

## CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The present study aims to explore the predictors of prejudice among female university students with and without headcover. Based on the variables adopted from the Integrated Threat Theory (ITT; Stephan & Stephan, 1993), realistic threats, symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety, negative stereotyping, negative intergroup contact, in-group identification, perceived status differences, perceived intergroup conflict, intergroup contact and closeness are explored as possible predictors of prejudice.

### The Headcover

The headcover (*başörtüsü*) is an Islamic garment for women and it involves the idea of commitment to religious faith by those who choose to wear it (Özdalga, 1998). The headcover is more a religious symbol than it is an ordinary piece of cloth. To reduce the headcover to a piece of cloth is to drain it of its meaning. The headcover is, first of all, a garment which the Islamic religion requires of faithful women to wear in order to be protected from male gaze and from “haram” in general (Mernissi, 1991). However religious faith does not seem to be the only reason why young women in college choose to wear it. As Giddens (2004) points out, the headcover has many different meanings for both those who wear it and those others around them. For instance, Brenner (1996), who studied Javanese

women in Indonesia, argues that to wear Islamic clothing signifies a transformation of the idea of self and identity for women in Java.

Shirazi (2001) states that the headcover is a very important symbol considering that it carries along with it years of religious, social, sexual, and political significance. The headcover has been an important issue of political and social debate in Turkey as well, beginning with the transition to a laicist republic in the 1920s. The headcover has a dynamic quality in the sense that it may acquire new meanings in time. Many researchers have attempted to find the new meanings of wearing a headcover, especially by those young women who go to college. El Guindi (2005), for instance, asks whether the headcover readopted by young college women is a manifestation of an identity crisis, the Islamic version of the 60's hippie movement, a youth protest against authority, a life crisis, an expression of resistance, or a psychic disturbance.

Brenner (1996) who studied Javanese women points out that the headcover can serve as “a form of symbolic shelter” for women in Java. In other words, by covering their heads, Javanese women can leave the private space of their houses and enter public space more freely, without any fear of committing religious offense. However, Brenner also points out that in societies where women are not confined to private spaces but can coexist with men in public spheres, the headcover can be not an advantage but rather a disadvantage considering the employment requirements that many firms or institutions impose. There can also be social discouragements against the headcover. In some cases not only friends and acquaintances of the woman but also the family can have a negative attitude

towards the headcover. Even rumors and gossip can interfere with the daily life of a woman who wears a headcover. So, what does the headcover mean, besides a sign of religious belief and why do women wear it against all obstacles? What other purpose does it fulfill beyond and besides religious faith? Does the headcover mean a form of modernity, or a new life perspective? Is it a reaction to the situation the world is in or is it a way to form new groups and solidarity in urban settings where people are anonymous to one another?

The headcover, along with its religious connotation, gives a sense of belonging to those who wear it. Brenner (1996) points out that the Islamic dress reappropriated by young women in Java can be the sign of becoming “part of a modern, global community of fellow Muslims who imagine themselves to be united in a shared set of beliefs and values and in their common resistance to non-Muslim cultural, political, and economic domination” (p. 678). As Brenner (1996) quotes from Anderson (1991) this is similar to the idea of an “imagined community”(p. 678). One of the interviewees of Peek (2005) told the researcher “If your brother or sister is not Muslim, but a stranger is, you’re closer to that stranger than your own brother or sister” (p. 230). This is a statement which shows that Islamic religion is a great deal about group and community.

Peek (2005) talks about religious identity in her study on Muslim university students in the United States. She states that many investigators fail to include religious identity as a form of social identity whereas some others explore the role that religion plays in forming and maintaining group identity and solidarity but still failing to focus on religion exclusively. Then, she adds that religion is one of the

primary domains which serve as bases for identity formation. Religion is important not only because it satisfies the individual's spiritual needs but also because belonging to a religious group or community has many non-religious benefits such as solidarity, belongingness, (in some cases) protection from social isolation, economic opportunities, educational resources, and other social benefits. The manifestation of belonging to a religious group is carried out primarily by visible symbols such as Islamic dress which is an important identity marker that promotes "individual self-awareness and preserve group cohesion" (p. 219).

Ali (2005) makes a perfect analogy between ethnic identities and religious identities, and considers religion to be a type of ethnic identity. He points out that as any ethnic identity, religious identity is socially constructed and claims that ethnic identities are produced and reproduced through an interaction between the self-ascription and ascription by others. He then continues that how others perceive and define us has an impact on how we see ourselves and how we define ourselves. What others ascribe or we ascribe on ourselves can also have an effect on which identity of our multiple identities becomes salient. So, by wearing a headcover, both those who wear it and those who are exposed to it make an ascription on one part of multiple identities. It is not nationality or race but is religious affiliation and even political choice that becomes salient and starts to define the whole identity of the person in question.

Kopp (2002) also points out that the need for social solidarity has an impact on women's personal choices when they make dress decisions and that dress in general, and Islamic style dress in particular, are more than solely a religious

statement. She then adds that what a Muslim woman wears and the way she dresses says a lot about her identity. The Islamic dress is a visible symbol of Islamic identity through which one is identified with the group.

Hessini (1994) also pointed out that dress is not only socially conditioned but that it is also a way to assert one's identity. The interviews she conducted with several men and women about the Islamic dress led her to conclude that there is a relationship between the Islamic dress and a search for Muslim identity. It is also perceived and used as a "unifying symbol shared by Muslim women" (p. 42).

El Guindi (2005) also talks about the meanings of wearing a headcover and argues that by wearing an Islamic dress, young women manifest their Islamic identity to the larger society and their belonging to the Islamic community. For instance, Zahedi (2007) talks about the mandatory unveiling process in Iran, during Rıza Şah's reign and points out that unveiling was extremely painful for women in Iran because they considered the veil to be part of their identity. The Islamic dress, which symbolized backwardness, traditionalism, and submissiveness to authority, Zahedi argues, now signifies resistance, and even (a new form of) modernity.

To sum up, what a woman wears and how she dresses can be an expression of religious identity and it is as much about faith as it is about group solidarity. In Turkey where the Islamic dress code is not imposed on women, wearing a headcover becomes an important tool to manifest group belonging and solidarity. The headcover, as a visible symbol, serves as a means of recognition as a member of the Muslim community.

## The Headcover Issue in Turkey

The headcover is a politically sensitive and significant issue in Turkey and it has been so since the foundation of the modern Turkish Republic (Shively, 2005). The opinion is divided on whether the headcover is compatible with the Kemalist principles and revolutionary ideals. As Seçkinelgin (2006) also points out for some, the headcover stands in a contradictory position to the Kemalist principles and revolutionary ideals such as secularism, modernism but for others it does not antagonize these principles and ideals. That is why the appearance of students with a headcover at universities has been alarming for those who are strongly attached to secularist and modernist principles. It has been a fundamentalistic threat to the very idea of modernity and secularity. To sum up, the issue of headcover is not recent and has been politically, socially, and ideologically significant since the beginning of the Kemalist Turkish Republic.

The aim of the present study is to explore the intergroup relations between two politically and ideologically antagonized groups. Although the headcover issue affects and is affected by the Turkish society as a whole, the main purpose of the present study is to explore intergroup relations within the context of universities and among peer students.

## The Integrated Threat Theory

The present study aims to examine the relationship between female university students with or without headcover from the perspective of the Integrated Threat Theory (ITT; Stephan & Stephan, 1993). The Integrated Threat Theory brings together previous models, hypotheses, and theories in the intergroup relations literature on prejudice including the Social Identity Theory (SIT; Tajfel & Turner, 1979), Realistic Group Conflict Theory (Sherif, 1966) and the Contact Hypothesis (Allport, 1954). The ITT makes use of the variables, measures and assumptions employed by these individual theories, hypotheses, and models along with others in order to provide a more comprehensive and detailed explanation to the problem of prejudice. An integrative approach is necessary because no single approach is sufficient to provide a complete, satisfactory explanation to the very complicated and sophisticated problem of intergroup relations by itself (Duckitt, 1992; Hamilton, & Trolie, 1986; as cited in Corenblum, & Stephan, 2001).

First, the individual theories that underlie the ITT and the ITT itself will be examined. The social identity theory is related to prejudice and constitutes one of the underlying theories of ITT. Tajfel (1972) defined social identity as “the individual’s knowledge that he belongs to certain social groups together with some emotional and value significance to him of his group membership” (p. 292). In other words, when people claim their social identity, it is assumed that they are aware of their belonging to a group and of its status in the social hierarchy. In addition to cognitive awareness, people develop an emotional attachment to the

group that they belong to. Cohen and Garcia (2005) point out that individuals derive their identity from their group memberships and that their behaviors, ideas, and feelings are somehow influenced by those of their in-group. Brewer and Brown (1998) also point out that ingroup-outgroup categorization is not merely cognitive but also emotional. In that sense, social identities are generally derived from membership in emotionally significant groups.

The relationship between individuals and the groups that they belong to has been alternatively conceptualized by other researchers as well. For instance, Smith (1993; as cited in Mackie & Smith, 1998) talked about the idea of the socially extended self and combined it with theories of emotion. In Smith's conceptualization, the socially extended self appears as the individual incorporates the in-group as part of his/her self. As a result, the in-group acquires affective importance.

Prejudice is found to be related to the concept of social identification (e.g., Brewer, 2000; Turner, Brown, & Tajfel, 1979; as cited in Hong, Coleman, Chan, Wong, Chiu, Hansen, Lee, Tong, & Fu, 2004). It is assumed that the stronger the individuals identify with their group, the greater will be in-group favoritism and ethnocentrism, which in turn may have an effect on out-group derogation, and prejudice against the out-group members. According to the social identity theory both intergroup attitudes and discrimination are influenced by the degree to which individuals identify themselves with their ingroup (Brown, 1995; Brewer & Miller, 1996; Deaux, 1996; Kelly, 1988; Perreault & Bourhis, 1998; Tajfel & Turner, 1979; Taylor & Moghaddam, 1994; as cited in Jackson, 2002). The ITT approach

integrates social identity into the model and predicts that the stronger people identify with their group, the greater will be in-group favoritism and out-group derogation.

The Realistic Group Conflict Theory (RGCT; Sherif, 1966), on the other hand, is based on the idea that limited or scarce resources lead to conflict between groups that have to share these resources. The ITT makes use of the RGCT to explain prejudice, but it also elaborates and broadens the definition of threat by introducing four different types of threat: realistic threats, symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes. According to the definition presented by Corenblum and Stephan (2001), realistic threats are those to the economic and political power and to the welfare of the in-group. The present study predicts that the more the perceived realistic threat, the stronger will be in-group bias and out-group derogation.

Symbolic threats, on the other hand, refer to threats to the symbolic beliefs, values, morals, standards, attitudes and, norms of the in-group. Stephan, Ybarra, Martinez, Schwarzwald, and Tur-Kaspa (1998) describe symbolic threats as those to the worldview of the ingroup and that they arise as a result of “a belief in the moral rightness of the in-group’s system of values” (p. 560). They also point out that the in-group perceives symbolic threats when their system of values is or perceived as undermined by an out-group. Corenblum and Stephan (2001) point out that minority as well as majority groups should view those who disregard and disdain their own worldviews and symbolic beliefs negatively. The present study

predicts that the more the perceived symbolic threat, the stronger will be in-group bias and out-group derogation.

Intergroup anxiety arises in intergroup interactions because people expect and are concerned about negative outcomes such as rejection, embarrassment, and disapproval from the members of the out-group (Stephan et al., 1998). These anticipations are aggravated if the groups have a history of antagonism, lack prior personal contact, are ethnocentric and ignorant of one another or in a competitive situation where one has higher status than the other. The present study predicts that the more the intergroup anxiety, the stronger will be in-group bias and out-group derogation.

Negative stereotypes are conceptualized as threats from the out-group to the in-group (Stephan et al., 1998). When expectations about the out-group are negative, interactions are anticipated to be conflictual and unpleasant. The present study predicts that the more the negative stereotyping, the stronger will be in-group bias and out-group derogation.

Cottrell and Neuberg (2005) suggested that feelings towards a certain group are a function of the quality of the perceived threat. Depending on the type of threat, the feelings towards the group would vary. When personal freedoms and rights of group members are perceived as being at stake, or when established in-group norms and social coordination are threatened, the in-group members primarily experience anger. The feeling of disgust can accompany anger. When an out-group promotes values opposing those of the in-group, disgust is the principal emotion, accompanied by anger and fear. Finally, fear is elicited as a primary

emotion when the in-group's safety or future well-being is threatened or perceived as being threatened. Cottrell and Neuberg's (2005) study is important because not only does it relate the idea of threat to the concept of prejudice but it also talks about different types of threat. However, it also entails a detailed examination of different types of emotion that are elicited in the face of different types of threat. Such a detailed examination of emotions are beyond the aim and scope of the present study. The emotions are the concern of the present study only to the extent that they can create prejudice and discriminatory attitude towards the out-group.

The third theoretical framework that is incorporated in the ITT is the Contact Hypothesis (Allport, 1954) and its reformulation, which is basically about self-disclosure and friendship (Pettigrew, 1998). The Contact Hypothesis basically predicts that when groups that are in a conflicting relationship come into contact under optimal conditions, the prejudice between groups will be diminished. Wright (1997) who revised and elaborated Allport's (1954) hypothesis predicted that not only intergroup contact, but also some indirect contact between groups serves to reduce prejudice. Not as a group but as individuals, those people who have cross-group friendships show lower degrees of prejudice than those who do not. The main reason is the emotional intimacy of self-disclosure elements in friendships. As people disclose themselves to one another, they feel more affectionate and understanding towards one another, which reduces negative attitudes and prejudice at a general level. Pettigrew (1998) also argues that contact between an individual and an out-group member can even reduce prejudice of the individual towards other out-groups.

The relationship between contact and prejudice can be extended to a situation where a friend of an individual forms a friendship with an out-group member. The extended contact hypothesis (Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Ropp, 1997) involves different types of intergroup contact: cross-group friendship and extended contact. According to this hypothesis, not only having an outgroup friend but also having an ingroup friend who has a friend from the outgroup reduces intergroup prejudice. Studies show that when there is extended contact, prejudice against the out-group tends to diminish. Mackie and Smith (1998) also point out that if an individual becomes or already is friends with an out-group member, provided that the friendship is more than an acquaintance and a close one, the individual incorporates the self of the friend into his/her own self. That also means the incorporation of the whole out-group as well because the group an individual belongs to is an important part of that individual's (social) identity. The present study predicts that the more various and frequent intergroup contact one has, the less prejudice s/he will have against the out-group(s).

Related to the contact hypothesis and extended contact, the ITT focuses on the negative intergroup contact and its effect on negative intergroup attitudes. Instances of negative contact with the out-group may increase the feeling of threat, hence as a distal variable may have a negative effect on intergroup attitudes (Stephan, Boniecki, Ybarra, Bettencourt, Ervin, Jackson, McNatt, & Renfro, 2002). Negative contact can be any kind of disagreement, fights or unpleasant interactions with one or several out-group members. The present study also predicts that the more frequent negative contacts one experiences, the more prejudice s/he will have.

The fourth theoretical issue is the status difference between the groups. Many theorists (e.g., Apfelbaum, 1979; Cartwright, 1959; as cited in Grant, 1992) argued that power and status differences between groups can have a significant effect on the quality of intergroup relations. Brewer and Brown (1998) pointed out that there are two opposing views on this issue. One view states that high-status groups may use discrimination on lower-status groups to maintain the social status-quo. Grant (1992) pointed out that high-status groups may act in an ethnocentric way toward the out-group in order to maintain the status-quo and to justify their discriminatory action. By the same token, Campbell (1965) mentioned that the high-power groups might be able to use their already established power to secure the scarce resources and also to act in a discriminative and ethnocentric way to the low-power group. The other view stated that groups which already have a relatively high status do not need to exert intergroup discrimination and it is rather the low-status groups that would exhibit greater discrimination in order to improve their situation. One of the propositions that Campbell (1965) listed was that low-power groups might be more ethnocentric than high-power groups because the members of the former will be more vulnerable and more threatened in an intergroup conflict situation when the resources are scarce.

Brewer and Brown (1998) pointed out that the findings of the research on the relationship between intergroup status differences and prejudice are mixed. The first meta-analytic study on intergroup status differences and prejudice (Mullen, Brown, & Smith, 1992) found that overall, high-status groups show greater intergroup bias than low-status groups. In a more recent meta-analytic study,

Bettencourt, Dorr, Charleton and Hume (2001) took variables such as intergroup permeability, in-group hierarchy, legitimacy of the status structure and relevance of evaluative dimensions into consideration and found that overall, high-status groups were more biased than low-status groups. However, in a dynamic context where groups are not only unstable but also not clearly separated in terms of social, economic, and political borders, it might be difficult and misleading to label these groups as low and high-status. Therefore it makes more sense to look at the perceived status differences rather than the actual ones as the ITT does. Therefore, the present study predicts that the more the perceived status difference between groups, the more will be the prejudice towards the out-group.

As can be seen, the ITT comprises almost all of the important theories to provide a comprehensive explanation to conflicting intergroup relations, and in particular, prejudice. The ITT does not provide a new theoretical framework; however, it integrates the main theories in one single model. The end result is a more simple and parsimonious theoretical model as well as a more comprehensive account of intergroup relations.

One more point to be mentioned about the ITT model is the differentiation between proximal and distal variables. The ITT focuses on a number of variables that are considered to have an impact on prejudice. The main idea is that threat leads to prejudice (Corenblum & Stephan, 2001). According to the theory, it is suggested that there are at least four such threats: Realistic threat, symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotyping. In the ITT, these are categorized as proximal variables. However, there are certain other factors that might have an

indirect impact on intergroup prejudice, in other words “potential antecedents of prejudice” (Corenblum & Stephan, 2001). Based on past research and previous theories, the ITT embraces the assumption that the four types of threats are associated with four antecedent variables, namely the strength of in-group identification, negative out-group contact, history of intergroup conflict, and perceived between-group status differences which are categorized as distal variables. Curşeu, Stoop, and Schalk (2006) also tested the ITT model in a sample of Dutch employees and included intergroup conflict, status inequalities, in-group identification, knowledge about the out-group, and contact in the category of distal variables.

Different from what the ITT suggests, the present study does not categorize variables as proximal (realistic threats, symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety, negative stereotyping) or distal (negative contact, in-group identification, intergroup conflict and perceived status differences) but rather as single, independent variables which may have their own effect on prejudice. The reason for such an approach is to examine the relationship between these predictor variables and prejudice directly in order to see whether these variables predict prejudice individually. Therefore, the present study makes use of the ITT as a source of possible predictors of prejudice.

Besides the theoretical approach it employs, the present study also attempts to be comprehensive in that the stereotypes and prejudicial attitudes are examined not only from the majority towards the minority, but also vice versa. Research on stereotypes, prejudice, and discrimination has generally been concerned with the

oppressive treatment of the minorities by the dominant majorities. However, one should examine the perspective of the minority groups as well, even though the aforementioned concern remains intact because the way minority groups feel and think about majority groups is one of the factors that has an impact on how the former are treated. One point should be made clear about the majority-minority distinction, concerning the groups of the present study. Generally speaking, there is no clear sense to which of the groups is the majority or the minority in the Turkish society. However, when the context changes to a university setting, it becomes more clear that the group with the headcover presents a minority group as opposed to the majority who do not wear a headcover. The society as a whole seems to be more heterogenous than the university setting concerning the headcover. So, in the particular university context, it becomes easier to talk about the group wearing a headcover as a minority group.

### The Present Study

The main aim of the present study is to examine the intergroup relations between female students with and without headcover. The study examines the link between several predictor variables and prejudice. The predictor variables are adopted from the ITT. The hypotheses to be tested are as follows:

- 1 In terms of what the ITT identifies as proximal variables, the more the individuals perceive realistic and symbolic threats, the greater the intergroup

anxiety and negative stereotyping, the higher will be prejudice towards the out-group.

2 In terms of what the ITT identifies as distal variables, the more status difference and conflict (historical or current) the individuals perceive between the groups, the more frequent negative contacts the individuals experience, and the stronger the individuals identify with their group, the higher will be prejudice towards the out-group.

3 The more various and frequent intergroup contact the individuals have and the closer the intergroup contact is, the lower will be prejudice against the out-group.

## CHAPTER II: METHOD

### Participants

A total of 133 students at Boğaziçi University (N=87) and İstanbul Bilgi University (N=46) participated in the study. Twenty-six female students with a headcover and 107 female students without a headcover participated in the study. The participants were recruited at mass psychology courses and were given 1 credit for their participation. The reason why two universities were included in the study, instead of one, is to have access to a more various sample, as the ‘culture’ of these two universities are more or less different from each other.

### Instruments

The scales used in the present study to measure realistic threats, symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety, negative stereotyping, perceived intergroup conflict, perceived status differences, intergroup contact, in-group identification, and prejudice towards the out-group are the modified versions of the scales used in the studies by Stephan et al. (2002). The scales in English were translated into Turkish by two independent translators, then were translated back into English and the discrepancies were resolved by discussion (See Appendix A and B for English and Turkish versions respectively).

*Prejudice towards the out-group.* In order to measure prejudicial attitudes towards the out-group, Stephan and Stephan's (1993) measure of intergroup attitudes were used. The measure consists of 12 items containing evaluative or emotional statements. The participants were asked to indicate their reactions to these statements on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*extremely*) with higher scores indicating greater prejudice. Items 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12 (admiration, acceptance, affection, approval, sympathy and warmth) were reverse scored. The Cronbach's alphas ranged from .83 to .93.

*Realistic threat.* Perceived realistic threat was measured by the scale used by Corenblum and Stephan (2001) and Stephan et al. (2002). The measure consists of 12 items. The participants were asked to indicate the degree to which they were politically and economically threatened by the out-group. Their responses were indicated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) with higher scores indicating greater perceived realistic threat. In previous studies the Cronbach's alphas ranged from .92 to .95.

*Symbolic threat.* Perceived symbolic threat was measured by a scale used by Corenblum and Stephan (2001) and Stephan et al. (2002). The measure consists of 12 items and participants were asked to indicate the level of threat that they perceived due to differences between the values and beliefs of their own group and the out-group. Their responses were indicated on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) with higher scores indicating greater perceived symbolic threat. In previous studies the Cronbach's alphas ranged from .83 to .89.

*Intergroup anxiety.* A measure used by Corenblum and Stephan (2001) and Stephan et al. (2002) was employed in order to assess the degree of intergroup anxiety. The measure consists of 12 items and the participants were asked how they would feel interacting with members of the out-group. The participants gave their responses on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) with higher scores indicating greater intergroup anxiety. Items 2, 4, 6, 8, 10 and 12 (friendly, comfortable, trusting, confident, safe and at ease) were reverse scored. In previous studies the Cronbach's alphas ranged from .83 to .93.

*Negative stereotype index.* In order to assess stereotypes, an index developed by Yapıcı (2004) for identifying the stereotypes about Jewish, Christian, Muslim, Sunnite, and Alewite groups in Turkey was used. Of the 32 trait-index, 24 items were chosen and presented to the participants and they were asked to indicate to what degree they would use each trait to define members of the out-group. The participants gave their responses on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*definitely*) with higher scores indicating greater negative stereotyping. Items 2, 10, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23 and 24 (hard-working, logical/rationalist, bold/brave, democratic, clean, charitable, honest, amiable/congenial, kind/polite, pacifistic, trustworthy and tolerant) were reverse scored. The Cronbach's alphas obtained by Yapıcı (2004) ranged from .75 to .83. However, the measure that was used in the present study did not measure the percentage of an in-group that uses one particular stereotype to define the out-group but instead to measure the extent to which participants use these stereotypes to define the out-group members.

*Negative intergroup contact.* The measure of negative intergroup contact that was employed in the present study was modeled on a measure developed by Stephan, Stephan, Demitrakis, Yamada, and Clason (2000). The measure consists of 14 items. The participants were asked to indicate the frequency of their negative experiences with the out-group members. The responses were given on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*never*) to 7 (*very frequently*) with higher scores indicating more negative intergroup contact. The measure of negative intergroup contact was used by Corenblum and Stephan (2001) and Stephan et al. (2002). The Cronbach's alphas ranged from .94 to .96.

*In-group identification.* In-group identification was measured by the Group Identification Scale (Kirchler, Palmonari, & Pombeni, 1994) adapted into Turkish by Hortaçsu (2000). The scale consists of 10 items. The participants were asked to indicate the degree to which they identified with their group. The responses were given on a 7-point Likert scale (originally 5-point) ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) with higher scores indicating stronger identification with the in-group. The original scale was changed from a 5-point to a 7-point in order to be consistent with all of the measures. In previous studies (Hortaçsu, 2000; Kirchler et al., 1994) the Cronbach's alphas ranged from .80 to .96.

*Perceived intergroup conflict.* The measure of perceived intergroup conflict consists of 4 items that was used by Corenblum and Stephan (2001) and Stephan et al. (2002). The participants were asked to indicate the degree to which they perceived intergroup conflict (historical or current). The responses were given on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) with

higher scores indicating greater perceived intergroup conflict. The Cronbach's alphas ranged from .68 to .79.

*Perceived status differences.* Perceptions of status differences were measured with a 5-item scale. The scale was used by Corenblum and Stephan (2001) and Stephan et al. (2002). The participants were to indicate the degree to which they perceive status differences between the in-group and the out-group. The responses were given on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*) with higher scores indicating greater perceived status differences. Item 4 ('the differences in status, power, and wealth between the group which covered students belong to and the group which uncovered students belong to are decreasing') and item 5 ('the differences in status, power, and wealth between the group which uncovered students belong to and the group which covered students belong to should not exist') were reverse scored. The Cronbach's alphas ranged from .77 to .81.

*Intergroup contact.* A measure used by McLaughlin-Volpe (2005) was used to measure the frequency and the closeness of intergroup contact. To assess the frequency of contact with out-group members, a measure adapted from a previous study (Mc-Laughlin-Volpe, Aron, Aright, & Reis, 2000; as cited in McLaughlin-Volpe, 2005) was used. The measure consists of 9 items. The participants were asked to indicate the number of out-group members that they are friends or are acquainted with, that they had a conversation with, and to what degree they avoid intergroup contact. The participants gave their response on a 7-point Likert scale, with higher scores indicating more frequent intergroup contact, except for the items 5, 6, 7, and 8. Items 4 ('To what extent do you avoid contact with covered

students?'), 5 ('About how many of your friends are covered students?'), 6 ('About how many of your uncovered friends do you think have friends who are covered?'), 7 ('To what extent do you think covered students are similar or dissimilar to each other? Are they pretty much all alike or are there big differences among them?') and 8 ('Do you think that covered students share similar attitudes with one another?') were reverse scored. Of the items that were reverse scored, items 5, 6, 7, and 8 were reverse scored not because the questions but the answers were reversely presented.

*Closeness.* In order to assess the closeness of intergroup contact, the Subjective Closeness Index (Berscheid, Snyder, & Omoto, 1989; as cited in McLaughlin-Volpe, 2005) was used. The participants were asked to indicate the degree of closeness to the closest friend from the out-group. If the participants did not have any friend from the out-group they reported likewise and left the questions unanswered. The scale consists of 2 items. The responses were given on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (*not at all close*) to 7 (*extremely close*) with higher scores indicating closer intergroup contact.

In addition to the measures mentioned above, the participants were asked how religious they were in 2 different questions along with their religious affiliation, and a social identity question. The questions concerning religious affiliation was as follows: 'What is your religious affiliation?'. Two religiosity questions were as follows: 'How important is religious belief for you?', and 'To what degree do you practice religious services?'. The religious affiliation question was open-ended. The participants reported as they wished. The other two questions were answered using a 7-point Likert scale, ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very*

*important*). For the social identity question ‘How would you primarily identify yourself?’, the participants were presented with multiple choices (young, human being, woman, muslim, turk, university student, and other) and were asked to name only one of the choices.

## CHAPTER III: RESULTS

### Descriptive Characteristics

The descriptive statistics of all variables used in this study are presented in

Table 1.

Table 1

#### *Descriptive Statistics for all Variables*

	Total sample Mean (SD)	Sample with headcover Mean (SD)	Sample without headcover Mean (SD)
Realistic Threats	4.11 (1.41)	4.04 (1.08)	4.14 (1.49)
Symbolic Threats	4.57 (1.17)	4.31 (1.09)	4.64 (1.19)
Intergroup Anxiety	2.94 (1.27)	2.07 (1.12)	3.16 (1.22)
Stereotyping	3.64 (.82)	3.35 (.84)	3.72 (.81)
Negative Contact	2.15 (1.21)	2.84 (1.47)	1.99 (1.09)
Identification	5.29 (1.55)	5.55 (1.61)	5.23 (1.54)
Conflict	4.07 (1.72)	3.12 (1.72)	4.30 (1.65)
Status	3.73 (1.11)	3.01 (.83)	3.92 (1.11)
Contact	4.60 (1.28)	6.35 (.60)	4.18 (1.02)
Closeness	4.21 (2.06)	6.25 (1.57)	3.40 (2.02)
Prejudice	3.29 (1.19)	2.46 (.91)	3.50 (1.17)
Religiosity	4.04 (1.76)	6.10 (.49)	3.55 (1.59)

The participants were asked about their religious affiliation with an open-ended question. Table 2 depicts the frequencies of their responses.

Table 2

*Frequencies for Religious Affiliation*

	Agnostic	Atheist	Non-religious	Muslim
With headcover (N= 26)	-	-	-	26
Without headcover (N = 107)	2	1	15	89

The participants were also asked to report in what terms they would primarily identify themselves. The participants either chose from the alternatives or reported another social identity of their preference. Table 3 presents the frequencies for social identification.

Table 3

*Frequencies for Social Identification*

	With headcover	Without headcover
Young	1	5
Human Being	2	26
Woman	-	7
Kurd	-	1
Muslim	9	2
Turk	2	3
University Stu.	12	63

The reliabilities of all measures are reported in Table 4. Cronbach's alphas turned out to be either high or acceptable

Table 4

*Reliabilities (Cronbach's Alphas) of all variables*

Realistic Threats	.93
Symbolic Threats	.86
Intergroup Anxiety	.92
Stereotyping	.74
Negative Contact	.93
Identification	.96
Conflict	.90
Status	.59
Contact	.74
Closeness	.98
Prejudice	.92
Religiosity	.81

#### Comparisons between Students with and without Headcover

In order to compare students with and without headcover on perceived realistic threats, perceived symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety, negative stereotyping, negative intergroup contact, in-group identification, intergroup conflict, perceived status differences, intergroup contact, closeness of intergroup contact, prejudice and religiosity, independent samples t-tests were carried out. There was not a significant difference between the group with headcover ( $M = 4.04$ ;  $SD = 1.08$ ) and the group without headcover ( $M = 4.14$ ;  $SD = 1.49$ ) on perceived realistic threats,  $t(131) = -.32$ , ns. There was not a significant difference between the group with headcover ( $M = 4.31$ ;  $SD = 1.09$ ) and the group without headcover ( $M = 4.64$ ;  $SD = 1.19$ ) on perceived symbolic threats,  $t(131) = -1.30$ , ns.

The group without headcover ( $M = 3.16$ ;  $SD = 1.22$ ) reported more intergroup anxiety interacting with the out-group than the group with headcover ( $M = 2.07$ ;  $SD = 1.12$ ),  $t(131) = -4.14$ ,  $p < .001$ . The group without headcover ( $M = 3.72$ ;  $SD = .81$ ) negatively stereotyped the out-group more than the group with headcover ( $M = 3.35$ ;  $SD = .84$ ),  $t(131) = -2.03$ ,  $p < .05$ . The group with headcover ( $M = 2.84$ ;  $SD = 1.47$ ) reported more negative intergroup contact than the group without headcover ( $M = 1.99$ ;  $SD = 1.09$ ),  $t(131) = 3.30$ ,  $p < .01$ . There was not a significant difference between the group with headcover ( $M = 5.55$ ;  $SD = 1.61$ ) and the group without headcover ( $M = 5.23$ ;  $SD = 1.54$ ) on in-group identification,  $t(131) = .95$ , ns. The group without headcover ( $M = 4.30$ ;  $SD = 1.65$ ) perceived more intergroup conflict than the group with headcover ( $M = 3.12$ ;  $SD = 1.72$ ),  $t(131) = -3.26$ ,  $p < .01$ . The group without headcover ( $M = 3.92$ ;  $SD = 1.11$ ) perceived more status differences than the group with headcover ( $M = 3.01$ ;  $SD = .83$ ),  $t(131) = -3.92$ ,  $p < .001$ . The group with headcover ( $M = 6.35$ ;  $SD = .60$ ) had more intergroup contact than the group without headcover ( $M = 4.18$ ;  $SD = 1.02$ ),  $t(131) = 10.47$ ,  $p < .001$ . The group with headcover ( $M = 6.25$ ;  $SD = 1.57$ ) had closer intergroup contact than the group without headcover ( $M = 3.40$ ;  $SD = 2.02$ ),  $t(131) = 6.72$ ,  $p < .001$ . The group without headcover ( $M = 3.50$ ;  $SD = 1.17$ ) was more prejudiced towards the out-group than the group with headcover ( $M = 2.46$ ;  $SD = .91$ ),  $t(131) = -4.21$ ,  $p < .001$ . The group with headcover ( $M = 6.10$ ;  $SD = .49$ ) was more religious than the group without headcover ( $M = 3.55$ ;  $SD = 1.59$ ),  $t(131) = 8.06$ ,  $p < .001$ .

## The Interrelationships among Variables

The intercorrelations among the variables are reported in Table 5. Realistic threats, symbolic threats and the perceived status difference measures were found to be significantly correlated with all of the measures. Intergroup anxiety and negative stereotyping were found to be significantly correlated with all other measures except for the negative contact measure. Negative contact was significantly correlated with the realistic and symbolic threat measures at a .01 level and with the in-group identification and status measures at a .05 level. In-group identification turned out to be significantly correlated with all measures at a .01 level except for the negative contact measure which was found to be significant at a .05 level. Conflict was found to be significantly correlated with all measures except for the negative contact measure. Status differences were found to be significantly correlated for all measures at a .01 level except for the negative contact measure which was found to be significant at a .05 level. Contact was significantly correlated with all measures except for the negative contact measure. Closeness was found to be significantly correlated with all measures except for the negative contact measure. Prejudice was found to be significantly correlated with all measures except for the measure of negative contact.

Realistic threats were found to be positively correlated with all measures except for the contact and closeness measures; the strength of the correlation between the realistic threats measure was moderately high for all measures. Symbolic threats were found to be positively correlated with all the other measures

except for contact and closeness; the correlations were found to be moderately high for all measures. Intergroup anxiety was found to be positively correlated with all measures except for the contact and closeness measures; the strength of the correlations was found to be moderately high for all measures. Stereotype measure was found to be positive for all measures except for the contact and closeness measures; the strength of the correlation was found to be moderately high for all measures except for the in-group identification measure which turned out to be low. Negative contact was found to be positively correlated with all measures; the correlations between the negative contact measure and all other measures were found to be low except for the realistic and symbolic threats measures which turned out to be moderately high. In-group identification was found to be positive for all measures except for the contact and closeness measures; the strength of the correlation was found to be moderately high for all other measures except for the negative contact measure. Intergroup conflict was found to be positively correlated with all measures except for contact and closeness; the strength of the correlation was found to be moderately high for all measures. Status differences turned out to be positively correlated with all measures except for the contact and closeness. Contact was found to be negatively correlated with all measures except for closeness; the strength of the correlation turned out to be moderately high for all variables. Closeness was found to be negatively correlated with all measures except for contact; the strength of the correlation turned out to be moderately high for all measures. Prejudice was found to be positively correlated with all measures except

for contact and closeness; the strength of the correlation turned out to be moderately high for all measures.

Table 5

*Intercorrelations among Variables*

	Realistic Threats	Symbolic Threats	Intergroup Anxiety	Negative Stereotyping	Negative Contact	Identification	Conflict	Status	Contact	Closeness	Prejudice
Realistic Threats	-										
Symbolic Threats	.70**	-									
Intergroup Anxiety	.51**	.62**	-								
Negative Stereotyping	.44**	.63**	.50**	-							
Negative Contact	.34**	.29**	.16	.16	-						
Identification	.50**	.47**	.32**	.24**	.17*	-					
Conflict	.40**	.56**	.40**	.35**	.14	.32**	-				
Status	.69**	.63**	.56**	.44**	.19*	.36**	.55**	-			
Contact	-.33**	-.47**	-.64**	-.38**	.06	-.27**	-.43**	-.51**	-		
Closeness	-.38**	-.52**	-.63**	-.46**	-.20	-.25**	-.45**	-.56**	.75**	-	
Prejudice	.62**	.68**	.65**	.66**	.15	.46**	.50**	.65**	-.67**	-.66**	-

\*\* p ≤ .01

\* p ≤ .05

### The Effects of Predictor Variables on Prejudice

A multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to examine the effects of all the predictor variables on prejudice. As can be seen in in Table 6, 77% of the variance is predicted by the combination of all the variables. The effect of all predictor variables on prejudice revealed a significant relationship,  $F(11, 113) = 34.50, p < .05$ . The variables that made a unique contribution to the prediction of prejudice are realistic threats, negative stereotyping, in-group identification, low intergroup contact, and low religiosity. The direction of the coefficients indicated that as perceived realistic threats, negative stereotyping and in-group identification increased, prejudice increased as well. As intergroup contact and religiosity increased, on the other hand, prejudice decreased.

Table 6

*Summary of multiple regression analysis (N = 133)*

Variable	B	SE	Beta
Realistic threats	.20	.06	.23*
Symbolic threats	-.05	.09	-.05
Intergroup anxiety	.08	.07	.08
Negative Stereotyping	.49	.09	.34*
Negative contact	.02	.05	.02
Identification	.09	.04	.11*
Conflict	.05	.04	.08
Contact	-.21	.07	-.23*
Closeness	-.06	.04	-.10
Religiosity	-.08	.04	-.12*

Note  $R^2 = .77$

\*  $p < .05$

## Results Concerning Hypotheses

In terms of what the ITT identifies as proximal variables, it was first hypothesized that the more the individuals perceive realistic and symbolic threats, the greater the intergroup anxiety and negative stereotyping, the higher would be prejudice towards the out-group. In order to test this hypothesis, a one way between-subjects ANOVA was carried out, comparing groups with high and low scores on each measure. All the measures that the ITT identifies as proximal (perceived realistic threats, perceived symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety, negative stereotyping) ranged from 1 to 7. Those who scored above 3.5 were categorized as the high score group and those who scored below or equal to 3.5 as the low score group in all relevant variables, using a mid-point split.

Those who perceived lower realistic threats ( $M = 2.41$ ;  $SD = .82$ ) turned out to be less prejudiced towards the out-group than those who perceived higher realistic threats ( $M = 3.73$ ;  $SD = 1.11$ ),  $F(1, 131) = 48.94$ ,  $p < .001$ . Those who scored low on perceived realistic threats ( $N = 44$ ) constituted 33.08% and those who scored high on the same measure ( $N = 89$ ) constituted 66.92% of the total sample. The low perceived symbolic threat group ( $M = 1.95$ ;  $SD = .55$ ) and high perceived symbolic threat group ( $M = 3.61$ ;  $SD = 1.08$ ) also differed in prejudice towards the out-group. Those who scored low on perceived symbolic threats were less prejudiced towards the out-group than those who scored high on the same measure,  $F(1, 131) = 54.87$ ,  $p < .001$ . Those who scored low on perceived symbolic threats ( $N = 25$ ) constituted 18.80% and those who scored high on the same measure ( $N = 108$ ) constituted 81.20% of the total sample. There was a

significant difference in prejudice towards the out-group between the low intergroup anxiety group and the high intergroup anxiety group. Those who scored low on intergroup anxiety ( $M = 2.83$ ;  $SD = 1.04$ ) turned out to be less prejudiced towards the out-group than those who scored high on the same measure ( $M = 4.15$ ;  $SD = .98$ ),  $F(1, 131) = 51.26$ ,  $p < .001$ . Those who scored low on intergroup anxiety ( $N = 86$ ) constituted 64.66% and those who scored high on the same measure ( $N = 47$ ) constituted 35.34% of the total sample. There was a significant difference in prejudice towards the out-group between the low negative stereotyping group and the high negative stereotyping group. Those who scored low on negative stereotyping ( $M = 2.63$ ;  $SD = .86$ ) were less prejudiced towards the out-group than those who scored high on the same measure ( $M = 3.84$ ;  $SD = 1.16$ ),  $F(1, 131) = 45.06$ ,  $p < .001$ . Those who scored low on negative stereotyping ( $N = 60$ ) constituted 45.11% and those who scored high on the same measure ( $N = 73$ ) constituted 54.89% of the total sample.

In terms of what the ITT identifies as distal variables, it was hypothesized that the more status difference and conflict (historical or current) the individuals perceive between groups, the more frequent negative contacts the individuals experience, and the stronger the individuals identify with their group, the higher would be prejudice towards the out-group. To test this hypothesis, a one-way between subjects ANOVA was carried out, comparing groups with high and low scores on each measure. All the measures ranged from 1 to 7. Those who scored above 3.5 were categorized as the high score group and those who scored below or equal to 3.5 as the low score group in all relevant variables, using a mid-point split.

There was not a significant difference in prejudice towards the out-group between the low negative contact group ( $M = 3.28$ ;  $SD = 1.22$ ) and the high negative contact group ( $M = 3.34$ ;  $SD = 1.11$ ),  $F(1, 131) = .05$ , ns. Those who scored low on negative contact ( $N = 112$ ) constituted 84.21% and those who scored high on the same measure ( $N = 21$ ) constituted 15.79% of the total sample. There was a significant difference in prejudice towards the out-group between low in-group identification and high in-group identification. Those who scored low on in-group identification ( $M = 2.30$ ;  $SD = .86$ ) turned out to be less prejudiced towards the out-group than those who scored high on the same measure ( $M = 3.47$ ;  $SD = 1.16$ ),  $F(1, 131) = 18.45$ ,  $p < .001$ . Those who scored low on in-group identification ( $N = 20$ ) constituted 15.04% and those who scored high on the same measure ( $N = 113$ ) constituted 84.96% of the total sample. There was a significant difference in prejudice towards the out-group between the low and the high conflict groups. Those who scored low on perceived intergroup conflict ( $M = 2.69$ ;  $SD = .99$ ) turned out to be less prejudiced towards the out-group than those who scored high on the same measure ( $M = 3.68$ ;  $SD = 1.16$ ),  $F(1, 131) = 25.38$ ,  $p < .001$ . Those who scored low on perceived intergroup conflict ( $N = 52$ ) constituted 39.10% and those who scored high on the same measure ( $N = 81$ ) constituted 60.90% of the total sample. Results revealed that there was a significant difference in prejudice towards the out-group between the low and the high perceived status difference groups. Those who scored low on perceived status difference ( $M = 2.51$ ;  $SD = .93$ ) were less prejudice towards the out-group than those who scored high on the same measure ( $M = 3.81$ ;  $SD = 1.07$ ),  $F(1, 131) = 51.96$ ,  $p < .001$ . Those who

scored low on perceived status differences ( $N = 53$ ) constituted 39.85% and those who scored high on the same measure ( $N = 80$ ) constituted 60.15% of the total sample.

It was also hypothesized that the more various and frequent intergroup contact the individuals have and the closer the intergroup contact is, the lower would be prejudice against the out-group. To test this hypothesis, a one-way between-subjects ANOVA was carried out, comparing groups with high and low scores on each measure. All the measures ranged from 1 to 7. Those who scored above 3.5 were categorized as the high score group and those who scored below or equal to 3.5 as the low score group in all relevant variables, using a mid-point split.

Results revealed that there was a significant difference in prejudice towards the out-group between the low contact group and the high contact group. Those who scored low on intergroup contact ( $M = 2.92$ ;  $SD = 1.08$ ) turned out to be more prejudiced towards the out-group than those who scored high on the same measure ( $M = 4.39$ ;  $SD = .77$ ),  $F(1, 131) = 53.28$ ,  $p < .001$ . Those who scored low on intergroup contact ( $N = 38$ ) constituted 28.57% and those who scored high on the same measure ( $N = 95$ ) constituted 71.43% of the total sample. There was a significant difference in prejudice towards the out-group between the low closeness group and the high closeness group. Those who scored low on closeness ( $M = 2.74$ ;  $SD = 1.06$ ) turned out to be more prejudiced towards the out-group than those who scored high on the same measure ( $M = 4.06$ ;  $SD = .93$ ),  $F(1, 131) = 55.61$ ,  $p < .001$ . Those who scored low on closeness of intergroup conflict ( $N = 56$ )

constituted 42.11% and those who scored high on the same measure ( $N = 77$ )  
constituted 57.89% of the total sample.

## CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION

The present study aimed to examine prejudice between two groups by making use of certain principles of the Integrated Threat Theory. As predicted, the findings showed a significant difference on the level of prejudice between two groups when the groups were categorized as low and high on what the ITT identifies as proximal variables, namely perceived realistic threats, perceived symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety and negative stereotyping. Those who perceived high realistic threats, symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety and negative stereotyping were more prejudiced towards the out-group than those who were low on these variables. The results also found a significant difference on the level of prejudice between two groups when the groups were categorized as low and high on what the ITT identifies as distal variables, namely, negative contact, intergroup conflict, in-group identification and perceived status differences. Those who were high on in-group identification, perceived intergroup conflict and perceived status differences turned out to be more prejudiced towards the out-group than those who were low on these variables. However, the study failed to find a significant difference on the level of prejudice between groups who were low and high on the negative contact measure. These findings also showed that those who were high on intergroup contact and closeness were less prejudiced towards the out-group than those who scored low on the same variables.

### Findings Concerning the Hypotheses

All of the hypotheses of the study were supported, except for the negative contact measure. As predicted by the first hypothesis, the more people perceived realistic threats and symbolic threats, the greater the intergroup anxiety and negative stereotyping, the higher was prejudice towards the out-group.

Previous studies supported the hypothesis for all four types of threats (realistic, symbolic, intergroup anxiety and stereotyping) and prejudice. Realistic threats were found to be predicting prejudice in both experimental and correlational studies (Esses, Jackson, & Armstrong, 1998; Stephan, Diaz-Loving, & Duran, 2000; Stephan, Ybarra, & Bachman, 1999; Stephan, Ybarra, Martinez, Schwarld, & Turk-kapsa, 1998).

As predicted by the second hypothesis, the more perceived status difference and conflict (historical or current) the individuals perceive between groups and the stronger the individuals identify with their group, the higher was prejudice towards the out-group. However the study failed to find a relationship between negative contact and prejudice. For the in-group identification variable, previous research found that the people who are strongly identified with their in-group perceive the out-group as a threat (Duran, Renfro, Stephan, & Clason, 2001; as cited in Corenblum, & Stephan, 2001). For the intergroup conflict variable previous research found that the more violent and conflictual the history or the present condition is perceived by a group, the more threatened that group was towards the out-group (Stephan, Boniecki, Ybarra, Bettencourt, Ervin, Jackson, McNatt, & Renfro, 2001; as cited in Corenblum, & Stephan, 2001).

The present study failed to find a relationship between negative intergroup contact and prejudice. Concerning the sample, namely the female university students with and without headcover, and the context, namely the Turkish university setting, it might be argued that negative intergroup contact is not sufficient by itself to lead to prejudice. Stephan et al. (2002) found that the most powerful distal variable was negative contact but only when it was a distal variable. In other words, the relation between negative contact and prejudice is powerful only when it is mediated by one or more types of threats. A further study might be conducted to examine the relationship between negative contact and prejudice, using a mediational model.

As predicted by the third and last hypothesis, the more various and frequent intergroup contact the individuals have and the closer the intergroup contact was, the lower was prejudice against the out-group. The meta-analytic study by Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) revealed that intergroup contact reduces prejudice towards the out-group. The study included 713 independent samples from 515 studies. In their study on heterosexuals' attitudes towards gay men and lesbians Herek and Capitanio (1996) found that heterosexuals who had interpersonal contact with gay men and lesbians reported more favorable attitudes towards them compared to heterosexuals who did not experience any intergroup contact with gay people. But what was interesting in the study was that the quantity of the relationship was less important than the quality. In other words, the attitudes of those heterosexuals who experienced a close, intimate relationship with gay people turned out to be more favorable than those who had a superficial relationship.

## Findings Regarding Comparisons between Students with and without Headcover

The group without headcover was found to be more prejudiced towards the out-group than the group with headcover. The explanation for this finding can be found in previous studies that applied the ITT (Corenblum & Stephan, 2001; Stephan, Boniecki, Ybarra, Bettencourt, Ervin, Jackson, McNatt, & Renfro, 2002). The majority might be more prejudiced towards the minority than vice versa, because with the demands of the minority for equality, the majority might fear that they will get less of the scarce resources in society and such fears can only heighten the prejudicial attitudes of the majority toward the minority. On the other hand, the minority, having already lost so much, has less to lose and hence feel less threatened by and prejudiced towards the majority.

Between-group differences revealed that the students without headcover had more intergroup anxiety and stereotyped the outgroup more negatively than the group with headcover. As the ITT suggests, intergroup anxiety is a type of threat perceived when interacting with or being around out-group members. Hence, it is expected that under more or less equal conditions, individuals would feel less anxious when interacting with the out-group. In contrast, the majority would feel that their superiority is diminished by these equal conditions, hence feel more threatened by the out-group, i.e., the minority.

The group without headcover perceived more intergroup conflict. The majority group tends to see intergroup relations as conflictual because minority

groups can be pressing for their rights (Bobo, 1999). Likewise in the Turkish university setting where attending classes with headcover has been problematic, the female university students with headcover continue to press for their right to have access to education and attend classes wearing their headcover.

The group without headcover also reported more perceived status differences than the group with headcover. Nelson (2009) points out that members of high social status groups are more oriented to be socially dominant. In other words, they prefer inequality among social groups than are members of low social status groups. Therefore, the high scores obtained by the group without headcover might be due to the desire to maintain status differences between their in-group and the out-group (with headcover).

#### Limitations of the Study

The present study examined the relationship between prejudice and several predictor variables adopted from the Integrated Threat Theory (ITT; Stephan & Stephan, 1993) between female university students with and without headcover. Most of the hypotheses were supported by the study; however, the study was correlational. A study which is based on an experimental or at least a quasi-experimental design could be more useful for a better understanding of the relationship between all the predictor variables and prejudice, in other words to posit a causality between them, if there is any.

Another limitation of the study is the size of the sample of the students with a headcover. First of all, it should be clarified that the ratio of the students with a headcover to the ones without a headcover is very small in a university context. The students without a headcover outnumber the ones with a headcover even in universities where female students have the freedom to come to school wearing a headcover.

A further limitation of the study is that not every university in Turkey gives their students the freedom to attend classes wearing a headcover; hence the research of the present study had to be limited to two universities.

### Conclusion

The present study examined the relationship between prejudice and several predictor variables adopted from the Integrated Threat Theory (ITT; Stephan & Stephan, 1993) between female university students with and without headcover. The results of the study supported all the predictions except for the relationship between negative contact and prejudice. Those who perceived lower realistic and symbolic threats, who felt lower intergroup anxiety and who negatively stereotyped the out-group less were less prejudiced towards the out-group than those who scored high on these variables. By the same token, those who scored low on in-group identification, who perceived less intergroup conflict and less status difference were less prejudiced towards the out-group than those who scored high on these variables. The study failed to find a significant relationship between

negative intergroup contact and prejudice. Finally, the findings of the study revealed that those who had more intergroup contact and more closeness with members of the out-group were less prejudiced towards the out-group than those who scored lower on these variables.

## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

### Questionnaires for the Group without Headcover



7. Too much money per student is spent on education for the group which students with headcover belong to.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

8. The tax system favors the group which students with headcover belong to.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

9. Many companies hire less qualified people from the group which students with headcover belong to over more qualified people from the group which students without headcover belong to.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

10. The group which students with headcover belong to have more political power than it deserves in this country.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

11. Public service agencies favor the group which students with headcover belong to over the group which students without headcover belong to.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

12. The legal system is more lenient on the group which students with headcover belong to than on the group which students without headcover belong to.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

## Symbolic Threats

Use the scale printed below each item to indicate your agreement with each of the following statements concerning the group to which students with headcover belong to.

1. The group which students with headcover belong to and the group which students without headcover belong to have very different values.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

2. The group which students with headcover belong to has no right to think it has better values than the group which students without headcover belong to.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

3. The group which students with headcover belong to wants its rights to be put ahead of the rights of the group which students without headcover belong to.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

4. The group which students with headcover belong to does not understand the way the group which students without headcover belong to views the world.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

5. The group which students with headcover belong to does not value the rights granted by the Constitution (life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness) as much as the group which students without headcover belong to.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

6. The group which students with headcover belong to and the group which students without headcover belong to have different family values.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree



## Intergroup Anxiety

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

1. 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all nervous						Extremely nervous
2. 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all friendly						Extremely friendly
3. 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all uncertain						Extremely uncertain
4. 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all comfortable						Extremely comfortable
5. 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all worried						Extremely worried
6. 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all trusting						Extremely trusting
7. 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all threatened						Extremely threatened
8. 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all confident						Extremely confident
9. 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all awkward						Extremely awkward
10. 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all safe						Extremely safe

11. 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all anxious						Extremely anxious
12. 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all at ease						Extremely at ease

## Negative Stereotype Index

Please indicate, using the scale below each trait, to what extent you would use the traits to define the group which students with headcover belong to.

- |                         |            |   |   |   |   |   |            |
|-------------------------|------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------|
| 1. Insidious            | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |
| 2. Hard-working         | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |
| 3. Selfish (egotistic)  | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |
| 4. Aggressive           | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |
| 5. Fraudulent           | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |
| 6. Aloof                | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |
| 7. Prejudiced (Biased)  | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |
| 8. Religiously deviant  | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |
| 9. Dirty (Filthy)       | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |
| 10. Logical-Rationalist | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |

11. Superstitious							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
12. Bold (Brave)							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
13. Rude							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
14. Coward							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
15. Democratic							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
16. Clean							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
17. Charitable							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
18. Honest							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
19. Amiable (Congenial)							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
20. Lazy							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
21. Kind-Polite							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely

22. Pacifistic							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
23. Trustworthy							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
24. Tolerant							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely

## Negative Intergroup Contact

Experiences with students with headcover.. Please indicate how frequently you have experienced the following types of treatment from the group which students with headcover belong to, in general.

1. Been treated as inferior.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Never						Very frequently	
2. Been insulted.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Never						Very frequently	
3. Been ridiculed.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Never						Very frequently	
4. Been discriminated against.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Never						Very frequently	
5. Been rejected.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Never						Very frequently	
6. Been harassed.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Never						Very frequently	
7. Been put down.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Never						Very frequently	
8. Been taken advantage of.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Never						Very frequently	
9. Been unfairly criticized.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Never						Very frequently	
10. Been verbally abused.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Never						Very frequently	

11. Been threatened with harm.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Never							Very frequently
12. Been made to feel unwanted.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Never							Very frequently
13. Been physically harmed.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Never							Very frequently
14. Been intimidated.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Never							Very frequently

### Identification with the In-group

When answering the questions below, please think about your friends without headcover and indicate the degree to which you agree to each statement.

1. My friends without headcover are very important for me.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

2. I identify with my friends without headcover.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

3. I feel close to my friends without headcover.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

4. I am glad that I have my friends without headcover.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

5. I see myself as a member of the group of my friends without headcover.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

6. My friends without headcover have the same interests as I have.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

7. My life appreciation is in the same line as my friends without headcover.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

8. I see myself similar to my friends without headcover.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree





### Perceived Status Differences

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with the following statements.

1. There is a great difference between the status of the group which students with headcover belong to and the group which students without headcover belong to, in this society.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

2. In Turkey, the group students without headcover belong to has more political power than the group students with headcover belong to.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

3. In this society the group which students without headcover belong to is much better off economically than the group which students with headcover belong to.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

4. The differences in status, power, and wealth between the group which students with headcover belong to and the group which students without headcover belong to are decreasing.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

5. The differences in status, power, and wealth between the group which students without headcover belong to and the group which students with headcover belong to should not exist.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

### Intergroup Contact Measure

The following are questions concerning your and your friends (without headcover)' relationships with students with headcover.

1. With how many students with headcover did you have two or more conversations, in the last 6 months?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
None	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	More than 20

2. About how many students with headcover do you know?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
None	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	More than 20

3. In your student life, how much contact do you have with students with headcover?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
None						A great deal

4. To what extent do you avoid contact with students with headcover?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
None at all						Very much

5. About how many of your friends are students with headcover?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most						None

6. About how many of your friends without headcover do you think have friends who are students with headcover?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most						None

7. To what extent do you think students with headcover are similar or dissimilar to each other? Are they pretty much all alike or are there big differences among them?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
All completely different						All pretty much alike

8. Do you think that students with headcover share similar attitudes with one another?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

9. Have you ever considered covering your head?  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 Never All the time

SCI

Think about your closest friend among students with headcover. The following questions are about your relationship with that person and she will be mentioned as X in. Please answer these questions with X in mind.

Subjective Closeness Index (SCI; Berscheid, Snyder & Omoto, 1989)

Relative to all your other relationships, how would you characterize your relationship with this person?  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 Not at all close Extremely close

Relative to what you know about other people's close relationships, how would you characterize your relationship with this person?  
 1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
 Not at all close Extremely close

## Prejudice towards Out-groups

For each of the items listed, indicate, what your attitudes are towards the group which students with headcover belong to, by using the scale below.

My attitude towards the group which students with headcover belong to:

1. Hostility

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Extremely

2. Admiration

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Extremely

3. Dislike

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Extremely

4. Acceptance

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Extremely

5. Superiority (towards them)

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Extremely

6. Affection

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Extremely

7. Contempt

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Extremely

8. Approval

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Extremely

9. Hatred

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Extremely

10. Sympathy							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Extremely
11. Rejection (of them)							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Extremely
12. Warmth							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Extremely



## APPENDIX B

### Başı açık Grup için Sorular

## Gerçekçi Tehditler

Aşağıda, her maddenin altında verilmiş olan ölçeği kullanarak başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimle ilgili ifadelerle ne kadar katıldığınızı belirtin.

1. Başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim bu ülkede çok fazla iktidar ve sorumluluk mevkiine sahip.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2. Başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim Türk siyasetine olması gerektiğinden daha fazla hakim.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3. Başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim yetkili konumda olduğunda, işe alım kararları verirken başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesime karşı ayrımcılık yapıyor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

4. Başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimin faydalandığı eğitim programlarına çok fazla para harcıyor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

5. Başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimin bu ülkede hakettiğinden daha fazla ekonomik gücü var.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

6. Başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim sağlık ve çocuk bakımına harcanan paradan fazlasıyla pay alıyor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

7. Başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimin eğitimi için öğrenci başına haddinden fazla para harcıyor.
- |                         |   |   |   |   |   |                        |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------|
| 1                       | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7                      |
| Kesinlikle katılmıyorum |   |   |   |   |   | Kesinlikle katılıyorum |
8. Vergi sistemi başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimi kayırıyor.
- |                         |   |   |   |   |   |                        |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------|
| 1                       | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7                      |
| Kesinlikle katılmıyorum |   |   |   |   |   | Kesinlikle katılıyorum |
9. Birçok şirket işe alımlarda başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimden gelen ve daha az kalifiye olan elemanları başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimden gelen ve daha kalifiye kişilere tercih ediyor.
- |                         |   |   |   |   |   |                        |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------|
| 1                       | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7                      |
| Kesinlikle katılmıyorum |   |   |   |   |   | Kesinlikle katılıyorum |
10. Başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim, bu ülkede hak ettiğinden daha fazla siyasi güce sahip.
- |                         |   |   |   |   |   |                        |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------|
| 1                       | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7                      |
| Kesinlikle katılmıyorum |   |   |   |   |   | Kesinlikle katılıyorum |
11. Kamu hizmeti veren kuruluşlar başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimi başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim karşısında kayırıyor.
- |                         |   |   |   |   |   |                        |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------|
| 1                       | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7                      |
| Kesinlikle katılmıyorum |   |   |   |   |   | Kesinlikle katılıyorum |
12. Yasal sistem başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesime karşı, başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesime olduğundan çok daha hoşgörülü.
- |                         |   |   |   |   |   |                        |
|-------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------------------|
| 1                       | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7                      |
| Kesinlikle katılmıyorum |   |   |   |   |   | Kesinlikle katılıyorum |

## Sembolik Tehditler

Aşağıda, her maddenin altında verilmiş olan ölçeği kullanarak başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimle ilgili ifadelerle ne kadar katıldığınızı belirtin.

1. Başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim ve başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim birbirinden çok farklı değerlere sahip.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2. Başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimin, başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesiminkilerden daha iyi değerleri olduğunu düşünmeye hakkı yok.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3. Başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim, kendi haklarının başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimin haklarından öncelikli olmasını istiyor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

4. Başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim, başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimin dünya görüşlerini anlamıyor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

5. Başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim, Anayasa tarafından tanınan haklara (yaşam, özgürlük, mutluluğun temini vs) başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim kadar değer vermiyor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

6. Başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimle başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimin farklı aile değerleri vardır.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum



## Gruplar arası Endişe

Aşağıda yazılı her madde için başı örtülü öğrencilerle etkileşim içindeyken nasıl hissettiğinizi belirtin.

1. Gergin							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
2. Arkadaşça							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
3. Kararsız							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
4. Rahat							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
5. Endişeli							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
6. Güven duyan							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
7. Tehlikede							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
8. Kendinden emin							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
9. Tuhaf							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
10. Güvende (emniyette)							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece

11. Kaygılı							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
12. Huzurlu							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece

## Olumsuz Kalıp Yargı Dizini

Lütfen başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimi tanımlarken aşağıdaki sıfatların her birini ne dereceye kadar kullanacağınızı belirtin.

1. Sinsi							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
2. Çalışkan							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
3. Bencil (egoist)							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
4. Saldırgan							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
5. Hilekâr							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
6. Soğuk							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
7. Ön yargılı							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
8. Sapık inançlı							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
9. Pis							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
10. Mantıklı düşünen-Akılcı							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok

11. Hurafeci							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
12. Cesur							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
13. Kaba							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
14. Korkak							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
15. Demokrat							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
16. Temiz							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
17. Yardımsever							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
18. Dürüst							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
19. Cana yakın (sıcak)							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
20. Tembel							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
21. Nazik-Kibar							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok

22. Barışçı							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
23. Mert							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
24. Hoşgörülü							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok

## Gruplar arası Olumsuz Temas

Aşağıdaki davranışları başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimden, genel olarak hangi sıklıkla görüyorsunuz? Lütfen yanıtlarınızı her ifadenin altındaki ölçeği kullanarak verin.

1. Aşağılandım.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

2. Hakarete uğradım.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

3. Benimle dalga geçildi.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

4. Ayrımcılığa uğradım.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

5. Dışlandım.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

6. Tacize uğradım (rahatsız edildim).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

7. Küçük düşürüldüm.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

8. İstismar edildim.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

9. İnsafsızca eleştirildim.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

10. Sözlü tacize uğradım.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

11. Zarar vermekle tehdit edildim.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

12. İstenmediğimi hissettirildim.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

13. Fiziksel zarara uğradım.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

14. Bana göz dağı verdiler.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

İç Grupla Özdeşleşme

Aşağıdaki soruları yanıtlarken lütfen başı açık arkadaşlarınızı düşünüp aşağıdaki ifadelere ne derece katılıp katılmadığınızı belirtin.

1. (Başı açık) arkadaşlarım benim için çok önemlidir.

1            2            3            4            5            6            7  
Kesinlikle            Kesinlikle  
katılmıyorum            katılıyorum

2. (Başı açık) arkadaşlarımla özdeşleşirim.

1            2            3            4            5            6            7  
Kesinlikle            Kesinlikle  
katılmıyorum            katılıyorum

3. Kendimi (başı açık) arkadaşlarıma yakın hissederim.

1            2            3            4            5            6            7  
Kesinlikle            Kesinlikle  
katılmıyorum            katılıyorum

4. (Başı açık) arkadaşlarıma sahip olduğum için mutluyum.

1            2            3            4            5            6            7  
Kesinlikle            Kesinlikle  
katılmıyorum            katılıyorum

5. Kendimi (başı açık) arkadaş grubumun bir üyesi olarak görüyorum.

1            2            3            4            5            6            7  
Kesinlikle            Kesinlikle  
katılmıyorum            katılıyorum

6. (Başı açık) arkadaşlarım benimle aynı ilgilere sahiptir.

1            2            3            4            5            6            7  
Kesinlikle            Kesinlikle  
katılmıyorum            katılıyorum

7. Yaşam değerlerim (başı açık) arkadaşlarımla aynı doğrultudadır.

1            2            3            4            5            6            7  
Kesinlikle            Kesinlikle  
katılmıyorum            katılıyorum

8. Kendimi (başı açık) arkadaşlarıma benzer görüyorum.

1            2            3            4            5            6            7  
Kesinlikle            Kesinlikle  
katılmıyorum            katılıyorum

9. (Başı açık) arkadaşlarımla aynı sorunları paylaşıyorum.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6                      7  
Kesinlikle                      Kesinlikle  
katılmıyorum                      katılıyorum

10. (Başı açık) arkadaşlarım beni olduğum gibi kabul eder.

1                      2                      3                      4                      5                      6                      7  
Kesinlikle                      Kesinlikle  
katılmıyorum                      katılıyorum





## Gruplar arası İlişki Ölçeği

Aşağıda kendinizin ve başı açık arkadaşlarınızın başı örtülü üniversite öğrencileriyle ilişkilerine dair sorular bulacaksınız.

1. Geçtiğimiz 6 ay içinde kaç tane başı örtülü öğrenciyle iki veya daha fazla konuşmanız oldu?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	20'den fazla

2. Başı örtülü kaç öğrenci tanıyorsunuz?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	20'den fazla

3. Öğrencilik hayatınızda başı örtülü öğrencilerle ne kadar ilişkiniz oluyor?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok fazla

4. Başı örtülü öğrencilerle ilişkiye girmekten ne derece kaçınıyorsunuz?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok fazla

5. Arkadaşlarınızın ne kadarı başı örtülü?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Çoğu			Bir kısmı			Hiçbiri

6. Başı açık arkadaşlarınızdan kaç tanesinin başı örtülü öğrencilerle arkadaş olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Çoğu						Hiçbiri

7. Başı örtülü öğrenciler ne dereceye kadar birbirlerinin aynısı veya birbirlerinden farklı? Hemen hemen benzer mi yoksa aralarında büyük farklılıklar var mı?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hepsi farklı						Hepsi benzer

8. Başı örtülü öğrencilerin birbirleriyle benzer tutuma sahip olduklarını düşünüyor musunuz?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle hayır						Kesinlikle evet

9. Hiç başınızı kapamayı düşündünüz mü?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Asla						Her zaman

## SCI

Bu bölümdeki sorular başı örtülü öğrenciler arasından en yakın arkadaşınızla olan ilişkinize dairdir. Sorularda arkadaşınızdan X diye bahsedilecektir. Lütfen tüm soruları bu kişiyi yanıtlayarak düşünün.

Öznel yakınlık dizini (SCI; Berscheid, Snyder & Omoto, 1989)

Diğer tüm ilişkilerinizle karşılaştırıldığında X ile olan ilişkinizi nasıl değerlendirirsiniz?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç yakın değil Son derece yakın

Diğer insanların ilişkilerine dair bildiklerinizle karşılaştırıldığında X ile olan ilişkinizi nasıl tanımlarsınız?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç yakın değil Son derece yakın



10. Anlayış

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Aşırı derecede

11. Dışlama (başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimi)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Aşırı derecede

12. Sıcaklık

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Aşırı derecede



## APPENDIX C

### Questionnaires for the Group with Headcover









## Intergroup Anxiety

For each of the items listed below, indicate how you feel when interacting with students without headcover.

1. 1 Not at all nervous	2	3	4	5	6	7 Extremely nervous
2. 1 Not at all friendly	2	3	4	5	6	7 Extremely friendly
3. 1 Not at all uncertain	2	3	4	5	6	7 Extremely uncertain
4. 1 Not at all comfortable	2	3	4	5	6	7 Extremely comfortable
5. 1 Not at all worried	2	3	4	5	6	7 Extremely worried
6. 1 Not at all trusting	2	3	4	5	6	7 Extremely trusting
7. 1 Not at all threatened	2	3	4	5	6	7 Extremely threatened
8. 1 Not at all confident	2	3	4	5	6	7 Extremely confident
9. 1 Not at all awkward	2	3	4	5	6	7 Extremely awkward
10. 1 Not at all safe	2	3	4	5	6	7 Extremely safe

11. 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all anxious						Extremely anxious
12. 1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all at ease						Extremely at ease

## Negative Stereotype Index

Please indicate, using the scale below each trait, to what extent you would use the traits to define the group which students without headcover belong to.

- |                         |            |   |   |   |   |   |            |
|-------------------------|------------|---|---|---|---|---|------------|
| 1. Insidious            | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |
| 2. Hard-working         | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |
| 3. Selfish (egotistic)  | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |
| 4. Aggressive           | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |
| 5. Fraudulent           | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |
| 6. Aloof                | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |
| 7. Prejudiced (Biased)  | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |
| 8. Religiously deviant  | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |
| 9. Dirty (Filthy)       | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |
| 10. Logical-Rationalist | 1          | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7          |
|                         | Not at all |   |   |   |   |   | Definitely |

11. Superstitious							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
12. Bold (Brave)							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
13. Rude							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
14. Coward							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
15. Democratic							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
16. Clean							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
17. Charitable							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
18. Honest							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
19. Amiable (Congenial)							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
20. Lazy							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
21. Kind-Polite							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely

22. Pacifistic							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
23. Trustworthy							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely
24. Tolerant							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Definitely

## Negative Intergroup Contact

Experiences with students without headcover.. Please indicate how frequently you have experienced the following types of treatment from the group which students without headcover belong to, in general.

1. Been treated as inferior.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Never							Very frequently
2. Been insulted.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Never							Very frequently
3. Been ridiculed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Never							Very frequently
4. Been discriminated against.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Never							Very frequently
5. Been rejected.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Never							Very frequently
6. Been harassed.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Never							Very frequently
7. Been put down.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Never							Very frequently
8. Been taken advantage of.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Never							Very frequently
9. Been unfairly criticized.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Never							Very frequently
10. Been verbally abused.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Never							Very frequently

11. Been threatened with harm.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Never							Very frequently
12. Been made to feel unwanted.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Never							Very frequently
13. Been physically harmed.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Never							Very frequently
14. Been intimidated.							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Never							Very frequently

### Identification with the In-group

When answering the questions below, please think about your friends with headcover and indicate the degree to which you agree to each statement.

1. My friends with headcover are very important for me.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

2. I identify with my friends with headcover.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

3. I feel close to my friends with headcover.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

4. I am glad that I have my friends with headcover.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

5. I see myself as a member of the group of my friends with headcover.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

6. My friends with headcover have the same interests as I have.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

7. My life appreciation is in the same line as my friends with headcover.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

8. I see myself similar to my friends with headcover.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree

9. I have the same problems as my friends with headcover.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly						Strongly
disagree						agree

10. My friends with headcover accept me as I am.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly						Strongly
disagree						agree





### Intergroup Contact Measure

The following are questions concerning your and your friends (with headcover)' relationships with students without headcover.

1. With how many students without headcover did you have two or more conversations, in the last 6 months?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
None	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	More than 20

2. About how many students without headcover do you know?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
None	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	More than 20

3. In your student life, how much contact do you have with students without headcover?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
None						A great deal

4. To what extent do you avoid contact without students with headcover?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
None at all						Very much

5. About how many of your friends are students without headcover?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most						None

6. About how many of your friends with headcover do you think have friends who are students without headcover?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Most						None

7. To what extent do you think students without headcover are similar or dissimilar to each other? Are they pretty much all alike or are there big differences among them?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
All completely different						All pretty much alike

8. Do you think that students without headcover share similar attitudes with one another?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Strongly disagree						Strongly agree



## Prejudice towards Out-groups

For each of the items listed, indicate, what your attitudes are towards the group which students without headcover belong to, by using the scale below.

My attitude towards the group which students without headcover belong to:

- |                               |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |
|-------------------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|-----------|
| 1. Hostility                  |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |
| 1                             | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |           |
| Not at all                    |   |   |   |   |   |   | Extremely |
| 2. Admiration                 |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |
| 1                             | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |           |
| Not at all                    |   |   |   |   |   |   | Extremely |
| 3. Dislike                    |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |
| 1                             | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |           |
| Not at all                    |   |   |   |   |   |   | Extremely |
| 4. Acceptance                 |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |
| 1                             | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |           |
| Not at all                    |   |   |   |   |   |   | Extremely |
| 5. Superiority (towards them) |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |
| 1                             | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |           |
| Not at all                    |   |   |   |   |   |   | Extremely |
| 6. Affection                  |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |
| 1                             | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |           |
| Not at all                    |   |   |   |   |   |   | Extremely |
| 7. Contempt                   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |
| 1                             | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |           |
| Not at all                    |   |   |   |   |   |   | Extremely |
| 8. Approval                   |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |
| 1                             | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |           |
| Not at all                    |   |   |   |   |   |   | Extremely |
| 9. Hatred                     |   |   |   |   |   |   |           |
| 1                             | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |           |
| Not at all                    |   |   |   |   |   |   | Extremely |

10. Sympathy							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Extremely
11. Rejection (of them)							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Extremely
12. Warmth							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Not at all							Extremely



## APPENDIX B

### Başı örtülü Grup için Sorular

## Gerçekçi Tehditler

Aşağıda, her maddenin altında verilmiş olan ölçeği kullanarak başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimle ilgili ifadelerle ne kadar katıldığınızı belirtin.

1. Başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim bu ülkede çok fazla iktidar ve sorumluluk mevkiine sahip.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2. Başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim Türk siyasetine olması gerektiğinden daha fazla hakim.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3. Başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim yetkili konumda olduğunda, işe alım kararları verirken başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesime karşı ayrımcılık yapıyor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

4. Başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimin faydalandığı eğitim programlarına çok fazla para harcanıyor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

5. Başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimin bu ülkede hakettiğinden daha fazla ekonomik gücü var.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

6. Başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim sağlık ve çocuk bakımına harcanan paradan fazlasıyla pay alıyor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum



## Sembolik Tehditler

Aşağıda, her maddenin altında verilmiş olan ölçeği kullanarak başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimle ilgili ifadelerle ne kadar katıldığınızı belirtin.

1. Başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim ve başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim birbirinden çok farklı değerlere sahip.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

2. Başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimin, başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesiminkilerden daha iyi değerleri olduğunu düşünmeye hakkı yok.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

3. Başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim, kendi haklarının başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimin haklarından öncelikli olmasını istiyor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

4. Başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim, başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimin dünya görüşlerini anlamıyor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

5. Başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim, Anayasa tarafından tanınan haklara (yaşam, özgürlük, mutluluğun temini vs) başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesim kadar değer vermiyor.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum

6. Başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimle başı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimin farklı aile değerleri vardır.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle katılmıyorum						Kesinlikle katılıyorum



## Gruplar arası Endişe

Aşağıda yazılı her madde için başı açık öğrencilerle etkileşim içindeyken nasıl hissettiğinizi belirtin.

1. Gergin							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
2. Arkadaşça							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
3. Kararsız							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
4. Rahat							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
5. Endişeli							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
6. Güven duyan							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
7. Tehlikede							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
8. Kendinden emin							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
9. Tuhaf							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
10. Güvende (emniyette)							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece

11. Kaygılı							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece
12. Huzurlu							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç değil							Son derece

## Olumsuz Kalıp Yargı Dizini

Lütfen başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimi tanımlarken aşağıdaki sıfatların her birini ne dereceye kadar kullanacağınızı belirtin.

1. Sinsi							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
2. Çalışkan							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
3. Bencil (egoist)							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
4. Saldırgan							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
5. Hilekâr							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
6. Soğuk							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
7. Ön yargılı							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
8. Sapık inançlı							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
9. Pis							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
10. Mantıklı düşünen-Akılcı							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok

11. Hurafeci							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
12. Cesur							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
13. Kaba							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
14. Korkak							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
15. Demokrat							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
16. Temiz							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
17. Yardımsever							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
18. Dürüst							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
19. Cana yakın (sıcak)							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
20. Tembel							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok
21. Nazik-Kibar							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Çok

22. Barışçı							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç						Çok	
23. Mert							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç						Çok	
24. Hoşgörülü							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç						Çok	

## Gruplar arası Olumsuz Temas

Aşağıdaki davranışları başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimden, genel olarak hangi sıklıkla görüyorsunuz? Lütfen yanıtlarınızı her ifadenin altındaki ölçeği kullanarak verin.

1. Aşağılandım.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

2. Hakarete uğradım.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

3. Benimle dalga geçildi.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

4. Ayrımcılığa uğradım.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

5. Dışlandım.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

6. Tacize uğradım (rahatsız edildim).

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

7. Küçük düşürüldüm.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

8. İstismar edildim.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

9. İnsafsızca eleştirildim.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

10. Sözlü tacize uğradım.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

11. Zarar vermekle tehdit edildim.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

12. İstenmediğimi hissettirildim.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

13. Fiziksel zarara uğradım.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

14. Bana göz dağı verdiler.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Çok sık

İç grupla Özdeşleşme



1                    2                    3                    4                    5                    6                    7  
Kesinlikle                    Kesinlikle  
katılmıyorum                    katılıyorum

10. (Başı örtülü) arkadaşlarım beni olduğum gibi kabul eder.  
1                    2                    3                    4                    5                    6                    7  
Kesinlikle                    Kesinlikle  
katılmıyorum                    katılıyorum

## Algılanan Gruplar arası Çatışma

Aşağıdaki ifadelere ne dereceye kadar katılıp katılmadığınızı belirtin.

1. Başlı açık ve başlı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimlerin birbiriyle ilişkisi her zaman çatışmayla tanımlanmıştır.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle						Kesinlikle
katılmıyorum						katılıyorum

2. Başlı açık ve başlı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimlerin bu ülkede sorunlu bir geçmişi vardır.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle						Kesinlikle
katılmıyorum						katılıyorum

3. Her zaman görünür olmasa da bu ülkede başlı açık ve başlı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimler arasında süregelen bir çatışma vardır.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle						Kesinlikle
katılmıyorum						katılıyorum

4. Başlı açık ve başlı örtülü öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimler bu ülkede hiçbir zaman geçinememiştir.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle						Kesinlikle
katılmıyorum						katılıyorum



## Gruplar arası İlişki Ölçeği

Aşağıda kendinizin ve başı örtülü arkadaşlarınızın başı açık üniversite öğrencileriyle ilişkilerine dair sorular bulacaksınız.

1. Geçtiğimiz 6 ay içinde kaç tane başı açık öğrenciyle iki veya daha fazla konuşmanız oldu?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	20'den fazla

2. Başı açık kaç öğrenci tanıyorsunuz?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç	1-2	3-5	6-10	11-15	16-20	20'den fazla

3. Öğrencilik hayatınızda başı açık öğrencilerle ne kadar ilişkiniz oluyor?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok fazla

4. Başı açık öğrencilerle ilişkiye girmekten ne derece kaçınıyorsunuz?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hiç						Çok fazla

5. Arkadaşlarınızın ne kadarı başı açık?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Çoğu			Bir kısmı			Hiçbiri

6. Başı örtülü arkadaşlarınızdan kaç tanesinin başı açık öğrencilerle arkadaş olduğunu düşünüyorsunuz?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Çoğu						Hiçbiri

7. Başı açık öğrenciler ne dereceye kadar birbirlerinin aynısı veya birbirlerinden farklı? Hemen hemen benzer mi yoksa aralarında büyük farklılıklar var mı?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Hepsi farklı						Hepsi benzer

8. Başı açık öğrencilerin birbirleriyle benzer tutuma sahip olduklarını düşünüyor musunuz?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Kesinlikle hayır						Kesinlikle evet

9. Hiç başınızı açmayı düşündünüz mü?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Asla						Her zaman

## SCI

Bu bölümdeki sorular başı açık öğrenciler arasından en yakın arkadaşınızla olan ilişkinize dairdir. Sorularda arkadaşınızdan X diye bahsedilecektir. Lütfen tüm soruları bu kişiyi yanıtlayarak düşünün.

Öznel yakınlık dizini (SCI; Berscheid, Snyder & Omoto, 1989)

Diğer tüm ilişkilerinizle karşılaştırıldığında X ile olan ilişkinizi nasıl değerlendirirsiniz?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç yakın değil Son derece yakın

Diğer insanların ilişkilerine dair bildiklerinizle karşılaştırıldığında X ile olan ilişkinizi nasıl tanımlarsınız?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç yakın değil Son derece yakın

## Dış Gruplara karşı Önyargı

Aşağıda sıralanan tüm maddelerle ilgili olarak, maddelerin altındaki ölçekten yararlanarak başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimle ilgili tutumunuzu belirtin.

Başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesime karşı tutumum şöyledir:

### 1. Düşmanlık

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Aşırı derecede

### 2. Hayranlık

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Aşırı derecede

### 3. Antipati

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Aşırı derecede

### 4. Kabul etme

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Aşırı derecede

### 5. Üstünlük (başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesime karşı)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Aşırı derecede

### 6. Sevgi

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Aşırı derecede

### 7. Küçümseme

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Aşırı derecede

### 8. Tasvip etme (Onaylama)

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Aşırı derecede

### 9. Nefret

1 2 3 4 5 6 7  
Hiç Aşırı derecede

10. Anlayış							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Aşırı derecede
11. Dışlama (başı açık öğrencilerin dahil olduğu kesimi)							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Aşırı derecede
12. Sıcaklık							
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
Hiç							Aşırı derecede



## REFERENCES

- Ali, S. (2005). Why here, why now? Young Muslim women wearing hijab. *The Muslim World*, 95, 515-530.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley
- Bettencourt, B. A., Dorr, N., Charlton, K., & Hume, D. L. (2001). Status differences and in-group bias: A meta-analytic examination of the effects of status liability, status legitimacy, and group permeability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 520-542.
- Bobo, L. D. (1999). Prejudice as group position: Microfoundations of a sociological approach to racism and race relations. *Journal of Social Issues*, 55, 445-472.
- Brenner, S. (1996). Reconstructing self and society: Javanese Muslim women and “the veil”. *American Ethnologist*, 23, 673-697.
- Brewer, M. B., & Brown, R. J. (1998). Intergroup relations. In D. Gilbert, S. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology*, (pp.554-594). NY: McGraw Hill.
- Campbell, D. T. (1965). Ethnocentric and other altruistic motives. In D. Levine (Ed.), *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation* (pp. 283-311). Lincoln, NE; University of Nebraska Press.
- Cohen, G. L., & Garcia, J. (2005). “I am us”: negative stereotypes as collective threats. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 89, 566-582.
- Corenblum, B., & Stephan, W. G. (2001). White fears and native apprehensions: An integrated threat theory approach to intergroup attitudes. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 33, 251-268.
- Cottrell, C. A., & Neuberg, S. L. (2005). Different emotional reactions to different groups: A sociofunctional threat-based approach to “prejudice”. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 770-789.
- Curşeu, P. L., Stoop, R., & Schalk, R. (2006). Prejudice toward immigrant workers among Dutch employees: Integrated threat theory revisited. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37, 125-140.
- El Guindi, F. (2005). Gendered resistance, feminist veiling, Islamic feminism. *Ahfad Journal*, 22, 53-78.

- Esses, V.M., Jackson, L.M., & Armstrong, T.L. (1998). Intergroup competition and attitudes toward immigrants and immigration: An experimental model of intergroup conflict. *Journal of Social Issues, 54*, 699-724.
- Giddens, A. (2004). Beneath the hijab: A woman. *New Perspectives Quarterly, 21*, 9-11.
- Grant, P. R. (1992). Ethnocentrism between groups of unequal power in response to perceived threat to social identity and valued resources. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 24*, 348-370.
- Herek, G. M., & Capitano, J. P. (1996). "Some of my best friends": Intergroup contact, concealable stigma, and heterosexuals' attitudes toward gay men and lesbians. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 22*, 412-424.
- Hessini, L. (1994). Wearing the Hijab in Contemporary Morocco: Choice and Identity. In F. M. Göçek & S. Balaghi (Eds.), *Reconstructing Gender in the Middle East: Tradition, Identity, and Power*, (pp.40-56). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hong, Y., Coleman, J., Chan, G., Wong, R. Y. M., Chiu, C., Hansen, I. G., Lee, S., Tong, Y. & Fu, H. (2004). Predicting intergroup bias: the interactive effects of implicit theory and social identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*, 1035-1047.
- 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.
- Jackson, J. W. (2002). Group identity and prejudice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 32*, 908-933.
- Khan, Z. (2007). Potential terrorists, oil suppliers, harems, and worshippers of another god: Media coverage of Muslims, perceived threats from Muslims, intercultural contact, and ethnocentrism. (Doctoral dissertation, California State University, Fullerton, 2007). *Dissertations Abstracts International*, UMI number: 1442207
- Kirchler, B., Palmonari, A., & Pombeni, M. L. (1994). Social categorization processes between groups: A step into adolescents' peer groups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 24*, 541-563.
- Kopp, H. (2002). Dress and diversity: Muslim women and Islamic dress in an immigrant/minority context. *The Muslim World, 92*, 59-78.

- Luhtanen, R., & Crocker, J. (1992). A collective self-esteem scale: Self evaluation of one's own identity. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *18*, 302-318.
- Mackie, D. M., & Smith, E. R. (1998). Intergroup relations: Insights from a theoretically integrative approach. *Psychological Review*, *105*, 499–529.
- McLaughlin-Volpe, T. (2005). The intergroup contact effect as including an outgroup other in the self. (Doctoral dissertation, Stony Brook University, 2005). *DAI-B 67/02, Aug 2006, AAT 3206472*.
- Mernissi, F. (1991). *The veil and the male elite: A feminist interpretation of women's rights in Islam*. Trans. M. J. Lakeland. Massachusetts: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company.
- Mullen, B., Brown, R., & Smith, C. (1992). Ingroup bias as a function of salience, relevance, and status: An integration. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *22*, 103-122.
- Nelson, T. D. (2009). *Handbook of prejudice, stereotyping, and discrimination*. NY: Psychology Press
- Özdalga, E. (1998). *The veiling issue, official secularism, and popular Islam in modern Turkey*. Richmond, Surrey : Curzon.
- Peek, L. (2005). Becoming Muslim: The development of a religious identity. *Sociology of Religion*, *66*, 215-242.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *49*, 65–85.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*, 751-783.
- Seçkinelgin, H. (2006). Civil society between the state and the society: Turkish women with Muslim headscarves. *Critical Social Policy*, *26*, 748-769.
- Sherif, M. (1966). *Group conflict and cooperation*. London, UK: Routledge and Kegan Paul.
- Shirazi, F. (2001). *The veil unveiled: The hijab in modern culture*. Gainesville : University Press of Florida.
- Shively, Kim. (2005). Religious bodies and the secular state: The Merve Kavakçı affair. *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies*, *1*, 46-72.

- 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.
- Stephan, W.G., Diaz-Loving, R., & Duran, A. (2000). Integrated threat theory and intercultural attitudes: Mexico and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 31, 240-249.
- Stephan, C. W., Stephan, W. G., Demitrakis, K., Yamada, A. M., & Clason, D. (2000). Women's attitudes toward men: An integrated threat theory analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 63-73.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41, 157-175.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (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, W. G., Ybarra, O., Martinez, 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.
- Tajfel, H. (1972). La catégorisation sociale [Social categorization]. In S. Moscovici (Ed.), *Introduction à la psychologie sociale* (Vol. 1, pp. 272–303). Paris: Larousse université.
- Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. In W. G. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7-24). Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 73-90.
- Yapıcı, A. (2004). *Din, kimlik ve ön yargı: Biz ve onlar*. Adana: Karahan Kitabevi.
- Zahedi, A. (2007). Contested meaning of the veil and political ideologies of Iranian regimes. *Journal of Middle East Women's Studies*, 2007, 75-98.