

This is the peer reviewed version of the following article:

The role of the perceived engagement of the facilitator in a vicarious contact intervention: A school-based field-experiment in three countries / Maakinen, Viivi; Jasinskaja-Lahti, Inga; Renvik, T. A.; Lasticova, Barbara; Cocco, Veronica Margherita; Vezzali, Loris; Liebkind, Karmela. - In: JOURNAL OF COMMUNITY & APPLIED SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY. - ISSN 1099-1298. - 32:4(2022), pp. 623-636. [10.1002/casp.2579]

*Terms of use:*

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. For all terms of use and more information see the publisher's website.

03/05/2024 09:02

(Article begins on next page)

The role of the perceived engagement of the facilitator in a vicarious contact intervention:

A school-based field-experiment in three countries

### **Abstract**

Indirect forms of intergroup contact have been shown to reduce prejudice. However, little is known about the factors that can contribute to implementing these methods as interventions in real-life settings. In this study, we examined whether the students' perception of the facilitator's engagement in carrying out a school-based vicarious contact intervention affects the effectiveness of the intervention among adolescents in Finland ( $N = 360$ ), Italy ( $N = 113$ ), and Slovakia ( $N = 216$ ). As a result, the participants who perceived the facilitator as highly engaged held more positive intergroup attitudes after the intervention than those perceiving the facilitator less engaged. The results are discussed in relation to social and developmental psychological research on normative influences in adolescence and intergroup contact literature, in which normative support from authorities is considered to contribute to the extent to which contact reduces prejudice. By stressing the role of the facilitator, the results contribute both theoretically and practically to the understanding of the successful implementation of prejudice-reduction programs.

*Keywords:* vicarious contact, intervention facilitator, prejudice-reduction, school intervention, intergroup contact

**The role of the perceived engagement of the facilitator in a vicarious contact intervention: A school-based field experiment in three national settings**

With increasing ethnocultural diversity, encouraging harmonious intergroup relations has become an important task for societies to tackle. The growing need for ecologically valid interventions that can promote positive intergroup attitudes calls for a comprehensive translation of scientific knowledge into practice. Based on extensive empirical evidence, intergroup contact is considered one of the most influential and promising strategies for prejudice-reduction (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Pettigrew, Tropp, Wagner, & Christ, 2011). More recent research has also demonstrated that intergroup contact does not require face-to-face interaction, as even indirect forms of contact have been shown to diminish prejudice (for a review, see Dovidio, Eller, & Hewstone, 2011; Vezzali, Hewstone, Capozza, Giovannini, & Wölfer, 2014). For instance, vicarious contact, i.e., observing an ingroup member having a positive interaction with an outgroup member, improves intergroup attitudes (Mazziotta, Mummendey, & Wright, 2011). Although indirect forms of contact are often less effective than direct contact (Lemmer & Wagner, 2015), they can act as a preliminary step towards face-to-face contact, for example, by decreasing intergroup anxiety (Wölfer et al., 2019)

Despite the empirical evidence of its effectiveness, intergroup contact research has also been criticized for not being fully practitioners- and policy-ready (e.g., McKeown & Dixon, 2017; Paluck, Green, & Green, 2019). This critique is, for example, due to the lack of experimental studies in real-life settings and a focus on short-term outcomes measured immediately (i.e., less than 24 hours) after interventions (Paluck et al., 2019). Furthermore, contact interventions focusing on ethnic and racial prejudice tend to have weaker effects than those focusing on prejudice towards other groups, such as the elderly or people with mental

or physical disabilities (Beelman & Heinemann, 2014; Paluck et al., 2019). One plausible explanation for this is that prejudice toward these groups can be socially less acceptable than prejudice toward some other groups (Crandall, Eshleman, & O'brien, 2002). Also, ethnic and racial groups can appear more as a possible threat to the ingroup and thus arouse stronger and more negative reactions (Cuddy, Fiske, & Glick, 2008). In order to fully respond to the need for research-based strategies that can effectively combat ethnic and racial prejudice and reliably guide policy, it is crucial to understand different factors that might help or hinder the implementation of prejudice-reduction interventions derived from the contact hypothesis.

In most respects, the successful implementation and effectiveness of any intervention are dependent on its delivery. The importance of factors related to the intervention facilitator has indeed been acknowledged in the broader scope of the prevention science field (e.g., Swift et al., 2017), and especially in health-promoting interventions (e.g., Forman, Olin, Hoagwood, Crowe, & Saka, 2009; Wilde et al., 2019). However, the importance and influence of the person carrying out the intervention sessions have mostly been neglected in prejudice-reduction interventions utilizing different forms of intergroup contact.

Notwithstanding the gap in the previous contact research, we argue that the facilitator's role is crucial, as facilitators may be important role models and significant social referents promoting and supporting the message of the intervention with the expression of their own attitudes. Furthermore, they can communicate norms regarding what is valued and welcomed by the authorities, such as schools or other institutions where the intervention is conducted. Thus, the intervention facilitators can also be considered as potential sources of institutionalized norms. This makes the gap in the previous research even more striking as in the contact literature, support from authorities is considered to contribute to the extent to which contact reduces prejudice (Allport, 1954).

Social norms and their impact on the effectiveness of the prejudice-reduction interventions are especially important to consider in interventions targeted for adolescents. Youth is a critical developmental stage for the formation of intergroup attitudes (Dunham & Degner, 2010) due to this age group being responsive to normative influences in their social environment (Raabe & Beelmann, 2011). For instance, in their longitudinal study, Gniewosz and Noack (2015) found that parental attitudes predicted those of adolescents up until the age of 16. However, the most substantial effect of the parental attitudes took place in early adolescence (i.e., among students between grades six and seven). Similarly, another longitudinal study examining the effects of parents' and peers' attitudes on adolescents' anti-immigrant prejudice showed significant effects of both parents and peers on changes in youths' attitudes over time, although the impact of parental prejudice was highlighted (Miklikowska, 2017).

While the importance of parental and peer norms has been widely attested, the school's normative context is also a central predictor of adolescents' intergroup attitudes and behavior (Pehar, Čorkalo Biruški, Pavin Ivanec, 2020). Previous studies have shown that teachers' views and actions impact their students in several ways. For example, teachers' attitudes toward diversity (Grütter & Meyer, 2014), their perceived interpersonal relationship with classmates (Geerlings, Thijs, & Verkuyten, 2019), and even the implicit, unconscious responses to outgroup members, such as eye contact or body language (Castelli, De Dea, & Nesdale, 2008; Vezzali, Giovannini, & Capozza, 2012), may be detected by the students, influencing their intergroup attitudes. Moreover, teachers can also play a focal role in establishing the school's normative climate in general. For instance, in their study focusing on social norms on drug use, LaRusso, Romer, and Selman (2008) found that adolescents who

experienced more support and regard for students' perspectives from their teachers were more likely to consider the school climate as promoting healthier norms.

Numerous studies have tested the influence of perceived social norms on attitudes, but relatively few studies have investigated how the normative context adds to the prejudice-reducing effect of intergroup contact (Paluck et al., 2019). Nevertheless, intergroup contact, both direct and indirect, does not occur outside the realm of its social surroundings; instead, social context can strengthen or diminish contact's effect on attitudes (Kende, Tropp, & Lantos, 2017; Merino, 2013). For instance, in an intervention study conducted among university students in Hungary, Kende and colleagues (2017) found that perception of institutionalized norms against prejudice towards the Roma moderated the effect of direct contact with a Roma student on outgroup attitudes. The participants who perceived stronger non-prejudice norms prevailing at the university and in the society at large showed a more noticeable change in their attitudes (but not in contact intentions) than those who perceived institutional norms to be weaker.

Also in vicarious contact, the role of social norms is accentuated. Based on the theory of social learning (Bandura, 1986), vicarious contact builds on the idea that we learn attitudes and behavior favored in the given social context by observing others (Mazziotta et al., 2011). Consequently, social norms have been distinguished as one of the central mediators of vicarious contact's effect on intergroup attitudes (Vezzali et al., 2014). However, previous studies have not fully examined how vicarious contact interventions could benefit from the normative support from authorities, such as a person facilitating the intervention sessions. To our knowledge, this research need has so far been addressed in only one previous experimental study. In their study using vicarious contact through a film of two basketball teams practicing together, Gómez and Huici (2008) found that a coach, as an authority figure,

giving positive feedback to both teams strengthened the positive effect of vicarious contact among the supporters of the teams. Based on Allport's (1954) classic theorization, we argue that the perceived normative support from a person facilitating vicarious contact interventions requires more attention.

Facilitators have a pivotal role in delivering interventions. Like teachers (LaRusso et al., 2008) or other mentoring adults (Gómez & Huici, 2008), they could also be seen as authority figures who can potentially impersonate the institutionalized norms. However, intervention facilitators can be more or less convincing in providing students with the perception of institutional support for the intergroup contact. To examine this in the current study, we focus on the facilitators' engagement in conducting the intervention as perceived by the student participants. Following the operationalization of institutionalized norms in previous studies (e.g., Kende et al., 2017), we investigate the extent to which the facilitators are perceived to consider prejudice-reduction interventions important. In addition, we also measure the perceived degree of the facilitator's personal enjoyment in conducting the intervention; an enthusiastic and emotionally involved facilitator can send a stronger normative and persuasive message for attitude change by showing that they "practice what they preach" (see, e.g., Abacioglu et al., 2019).

The current study aims to complement the scarce previous research on the role of authority figures in delivering prejudice-reduction interventions. We do this by examining the extent to which the perceived engagement of the facilitator carrying out a school-based vicarious contact intervention adds to the effectiveness of the intervention in eliciting a positive change in intergroup attitudes. As a preliminary research question, we first test whether the intervention is successful in improving intergroup attitudes among adolescents. Based on theorizing and previous empirical evidence on vicarious intergroup contact, we



expect that the intervention will improve majority students' intergroup attitudes in all three national contexts (H1). As our primary research question, we examine in intervention groups only, whether the intervention effect on outgroup attitudes is moderated by the students' perception of the facilitator's engagement in the intervention. We predict that the perceived engagement of the facilitator contributes positively to the improvement of the majority adolescents' ethnic attitudes (H2). As prior direct contact with outgroup members may influence the effect of the vicarious contact intervention (Vezzali et al., 2014), we also controlled for its effect.

## **Method**

### **Participants**

Participants were secondary school students belonging to the national majority group in Finland, Slovakia, and Italy. After excluding participants who dropped out after the baseline assessment ( $N_{FI} = 28$ ;  $N_{SK} = 37$ ;  $N_{IT} = 27$ ), the final sample consisted of 360 Finnish students (46.9 % girls; mean age 14.38 years,  $SD = .53$ ), 216 Slovak students (46.8 % girls; mean age 13.94 years,  $SD = .69$ ) and 113 Italian students (26.5 % girls; mean age 16.35 years,  $SD = .59$ ). Students with an ethnic minority background (i.e., at least one foreign-born parent) were not included in this study ( $N_{FI} = 138$ ;  $N_{SK} = 9$ ;  $N_{IT} = 55$ ). In the Finnish and Italian samples, the students were determined to belong to the national majority group when neither of their parents was foreign-born (for a similar procedure, see e.g., Geerlings, Thijs, & Verkuyten, 2018). In the Slovak sample, the children of the parent(s) not born in Slovakia (e.g., in the former Czechoslovakia) were also considered belonging to the national majority group if their nationality was Slovak.

### **The contexts of the study**

The study was conducted in Finland, Slovakia, and Italy. The three countries represent different European national settings that differ regarding their immigration context. Both Slovakia and Finland have traditionally been countries of emigration rather than immigration. After joining the EU in 2004, the number of foreigners in Slovakia has steadily grown, although the representation of foreigners in the population has remained one of the lowest in Europe (International Organization for Migration, 2020). On the other hand, In Finland, ethnic and cultural diversity has been increasing notably since the 1990s, and this change has been relatively rapid. For example, the number of foreign-born inhabitants has nearly quadrupled in the past two decades (Statistics Finland, 2020). In Italy, a similar demographic change has started earlier, with net migration becoming positive in the 1970s and foreign nationals forming the increasing body of migration flows from the second half of the 1980s onwards (Bonifazi, Heins, Strozza, & Vitiello, 2009). These differences in the countries' migration history are also visible today in the percentages of foreign-born people in the total populations. In 2018, the year of the data collection, immigrants accounted for 10.2 percent of the population in Italy, 6.6 percent in Finland, and 3.5 percent in Slovakia (Eurostat, 2020).

In Italy and Finland the data was collected in areas where the proportion of immigrants was higher than in the rest of the country in total. In Finland, the study was conducted in the capital region, where people with a foreign background comprised 14.3% of the inhabitants in 2018 (Statistics Finland, 2020). In Italy, the data was collected from a medium-sized city in Northern-Italy, where immigrants represented 12.9% of the total population (ISTAT, 2019). Instead, in Slovakia, the study context was slightly more varied as the study was conducted in schools located in both the capital area and smaller towns in Western and Central-Eastern parts of the country. These regions had a lower proportion of

immigrants than Bratislava, where 32% of all the foreigners residing in the country lived, forming 8% of the city's inhabitants in the year of data collection (Kadlečíková, 2018). These areas were ethnically very homogeneous, except for one town with a substantial Roma community (18% of inhabitants, Atlas of the Roma Communities, 2019) and a moderately high proportion of ethnic Hungarians (29,62 % of the inhabitants). However, the differences between the regions were not visible in the sample obtained from the schools. From the total Slovak sample, students with an immigrant background counted for only four percent. On the other hand, in the Finnish and Italian samples, minority students comprised 27.7 and 32.7 percent, respectively.

### **Procedure**

With the approvals obtained from the school boards, the principals, and the parents of the participants in each country, the study was conducted in secondary schools during the academic year of 2017-2018. Altogether seven schools (38 classes) in Finland, five schools (12 classes) in Slovakia and three schools (12 classes) in Italy participated in the study. The classes within the schools were randomly allocated to experimental and control conditions. The intervention was assessed through a pretest-posttest design: the baseline assessment at T1 was conducted three weeks before the intervention and the T2 assessment two weeks after the intervention. In the experimental group, additional assessments were also conducted as a part of the intervention sessions.

The intervention consisted of altogether four 45-minute sessions that were implemented once a week for four consecutive weeks. In Finland and Slovakia, the facilitators of the intervention sessions were part of the schools' teaching staff, either teachers or study councilors. In Italy, research assistants carried out the sessions. All facilitators conducted the sessions according to a facilitator's manual that contained instructions and

designated time frames for every session. During the sessions, the students were introduced with altogether six written friendship stories told by peer models who belonged either to the national majority group (four stories) or to one of the largest minority groups in the country where the data was collected (two stories). The minority groups in the stories represented the largest minority groups in the country where the data was collected. In addition to the written friendship stories that were read out loud in the class, the sessions also included class discussions led by the facilitator, and a group task of filming short video blogs in which students described their own positive intergroup contact experiences. The purpose of these additional tasks was to emphasize the central message of the friendship stories and to make participants act as positive norm senders to each other.

The intervention procedure followed, to a large extent, an intervention manual created for teachers to use for anti-prejudice practices in schools (Solares, Huttunen, Mähönen, Hirvonen, & Liebkind, 2012) and tested earlier among Finnish secondary school students (Liebkind et al., 2014, 2019; Mäkinen, Liebkind, Jasinskaja-Lahti, & Renvik, 2019). The intervention manual used in this study along with friendship stories used in the Finnish context are provided as a supplementary material.

## **Measures**

*Outgroup attitudes* were assessed pre- and post-intervention by asking the participants to indicate their overall feelings towards people from other cultural groups on a single-item 'Feeling thermometer' (Haddock, Zanna, & Esses, 1993) scaling from 0 = *feelings extremely cold* to 100 = *feelings extremely warm*.

*Perceived engagement of the facilitator* was measured among students in the experimental condition after the last intervention session. The measure was developed for this study and consisted of two items which asked the students to think about the person who

carried out the lessons: "How happy do you think they were to run these lessons?", "How important do you think they consider it to have such lessons in schools?". Participants responded to the items on an 11-point scale ranging from 0 = *not at all* to 100 = *very much*. The variable for perceived engagement was computed based on the means of the two items.

*Prior outgroup contact* was assessed before intervention by asking the participants: "How often do you spend time with people from other cultural groups? They can be, for example, friends, parents of your friends, or neighbors." Response options ranged from 1 = *never* to 5 = *very often*.

*The number of outgroup friends* was measured before intervention by asking the participants to estimate how many close friends from other cultural groups they have with whom they are in contact most frequently. Response options included: 1; 2; 3-5; 6-10; 11-20; over 20 friends.

## **Analyses**

To examine the overall intervention effect on outgroup attitudes (H1),  $2 \times 2$  mixed design ANOVAs were conducted by using the condition (experiment vs control) as a between-subjects factor and time (outgroup attitudes at T1 and T2) as a within-subjects factor. The analyses were run separately for the whole sample and separately for three national samples. For testing the role of the perceived engagement of the facilitator (H2), one-way ANOVAs were run by using outgroup attitudes at T2 as the dependent variable and the facilitator's engagement as a continuous predictor when adjusting the model for baseline values of the outgroup attitudes. We also ran the same models with prior contact experiences, the number of outgroup friends and age as control variables. SPSS IBM version 26 was used in all statistical analyses.

## **Results**

### **Preliminary analyses**

We first examined country differences in the main variables studied at T1 by using one-way ANOVAs. As regards to outgroup attitudes, the results indicated a statistically significant difference in the mean scores for outgroup attitudes at T1 between the countries ( $F(2,679) = 30.290, p < .001, \eta^2 = .082$ ). The post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that there was a significant difference between outgroup attitudes among Finnish and Slovak ( $p < .001$ ) and Finnish and Italian adolescents ( $p < .001$ ), participants in Finland showing more positive prior outgroups attitudes (see Table 1 for means and standard deviations). There was also a significant difference between Slovak and Italian adolescents ( $p = .003$ ), prior outgroup attitudes being more positive among Slovak participants.

Next, we compared the mean scores in direct contact experiences at T1 between the participants in the three countries. Because the assumption of homogeneity of variances was violated, as assessed by Levene's test for equality of variances ( $p = .015$ ), Welch's test was used instead of on the one-way ANOVA. There was a difference in prior direct contact experiences between the samples, *Welch's*  $F(2,293.937) = 67.448, p < .001$ . The post hoc comparison using the Games-Howell test indicated that the differences between Finnish and Italian ( $p < .001$ ) samples, Finnish and Slovak samples ( $p < .001$ ), and Slovak and Italian samples ( $p < .001$ ), were statistically significant. As shown in Table 1, Finnish adolescents had had more direct contact experiences before the intervention when compared to Italian adolescents, who, on the other hand, had more direct experiences than Slovak adolescents.

Similarly, we also tested for mean differences in the number of outgroup friends among the samples. The one-way ANOVA indicated a statistically significant difference in the mean scores ( $F(2,682) = 23.325, p < .001, \eta^2 = .064$ ). The Tukey HSD test indicated that

in Italy the participants had more outgroup friends than in Finland ( $p = .004$ ) or Slovakia ( $p < .001$ ), where number of the outgroup friends was the lowest (Table 1).

Taken together, these descriptive analyses suggest that the three countries studied differed in terms of baseline measures of outgroup attitudes and in terms of participants' prior intergroup contact experiences. This is why we conducted the main analyses for the whole sample and each country separately, controlling for prior direct contact variables along with age.

INSERT TABLE 1 HERE

We also compared the mean scores for perceived engagement of the facilitator between the participants of the experimental groups in Finland, Italy and Slovakia. The differences between these sample groups were not statistically significant,  $F(2, 292) = 2.747$ ,  $p = .066$  (Italy:  $M = 82.88$ ,  $SD = 12.70$ ; Finland:  $M = 76.66$ ,  $SD = 18.85$ ; Slovakia:  $M = 75.15$ ,  $SD = 17.91$ ).

### **Main analyses**

Before testing the research question regarding the role of perceived engagement of the intervention facilitator on the effectiveness of the intervention, we tested the overall effectiveness of the intervention in order to know whether the mean change on outgroup attitudes between pre-intervention (T1) and post-intervention (T2) was different in the experimental and control groups. We used  $2 \times 2$  mixed design ANOVAs in which the condition (intervention vs control) was set as a between-subjects factor and time (outgroup attitudes at T1 and T2) as a within-subjects factor. There were no intervention effects on outgroup attitudes in the whole sample ( $F(1,668) = .23$ ,  $p = .630$ ,  $\eta^2 = .000$ ) and in any of the three country samples separately (See Table 2). The results remained the same after controlling for prior direct outgroup contact variables and age ( $F(1,656) = .19$ ,  $p = .664$ ,  $\eta^2 =$

.000). Notably, adolescents' attitudes seemed to improve over time with age ( $F(1,656) = 5.24, p = .018, \eta^2 = .008$ ). Based on the results we concluded that the first hypothesis was not supported.

INSERT TABLE 2 HERE

Next, we turned to our primary research question, i.e., the role of the facilitator in the magnitude of attitudinal change among students in the intervention groups. After adjusting the model for baseline outgroup attitudes, results showed that the perceived engagement of the facilitator affected the change in outgroup attitudes across the intervention groups in all three countries,  $F(1, 293) = 9.13, p = .003, \eta^2 = .030$ ). The effect of the facilitator remained significant also after controlling for prior direct contact variables and age  $F(1, 293) = 9.02, p = .003, \eta^2 = .031$ ). Thus, the second hypothesis was supported stating that the effectiveness of the intervention is dependent on the perceived engagement of the intervention facilitator. However, when looking at the three countries separately we found that perceived engagement of the facilitator particularly improved outgroup attitudes among Finnish ( $F(1,127) = 5.87, p = .017, \eta^2 = .044$ ) and Slovak ( $F(1,88) = 9.12, p = .003, \eta^2 = .094$ ), but not among Italian students ( $p = .643$ ). To illustrate these results, we examined the outgroup attitudes among students perceiving different degrees of facilitator's engagement during the intervention by using median split to dichotomize the variable to high versus low perceived engagement groups. As seen in Figure 1, the Finnish and Slovak students who perceived the facilitator to be highly engaged held more positive outgroup attitudes after the intervention than the students who perceived the facilitator to be less engaged.

INSERT FIGURE 1 HERE

## Discussion



Previous research has shown that indirect forms of contact, although effective in reducing prejudice, do not yield as strong effects as direct intergroup contact (Lemmer & Wagner, 2015). Furthermore, school-based interventions performed by the schools' teaching staff are usually less effective than interventions carried out by researchers (Ülger, Dette-Hagenmeyer, Reichle, & Gaertner, 2018). Thus, researchers look at ways to enhance the effectiveness of interventions based on indirect contact in school environments. Given that salient people in one's immediate social environment can act as a potential source of social influence (e.g., Telzer, Van Hoorn, Rogers, & Do, 2018), the role of a person carrying out an intervention program is a crucial, yet unresearched, aspect in implementing prejudice-reduction interventions in a naturalistic setting.

Research employing social norms in intervention programs among adolescents has often focused on how to decrease or prevent problem behavior rather than to support positive development among youth (for discussion, see Telzer et al., 2018). The present study contributed to the latter body of research by testing the extent to which the social influence of an intervention facilitator can promote a positive change in intergroup attitudes in a school-based vicarious contact intervention. Our results stress the importance of the student's perception of the facilitator's engagement in implementing the intervention as the participants who perceived the facilitator to be highly engaged held more positive outgroup attitudes after the intervention than those perceiving the facilitator to be less engaged.

Based on the results obtained in this study, vicarious contact via written stories of cross-group friendship was in itself not enough to produce a positive change in adolescents' intergroup attitudes. Although research on vicarious contact via story reading has been shown to be generally effective, effects may be weak and fade quickly (e.g., McKeown, Williams, & Pauker, 2017; cf. Vezzali & Stathi, 2021, Chapter 3). Possibly, this research did not consider

enough intervening factors that may determine the direction of the effects. In this study, we considered just one of these potential factors, that is, the facilitator's engagement.

Consequently, we found that the intervention effect was strengthened when the message of the intervention was coupled with the perception of the facilitator's engagement, which speaks for the importance of the social context for prejudice-reduction interventions. These results are consistent with earlier theorizing on intergroup contact (Allport, 1954), according to which providing normative support is one prerequisite for the prejudice-reducing effects of intergroup contact. In line with this, previous meta-analytical investigations on prejudice-reduction interventions have shown the importance of the authority figure interacting with the participants compared to, for example, video, poster-, or web-based interventions without any facilitating person (Beelmann & Heinemann, 2014; Ülger et al., 2017). Furthermore, the notion of the social influence of the intervention facilitator is also consistent with previous research in the fields of prevention science and health psychology (e.g., Forman et al., 2009; Swift et al., 2017; Wilde et al., 2019), where the role of intervention facilitators has been acknowledged for much longer than in research on indirect contact.

It should be noted that the perceived facilitator's engagement did not emerge as significant in the Italian sample, where the intervention was implemented by research assistants rather than by teachers. We believe that having included different types of facilitators (teachers in the Finnish and Slovak sample, and research assistants in the Italian sample) represents an added value of our study. In addition to paralleling research in the field, which made use of both, it allows us to assess when perception of engagement by the facilitator is more relevant. Teachers represent the authority figures for students, as they also represent the institution. Perceiving their engagement may therefore indirectly provide the institutional support, considered as an essential optimal condition by Allport. In contrast,

research assistants are external to the school environment, and can hardly be considered as authority figures by students. In this case, perception of their engagement is unlikely to denote institutional support, or at least much less so than that ascribed to facilitators who directly represent the school institution. Our study therefore allows us to speculate not only that the facilitator's engagement is key for the success of an intervention, but also that this is true only when such an engagement is interpreted as institutional support. Future studies should provide direct evidence for this speculation.

Following the body of research speaking for the significant influence of teachers on the positive development of youth (Pianta & Hamre, 2009; Rhodes, Spencer, Keller, Liang, & Noam, 2006), our findings also suggest that teachers' potential as facilitators of prejudice-reduction interventions should not be overlooked. Teachers can act as mentors for the youth, offering a supportive relationship with a non-parental adult, and through this relationship, teachers can serve as role models for adolescents (Rhodes et al., 2006). As previous studies have suggested, students monitor their teachers' intergroup attitudes and behavior both at the expressed (e.g., Grütter & Meyer, 2014; Geerlings et al., 2019) and the implicit level (Castelli et al., 2008; Vezzali et al., 2012). Through their attitudes and behavior, the teachers simultaneously communicate larger institutional and societal norms (LaRusso et al., 2008). These findings therefore support the importance of considering teachers as targets, as well as facilitators, of prejudice-reduction programs.

However, more research is required to gain a more in-depth understanding of which factors can contribute to the students' perception of the facilitator's engagement in vicarious contact interventions. Future research should also look more closely at how the students' perception of the facilitators' engagement could be reinforced to increase the effectiveness of teacher-led prejudice-reduction interventions. This knowledge would also have much-needed

policy implications as it would increase the effectiveness of prejudice-reduction interventions and guide the implementation of such interventions.

Future research should also try to overcome the shortcomings of our study. Firstly, the samples used in our study were not ideal for cross-cultural comparisons, especially regarding the age differences between the participants. Further cross-cultural comparisons would be much needed to disentangle the effects of context on the effectiveness of prejudice-reduction interventions (Pettigrew, 2017). Secondly, the use of a one-item measure to assess outgroup attitudes is suboptimal. Furthermore, it could be said that the intervention's relatively short duration might not have been optimal for obtaining strong and enduring changes in attitudes. However, unlike one-session interventions, our intervention included altogether four sessions, 45 minutes each (cf., Ülger et al., 2018). Nevertheless, we still succeeded in finding effects even two weeks after the intervention and after controlling for age and direct contact experiences, which speaks for the robustness of our findings. Overall, the limitations of our study design are rather typical challenges when conducting interventions in real-life settings such as schools, where all classes are not open for researchers, and the intervention needs to fit into schools' everyday program.

To conclude, our results highlight the role of perceived engagement of the intervention facilitator. As noted above, this could indicate the importance of institutional support in intervention strategies derived from the contact hypothesis. As Paluck and colleagues (2019) state, investigating the preconditions of the contact hypothesis is not only a matter of theoretical importance but also an urgent policy question. For research on intergroup contact to reliably guide policy, it is vital to understand and identify factors that can add to the effectiveness of prejudice-reduction interventions. This study calls for the need to focus more on the delivery of such interventions and the facilitators' role in that process.

### **Acknowledgments**

We wish to express our appreciation for the students who participated in this study and the teachers and research assistants who acted as intervention facilitators. We also thank Saga Luoma, Andrea Barnová, and Zuzana Peterčáková for their assistance in data collection. The intervention material was developed with the support of the European Social Fund [Grant number S20320]. Studies were also supported by the grants APVV 14-0531 and VEGA 2/0127/19 awarded to the fifth author, and Kone Foundation [201710418] awarded to the first author.

### References

- Abacioglu, C. S., Zee, M., Hanna, F., Soeterik, I. M., Fischer, A. H., & Volman, M. (2019). Practice what you preach: The moderating role of teacher attitudes on the relationship between prejudice reduction and student engagement. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 86*, 102887.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action in social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliss, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Beelmann, A., & Heinemann, K. S. (2014). Preventing prejudice and improving intergroup attitudes: A meta-analysis of child and adolescent training programs. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 35*(1), 10-24.
- Bonifazi, C., Heins, F., Strozza, S., & Vitiello, M. (2009). The Italian transition from emigration to immigration country. *IRPPS Working Papers 5*.
- Castelli, L., De Dea, C., & Nesdale, D. (2008). Learning social attitudes: Children's sensitivity to the nonverbal behaviors of adult models during interracial interactions. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*(11), 1504-1513.
- Crandall, C. S., Eshleman, A., & O'brien, L. (2002). Social norms and the expression and suppression of prejudice: The struggle for internalization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 82*(3), 359.
- Cuddy, A. J.C.; Fiske, S. T.; Glick, P. (2008). Warmth and competence as universal dimensions of social perception: The stereotype content model and the BIAS map. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 40*(1), 61–149.

- Dovidio, J. F., Eller, A., & Hewstone, M. (2011). Improving intergroup relations through direct, extended and other forms of indirect contact. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 14*(2), 147-160.
- Dunham, Y., & Degner, J. (2010). Origins of intergroup bias: Developmental and social cognitive research on intergroup attitudes. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 40*(4), 563-568.
- Eurostat (2020). Population and social conditions. [Data file]. Retrieved from <https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/main/data/database>
- Forman, S. G., Fagley, N. S., Steiner, D. D., & Schneider, K. (2009). Teaching evidence-based interventions: Perceptions of influences on use in professional practice in school psychology. *Training and Education in Professional Psychology, 3*(4), 226.
- Geerlings, J., Thijs, J., & Verkuyten, M. (2019). Preaching and practicing multicultural education: Predicting students' outgroup attitudes from perceived teacher norms and perceived teacher–classmate relations. *Journal of School Psychology, 75*, 89-103.
- Gniewosz, B., & Noack, P. (2015). Parental influences on adolescents' negative attitudes toward immigrants. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 44*(9), 1787-1802.
- Gómez, Á., & Huici, C. (2008). Vicarious intergroup contact and the role of authorities in prejudice reduction. *Spanish Journal of Psychology, 11*(1), 103.
- Grütter, J., & Meyer, B. (2014). Intergroup friendship and children's intentions for social exclusion in integrative classrooms: the moderating role of teachers' diversity beliefs. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 44*(7), 481-494.

Haddock, G., Zanna, M. P., & Esses, V. M. (1993). Assessing the structure of prejudicial attitudes: The case of attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *65*, 1105–1118.

International Organization for Migration. (2020, September 29). Migrácia na Slovensku [Migration in Slovakia]. <https://iom.sk/sk/migracia/migracia-na-slovensku.html>

ISTAT, Italian National Institute of Statistics (2019, January). *I.Stat* [Data warehouse]. Retrieved from <http://dati.istat.it/>

Kadlečíková, J. (2018). Cudzinci v Bratislave. [Foreigners in Bratislava.] Bratislava: CVEK, <http://cvek.sk/wp-content/uploads/2019/03/Integracia-cudzincov-v-Bratislave.pdf>

Kende, A., Tropp, L., & Lantos, N. A. (2017). Testing a contact intervention based on intergroup friendship between Roma and non-Roma Hungarians: Reducing bias through institutional support in a non-supportive societal context. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *47*(1), 47-55.

LaRusso, M. D., Romer, D., & Selman, R. L. (2008). Teachers as builders of respectful school climates: Implications for adolescent drug use norms and depressive symptoms in high school. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *37*(4), 386.

Lemmer, G., & Wagner, U. (2015). Can we really reduce ethnic prejudice outside the lab? A meta-analysis of direct and indirect contact interventions. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *45*(2), 152-168.

Liebkind, K., Mähönen, T. A., Solares, E., Solheim, E. & Jasinskaja-Lahti, I. (2014). Prejudice-reduction in Culturally Mixed Classrooms: The development and assessment of a theory-driven intervention among majority and minority youth in Finland. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *24*(4), 325–339.



- Liebkind, K., Mäkinen, V., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., Renvik, T. A., & Solheim, E. F. (2019). Improving outgroup attitudes in schools: First steps toward a teacher-led vicarious contact intervention. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, *60*(1), 77-86.
- Mazziotta, A., Mummendey, A., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Vicarious intergroup contact effects: Applying social-cognitive theory to intergroup contact research. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *14*(2), 255-274.
- McKeown, S., & Dixon, J. (2017). The “contact hypothesis”: Critical reflections and future directions. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *11*(1), e12295.
- McKeown, S., Williams, A., & Pauker, K. (2017). Stories that move them: Changing children’s behaviour toward diverse peers. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, *27*(5), 381-387.
- Merino, S. M. (2013). Contact with gays and lesbians and same-sex marriage support: The moderating role of social context. *Social Science Research*, *42*(4), 1156-1166.
- Miklikowska, M. (2017). Development of anti-immigrant attitudes in adolescence: The role of parents, peers, intergroup friendships, and empathy. *British Journal of Psychology*, *108*(3), 626-648.
- Mäkinen, V., Liebkind, K., Jasinskaja-Lahti, I., & Renvik, T. A. (2019). A teacher-led vicarious contact intervention in culturally mixed classrooms with in-and outgroup role models of intergroup friendship. *Journal of School Psychology*, *75*, 27-40.
- Paluck, E. L., Green, S. A., & Green, D. P. (2019). The contact hypothesis re-evaluated. *Behavioural Public Policy*, *3*(2), 129-158.

- Pehar, L., Čorkalo Biruški, D., & Pavin Ivanec, T. (2020). The role of peer, parental, and school norms in predicting adolescents' attitudes and behaviours of majority and different minority ethnic groups in Croatia. *PloS one*, *15*(1), e0227512.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (2018). The emergence of contextual social psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *44*(7), 963-971.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*(5), 751.
- Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *35*(3), 271-280.
- Pianta, R. C., & Hamre, B. K. (2009). Classroom processes and positive youth development: Conceptualizing, measuring, and improving the capacity of interactions between teachers and students. *New Directions for Youth Development*, *2009*(121), 33-46.
- Raabe, T., & Beelmann, A. (2011). Development of ethnic, racial, and national prejudice in childhood and adolescence: A multinational meta-analysis of age differences. *Child Development*, *82*(6), 1715-1737.
- Rhodes, J. E., Spencer, R., Keller, T. E., Liang, B., & Noam, G. (2006). A model for the influence of mentoring relationships on youth development. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *34*(6), 691-707.
- Solares, E., Huttunen, S., Mähönen, T.A., Hirvonen, M-T. & Liebkind, K. (2012). *Tarinoita kaveruudesta – Hyviä ryhmienvälisiä suhteita tukemassa. Opettajan opas*. [Stories of friendship – supporting good intercultural relations. Teacher's manual]. Unit of Social Psychology, University of Helsinki.

- Statistics Finland (2020). Numbers and shares of persons with immigrant background by area, 1990-2019. Retrieved from <http://pxnet2.stat.fi/PXWeb/pxweb/en/StatFin/>
- Swift, L. E., Hubbard, J. A., Bookhout, M. K., Grasseti, S. N., Smith, M. A., & Morrow, M. T. (2017). Teacher factors contributing to dosage of the KiVa anti-bullying program. *Journal of School Psychology, 65*, 102-115.
- Telzer, E. H., Van Hoorn, J., Rogers, C. R., & Do, K. T. (2018). Social influence on positive youth development: a developmental neuroscience perspective. *Advances in Child Development and Behavior, 54*, 215-258.
- Ülger, Z., Dette-Hagenmeyer, D. E., Reichle, B., & Gaertner, S. L. (2018). Improving outgroup attitudes in schools: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of School Psychology, 67*, 88-103.
- Vezzali, L., Giovannini, D., & Capozza, D. (2012). Social antecedents of children's implicit prejudice: Direct contact, extended contact, explicit and implicit teachers' prejudice. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 9*(5), 569-581.
- Vezzali, L., Hewstone, M., Capozza, D., Giovannini, D., & Wölfer, R. (2014). Improving intergroup relations with extended and vicarious forms of indirect contact. *European Review of Social Psychology, 25*(1), 314-389.
- Vezzali, L., & Stathi, S. (2021). *Using intergroup contact to fight prejudice and negative attitudes: Psychological perspectives*. European Monographs in Social Psychology Series. Abingdon, UK: Routledge.
- Wilde, S., Sonley, A., Crane, C., Ford, T., Raja, A., Robson, J., . . . Kuyken, W. (2019). Mindfulness training in UK secondary schools: A multiple case study approach to identification of cornerstones of implementation. *Mindfulness, 10*(2), 376-389.

Wölfer, R., Christ, O., Schmid, K., Tausch, N., Buchallik, F. M., Vertovec, S., & Hewstone, M. (2019). Indirect contact predicts direct contact: Longitudinal evidence and the mediating role of intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *116*(2), 277.

**Table 1.** Means and standard deviations for the baseline assessment of outgroup attitudes and direct contact

Measure (scale)	Finland		Italy		Slovakia	
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Outgroup attitudes (0-100)	74.15	21.77	56.33	23.36	64.91	22.82
Outgroup friends <sup>a</sup> (1-7)	3.66	1.72	4.23	1.38	2.98	1.65
Prior contact (1-5)	3.76	1.00	3.18	.97	2.72	1.09

<sup>a</sup>The values do not refer to the actual number of outgroup friends

**Table 2.** The result of 2 (time) x 2 (condition) mixed design ANOVAs.

Dependent measure per condition	Finland				Italy				Slovakia			
	T1	T2	time x group	ES	T1	T2	time x group	ES	T1	T2	time x group	ES
	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>F</i>	Partial $\eta^2$	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>F</i>	Partial $\eta^2$	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>M (SD)</i>	<i>F</i>	Partial $\eta^2$
Outgroup attitudes (0-100)			.37	.001			3.62	.035			.91	.004
<i>Control</i>	74.86 (22.29)	75.08 (21.98)			52.95 (25.39)	51.31 (28.49)			64.60 (21.85)	65.10 (19.92)		
<i>Experimental</i>	73.20 (21.28)	72.17 (22.18)			61.95 (17.21)	52.93 (19.52)			65.17 (23.72)	67.84 (22.33)		

# VICARIOUS CONTACT INTERVENTION

**Figure 1**

*Intergroup attitudes at T2 by country by low versus high perceived engagement of intervention facilitator*

