

Western Kentucky University

TopSCHOLAR®

Masters Theses & Specialist Projects

Graduate School

Fall 2019

Imagined Contact Intervention with an American Muslim Target

Jamie Williams

Western Kentucky University, jamie.williams539@topper.wku.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses>



Part of the [Personality and Social Contexts Commons](#), [Race and Ethnicity Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Williams, Jamie, "Imagined Contact Intervention with an American Muslim Target" (2019). *Masters Theses & Specialist Projects*. Paper 3152.

<https://digitalcommons.wku.edu/theses/3152>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by TopSCHOLAR®. It has been accepted for inclusion in Masters Theses & Specialist Projects by an authorized administrator of TopSCHOLAR®. For more information, please contact topscholar@wku.edu.

IMAGINED CONTACT INTERVENTION WITH AN AMERICAN MUSLIM
TARGET

A Thesis
Presented to
The Faculty of the Department of Psychology
Western Kentucky University
Bowling Green, Kentucky

In Partial Fulfillment
Of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

By
Jamie Williams

December 2019

IMAGINED CONTACT INTERVENTION WITH AN AMERICAN MUSLIM
TARGET

Date Recommended 11/20/2019




Adam Lockwood, Director of Thesis



Anthony Paquin



Jay Gabbard

 11/22/19
Dean, Graduate School Date

CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Social Identity Theory.....	3
Intergroup Contact Theory.....	4
Social Cognitive Theory	5
Imagined Contact Intervention	6
Purpose of the Study	8
Method	9
Research Design.....	9
Participants.....	9
Procedure	12
Materials and Measures	13
Results.....	14
Discussion.....	15
Conclusion	19
References.....	20
APPENDIX A.....	23
APPENDIX B.....	24
APPENDIX C.....	25

IMAGINED CONTACT INTERVENTION WITH AN AMERICAN MUSLIM TARGET

Jamie Williams

December 2019

25 Pages

Directed by: Adam Lockwood, Anthony Paquin, Jay Gabbard

Department of Psychology

Western Kentucky University

Recent studies have shown that imagining contact with a member of a differing social group can reduce prejudice toward said group. This type of prejudice intervention, known as an imagined contact intervention, can be beneficial when direct contact with the out-group is not feasible. This study adds to existing research on imagined contact interventions by replicating a simple version of the intervention by Husnu and Crisp (2010) and assessing attitudes toward an American Muslim out-group. This study extends the research of Husnu and Crisp (2010) by using American participants as opposed to British participants and also uses an online distribution for the intervention as opposed to a laboratory setting. The research question was: Will the imagined contact intervention significantly reduce prejudice toward the American Muslim out-group when compared to a control condition? Participants who reported socializing with the Muslim out-group less than three times in the past six months completed a form of the intervention online, responded to an out-group attitude index regarding the Muslim out-group, and completed demographics questions. In this study, there was no significant effect of the imagined contact intervention on out-group attitudes. Possible reasons for the intervention's ineffectiveness, including the use of online distribution for the survey, are discussed along with directions for future research.

Introduction

In today's society, race relations are being pulled to the forefront of the news. Protests and riots are helping to expose unfair minority treatment at the hands of police officers and other ethnic majority members. After the Civil Rights Movement occurred, many people believed all members of the United States were treated equally. However, just because racism is not seen as an acceptable social norm anymore does not mean that ethnic minority members are treated equally to the ethnic majority. Research has shown that ethnic prejudice has only become more indirect as opposed to decreasing all together (Monteiro, De França, & Rodrigues, 2009). Nesdale (1999) went so far as to say, "recent evidence suggests that prejudice may simply be being expressed in new disguises, and may actually be increasing" (p. 92). Today, ethnic mistreatment ranges from racial stereotyping on social media to racial profiling in police forces across the nation. At best, ethnic prejudice is a cruel joke or slur aimed at a minority group, and at its worst, ethnic prejudice can result in the murder of innocent human beings (Federal Bureau of Investigation; FBI, 2016).

In the United States, hate crimes against Muslim individuals are fairly common. In 2016, nearly 25 percent of all victims of religious hate crimes were Muslim (FBI, 2016). While the FBI's data only goes through 2016, new data projections through 2017 predict the number of hate crimes in the U.S. to continue to rise – up 12 percent from 2016 (California State University; CSU - San Bernardino, 2018). Reports from 2016 state that anti-Muslim hate crime continues to increase, and reached its highest levels since the terrorist attack on September 11, 2001 (CSU - San Bernardino, 2016). This report, published by CSU - San Bernardino (2016) found that anti-Muslim hate crime increased

by 78 percent in 2015 alone. While there is no direct causal relationship between the events of 2015 and the increase in hate crime, it is possible the increase was influenced by anti-immigrant and anti-refugee rhetoric from the American government and terrorist attacks that took place in Europe (CSU – San Bernadino, 2018).

While hate crimes are an extreme result of anti-Muslim prejudice, Muslim individuals may experience many other negative effects due to prejudice. Nadal, Griffin, Hamit, Leon, Tobio, & Rivera (2012) compiled anecdotes from Muslim individuals regarding microaggressions they had experienced because of their Islamic faith. Nadla et al. (2012) defines microaggressions as a subtle form of discrimination that can send negative messages to out-group members. Microaggressions are often unintentional and unconscious but can still result negatively affect out-group members much like more direct forms of prejudice. These microaggressions are often unconscious or unintended, seemingly innocent actions, but over time they can build up and cause harm to victims. In regard to Muslims, for example, a microaggression may consist of endorsing harmful stereotypes (such as all Muslims are terrorists) or pathologizing someone due to their religious beliefs (such as having negative stereotypes about hijabs or other Muslim head coverings, while not holding the same negative stereotypes about habits or traditional garments worn by individuals from other religions) (Nadal et al., 2012).

At this time, there is little research on the long-term effects of microaggressions, but several studies have conducted anecdotal research with victims of microaggressions. For example, Nadal et al. (2012) interviewed American Muslims about microaggressions they had experienced. These included Muslim individuals being purposefully selected at airport security or being called terrorists. While some of the anecdotes were single

events, some were continuous experiences that lasted throughout school years or time with a certain employer. These microaggressions may not be as explicitly harmful as intentional prejudice, but over time they can still be very stressful for the victim (Nadal et al., 2012).

Social Identity Theory

Social identity theory is one theory that might help explain why certain individuals are selected for prejudice. This theory, first proposed by Tajfel and Turner in 1979, states that a person draws his or her own identity or sense of self from their social relationships or group membership. Tajfel and Turner stated that a person's group membership is important to an individual's self-esteem; therefore, an individual wants to feel proud of the group (or groups) to which they belong. Tajfel and Turner went on to hypothesize that individuals will inflate the status of their own group while putting down other groups in order to feel better about their own group, and in turn, feel better about themselves. This leads the individual to form ideas about the in-group, the group to which they belong, and the out-group, the group to which they do not belong. Generally, these ideas take shape as positive attitudes toward the in-group and negative attitudes toward the out-group (Tajfel & Turner, 1979).

Tajfel and Turner (1979) clarified that not all stereotyping is inherently negative. They posit that the categorizing that occurs during stereotyping is a natural cognitive process and allows us to group everything from objects to people together. During this stereotyping process, we often exaggerate similarities within groups and differences between groups (Tajfel & Turner, 1979). The basics of this categorization process generalize to stereotyping that occurs between people. We tend to view our in-group as

similar to us (and in a positive light,) while we view the out-group as different to us (and in a negative light). Although this categorization is a normal cognitive process, it can cross the line into prejudice if an individual is not aware of their biases toward the in-group and against the out-group.

Intergroup Contact Theory

Intergroup contact theory states that contact between groups, under positive conditions, can reduce prejudice between members of the in-group and out-group (Allport, 1954). Based on this theory, the most effective way to reduce intergroup stereotyping and prejudice is by having positive interactions with the out-group. Studies show that there is a significant negative relationship between contact with and prejudice toward the out-group (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). In other words, the more an individual interacts with the out-group, the less stereotyping and prejudice they display toward said out-group. Research has shown that several types of contact interventions, including direct contact, extended contact, vicarious contact, and imagined contact are effective at reducing prejudice (Crisp & Turner, 2009).

Direct contact involves interacting face-to-face with a member from the out-group. A meta-analysis by Lemmer and Wagner (2015) found that direct contact is effective in reducing prejudice toward the out-group. In addition, Tropp and Pettigrew (2005) found that direct contact increases empathy toward out-group individuals, and it can reduce anxiety that arises from intergroup interaction. Indirect contact interventions are also based in intergroup contact theory; however, the interactions are not face-to-face. For example, one method of indirect contact, extended contact, involves the out-group member tangentially knowing someone from the out-group – such as a friend of a friend.

Another method, imagined contact, involved the in-group member imagining an interaction with the out-group without actually meeting them. For these indirect interventions, social cognitive theory also plays a role in the interventions' effectiveness. Husnu and Crisp (2010), along with the current study, are grounded in both of these theories since they involve testing an imagined contact intervention – a form of indirect contact.

Social Cognitive Theory

Social cognitive theory posits that individuals can learn new behaviors without engaging in the behaviors directly (Bandura, 1978). Individuals can learn by observing others perform behaviors or by simply imagining themselves carrying out a behavior, as is the case with imagined contact. While direct contact with the out-group falls more in line with intergroup contact theory, Crisp and Turner (2009) hypothesized that social cognitive theory could apply to other, indirect interventions. In their article, they cited past research on extended contact as a successful intervention to reduce prejudice and hypothesized that imagined contact would be another successful extension of indirect interventions. Past research on imagined contact has shown that although imagined contact does not involve direct contact with the out-group, it still results in a decrease in prejudice, much like extended contact interventions (Crisp & Turner, 2009). Although Crisp and Turner hypothesized that indirect contact interventions would not be as effective at decreasing prejudice as direct contact interventions, Lemmer and Wagner (2015) found that direct and indirect interventions were both significantly effective.

Similar to direct contact interventions, indirect contact interventions result in an increase in empathy toward the out-group and reduced anxiety toward intergroup

interaction, which can lead to a decrease in out-group prejudice (Troop & Pettigrew, 2005). Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, and Ropp (1997) investigated extended contact interventions and found that the intervention resulted in a greater salience of group membership along with decreased intergroup anxiety. This leads to the conclusion that extended contact, along with other variations of indirect contact interventions, could be effective in mediating individuals' affect and therefore reducing prejudice.

Imagined Contact Intervention

One intervention that utilizes the principles of social cognitive theory is the imagined contact intervention. Imagined intergroup contact has been presented as an effective, indirect intervention used to decrease prejudice (Crisp & Turner, 2009). This intervention involves an individual imagining a scenario in which they have a positive interaction with a member of the out-group. For example, an individual is prompted to imagine meeting and having a pleasant interaction with an out-group member at a bus stop. This out-group interaction, although it is imaginary, leads to the formation of behavioral scripts in the individual that make it more likely for the individual to feel comfortable interacting with the out-group in the future (Crisp & Turner, 2009). The imagery involved in imagined contact allows the individual to rehearse and prepare for an interaction with the out-group without engaging in contact (Marks, 1999).

Imagined contact is an intervention that is simple to administer, inexpensive, and can be used in situations where direct contact or extended contact are difficult or impossible. For example, imagined contact can be useful in rural areas with a homogenous population and no opportunities for in-group members to interact with the out-group. While studies show that imagined contact on its own is not as effective as

direct contact in reducing prejudice, it is difficult to ignore the practicality and usefulness of imagined contact (Paolini, Hewstone, Cairns, & Voci, 2004).

Additionally, imagined contact can also be used as a “stepping stone” intervention to prepare an individual for forms of direct contact in the future. Crisp and Turner (2009) state that imagined contact should be used along with extended or direct contact interventions for maximum effectiveness. They go on to state that imagined contact can prepare individuals for more direct interactions with the out-group by decreasing the anxiety that they may experience from those real-life interactions. Various studies (e.g. Cameron & Rutland, 2006; Stathi, Cameron, Hartley, & Bradford, 2014; Vezzali, Capozza, Giovannini, & Stathi, 2011) have examined the effectiveness of this relatively new type of intervention among different minority groups, possible mediators, such as varied imagined scenarios (Husnu & Crisp, 2010), and characteristics of the in-group individual, such as one’s prior contact with the out-group (Hoffarth & Hodson, 2016). Overall, studies have shown that imagined contact leads to improved out-group attitudes, reduced stereotyping, decreased intergroup anxiety, and the attribution of more positive traits to out-group members (Crisp & Turner, 2009).

One example of an effective implementation of an imagined contact intervention is a study conducted by Husnu and Crisp (2010). This study consisted of three experiments examining the effectiveness of an imagined contact intervention under different conditions. In the first experiment, participants either received an imagined contact scenario with a British Muslim target or a benign control scenario. Following the imagined scenario, researchers measured participants’ willingness to engage in future contact with British Muslims. Results showed that participants who received the

imagined contact scenario reported significantly greater intentions to interact with the out-group in the future compared to participants who received the control scenario. The other two experiments in Husnu and Crisp's study included variations on the basic imagined contact intervention and additional dependent variables; we chose to replicate their first experiment for ease of administration and to focus on a singular measure of out-group attitudes.

The current study replicated the first experiment from Husnu and Crisp (2010), using American participants and an American Muslim target as opposed to British participants and a British Muslim target. The purpose of the current research is to determine if there are any significant differences in the effectiveness of this imagined contact intervention toward a Muslim out-group between British and American populations.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study was to examine how an imagined contact intervention affects Caucasians' levels of prejudice toward an American Muslim out-group. The research question was: Will the imagined contact intervention significantly reduce prejudice toward the American Muslim out-group when compared to a control condition? Following the past research of Husnu & Crisp (2010), it was hypothesized that the imagined contact intervention would significantly reduce prejudice toward the American Muslim out-group.

In order to test this hypothesis, participants received either a standard imagined contact intervention or a control scenario and responded to questions regarding their attitudes toward the American Muslim out-group.

Method

Research Design

This study utilized a between-subjects design wherein there were two conditions – an imagined contact condition and a control condition.

Participants

Participants were 196 college students from a Southeastern university (142 female, $M = 20.08$, $SD = 1.68$). Participants were majority Caucasian (84 percent). Participants were collected through convenience sampling via StudyBoard – an online system used for scheduling participation in psychological studies. They received class credit or extra credit for participating in the study. The researcher recruited the number of participants based on power analyses related to the primary statistical analysis. Participants completed a pre-screening through the StudyBoard system to ensure they were at least 18 years old. Participants also completed demographics questions regarding their race and the amount of previous contact they have had with American Muslims. Participants who had three or more encounters with American Muslims in the past year were removed from the data set ($n = 135$; 70 percent), as this research wanted to examine specifically individuals who have little to no contact with the out-group. Participants who did not answer every question or who did not complete the task following the intervention were removed from the study. After removal of participants who did not meet criteria for the study and participants who did not fully complete the study, data consisted of 83 participants (64 female, 73 percent). Mean age of the sample was 20.09 years old ($SD = 1.53$). Participants were majority Caucasian (84 percent). Chi square analyses showed no significant differences between participants in each condition on the

basis of gender ($p = .69$), age ($p = .64$), race ($p = .42$), or prior contact ($p = .37$). See Table 1 for complete demographics information.

Table 1

Sample Demographics

		Condition	
		Control	Imagined Contact
Demographics		<i>N</i> (%)	<i>N</i> (%)
Gender	<i>Male</i>	24 (23%)	25 (31%)
	<i>Female</i>	78 (75%)	54 (68%)
	<i>Non-binary</i>	2 (2%)	1 (1%)
Age	<i>18-19</i>	44 (44%)	18 (27%)
	<i>20-21</i>	41 (41%)	36 (54%)
	<i>22-30</i>	16 (16%)	13 (19%)
Race	<i>White</i>	85 (82%)	78 (87%)
	<i>Black</i>	10 (10%)	9 (10%)
	<i>Middle Eastern</i>	1 (1%)	1 (1%)
	<i>Asian</i>	2 (2%)	0 (0%)
	<i>Indian</i>	1 (1%)	0 (0%)
	<i>Other</i>	5 (5%)	2 (2%)
Prior Contact	<i>Never</i>	25 (24%)	24 (27%)
	<i>1-2 times</i>	33 (32%)	26 (29%)
	<i>3-4 times</i>	22 (21%)	19 (21%)
	<i>5-9 times</i>	8 (8%)	8 (9%)
	<i>10+ times</i>	16 (15%)	13 (14%)

Procedure

This study utilized the methodology of Husnu and Crisp (2010). Participants were informed that the study would be gauging their perceptions and attitudes of various social issues. Participants completed the study online using the Qualtrics system. After reading the implied consent form and giving implied consent by continuing with the study, participants were randomly assigned to complete one of two tasks – either the standard imagined contact condition or the control condition. In the imagined contact condition, participants were given instructions to imagine a scenario in which they meet a member of the out-group. This scenario was identical to the one given by Husnu and Crisp (2010) with the exception that “British” was changed to “American.” See Appendix A for the given scenarios.

The control condition also utilized the same scenario as Husnu and Crisp (2010) and provided the participant with a prompt to imagine that did not include interaction with the Muslim out-group. This task is based upon previous research from Stathi and Crisp (2008) and Turner, et al. (2007). In the control condition, participants received instructions to imagine a scenario in which they are simply outdoors, without interacting with the out-group.

Participants were instructed to take one minute to imagine the scenario they had been given. Participants were then asked to describe as many aspects of their scenario as possible in one minute. After describing their scenario, participants completed the dependent measures, including nine-point Likert scales measuring their out-group attitudes. Participants then completed demographics questions, including a screener question to determine the level of prior contact they have had with American Muslims

(see Appendix C). This screener question was placed at the end of the study so as not to influence participants' attitudes on the dependent measures. Finally, participants read a debriefing form and received credit for their participation.

Materials and Measures

Preliminary Analyses. A power analysis was conducted in G*Power to determine the number of participants required to complete a significant statistical analysis (Faul, Erdfelder, Lang, & Buchner, 2007). The power analysis used a Cohen's d effect size of $d = .82$, as found in Husnu and Crisp (2010). The power analysis indicated that at least 66 participants would need to be recruited (33 participants per condition).

The prior contact item on the demographics survey was used as a screener item. Any participant who has had three or more encounters with a Muslim American over the past year was removed from the data in order to focus on individuals who had very limited contact with the out-group. Participants' data was also removed if they did not complete all of the questions, including the manipulation check to ensure they were engaged in the imagery activity. After removal of these participants, there were 83 in the final data set.

The means and standard deviations for the dependent measure (out-group attitudes) were calculated for both the control and imagined contact groups. The out-group attitudes index value used in the primary analyses was calculated by averaging the Likert scale responses to each of the six scale items.

Primary Analyses. In all analyses, an alpha level of 0.05 was used. To test the hypothesis that the imagined contact intervention significantly reduced participants' prejudice, an independent samples t -test was used. This t -test used group means on the

out-group attitudes index to determine if there was any significant difference between the control group and imagined contact group. To measure the effect size, Cohen's d was used. Cohen's d levels of .20, .50, and .80 were considered small, medium, and large effect sizes, respectively (Cohen, 1992).

Dependent Measure. The dependent measure in this study was participants' attitudes of the out-group following the imagined contact intervention (or control scenario). This dependent measure was taken directly from Husnu and Crisp (2010), the only exception being slight changes of "British" to "American." Participants completed items to measure their attitudes toward the out-group. Participants were asked how they feel about American Muslims in general, based on the following indices: *cold-warm*; *positive-negative*; *friendly-hostile*; *suspicious-trusting*; *respectful-contempt*; *admiration-disgust* on bipolar Likert scales ranging from 1 to 9. See Appendix B for the format of the items. The mean of these indices was taken as a composite measure of out-group attitudes.

Results

In order to determine whether participants who had the imagined contact intervention expressed less prejudiced out-group attitudes compared to those in a control group, we computed a one-tailed between-subjects t -test. Participants in the imagined contact condition ($M = 6.50$, $SD = 2.15$) did not express significantly less prejudiced attitudes than those in the control group ($M = 6.03$, $SD = 1.83$), $t(82) = -1.061$, $p = .292$, $d = .23$. See Table 2 for group means. These findings were inconsistent with our expectation that engaging in imagined contact would result in less prejudiced attitudes toward the American Muslim out-group.

Table 2

Average Mean Scores of Attitudes toward the Out-group

Condition	Out-group Attitudes Score	
	<i>M (SD)</i>	95% CI
Control	6.03 (1.83)	5.39, 6.67
Imagined Contact	6.50 (2.15)	5.73, 7.27

Discussion

Current research indicates that imagined contact interventions are an effective way to reduce out-group prejudice, especially when interventions such as direct contact are not available (Crisp & Turner, 2009). However, there is still much to be researched regarding how to maximize effectiveness of imagined contact interventions. In the current research, we examined if an existing imagined contact intervention could be replicated online using an American sample instead of a British sample. The current study found that the imagined contact intervention did not have a significant effect on out-group attitudes; however, this could be due to several experimental factors which will be discussed.

Limitations. First, this study differed from Husnu and Crisp (2010) in that participants completed the experiment online and were not in a laboratory setting. We hypothesized that this would make participants less likely to fall prey to the social desirability effect, providing more honest answers. However, since the experimental setting was less controlled, we have less information regarding participants' completion of the tasks. While there was a check to ensure participants imagined their given scenarios, it is

possible that the vividness of their scenarios may have been greater in a laboratory setting, which would likely have provided a more significant decrease in prejudiced attitudes, as evidenced by past studies examining how vividness of the imagined scenario can affect attitudes (Husnu & Crisp, 2010). Additionally, without being observed directly by a researcher, it is possible that participants could have put less effort into self-reflection in order to give accurate responses to the out-group attitude scales.

Second, the study focused on participants who had very little prior contact with the out-group (less than three conversations within the past six months). In contrast, Husnu and Crisp (2010) examined participants with all levels of prior contact. We were mainly interested in this group since imagined contact interventions are often helpful for environments in which participants have had very little contact with the out-group (e.g. schools in rural, homogeneous areas). Thus, it would be most beneficial for real world application to examine how these interventions affect individuals who need it the most. However, research suggests that individuals who have had at least some contact with the out-group benefit more from imagined contact interventions (due to the fact that they can more easily create a vivid scenario; Husnu & Crisp, 2010). Participants in the current study who reported no contact with the Muslim out-group may have had more difficulty forming a vivid scenario during the task; therefore, their attitudes were not significantly affected by the intervention. Additionally, the current study used composite data in its analysis – from individuals who had never had an interaction with a Muslim in the past six months and from individuals who had one or two interactions. Even a small number of interactions can increase vividness of an individual’s imagined scenario since they are able to use information from their lived experiences. It is possible that participants in the

one or two interactions group differed from participants who had not had any interaction with the out-group.

Additionally, it is possible that an American sample is qualitatively different from a British sample like that of Husnu and Crisp (2010). On the surface, the current sample and the sample used by Husnu and Crisp do not appear to differ substantially – their sample was made of college undergraduates (like the current sample), majority female (73 percent; versus 75 percent in the current study) and age ranged between 18 and 24 ($M = 20.5$). Participants in the current study ranged in age from 18 to 30 ($M = 20.09$). However, Husnu and Crisp did not provide other demographic information, such as race, religious affiliation, or quantity of prior contact, that could have been significantly different from that of the current sample. As previously mentioned, the non-Muslim American population has a unique relationship with its Muslim population following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001. While Britain has experienced terrorist attacks as well, none of them have been on a scale as large as those that occurred in the U.S. on 9/11. Additionally, this study was conducted in a Southern area of the U.S. – an area commonly known as the Bible Belt, where the population is largely of Christian faith. It is possible that this difference in religious ideals also influenced participants' attitudes toward the out-group. While there is research showing the effectiveness of imagined contact interventions with various out-groups and in-groups, it is possible that historical effects act as a greater mediator to the intervention in the American population.

Research also shows that factors such as an individual's prior contact with the out-group or their motivation to engage in the intervention task can affect the overall effectiveness of the intervention (Husnu & Crisp, 2010). As previously stated, an

individual's number of previous interactions with the out-group can influence vividness, and therefore effectiveness of, the imagined contact scenario. While we measured participants' frequency of prior contact, we did not gather data regarding the quality of prior interactions. To that effect, an individual's prior contact with the out-group could be fleeting or extended, positive or negative, anxiety-inducing or not. These characteristics could all have an effect on an individual's existing attitudes toward the out-group, and could affect the scenario in which they imagine. For example, an individual who has only had negative interactions with the out-group may find it more difficult to imagine a positive interaction; therefore, the intervention may have less of an effect. Further research in this area would be beneficial to understand how prior contact can influence the effectiveness of imagined contact interventions.

Finally, there were no measures to assess participants' attitudes toward Muslims prior to the intervention. While this was assessed in one of the experiments in Husnu and Crisp's 2010 study, it was not a focus in this particular experiment. It is possible that existing attitudes could influence the effectiveness of the intervention. The aforementioned experiment in Husnu and Crisp (2010) found that participants who had higher levels of existing prejudice showed a larger decrease in prejudice following the intervention than participants who had lower levels of existing prejudice. If participants in the current study already had more unbiased attitudes, the results of Husnu and Crisp (2010) would suggest that they would not be as affected by the intervention, explaining the insignificance of the results.

Implications. This study adds to the growing research base surrounding imagined contact interventions and anti-prejudice interventions in general. While the results are not what

was hypothesized, they provide some important findings for imagined contact interventions. Past research, including Husnu and Crisp (2010) has relied on using a laboratory environment or other face-to-face setting (e.g. a school classroom such as in Stathi, Cameron, Hartley, & Bradford, 2014) in which to conduct the intervention. This study attempted to implement the intervention through an online survey, which participants completed outside the laboratory. While the results from this study show there was not a significant result when using the online survey as opposed to face-to-face intervention, it is an important area worth studying that has not yet been addressed by imagined contact research. If online interventions were found to be effective in reducing prejudice, it would make imagined contact interventions that much easier and inexpensive to distribute.

Conclusion

Recent research shows that imagined contact interventions can be an effective means of reducing prejudiced attitudes. This study replicated a previous study examining the use of an imagined contact intervention with a Muslim out-group. While the imagined contact intervention in this study did not result in a significant decrease in prejudice, it does pose some questions about why the intervention may have failed. Future research should focus on the use of imagined contact interventions when the researcher is not present and the use of the intervention with a variety of in-groups.

References

- Allport, G., Clark, K., & Pettigrew, T. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Bandura, A. (1978). Social learning theory of aggression. *Journal of Communication, 28*(3), 12-29.
- California State University, San Bernadino (2018). Report to the nation: Hate crimes rise in U.S. cities and counties in times of division and foreign interference. https://csbs.csusb.edu/sites/csusb_csbs/files/2018%20Hate%20Final%20Report%205-14.pdf
- Cameron, L., & Rutland, A. (2006). Extended contact through story reading in school: Reducing children's prejudice toward the disabled. *Journal of Societal Issues, 62*(3), 469-488.
- Cohen, J. (1992). Statistical Power Analysis. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 1*(3), 98-101.
- Crisp, R., & Turner, R. (2009). Can imagined interactions produce positive perceptions? Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. *American Psychologist, 64*(4), 231-240.
- Faul, F., Erdfelder, E., Lang, A., & Buchner, A. (2007). G*Power 3: A flexible statistical power analysis program for the social, behavioral, and biomedical sciences. *Behavior Research Methods, 39*, 175-191.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation (2016). Incidents, offenses, and known offenders by bias motivation. Retrieved from <https://ucr.fbi.gov/hate-crime/2016/tables/table-1>

- Hoffarth, M., & Hodson, G. (2016). Who needs imagined contact? Replication attempts examining previous contact as a potential moderator. *Social Psychology, 47*(2), 118-124.
- Husnu, S., & Crisp, R. (2010). Elaboration enhances the imagined contact effect. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 46*, 943-950.
- Lemmer, G., & Wagner, U. (2015). Can we really reduce ethnic prejudice outside the lab? A meta-analysis of direct and indirect contact interventions. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 45*(2), 152-168.
- Marks, D. (1999). Consciousness, mental imagery and action. *British Journal of Psychology, 90*(4), 567-585.
- Monteiro, M. B., de França, D. X., & Rodrigues, R. (2009). The development of intergroup bias in childhood: How social norms can shape children's racial behaviours. *International Journal of Psychology, 44*(1), 29-39.
- Nadal, K., Griffin, K., Hamit, S., Leon, J., Tobio, M., & Rivera, D. (2012). Subtle and overt forms of Islamophobia: Microaggressions toward Muslim Americans. *CUNY Academic Works*.
- Nesdale, D. (1999). Developmental changes in children's ethnic preferences and social cognitions. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 20*(4), 501-519.
- Paolini, S., Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., & Voci, A. (2004). Effects of direct and indirect cross-group friendships on judgments of Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland: The mediating role of an anxiety-reduction mechanism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(6), 770-786.

- Pettigrew, T., & Tropp, L. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 751-783.
- Pettigrew, T., Wagner, U., Christ, O., & Stellmacher, J. (2007) Direct and indirect intergroup contact effects on prejudice: A normative interpretation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 31*(4), 411-425.
- Pham, L., & Taylor, S. (1999). From thought to action: Effects of process-versus outcome-based mental simulations on performance. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25*(2), 250-260.
- Stathi, S., Cameron, L., Hartley, B., Bradford, S., (2014). Imagined contact as a prejudice-reduction intervention in schools: The underlying role of similarity and attitudes. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 44*, 536-546.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The Social Psychology of Intergroup Relations, 33-47*.
- Vezzali, L., Capozza, D., Giovannini, D., & Stathi, S. (2011). Improving implicit and explicit intergroup attitudes using imagined contact: An experimental intervention with elementary school children. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 15*(2), 203-212.
- Wright, S., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social psychology, 73*(1), 73.

APPENDIX A

Scenarios

Imagined Contact. “I would like you to take a minute to imagine yourself meeting an American Muslim stranger for the first time. During the conversation, imagine you find out some interesting and unexpected things about the stranger.”

Control. “I would like you to take a minute to imagine you are walking in the outdoors. Try to imagine aspects of the scene about you (e.g., is it a beach, a forest, are there trees, hills, what's on the horizon).”

APPENDIX B

Dependent Measure – Out-group Attitudes

On the following items, rate your attitudes toward Muslim Americans on each attribute by circling one of the numbers 1 to 9.

Cold

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Warm

Negative

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Positive

Hostile

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Friendly

Suspicious

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Trusting

Contempt

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Respectful

Disgust

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Admiration

Note: Measure adopted from Husnu and Crisp (2010).

APPENDIX C

Demographics Questionnaire

DIRECTIONS: For the following items, please check boxes related to the best fitting answer and/or write in a short response where asked. Please complete every applicable item to your best knowledge.

(1) Please, indicate how you identify your gender. Check the box next to the most applicable response:

1. Female 2. Male 3. Other, please specify:

(2) With what race/ethnicity do you most closely identify? Check the box next to *only one*.

1. American Indian or Alaskan Native
 2. Asian or Pacific Islander
 3. Black and/or African American
 4. Middle Eastern and/or North African
 5. Native Hawaiian and/or Other Pacific Islander
 6. White and/or Caucasian
 7. Other, please specify: _____

(3) Please write your age in years. _____ years

(4) In the last 6 months, how often have you had a conversation with a Muslim American?

1. Never
 2. 1-2 times
 3. 3-4 times
 4. 5+ times