative deprivation, outgroup attitudes, collective action tendencies (studies 1 and 2)	Imagined contact was only beneficial for the dominant group members (Turks). It increased collective action tendencies directly among the Turks, and through perceived discrimination and ethnic identification among the Kurds.
Correlational studies						
Bagci, Stathi et al. (2021), Studies 1 and 2	Turkish university students ($N = 384$, study 1) ($N = 217$, study 2) (relation with Kurdish people)	Extended contact, measured as the number of outgroup friends one believes that	Ingroup identification, ingroup morality	Outgroup attitudes	Ingroup social distance, attitudes towards ingroup members	When their outgroup attitudes were more negative, participants' positive extended contact led to worse attitudes towards the ingroup through reduced ingroup identification.

other ingroup
members have

When outgroup attitudes were
positive, people showed the
same response through
enhanced morality.

References

- Allport, G. W. 1. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, Mass: Addison-Wesley Pub. Co.
- Árnadóttir, K., Lolliot, S., Brown, R., & Hewstone, M. (2018). Positive and negative intergroup contact: Interaction not asymmetry. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 48*, 784-800. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2365
- Asbrock, F., Gutenbrunner, L., & Wagner, U. (2013). Unwilling, but not unaffected Imagined contact effects for authoritarians and social dominators. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 43*, 404-412. doi:10.1002/ejsp.1956
- Bagci, S. C., & Blazhenkova, O. (2020). Unjudge someone: human library as a tool to reduce prejudice toward stigmatized group members. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 42*, 413-431. doi:10.1080/01973533.2020.1792298
- Bagci, S. C., & Çelebi, E. (2017). Cross-group friendships and outgroup attitudes among Turkish–Kurdish ethnic groups: does perceived interethnic conflict moderate the friendship-attitude link?. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 47*, 59-73. doi:10.1111/jasp.12413
- Bagci, S. C., & Gungor, H. (2019). Associations between perceived positive and negative parental contact and adolescents' intergroup contact experiences. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 69*, 76-86. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2019.01.002
- Bagci, S. C., Guvensoy, I., Turner, R. N., White, F. A., & Piyale, Z. E. (2021). Investigating the role of E-contact and self-disclosure on improving Turkish-Kurdish interethnic relations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*. doi:10.1111/jasp.12760
- Bagci, S. C., Husnu, S., Turnuklu, A., & Tercan, M. (2020). Do I really want to engage in contact? Volition as a new dimension of intergroup contact. *European Journal of Social Psychology*. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2733
- Bagci, S. C., Piyale, Z. E., Bircek, N. I., & Ebcim, E. (2018). Think beyond contact: Reformulating imagined intergroup contact theory by adding friendship potential. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 21*, 1034-1052. doi:10.1177/1368430217690237
- Bagci, S. C., Piyale, Z. E., & Ebcim, E. (2018). Imagined contact in high conflict settings: The role of ethnic group identification and the perspective of minority group members. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 48*, 3-14. doi:10.1111/jasp.12485
- Bagci, S. C., Piyale, Z. E., Sen, E., & Yildirim, O. (2019). Beyond shifting intergroup attitudes: Intergroup contact's association with socio cognitive skills and group-based ideologies. *Journal of Theoretical Social Psychology, 3*, 176-188. doi:10.1002/jts5.45
- 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. doi:10.1111/bjdp.12028

- Bagci, S. C., Stathi, S., & Piyale, Z. E. (2019a). When imagining intergroup contact mobilizes collective action: The perspective of disadvantaged and advantaged groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *69*, 32-43. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2018.12.003
- Bagci, S. C., Stathi, S., & Piyale, Z. E. (2019b). Imagined contact facilitates acculturation, Sometimes: Contradicting evidence from two sociocultural contexts. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *25*, 539-552. doi:10.1037/cdp0000256
- Bagci, S. C., Stathi, S., Vezzali, L., Turnuklu, A., & Piyale, Z. E. (2021). I (dis)like the way you (dis)like them: The role of extended contact on social distance and attitudes towards the ingroup. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *60*, 95-120. doi:10.1111/bjso.12381
- Bagci, S. C. & Turnuklu, A. (2019). Intended, unintended, and unknown consequences of contact: The role of positive-negative contact on outgroup attitudes, collective action tendencies, and psychological well-being. *Social Psychology*, *50*, 7-23. doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000355.
- Bagci, S. C., Turnuklu, A., & Bekmezci, E. (2018a). The buffering role of in-group identification and intergroup contact on the association between perceived discrimination and mental health. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *28*, 293-305. doi:10.1002/casp.2357
- Bagci, S. C., Turnuklu, A., & Bekmezci, E. (2018b). Cross-group friendships and psychological well-being: A dual pathway through social integration and empowerment. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *57*, 773-792. doi:10.1111/bjso.12267
- Bagci, S. C., Turnuklu, A., & Tercan, M. (2020). Positive intergroup contact decreases the likelihood that prejudicial attitudes become avoidant behavioral tendencies. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *50*, 597-613. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2646
- Bagci, S. C., Verkuyten, M., Koc, Y., Turnuklu, A., Piyale, Z. E., & Bekmezci, E. (2020). Being tolerated and being discriminated against: Links to psychological well-being through threatened social identity needs. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *50*, 1463-1477. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2699
- Bağcı, S. Ç. ve Canpolat, E. (2019). Suriyeli sığınmacılarda Türklerle temas ve psikolojik iyi oluş ilişkisinde aracı değişkenler [Mediators on the relationship between contact with Turks and psychological well-being among Syrian immigrants]. *Nesne: Psikoloji Dergisi*, *7*, 149-169. doi:10.7816/nesne-07-15-01
- Bağcı, S. Ç., & Çelebi, E. (2017). Gruplararası temas ve çatışma ile azınlıklara yönelik tutumlar ve çokkültürlülüğe destek arasındaki ilişkiler: Gruplararası tehdit ve kaygının aracı rolü [Effects of intergroup contact and conflict on attitudes and multiculturalism: The mediating role of intergroup threat and anxiety]. *Türk Psikoloji Yazıları*, *20*, 3-18.
- Bağcı, S. Ç., Piyale, Z. E., Karaköse, S., & Şen, E. (accepted). Rekabetçi mağduriyet algısını yordamada gruplararası temas, dış grubun bakış açısını alma, ve iç grupla özdeşimin rolü [The role of intergroup contact, outgroup perspective-taking and

- ingroup identification on competitive victimhood beliefs]. *Turkish Journal of Psychology*.
- Barlow, F. K., Hornsey, M. J., Thai, M., Sengupta, N. K., & Sibley, C. G. (2013). The wallpaper effect: The contact hypothesis fails for minority group members who live in areas with a high proportion of majority group members. *PLoS One*, 8. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0082228
- Barlow, F. K., Paolini, S., Pedersen, A., Hornsey, M. J., Radke, H. R., Harwood, J., ... & 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, 1629-1643. doi:10.1177/0146167212457953
- Bar-Tal, D. (1990). Causes and consequences of delegitimization: Models of conflict and ethnocentrism. *Journal of Social Issues*, 46, 65-81. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.1990.tb00272.x
- Becker, J. C., Wright, S. C., Lubensky, M. E., & Zhou, S. (2013). Friend or ally: Whether cross-group contact undermines collective action depends on what advantaged group members say (or don't say). *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39, 442-455. doi:10.1177/0146167213477155
- Bikmen, N., & Sunar, D. (2013). Difficult dialogs: Majority group members' willingness to talk about inequality with different minority groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 37, 467-476. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2012.11.002
- Bilali, R., Iqbal, Y., & Çelik, A. B. (2018). The role of national identity, religious identity, and intergroup contact on social distance across multiple social divides in Turkey. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 65, 73-85. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2018.04.007
- Boin, J., Rugar, M., Graf, S., Neji, S., Spiegler, O., & Swart, H. (2021). The generalization of intergroup contact effects: Emerging research, policy relevance, and future directions. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77, 105-131. doi:10.1111/josi.12419
- Brown, R., & Hewstone, M. (2005). An Integrative Theory of Intergroup Contact. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Vol. 37 (p. 255–343). Elsevier Academic Press. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(05)37005-5
- Brylka, A., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., & Mähönen, T. A. (2016). The majority influence on interminority attitudes: The secondary transfer effect of positive and negative contact. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 50, 76-88. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2015.12.007
- Cakal, H., Hewstone, M., Schwär, G., & Heath, A. (2011). An investigation of the social identity model of collective action and the 'sedative' effect of intergroup contact among Black and White students in South Africa. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 50, 606-627. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02075.x
- Castano, E. (2008). On the perils of glorifying the in-group: Intergroup violence, in-group glorification, and moral disengagement. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2, 154-170. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2007.00040.x

- Christ, O., Hewstone, M., Tausch, N., Wagner, U., Voci, A., Hughes, J., & Cairns, E. (2010). Direct contact as a moderator of extended contact effects: Cross-sectional and longitudinal impact on outgroup attitudes, behavioral intentions, and attitude certainty. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *36*, 1662-1674. doi:10.1177/0146167210386969
- 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*, 188–236. doi:10.1080/10463283.2010.543312
- Çakal, H., Hewstone, M., Güler, M., & Heath, A. (2016). Predicting support for collective action in the conflict between Turks and Kurds: Perceived threats as a mediator of intergroup contact and social identity. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *19*, 732-752. doi:10.1177/1368430216641303
- Çelebi, E., Verkuyten, M., & Smyrnioti, N. (2016). Support for Kurdish language rights in Turkey: the roles of ethnic group, group identifications, contact, and intergroup perceptions. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, *39*, 1034-1051. doi:10.1080/01419870.2015.1103881
- Çelik, A. B., Bilali, R., & Iqbal, Y. (2017). Patterns of ‘othering’ in Turkey: A study of ethnic, ideological, and sectarian polarisation. *South European society and politics*, *22*, 217-238. doi:10.1080/13608746.2016.1250382
- Di Bernardo, G. A., Vezzali, L., Stathi, S., McKeown, S., Cocco, V. M., Saguy, T., & Dixon, J. (2021). Fostering social change among advantaged and disadvantaged group members: Integrating intergroup contact and social identity perspectives on collective action. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *24*, 26-47. doi:10.1177/1368430219889134
- Ditlmann, R. K., & Samii, C. (2016). Can intergroup contact affect ingroup dynamics? Insights from a field study with Jewish and Arab-Palestinian youth in Israel. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, *22*, 380-392. doi:10.1037/pac0000217
- Dixon, J. C., & Ergin, M. (2010). Explaining anti-Kurdish beliefs in Turkey: Group competition, identity, and globalization. *Social Science Quarterly*, *91*, 1329-1348. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6237.2010.00734.x
- Dixon, J., & McKeown, S. (2021). Negative contact, collective action, and social change: Critical reflections, technological advances, and new directions. *Journal of Social Issues*, *77*, 242-257. doi:10.1111/josi.12429
- Dixon, J., Tredoux, C., Davies, G., Huck, J., Hocking, B., Sturgeon, B., ... & Bryan, D. (2020). Parallel lives: Intergroup contact, threat, and the segregation of everyday activity spaces. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *118*, 457-480. doi:10.1037/pspi0000191
- Esses, V. M., Dovidio, J. F., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (2001). The immigration dilemma: The role of perceived group competition, ethnic prejudice, and national identity. *Journal of Social issues*, *57*, 389-412. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00220

- Firat, M., & Ataca, B. (2020). When Does Imagined Contact Reduce Prejudice?. *Social Psychology, 51*, 254–266. doi:10.1027/18649335/a000413
- Fischer, M. J. (2008). Does campus diversity promote friendship diversity? A look at interracial friendships in college. *Social Science Quarterly, 89*, 631-655. doi:10.1111/j.1540-6237.2008.00552.x
- Fuochi, G., Voci, A., Boin, J., & Hewstone, M. (2020). Close to me: The importance of closeness versus superficiality in explaining the positive-negative contact asymmetry. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 50*, 766-782. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2667
- Graham, S., Munniksma, A., & Juvonen, J. (2014). Psychosocial benefits of cross-ethnic friendships in urban middle schools. *Child development, 85*, 469-483. doi:10.1111/cdev.12159
- Green, E. G., Visintin, E. P., Sarrasin, O., & Hewstone, M. (2020). When integration policies shape the impact of intergroup contact on threat perceptions: a multilevel study across 20 European countries. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 46*, 631-648. doi:10.1080/1369183X.2018.1550159
- Güler, M. (2019). Ortak İç-grup Kimliği, Gruplararası Temas ve Algılanan Tehditlerin Suriyeli Bireylere Yardım Etme Niyeti Üzerine Etkisi [The Impact of Common In group Identity, Intergroup Contact and Perceived Threats on the Intention of Helping Syrian Individuals]. *Itobiad: Journal of the Human & Social Science Researches, 8*. doi:10.15869/itobiad.497145
- Güler, M. Y., & Hovardaoğlu, S. T. D. (2013). *Gruplar arası temas, kaygı ve yanlılığın sosyal mesafeye etkisi: Türk ve Kürt kökenli gruplar üzerine bir çalışma* (Doctoral dissertation). Ankara Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü, Ankara.
- Hässler, T., Ullrich, J., Bernardino, M., Shnabel, N., Van Laar, C., Valdenegro, D., ... & Ugarte, L. M. (2020). A large-scale test of the link between intergroup contact and support for social change. *Nature Human Behaviour, 4*, 380-386. doi:10.1038/s41562-019-0815-z
- Hässler, T., Uluğ, Ö. M., Kappmeier, M., & Travaglino, G. A. (2021). Intergroup contact and social change: An integrated contact-collective action model. *Journal of Social Issues, 77*, 217-241. doi:10.1111/josi.12412
- Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., Voci, A., Hamberger, J., & Niens, U. (2006). Intergroup contact, forgiveness, and experience of “The Troubles” in Northern Ireland. *Journal of Social Issues, 62*, 99-120. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2006.00441.x
- Hewstone, M., Lollot, S., Swart, H., Myers, E., Voci, A., Al Ramiah, A., & Cairns, E. (2014). Intergroup contact and intergroup conflict. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 20*, 39-53. doi:10.1037/a0035582
- Hodson, G., Crisp, R. J., Meleady, R., & Earle, M. (2018). Intergroup contact as an agent of cognitive liberalization. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 13*, 523-548. doi:10.1177/1745691617752324

- Husnu, S., & Crisp, R. J. (2015). Perspective-taking mediates the imagined contact effect. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 44, 29-34. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2014.11.005
- Jetten, J., Haslam, S. A., & Haslam, C. (2012). The case for a social identity analysis of health and well-being. In J. Jetten, S. A. Haslam, C. Haslam (Eds.) *The social cure: Identity, health and well-being* (p. 3-19). New York: Taylor & Francis.
- Kaçmaz, T., Türnüklü, A., & Karazor, V. (2019). Gruplararası Temas: Farklı Sosyal Kimliklere Sahip Üniversite Öğrencilerinin, Aynı Yurt Odasında Yaşadıkları Gruplararası Temasın İncelenmesi [Intergroup Contact: An Investigation of Intergroup Contact between Students with Different Social Identities Living in The Same Dormitory Room]. *Eğitimde Nitel Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 7, 688-709. doi:10.14689/issn.2148-2624.1.7c.2s.10m
- Karasu, M., & Göregenli, M. (2016, May). *Evaluations of Turkish People Related to 'The Armenian Issue': A Q Methodology Study*. Paper presented at Armenia-Turkey: Paving Ways for Dialogue and Reconciliation At: Caucasus Research Resource Center-Armenia, Yerevan, Armenia.
- Karazor, V. (2019). *Farklı sosyal-kimlik kategorilerine sahip üniversite öğrencilerinin, yurt yaşamlarında gruplararası temas, arkadaşlık, empati, kaygı ve tutum süreçlerinin incelenmesi [An Analysis of the Intergroup Contact, Friendship, Empathy, Anxiety and Attitudes of University Students From Different Backgrounds in their Dormitory Life]* (Master's thesis). Dokuz Eylül University, İzmir.
- Kauff, M., Asbrock, F., & Schmid, K. (2021). Pro-diversity beliefs and intergroup relations. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 1-36. doi:10.1080/10463283.2020.1853377
- Kauff, M., Green, E. G., Schmid, K., Hewstone, M., & Christ, O. (2016). Effects of majority members' positive intergroup contact on minority members' support for ingroup rights: Mobilizing or demobilizing effects?. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 46, 833-839. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2194
- Kawabata, Y., & Crick, N. R. (2011). The significance of cross-racial/ethnic friendships: Associations with peer victimization, peer support, sociometric status, and classroom diversity. *Developmental Psychology*, 47, 1763-1775. doi:10.1037/a0025399
- Kelman, H. C. (1999). The interdependence of Israeli and Palestinian national identities: The role of the other in existential conflicts. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 581-600. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00134
- KONDA Barometer, (2015). *Trust and Kurdish issue*. Retrieved from <https://konda.com.tr/tr/rapor/guven-ve-kurt-meselesi/>
- Lease, A. M., & Blake, J. J. (2005). A comparison of majority-race children with and without a minority-race friend. *Social Development*, 14, 20-41. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9507.2005.00289.x

- Maoz, I. (2011). Does contact work in protracted asymmetrical conflict? Appraising 20 years of reconciliation-aimed encounters between Israeli Jews and Palestinians. *Journal of Peace Research*, 48, 115-125. doi:10.1177/0022343310389506
- Moss, S. M., Uluğ, Ö. M., & Acar, Y. G. (2019). Doing research in conflict contexts: Practical and ethical challenges for researchers when conducting fieldwork. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 25, 86-99. doi:10.1037/pac0000334
- Muldoon, O. T., & Downes, C. (2007). Social identification and post-traumatic stress symptoms in post-conflict Northern Ireland. *The British Journal of Psychiatry*, 191, 146-149. doi:10.1192/bjp.bp.106.022038
- Munniksma, A., & Juvonen, J. (2012). Cross-ethnic friendships and sense of social-emotional safety in a multiethnic middle school: An exploratory study. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 58, 489-506. doi:10.2307/41851015
- Özkan, Z., Ergün, N., & Çakal, H. (2021). Positive versus negative contact and refugees' intentions to migrate: The mediating role of perceived discrimination, life satisfaction and identification with the host society among Syrian refugees in Turkey. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*. doi:10.1002/casp.2508
- Özkeçeci, H. H. (2017). *The role of contact and the perception of threat in prejudice towards Syrians in Turkey*. (Unpublished Master's dissertation). Boğaziçi University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- 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, 1080-1094. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.95.5.1080
- Paolini, S., Harwood, J., Hewstone, M., & Neumann, D. L. (2018). Seeking and avoiding intergroup contact: Future frontiers of research on building social integration. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 12. doi:10.1111/spc3.12422
- 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, 1723-1738. doi:10.1177/0146167210388667
- 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, 548-562. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2029
- Paolini, S., White, F. A., Tropp, L. R., Turner, R. N., Page-Gould, E., Barlow, F. K., & Gómez, Á. (2021). Intergroup contact research in the 21st century: Lessons learned and forward progress if we remain open. *Journal of Social Issues*, 77, 11-37. doi:10.1111/josi.12427
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 173-185. doi:10.1177/0146167297232006

- Pettigrew, T. F. (2009). Secondary transfer effect of contact: Do intergroup contact effects spread to noncontacted outgroups?. *Social Psychology, 40*, 55-65. doi:10.1027/1864-9335.40.2.55
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2005). Allport's intergroup contact hypothesis: Its history and influence. In J. Dovidio, P. Glick, & L. A. Rudman (Eds.) *On the nature of prejudice: Fifty years after Allport* (p. 262-277). Australia: Blackwell publishing.
- 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., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 35*, 271-280. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.03.001
- Rouhana, N., & Fiske, S. T. (1995). Perception of power, threat, and conflict intensity in asymmetric intergroup conflict: Arab and Jewish citizens of Israel. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 39*, 49- 81. doi:10.1177/0022002795039001003
- Rutland, A., & Killen, M. (2015). A developmental science approach to reducing prejudice and social exclusion: Intergroup processes, social-cognitive development, and moral reasoning. *Social Issues and Policy Review, 9*, 121-154. doi:10.1111/sipr.12012
- Saguy, T., Tausch, N., Dovidio, J. F., & Pratto, F. (2009). The irony of harmony: Intergroup contact can produce false expectations for equality. *Psychological Science, 20*, 114-121. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02261.x
- Schäfer, S. J., Kauff, M., Prati, F., Kros, M., Lang, T., & Christ, O. (2021). Does negative contact undermine attempts to improve intergroup relations? Deepening the understanding of negative contact and its consequences for intergroup contact research and interventions. *Journal of Social Issues, 77*, 197-216. doi:10.1111/josi.12422
- Schmid, K., & Muldoon, O. T. (2015). Perceived threat, social identification, and psychological well-being: The effects of political conflict exposure. *Political Psychology, 36*, 75-92. doi:10.1111/pops.12073
- Stathi, S., Husnu, S., & Pendleton, S. (2017). Intergroup contact and contact norms as predictors of postconflict forgiveness. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 21*, 20-39. doi:10.1037/gdn0000060
- Stathi, S., Pavetich, M., Di Bernardo, G. A., Cadamuro, A., Cocco, V. M., & Vezzali, L. (2020). Intergroup fears and concerns among minority and majority groups: Implications for contact and attitudes. *Journal of community psychology, 48*, 1010-1027. doi:10.1002/jcop.22322
- Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J., & Cairns, E. (2009). Intergroup trust in Northern Ireland. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*, 45-59. doi:10.1177/0146167208325004
- Tausch, N., Saguy, T., & Bryson, J. (2015). How does intergroup contact affect social change? Its impact on collective action and individual mobility intentions among

- members of a disadvantaged group. *Journal of Social Issues*, 71, 536-553. doi:10.1111/josi.12127
- Tercan, M., Bisagno, E., Cocco, V. M., Kaçmaz, T., Turnuklu, A., Stathi, S., & Vezzali, L. (2021). Reducing prejudice toward Syrian refugee children: A vicarious contact intervention among Turkish elementary school children. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 49, 564-587. doi:10.1002/jcop.22480
- Titzmann, P. F., Brenick, A., & Silbereisen, R. K. (2015). Friendships fighting prejudice: A longitudinal perspective on adolescents' cross-group friendships with immigrants. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 44, 1318-1331. doi:10.1007/s10964-015-0256-6
- Troian, J., & Bağcı, Ç. (2020). The pathogen paradox: evidence that perceived COVID-19 threat is associated with both pro-and anti-immigrant attitudes. *International Review of Social Psychology*. doi:10.31234/osf.io/948ch
- Tropp, L. R. (2006). Stigma and intergroup contact among members of minority and majority status groups. In S. Levin, & C. Van Laar (Eds.), *Stigma and group inequality: Social psychological perspectives* (p. 171-191). Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Tropp, L. R., Hawi, D. R., O'Brien, T. C., Gheorghiu, M., Zetes, A., & Butz, D. A. (2017). Intergroup contact and the potential for post-conflict reconciliation: Studies in Northern Ireland and South Africa. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 23, 239-249. doi:10.1037/pac0000236
- Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005). Relationships between intergroup contact and prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological Science*, 16, 951-957. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2005.01643.x
- Tropp, L. R., Uluğ, Ö. M., & Uysal, M. S. (2021). How intergroup contact and communication about group differences predict collective action intentions among advantaged groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 80, 7-16. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2020.10.012
- Türk, F., Turnuklu, A., Tercan, M., & Kaçmaz, T. (2019). Gruplar arası olumlu ve olumsuz temas: Türk ve Suriyeli ilkököl öğrencilerinin sınıf içi etkileşimlerinin incelenmesi [Positive and Negative Intergroup Contact: An Investigation of Classroom Interactions between Turkish and Syrian Primary School Students]. *Nesne Psikoloji Dergisi*, 7, 214-235. doi:10.7816/nesne-07-15-05
- 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, 212-246. doi:10.1111/sipr.12023
- Turner, R. N., Crisp, R. J., & Lambert, E. (2007). Imagining intergroup contact can improve intergroup attitudes. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 10, 427-441. doi:10.1177/1368430207081533

- Uluğ, Ö. M., & Cohrs, J. C. (2016). An exploration of lay people's Kurdish conflict frames in Turkey. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 22*, 109-119. doi:10.1037/pac0000165
- Uluğ, O. M., & Cohrs, J. C. (2017). "If we become friends, maybe I can change my perspective:" Intergroup contact, endorsement of conflict narratives, and peace related attitudes in Turkey. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 23*, 278-287. doi:10.1037/pac0000216
- Ülkücan, G. O., Türnüklü, A., İnceç, O. E., & Akbulut, S. T. (2019). Gruplar arası temas ve çapraz evlilikler: İzmir'de alevi-sünnievlilikleri. *Türkiye Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi, 23*, 1-24.
- Vezzali, L., & Stathi, S. (2021). *Using intergroup contact to fight prejudice and negative attitudes: Psychological perspectives. European Monographs in Social Psychology Series*. London: Routledge.
- Voci, A., Hadziosmanovic, E., Cakal, H., Veneziani, C. A., & Hewstone, M. (2017). Impact of pre-war and post-war intergroup contact on intergroup relations and mental health: Evidence from a Bosnian sample. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 23*, 250-259. doi:10.1037/pac0000222
- Wang, C., Huang, F., Stathi, S., & Vezzali, L. (2020). Positive and negative intergroup contact and willingness to engage in intergroup interactions among majority (Han) and minority (Uyghur) group members in China: The moderating role of social dominance orientation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 75*, 132-140. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2018.09.002
- Waytz, A., & Epley, N. (2012). Social connection enables dehumanization. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*, 70-76. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2011.07.012
- White, F. A., & Abu-Rayya, H. M. (2012). A dual identity-electronic contact (DIEC) experiment promoting short-and long-term intergroup harmony. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*, 597-608. doi:10.1016/j.jesp.2012.01.007
- White, F. A., Turner, R. N., Verrelli, S., Harvey, L. J., & Hanna, J. R. (2019). Improving intergroup relations between Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland via E contact. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 49*, 429-438. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2515
- Wölfer, R., & Hewstone, M. (2017). Beyond the dyadic perspective: 10 reasons for using social network analysis in intergroup contact research. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 56*, 609-617. doi:10.1111/bjso.12195
- Wölfer, R., Schmid, K., Hewstone, M., van Zalk, M. (2016). Developmental dynamics of intergroup contact and intergroup attitudes: Long-term effects in adolescence and early adulthood. *Child Development, 87*, 1466-1478. doi:10.1111/cdev.12598
- 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. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.73

- Yanbolluođlu, O. (2018). *Suriyeli mültecilere yönelik duygular ve algılanan sosyal mesafede, gruplararası pozitif ve negatif temas, sosyal baskınlık yönelimi, gruplararası tehdit ve gruplararası kaygının rolü [The role of positive and negative intergroup contact, social dominance orientation and intergroup threat and anxiety on the feelings and the perceived social distance towards syrian refugees]* (Master's thesis). Uludağ Üniversitesi, Bursa.
- Yörük, E. (2012). Welfare provision as political containment: The politics of social assistance and the Kurdish conflict in Turkey. *Politics & Society*, 40, 517-547. doi:10.1177/0032329212461130
- Zagefka, H., Brown, R., Broquard, M., & Martin, S. L. (2007). Predictors and consequences of negative attitudes toward immigrants in Belgium and Turkey: The role of acculturation preferences and economic competition. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 46, 153-169. doi:10.1348/014466606X111185