




Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

## Current Research in Ecological and Social Psychology

journal homepage: [www.elsevier.com/locate/cresp](http://www.elsevier.com/locate/cresp)

## #WeDontWantRefugees: Mass-mediated contact, dehumanization, and support for Afghan refugee rights in Turkey

Sabahat Cigdem Bagci<sup>a,\*</sup>, Sofia Stathi<sup>b</sup>, Dilba Sağlam<sup>a</sup>, Ekin Kösegil<sup>c</sup><sup>a</sup> Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Sabanci University, Orhanlı/Tuzla, Istanbul 34956, Turkiye<sup>b</sup> Greenwich University, UK<sup>c</sup> Ankara Bilim University, Turkiye

## ARTICLE INFO

## Keywords:

Mass-mediated contact  
 Contact valence  
 Dehumanization  
 Support for rights  
 Refugees

## ABSTRACT

In two studies, we investigated how positive and negative mass-mediated contact shape attitudes towards refugees and support for their rights through dehumanization. Study 1 (correlational,  $N = 193$ , community sample) demonstrated both positive and negative mass-mediated contact to predict attitudes towards Afghan refugees, as well as support for their rights, through lower and higher levels of dehumanization, respectively. Study 2 (experimental,  $N = 214$ , student sample) showed that positive mass-mediated contact directly improved attitudes towards refugees, whereas negative (but not positive) mass-mediated contact increased the dehumanization (*less human view*) of refugees, which was in turn related to reduced support for their rights. Findings highlight the critical role of mass-mediated contact in the formation of pro-refugee attitudes in an increasingly hostile migration context.

## Introduction

Despite significant growth in egalitarian values and tolerant attitudes towards minority group members in recent years, refugees still constitute one of the most marginalized groups in society, suffering from pervasive discrimination (e.g., Cheung et al. 2022). The so-called *refugee crisis* in various parts of the world is eventually accompanied by increased contempt, distrust, and perceptions of threat among host society members who strive to protect their privileges against the increasing number of newcomers (e.g., Esses et al. 2017, 2021). Hostile discourses towards refugees have become much more prevalent universally, and are even more visible in countries such as Turkey where the influx of refugees has rapidly amplified anti-refugee sentiments and defensive reactions (Aktas et al., 2018; Bagci et al., 2022b; De Coninck et al., 2021).

While refugees' residential movement into cities creates opportunities for native-refugee interactions to take place in various societal settings such as schools and neighbourhoods (e.g., Wagner et al. 2006), in practical terms such encounters that cross group boundaries may not easily transform into meaningful intergroup experiences due to various psychological barriers (e.g., Kotzur and Wagner 2021, Paolini et al. 2021). Hence, indirect types of contact such as interactions that occur through mass media (mass-mediated contact, but see also parasocial contact, e.g., Schiappa et al. 2005) may partly shape attitudes towards refugees, with whom high quality direct contact may not be feasible (e.g., Gregurović et al. 2019, Joyce and Har-

wood, 2012). However, like other forms of contact, mass-mediated contact can also stimulate hostile attitudes and behaviors towards refugees who are often portrayed in negative ways in various communication channels (e.g., Igartua et al. 2014, Visintin et al. 2017). In such contexts, mass media may become an important agent of *dehumanization* (e.g., Esses et al. 2013, Jelínková 2019), a process whereby outgroup members are deprived of uniquely human traits and emotions and are perceived to be less human than ingroup members (see Kteily and Landry 2022 for a review).

Through two studies (one correlational and one experimental), we aimed to delineate how both positive and negative mass-mediated contact with Afghan refugees in Turkey would predict natives' attitudes and support for refugee rights through outgroup dehumanization, over and beyond direct contact effects. Despite increasing attention to the role of mass-mediated contact on attitudes towards refugees worldwide, existing research has been primarily correlational (e.g., Graf and Sczesny 2019, Visintin et al., 2017), focused on the amount of mass-mediated contact with no valence considerations (e.g., De Coninck et al. 2021), and has rarely tested the role of dehumanization in this relationship (e.g., Esses et al. 2013). Moreover, how mass-mediated contact with refugees shapes the perception of natives has been studied primarily in Western contexts (e.g., Pagotto and Voci 2013, Visintin et al., 2017), limiting the evidence regarding the potential generalizability of existing findings. We aimed to fill these gaps in the literature by using both correlational and experimental methods to reveal the unique effects of

\* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: [cigdem.bagci@sabanciuniv.edu](mailto:cigdem.bagci@sabanciuniv.edu) (S.C. Bagci).

positive and negative mass-mediated contact in the understanding of increasing hostility towards Afghan refugees in Turkey.

#### *Mass-mediated contact*

Over the last decades, intergroup relations research has consistently shown contact to be one of the most effective tools to reduce prejudice in a variety of intergroup contexts (e.g., Dovidio et al. 2003, Lemmer and Wagner 2015, Pettigrew and Tropp 2006), primarily through increased empathy and decreased intergroup anxiety (Pettigrew and Tropp, 2008). Hence, a great deal of research has shown direct intergroup contact to effectively improve attitudes and behaviors towards refugees in various cultural settings (e.g., De Coninck et al. 2021, Graf and Sczesny 2019, Kotzur et al. 2019, Lutterbach and Beelmann 2020, Meleady and Forder 2019).

Recent research avenues in the intergroup contact field have further suggested that contact may also improve intergroup relationships even when it does not involve direct, face to face interactions (e.g., Brown and Paterson 2016, Dovidio et al. 2011). An increased volume of research conducted within the last two decades has shown that indirect contact can function not only as a replacement of direct contact, but as a unique tool that directly influences attitudes towards outgroups (White et al., 2021). Among indirect contact strategies, mass-mediated contact which is an indirect interaction with an outgroup member through newspapers, TV news, and social media is suggested to be particularly relevant for shaping attitudes with refugees, given that media consumption is often a primary mechanism of interaction and impression formation about this outgroup (e.g., Abrams et al. 2018). While mass-mediated contact (like other indirect forms of contact) has been suggested to exert a greater impact on attitudes when direct contact is absent (e.g., Shim et al. 2012), other studies have indicated such contact to have unique effects beyond direct experiences (e.g., Abrams et al. 2018, De Coninck et al. 2021, Wojcieszak and Azrout 2016).

Contemporary literature also acknowledges now the role of negative contact experiences in addition to positive ones (e.g., Paolini et al. 2010). Research considering the differential effects of positive and negative mass-mediated contact on attitudes revealed mixed findings (e.g., Schemer 2012, Visintin et al. 2017). While positive or negative mass-mediated contact can be more predictive of attitudes across different intergroup contexts (Pagotto and Voci 2013, Rugar and Graf 2019, Rugar et al. 2022), a recent meta-analysis concluded both forms of contact to produce opposite, but equally strong effects on attitudes (Banas et al., 2020).

While scarce research is devoted to understanding the associations between mass-mediated contact and support for outgroup rights, existing evidence suggests that contact through media may also shape attitudes towards immigration policies (e.g., Esses et al. 2013). For example, mediated contact with Black characters on television was found to be associated with a more favourable perception of Black people, as well as increased support for racialized social issues (Stamps and Sahlman, 2021). On the other hand, negative portrayal of immigrants on media is likely to trigger tendencies to support anti-immigrant actions (Saleem et al., 2017). Overall, these findings suggest that both positive and negative mass-mediated contact are likely to shape not only attitudes towards refugees, but also the extent to which refugee rights are supported.

#### *The mediating role of dehumanization*

Despite growing interest in mass-mediated contact, only few social psychological processes have been investigated as explanatory mechanisms. Park (2012), for example, indicated that mediated contact shapes perceptions of the outgroup, since the audience would identify with the outgroup member and thereby show greater outgroup empathy. Further research has shown typical contact mediators such as trust, empathy, and anxiety to explain mass-mediated contact effects (Pagotto

and Voci, 2013; Visintin et al., 2017). Critically, consistent research in the media literature has also indicated that refugees and immigrants are likely to be portrayed as delinquents or criminals in many societies and they are depicted as posing important cultural, economic and security threats to the host nation (see Eberl et al. 2018 for a recent review; Parker 2015, Müller 2018, Wahlström et al. 2021), which may in turn provoke dehumanizing beliefs about the outgroup (e.g., Louis et al. 2013). In fact, depictions of refugees in mass media might bolster their dehumanization through representing this group as a critical source of threat (De Coninck et al., 2021; Esses et al., 2013), and using consistently a dehumanizing language (Lazović, 2021; Steuter and Wills, 2009).

Following this line of research, we focused on dehumanization - the denial of full humanness to others - as an explanatory variable between mass-mediated contact and refugee attitudes and support. Based on previous research that has shown both direct and indirect forms of contact to relate to outgroup dehumanization (Bruneau et al., 2021; Capozza et al., 2014; Prati and Loughnan, 2018; Stathi et al., 2017), as well as studies suggesting mass media to function as one of the primary tools to stimulate the dehumanization of particular groups in society such as refugees (e.g., Esses et al. 2013), we argued that both positive and negative forms of mass-mediated contact would be linked to the extent at which refugees are seen as more or less human.

Dehumanization, in turn, explains hostile behaviors towards various groups, especially vulnerable ones such as refugees, through negative emotions such as contempt and anger (e.g., Esses et al. 2013, Utych 2018). Dehumanization of refugees and the associated threat perceptions may justify dominant groups' willingness to protect their own privileges (Esses et al., 2013, 2021), supporting the process of moral disengagement in society (Motal, 2015). More specifically, dehumanization has been found to relate to support for deportation and forced internal displacement, as well as rejection of refugees or immigrants (e.g., Esses et al. 2021, Haslam 2006, Haslam and Stratemeyer 2016). Therefore, we expected that positive and negative mass-mediated contact would be linked to attitudes and support for refugee rights through decreased and increased dehumanization of refugees, respectively.

#### *The Afghan refugee context*

Turkey has witnessed a significant influx of Syrian refugees (over three and a half million, UNHCR 2022) within the last decade, which was followed by a second wave of Afghan refugees after 2018 (Karakaya and Karakaya, 2021). While initial responses to immigration were characterized by humanitarian concerns, with increasing numbers of refugees and heightened perceptions of threat, the welcoming climate has become more hostile over time (e.g., Bağcı et al. 2022a, 2022b). A recent study comparing attitudes towards refugees in Europe and Turkey, for example, indicated that negative socioeconomic conditions as well as the higher number of refugees accepted in the country explained Turkish natives' relatively greater hostility towards refugees compared to Europeans (De Coninck, Ogan et al., 2021).

Hostile attitudes towards refugees in Turkey are also represented in various mass media tools (Ünal, 2014). For example, the popular campaign of '#I don't want refugees in my country' has been a trending topic on various social media platforms such as Twitter. Refugees, in general, are commonly situated at the center of societal issues such as increased economic problems and conflicts, and are depicted with exclusionary and separationist discourses (Göker and Keskin, 2015; Gölcü and Dağlı, 2017). Yet, this literature has primarily centered on Syrian refugees (e.g., Çirakoğlu et al. 2021, Firat and Ataca 2021, Yitmen and Verkuyten 2018), with much less empirical research devoted to understanding attitudes particularly towards Afghan refugees.

Afghan immigration to Turkey dates to early 70's, yet Turkey has received a recent wave of refugees from Afghanistan particularly after 2018 (Ministry of Migration, 2021). Whereas the number of Afghan refugees is smaller compared to the number of Syrian refugees, the ar-

rival of Afghans corresponds to a period when Turkish society was already dealing with what many consider as a 'refugee crisis' from Syria (e.g., Eroler and Süleymanoğlu-Kürüm 2021). Moreover, unlike the majority of Syrians, Afghans do not have the 'under temporary protection' status in Turkey (Karadağ, 2021). Therefore, compared to Syrian refugees, Afghan refugees are often evaluated even more negatively by Turkish citizens (Bağcı and Sağlam, 2022). Recent research has indicated specifically Afghans to constitute a socially 'ignored' group in Turkey, facing a variety of challenges (Karakaya and Karakaya, 2021) and being consistently represented in mass media as 'invaders' (Erol and Yaylaci, 2022; Tümtaş, 2022). Hostile attitudes towards Afghan refugees become even more prominent with increased tensions in the country. For example, after the devastating earthquakes that took place in Turkey in February 2023, refugees have been depicted as 'looters' and anti-refugee discourses have greatly increased in mass media. This suggests the urgent need to investigate how mass-mediated contact may shape the perception of refugees in this increasingly hostile context.

### The current study

In summary, the current studies explored the role of positive and negative mass-mediated contact on attitudes towards refugees and support for their rights, by testing dehumanization as a mediator in a correlational (Study 1) and an experimental (Study 2) study. We aimed to contribute to the existing literature by (a) investigating the role of both positive and negative mass-mediated contact, (b) testing dehumanization as a critical mediator, (c) using experimental procedures to draw causal assumptions between the variables (Study 2), (d) controlling for both positive and negative direct contact to explore the unique effects of mass-mediated contact, and (e) focusing on a less-investigated sociocultural context, Turkey, that has experienced a recent, considerable influx of refugees.

Based on previous research, we hypothesized that positive mass-mediated contact would be associated with more positive attitudes and greater support for refugee rights, whereas negative mass-mediated contact would be associated with more negative attitudes and lower support. Moreover, we expected dehumanization to function as a critical explanatory mechanism on these relationships. We also hypothesized mass-mediated contact to have unique effects on the dependent variables after controlling for both positive and negative direct contact.

### Study 1

Study 1 (correlational) tested Turkish natives' positive and negative mass-mediated contact with Afghan refugees in relation to their outgroup attitudes and support for refugee rights. Furthermore, we examined the role of dehumanization as a mediator and controlled for direct positive and negative contact experiences.

### Method

#### Participants and procedure

The final sample included 193<sup>1</sup> Turkish adults ( $M_{age} = 38.04$ ,  $SD = 14.57$ ; 111 Females, 79 Males, 1 Other, 2 Unreported) who participated in an online study advertised on social media and data were collected through the help of research assistants. The mean subjective socioeconomic status of participants ('How would you rate your income?', ranging from 1 = *Very low* to 7 = *Very high*) was close to mid-point 4 ( $M = 3.94$ ,  $SD = 1.06$ ,  $t(192) = -0.75$ ,  $p = .455$ ). The political tendency of the sample was closer to the left (1 = *Extremely left*, 11 = *Extremely*

*right*,  $M = 4.14$ ,  $SD = 2.26$ ,  $t(192) = -11.43$ ,  $p < .001$  when compared to mid-point 6).<sup>2</sup>

### Measures

*Direct positive/negative intergroup contact* were each measured by a single item ('On average, how frequently do you have positive contact with Afghan refugees?' and 'On average, how frequently do you have negative contact with Afghan refugees?' response scale ranging from 1 = *Never*, 7 = *Extremely frequently*) adapted from Barlow et al. (2012).

We assessed *mass-mediated positive/negative intergroup contact* (adapted from Graf and Sczesny 2019 and Pagotto and Voci 2013) by using two items for each construct: 'How frequently do you get positive/negative impressions about Afghan refugees from what you hear or read about them in the news (TV news, radio news, newspaper, and social media)?' and 'How frequently do you hear positive/negative information about Afghan refugees in the news (TV news, radio news, newspaper, social media)?', with a response scale ranging from 1 (*Never*) to 7 (*Extremely frequently*). The scales formed a reliable measure for both constructs (Positive mass-mediated contact  $r = 0.71$  and Negative mass-mediated contact  $r = 0.73$ , both  $p < 0.001$ ).

Our measure of *outgroup dehumanization* consisted of nine items and was adapted from Kteily and Bruneau (2017), asking participants to rate the extent to which they attributed different humanity characteristics (e.g., 'refined and cultured'; 'rational and logical', 'savage and aggressive') to Afghan refugees. The response scale ranged from 1 (*Not at all*) to 7 (*Very much*) and the items were recoded such that higher scores indicated greater dehumanization (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.91).

Attitudes towards Afghans were assessed with a *feeling thermometer* (Haddock et al., 1993): 'Please report your feelings towards Afghan refugees using a scale from 0° (*Extremely unfavourable attitudes*) to 100° (*Extremely favourable attitudes*)', with higher scores indicating more positive attitudes towards the outgroup.

*Support for refugee rights* was measured with a five-item scale (adapted from Firat and Ataca 2021) assessing participants' agreement on granting various rights to Afghan refugees (e.g., 'Afghans should have the right to establish their own schools in Turkey' and 'More precautions should be taken in Turkey against the discrimination of Afghans', 1 = *Strongly disagree*, 7 = *Strongly agree*, Cronbach's Alpha = 0.81).

### Results

Means and standard deviations, as well as correlations for the main variables are shown in Table 1. Positive mass-mediated contact ( $M = 1.88$ ,  $SD = 1.08$ ) was less prevalent than negative mass-mediated contact ( $M = 5.30$ ,  $SD = 1.85$ ), as demonstrated by a significant paired samples t-test,  $t(192) = -19.85$ ,  $p < 0.001$ .

### Mediation model

We tested our model with Structural Equation Modelling using Mplus (Muthén and Muthén, 1998-2011). We entered positive and negative mass-mediated contact as independent variables, dehumanization as the mediator, outgroup attitudes and support for rights as dependent variables, while controlling for direct positive and negative contact effects on both the mediator and the outcome variables<sup>3</sup>. Mass-mediated contact measures, dehumanization and support for refugee rights were represented as latent constructs. Model fit was assessed by the following criteria:  $\chi^2/df < 3$ , CFI  $\geq 0.93$ , RMSEA  $\leq 0.07$ , and SRMR  $\leq 0.07$

<sup>2</sup> The initial sample included ethnic minority participants ( $N = 11$ ), yet there were mean differences demonstrating ethnic minority group members to be more positive towards refugees. Therefore, we only included ethnic/native Turks in the final analysis.


<sup>3</sup> While age, gender and socio-economic status were not correlated with the outcome variables, their addition to the main model did not change the fit or the associations between the variables.

<sup>1</sup> We estimated our sample sizes in each study to be around 200, as generally required for the use of Structural Equation Modelling based on Kline (2012) suggestion. Our initial sample sizes (without any exclusions) were both  $> 200$ , satisfying the minimum requirement.

**Table 1**  
Means, standard deviations and correlations for the main variables in Study 1.

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1.Positive direct contact	1.57	1.08	-	0.41***	0.27***	0.02	.27***	0.12	-0.27***
2.Negative direct contact	1.93	1.64	-	-	0.14†	0.19**	-0.04	-0.15*	.11
3.Positive mass-mediated contact	1.88	1.08	-	-	-	-0.29***	.37***	0.29***	-0.35***
4.Negative mass-mediated contact	5.30	1.85	-	-	-	-	-0.25**	-0.13†	0.29***
5.Outgroup attitudes	27.12	26.96	-	-	-	-	-	0.60***	-0.61***
6.Support for refugee rights	2.67	1.45	-	-	-	-	-	-	-0.47***
7.Outgroup dehumanization	5.13	1.20	-	-	-	-	-	-	-

Notes.  
†  $p < 0.10$ .  
\*  $p < 0.05$ .  
\*\*  $p < 0.01$ .  
\*\*\*  $p < 0.001$ .



**Fig. 1.** Mediation model predicting attitudes and support for refugee rights in Study 1. Notes. \* $p < 0.05$ , \*\* $p < 0.01$ , \*\*\* $p < 0.001$ . MC = Mass-mediated contact. DC = Direct contact. Standardized coefficients and standard errors (in brackets) were presented. Correlations between contact variables that are accounted: Positive and negative MC:  $r = -0.31$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; positive and negative DC:  $r = 0.41$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; Positive MC and DC:  $r = 0.32$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ; Negative MC and DC:  $r = 0.19$ ,  $p = 0.01$ ; Positive MC and Negative DC:  $r = 0.17$ ,  $p = 0.03$ ; Negative MC and Positive DC:  $r = 0.01$ ,  $p = 0.87$ .

(Bagozzi and Yi, 2012; Marsh et al., 2004). We used random item parceling for dehumanization (three parcels) and support for refugee rights (two parcels) to increase model fit (e.g., Matsunaga 2008). Indirect effects were tested with bootstrapping (5000 samples).

The measurement model including latent measures had an acceptable fit:  $\chi^2/df = 2.75$ , CFI = .96, RMSEA = 0.09, and SRMR = 0.06<sup>4</sup>, with all items significantly loading on the relevant constructs (item loadings > 0.62).

The final structural model demonstrated an acceptable fit,  $\chi^2/df = 2.60$ , CFI = .95, RMSEA = 0.09, and SRMR = 0.05. Results demonstrated that positive mass-mediated contact predicted lower dehumanization ( $\beta = -0.25$ ,  $SE = 0.08$ ,  $p = 0.001$ ), while negative mass-mediated contact predicted greater dehumanization ( $\beta = 0.22$ ,  $SE = 0.08$ ,  $p = 0.005$ ). Dehumanization was, in turn, strongly associated with attitudes, as well as support for rights ( $\beta = -0.47$ ,  $SE = 0.07$  and  $\beta = -0.41$ ,  $SE = 0.08$ , respectively, both  $p < 0.001$ ). While negative mass-mediated contact was not directly associated with the outcome variables, positive mass-mediated contact was also directly related to both attitudes ( $\beta = 0.18$ ,  $SE = 0.08$ ,  $p = 0.025$ ) and support for refugee rights ( $\beta = 0.25$ ,  $SE = 0.10$ ,  $p = 0.010$ ).

Our mediational analyses (See Fig. 1) demonstrated that the associations between positive mass-mediated contact and attitudes ( $\beta = 0.12$ ,  $SE = 0.04$ , 95% CI [0.003, 0.213], as well as support for refugee rights ( $\beta = 0.10$ ,  $SE = 0.04$ , 95% CI [.003, 0.195]) were significantly mediated by dehumanization. The indirect role of negative mass-mediated contact was also significant through dehumanization (for outgroup at-

titudes:  $\beta = -0.10$ ,  $SE = 0.04$ , 95% CI [-0.203, -0.012]; for support:  $\beta = -0.09$ ,  $SE = 0.04$ , 95% CI [-0.184, -0.009]).

As control variables, both direct positive and negative contact were associated with dehumanization in opposite ways ( $\beta = -0.25$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ , and  $\beta = 0.24$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ , respectively, both  $p = 0.001$ ). Direct negative contact also predicted lower support for refugee rights ( $\beta = -0.17$ ,  $SE = 0.08$ ,  $p = 0.043$ ).

**Additional analyses**

We conducted additional analyses to test whether the associations between mass-mediated contact and the outcome variables were dependent on participants' level of direct contact, as suggested in previous research. We tested multiple moderated mediations with Process (Hayes 2012, Model 8), where direct contact was tested as a moderator of the associations between mass-mediated contact and dehumanization, as well as mass-mediated contact and outcome variables. The level of direct positive contact did not significantly moderate the role of positive or negative mass-mediated contact. However, negative direct contact moderated the associations between negative mass-mediated contact and dehumanization (interaction coefficient = 0.07,  $SE = 0.03$ ,  $p = 0.016$ ), such that the role of negative mass-mediated contact on dehumanization was more pronounced among individuals who indicated greater direct negative contact ( $B = 0.31$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) compared to the ones with less direct negative contact ( $B = 0.13$ ,  $SE = 0.05$ ,  $p = 0.014$ ). Other direct or indirect effects were not moderated by negative contact.

**Discussion**

Study 1 demonstrated that, as indicated by previous research (e.g., Igartua et al. 2014, Visintin et al. 2017), negative mass-mediated contact

<sup>4</sup> Although the RMSEA level was relatively high, an RMSEA between .08 and .10 has been shown to demonstrate an acceptable fit (MacCallum et al., 1996).



was much more prevalent than positive mass-mediated contact and this seemed to be accompanied by high levels of dehumanization towards refugees in the current context. As expected, both positive and negative mass-mediated contact had a unique role in predicting dehumanization of refugees, which was in turn related to whether refugees are positively evaluated and supported. Particularly positive mass-mediated contact was also predictive of attitudes and support for refugee rights directly. While the role of mass-mediated contact was largely present independent of direct contact, negative direct contact seemed to reinforce the dehumanizing role of negative mass-mediated contact.

## Study 2

While Study 1 provided important insights into how mass-mediated contact may predict the evaluation of refugees, one limitation was the correlational design of the study, which restricts causal assumptions about mass-mediated contact. Therefore, Study 2 addressed this issue with the use of an experimental design where we manipulated positive and negative mass-mediated contact in the same refugee context.

## Method

### Participants and procedure

The final sample was composed of 214<sup>5</sup> university students ( $M_{age} = 22.25$ ,  $SD = 1.90$ ; 130 Females, 82 Males, 2 Other) who participated in an online experiment in exchange for course credit. The mean socioeconomic status (indicated by income as in Study 1) was relatively upper-middle class ( $M = 4.54$ ,  $SD = 1.08$ , compared to midpoint level 4,  $t(213) = 7.27$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and the sample was mostly left-oriented ( $M = 4.01$ ,  $SD = 1.66$ , response scale ranging from 1 = *Extremely left* to 10 = *Extremely right*, compared to midpoint 5.50,  $t(213) = -13.10$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ).<sup>6</sup>

Participants were randomly assigned to three different conditions. The procedure was similar to mass-mediated contact manipulations used in previous research (e.g., Rupar et al. 2022). The positive mass-mediated contact condition ( $N = 65$ ) included a bogus news report where participants read about the contributions of Afghan refugees to Turkey both culturally and economically, with a specific example of an Afghan refugee who won a scientific prize. In the negative mass-mediated contact condition ( $N = 72$ ), participants read a similar news report focusing on increased tension and hostility between Turks and Afghans. The neutral condition ( $N = 77$ ) did not include any newspaper report (See Supplementary Materials for all the scenarios). In line with experimentally induced contact literature, to reinforce the manipulation, participants were then asked to report their thoughts and feelings about this news report in five-six sentences.

### Measures

The same measures as in Study 1 were used. The reliabilities ranged between (Cronbach's Alpha = 0.78–0.90). A manipulation check item assessed the perceived positivity of the news ('How positive was the news you read?' ranging from 1 = *Very negative* to 7 = *Very positive*).

<sup>5</sup> In Study 2, we also conducted a post-hoc G\*power analysis for multivariate analyses. This showed that for a small effect size ( $f^2 = 0.03$ ),  $\alpha = 0.05$ , with three groups and three response variables, our final sample size ( $N = 214$ ) provided a power of 0.79, which is close to the conventional power criterion (0.80).

<sup>6</sup> As in Study 1, since mean differences were different across majority and minority ethnic status group members, the final data did not include ethnic minorities ( $N = 25$ ). Four people were further excluded in the study as they completed the study in under 120 seconds. The exclusion of the participants did not change the overall pattern of the results.

## Results

Our manipulation check demonstrated that mass-mediated contact in the positive condition ( $M = 4.57$ ,  $SD = 2.02$ ) was perceived to be significantly more positive than the mass-mediated contact in the negative condition ( $M = 1.54$ ,  $SD = 0.71$ ),  $t(78.29) = -11.48$ ,  $p < 0.001$ .

### Group differences

In order to assess mean differences across conditions, we conducted a MANCOVA test where dehumanization, attitudes and support for rights were dependent variables, positive and negative direct contact were covariates.

The overall model was significant,  $F(6, 414) = 2.28$ ,  $p = 0.036$ , Wilks' Lambda = 0.94,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.03$ . Both direct positive and negative contact as covariates had significant effects on each dependent variable (all  $p < .05$ ). After controlling direct contact effects, condition did not have a significant impact on support of refugees,  $F(2,209) = 1.41$ ,  $p = 0.367$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.01$ , whereas both dehumanization and attitudes were significantly different across conditions,  $F(2,209) = 3.05$ ,  $p = 0.049$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.03$  and  $F(2,209) = 3.11$ ,  $p = 0.047$ ,  $\eta_p^2 = 0.03$ , respectively.

Further LSD post-hoc test results demonstrated that while positive mass-mediated contact ( $M = 5.22$ ,  $SD = 1.19$ ) did not reduce dehumanization when compared to the neutral condition ( $M = 5.31$ ,  $SD = 1.07$ ),  $p = 0.582$ , negative mass-mediated contact ( $M = 5.75$ ,  $SD = 1.02$ ) produced more dehumanization compared to the positive condition ( $p = 0.021$ ). The comparison between negative and neutral condition was marginally significant ( $p = 0.063$ ). On the other hand, attitudes in the positive mass-mediated contact condition ( $M = 24.88$ ,  $SD = 22.46$ ) were significantly more positive than the neutral ( $M = 19.12$ ,  $SD = 18.51$ ), as well as the negative mass-mediated contact condition ( $M = 16.03$ ,  $SD = 18.01$ ),  $p = 0.027$  and  $p = 0.034$ , respectively. Negative mass-mediated contact did not seem to worsen attitudes towards Afghans,  $p = 0.963$ . Means and standard deviations for all conditions were given in Table 2.

### Mediation analyses

We further used Mplus to test our mediational model through Structural Equation Modelling. We created two dummy variables, one representing positive mass-mediated contact and the other representing negative mass-mediated contact, with the neutral group as the reference category. As in Study 1, we entered dehumanization as the mediator, and attitudes and support for refugee rights as dependent variables, while controlling for positive and negative direct contact. We used the same model indices and random item parceling methods as in Study 1.<sup>7</sup>


The measurement model had a good fit,  $\chi^2/df = 1.07$ , CFI = 1.00, RMSEA = 0.02, and SRMR = .01, and all observed variables loaded significantly on their relevant construct (loadings > 0.82). The final mediation model also fitted well,  $\chi^2/df = 0.76$ , CFI = 1.00, RMSEA = 0.00, and SRMR = 0.02. Accordingly, only negative mass-mediated contact predicted a marginally significant increase in dehumanization ( $\beta = 0.14$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ,  $p = 0.050$ ), but positive mass-mediated contact did not reduce dehumanization ( $\beta = -0.04$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ,  $p = 0.627$ ), compared to the control condition. In turn, dehumanization was associated strongly with negative attitudes ( $\beta = -0.60$ ,  $SE = 0.05$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ) and support for refugee rights ( $\beta = -0.57$ ,  $SE = 0.07$ ,  $p < 0.001$ ). While negative mass-mediated contact did not directly change support for refugee rights or attitudes, positive mass-mediated contact directly improved attitudes towards Afghan refugees ( $\beta = 0.12$ ,  $SE = 0.05$ ,  $p = 0.015$ ).

Indirect effects demonstrated that positive mass-mediated contact effects were not significantly mediated by dehumanization. Yet, the

<sup>7</sup> As demographic variables (age, socio-economic status, gender) were only weakly associated with the outcome constructs, they were not included in the final model. With their addition in the model, only age predicted significantly lower support for refugee rights ( $\beta = -0.15$ ,  $SE = 0.06$ ,  $p = 0.023$ ). The addition of the control variables did not change the overall pattern of the effects.

**Table 2**  
Means and standard deviations for the main variables across condition in Study 2.

Conditions	Dehumanization	Attitudes	Support for rights
Positive mass-mediated contact	5.22 (1.19)	24.88 (22.46)	2.54 (1.28)
Negative mass-mediated contact	5.75 (1.02)	16.03 (18.01)	2.23 (1.21)
Neutral	5.31 (1.07)	19.12 (18.51)	2.58 (1.16)



**Fig. 2.** Mediation model predicting attitudes and support for refugee rights in Study 2.

Notes.  $*p \leq 0.05$ ,  $***p < 0.001$ .

MC = Mass-mediated contact. Standardized coefficients and standard errors (in brackets) were presented.

effects of negative mass-mediated contact on both attitudes and support for refugee rights were mediated by dehumanization ( $\beta = -0.08$ ,  $SE = 0.04$ , 95% CI  $[-0.17, -0.001]$  and  $\beta = -0.08$ ,  $SE = 0.04$ , 95% CI  $[-0.17, 0.000]$ , respectively). When the effects of direct positive and negative contact were not included in the model, the indirect effects of negative mass-mediated contact (but not of positive mass-mediated contact) through dehumanization were significant and relatively stronger ( $\beta = -0.14$ ,  $SE = 0.06$ , 95% CI  $[-0.25, -0.04]$  for attitudes and  $\beta = -0.12$ ,  $SE = 0.05$ , 95% CI  $[-0.21, -0.03]$  for support for refugee rights). See Fig. 2 for the final mediation model.

Both positive and negative direct contact were also associated with dehumanization ( $\beta = -0.30$ ,  $SE = 0.06$  and  $\beta = 0.31$ ,  $SE = 0.31$ , respectively, both  $p < 0.001$ ) and outgroup attitudes ( $\beta = 0.28$ ,  $SE = 0.05$  and  $\beta = -0.12$ ,  $SE = 0.05$ , respectively, both  $p < 0.001$ , respectively).

#### Additional analyses

As in Study 1, we conducted moderated mediations to assess whether the effects of mass-mediated contact depended on positive and negative direct contact. We detected only one moderation by positive direct contact on the association between condition and support for rights (interaction coefficient = 0.56,  $SE = 0.27$ ;  $p = 0.040$ ); yet the conditional effects were not significant (for lower positive direct contact:  $B = -0.26$ ,  $SE = 0.20$ ,  $p = 0.191$ ; and for higher positive direct contact:  $B = 0.30$ ,  $SE = 0.25$ ,  $p = 0.237$ ). Negative direct contact did not moderate any effects of mass-mediated contact.

#### Discussion

In summary, Study 2 indicated that particularly negative mass-mediated contact played a role in the increase in dehumanization, which was in turn associated with more negative attitudes and lower support of refugees. While positive mass-mediated contact did not seem to reduce dehumanization or support for refugee rights, it did create positivity towards refugees by directly increasing individuals' positive attitudes.

#### General discussion

The way immigration is framed within society is likely to play a critical role in the relationship between natives and newcomers. Rep-

resenting refugees as bogus claimants who pose cultural and security threats to the country in mass media is likely to trigger a range of hostile behaviors towards these groups (e.g., Esses et al. 2021). The current studies examined how contact through mass media could be linked to pro-refugee attitudes and support for their rights through dehumanization in a context where the refugee crisis has been at the center of public discourse.

#### Mass-mediated contact effects

In line with our hypotheses, our initial correlational study indicated that while positive mass-mediated contact predicted more positive attitudes and greater support for refugee rights through reduced dehumanization, negative mass-mediated contact was associated with more negative attitudes and reduced support through increased dehumanization. This was generally replicated in a second experimental study, whereby positive mass-mediated contact improved attitudes directly and negative mass-mediated contact reduced such attitudes and support through decreased dehumanization.

As expected, in both studies, these associations were found over and beyond the effects of direct contact, which is in line with previous studies highlighting mass-mediated contact as a unique form of indirect contact that shapes attitudes towards refugees (e.g., De Coninck et al. 2021). Our additional analyses showed only minor moderation effects whereby negative direct contact strengthened the dehumanizing role of negative mass-mediated contact (Study 1) and positive direct contact determined whether negative mass-mediated contact contributed to support for refugees (with non-significant conditional effects, Study 2). Hence, while both forms of direct contact had substantial impact on the outcome variables in both studies, mass-mediated contact also seems to be uniquely linked to how refugees are perceived regardless of how much individuals engage in direct positive and negative contact. Nevertheless, considering the mixed findings regarding the moderating role of direct contact though, future research should explore its role further. For example, research can consider not only the valence of direct contact as a potential moderator, but also the content of direct and indirect forms of contact between natives and refugees (Stathi et al., 2020; Tropp et al., 2021).

We further found that the relative strength of positive versus negative mass-mediated contact effects varied across variables. For example, particularly in Study 1, positive mass-mediated contact (but not negative mass-mediated contact) was a direct predictor of all the outcome variables, which is in line with previous research conducted in more hostile intergroup contexts (Rupar et al., 2022). Studies conducted in Turkey have also previously shown direct positive contact to have a stronger role in predicting attitudes compared to negative contact, potentially due to greater category salience of positive contact which might be more transformative in highly threatening contexts (Bağcı et al., 2022a; Bağcı and Turnuklu, 2019). In fact, Study 1 showed that negative mass-mediated contact was more prevalent than positive mass-mediated contact, which is in line with previous research demonstrating refugees to be disproportionately negatively depicted in various mass media channels (e.g., Rupar et al. 2022).

While Study 2 confirmed that positive mass-mediated contact directly affected outgroup attitudes unlike negative mass-mediated contact, we also found that only negative mass-mediated contact had indirect effects through dehumanization. The differential effects of positive and negative mass-mediated contact particularly in relation to dehumanization across the studies may be based on different sample characteristics. While dehumanization was equally high in both studies, the sample in Study 2 included participants who are younger and of relatively higher socioeconomic status. Therefore, they might be less exposed to (or less interested in following) news about Afghans compared to the community sample in Study 1, who are likely to be more 'desensitized' to negative news. Consequently, the negative mass-mediated contact procedure in our experiment might have been more effective on dehumanization among those people who are relatively less exposed to such news in real life. Future research may consider controlling for initial levels of mass-mediated contact in addition to direct contact to assess whether the effectiveness of such bogus news reports changes with varying levels of initial mass-mediated contact. On the other hand, in a context where the level of outgroup dehumanization is particularly high (in both studies,  $M_s = >5$  in a 7-point scale), the use of an experimental, one-shot positive indirect contact manipulation may not be robust enough to produce a substantial change in supportive behaviors. A combination of outgroup-specific strategies to enhance humanization (Vezzali et al., 2022) and subsequent attitudinal and behavioral positivity may be essential in such contexts.

#### Limitations and future directions

A few limitations of the study should be acknowledged. Our data in both studies were collected through convenience sampling and from a large city (Istanbul), which means that our participants were less likely to represent the overall population's diverse reactions to refugees. Moreover, our studies were conducted in Turkey, which is a unique socio-cultural context where the overall refugee population has increased drastically in a very short period of time. Previous studies have shown that attitudes towards refugees are particularly negative in such a context compared to European countries, mainly because of existing socioeconomic challenges at the country level (De Coninck et al., 2021). Therefore, while negative mass-mediated contact was found to be more prevalent than positive mass-mediated contact similar to some other contexts (e.g., Visintin et al. 2017), the particularly threatening 'refugee crisis' in the country may be a more central element of public discourse in Turkey, making mass-mediated contact a critical impression formation tool in this context.

Methodologically, while we focused on the valence of mass-mediated contact in the current study, we conceptualized mass-mediated contact as a single construct with no distinction across different types of media sources. For example, distinguishing between 'news' and 'movies' contact, Pagotto and Voci (2013) found that negative news contact, but positive movie contact, were associated with attitudes towards outgroups. Similarly, De Coninck et al. (2021) demonstrated that exposure to news,

as well as public news consumption were positively related to attitudes, whereas commercial news consumption predicted more negative attitudes.

Relatedly, the effectiveness of the experimental procedure we used in Study 2 was confirmed with a single manipulation check item that asked about the valence of the news, but not whether the impression of refugees on media was positive or negative. Moreover, the bogus positive and negative news reports included scenarios that differed contextually. While we believe the external validity of both news reports is high because of the similarity of such news to real-life media content, further research is needed to fully understand what specific types or sources of mass-mediated contact are more effective in shaping attitudes towards refugees. On the other hand, the negative mass-mediated contact procedure was intended to temporally increase the salience of dehumanizing attitudes in an already negative intergroup climate. While we believe these effects are short-lived, an assessment of how long-lasting these negative effects are is critical.

Although we investigated the mechanisms of how mass-mediated contact is effective in shaping attitudes and behaviors towards refugees, we were unable to show which (individual) factors may increase the predictive role of mass-mediated contact on attitudes.

For example, Bond (2021) indicated that initial levels of prejudice were likely to increase the effectiveness of a fictional television series on prejudice reduction. Beyond the classically studied ideologies such as social dominance orientation in the direct contact literature (e.g., Asbrock et al. 2011), future research could also examine various personality factors that determine 'who' is more likely to be influenced by mass-mediated contact. For example, previous studies suggested extraversion and openness to experience to be associated with mass media usage (Finn, 1997), as well as the ability to discern real and fake news (Calvillo et al., 2021), indicating some individuals to be potentially more vulnerable to the effects of positive and negative mass-mediated contact.

#### Implications and conclusion

In summary, using both correlational and experimental research designs, the current research contributes to the growing mass-mediated contact literature by examining the role of both positive and negative mass-mediated contact on pro-refugee attitudes, testing dehumanization as a critical mechanism underlying these effects. Findings highlight how both types of mass-mediated contact may link to a *less human* perception of refugees and the extent to which they are supported in a unique immigration context. Overall, these findings may have important implications for policies regarding the integration of refugees. Since the initial arrival of refugees in Turkey, attitudes towards this group have drastically become more negative over time (Bağcı et al., 2022a) and as this study shows, dehumanization and negative attitudes prevail to a large extent, overall demonstrating the urgent need to understand social psychological processes that underlie responses to refugees.

Particularly, Study 1 demonstrates clear evidence about the disproportionate exposure of individuals to negative portrayals of refugees, which implies that reducing negative mass-mediated contact might directly decrease dehumanization of refugees and encourage pro-refugee support. Hence, it is important to consider ways of reducing these negative portrayals and the dehumanizing language used in mass media and encourage more informative and inclusive representations of stigmatized minority groups such as refugees. For example, mass media channels can work toward establishing anti-racist and inclusive language and norms, which can enhance societal awareness as well as broader diversity and equality literacy (e.g., Tisdell and Thompson 2007). At the same time, promoting positive mass-mediated contact (along with other humanizing strategies based on, for example, categorization) may function as an important 'rehumanizing' tool that would create better ways to integrate refugees in the society (Esses et al., 2021). Future research is needed to understand the types of mass-mediated contact that are effective in shaping attitudes towards refugees, as well as to recognize



the mediating and moderating processes that can facilitate a peaceful integration process.

### Declaration of Competing Interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

### Ethical statement

Ethical approval for this study was granted from the first author's affiliated university (Ethical statement no: FASS-2022-23).

### Supplementary materials

Supplementary material associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at [doi:10.1016/j.cresp.2023.100133](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cresp.2023.100133).

### References

- Abrams, J.R., McGaughey, K.J., Haghghat, H., 2018. Attitudes toward Muslims: a test of the parasocial contact hypothesis and contact theory. *J. Interact. Commun. Res.* 47 (4), 276–292. doi:10.1080/17475759.2018.1443968.
- Aktas, V., Tepe, Y.K., Persson, R.S., 2018. Investigating Turkish University Students' attitudes towards refugees in a time of civil war in neighboring Syria. *Curr. Psychol.* 40 (2), 553–562. doi:10.1007/s12144-018-9971-y.
- Asbrock, F., Christ, O., Duckitt, J., Sibley, C.G., 2011. Differential effects of intergroup contact for authoritarians and social dominators. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 38 (4), 477–490. doi:10.1177/0146167211429747.
- Bagci, S.C., Baysu, G., Tercan, M., Turnuklu, A., 2022a. Dealing with increasing negativity toward refugees: a latent growth curve study of positive and negative intergroup contact and approach-avoidance tendencies. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* doi:10.1177/01461672221110325.
- Bagci, S.C., Saçlam, D., 2022. The role of direct and mass-mediated contact on attitudes and behaviors towards Syrian and Afghan refugees. In: *Proceedings of the 4th Social Psychology Congress, Izmir, Turkey*.
- 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. *Soc. Psychol.* 50, 7–23. doi:10.1027/1864-9335/a000355.
- Bagci, S.C., Verkuyten, M., Canpolat, E., 2022b. When they want to take away what is "ours": collective ownership threat and negative reactions towards refugees. *Group Process. Intergroup Relat.* doi:10.1177/13684302221084232.
- Bagozzi, R.P., Yi, Y., 2012. Specification, evaluation, and interpretation of structural equation models. *J. Acad. Market. Sci.* 40, 8–34. doi:10.1007/s11747-011-0278-x.
- Banas, J.A., Bessarabova, E., Massey, Z.B., 2020. Meta-analysis on mediated contact and prejudice. *Hum. Commun. Res.* 46 (2–3), 120–160. doi:10.1093/hcr/hqaa004.
- 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. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 38 (12), 1629–1643. doi:10.1177/01461672122457953.
- Bond, B.J., 2021. The development and influence of parasocial relationships with television characters: a longitudinal experimental test of prejudice reduction through parasocial contact. *Commun. Res.* 48 (4), 573–593. doi:10.1177/0093650219900632.
- Brown, R., Paterson, J., 2016. Indirect Contact and prejudice reduction: limits and possibilities. *Curr. Opin. Psychol.* 11, 20–24. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.03.005.
- Bruneau, E., Hameiri, B., Moore-Berg, S.L., Kteily, N., 2021. Intergroup contact reduces dehumanization and meta-dehumanization: cross-sectional, longitudinal, and quasi-experimental evidence from 16 samples in five countries. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 47 (6), 906–920. doi:10.1177/0146167220949004.
- Calvillo, D.P., Garcia, R.J., Bertrand, K., Mayers, T.A., 2021. Personality factors and self-reported political news consumption predict susceptibility to political fake news. *Pers. Individ. Diff.* 174, 110666. doi:10.1016/j.paid.2021.110666.
- Capozza, D., Falvo, R., Di Bernardo, G.A., Vezzali, L., Visintin, E.P., 2014. Intergroup contact as a strategy to improve humanness attributions: a review of studies. *TPM-testing, psychometrics. Methodol. Appl. Psychol.* 21 (3), 349–362. doi:10.4473/TPM21.3.9.
- Cheung, H.K., Baranik, L.E., Burrows, D., Ashburn-Nardo, L., 2022. Hiring discrimination against refugees: examining the mediating role of symbolic and realistic threat. *J. Vocat. Behav.* 138, 103765. doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2022.103765.
- Çirakoğlu, O.C., Demirutku, K., Karakaya, O., 2021. The mediating role of perceived threat in the relationship between casual contact and attitudes towards Syrian refugees in Turkey. *J. Refug. Stud.* 34 (3), 2984–2999. doi:10.1093/jrs/fez118.
- De Coninck, D., Ogan, C., d'Haenens, L., 2021. Can 'the other' ever become 'one of us'? Comparing Turkish and European attitudes toward refugees: a five-country study. *Int. Commun. Gaz.* 83 (3), 217–237. doi:10.1177/1748048519895376.
- De Coninck, D., Rodríguez-de-Dios, I., d'Haenens, L., 2021. The contact hypothesis during the European refugee crisis: relating quality and quantity of (in) direct intergroup contact to attitudes towards refugees. *Group Process. Intergroup Relat.* 24 (6), 881–901. doi:10.1177/1368430220929394.
- Dovidio, J.F., Eller, A., Hewstone, M., 2011. Improving intergroup relations through direct, extended and other forms of indirect contact. *Group Process. Intergroup Relat.* 14 (2), 147–160. doi:10.1177/1368430210390555.
- Dovidio, J.F., Gaertner, S.L., Kawakami, K., 2003. Intergroup contact: the past, present, and the future. *Group Process. Intergroup Relat.* 6 (1), 5–21. doi:10.1177/1368430203006001009.
- Eberl, J.M., Meltzer, C.E., Heidenreich, T., Herrero, B., Theorin, N., Lind, F., Berganza, R., Boomgaarden, H.G., Schemer, C., Strömbäck, J., 2018. The European Media Discourse on immigration and its effects: a literature review. *Ann. Int. Commun. Assoc.* 42 (3), 207–223. doi:10.1080/23808985.2018.1497452.
- Erol, H., Yaylacı, F.G., 2022. Türkiye'deki Afgan Sığınmacılar ve Medya Temsilleri Bağlamında Görüşleri. *Göç Dergisi* 9 (2), 181–206. doi:10.33182/gd.v9i2.806.
- Eroler, E.G., Kürüm, R.S., 2021. Türkiye'de Medyadaki "Medenileşme" Algısında Avrupa Temsili: Suriyeli Göçmen Krizi Dönemi. *Dumlupınar Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi* 69, 1–19. doi:10.51290/dpusbe.820210.
- Esses, V.M., Hamilton, L.K., Gaucher, D., 2017. The global refugee crisis: empirical evidence and policy implications for improving public attitudes and facilitating refugee resettlement. *Soc. Issues Policy Rev.* 11 (1), 78–123. doi:10.1111/sipr.12028.
- Esses, V.M., Medianu, S., Lawson, A.S., 2013. Uncertainty, threat, and the role of the media in promoting the dehumanization of immigrants and refugees. *J. Soc. Issues* 69 (3), 518–536. doi:10.1111/josi.12027.
- Esses, V.M., Medianu, S., Sutter, A., Kronfeldner, M., 2021. *The dehumanization and rehumanization of refugees*. In: *The Routledge Handbook of Dehumanization*. Routledge, pp. 275–291.
- Finn, S., 1997. Origins of media exposure: linking personality traits to TV, radio, print, and film use. *Commun. Res.* 24 (5), 507–529. doi:10.1177/009365097024005003.
- Firat, M., Ataca, B., 2021. Does perceived cultural distance mediate the relationship between intergroup contact and support for refugee rights? A preliminary investigation. *J. Commun. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 32 (1), 57–72. doi:10.1002/casp.2536.
- Graf, S., Sczesny, S., 2019. Intergroup contact with migrants is linked to support for migrants through attitudes, especially in people who are politically right wing. *Int. J. Intercult. Relat.* 73, 102–106. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2019.09.001.
- Gregurović, M., Kaufmann, P.R., Župarić-Iljić, D., Dujmović, M., 2019. Are attitudes determined by location? Differences in perceptions of asylum seekers between residents of two Zagreb neighbourhoods. *Geoforum* 104, 244–258. doi:10.1016/j.geoforum.2019.05.004.
- Göker, G., Keskin, S., 2015. Haber medyası ve mülteciler: Suriyeli mültecilerin Türk yazılı basınındaki temsili [News media and refugees: the representation of Syrian refugees in printed Turkish media]. *İletişim Kuram ve Araştırma Dergisi* 41, 229–256. [https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/50347509/HABER\\_MEDYASI\\_VE\\_MULTECILER-with-cover-page-v2.pdf?Expires=1666873583&Signature=UvM9a6XqFgc-iBkoQ170a2Hui13gi3nW7h1W6WqhsksL2mlEsWqznYQqRfbFqavUdMvPc~FGBeavwVQAUt9IzdeJH3y4yMU14JolKoeWf860hhB2fQvVUFbujVVPqCfk-5UqAPVYqTZenW45Wz70KOb-Phsa0RgBjrJlAcjZl5FvnxRZ9DTPSNlwkseSC-jzRJRJSYR4Ri~7VfV4HA~mG-V7Z5qNFVCh6grAdlsU9vfdTnnhxlbs-gyJn9CsYbyjCUoV6aQVm5kd~QQOD-FVXdESphu4YXQyAex~q6bulFOUBh5o3dSVkVbBqYWnbAqkLLNytHiMXwjOPkvYg\\_&Key-Pair-Id=APKA-JOEHF5GGSLRBV4ZA](https://d1wqtxts1xzle7.cloudfront.net/50347509/HABER_MEDYASI_VE_MULTECILER-with-cover-page-v2.pdf?Expires=1666873583&Signature=UvM9a6XqFgc-iBkoQ170a2Hui13gi3nW7h1W6WqhsksL2mlEsWqznYQqRfbFqavUdMvPc~FGBeavwVQAUt9IzdeJH3y4yMU14JolKoeWf860hhB2fQvVUFbujVVPqCfk-5UqAPVYqTZenW45Wz70KOb-Phsa0RgBjrJlAcjZl5FvnxRZ9DTPSNlwkseSC-jzRJRJSYR4Ri~7VfV4HA~mG-V7Z5qNFVCh6grAdlsU9vfdTnnhxlbs-gyJn9CsYbyjCUoV6aQVm5kd~QQOD-FVXdESphu4YXQyAex~q6bulFOUBh5o3dSVkVbBqYWnbAqkLLNytHiMXwjOPkvYg_&Key-Pair-Id=APKA-JOEHF5GGSLRBV4ZA).
- Gölcü, A., Dağlı, A.N., 2017. Haber söyleminde 'öteki'yi aramak: Suriyeli Mülteciler örneği [Searching for the "Others" in the News Discourse: Syrian Refugees Example]. *Akdeniz Üniversitesi İletişim Fakültesi Dergisi* 28, 11–38. doi:10.31123/akil.437410.
- Haddock, G., Zanna, M.P., Esses, V.M., 1993. Assessing the structure of prejudicial attitudes: the case of attitudes toward homosexuals. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 65 (6), 1105–1118. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.65.6.1105.
- Haslam, N., 2006. Dehumanization: an integrative review. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Rev.* 10 (3), 252–264. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr1003\_4.
- Haslam, N., Stratemeyer, M., 2016. Recent research on dehumanization. *Curr. Opin. Psychol.* 11, 25–29. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2016.03.009.
- Hayes, A.F. (2012). PROCESS: a versatile computational tool for observed variable mediation, moderation, and conditional process modeling [White paper]. Retrieved from <http://www.afhayes.com/public/process2012.pdf>.
- Igartua, J.J., Barrios, I.M., Ortega, F., Frutos, F.J., 2014. The image of immigration in fiction broadcast on prime-time television in Spain. *Palabra Clave - Revista De Comunicación* 17 (3), 589–618. doi:10.5294/pacla.2014.17.3.2.
- Jelínková, M., 2019. A refugee crisis without refugees: policy and media discourse on refugees in the Czech Republic and its implications. *Central Eur. J. Public Policy* 13 (1), 33–45. doi:10.2478/cejpp-2019-0003.
- Joyce, N., Harwood, J., 2012. Improving intergroup attitudes through televised vicarious intergroup contact. *Commun. Res.* 41 (5), 627–643. doi:10.1177/0093650212447944.
- Karadağ, S. (2021). Ghosts of Istanbul: Afghans at the margins of precarity. Report of Association of Migration Research. <https://gocarastirmalaridernegi.org/attachments/article/192/GHOSTS%20OF%20ISTANBUL%20N.pdf>
- Karakaya, C., Karakaya, E.N., 2021. Turkey's ignored immigrants: Afghans. *Uluslararası Kültürel ve Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi (UKSAD)* 7 (1), 100–111.
- Kline, R. B., 2012. Assumptions in structural equation modeling. In: *Hoyle, R.H. (Ed.), Handbook of structural equation modeling*. Guilford Press, pp. 111–125.
- Kotzur, P.F., Schäfer, S.J., Wagner, U., 2019. Meeting a nice asylum seeker: intergroup contact changes stereotype content perceptions and associated emotional prejudices, and encourages solidarity-based collective action intentions. *Br. J. Soc. Psychol.* 58 (3), 668–690. doi:10.1111/bjso.12304.
- Kotzur, P.F., Wagner, U., 2021. The dynamic relationship between contact opportunities, positive and negative intergroup contact, and prejudice: a longitudinal investigation. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 120 (2), 418–442. doi:10.1037/pspi0000258.
- Kteily, N., Bruneau, E., 2017. Backlash: the politics and real-world consequences of minority group dehumanization. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 43 (1), 87–104. doi:10.1177/0146167216675334.



- Kteily, N.S., Landry, A.P., 2022. Dehumanization: trends, insights, and challenges. *Trends Cogn. Sci. (Regul. Ed.)* 26 (3), 222–240. doi:10.1016/j.tics.2021.12.003.
- Lazović, V., 2021. Dehumanization Revisited. *AAA: Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 46 (2), 115–138. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/27097917>.
- Lehmer, G., Wagner, U., 2015. Can we really reduce ethnic prejudice outside the lab? A meta-analysis of direct and indirect contact interventions. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* 45 (2), 152–168. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2079.
- Louis, W.R., Esses, V.M., Lalonde, R.N., 2013. National identification, perceived threat, and dehumanization as antecedents of negative attitudes toward immigrants in Australia and Canada. *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 43, E156–E165. doi:10.1111/jasp.12044.
- Lutterbach, S., Beelmann, A., 2020. Positive and negative intergroup contact and shared reality: contact effects among host society and refugees. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* 50 (1), 143–159. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2601.
- Marsh, H.W., Hau, K., Wen, J., 2004. In search of golden rules: comment on hypothesis-testing approaches to setting cutoff values for fit indexes and dangers in overgeneralizing Hu and Bentler's (1999) findings. *Struct. Eq. Model.* 11 (3), 320–341. doi:10.1207/s15328007sem1103\_2.
- Matsunaga, M., 2008. Item parceling in structural equation modeling: a primer. *Commun. Methods Meas.* 2 (4), 260–293. doi:10.1080/19312450802458935.
- Meleady, R., Forder, L., 2019. When contact goes wrong: negative intergroup contact promotes generalized outgroup avoidance. *Group Process. Intergroup Relat.* 22 (5), 688–707. doi:10.1177/1368430218761568.
- Ministry of Migration, 2021. [Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü]. *Göç İdaresi Genel Müdürlüğü*.
- Motal, J., 2015. Dehumanization of refugees in media as a case of moral disengagement. *Ethics Bioeth.* 5 (3–4), 183–196. <https://www.unipo.sk/public/media/28743/Ethics%202015-3-4.pdf#page=57>.
- Muthén, L.K., Muthén, B.O., 1998–2011. *Mplus User's Guide. Sixth Edition*. Muthén & Muthén, Los Angeles, CA.
- Müller, T., 2018. Constructing cultural borders: depictions of Muslim refugees in British and German media. *Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Politikwissenschaft* 12 (1), 263–277. doi:10.1007/s12286-017-0361-x.
- Pagotto, L., Voci, A., 2013. Direct and mass-mediated contact: the role of different intergroup emotions. *TPM: Test. Psychom. Methodol. Appl. Psychol.* 20 (4), 365–381. doi:10.4473/TPM20.4.5.
- Paolini, S., Harwood, J., Rubin, M., 2010. Negative intergroup contact makes group memberships salient: explaining why intergroup conflict endures. *Pers. Soc. Psychol. Bull.* 36 (12), 1723–1738. doi:10.1177/0146167210388667.
- 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. *J. Soc. Issues* 77 (1), 11–37. doi:10.1111/josi.12427.
- Park, S.Y., 2012. Mediated intergroup contact: concept explication, synthesis, and application. *Mass Commun. Soc.* 15 (1), 136–159. doi:10.1080/15205436.2011.558804.
- Parker, S., 2015. Unwanted invaders: the representation of refugees and asylum seekers in the UK and Australian print media. *ESharp* 23, 1–21. <https://orca.cardiff.ac.uk/id/eprint/79108/1/ESharp%20Article%20SP.pdf>.
- Pettigrew, T.F., Tropp, L.R., 2006. A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *J. Pers. Soc. Psychol.* 90 (5), 751–783. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751.
- Pettigrew, T.F., Tropp, L.R., 2008. How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* 38 (6), 922–934. doi:10.1002/ejsp.504.
- Prati, F., Loughnan, S., 2018. Imagined intergroup contact promotes support for human rights through increased humanization. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* 48 (1), O51–O61. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2282.
- Rupar, M., Graf, S., 2019. Different forms of intergroup contact with former adversary are linked to distinct reconciliatory acts through symbolic and realistic threat. *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 49 (2), 63–74. doi:10.1111/jasp.12565.
- Rupar, M., Graf, S., Voca, S., 2022. Contact with former adversaries through mass-media is linked to forgiveness after dyadic and multi-ethnic conflicts. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* 52 (5–6), 963–983. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2878.
- Saleem, M., Prot, S., Anderson, C.A., Lemieux, A.F., 2017. Exposure to Muslims in media and support for public policies harming Muslims. *Commun. Res.* 44 (6), 841–869. doi:10.1177/0093650215619214.
- Schemer, C., 2012. The influence of news media on stereotypic attitudes toward immigrants in a political campaign. *J. Commun.* 62 (5), 739–757. doi:10.1111/j.1460-2466.2012.01672.x.
- Schiappa, E., Gregg, P.B., Hewes, D.E., 2005. The parasocial contact hypothesis. *Commun. Monogr.* 72 (1), 92–115. doi:10.1080/0363775052000342544.
- Shim, C., Zhang, Y.B., Harwood, J., 2012. Direct and mediated intercultural contact: Koreans' attitudes toward U.S. Americans. *J. Int. Intercult. Commun.* 5 (3), 169–188. doi:10.1080/17513057.2012.670715.
- Stamps, D.L., Sahlman, J., 2021. Audiences' mediated contact with black characters in scripted television and support for racialized social issues. *Commun. Stud.* 72 (5), 834–849. doi:10.1080/10510974.2021.1975140.
- Stathi, S., Guerra, R., Di Bernardo, G.A., Vezzali, L., 2020. Spontaneous imagined contact and intergroup relations: quality matters. *Eur. J. Soc. Psychol.* 50 (1), 124–142. doi:10.1002/ejsp.2600.
- Stathi, S., Husnu, S., Pendleton, S., 2017. Intergroup contact and contact norms as predictors of postconflict forgiveness. *Group Dyn. Theory Res. Pract.* 21 (1), 20–39. doi:10.1037/gdn0000060.
- Steuter, E., Wills, D., 2009. *At War with Metaphor: Media, Propaganda, and Racism in the War on Terror*. Lexington Books, Plymouth, UK.
- Tisdell, E.J., Thompson, P.M., 2007. 'Seeing from a different angle': the role of pop culture in teaching for diversity and critical media literacy in adult education. *Int. J. Lifelong Educ.* 26 (6), 651–673. doi:10.1080/02601370701711349.
- 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. *Int. J. Intercult. Relat.* 80, 7–16. doi:10.1016/j.ijintrel.2020.10.012.
- Tümtaş, M.S., 2022. Türkiye'ye Düzensiz Afgan Göçü: zorunlu Göç Mü "İstila" Mı? *Gaziantep Univ. J. Soc. Sci.* 21 (1), 338–353. doi:10.21547/jss.1009054.
- UNHCR (2022). Number of Syrians in Turkey April 2022. Retrieved at: <https://multeciler.org.tr/eng/number-of-syrians-in-turkey/?gclid=CjwKCAjw2OiaBhBSiEiwAh2ZSP7smr98BixKgMv2vu-XYPkK2rl5Fxcv8sil4rqm6FAZKFxWkr81cHROcKagQAvD.BwE>
- Utych, S.M., 2018. How dehumanization influences attitudes toward immigrants. *Polit. Res. Q.* 71 (2), 440–452. doi:10.1177/1065912917744897.
- Ünal, S., 2014. Türkiye'nin beklenmedik konukları: "Öteki" bağlamında yabancı göçmen ve mülteci deneyimi [Turkey's unexpected guests: foreign immigrants and refugees experience in the context of "other"]. *Zeitschrift für die Welt der Türken/J. World Turks* 6 (3), 65–89. <https://www.dieweltderuerken.org/index.php/ZfWT/article/view/643>.
- Vezzali, L., Capozza, D., Di Bernardo, G.A., Falvo, R., Stathi, S., Hodson, G., 2022. Strategies for the promotion of humanity attribution to outgroups. *Eur. Rev. Soc. Psychol.* 33, 215–254. doi:10.1080/10463283.2021.1963156.
- Visintin, E.P., Voci, A., Pagotto, L., Hewstone, M., 2017. Direct, extended, and mass-mediated contact with immigrants in Italy: their associations with emotions, prejudice, and humanity perceptions. *J. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 47 (4), 175–194. doi:10.1111/jasp.12423.
- Wagner, U., Christ, O., Pettigrew, T.F., Stellmacher, J., Wolf, C., 2006. Prejudice and minority proportion: contact instead of threat effects. *Soc. Psychol. Q.* 69 (4), 380–390. doi:10.1177/019027250606900406.
- Wahlström, M., Törnberg, A., 2021. Social media mechanisms for right-wing political violence in the 21st century: discursive opportunities, group dynamics, and co-ordination. *Terror. Polit. Violence* 33 (4), 766–787. doi:10.1080/09546553.2019.1586676.
- White, F.A., Borinca, I., Vezzali, L., Reynolds, K.J., Blomster Lyshol, J.K., Verrelli, S., Falomir-Pichastor, J.M., 2021. Beyond direct contact: the theoretical and societal relevance of indirect contact for improving intergroup relations. *J. Soc. Issues* 77 (1), 132–153. doi:10.1111/josi.12400.
- Wojcieszak, M., Azrout, R., 2016. I saw you in the news: mediated and direct intergroup contact improve outgroup attitudes. *J. Commun.* 66 (6), 1032–1060. doi:10.1111/jcom.12266.
- Yitmen, Ş., Verkuyten, M., 2018. Positive and negative behavioural intentions towards refugees in Turkey: the roles of national identification, threat, and humanitarian concern. *J. Commun. Appl. Soc. Psychol.* 28 (4), 230–243. doi:10.1002/casp.2354.