Wagner, 06/06/2017

EFPA Refugee Group: Psychological support for issues associated with migration (migration crisis group) - Report to EFPA

The group met face-to-face once in Brussels at the EFPA Head Office on September 15th, 2016. Participants were Telmo Mourinho Baptista, Nicholas Carr, Susana Gouveia, Polli Hagenaars, Evert Hummelen, Pierre Nederlandt, Magda Rooze, and Ulrich Wagner.

Telmo Mourinho Baptista informed the participants that the tasks of the Working Group as requested by the General Assembly were to
- Make suggestions for effective psychological contributions to meeting the problems of migrants, countries of departure and receiving societies;
- Give recommendations for the next steps to proceed in form of an action plan;
- And help authorities responsible for managing crisis problems.

Ulrich Wagner (Social Psychologist at the University of Marburg) was elected as convenor.

In the following, the group went into an intensive e-mail exchange. One result was the preparation of two papers, one on contact theory and one on the psychological concept of acculturation attitudes. The intention of the papers is to transport psychological knowledge in the context of migration to psychologists working in the field, and to deliver a scientific argumentation base for suggestions to policy and politicians. The papers are attached to this report.

Another result of the discussion in the group was an overview that describes possible or already existing fields for the application of professional psychological knowledge (see below). The intention of the overview is to bring the attention to possible contributions that psychologists can deliver to reducing problems associated with migration and immigration.

Currently, Ulrich Wagner is running a Europe-wide survey among university psychologists to get an overview of psychological research on the topic of migration. The results will be presented at the coming EFPA European Congress of Psychology in Amsterdam.

Appendix 1

Possible psychological contributions to reduce migration problems

The following list describes problems associated with migration in which psychological expertise might help
- to understand what is going on
- and to reduce negative consequences for the migrants, autochthonous and the societies involved.

The list shall demonstrate - both within the profession as well as to the public - the relevance of psychological contributions for handling one of the most important social problems of our times.

Area	Open questions and problems	Which psychological discipline might be helpful?
Political goals, reception procedure, settling policy, media coverage		
	What is the concept of integration?	ComP, PP, SP
	What is the best way to realize first aid and support?	OP
	How to settle newcomers in the country?	SP
	How to cover the topic of immigration appropriate in the media?	MP, PP, SP
	How to enhance community building?	ComP, SP
	How to best advise policy makers?	ComP, PP, SP
Reasons for flight and migration		
	Avoidance and reduction of violent conflicts	SP
	Treatment of psychological consequences of violent conflicts	CP
	Support for the development of local economies, entrepreneurship	OP
Acculturation		
	Diagnoses of abilities and goals	PD
	Trauma treatment	CP
	Unaccompanied children	ChP
	Intercultural training	EP
	Settlement	ComP, SP
	School education and job qualification	EP, OP
	Prejudice, discrimination, violence, (de)radicalization	PP, SP

Reintegration into sending societies		
	Support of remigrants	PP, ChP
???	??? Support of forced re-migration	PP, ChP, CP
Helping the supporters		
	How to support colleagues and other civilians who help refugees and being (secondary) traumatized?	ComP, CP

ComP: community psychology
ChP: child psychology
CP: clinical psychology
EP: educational psychology
MP: media psychology
OP: organisational psychology
PD: psychological diagnostics
PP: political psychology
SP: social psychology

Appendix 2

Ulrich Wagner, Philipps-University Marburg, 15/10/2016

Acculturation attitudes

In everyday life, people often talk about integration of immigrants and other minorities. The meaning of the term, however, often remains unclear. The Canadian social psychologist John Berry offered a classification system that allows a definition of integration and related terms (see, e.g. Berry et al., 1989).

Berry described acculturation attitudes as varying possible attitudes related to the way in which members of different groups like to live together. To specify which acculturation attitude an individual or group prefers, he or she has to answer two questions: (1) "Is it considered to be of worth to come into contact with the new group and its culture" and (2) "Is it considered to be of worth to hold relations with the old group and its culture." Allowing only yes- and no-answers, this ends up in four acculturation strategies as described in figure 1. In this sense, integration means for each group the acknowledgement of new cultural influences mixed with old ones. This also implies a movement on both sides.

Figure 1: Acculturation strategies

| | | Is it considered to be of value to maintain cultural identity and characteristics? | |
		yes	no
Is it considered to be of value to maintain relationships with the other group?	yes	Integration	Assimilation
	no	Separation	Exclusion

for receiving society, immigrating groups, instituions, individuals, etc.

Berry, J.W., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., & Bujaki, M. (1989). Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. *Applied Psychology: An International Journal, 38*, 185-206.

Acculturation attitudes can be developed from different perspectives, e.g., from the perspectives of immigrants or from the perspective of the receiving population. This might produce differences and conflicts between the groups (cf. Bourhis et al., 1997). For example, we know from surveys that immigrants often prefer integration in Berry's terms, whereas the receiving society expects assimilation.

Figure 1 makes clear that if, in these days of immigration of refugees, politicians and the public talk about integration by requesting language expertise and western working skills, is this, according to Berry, a demand for assimilation and not for integration.

Acculturation attitudes can refer to different contents. Researchers on migration often differentiate between acculturation in language, education, housing, way of living, etc. Rudmin (2009) refers to acculturation in skills and behavior, identities and loyalties, social relations, and beliefs and values. Combining these acculturation topics with Berry's concept of acculturation attitudes ends up in a differentiation that is described in figure 2.

Figure 2: Acculturation strategies elaborated

		Is it considered to be of value to maintain cultural identity and characteristics?	
		yes	no
Is it considered to be of value to maintain relationships with the other group?	yes	Integration in • skills and behavior, • identities and loyalties • social relations • beliefs and values	Assimilation in • skills and behavior, • identities and loyalties • social relations • beliefs and values
	no	Separation in • skills and behavior, • identities and loyalties • social relations • beliefs and values	Exclusion in • skills and behavior, • identities and loyalties • social relations • beliefs and values

for receiving society, immigrating groups, instituions, individuals, etc.

Berry, J.W., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., & Bujaki, M. (1989). Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. *Applied Psychology: An International Journal, 38*, 185-206.
Rudmin, F. (2009). Constructs, measurements and models of acculturation and acculturative stress. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 33*, 106–123.[2]

Figure 2 makes clear that different acculturation attitudes can relate to different contents. For example, a receiving society might expect assimilation of immigrants in public life, whereas in private space integration is accepted. Again, there might be a discrepancy between receiving society and immigrants. Such conflicts at best are solved integratively.

References

Berry, J.W., Kim, U., Power, S., Young, M., & Bujaki, M. (1989). Acculturation attitudes in plural societies. Applied Psychology: An International Journal, 38, 185-206.

Bourhis, R.Y., Moise, C.L., Perreault, S. & Seneca, S. (1997). Immigration und Multikulturalismus in Kanada: Die Entwicklung eines interaktiven Akkulturationsmodells. In A. Mummendey & B. Simon (Eds), Identität und Verschiedenheit (S. 63-107). Bern: Huber.

Rudmin, F. (2009). Constructs, measurements and models of acculturation and acculturative stress. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 33, 106–123.

Appendix 3

Ulrich Wagner, Philipps-University Marburg, 15/10/2016

Fundamentals of the Contact Hypothesis

Current research on contact (see Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011) is significantly influenced by the American personality and social psychologist Gordon W. Allport, who published the book *The Nature of Prejudice* in 1954. In one of its chapters, Allport considered the possibility of improving the relationship between groups – he especially focused on the relationship between white and black US citizens – through contact. He concluded that contact particularly helps to reduce prejudice and improve intergroup relations when the participating members of the different groups, at least during the contact situation, have *the same status*, pursue *common goals cooperatively* and when contact is *supported by authorities*. According to Allport, the last point means that advocacy of state authorities, like politics or schools, is mandatory to improve the effectiveness of interventions to the benefit of minorities. In the year of publication of Allports book, the US-Supreme Court only just had decided that the segregation of students with different ethnical background was unconstitutional. In the following years, the police and the National Guard were repeatedly deployed to enforce the opening of schools and universities for black students against local resistance.

Since the publication of *The Nature of Prejudice,* a vast number of researchers empirically examined the Contact Hypothesis. Pettigrew & Tropp (2006) composed findings up until the year 2000 of all published and accessible unpublished studies regarding Contact Hypothesis in a meta-analysis. In total, they counted 515 studies worldwide. Their results show that contact is in fact a suitable mean to reduce prejudice between groups. The mean correlation of contact and prejudice over all recorded studies is r = -.21. Additionally, the authors prove that studies that meet Allport's conditions showed a greater extent of reduced prejudice than studies that ignored these boundary conditions. Though, even contact in unfavorable conditions often helps reducing rejection.

A great number of surveys regarding Contact Hypothesis rely on correlative relations. However, the sole relation in cross-sectional studies does no prove *causality*: A significant correlation between contact and xenophobia can stem, as assumed, from the reduction of prejudice through contact. The same relationship, however, would also support the notion of an inverted causal relationship - if people with high levels of prejudice against foreigners were more prone to avoid contact. In fact, highly-prejudiced people tend to avoid contact (Binder et al., 2009). Our assumed relationship, though, still applies: Shook and Fazio (2008) manipulated contact experiences in an experimental study. Black and white US first-year university students were randomly assigned to a roommate either of the same or a different ethical group. After a quarter of the year, participants of the mixed group expressed less prejudice, whereas prejudice in the homogeneous groups did not change. Given the experimental manipulation of contact in this study, it can be concluded that this was the cause for the reduction of prejudice. In a longitudinal study, people were repeatedly interviewed in 2002, 2004, and 2006. Data analysis showed that participants who

reported increased contact with immigrants in 2002 or 2004, expressed less prejudice against immigrants two years later than those that indicated less contact (Christ & Wagner, 2008). This also supports the causal effect of contact on prejudice.

The crucial question at this point is: Does contact genuinely always help to reduce prejudice against minorities? The answer: No, it does not. Pham, Weinstein and Longman (2004) point to the impact of extremely negative contact experiences. Their study in Ruanda shows that those who suffered from negative experiences with members of the conflict outgroup (Hutu or Tutsi) during the genocide were more strongly rejecting the outgroup and less willing to accept reconciliation after the violent conflict had ended. Luckily, such extremely negative contact experiences are quite rare. There is evidence, that participants in surveys were less often reporting negative contact experiences ("How often did you have unpleasant experiences with foreigners?") with outgroup members, especially foreigners in Germany, than positive (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011). Contact experiences usually seem to be positive in nature. Contact – almost – always helps.

Forms of contact

When Allport (1954) talked about contact between groups, he had in mind direct physical encounters between black and white US Americans. Recent research implies, however, that indirect contact can also contribute to improving intergroup relations and decreasing prejudice. Turner, Crisp, and Lambert (2007) showed in a series of experiments that merely the imagination of a positive encounter with a member of a rejected group could change ones attitude towards that group. They called this form of contact *imagined contact*. In addition, *virtual contact* (Lemmer & Wagner, 2015) using electronic media showed to be helpful in reducing prejudice. Yablon and Katz (2001) reported a study in which they gave Jewish-Israeli and Muslim-Arabic students the opportunity to communicate through the internet. As contact hypothesis would predict, participants subsequently showed less prejudice. Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, and Ropp (1997) examined other forms of contact, *extended contact*. According to this form of contact, mere knowledge about contact between a member of the ingroup and a member of the outgroup can reduce prejudice. In accordance with the extended contact hypothesis Christ, Hewstone, Tausch, Wagner, Voci, Hughes, and Cairns (2010) demonstrated that Germans whose German friends have had contact with foreigners in Germany expressed less xenophobia than those whose German friends have had no contact with foreigners whatsoever. Over and above, it became apparent that *extended contact* particularly reduced prejudice in such instances where respondents did not have many opportunities for *direct contact*, for example because there were only few immigrants in the neighborhood.

Why contact works: Fear, empathy and deprovincialisation

Empirically, the hypothesis that contact is able to reduce hostilities between groups is impressively evident in a vast number of circumstances. W*hy* the reduction, though? Pettigrew and Tropp (2008) tested three hypotheses in another meta-analytical summary of accessible studies worldwide. They concluded that contact helps because it *reduces fears*, like fears of

misunderstandings in encounters with members of the outgroup, but also concerns of material exploitation by the outgroup, as well as fear that one's norms, values and culture are being threatened. The second reason why contact works is that it helps understanding the outgroup, and therefore it increases *empathy* with its members. Pettigrew and Tropp (2008) could find only weak support for the examined assumption that increasing contact led to increased knowledge about the outgroup and thus reduced prejudice.

We would like to point out another explanation, which was rarely tested: Contact with members of outgroups reduces prejudice because it changes the attitudes towards the ingroup. Pettigrew (1998) called this *deprovincialisation*, which means realizing that one's own cultural standards and customs are not the only ones conceivable or possible. A related construct is that of *diversity beliefs*. It denotes the opinion that diversity is valuable for the functioning of the ingroup (Wolf & van Dick, 2008). People who share these beliefs think of diversity as beneficial for their own society, while people with low manifestation on diversity beliefs think of it as detrimental. According to Pettigrews (1998) deprovincialisation hypothesis, contact should lead to the belief that a society profits from diversity and therefore, prejudice should be reduced. Indeed, the reduction of xenophobia through contact is partly mediated by an increase in diversity beliefs (Asbrock et al., 2012). Thus, contact can broaden one's own cultural horizon, which in turn decreases prejudice against minorities (see also Christ & Wagner, 2008).

Contact and behavior

Psychological research often concentrates on prejudice, which in turn is predicting discriminatory behavior (see e.g., Dovidio, Brigham, Johnson, & Gaertner, 1996; Schütz & Six, 1996). Therefore, contact experiences should not only have a positive influence on intergroup attitudes, but also on corresponding behavior, particularly on the reduction of discrimination and aggression as well as on the improvement of positive and equalitarian relationships between members of different groups. Wagner, Christ, and Pettigrew (2008) were able to show that persons who expressed xenophobic prejudice were longitudinally more prone to discrimination against foreigners. They also found that contact is linked to reduced discriminatory intentions against foreigners directly *and* indirectly, through the reduction of prejudice. Contact opportunities in the residential environment also reduce discrimination: Asbrock, Wagner, and Christ (2006) identified a negative relation between the proportion of foreigners in the residential area on the one hand (see also Wagner, Christ, Pettigrew, Stellmacher, and Wolf, 2006) and avoidance tendencies ($r = -.16$, $p < .01$) or aggressive potential against foreigners on the other ($r = -.08$, $p < .01$).

Thus, contact affects more than just attitudes and is therefore capable of reducing discriminatory behavior. This is crucial for the improvement of intergroup relations, because for a peaceful and respectful coexistence, not only attitudes, but also the resulting behavior are relevant.

Contact interventions

The often replicated finding that prejudice, discrimination, and aggressive behavior between groups usually stem from a lack of contact opens up the possibility of interventions through planned and specific provision of contact opportunities. For example, Deutsch and Collins (1951) and Wilner, Walkley, and Cook (1955) examined the significance of contact for the design of

residential neighborhoods. They point out that ethnically mixed assignment of apartments leads to an improvement of the relationships between white and black residents. The majority of interventions based on contact theory has been implemented in school settings, especially in the US and Northern Ireland. Research (Stephan, 1978) shows, though, that mere joint teaching of members of ethnically diverse groups does not suffice to establish contact. To move students outside their ethnical networks, programs in the conceptual vein of Cooperative Group-Education are employed, mainly in the USA (Slavin & Cooper, 1999) and Israel (Sharan, Kussell, Hertz-Lazarowitz, Bejarano, Raviv, & Sharan, 1948). These programs put the assumptions of Allport's contact hypothesis into practice. Students of the same class are assigned to ethnically diverse small groups. While in these small groups, students have to solve group tasks *cooperatively*. To solve the group task is a *common goal* that can only be achieved if every group member contributes successfully. Consequently, all participants have an *equal* status. If the school or teacher implements such a form of group lesson, *authority is supporting contact* (see Lanphen, 2011). In a meta-analytic summary of all globally available evaluations of contact interventions, Lemmer & Wagner (2015) were able to show that these forms of contact programs indeed contribute to significantly improving intergroup relations. Lemmer & Wagner also found improvements for those intervention programs which were based on indirect or virtual forms of contact. These are for example programs where students read stories about positive encounters between members of the own and a foreign group (Cameron, Rutland, Brown & Douch, 2006), where participants imagine a contact situation with members of the outgroup (Husnu & Crisp, 2010) or where they communicate with outgroup members using the Internet (Yablon & Katz, 2001). These measures resulted to be almost as effective as interventions based on direct contact (Lemmer & Wagner, 2015).

Conditions for the effectiveness of contact

The prejudice-reducing effect of contact depends on individually and structural conditions. Studies demonstrate especially strong effects of encounters with outgroup members for persons with high levels of right-wing authoritarianism, meaning persons who tend to take up a subordinate role to authorities and who advocate for higher penalties for persons deviating from traditional norms and values (Dhont & Van Hiel, 2009; Asbrock, Christ, Duckitt, & Sibley, 2012). These persons also show higher levels of prejudice and tend to avoid contact experiences (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011). Therefore, it appears that contact can be especially effective in those who need it the most.

Apart from individual characteristics, structural conditions also influence the effects of contact. In order to reduce prejudice in the first place, people need to have the opportunity to gain experiences with the outgroup, for example through encounters in the neighborhood or at the workplace. Wagner, Christ, Pettigrew, Stellmacher, & Wolf (2006) demonstrate a negative relation between the amount of foreigners in a district, as measured in the official statistics of residents, and the level of prejudice of the participants. The *higher* the ratio of foreigners, the *lower* the prejudice. With increased ratio of foreigners, the participants have more opportunities for contact with foreigners and can therefore reduce prejudice. The difference in prejudice between people in Eastern and Western Germany, which was has been found for 25 years now,

can be explained with the same logic: Persons in Western Germany state in almost all surveys on average less prejudice against foreigners than persons from Eastern Germany (e.g., Wagner et al., 2003). The ratio of foreigners in Western Germany is 10%, in Eastern Germany 2 % (Statistisches Bundesamt, 2016). Persons in Western Germany therefore have simply more opportunities than people in Eastern Germany to get into contact with foreigners and therefore reduce their prejudice.

The outlined results contradict the widely spread and often politically supported stereotype that with an increased ratio of foreigners, the capacity of the autochthonous population is exceeded. The data point out the contrary: The lower the number of foreigners living in a neighborhood, the lower the possibilities of contact with members of the outgroup, the less opportunity for the people to revise their stereotype ideas about "the foreigners". The presence of "the others" in the neighborhood consequently has to be seen as an opportunity. Those who live in ethnically homogeneous neighborhoods and therefore have no opportunity to gain intercultural competence through contact are the disadvantaged.

References:

Allport, G. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Asbrock, F., Christ, O., Duckitt, J., & Sibley, C. G. (2012). Differential effects of intergroup contact for authoritarians and social dominators – A dual process model perspective. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38*(4), 477-490.

Asbrock, F., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2006). Diskriminierung. Folgen der Feindseligkeit. In W. Heitmeyer (Hrsg.), *Deutsche Zustände. Folge 4* (156-175). Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp.

Binder, J., Brown, R., Zagefka, H., Funke, F., Kessler, T., Mummendey, A., … Leyens, J.-P. (2009). Does contact reduce prejudice or does prejudice reduce contact? A longitudinal test of the contact hypothesis among majority and minority groups in three European countries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 96*(4), 843-856.

Cameron, L., Rutland, A., Brown, R., & Douch, R. (2006). Changing children's intergroup attitudes towards refugees: Testing different models of extended contact. *Child Development, 77*(5), 1208-1219.

Christ, O., Hewstone, M., Tausch, N., Voci, A., Wagner, U., Hughes, J., & Cairns, E. (2010). Direct contact as a moderator of extended contact effects: Cross-sectional and longitudinal impact on attitudes and attitude strength. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 36, 1662-1674.

Christ, O., & Wagner, U. (2008). Interkulturelle Kontakte und Gruppenbezogene Menschenfeindlichkeit. In W. Heitmeyer (Hrsg.), *Deutsche Zustände. Folge 6* (S. 154-168). Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp.

Deutsch, M., & Collins, M. (1951). *Interracial housing: A psychological evaluation of a social experiment.* Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Dhont, K., & van Hiel, A. (2009). We must not be enemies: Interracial contact and the reduction of prejudice among authoritarians. *Personality and Individual Differences, 46*, 172-177.

Dovidio, J. F., Brigham, J. C., Johnson, B. T., Gaertner, S. L. (1996). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination: Another look. In C.N. Macrae, C. Stangor & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Stereotypes & Stereotyping*. New York: The Guilford Press.

Husnu, S., & Crisp, R. J. (2010). Imagined intergroup contact: A new technique for encouraging greater inter-ethnic contact in Cyprus. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 16*(1), 97-108.

Lanphen, J. (2011). *Kooperatives Lernen und Integrationsförderung*. Münster: Waxmann Verlag.

Lemmer, G., & Wagner, U. (2015). Can we really reduce ethnic prejudice outside the lab? A meta-analysis of direct and indirect contact interventions. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 45*, 152-168.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65-85.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*, 751-783.

Pettigrew, T. F. & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38*, 922-934.

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2011). *When groups meet – The dynamics of intergroup contact.* New York: Psychology Press.

Pham, P. N., Weinstein, H. M., & Longman, T. (2004). Trauma and PTSD symptoms in Rwanda: Implications for attitudes toward justice and reconciliation. *JAMA, 292*, 602-612.

Schütz, H., & Six, B. (1996). How strong is the relationship between prejudice and discrimination? A meta-analytic answer. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 2*(3-4), 441-462.

Sharan, S., Kussell, P., Hertz-Lazarowitz, R., Bejarano, Y., Raviv, S., & Sharan, Y. (1985). Cooperative learning effects of ethnic relations and achievement in Israeli junior-high-school classrooms. In R. Slavon, S. Sharan, S. Kagan, R. Hertz-Lazarowitz, C. Webb & R. Schmuck (Eds.), *Learning to Cooperate, Cooperate to Learn.* New York: Springer Science + Business Media.

Shook, N. J., & Fazio, R. H. (2008). Interracial roommate relationships: An experimental field test of the contact hypothesis. *Psychological Science, 19*, 717-723.

Slavin, R. E., & Cooper, R. (1999). Improving intergroup relations: Lessons learned from cooperative learning programs. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*(4), 647-663.

Statistisches Bundesamt (2016). *Ausländische Bevölkerung am 31.12.2015.* Retrieved from https://www.destatis.de/DE/ZahlenFakten/GesellschaftStaat/Bevoelkerung/MigrationInteg ration/AuslaendischeBevolkerung/Tabellen/Bundeslaender.html

Stephan, W. G. (1978). School desegregation: An evaluation of predictions made in Brown v. Board of Education. *Psychological Bulletin, 85*, 217-238.

Turner, R. N., Crisp, R. J., & Lambert, E. (2007). Imagining intergroup contact can improve intergroup attitudes. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 10*, 427-441.

Wagner, U., van Dick, R., Pettigrew, T.F. & Christ, O. (2003). Ethnic prejudice in East- and West-Germany: The explanatory power of intergroup contact. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, *6*, 23-37.

Wagner, U., Christ, O., Pettigrew, T. F., Stellmacher, J., & Wolf, C. (2006). Prejudice and minority proportion: Contact instead of threat effects. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 69*(4), 380-390.

Wilner, D. M., Walkley, R. P., & Cook, S. W. (1955). *Human relations in interracial housing: A study of the contact hypothesis*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Wolf, C., & van Dick, R. (2008). Wenn anders nicht schlechter bedeutet - Wertschätzung von Vielfalt fördert Gleichwertigkeit der Gruppen. In W. Heitmeyer (Hrsg.), *Deutsche Zustände. Folge 6* (S. 137-153). Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp.

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.

Yablon, Y. B. & Katz, Y. J. (2001). Internet-based group relations: A high school peace education project in Israel. *Education Media International, 38*, 175-182*.*