

PREDICTORS OF PREJUDICE AGAINST DIFFERENT
TYPES OF HEAD-COVERING PRACTICES

GÜLİN SEVER

BOĞAZIÇI UNIVERSITY

2014

PREDICTORS OF PREJUDICE AGAINST DIFFERENT TYPES OF HEAD-COVERING
PRACTICES

Thesis submitted to the
Institute for Graduate Studies in the Social Sciences
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts
in
Psychology
by
Glin Sever

Boğaziçi University
2014

Thesis Abstract

Gülin Sever, “Predictors of Prejudice Against Different Types of Head-Covering Practices”

The present study explored female Turkish university students’ perceptions and attitudes towards groups with different types of head-covers. A total of 174 students without headcover were presented with 6 groups of photos based on interviews prior to data collection. The groups consisted of veiled women in black garments, women wearing various types of headcovers described as contemporary, urban fashioned, conservative, and traditional style as well as women without headcovers. For each group, participants completed measures assessing variables of the Integrated Threat Theory (Stephan & Stephan, 1999). It was shown that perceived realistic threat, perceived symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, negative stereotyping, and prejudice differed significantly across groups. In particular, perceived symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, negative stereotyping, and prejudice were the highest towards veiled women in black garments followed by women wearing contemporary, urban fashioned and conservative, and traditional headcovers, and the lowest towards women without headcovers. Behavioral tendencies also showed differences across groups. Aggressive and avoidant behavioral tendencies were the highest and approach behavioral tendencies were the lowest towards veiled women in black garments. There was a negative relationship between intergroup contact, both direct and extended, and prejudice in cases of groups with contemporary, urban-fashioned and conservative styles.

Tez Özeti

Gülin Sever, “Farklı Baş Örtme Tarzlarına Yönelik Önyargı ve Belirleyicileri”

Bu çalışma, üniversite öğrencilerinin baş örtüsünün farklı kullanımları konusundaki algı ve tutumlarını incelemeyi amaçlamaktadır. 174 başı açık kız öğrenciye, ön çalışma ile belirlenmiş 6 farklı grubun fotoğrafları gösterilmiştir. Bu gruplar siyah çarşafli kadınlar, modern, moda ve muhafazakar türbanlılar, eşarplılar ve başı açık kadınlar şeklinde oluşturulmuştur. Katılımcılar, her bir grup için, Entegre Edilmiş Tehdit Teorisi (Stephan & Stephan, 1999) değişkenlerini değerlendirmeyi amaçlayan ölçekleri tamamlamıştır. Bu bağlamda, gerçekçi tehdit, sembolik tehdit, gruplar arası endişe, olumsuz kalıp yargı dizini ve önyargı değişkenleri gruplar arası anlamlı farklılıklar göstermiştir. Özellikle sembolik tehdit, gruplar arası endişe, olumsuz kalıp yargı dizini ve önyargının en çok siyah çarşafli kadın grubuna karşı olduğu gözlemlenmektedir. Bunu sırasıyla, modern, moda, muhafazakar türbanlı, eşarpli ve en az olarak da başı açık kadın grupları takip etmektedir. Davranışsal eğilimlerde de gruplar arası anlamlı farklılıklar ortaya çıkmıştır. En çok olumsuz ve en az olumlu davranışsal eğilimler siyah çarşafli kadın grubuna karşı gösterilmektedir. Gruplar arası hem doğrudan hem de dolaylı temas ile önyargı arasında negatif korelasyon olduğu, modern, moda ve muhafazakar türban grupları için tespit edilmiştir.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I would like to express my heartfelt gratitude to Professor Bilge Ataca for her continuous support, help, and valuable guidance. I am especially grateful for her kind patience and constant encouragement to do this work. Without her illuminating instruction and constructive criticism, this thesis would not have reached its present form.

My sincere thanks must also go to the members of my thesis advisory committee: Professor Hale Bolak Boratav and Associate Professor Adil Sarıbay. They generously gave their time to offer me valuable comments toward improving my work.

I would like to thank Professor Çiğdem Kağıtçıbaşı and Professor Muzaffer Bodur for their encouragement and support which made my dream of being a student at Boğaziçi University a reality.

Finally, I would like thank my parents and my brother for their unfailing emotional support and especially my mother Dr. Leyla Sever for her inspiring energy.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION.....	1
Issue of Headcover	1
Integrated Threat Theory.....	2
Prejudice and Behavioral Tendencies.....	5
Intergroup Contact Hypothesis.....	6
Present Study.....	9
CHAPTER II: METHOD.....	11
Participants.....	11
Procedure.....	11
Instrument.....	12
CHAPTER III: RESULTS.....	16
Descriptive Characteristics.....	16
Interrelationships among Variables.....	18
Results Concerning Hypotheses.....	25
Prejudice.....	26
Behavioral Tendencies.....	27
Intergroup Contact.....	28
Effects of Predictor Variables on Prejudice.....	29
CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION.....	31
Findings Concerning Hypotheses.....	32
Findings on Group Differentiation.....	34
Limitations and Future Directions.....	37
Conclusion.....	38
APPENDICES.....	39
A. Photos used to represent each group.....	40
B. Questionnaires (English).....	41
C. Questionnaires (Turkish).....	52
REFERENCES.....	63

TABLES

1. Descriptive Statistics for all Variables	16
2. Descriptive Statistics for all Variables for each group.....	17
3. Intercorrelations among Variables.....	19
4. Correlations among Variables (Black Veiled).....	20
5. Correlations among Variables (Contemporary).....	21
6. Correlations among Variables (Urban Fashioned).....	22
7. Correlations among Variables (Conservative).....	23
8. Correlations among Variables (Traditional).....	24
9. Summary of Hierarchical Multiple Regression Analysis for Prejudice.....	30

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The present study aims to explore the realistic and symbolic threat perceptions, intergroup anxiety, outgroup attitudes (negative prejudice), and positive and negative behavioral tendencies of female university students without headcovers towards women with headcovers. In particular, it aims to examine the possible predictors of prejudice related to different types of head-covering practices currently prevalent among Turkish women.

The Issue of Headcover

In recent years, headcovering has become a disputed political symbol beyond a simple religious practice in Turkey (Saktanber & Çorbacıoğlu, 2008). Given that Turkey is a secular democracy with an approximately ninety-nine percent Muslim population, the contested politics of headcovering poses a significant problem polarizing the society both emotionally and ideologically (Hortaçsu, 2000). In the past decade, the increasing number of women wearing headcovers has heightened the skepticism and anxiety regarding the Islamization of society, especially among secular unveiled groups (Hortaçsu 2000, Saktanber & Çorbacıoğlu, 2008).

Today, nearly seventy percent of Turkish women cover their heads with the distribution depending much on region and socio-economic status (Vojdik, 2010). The covering practices differ in form, which convey different meanings about the person's religious and political standpoints (Vojdik, 2010). Less than three percent wears a black colored garment called the 'çarşaf' which covers the whole body excluding the hands and the eyes. Rural and/or elderly women loosely cover the hair with a scarf ('başörtüsü') tied under the chin. Since the 1980's a

different style of covering called ‘türban’ (also called ‘tesettür’) has emerged, which requires the covering of not only the head but also the neck and the shoulders. This covering is complemented by wearing a shapeless overcoat concealing the feminine figure. This style has evolved into more urban forms over time. For example, urban women tend to replace the overcoat by narrower formats or tunics over pants. Through such fashionable interpretations of headcover, these women differentiate themselves from more traditional and rural adaptations (Vojdik, 2010). Such visual cues serve to create stereotypic images of a group (Brader, Valentino, & Suhay, 2008). The symbolic nature of group cues has the potential to trigger emotional reactions. Specifically, ‘stigmatized’ outgroup cues can lead to anxiety (Sears, 2001).

The prejudice literature so far relies on a more general distinction of covered versus uncovered groups. There is a need to go beyond the simple and general categorization of ‘women with and without headcovers’ and to understand the differences in intergroup perceptions due to different types of head covering. In line with this aim, the study tries to explore how the cues related to different head covering practices as stereotypic images lead to different levels of perceived threat and intergroup anxiety.

Integrated Threat Theory

In the present study, intergroup perceptions are explored with the use of the Integrated Threat Theory (ITT; Stephan & Stephan, 1999). ITT utilizes and builds upon research focusing on the major role of anxiety as an agent of negative intergroup relations (Stephan & Stephan, 1999). ITT postulates that out-group prejudice is driven by a combination of several conceptions of threat. Specifically, the impact on perceptions of threat is examined with reference to four types

of threat, namely, realistic threat, symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes that lead to prejudice and contribute to negative out-group attitudes and behavior (Stephan & Stephan, 1999). A recent meta-analysis demonstrated that each type of threat contributed uniquely to negative outgroup attitudes (Riek, Mania, & Gaertner, 2006). The analysis also revealed that the four types of threats are either moderately or strongly correlated with each other (Riek et al., 2006).

Realistic threats involve any conflicting goals which may be threatening the economic and the political power of the in-group (Stephan & Stephan, 1999). In particular, these threats target the existence of the in-group including its members' physical and material welfare. The ITT highlights that the mere perception of threat regardless of its actuality is sufficient in leading to prejudice towards the out-group. Symbolic threats are with regards to differences in viewpoints of the two groups including their values, beliefs, and attitudes. They target the in-group's world view given that the in-group members rely on their own moral rightness and set of values as point of reference. A study revealed that Whites in the U.S. who perceived Blacks as not supportive of their values described Blacks more negatively than Whites who did not have such perceptions (Biernat, Vescio, & Theno, 1996).

According to Riek et al. (2006), although realistic and symbolic threats function at the same level, it is also possible that in some cases one type of threat can operate as a precursor of the other. Especially in religious contexts, symbolic threats may be experienced prior to conflict, thus acting as an antecedent of realistic threat. However, specific characteristics of the context seem to be influential in determining this relationship. Research by Tausch, Hewstone, and Roy (2009) regarding Hindu-Muslim relations in India also revealed that different threats can be at work in a given intergroup context. They found that symbolic threat served as a predictor of prejudice against Hindus; whereas, realistic threat was a more significant predictor in case of Muslims (Tausch et al., 2009).

ITT also underlines that such perceived threats related to intergroup interactions lead to anxiety, which, in turn, might result in prejudice (Riek et al., 2006). Intergroup anxiety is associated with feelings of apprehension and disquietude in the presence of out-group members due to lack of certainty about how to interact with them. Consequently, intergroup anxiety negatively influences intergroup relations with increased negativity towards the out-group that typically results in avoidance of the out-group (Riek et al., 2006). Plant and Devine (2003) explored both precursors and results of intergroup anxiety in case of White and Black people in the U.S. and reported that people who have negative expectations about a possible intergroup interaction have more intergroup anxiety. Stephan and Stephan (1993) argued that people's fear of negative consequences also involves being negatively evaluated by members of in-groups, and negative consequences for one's self-concept. A study on Dutch students' attitudes towards the homeless revealed that intergroup anxiety led to avoidant and offensive action tendencies towards the out-group (Zomerren, Fisher, & Spears, 2007).

In the context of ITT, negative stereotypes can also be considered as threat since they lead to anticipation of negative events as a consequence of the out-group members' behavior (Stephan & Stephan, 1999). Stephan and Stephan (1999) point out that the more negative the stereotypes, the more likely it is to expect more antagonistic and disconcerting interactions. Studies in this area revealed that negative stereotypes consistently predicted prejudice (Esses, Haddock, & Zanna, 1993; Stephan & Stephan, 1993). Negative stereotypes are intertwined with emotions such as fear and anger, which inherently heighten negative out-group attitudes (Riek, Mania, Gaertner, McDonald, & Lamoreaux, 2010).

Robust support for the ITT is available across a range of intergroup contexts such as gender attitudes, and attitudes towards immigrant, ethnic, and racial groups (Riek et al., 2010). Stephan, Ybarra, Martinez, Schwarzwald, and Tur-Kaspa (1998) used the four variables of ITT to predict attitudes towards immigrants in Spain and Israel. Their study revealed that all four

threats functioned as predictors of attitudes towards either one or both groups; Moroccan immigrants to Spain, and Russian and Ethiopian immigrants to Israel. Gonza'lez, Verkuyten, Weesie, and Poppe (2008) also used ITT to examine Dutch teenagers' prejudice against Muslim minorities. In this research, especially symbolic threat and negative stereotyping predicted prejudice against Muslims.

Prejudice and Behavioral Tendencies

It is important to examine prejudice not just as a general attitude, but also with regards to the distinct emotions and threat reactions it evokes (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005). Cottrell and Neuberg (2005) suggest that although ITT clearly defines concrete types of threat, it does not elaborate how different types of threat may lead to specific emotions. Cottrell and Neuberg's (2005) model highlights different emotions that give way to different behavioral reactions, which are crucial in understanding intergroup relations. Their research on European American participants' reactions to a range of frequently encountered ethnic and religious groups within the United States revealed that different groups can elicit different types of emotional reactions. In their study, although the respondents expressed negative prejudice to all of the subsets including African Americans, Asian Americans, and Native Americans, their affective reactions to each subset differed significantly. The measures of general threat and prejudice without exploring the rich texture of these distinct and functionally relevant reactions will lead to an inadequate portrayal of these phenomena (Neuberg & Cottrell, 2005). Their model focuses behavioral outcomes depending on the type of threat. For instance, threats to the in-group's economic security may evoke fear and anger that consequently lead to aggressive

behavior to ensure security (Neuberg & Cottrell 2002; as cited in Riek, Mania & Gaertner, 2006).

Subsequent research by Zomeran, Fischer, and Spears (2007) points out that anger consistently predicted aggressive behavioral tendencies. Mackie, Devos, and Smith (2000) also suggest that anger and fear can lead to aggressive action and avoidant behavioral tendencies, respectively, which are both negative in nature. In cases of intergroup anxiety, another typical response may be the avoidance of the out-group as it tends to reduce anxiety (Zomeran et al., 2007).

Pettigrew (1998) emphasized the contribution of positive intergroup affect by way of cross-group friendships, which enable empathy and decrease negative action tendencies over time. Similarly, Tam, Hewstone, Kenworthy, and Cairns (2009) added that positive inter-group emotions can also influence action tendencies. Their study that investigated the relationship between trust and intergroup behavioral tendencies in Northern Ireland demonstrated that out-group trust mediated the effect of contact on behavioral tendencies. The present study aims to explore the nature of behavioral tendencies towards groups with different head covering styles.

Intergroup Contact Hypothesis

In the context of anxiety towards out-groups, intergroup contact has long been emphasized as a highly effective strategy to ameliorate intergroup relations and reduce prejudice (Dovidio, Eller, & Hewstone, 2011). Allport (1954) has introduced the term ‘contact hypothesis’ which underline that contact can be effective in decreasing hostility and prejudice and improving intergroup relations, especially if certain conditions are achieved. In Allport’s version, optimal

contact situation requires equal status among the groups, cooperation between groups for a common goal, and support of institutional legitimacy (Allport, 1954; as cited in Hewstone, 2009).

Pettigrew (1998) has further emphasized that positive interactions in the form of intergroup friendships and self-disclosure can effectively reduce prejudice. Thus, key principles of contact have been shaped into intergroup contact theory which explore how, when, and why contact is linked with reduced prejudice (Crisp & Turner, 2009; Pettigrew, 1998). In their meta-analysis of intergroup contact theory which included 515 studies with 713 independent samples, Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) reported that there was a significant inverse relationship between contact and prejudice. In particular, cross-group friendships were significantly more predictive of reduced bias (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). In the Turkish context, a study that examined the predictors of prejudice between students with and without headcover revealed that the higher the intergroup contact, the lower was the prejudice towards out-group members (Kunduz, 2009).

Contact can decrease prejudice only when there is opportunity for positive interaction with one another (Turner, Hewstone, & Voci, 2007; as cited in Crisp & Turner, 2009). Extended intergroup contact hypothesis is developed with the motivation to create the positive impact of contact without the presence of actual contact (Wright, Ropp, Aron, & Mclaughlin-Volpe, 1997). Specifically, the extended intergroup contact hypothesis emphasizes the positive impact of the knowledge of an in-group member's contact with an out-group member on the overall intergroup attitudes (Wright et al., 1997). There is growing evidence which shows that out-group prejudice can be reduced by encouraging not only direct friendship but also indirect friendship (Paolini, Hewstone, Cairns, & Voci, 2004). In their study, Wright et al. (1997) provided correlational proof that knowledge of a cross-group friendship, the number of such friendships known, and the perceived intimacy between friends were linked with less negative

attitudes towards out-group members. They have also shown experimentally that forming cross-group friendships helped decrease negative intergroup attitudes of in-group members who do not have any contact with out-group members (Wright et al., 1997).

Turner, Hewstone, Voci, and Vonofakou (2008) have further explored the mechanisms which result in reduction of prejudice through extended contact. Learning about a positive intergroup interaction from a distance decreases anxiety and negative expectations about encountering out-group members which otherwise lead to avoidance of out-group members and dependence on stereotypes. Secondly, information coming from an in-group member can be influential and serve as a norm regarding behavior and attitudes towards out-groups. Additionally, the knowledge of the positive behavior of an out-group member towards an in-group member can provide information regarding out-group norms and alleviate negative stereotypes (Turner et al., 2008).

Extended intergroup contact hypothesis is especially important in cases where there is less opportunity for direct cross-group friendships (Christ et al., 2010). Research in this area revealed that without social integration policies, different groups have a tendency to retreat into their own communities in separate zones, further decreasing the chance of interaction with outgroup members (Hewstone, 2003). In fact, even in multicultural communities where many different groups live in the same area with one another, there can be limited occasion for meaningful communication because people are likely to communicate with those similar to themselves in terms of race, gender, and age (Graham & Cohen, 1997; as cited in Crisp & Turner, 2009). For example, in the multiracial city of Bradford, United Kingdom, South Asian and White communities are reported to live 'parallel lives' which is thought to play a role in Britain's race riots in July 2001 (Cantle, 2001; as cited in Crisp & Turner, 2009). In the Turkish context, this sort of 'parallel living' is relevant to some extent as different groups begin to communally differentiate themselves from each other by weeding out out-group members, as

increasingly covered in media (İki şehir iki dünya, 2010). The present study also aims to understand the extent of direct and extended contact of female university students without headcover with out-groups with different head-covering practices and its impact on perceived threat, anxiety, and consequently, on prejudice.

The Present Study

The present study mainly aims to examine the predictors of prejudice against different types of head covering practices. The following hypotheses tested within this context were drawn based on media coverage and public discourse regarding the issue of headcovering practices:

1. Perceived realistic threat, perceived symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotyping will differ across groups with different headcovering and clothing practices. In particular, perceived realistic threat, perceived symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotyping will be the highest towards women veiled in fully black garment, and the lowest towards women without headcover and women who wear traditional headcover, with women who wear headcover with contemporary interpretations and urban fashioned headcover in between.

2.a. The higher the perceived realistic and symbolic threats, and the higher the intergroup anxiety and negative stereotyping, the higher will be the prejudice towards each outgroup.

2.b. The highest prejudice will be against women fully veiled in black garment and the lowest will be against women without headcover and women who wear traditional headcover, with women who wear headcover with contemporary interpretations and urban fashioned headcover in between.

3. Behavioral tendencies will show differences across groups with different headcovering and clothing practices. Aggressive and avoidant behavioral tendencies will be higher towards women fully veiled in black garment. Approach behavioral tendencies will be higher towards women without headcover and women wearing traditional headcover.

4.a. The higher the intergroup contact, the lower will be the prejudice and negative behavioral tendencies towards the outgroup.

4.b. The higher the extended contact, the lower will be the prejudice and negative behavioral tendencies towards the outgroup.

CHAPTER II: METHOD

Participants

A total of 244 undergraduate female students with and without headcover, at Bogazici University, İstanbul, Turkey participated in the study. The data of 174 undergraduate female students without headcover (Mean age = 20.19, $SD = 1.49$) were selected for this research. All participants received an additional credit for an introductory psychology course.

Procedure

The study was presented to participants as an exploration of university students' perceptions and attitudes towards various groups with different types of clothing. A self-administered questionnaire was completed in approximately 1 hour. Prior to completion of the questionnaire, the participants were shown a card displaying six different groups of photos. For each group, 3 representative photos were selected based on the results of a qualitative pilot study (See Appendix A). The participants were then asked to spontaneously give a description for each group in an open response format. A questionnaire was then completed for each of the six groups. There were 6 sets of differing orders of photos prepared using Latin square design. The research design was approved by the Ethics Committee for Research with Human Subjects.

Pilot. For the selection of representative photos, a qualitative pilot study was carried out. Four friend pairs, who were all female university students without headcover, were interviewed for 2 hours. In each interview, the participants were given 165 pictures of women with different types of clothing that were obtained from various sites on the internet. They were asked to group the photos into as many meaningful categories as possible. The respondents were then asked to explain their reasoning behind such a grouping and elaborate on each group's

perceived defining and differentiating characteristics. For each formed category, the participants were then asked to select the most representative photos along with a defining group name. Additionally, the main questionnaire was given for each of the categories in order to assess any problems with regard to language, get feedback in order to eliminate the irrelevant items, and measure the amount of time needed for the completion of the questionnaire. The results of the pilot showed that the commonly emerging groups were women fully veiled in black garment, women wearing conservative headcover, women wearing headcover with contemporary interpretations, women wearing urban fashioned headcover, and women wearing traditional headcover. Women without headcovers were also included as a control group in the instrument.

Instrument

Realistic threat. A 4-item scale used by Stephan, Boniecki, Ybarra, Bettencourt, Ervin, Jackson, McNatt, and Renfro (2002) was employed to measure perceived realistic threat. The items referred to economic and political power, influence on society, and threat to society. The responses were indicated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 *strongly disagree* to 7 *strongly agree* with higher scores indicating greater realistic threat. The Cronbach's alpha ranged from .70 to .95 (Stephan et al., 2002; Zomeren et al., 2007). A Turkish study that employed a similar female university sample reported a Cronbach alpha of .93 (Kunduz, 2009).

Symbolic threat. A 7-item scale was adapted from Stephan et al. (2002) to measure perceived symbolic threat. The participants were asked to indicate the degree to which they felt threatened by the out-group with regards to their differences in terms of general values, mentality/ worldview, general ethics, norms, family, moral values, and general rights. The

responses were indicated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 *strongly disagree* to 7 *strongly agree* with higher scores indicating greater symbolic threat. In previous studies, the Cronbach's alphas ranged from .78 to .85 (Stephan et al., 2002; Zomeran et al., 2007). In Kunduz's study that used a similar female university sample, Cronbach's alpha was .86 (Kunduz, 2009).

Intergroup anxiety. An 8-item scale used by Stephan et al. (2002) was administered to measure the degree of intergroup anxiety. The participants were asked how they felt in their interaction with different out-groups. The items included were 'nervous, anxious, threatened, awkward'. The items 16, 17, 21, and 22 (friendly, comfortable, safe, and at ease) were reverse scored. The responses were indicated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 *not at all* to 7 *extremely* with higher scores indicating greater intergroup anxiety. In previous studies, the Cronbach's alphas were between .83 and .91 (Plant & Devine, 2003; Stephan et al., 2002; Zomeran et al., 2007). In Kunduz's study that used a similar female university sample, Cronbach's alpha was .92 (Kunduz, 2009).

Negative stereotype index. A 14-item scale adapted from a study by Kunduz (2009) was administered to measure the extent of negative stereotyping of different out-groups. The original index consisted of 32 items aiming to identify the stereotypes about Jewish, Christian, Muslim, Sunnite, and Alewite groups in Turkey (Yapıcı, 2004; as cited in Kunduz, 2009). The participants were asked to indicate to what degree they would attribute each trait to different out-groups. The participants gave their responses on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 *not at all* to 7 *extremely* with higher scores indicating greater negative stereotyping for the following items; Insidious, prejudiced, religiously deviant, superstitious, rude, fraudulent, and aggressive. Items 24, 25, 27, 29, 31, 33, and 34 (hard-working, democratic, trustworthy, logical-rationalist, bold, tolerant, congenial) were reverse scored. The Cronbach's alpha obtained by Kunduz (2009) was .74.

Behavioral tendencies. Measures for out-group behavioral tendencies were adapted from Mackie, Devos, and Smith (2000) and Tam, Hewstone, Kenworthy, and Cairns (2009). The participants were asked to indicate the degree of their aggressive, avoidant, and approach tendencies toward each out-group. The responses were given on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 *not at all* to 7 *extremely* with higher scores indicating greater action tendencies. Three items for aggressive tendencies included “opposing”, “confronting”, and “arguing with outgroup members”. Cronbach’s alphas ranged from .79 to .81 (Mackie et al., 2000; Plant & Devine, 2003). Items for avoidant tendencies referred to “keeping them at a distance,” “having nothing to do with them,” and “avoiding them”. Cronbach’s alphas ranged from .86 to .91 (Mackie et al., 2000; Plant & Devine, 2003). Three items for approach behavioral tendencies included “finding out more about them,” “spending time with them,” and “talking to them”. Cronbach’s alpha was .79 in a study by Tam et al. (2009). The items that measured all three groups of behavioral tendencies were given in a random order to participants.

Intergroup contact. The direct and extended contacts were assessed by 3 questions as used by Christ et al. (2010). The direct contact was the average of the two questions: “How many of your relatives and family members belong to this group?” and “How many of your friends belong to this group?” The extended contact question was “How many of your friends have friends belonging to this group?” The participants gave their responses on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 *none*, 4 *half of them* to 7 *all* with higher scores indicating more members of each group.

Attitude toward the out-group (prejudice scale). Prejudice was measured by a 12-item scale used by Stephan et al. (1993). The participants were asked to indicate the extent each item reflected their attitude towards each out-group. The participants indicated their reactions on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 *not at all* to 7 *extremely* with higher scores signifying higher prejudice against each out-group. Items were ‘hostility, dislike, superiority, contempt, hatred,

rejection'. Items 38, 40, 42, 44, 46, 48 (admiration, acceptance, affection, approval, sympathy, and warmth) were reverse scored. The Cronbach's alphas were between .83 and .93 (Stephan & Stephan, 1993). The Cronbach's alpha obtained by Kunduz (2009) was .92.

Perceived similarity. The respondents were also asked a question on perceived similarity. They were shown the card displaying six different groups of photos and asked to rate how similar they found themselves to each group on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 *I am not similar at all* to 7 *I am very similar* with higher scores indicating greater similarity.

CHAPTER III: RESULTS

Descriptive Characteristics

The descriptive statistics of all variables for all groups combined and for each group separately are presented in Tables 1 and 2, respectively. Cronbach alphas as shown in Table 1 were high in general.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics for all Variables

	Total Sample Mean (SD)	Actual Range of Scores	Cronbach's Alphas
Realistic Threats	3.84 (0.80)	1.21-6.17	.87
Symbolic Threats	4.57 (0.75)	2.33-6.40	.91
Intergroup Anxiety	3.63 (0.81)	1.50-5.50	.94
Negative Stereotyping	3.86 (0.54)	2.49-5.35	.93
Approach Behavioral Tendencies	3.81 (0.84)	1.72-6.11	.84
Avoidant Behavioral Tendencies	3.11 (1.16)	1.00-6.00	.91
Aggressive Behavioral Tendencies	3.47 (1.13)	1.00-6.28	.89
Direct Contact	2.36 (0.37)	1.60-3.83	
Indirect Contact	2.73 (0.67)	1.20-5.17	
Prejudice	3.71 (0.83)	1.71-5.63	.96

Table 2:

Descriptive Statistics for all Variables for Each Group

	<u>Black-veiled</u>	<u>Contemporary</u>	<u>Urban-fashion</u>	<u>Conservative</u>	<u>Traditional</u>	<u>Uncovered</u>
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Realistic Threat	3.89 ^c (1.52)	5.87 ^a (1.12)	4.38 ^b (1.59)	3.06 ^c (1.45)	2.36 ^d (1.05)	3.46 ^c (0.96)
Symbolic Threat	6.23 ^a (0.92)	5.56 ^b (1.37)	5.29 ^c (1.27)	4.89 ^d (1.34)	3.45 ^e (1.37)	2.02 ^f (0.99)
Intergroup Anxiety	5.71 ^a (1.20)	4.36 ^b (1.52)	3.75 ^c (1.25)	3.73 ^c (1.26)	2.50 ^d (1.07)	1.75 ^e (0.70)
Negative Stereotyping	5.33 ^a (1.03)	4.33 ^b (1.23)	3.39 ^c (0.64)	4.25 ^b (0.98)	3.24 ^c (0.94)	2.62 ^d (0.78)
Perceived Similarity	1.16 ^c (1.06)	1.52 ^b (1.40)	1.35 ^b (1.18)	1.32 ^b (1.13)	1.81 ^b (1.47)	6.41 ^a (0.97)
Approach Behavioral Tendencies	2.49 ^d (1.29)	3.50 ^c (1.30)	3.48 ^c (1.22)	3.46 ^c (1.28)	4.11 ^b (1.28)	5.76 ^a (1.06)
Avoidant Behavioral Tendencies	4.90 ^a (1.84)	3.64 ^b (1.89)	3.49 ^b (1.71)	3.30 ^b (1.78)	2.09 ^c (1.36)	1.18 ^d (0.54)
Aggressive Behavioral Tendencies	4.38 ^a (1.77)	4.11 ^a (1.67)	3.75 ^b (1.60)	3.41 ^c (1.53)	2.65 ^d (1.39)	3.08 ^c (1.94)
Direct Contact	1.02 (0.11)	1.62 (0.06)	1.82 (0.85)	1.80 (0.85)	2.05 (0.85)	5.88 (0.07)
Extended Contact	1.24 (0.46)	2.22 (1.20)	2.54 (1.22)	2.14 (1.01)	2.14 (1.27)	6.14 (1.02)
Prejudice	5.20 ^a (1.32)	4.34 ^b (1.50)	4.07 ^c (1.26)	3.84 ^d (1.18)	2.84 ^e (0.99)	1.94 ^f (0.60)

*Different superscripts refer to different significance across groups / Significant differences across groups are shown by letter superscripts

Interrelationships among Variables

The intercorrelations among the variables are reported in Table 3. Symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, negative stereotyping, prejudice, avoidant, aggressive behavioral tendencies and direct contact measures were found to be significantly correlated with all of the measures. Realistic threat was found to be correlated negatively with direct contact and was not found to be correlated with approach behavioral tendencies and extended contact. Symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, negative stereotyping, and prejudice were positively correlated with all of the measures except approach behavioral tendencies, direct and extended contact with which they were negatively correlated.

Aggressive behavioral tendencies were significantly correlated with all of the measures except extended contact. Avoidant behavioral tendencies were positively correlated with all of the measures except direct and extended contact with which they were negatively correlated. In particular, approach behavioral tendencies were negatively correlated with all of the variables except aggressive behavioral tendencies, direct and extended contact. Additionally, direct and extended contact measures were negatively correlated with all of the measures except approach behavioral tendencies.

Table 3:

Intercorrelations among Variables

	Realistic Threats	Symbolic Threats	Intergroup Anxiety	Negative Stereotyping	Approach Behavioral Tendencies	Avoidant Behavioral Tendencies	Aggressive Behavioral Tendencies	Direct Contact	Extended Contact	Prejudice
Realistic Threats	-									
Symbolic Threats	.60**	-								
Intergroup Anxiety	.55**	.62**	-							
Negative Stereotyping	.51**	.72**	.70**	-						
Approach Behavioral Tendencies	-.11	-.29**	-.38**	-.33**	-					
Avoidant Behavioral Tendencies	.48**	.57**	.67**	.63**	-.51**	-				
Aggressive Behavioral Tendencies	.37**	.49**	.41**	.42**	.21**	.28**	-			
Direct Contact	-.20**	-.42**	-.28**	-.37**	.32**	-.37**	-.26**	-		
Extended Contact	-.01	-.24**	-.22**	-.19*	.24**	-.21**	-.10	.56**	-	
Prejudice	.58**	.69**	.78**	.80**	-.42**	.78**	.48**	-.41**	-.20**	-

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. $N = 174$ for all analyses.

Table 4:

Correlations among Variables (Black-veiled)

	Realistic Threats	Symbolic Threats	Intergroup Anxiety	Negative Stereotyping	Approach Behavioral Tendencies	Avoidant Behavioral Tendencies	Aggressive Behavioral Tendencies	Direct Contact	Extended Contact	Prejudice
Realistic Threats	-									
Symbolic Threats	.47**	-								
Intergroup Anxiety	.36**	.60**	-							
Negative Stereotyping	.48**	.63**	.68**	-						
Approach Behavioral Tendencies	-.08	-.29**	-.51**	-.44**	-					
Avoidant Behavioral Tendencies	.24**	.38**	.61**	.58**	-.58**	-				
Aggressive Behavioral Tendencies	.35**	.38**	.37**	.44**	-.01	.21**	-			
Direct Contact	.15	.10	-.00	.02	.10	-.05	.02	-		
Extended Contact	-.11	-.25**	-.30**	-.25**	.24**	-.26**	-.12	.15**	-	
Prejudice	.46**	.54**	.67**	.82**	-.50**	.66**	.53**	.00	-.26**	-

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. $N = 174$ for all analyses.

Table 5:

Correlations among Variables (Contemporary)

	Realistic Threats	Symbolic Threats	Intergroup Anxiety	Negative Stereotyping	Approach Behavioral Tendencies	Avoidant Behavioral Tendencies	Aggressive Behavioral Tendencies	Direct Contact	Extended Contact	Prejudice
Realistic Threats	-									
Symbolic Threats	.68**	-								
Intergroup Anxiety	.61**	.70**	-							
Negative Stereotyping	.59**	.79**	.75**	-						
Approach Behavioral Tendencies	-.29*	-.48**	-.46**	-.49**	-					
Avoidant Behavioral Tendencies	.50**	.62**	.66**	.65*	-.62**	-				
Aggressive Behavioral Tendencies	.53**	.60**	.55**	.57**	-.06	.42**	-			
Direct Contact	-.39**	-.61**	-.50**	-.50**	.45**	-.47**	-.37**	-		
Extended Contact	-.32**	-.49**	-.38**	-.41**	.36**	-.40**	-.27**	.66**	-	
Prejudice	.65**	.75**	.81**	.85**	-.54**	.76**	.60**	-.54**	-.44**	-

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. $N = 174$ for all analyses.

Table 6:

Correlations among Variables (Urban Fashioned)

	Realistic Threats	Symbolic Threats	Intergroup Anxiety	Negative Stereotyping	Approach Behavioral Tendencies	Avoidant Behavioral Tendencies	Aggressive Behavioral Tendencies	Direct Contact	Extended Contact	Prejudice
Realistic Threats	-									
Symbolic Threats	.55**	-								
Intergroup Anxiety	.42**	.58**	-							
Negative Stereotyping	.26**	.22**	.21**	-						
Approach Behavioral Tendencies	-.15*	-.38**	-.44**	.03	-					
Avoidant Behavioral Tendencies	.42**	.53**	.66**	.18*	-.56**	-				
Aggressive Behavioral Tendencies	.23**	.47**	.40**	.25**	.063	.25**	-			
Direct Contact	-.20**	-.51**	-.39**	-.04	.45**	-.41**	-.29**	-		
Extended Contact	-.06	-.32**	-.31**	.05	.41**	-.31**	-.20**	.69**	-	
Prejudice	.46**	.65**	.76**	.19**	-.56**	.75**	.48**	-.52**	-.37**	-

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. $N = 174$ for all analyses.

Table 7:

Correlations among Variables (Conservative)

	Realistic Threats	Symbolic Threats	Intergroup Anxiety	Negative Stereotyping	Approach Behavioral Tendencies	Avoidant Behavioral Tendencies	Aggressive Behavioral Tendencies	Direct Contact	Extended Contact	Prejudice
Realistic Threats	-									
Symbolic Threats	.53**	-								
Intergroup Anxiety	.46**	.63**	-							
Negative Stereotyping	.42**	.69**	.69**	-						
Approach Behavioral Tendencies	-.09	-.39**	-.38**	-.44**	-					
Avoidant Behavioral Tendencies	.37**	.57**	.57**	.67**	-.55**	-				
Aggressive Behavioral Tendencies	.37**	.46**	.40**	.43**	.15**	.32**	-			
Direct Contact	-.21**	-.51**	-.40	-.47**	.45**	-.48**	-.22**	-		
Extended Contact	.06	-.23**	-.23**	-.26**	.33**	-.31**	.01	.56**	-	
Prejudice	.43**	.64**	.67**	.76**	-.54**	.76**	.38**	-.50**	-.29**	-

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. $N = 174$ for all analyses.

Table 8:

Correlations among Variables (Traditional)

	Realistic Threats	Symbolic Threats	Intergroup Anxiety	Negative Stereotyping	Approach Behavioral Tendencies	Avoidant Behavioral Tendencies	Aggressive Behavioral Tendencies	Direct Contact	Extended Contact	Prejudice
Realistic Threats	-									
Symbolic Threats	.58**	-								
Intergroup Anxiety	.52**	.61**	-							
Negative Stereotyping	.50**	.76**	.73**	-						
Approach Behavioral Tendencies	-.11	-.33**	-.41**	-.45**	-					
Avoidant Behavioral Tendencies	.40**	.57**	.49**	.58**	-.46**	-				
Aggressive Behavioral Tendencies	.30**	.40**	.38**	.30**	.11	.30**	-			
Direct Contact	-.04	-.17*	-.15*	-.12	.20**	-.13	-.09	-		
Extended Contact	.16*	-.07	-.07	.01	.08	.02	-.04	.33**	-	
Prejudice	.41**	.63**	.76**	.72**	-.55**	.71**	.42**	-.19	.01	-

Note. * $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$. $N = 174$ for all analyses.

Results Concerning Hypotheses

In order to test the first hypothesis that perceived realistic threat, perceived symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotyping would significantly differ across the six groups, one-way repeated measures ANOVAs were performed for each of these variables. The main effect of headcovering practices on realistic threat was significant, $F(5, 855) = 47.32$ $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .22$. Post hoc analyses using the Bonferroni correction showed that the highest realistic threat was perceived from the contemporary style group ($M = 5.87$, $SD = 1.12$), followed by the urban-fashioned ($M = 4.38$, $SD = 1.59$), veiled in black garment ($M = 3.89$, $SD = 1.52$), uncovered ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 0.96$), conservative ($M = 3.06$, $SD = 1.45$), and traditional ($M = 2.36$, $SD = 1.05$). The hypothesis was not supported (See Table 2).

There was a significant main effect of head covering practices on perceived symbolic threat, $F(5, 855) = 81.07$ $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .32$. The highest symbolic threat was perceived from veiled women ($M = 6.23$, $SD = 0.92$), followed by contemporary ($M = 5.56$, $SD = 1.37$), urban-fashioned ($M = 5.29$, $SD = 1.26$), conservative ($M = 4.89$, $SD = 1.34$), and traditional ($M = 3.45$, $SD = 1.37$) group; the lowest symbolic threat was perceived from women without headcover ($M = 2.02$, $SD = 0.99$). Hence, the hypothesis was supported (See Table 2).

The effect of headcovering practices on intergroup anxiety was also significant, $F(5, 855) = 90.38$ $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .35$. Post hoc analyses using the Bonferroni correction showed that the highest intergroup anxiety was from veiled women ($M = 5.71$, $SD = 1.20$), followed by women with contemporary style headcover ($M = 4.36$, $SD = 1.52$), while the lowest was from women without any headcovers ($M = 1.75$, $SD = 0.70$). There was no significant difference between urban fashioned ($M = 3.75$, $SD = 1.25$) and conservative styles ($M = 3.73$, $SD = 1.26$). Hence, the hypothesis was supported (See Table 2).

There was also a main effect of headcovering practices on negative stereotyping, $F(5, 850) = 217.56$ $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .56$. Post hoc tests using the Bonferroni correction revealed that the highest negative stereotyping was of veiled women ($M = 5.33$, $SD = 1.03$) while the lowest was of women without headcover ($M = 2.62$, $SD = 0.78$). Veiled women were followed by contemporary ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 1.23$) and conservative styles ($M = 4.25$, $SD = 0.98$) which were equally subject to more negative stereotyping than urban-fashioned ($M = 3.39$, $SD = 0.64$) and traditional styles ($M = 3.24$, $SD = 0.94$). The hypothesis was supported (See Table 2).

The second hypothesis was that the higher the perceived realistic and symbolic threats, and the higher the intergroup anxiety and negative stereotyping, the higher the prejudice would be towards each outgroup. The positive intercorrelations between these variables and prejudice (See Tables 4-8) for each group revealed that this was the case for all groups; hence, this hypothesis was also supported.

Prejudice

The second hypothesis also stated that the highest prejudice would be against women fully veiled in black garments and the lowest against women without headcovers and women wearing traditional headcovers, with women wearing headcovers with contemporary interpretations, urban fashioned and conservative style headcovers in between. A one-way repeated measures ANOVA showed that prejudice varied according to the headcovering practices, $F(5, 855) = 66.12$ $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .30$. Post hoc tests using Bonferroni correction revealed that the differences between each group were statistically significant. The prejudice against women veiled in black garments ($M = 5.20$, $SD = 1.32$) was the highest followed by contemporary ($M = 4.34$, $SD = 1.50$), urban-fashioned ($M = 4.07$, $SD = 1.26$), conservative ($M = 3.84$, $SD = 1.18$), and traditional ($M = 2.84$, $SD = 0.99$) styles; the least prejudice was shown

against women without headcovers ($M = 1.94, SD = 0.60$). The hypothesis was thus supported (See Table 2).

Behavioral Tendencies

The third hypothesis was that behavioral tendencies would show differences across groups with different headcovering and clothing practices. In particular, approach behavioral tendencies would be higher towards women without headcovers and women wearing traditional headcovers. Conversely, aggressive and avoidant behavioral tendencies would be higher towards women fully veiled in black.

To test this hypothesis, a one-way repeated measures ANOVA was carried out with photo order as the covariate. The results revealed that there was a significant effect of headcovering practices on approach behavioral tendencies, $F(5, 855) = 50.67, p < .001, \eta^2 = .23$; approach behavioral tendencies showed differences across groups as predicted. There was no effect of rotation as the covariate, $F(5, 855) = 2.83, p = .016, \eta^2 = .02$. Post hoc tests using Bonferroni correction revealed that approach behavioral tendencies were the highest towards women without headcovers ($M = 5.76, SD = 1.06$), followed by women wearing traditional head covers ($M = 4.11, SD = 1.28$) which, in turn, was followed by contemporary ($M = 3.50, SD = 1.30$), urban-fashioned ($M = 3.48, SD = 1.22$) and, conservative ($M = 3.46, SD = 1.28$) groups which were not statistically different from each other. The lowest approach behavioral tendencies was towards veiled women in black garments ($M = 2.49, SD = 1.29$) (See Table 2).

A one-way repeated measures ANOVA showed that there was a significant main effect of headcovering practices on both avoidant behavioral tendencies, $F(5, 850) = 55.44, p < .001, \eta^2 = .25$, and aggressive behavioral tendencies, $F(5, 855) = 14.85, p < .001, \eta^2 = .08$. In both cases, there was no significant effect of photo order as the covariate $F(5, 850) = 2.63, p = .023, \eta^2 = .015$ and $F(5, 855) = 1.32, p = .255, \eta^2 = .008$. Post hoc tests using Bonferroni

correction revealed that avoidant behavioral tendencies ($M = 4.90$, $SD = 1.84$) were the highest towards veiled women, followed by contemporary, urban-fashioned, and conservative style groups, which were not different from each other. Avoidant behavioral tendencies were the lowest towards non-covered women ($M = 1.18$, $SD = 0.54$). Aggressive behavioral tendencies were the highest towards both veiled women ($M = 4.38$, $SD = 1.77$) and women wearing contemporary styles ($M = 4.11$, $SD = 1.67$) which were not significantly different from each other. The two groups were followed by urban-fashioned style ($M = 3.75$, $SD = 1.61$), conservative ($M = 3.41$, $SD = 1.53$) and uncovered ($M = 3.08$, $SD = 1.94$) styles which were not significantly different from each other. Aggressive behavioral tendencies were the lowest towards women wearing traditional headcovers ($M = 2.65$, $SD = 1.39$) (See Table 2). Hence, the third hypothesis received full support.

Intergroup Contact

The final hypothesis was that the more the direct and the extended intergroup contact, the less the prejudice and negative behavioral tendencies towards the outgroup. Intercorrelations among variables shown in Table 3 revealed that this hypothesis was supported for all of the relationships except a significant relationship between extended contact and aggressive behavioral tendencies. The intercorrelations among the variables (Tables 4-8) for each group showed that the hypothesis was fully supported for women with contemporary and urban-fashioned styles. In the case of women with conservative styles, there was no significant correlation between extended contact and aggressive behavioral tendencies. In the case of the veiled group, there was no significant correlation between direct contact and any of the variables. Extended contact was correlated negatively with prejudice and avoidant behavioral tendencies, yet it was not correlated with aggressive behavioral tendencies. Finally, for the traditional group, the hypothesis was not supported for any of the variables.

A one-way repeated measures ANOVA showed that there was a significant main effect of headcovering practices on perceived similarity, $F(5, 865) = 927.30$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .84$. Post hoc tests using Bonferroni correction revealed that perceived similarity was the highest to uncovered ($M = 6.41$, $SD = 0.97$), followed by traditional ($M = 1.81$, $SD = 1.47$), contemporary ($M = 1.52$, $SD = 1.40$), urban-fashioned ($M = 1.35$, $SD = 1.18$), and conservative ($M = 1.32$, $SD = 1.13$) styles, which were not significantly different from each other. The lowest perceived similarity was to black veiled group ($M = 1.16$, $SD = 1.06$) (See Table 2).

Effects of Predictor Variables on Prejudice

A three stage hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the effects of all of the predictor variables on prejudice across groups. As can be seen in Table 9, 83% of variance in prejudice was explained by the predictors. On the first step, ITT variables were entered into the model. The effect of ITT variables on prejudice revealed a significant relationship, $F(4, 169) = 126.52$, $p < .05$ and accounted for 75% of the variation in prejudice. Realistic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotyping made unique contributions to the prediction of prejudice. As each increased, prejudice increased as well. Symbolic threat did not have a significant partial effect in the full model. On the second step, behavioral tendencies were entered into the model resulting in a significant increase in variance, $F(7, 166) = 111.82$, $p < .05$. Behavioral tendencies explained an additional 8% of variance on top of ITT variables. Each contributed to the prediction of prejudice. As avoidant and aggressive behavioral tendencies increased, so did prejudice. However, as approach behavioral tendencies increased, prejudice decreased. On the third step, contact was entered into the model. The addition of contact to the regression model did not explain an additional variance.

Table 9:

Summary of hierarchical multiple regression analysis for prejudice (N = 174)

Variable	B	SE	Beta
Model 1			
Realistic Threat	.11	.05	.11*
Symbolic Threat	.10	.07	.09
Intergroup Anxiety	.37	.06	.37*
Negative Stereotyping	.64	.10	.42*
Model 2			
Realistic Threat	.10	.05	.09*
Symbolic Threat	-.01	.06	-.01
Intergroup Anxiety	.19	.05	.18*
Negative Stereotyping	.49	.08	.32*
Approach Behavioral Tendencies	-.12	.04	-.12*
Avoidant Behavioral Tendencies	.22	.04	.30*
Aggressive Behavioral Tendencies	.13	.03	.18*
Model 3			
Realistic Threat	.09	.05	.09*
Symbolic Threat	-.02	.06	-.02
Intergroup Anxiety	.20	.06	.20*
Negative Stereotyping	.48	.08	.32*
Approach Behavioral Tendencies	-.11	.05	-.11*
Avoidant Behavioral Tendencies	.21	.04	.30*
Aggressive Behavioral Tendencies	.13	.03	.17*
Direct Contact	-.11	.10	-.05
Extended Contact	.04	.05	.03

Note for Model 1 $R^2 = 0.75^*$, for Model 2 $\Delta R^2 = 0.08^*$, for Model 3 $\Delta R^2 = 0.001$ $p < .05$

CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

The present study aimed to explore the possible predictors of uncovered women's prejudice against groups with different types of head-covering practices based on the principles of Integrated Threat Theory, behavioral tendencies, and contact. The findings showed a significant difference on the level of prejudice against a range of groups with differing head-covering practices. As predicted, the highest prejudice was against women fully veiled in black garments, followed by women with contemporary, urban-fashioned, conservative head covering styles; the lowest prejudice was against women without headcover.

A detailed analysis of the principles of Integrated Threat Theory showed that perceived realistic threat, perceived symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotyping significantly differed across the six groups. The highest realistic threat was perceived from women with contemporary style headcover, followed by women with urban-fashioned style headcover, which in turn, was followed by women veiled in black garment, uncovered women and women with conservative headcover. The least realistic threat was perceived from women with traditional headcover. Symbolic threat was perceived the highest from veiled women, followed by women with contemporary, urban-fashioned, conservative, and traditional headcover styles; the least from women without headcover. Intergroup anxiety was the highest towards veiled women, followed by women with contemporary style headcover, which in turn, was followed by women with urban fashioned and conservative style headcover. The lowest was towards uncovered women. The highest negative stereotyping was of veiled women while the lowest was of women without headcover. Women with contemporary and conservative style headcovers had the second highest negative stereotyping followed by women with urban-fashioned and traditional style headcover.

Additionally, the higher the perceived realistic and symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotyping, the higher the prejudice was towards each outgroup. In terms of behavioral tendencies, the highest approach behavioral tendencies were towards women without headcovers followed by women wearing traditional head covers, which in turn, was followed by contemporary, urban-fashioned, and conservative group. Avoidant behavioral tendencies were the highest towards the veiled, followed by women with contemporary, urban-fashioned, and conservative style headcover. The lowest was towards uncovered women. Similarly, aggressive behavioral tendencies were the highest towards veiled women and women with contemporary styles followed by women with urban-fashioned styles. These were followed by women with conservative style and uncovered women. The lowest was towards women wearing traditional headcovers.

Finally, the more the direct and the extended intergroup contact, the less the prejudice and avoidant behavioral tendencies were towards outgroup. This was the case for groups with contemporary, urban-fashioned, and conservative styles.

Findings Concerning Hypotheses

As predicted by the first hypothesis, perceived realistic threat, perceived symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotyping differed significantly across various groups with different headcovering and clothing practices. In particular, perceived symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotyping were the highest for women veiled in fully black garments and the lowest for women wearing traditional headcover and uncovered women. Contrary to the hypothesis, the highest realistic threat was not perceived from women veiled in fully black garments, but from women with contemporary and urban fashioned headcovers. A

detailed analysis of the items of realistic threat showed that women with contemporary and urban fashioned headcovers were perceived to have more economic and political power than those women veiled in black, hence, the higher perception of realistic threat from these groups.

The second hypothesis that predicted higher prejudice against each outgroup with higher perceived realistic and symbolic threats, and higher intergroup anxiety and negative stereotyping was fully supported. Additionally, as predicted, the highest prejudice was against women fully veiled in black garments and the lowest was against women without headcover and women wearing traditional headcover, with women wearing headcovers with contemporary interpretations and urban fashioned headcovers in between. Stephan & Stephan (1993) suggested that the perception of four types of threat described in ITT can cause prejudice whether there is an actual threat or not. Furthermore, the role of different types of threat can vary depending on cultural context and the types of outgroup (Shimoni & Schwarzwald, 2003; as cited in Gonza'lez, Verkuyten, Weesie, & Poppe, 2008). According to Gonza'lez et al. (2008), in studies focusing on Muslim minorities in the European context, symbolic threat and negative stereotypes were more likely to predict prejudice than realistic threat. However, in Israel, realistic threat had stronger associations with Muslim prejudice than symbolic threat (Bizman & Yinon, 2001; as cited in Gonza'lez et al., 2008). The findings of the present study showed that realistic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotyping each predicted prejudice whereas symbolic threat did not. As each increased, prejudice increased as well.

As predicted by the third hypothesis, avoidant behavioral tendencies were the highest for the veiled; followed by women with contemporary, urban-fashioned, and conservative style headcovers. Avoidant behavioral tendencies were the lowest for uncovered women and women wearing traditional headcovers. This was an expected outcome given that threat perceptions and intergroup anxiety often lead to avoidance of intergroup contact (Zomeran, Fisher, & Spears, 2007).

As also predicted by the third hypothesis, aggressive behavioral tendencies were the highest for the veiled. However, women with contemporary style were also seen equally susceptible to negative reactions. These were followed by women with conservative headcover and uncovered women. The lowest was towards women wearing traditional headcovers. The approach behavioral tendencies were the highest for women without headcover followed by those with traditional headcover and the least for the veiled. Behavioral tendencies were important to include in this study as they clearly showed group members' inner desire to behave in a particular way toward the outgroup (Crisp et al., 2007).

The fourth hypothesis predicted that the more the intergroup direct and extended contact, the less the prejudice and negative behavioral tendencies towards the outgroup. This was the case for groups with contemporary, urban-fashioned, and conservative styles. This was in line with a previous meta analytic study based on 713 independent samples from 515 studies, which revealed that intergroup contact reduces prejudice toward the outgroup (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006).

Findings on Group Differentiation

One of the strengths of this study was that it reflected the currently observed groupings in the Turkish society as fully and realistically as possible. It also captured the nuances of perception and behavior towards these groups by going beyond the generic categorization as 'covered' versus 'uncovered' or 'religious' versus 'secular'.

A methodological strength of the study was the use of qualitative research techniques. Paired interviews prior to quantitative data collection allowed obtaining a socially reflective and differentiated set of groups for testing. The spontaneous responses collected from the

participants during testing also provided deeper insight when interpreting statistical data. Thus, the strength of this research lies in making use of both qualitative and quantitative methods which helped to statistically capture the reality of sharply divided groups in society.

An analysis of the principles of Integrated Threat Theory showed that perceived realistic threat, perceived symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotyping significantly differed across the six groups. One notable result was that the group with black veiled garments was clearly differentiated from all the other groups with headcovering practices -by getting the highest or the lowest scores- across all the variables except realistic threat. Only in the case of realistic threat, the results yielded a different order in which the groups with contemporary and urban-fashioned head covers created higher levels of threat perception than the black-veiled group. Realistic threat consisted of four items, namely, economic and political power, influence on society, and threat to society. When these items were analyzed separately, it was revealed that although the black veiled group was not perceived as having the most economic or political power and influence on society, it was rated the highest as a 'threat to society'.

Similarly, when the items within intergroup anxiety measure were further analyzed to gain more insight regarding the perception of the black veiled group, it was revealed that the respondents felt the least "safe" in case of interaction with this group. Given that stereotypes shape the expectations about out group members which often lead to prejudice, the selection of negative and threatening characteristics would be expected (González et al., 2008). In case of negative stereotyping, the group with black veiled garments was perceived as the most prejudiced, superstitious, and the least democratic, tolerant, logical, and rationalist compared to all groups. The perception of this group as insidious and fraudulent was also the highest and the same as the group with contemporary style. Finally, the respondents felt the most distant to the group wearing black veiled garments in terms of perceived similarity.

Another striking difference was the clear differentiation of the group with traditional head covering style from the other head covered groups and its similarity to the group without headcover across most of the variables. Although there was a significant difference between the groups without headcover and traditional in terms of prejudice, the traditional was perceived as the most similar group. This was also the case for approach and avoidant behavioral tendencies. The same pattern could be observed in case of symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotyping. Additionally, the traditional group was rated the lowest in terms of realistic threat and aggressive behavioral tendencies. More detailed analysis of the items of realistic threat revealed that this group was perceived to be less empowered compared to other groups, having the least economic power and influence on society.

Qualitatively, the spontaneous responses showed that the group with traditional head covering style was described mostly with familial terms such as ‘grandmother’, ‘aunt’ etc. The intergroup anxiety items showed that the respondents felt the safest with women wearing traditional style headcover following the uncovered. This is also in line with the findings in literature which argue that group images can lead to changes in attitude and behavior triggering emotional reaction (Brader, Valentino, & Suhay, 2008).

It is generally assumed that positive stereotypes are linked with lower levels of fear and anger (González et al., 2008). Similarly, the traditional group was also described as the most congenial and warm, and the least insidious and fraudulent; not being significantly different from the group without headcover. Additionally, they were described as the most democratic and tolerant after the uncovered. Interestingly, this group was rated the lowest in terms of being religiously deviant. Perhaps, the group’s clear differentiation from other groups including the uncovered in terms of religious deviance may imply that the practice of headcovering is in fact perceived as acceptable in the domain of religious spirituality. It is also important to note that

the highest level of contact was with this group and that there was a positive correlation between direct contact and approach behavioral tendencies.

The findings show the importance of threat perceptions on prejudice. Perceptions of threat seem to have a more powerful role in explaining prejudice than behavioral measures. In fact, when behavioral tendencies were controlled, direct contact made no further contribution to explaining prejudice.

Limitations and Future Directions

A generally acknowledged disadvantage of self report is that people may not always be truthful to themselves or to the researcher and that there may be bias due to social desirability. Despite the possibility that students may have resorted to self-censorship when evaluating out-group members, the results still reveal significant differences as hypothesized.

The present study points out to an evident tension between various groups in society which renders the role of contact also important. Contact in the present study was measured only by number of people. In future work, contact should be measured more adequately by including the frequency and quality of contact in the measure. Exploring the effects of different types of contact in this context would also help making sense of possible changes in perception over time and within society.

Additionally, bivariate correlations were used to analyze self report data. It may raise the question that significant correlations can be attributed to shared method variance. In future work, it is worth using correction methods to limit this possible inflation.

It is also important to note that the data for this research was collected in May 2011. In light of contact theory, the replication of this study in the future would be interesting and

valuable in order to understand the change in perception and behavioral tendencies in this context.

Conclusion

In conclusion, this study was one of the first to go beyond the generic categorization as ‘covered’ versus ‘uncovered’ or ‘religious’ versus ‘secular’ when studying the currently observed groups in Turkish society. The hypotheses received support in most cases. It was shown that perceived realistic threat, perceived symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, negative stereotyping, and prejudice differed significantly across groups. In particular, perceived symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, negative stereotyping, and prejudice were the highest towards veiled women in black garments followed by women wearing contemporary, urban fashioned and conservative, and traditional headcovers, and the lowest towards women without headcovers. Behavioral tendencies also showed differences across groups. Aggressive and avoidant behavioral tendencies were the highest and approach behavioral tendencies were the lowest towards veiled women in black garments. Finally, the findings show the importance of the role of threat perceptions on prejudice.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Photos used to represent each group



Black veiled



Urban Fashioned



Traditional



Without Headcovers



Contemporary



Conservative

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire

Part A: Intergroup contact

1. How many of your relatives and family members belong to this group?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
None			Half of them			All

2. How many of your friends belong to this group?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
None			Half of them			All

3. How many of your friends have friends belonging to this group?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
None			Half of them			All

Part 1: Realistic threats

Use the scale printed below each item to indicate your agreement with each of the following statements concerning this group.

4. The group which these people belong to has too much economic power in this country.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly Agree

5. The group which these people belong to has too much political power in this country.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly Agree

6. The group which these people belong to has too much influence on society.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly Agree

7. I see the group which these people belong to as a threat to society.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly Agree

Part 2: Symbolic threats

Use the scale printed below each item to indicate your agreement with each of the following statements concerning this group.

8. The group which these people belong to and the group which I belong to have very different values.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

9. The group which these people belong to wants its rights to be put ahead of the rights of the group which I belong to.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

10. The group which these people belong to do not understand the way the group which I belong to views the world.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

11. The group which these people belong to do not value the rights granted by the Constitution as much as the group which I belong to.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

12. The group which these people belong to and the group to which I belong have different family values.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

13. The group which these people belong to regards itself as morally superior to the group which I belong.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

14. The group which these people belong to should not try to impose its values on the group to which I belong.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

Part 3: Intergroup anxiety

For each of the items listed below, indicate how you feel when interacting with this group.

15. Nervous

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Extremely

Part 4: Negative stereotype index

Please indicate to what extent you would use each trait to define this group.

23. Insidious

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Very much

24. Hard-working

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Very much

25. Democratic

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Very much

26. Prejudiced

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Very much

27. Trustworthy

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Very much

28. Religiously deviant

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Very much

29. Logical-Rationalist

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Very much

30. Superstitious

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Very much

31. Bold

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Very much

32. Rude

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Very much

33. Tolerant

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Very much

34. Congenial

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Very much

35. Fraudulent

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Very much

36. Aggressive

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Very much

Part 5: Attitude toward the outgroup

For each of the items listed, indicate, what your attitudes are towards this group, using the scale below

My attitude towards this group:

37. Hostility

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Extremely

38. Admiration

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Extremely

39. Dislike

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Extremely

40. Acceptance

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Extremely

41. Superiority

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Extremely

42. Affection

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Extremely

Demographic Questions

Age:

Place of birth:

Major:

Grade:

Highschool:

Mother's education and occupation

Father's education and occupation:

Please write down the places you have lived in since birth (for example, city, town, village). Please specify when and how long you lived in each place.

.....

.....

.....

APPENDIX C

Soru Formu

Bölüm A: Gruplar arası İlişki Ölçeği

1. Ailenizden ve akrabalarınızın ne kadarı bu gruba mensup?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç			Yarıyarıya			Tamamı

2. Arkadaşlarınızın ne kadarı bu gruba mensup?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç			Yarıyarıya			Tamamı

3. Kendi arkadaşlarınızdan kaç tanesinin bu tip arkadaşları olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç			Yarıyarıya			Tamamı

Bölüm 1: Gerçekçi Tehditler

Aşağıda, her maddenin altında verilmiş olan ölçeği kullanarak bu kişilerin dahil olduğu kesimle ilgili ifadelere ne kadar katıldığınızı belirtin.

4. Bu grubun dahil olduğu kesim bu toplumda çok fazla ekonomik güce sahip.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

5. Bu grubun dahil olduğu kesim bu toplumda çok fazla politik güce sahip.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

6. Bu grubun dahil olduğu kesimin bu toplum üzerinde çok fazla etkisi var.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

7. Bu grubun dahil olduđu kesimi bu topluma bir tehdit olarak görüyorum.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

Bölüm 2: Sembolik Tehditler

Aşağıda, her maddenin altında verilmiş olan ölçeđi kullanarak bu kişilerin dahil olduđu kesimle ilgili ifadelere ne kadar katıldığınızı belirtin.

8. Bu grubun dahil olduđu kesim ve benim dahil olduđum kesim birbirinden çok farklı değerlere sahip.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

9. Bu grubun dahil olduđu kesim, kendi haklarının benim dahil olduđum kesimin haklarından öncelikli olmasını istiyor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

10. Bu grubun dahil olduđu kesim, benim dahil olduđum kesimin dünya görüşlerini anlamıyor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

11. Bu grubun dahil olduđu kesim, Anayasa tarafından tanınan haklara benim dahil olduđum kesim kadar değer vermiyor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

12. Bu grubun dahil olduđu kesimle benim dahil olduđum kesimin farklı aile deđerleri vardır.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

13. Bu grubun dahil olduđu kesim, kendilerini benim dahil olduđum kesimden ahlaki olarak üstün sayıyor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

14. Bu grubun dahil olduđu kesim, kendi deđerlerini benim dahil olduđum kesime empoze etmeye çalışmamalı.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

Bölüm 3: Gruplar arası Endişe

Aşağıda yazılı her madde için bu grup ile etkileşim içindeyken nasıl hissettiğiniz belirtin.

15. Gergin

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç deđil						Son derece

16. Arkadaşça

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç deđil						Son derece

17. Rahat

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç deęil						Son derece

18. Endişeli (kaygılı)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç deęil						Son derece

19. Tehlikede

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç deęil						Son derece

20. Tuhaf

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç deęil						Son derece

21. Güvende (emniyette)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç deęil						Son derece

22. Huzurlu

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç deęil						Son derece

Bölüm 4: Olumsuz Kalıp Yargı Dizini

Bu kesimi tanımlarken aşağıdaki sıfatların her birini ne dereceye kadar kullanacağınızı belirtin

23. Sinsi

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok

24. Çalışkan

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok

25. Demokrat

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok

26. Ön yargılı

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok

27. Güvenilir

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok

28. Dini açıdan aykırı

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok

29. Mantıklı – akılcı düşünen

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok

30. Batıl inançlı

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok

31. Cesur

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok

32. Kaba

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok

33. Hoşgörülü

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok

34. Canayakın (sıcak)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok

35. Hilekar

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok

36. Saldırgan

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok

Bölüm 5: Dış Gruplara karşı Önyargı

Aşağıda yazılı her maddenin bu gruba olan tutumunuzu ne kadar yansıttığını belirtin.

Bu gruba karşı tutumum şöyledir:

37. Düşmanlık

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Aşırı derecede

38. Hayranlık

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Aşırı derecede

39. Antipati

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Aşırı derecede

40. Kabul etme

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Aşırı derecede

41. Üstünlük

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Aşırı derecede

42. Sevgi

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Aşırı derecede

43. Küçümseme

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Hiç Aşırı derecede

44. Tasvip etme (Onaylama)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Hiç Aşırı derecede

45. Nefret

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Hiç Aşırı derecede

46. Anlayış

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Hiç Aşırı derecede

47. Dışlama

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Hiç Aşırı derecede

48. Sıcaklık

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Hiç Aşırı derecede

Bölüm 6: Davranışsal Eğilimler

Aşağıda yazılı her maddenin bu gruba olan davranışsal yaklaşımınızı kadar yansıttığını belirtin.

49. Karşı çıkarım

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Hiç değil Son derece

50. Yüzleşirim/ karşı karşıya gelirim

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Hiç değil Son derece

51. Daha fazla bilgi edinirim

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Hiç değil Son derece

52. Mesafe koyarım

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Hiç değil Son derece

53. Konuşurum

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Hiç değil Son derece

54. Görmezden gelirim

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Hiç değil Son derece

55. Tartışırım

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Hiç değil Son derece

56. Daha çok zaman geçiririm

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Hiç değil Son derece

57. Hiçbir ilişkim/ alakam olmaz

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Hiç değil Son derece

Demografik Sorular

Yaşınız:

Doğum yeriniz:

Üniversitedeki bölümünüz:

Kaçıncı sınıftasınız?

Bitirdiğiniz lise:

Annenizin eğitim durumu ve mesleği:

Babanızın eğitim durumu ve mesleği:

Doğumunuzdan itibaren nerelerde yaşadığınızı yazıp, buraların ne olduğunu (örneğin, şehir, ilçe, köy) belirtiniz. Her bir yerde, ne kadar süreyle yaşadınız?

.....

.....

.....

REFERENCES

- Biernat, M., Vescio, T. K., & Therno, S. A. (1996). Violating American values: A 'value-congruence' approach to understanding outgroup attitudes. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 32*, 387-410.
- Brader, T., Valention, N. A., & Suhay, E. (2008). What triggers public opposition to immigration? Anxiety, group cues, and immigration threat. *American Journal of Political Science, 52*, 959-978.
- Christ, O., Hewstone, M., Tausch, N., Wagner, U., Voci, A., Hughes, J., & Cairns, E. (2010). Direct contact as a moderator of extended contact effects: Cross-sectional and longitudinal impact on outgroup attitudes, behavioral intentions, and attitude certainty. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20*, 1-13.
- Cottrell, C. A., & Neuberg, S. L. (2005). Different emotional reactions to different groups: A socio functional threat-based approach to prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 88*, 770-789.
- Crisp, R. J., Heuston, S., Matthew, J. F., & Turner, R. N. (2007). Seeing red or feeling blue: Differentiated intergroup emotions and ingroup identification in soccer fans. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 10*, 9-26.
- Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2009). Can imagined interactions promote positive perceptions? Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. *American Psychologist, 64*, 231-240.

Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2010). Imagining intergroup contact reduces implicit prejudice. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 49, 129-142.

Dovidio, J. F., Eller, A., & Hewstone, M. (2011). Improving intergroup relations through direct, extended and other forms of indirect contact. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 14, 147-160.

Esses, V. M., Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1993). Values, stereotypes, and emotions as determinants of intergroup attitudes. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception* (pp. 137-166). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Gonza'lez, K. V., Verkuyten, M., Weesie, J., & Poppe, E. (2008). Prejudice towards Muslims in the Netherlands: Testing integrated threat theory. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 47, 667-685.

Hewstone, M. (2003). Intergroup contact: Panacea or prejudice? *Psychologist*, 16, 352-355.

Hewstone, M. (2009). *Living apart, living together? The role of intergroup contact in social integration* (MMG Working Paper 09-12). Retrieved from Max Planck Institute for the Study of Religious and Ethnic Diversity website:
<http://www.mmg.mpg.de/workingpapers>

Hortaçsu, N. (2000). Intergroup relations in a changing political context: The case of veiled and unveiled university students in Turkey. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30, 733-744.

İki şehir iki dünya: Ataşehir – Başakşehir. (2010, November 29). Radikal gazetesi, p.1.

- Kunduz, C. O. (2009). *An exploration of the predictors of prejudice among university students with and without headcover*. Unpublished master's thesis. Bogazici University, Istanbul, Turkey.
- Mackie, D. M., Devos, T., & Smith, E. R. (2000). Intergroup emotions: Explaining offensive action tendencies in an intergroup context. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 79*, 602-616.
- Paolini, S., Hewstone, M., Cairns, E., & Voci, A. (2004). Effects of direct and indirect cross-group friendships on judgments of Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland: The mediating role of an anxiety-reduction mechanism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 770-786.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Reviews of Psychology, 49*, 65-85.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 751-783.
- Plant, E. A. & Devine, P. G. (2003). The antecedents and implications of interracial anxiety. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 790-801.
- Riek, B. M., Mania, E. W., & Gaertner, S. L. (2006). Intergroup threat and outgroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*, 336-353.
- Riek, B. M., Mania, E. W., Gaertner, S. L., McDonald, S. A., & Lamoreaux, M. J. (2010). Does a common ingroup identity reduce intergroup threat? *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 13*, 403-423.
- Saktanber, A., & Çorbacioğlu, G. (2008). "Veiling and headscarf skepticism in Turkey", *Social Politics, 15*, 514-538.

- Sears, D. O. (2001). The role of affect in symbolic politics. In J. H. Kuklinski (Ed.), *Citizens and politics: Perspectives from political psychology* (pp. 14–40). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Stephan, C. W., Stephan, W. G., & Gudykunst, W. B. (1999). Anxiety in intergroup relations: A comparison of anxiety/uncertainty management theory and integrated threat theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 23*, 613-628.
- Stephan, C. W., & Stephan, W. G. (1993). Cognition and affect in stereotyping: Parallel interactive networks. In D. M. Mackie, & D. L. Hamilton (Eds.), *Affect, cognition and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception* (pp. 111-136). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Stephan, G. W., Ybarra, O., Martinez, M. C., Schwarzwald, J., & Tur-Kaspa, M. (1998). Prejudice toward immigrants to Spain and Israel: An Integrated Threat Theory analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 29*, 559-576.
- Stephan, W. G., Boniecki, K. A., Ybarra, O., Bettencourt, A., Ervin, K. S., Jackson, L. A., McNatt, P. S., & Renfro, C. L. (2002). The role of threats in the racial attitudes of blacks and whites. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 28*, 1242-1254.
- Tam, T., Hewstone, M., Kenworthy, J., & Cairns, E. (2009). Intergroup trust in Northern Ireland. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*, 45-59.

- Tausch, N., Hewstone, M., & Roy, R. (2009). The relationship between contact, status and prejudice: An integrated threat theory analysis of Hindu-Muslim relations in India. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 19*, 83-94.
- Turner, R. N., Hewstone, M., Voci, A., & Vonofakou, C. (2008). A test of the extended intergroup contact hypothesis: The mediating role of intergroup anxiety, perceived ingroup and outgroup norms, and inclusion of the outgroup in the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 843-860.
- Vojdik, V. (2010). Politics of the headscarf in Turkey: Masculinities, feminism, and the construction of collective identities. *Harvard Journal of Law & Gender, 33*, 661-685.
- Wright, S. C., Ropp, S. A., Aron, A., & McLaughlin-Volpe, T. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*, 73-90.
- Zomeran, M. V., Fischer, A. H., & Spears, R. (2007). Testing the limits of tolerance: How intergroup anxiety amplifies negative and offensive responses to out-group initiated contact. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*, 1686-1699.