

**European Journal of Social Psychology**

**Spontaneous imagined intergroup contact and intergroup relations: Quality matters**

Journal:	<i>European Journal of Social Psychology</i>
Manuscript ID	EJSP-18-0341.R2
Wiley - Manuscript type:	Research Article

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

RUNNING HEAD: SPONTANEOUS IMAGINED CONTACT

**Spontaneous imagined intergroup contact and intergroup relations: Quality matters**

For Peer Review

## Abstract

While research on experimental interventions that aim to improve outgroup attitudes via contact imagery grows, it is important to examine if contact imagery that occurs in spontaneous, non-experimentally controlled conditions drives attitudes, and in what direction. To answer this, we constructed and validated a spontaneous imagined intergroup contact scale (SIICS) that differentiates between frequency, quality and elaboration of the spontaneous imagery of outgroups. In three correlational studies ( $N_{Portugal} = 305$ ,  $N_{United Kingdom} = 185$ ,  $N_{Italy} = 276$ ), we tested the role of spontaneous imagined contact frequency, quality and elaboration in predicting attitudes and social distance (Studies 1-3) and intended behaviour (Study 3) toward immigrant groups. Results demonstrated that spontaneous imagined contact quality consistently predicted key outcome variables above and beyond the other two dimensions. Importantly, the effects were significant while controlling for other potent forms of direct and indirect contact. Implications of the findings for theory and practice are discussed.

*Keywords:* imagined contact, attitudes, intended behaviour, empathy, anxiety

1  
2  
3                   Research on improving intergroup relations emphasises the role of intergroup contact  
4  
5 as a key factor predicting reduced prejudice and positive attitudes toward outgroups  
6  
7 (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Intergroup contact scholars have explored the effectiveness of the  
8  
9 technique in numerous contexts with a large array of targets, and although contact is not a  
10  
11 panacea for prejudice (Dixon, Durrheim, & Tredoux, 2005), its fundamental role in  
12  
13 ameliorating intergroup conflict has been clearly demonstrated (e.g., Al Ramiah & Hewstone,  
14  
15 2013; Hodson & Hewstone, 2013; Pettigrew, Tropp, Wagner, & Christ, 2011). Recent  
16  
17 developments in the field of intergroup contact theory have pointed to novel theoretical and  
18  
19 practical implications for intergroup relations scholars (Vezzali & Stathi, 2017), while much  
20  
21 of the reignited interest in the field is driven by advances in indirect contact strategies  
22  
23 (Dovidio, Eller, & Hewstone, 2011). Research over the last two decades demonstrated that  
24  
25 indirect contact, that is forms of contact without the face-to-face element, can also improve  
26  
27 intergroup relations.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33                   One implementation of indirect contact that has recently attracted scholarly interest is  
34  
35 imagined contact (Crisp, Stathi, Turner, & Husnu, 2008; Crisp & Turner, 2009), and  
36  
37 empirical evidence for its efficacy as a versatile prejudice-reduction strategy started emerging  
38  
39 rapidly (for meta-analysis see Miles & Crisp, 2014). Imagined contact is operationalized by  
40  
41 instructing individuals to imagine a –typically– positive and relaxed intergroup encounter  
42  
43 with an unknown person from the outgroup (Crisp & Turner, 2009). Mental imagery under  
44  
45 these instructions improves attitudes compared to control conditions, in which participants  
46  
47 simply think about the outgroup without any contact element or think about neutral scenes  
48  
49 (Stathi & Crisp, 2008; Turner, Crisp, & Lambert, 2007).  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

55                   This points to an interesting and yet unexplored question: do people spontaneously  
56  
57 and without any experimental instructions think about interactions with the outgroup, and if  
58  
59 so, what happens when people engage in such spontaneous contact imagery in daily life,  
60

1  
2  
3 outside the laboratory? Without ad hoc, experimental instructions to think about positive  
4  
5 intergroup encounters, does spontaneous contact imagery lead to positive intergroup  
6  
7 emotions and attitudes? In three studies, we explored the role of spontaneous (i.e., non-  
8  
9 experimentally manipulated) imagined contact as predictor of outgroup attitudes, above and  
10  
11 beyond powerful contact forms such as extended contact and intergroup friendships (Study  
12  
13 2), and quantity and quality of existing contact (Study 3). Our research was correlational and  
14  
15 was conducted with three different samples in three different national contexts: Portuguese  
16  
17 nationals and their attitudes toward immigrant groups in Portugal (Study 1), British nationals  
18  
19 and their attitudes toward Eastern Europeans in the UK (Study 2), and Italian nationals and  
20  
21 their attitudes toward Eastern European immigrants in Italy (Study 3). In order to examine the  
22  
23 role of spontaneous imagined contact, we designed and validated a scale of spontaneous  
24  
25 imagined intergroup contact that, in line with premises deriving from experimental research  
26  
27 (Husnu & Crisp, 2010; West, Holmes, & Hewstone, 2011), differentiates between frequency,  
28  
29 quality and elaboration of the contact imagery. The spontaneous imagined intergroup contact  
30  
31 scale (SIICS) was tested and used in all three studies.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

### 38 **Positive intergroup contact**

39  
40  
41 Ample empirical evidence, meta-analyses and influential reviews on intergroup  
42  
43 contact point to the effectiveness of the technique in the fight against prejudice (Hodson &  
44  
45 Hewstone, 2013; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Pettigrew et al., 2011). Contact is a useful  
46  
47 method when seeking to improve people's attitudes toward outgroups, even in contexts of  
48  
49 conflict (Al-Ramiah & Hewstone, 2013). Research over the last two decades identified  
50  
51 several mediators of the contact-prejudice relationship and predominantly highlighted the  
52  
53 affective processes that explain how contact reduces intergroup bias (Brown & Hewstone,  
54  
55 2005; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). Pettigrew and Tropp (2008) demonstrated that empathy and  
56  
57 anxiety are two particularly important factors that explain the path from contact to reduced  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 prejudice. That is, contact with outgroup members enhances empathy toward the outgroup  
4  
5 and reduces the anxiety usually raised in intergroup situations, which, in line, leads to  
6  
7 improvements in intergroup attitudes.  
8  
9

10  
11 Pettigrew and Tropp's (2006) extensive meta-analysis of the effects of contact on  
12  
13 prejudice demonstrated that even in the absence of the optimal conditions highlighted by  
14  
15 Allport (1954), contact reduces prejudice. However, recently, intergroup contact scholars also  
16  
17 started delving into the prevalence and outcomes of negative contact (Aberson, 2015; Barlow  
18  
19 et al., 2012; Graf & Paolini, 2017; Paolini, Harwood, Rubin, Husnu, Joyce, & Hewstone,  
20  
21 2014). Research suggests that although positive intergroup contact is, generally speaking,  
22  
23 more commonly experienced than negative contact, negative contact can yield more  
24  
25 powerful, harmful effects on intergroup relations (Graf, Paolini, & Rubin, 2014). For  
26  
27 example, Barlow et al. (2012) showed that negative contact experiences with specific  
28  
29 outgroup members are more easily generalised to the outgroup as a whole than positive  
30  
31 experiences. Recent research, however, found no support for the positive-negative asymmetry  
32  
33 effect (Arnadottir, Lollot, Brown, & Hewstone, 2018). Regardless for the mixed results,  
34  
35 acknowledging the impact of negative contact is important because it highlights that if  
36  
37 contact with outgroups lacks the element of positivity it can have detrimental consequences.  
38  
39 Positive, high-quality contact, on the other hand, ameliorates outgroup attitudes (Islam &  
40  
41 Hewstone, 1993; Tredoux & Finchilescu, 2010). Therefore, it is important to highlight that  
42  
43 positivity is a key factor for direct and indirect forms of contact to yield positive effects on  
44  
45 intergroup relations.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50

### 51 52 **Experimentally induced imagined contact**

53  
54  
55 Aiming to investigate the implementation and effectiveness of contact-based  
56  
57 interventions, scholars have also explored indirect (i.e., not face-to-face) contact, primarily  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 focusing on two methods; extended contact, that is knowing that fellow ingroup members  
4 interact positively with outgroup members (Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Ropp,  
5 1997, for review see Vezzali, Hewstone, Capozza, Giovannini, & Wolfer, 2014; for a meta-  
6 analysis, see Zhou, Page-Gould, Aron, Moyer, & Hewstone, 2018), and imagined contact,  
7 that is mentally simulating interactions with the outgroup (Crisp & Turner, 2009). Wright et  
8 al. (1997) theorized and provided empirical support for the extended contact hypothesis,  
9 suggesting that direct contact is not always necessary when seeking to improve people's  
10 attitudes. Evidence from research with adults and children has now demonstrated that  
11 knowing that ingroup members have close relations with outgroup members reduces  
12 intergroup biases (Vezzali et al., 2014; Zhou et al., 2018).

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Imagined contact research emerged as a complementary implementation of indirect  
contact, and its operationalisation was predominantly based on mental imagery research that  
indicated that mentally simulating experiences shares common characteristics with real  
experiences (Dadds, Bovbjerg, Redd, & Cutmore, 1997; Kosslyn, Ganis, & Thompson,  
2001). A meta-analysis of a sample of 70 studies that rapidly followed the introduction of the  
imagined contact hypothesis showed that the mental simulation of positive intergroup  
interactions improves people's attitudes toward outgroups and promotes behavioural  
intentions to engage with the outgroup (Miles & Crisp, 2014). In line with findings regarding  
direct contact, there is now evidence that participants allocated to conditions that instruct  
them to imagine positive interactions with outgroups report reduced bias and negative  
emotions (Ioannou, Hewstone, & Al Ramiah, 2017, Study 2; Stathi, Tsantila, & Crisp, 2012)  
and enhanced positive emotions and contact behavioural intentions (Pagotto, Visinti, De  
Iorio, & Voci, 2012; Vezzali, Capozza, Stathi, & Giovannini, 2012; for a review, see Vezzali,  
Crisp, Stathi, & Giovannini, 2013). This is evidenced by studies conducted with various  
target groups, in various sociocultural contexts and with samples of both children and adults

1  
2  
3 (Miles & Crisp, 2014). Research has shown that the imagined contact effects are explained by  
4  
5 many of the same processes that occur as a consequence of actual contact. For example,  
6  
7 imagined contact leads to increased empathy (Kuchenbrandt, Eyssel, & Seidel, 2013) and  
8  
9 reduced intergroup anxiety, which mediates the positive effects of the strategy (Stathi, Crisp,  
10  
11 Turner, West, & Birtel, 2012; Stathi et al., 2012; Turner et al., 2007; Turner, West, &  
12  
13 Christie, 2013).  
14  
15

16  
17 In line with research that argues for the role of qualitative, positive contact in real  
18  
19 intergroup encounters (Islam & Hewstone, 1993; Tredoux & Finchilescu, 2010), the role of  
20  
21 positivity has also been noted in imagined contact research. Studies that examined how to  
22  
23 best use imagined contact to improve attitudes demonstrated that compared to neutral  
24  
25 imagined contact, participants who are instructed to think about positive interactions with  
26  
27 unknown outgroup members are subsequently more positive toward the outgroup as a whole  
28  
29 (Meleady & Seger, 2016; Stathi & Crisp, 2008; West et al., 2011). Similarly, when imagined  
30  
31 contact is instructed to be cooperative the positive intergroup outcomes are enhanced  
32  
33 (Kuchenbrandt et al., 2013). Importantly, Kuchenbrandt et al. (2013) further found that  
34  
35 perceived quality of the imagined interaction mediated the effects of imagined contact.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41  
42 Given that imagined contact research is experimental, the issue of creating positive  
43  
44 mental imagery conditions is addressed by giving explicit instructions to participants  
45  
46 regarding the valence of the imagery. For example, they are asked to imagine “relaxed”,  
47  
48 “positive” and “interesting” encounters with outgroups, or to imagine “co-operative” contact  
49  
50 (see Crisp et al., 2009; Kuchenbrandt et al., 2013). The fact that simple and easily  
51  
52 implemented instructions to engage in positive mental simulation of intergroup interactions  
53  
54 can improve outgroup attitudes and contact behavioural intentions has allowed the  
55  
56 development of imagined contact as a cost-effective and versatile prejudice reduction tool.  
57  
58 Interestingly, Husnu and Paolini (2018) showed that when people have the choice to imagine  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 either a positive or a negative contact scenario, they tend to actively chose to imagine positive  
4 rather than negative contact. Yet, it is important to acknowledge that people also engage in  
5 mental imagery in non-controlled, non-experimental conditions since in everyday life mental  
6 imagery often occurs spontaneously (e.g., Somerville, Cooper, & Hackmann, 2007). Social  
7 cognition research has shown that people make social inferences spontaneously and the  
8 situational context can affect spontaneous attitudes (Macrae, Bodenhausen, Milne, Thorn, &  
9 Castelli, 1997; Uleman, Saribay, & Gonzalez, 2008; Wittenbrink, Judd, & Park, 2001). We  
10 argue that, from an intergroup perspective, it is likely that this spontaneous everyday imagery  
11 involves to some extent interactions with other people, some of whom may belong to  
12 outgroups. Given that experimentally manipulated mental imagery of contact predicts  
13 attitudes toward the outgroup (Miles & Crisp, 2014), we argue that it is important to  
14 understand whether the spontaneous forms of imagined contact that occur outside the  
15 laboratory also drive outgroup attitudes, and in which direction. If people do indeed imagine  
16 contact experiences with outgroup members, then we need to understand the outcomes of this  
17 spontaneous process.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

Spontaneous imagined contact as it occurs in everyday life (rather than in carefully-  
designed experiments) is likely to be unstructured and not adhering to the guidelines usually  
accompanying the relevant experimental studies. These guidelines usually instruct people to  
engage in a positively valanced mentally simulated interaction, in line with the contact  
hypothesis that suggests that contact is more effective under optimal conditions (Allport,  
1954; Pettigrew, 1998). However, when imagined intergroup contact occurs in everyday  
conditions people may rely on heuristics and outgroup stereotypes to guide their imagined  
interactions (Uleman et al., 2008). This can be exacerbated in contexts of conflict or threat,  
where reliance on negative stereotypes is stronger (Bar-Tal & Teichman, 2005; Zárate,  
Garcia, Garza, & Hitlan, 2004). Therefore, when people engage in spontaneous imagined

1  
2  
3 contact outside the laboratory they may make use of biased information concerning the  
4  
5 outgroup, which could then perpetuate negative attitudes and entrench contact avoidance.  
6  
7 Spontaneous contact mental imagery may thus serve to fit the schemas that people have about  
8  
9 the outgroups (Park & Rothbart, 1982). When considering the spontaneous, non-  
10  
11 experimentally induced mental imagery of interactions in everyday life it is therefore  
12  
13 important to assess the positivity attributed to these imagined interactions.  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 In line with the contact and imagined contact literature, it is important to distinguish  
19  
20 between the quantity and the positivity, i.e. quality, of the spontaneous imagined contact  
21  
22 thoughts. Based on the research reviewed above, we expect that it is primarily the quality  
23  
24 rather than the frequency of spontaneous contact imagery that will predict positive attitudes.  
25  
26 Another key factor that is relevant when considering the strength of the outcomes of  
27  
28 spontaneous imagined contact is that of elaboration (Husnu & Crisp, 2010). Elaboration, that  
29  
30 is increasing the vividness of the imagined scenario by asking participants to include details,  
31  
32 has been used in the instructions of the imagined contact conditions as a condition further  
33  
34 enhancing its effects. Husnu and Crisp (2010) found that participants who elaborated on the  
35  
36 imagined contact task subsequently reported more favourable outgroup attitudes. This result  
37  
38 is in line with research showing that elaboration has stronger impact on associated attitudes  
39  
40 and behaviour because it provides an available script upon which one can act (Gollwitzer,  
41  
42 1993; Ross, Lepper, & Hubbard, 1975).  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47

48 We argue that in order to assess the association between spontaneous imagined  
49  
50 intergroup contact and attitudes, we need to consider whether this association exists above  
51  
52 and beyond existing contact with the outgroup. It has generally been argued that imagined  
53  
54 contact as a prejudice reduction tool is more beneficial when levels of existing contact are  
55  
56 low (Crisp et al., 2008; Hoffarth & Hodson, 2016). Hoffarth and Hodson (2016) found that  
57  
58 previous contact moderated the efficacy of imagined contact. That is important because it  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 suggests that when people have experiences of direct intergroup interactions the effect of  
4  
5 imagined contact is not as strong as when people do not have real contact experiences. In our  
6  
7 research, after examining the initial association between spontaneous imagined contact and  
8  
9 attitudes (Study 1) we measured different forms of direct and indirect contact, and used them  
10  
11 as covariates (Studies 2 and 3). Specifically, we included extended contact and cross-group  
12  
13 friendships as covariates in Study 2, and quantity and quality of existing intergroup contact as  
14  
15 covariates in Study 3. Given that these forms of contact are fundamental determinants of  
16  
17 intergroup attitudes, it is important to include them in the design of the current studies in  
18  
19 order to explore whether spontaneously imagining contact with the outgroup is still  
20  
21 associated with an improved stance toward the outgroup when they are also involved. Finding  
22  
23 evidence that imagining contact outside the strictly controlled conditions created in  
24  
25 experimental studies predicts attitudes, and that it does so while controlling for several  
26  
27 different forms of direct and indirect contact, would provide important support for the role of  
28  
29 spontaneous intergroup imagery.  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 In order to further understand the processes that underlie the potential link between  
37  
38 spontaneous contact imagery and attitudes toward the outgroup we measured two key  
39  
40 mediators highlighted in the contact and imagined contact literature, intergroup empathy and  
41  
42 anxiety (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). As reviewed above, the role of both affective  
43  
44 mechanisms has been largely supported when seeking to understand how contact reduces  
45  
46 prejudice. It is thus interesting to examine if spontaneous contact imagery relates to  
47  
48 intergroup anxiety and empathy toward the outgroup in a similar way as real contact  
49  
50 experiences do.  
51  
52  
53  
54

### 55 **The present research**

56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 In three correlational studies we tested whether people's spontaneous imagined  
4 intergroup interactions predict positive attitudes toward the outgroup (Studies 1-3) and  
5 contact behavioural intentions (Study 3) above and beyond reported levels of extended  
6 contact and cross group friendships (Study 2) and quantity and quality of existing intergroup  
7 contact (Study 3). Although research demonstrating the effects of experimentally induced  
8 imagined contact has found that the strategy reduces intergroup biases, it is unclear whether  
9 everyday spontaneous imagery regarding intergroup interactions is associated with attitudes  
10 in a similar, positive way. Exploring this can shed light on the outcomes of casual thinking  
11 processes associated with contact. In addition, imagined contact has been tested by research  
12 in the laboratory, whereas only few studies examined naturalistic contexts (e.g., De Carvalho-  
13 Freitas & Stathi, 2017; Stathi, Cameron, Hartley, & Bradford, 2014; Vezzali et al., 2012).  
14 The study of spontaneous contact imagery allows to go beyond the restrictions of laboratory  
15 research, and can provide first evidence of how (spontaneous) imagined contact may affect  
16 the course of intergroup relations in everyday life.

17  
18  
19 To address the questions of the current research, we also created and validated a  
20 spontaneous imagined intergroup contact scale (SIICS), with three dimensions previously  
21 shown to impact on imagined and direct contact outcomes; frequency, quality and elaboration  
22 of the imagined imagery. Decomposing spontaneous imagined contact allows us to test which  
23 of these dimensions is more strongly related to positive outgroup views. Therefore, our  
24 research not only enhances our understanding of whether people spontaneously imagine  
25 intergroup contact and the outcomes of this, but also allows a more careful consideration of  
26 attitude change interventions. That is, knowing that certain dimensions of the spontaneous  
27 contact imagery are more likely to drive outgroup attitudes can inform the tailoring of  
28 interventions to take into account the thinking processes that occur in daily life.

1  
2  
3 We hypothesise that the frequency, quality and elaboration of spontaneously (i.e.,  
4 non-experimentally induced) imagined intergroup contact will be associated with more  
5 positive attitudes, above and beyond existing contact. Based on direct contact research, we  
6 expect that the predictive role of the quality of the imagined interactions will be stronger than  
7 that of frequency and elaboration. We further expect that affective responses, specifically  
8 empathy and anxiety, will mediate the path from the spontaneous contact imagery to  
9 attitudes.  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

### 20 **Study 1**

21  
22 Study 1 aimed to explore if people spontaneously imagine interactions with an  
23 outgroup, and if so, whether this spontaneous imagery associated with attitudes toward the  
24 targeted outgroup. To do so, we developed the spontaneous imagined intergroup contact scale  
25 (SIICS), an instrument to assess spontaneous imagined intergroup contact, based on the  
26 previously identified key aspects of direct contact (i.e., quality and frequency) and  
27 experimentally induced contact imagery (i.e., elaboration).  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

### 38 **Method**

#### 39 **Participants and Procedure**

40  
41 Participants were 305 Portuguese nationals (68.2% female) with age ranging from 18  
42 to 73 years ( $M = 30.33$ ,  $SD = 10.72$ ). Regarding education, 47.6% had Bachelor degrees,  
43 32.8% reported having a high school degree, 17% had a Master or Doctoral degree, and less  
44 than 3% reported having a primary school degree. Approximately half of the participants  
45 were employed (58.7%), 30.5% were students and less than 3% were unemployed.  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52  
53 Participants were recruited via email and Facebook and completed an online survey  
54 (Qualtrics)<sup>1</sup>. After questions on demographics, participants answered the measures of  
55 interest: imagined contact, social distance and warmth. The items referred to one of the three  
56 most represented immigrant groups in Portugal: Africans, Brazilians and Ukrainians (SEF,  
57  
58  
59  
60

2015). Participants saw the attitudes measures and then the SIICS questions, and each participant only rated one of the three possible target groups. Data collection was implemented with the aim of reaching a) a minimum sample size for detecting a small effect size with the power of .80 for running a multiple regression with three predictors (minimum  $N = 274$ ), and b) an adequate sample for running an exploratory factor analysis ( $200 \leq N \leq 500$ , see e.g., Cattell, 1978).

After completing the survey, participants were debriefed and thanked for their participation.<sup>2</sup>

### Measures

**SIICS.** We developed 8 items to assess participants' spontaneous imagined intergroup contact. Two items assessed the frequency of imagined contact (*In everyday life, how frequently do you imagine interacting with "target-group"*, 1 = Never/almost never, 5 = Always/almost always; *Specifically, how often do you imagine having contact with "target-group"*, ranging from at least once a day [1] to less than once per year [8]); 2 items assessed the quality of imagined contact (*When you imagine interacting with "target-group", these encounters are* (1) Unpleasant -Pleasant (5), (1) Hostile – Friendly (5); and 4 items assessed the degree of elaboration (*When you imagine interacting with "target-group: do you imagine the reason behind this contact; do you think about the details of where and when this contact takes place, do you share this interaction with your friends*, 1 = Never/almost never, 5 = Always/almost always; *On average, when you imagine having contact with "target-group", how much time do you spend imagining the contact scene?*, Less than 1 minute, Approximately one minute, More than 1 minute). All items were standardized using Z-Points ( $r_{\text{frequency}} = .77$ ,  $r_{\text{quality}} = .57$ ;  $\alpha_{\text{elaboration}} = .85$ ) apart from the case of the ANOVA, where a different index was used (see Footnote 3).

**Social Distance.** Participants rated how favourable they were to have the target group in six different situations (e.g., classmates, neighbours, in-laws) (1=Not at all to 5=Very much) (based on Binder et al., 2009). We reversed-scored the scale so that higher values mean more social distance toward the target-group ( $\alpha_{\text{Africans}} = .97$ ;  $\alpha_{\text{Brazilians}} = .95$ ;  $\alpha_{\text{Ukrainians}} = .94$ ).

**Outgroup attitudes.** Participants rated how positive/negative they felt towards the target group on a thermometer ranging from 0 to 100 degrees (based on Haddock, Zanna, & Esses, 1993). Values higher than 50 degrees indicated a positive/warm feeling towards the outgroup.

## Results

We conducted an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) with IBM SPSS Statistics, version 23, involving the 8 items developed to assess imagined contact. Next we tested the scale sensitivity by examining its potential to detect differences between the different target groups, and explored its criterion validity by examining the correlations with two attitudinal measures.

### **Exploratory factor analysis and reliability**

We conducted an EFA with principal axis factoring extraction and *Oblimin* rotation on the 8 items (Table 1). The number of retained factors was determined by scree plot analysis and item loadings were taken from pattern matrices. Items with factor loadings  $\geq .35$  in more than one factor were removed from the analysis (Costello & Osborne, 2005). The analyses revealed a 3-factor structure explaining 61.21% of variance: (I) Frequency, (II) Quality, and (III) Elaboration. Items had moderate-to-high loadings on the respective factor and all factors presented good reliability (see Table 1). Since one loading was quite low, one item from the elaboration dimension (i.e., *On average, when you imagine having contact with*

1  
2  
3 “target-group”, how much time do you spend imagining the contact scene?) was discharged  
4  
5 from the analyses and from the other two studies.  
6

### 7 8 **Scale sensitivity**

9  
10 To examine the scale sensitivity to different target groups, we conducted a 3 imagined  
11 contact (frequency vs. quality vs. elaboration)  $\times$  3 target-group (African vs. Brazilian vs.  
12 Ukrainian immigrants) mixed-factors repeated measures ANOVA<sup>3</sup>. Results showed a  
13 significant main effect of contact,  $F(2, 280) = 426.11, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .75$ , showing that SIICS  
14 can detect differences even when the same latent construct is underlined. Specifically,  
15 regardless of target-group, participants reported more imagined contact quality ( $M = 3.80, SD$   
16  $= 0.90$ ) than frequency ( $M = 2.23, SD = 1.25$ ),  $t(283) = 19.71, p < .001$ , and elaboration ( $M =$   
17  $1.77, SD = 0.91$ ),  $t(283) = 28.35, p < .001$ , and more frequency compared to elaboration,  
18  $t(283) = 6.00, p < .001$ . Similarly, the main effect of target-group was also significant  $F(2,$   
19  $281) = 18.32, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .11$ , showing that ratings for the African immigrants ( $M = 2.89,$   
20  $SD = 0.70$ ) were significantly higher than for Brazilians ( $M = 2.62, SD = 0.71$ ),  $t(182) = 2.68,$   
21  $p < .01$ , and Ukrainians ( $M = 2.31, SD = 0.61$ ),  $t(192) = 6.20, p < .001$ ; in addition, participants  
22 reported higher scores for Brazilians compared to Ukrainians,  $t(188) = 3.20, p < .01$ .  
23 Importantly, there was an interaction between the factors,  $F(4,562) = 3.78, p < .01, \eta^2_p = .03$ .  
24 Post-hoc comparisons showed that participants imagined significantly more frequent contact  
25 with African immigrants ( $M = 2.76, SD = 1.28$ ), relative to both Brazilians ( $M = 2.18, SD =$   
26  $1.20$ ),  $t(182) = 3.17, p < .01$ , and Ukrainians ( $M = -.34, SD = .80$ ),  $t(192) = 5.84, p < .001$ , and  
27 imagined contact was more frequent for Brazilians than for Ukrainians,  $t(188) = 2.49, p < .05$ .  
28 Quality of imagined contact was also higher for African ( $M = 3.92, SD = 0.76$ ),  $t(192) = 2.74,$   
29  $p < .01$ , and Brazilian targets ( $M = 3.90, SD = 0.97$ ),  $t(188) = 2.23, p < .05$ , relative to  
30 Ukrainian targets ( $M = 3.59, SD = 0.91$ ); imagined contact quality did not differ across  
31 Africans and Brazilians,  $t(182) = 0.20, ns$ . Finally, regarding elaboration, participants  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 reported significantly more elaboration of imagined contact of Africans ( $M = 1.99$ ,  $SD =$   
4  $1.04$ ),  $t(192) = 3.34$ ,  $p < .001$ , and Brazilians ( $M = 1.76$ ,  $SD = 0.88$ ),  $t(188) = 1.73$ ,  $p < .09$ ,  
5  
6 relative to Ukrainians ( $M = 1.56$ ,  $SD = 0.75$ ). No differences emerged between the African  
7  
8 and Brazilian outgroup scores,  $t(182) = 1.61$ , *ns*.  
9

### 10 11 12 **Preliminary evidence for criterion validity**

13  
14  
15 Correlations among the variables are reported in Table 2. We conducted two multiple  
16  
17 regression analyses, separately for target groups to explore whether frequency, quality and  
18  
19 elaboration of imagined contact were significantly related with social distance and outgroup  
20  
21 attitudes. Results are presented in Table 3. Across the three groups, imagined contact quality  
22  
23 was associated with decreased social distance; in addition, only for the Ukrainian target-  
24  
25 group, imagined contact elaboration was negatively, but marginally, related to social  
26  
27 distance. Similar results emerged when attitudes were the dependent variable. In particular,  
28  
29 imagined contact quality was correlated with a positive evaluation of the three target groups;  
30  
31 on the other hand, imagined contact frequency was positively associated with positive  
32  
33 attitudes when considering both the Brazilian and the African (marginally) target groups.  
34  
35 Finally, no effect of imagined contact elaboration was found<sup>4</sup>.  
36  
37  
38  
39

40  
41 Study 1 provided initial empirical support for the role of spontaneous contact imagery  
42  
43 on two dimensions of attitudes, social distance and outgroup attitudes. All three dimensions  
44  
45 of imagined contact, that is quality, frequency and elaboration, were positively associated  
46  
47 with outgroup attitudes and negatively associated with social distance. Studies 2 and 3  
48  
49 expand on these findings by adding new outcome and control variables.  
50

### 51 52 **Study 2**

53  
54  
55 In Study 2 we seek to extend the initial findings of Study 1 while controlling for  
56  
57 intergroup friendships and extended contact, and by also looking at two key mediators,  
58  
59 empathy toward the outgroup and intergroup anxiety. We decided to control for extended  
60

1  
2  
3 contact and a particularly potent form of intergroup contact, that is cross-group friendships, in  
4  
5 order to ensure that the spontaneous contact imagery exerts its predictive role above and  
6  
7 beyond the effects of real and extended contact experiences. Additionally, we aimed to  
8  
9 enhance the generalizability of our results by looking at a different intergroup context, British  
10  
11 and Eastern Europeans in the UK shortly after the Brexit referendum.  
12  
13  
14

## 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 32 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 45 46 47 48 49 50 51 52 53 54 55 56 57 58 59 60

**Method**

### **Participants**

Participants were 185 British nationals (60.3% female) who fully completed the study online. Those who did not indicate that they are British or who did not fill in the entire questionnaire were omitted from the data analyses. Participants were recruited via social media and via the Prolific Academic platform, and were asked to participate on an online study on “social views in the UK”. Age ranged from 18 to 72 years ( $M = 34.04$ ,  $SD = 13.25$ ). Of the 180 participants who completed information regarding their employment, 61.7% currently held a job, 20.5% were students, 8.9% were homemakers/mothers, 5.6% did not currently work, and 3.3% were retired. Participants were recruited in order to reach a sample allowing for running a structural equation model with nine latent and 17 observed variables (minimum sample size = 184).

All participants saw the SIICS items first, then the intergroup friendship and extended contact measures counterbalanced, and then all attitudes measures counterbalanced. Upon completion, participants were asked to fill in their demographic details, and were then thanked and debriefed.

### **Measures**

All outcome measures used a 5-point scale apart from the outgroup attitude measure (details below); unless indicated otherwise, higher numbers represented greater endorsement of the items (for example, *Very Much*, *Strongly Agree*, or *Very Frequently*).

1  
2  
3       **SIICS.** The seven items emerged in Study 1 were used to measure the frequency,  
4 quality and elaboration of the imagined contact; the target outgroup this time was Eastern  
5 Europeans. As in Study 1, all items were standardized. Regarding frequency and quality  
6 dimensions, the correlations between items were  $.72, p < .001$ , and  $.82, p < .001$ , respectively.  
7  
8 Regarding the elaboration dimension,  $\alpha = .72$ .

9  
10  
11       **Intergroup friendships.** Two items measured friendships with Eastern Europeans  
12 (based on Swart, Hewstone, Christ, & Voci, 2011), “How many close friends do you have  
13 who are Eastern Europeans?” (*None, One, 2 to 5, 6 to 10, More than 10*) and “How often do  
14 you spend time with your Eastern European friends?”,  $r = .72, p < .001$ .

15  
16       **Extended contact.** Five items measured extended contact (based on Turner,  
17 Hewstone, Voci, & Vonofakou, 2008), for example: “How many British people do you know  
18 who have friends who are Eastern Europeans?”, “How many of your British friends have  
19 friends who are Eastern Europeans?” (*None, One, 2 to 5, 6 to 10, More than 10*),  $\alpha = .88$ .

20  
21       **Outgroup attitudes.** Participants rated their overall favourable/unfavourable  
22 evaluation of Eastern Europeans in general on a slider thermometer (based on Haddock et al.,  
23 1993) ranging from 0 (*extremely unfavourable*) to 100 degrees (*extremely favourable*) with  
24 50 as the neutral evaluation (*neither positive nor negative*).

25  
26       **Social Distance.** The same items as in Study 1 were used (based on Binder et al.,  
27 2009), with the exception that the target outgroup was Eastern Europeans,  $\alpha = .94$ .

28  
29       **Intergroup anxiety.** Participants were asked to think about a hypothetical situation  
30 where they would be the only British person among a groups of Eastern European strangers,  
31 and indicate how they would feel using seven anxiety-related adjectives (based on Voci &  
32 Hewstone, 2003), for example: awkward, comfortable (reverse coded),  $\alpha = .91$ .

1  
2  
3       **Intergroup Empathy.** Three items were used to assess empathic responses toward  
4  
5 Eastern Europeans (based on Swart et al., 2011), for example “If I heard that an Eastern  
6  
7 European was upset, and suffering in some way, I would also feel upset”,  $\alpha = .87$ .  
8  
9

### 10   **Introductory analyses**

11  
12       Means, standard deviations and correlations among variables are reported in Table 3.  
13  
14 From the means, it appears that participants did not have many friends in the outgroup but, on  
15  
16 the other hand, they had ingroup friends with Eastern Europeans friends (extended contact). It  
17  
18 also emerged that, generally, levels of empathy are high while anxiety and social distance are  
19  
20 relatively low. Finally, participants reported generally positive attitudes of Eastern  
21  
22 Europeans, since the mean for outgroup attitudes is significantly higher than the mid-point of  
23  
24 the scale,  $t(184) = 2.72, p < .01$ .  
25  
26  
27

### 28   **Confirmatory factor analysis**

29  
30       To further test the construct validity of SIICS, we conducted a Confirmatory Factor  
31  
32 Analysis (CFA) involving the seven items developed in Study 1. The factor structure  
33  
34 obtained in Study 1 with the EFA was treated as the hypothesized model and compared with  
35  
36 two alternative models which are described below. The factor loadings of the error terms and  
37  
38 one factor loading of each latent factor (i.e., the item with highest loading on each factor)  
39  
40 were fixed at one. Factor and error variances were freely estimated and correlations among  
41  
42 factors were allowed. Moreover, model adaptation to data was assessed by using four indexes  
43  
44 (in parentheses the cut-off values suggested by Hu & Bentler, 1999), namely, the  $\chi^2/df$  (lower  
45  
46 than 3), the CFI (greater than .95), the SRMR (equal or smaller than .08), and the RMSEA  
47  
48 (smaller than .06). Next, we tested the scale criterion validity by examining the correlations  
49  
50 with several outcome measures.  
51  
52  
53  
54

55  
56       The 3-factor model structure obtained in Study 1 was compared to four alternative  
57  
58 models: three 2-factor models that aggregated in a single factor respectively a) *Frequency*  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 and *Quality* b) *Frequency* and *Elaboration* and c) *Quality* and *Elaboration*; and a 1-factor  
4  
5 model that grouped all items in one single factor. The 3-factor model showed a better fit for  
6  
7 all indexes – comparative fit index (CFI), root mean square error of approximation (RMSEA)  
8  
9 and the standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) (CFI = .99, RMSEA = .05, SRMR =  
10  
11 .05) (Table 5). The chi-square difference tests showed that the 3-factors model was  
12  
13 significantly different from the 1-factor  $\Delta\chi^2(3) = 338.87, p < .001$  and the three 2-factors  
14  
15 models  $\Delta\chi^2(2) > 158.40, p < .001$  (Table 5). All the individual items loaded acceptably on their  
16  
17 predicted factors, with standardized loadings ranging from .75 to .96 for *Frequency*, .81 to  
18  
19 1.00 for *Quality*, and .82 to .90 for *Elaboration*.

### 23 24 **Convergent validity**

25  
26 A second CFA was applied in order to test convergent and discriminant validity of  
27  
28 SIICS. In particular, the aim was to test whether the three dimensions of the proposed  
29  
30 measure were correlated, but different, with the two contact measures, namely cross-group  
31  
32 friendships and extended contact. Thus, the model presented five latent factors, each of them  
33  
34 saturating two indicators created following the suggestions by Little Cunningham, Shahar,  
35  
36 and Widaman (2002); or, for the two-item measures, created by considering the single items  
37  
38 as the indicators.  
39  
40

41  
42 The model presented an excellent fit to data,  $\chi^2(25) = 34.68, p = .09, \chi^2/df = 1.39,$   
43  
44 RMSEA = .04, CFI = 0.99, SRMR = .03. Findings revealed that direct cross-group  
45  
46 friendships were correlated significantly with frequency ( $r = .56, p < .001$ ) and quality ( $r =$   
47  
48  $.17, p < .05$ ) and with elaboration ( $r = .21, p < .05$ ); similarly, extended contact was  
49  
50 significantly associated all the three dimensions of the imagined contact scale ( $r = .48, p <$   
51  
52  $.001$ , for frequency;  $r = .27, p < .01$ , for quality;  $r = .20, p < .05$ , for elaboration). Regarding  
53  
54 the correlations between the imagined contact factors, frequency was correlated with quality  
55  
56 ( $r = .42, p < .001$ ) and with elaboration ( $r = .26, p < .01$ ), while quality was not significantly  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 related to elaboration ( $r = -.03, ns$ ). Moreover, all the previous correlations were significantly  
4 different from 1; in fact, all the 95% confidence intervals, obtained considering two standard  
5 errors above and below the estimated correlation, did not included 1.  
6  
7  
8  
9

### 10 **Criterion validity**

11  
12 Criterion validity of SIICS was investigated with a mediation model using structural  
13 equation modelling (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 2007). In particular, exogenous variables were the  
14 three dimensions of imagined contact scale (frequency, quality and elaboration); intergroup  
15 anxiety and empathy represented the mediators, and social distance with outgroup attitudes  
16 were the dependent variables; finally, cross-group friendships and extended contact were  
17 included as control variables at the exogenous variables level. Direct effects from the  
18 exogenous variables (i.e., the three imagined contact dimensions and the two contact  
19 measures) to the dependent variables, as well as the correlation between the same level  
20 variables, were estimated. The significance of the indirect effects was tested by using  
21 bootstrapping techniques with 5,000 resamples (Preacher & Hayes, 2008); mediation is  
22 considered reliable when the 95% confidence interval does not include 0. For each latent  
23 factor, except for the outgroup attitudes and the two-item measures, two parcels were created  
24 following the suggestions by Little et al. (2002), namely parcels were created by pairing the  
25 two highest loaded items with the lowest loaded ones (i.e., item-to-construct balance  
26 method); since the attitude thermometer was composed of a single item, the relative latent  
27 factor saturated a single parcel, and the relative error was fixed to 0. In structural equation  
28 modelling, using item aggregation has several advantages compared with loading factor  
29 single items (e.g., higher reliability and communality, increased model stability), and, since  
30 parcelling reduces the number of estimated parameters (thus reducing the number of  
31 participants required), it is useful for small sample sizes (for a more detailed description of  
32 the advantages and disadvantages of parcels, see Little et al., 2002; see also, Hau & Marsh,  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

2004). Direct effects between the exogenous variables with the two dependent measures, and correlations between the same level variables were estimated.

The proposed model showed a good fit to data,  $\chi^2(84) = 131.82, p < .001, \chi^2/df = 1.57$ , RMSEA = .04, CFI = .99, SRMR = .03. As indicated in Figure 1, the quality dimension of SIICS was positively associated with increased empathy and with favourable attitudes toward Eastern Europeans; in addition, negative relations emerged between imagined contact quality with both anxiety and social distance. Both mediators were significantly related to the outcome variables. That is, there was a positive correlation between empathy and outgroup attitudes, and a negative correlation with social distance, and anxiety was positively associated with increased social distance and with more negative outgroup attitudes. No associations emerged for imagined contact frequency and elaboration<sup>5,6</sup>.

Table 5 reports the results concerning bootstrapping analyses. As can be seen, all paths concerning mediated association between imagined contact quality and the two dependent variables are significant (since the 95% confidence intervals did not include 0), with the exception of the indirect effect of anxiety in the relation between imagined contact quality and outgroup attitude (but a direct effect between the two variables was observed).

The results of Study 2 provided support for the hypothesis that the quality of spontaneous contact imagery predicts more positive attitudes and empathy as well as reduced social distance and anxiety, while controlling for a potent form of intergroup contact, i.e. cross-group friendships, and extended contact. Additionally, the results demonstrated that empathy mediated the relationship between imagined contact quality and social distance, as well as imagined contact quality and outgroup attitudes. Anxiety, on the other hand, mediated the path from imagined contact quality to social distance. Interestingly, while spontaneous imagined contact frequency correlated in the expected direction with all outcome variables, it did not emerge as a predictor when tested against all other variables. In this context, unlike

1  
2  
3 Study 1, imagined contact elaboration did not correlate with any of the outcome variables,  
4  
5 which will be further addressed in the discussion.  
6  
7

### 8 **Study 3**

9  
10 Following the results obtained thus far, the aim of Study 3 was threefold: (a) to  
11 confirm the three-factor structure of the imagined contact scale with a different sample of  
12 participants (b) to replicate the results of Study 2 in a different intergroup context,  
13 specifically in Italy, focusing on Italians and Eastern European immigrants, while controlling  
14 for both direct quality and quantity of contact, and (c) to extend the previous findings by  
15 investigating contact behavioural intentions. The imagined contact literature has drawn  
16 attention to this variable as it is argued to act as a precursor of approaching the outgroup  
17 (Miles & Crisp, 2009).  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27

### 28 **Method**

#### 29 **Participants and procedure**

30  
31  
32  
33 Two hundred and seventy six Italian nationals (246 females and 30 males,  $M_{\text{age}} =$   
34 22.00,  $SD = 4.99$ ) voluntarily took part in the survey. Participants were students at a medium-  
35 sized university located in the Northern part of Italy and were recruited during psychology  
36 lectures. Data collection aimed to guarantee a data sample suitable for detecting a medium  
37 effect size, with a power of .80, for structural equation modelling with 10 latent variables  
38 loading 19 observed indicators (required minimum sample = 190). Participants were invited  
39 to complete an online questionnaire investigating perceptions and attitudes toward Eastern  
40 Europeans immigrants in Italy. All participants saw the SIICS items first, then the direct  
41 contact measures, and then all attitudes measures. Upon completion, participants were asked  
42 to fill in their demographic details, and were then thanked and debriefed.  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54

#### 55 **Measures**



1  
2  
3 The same measures as in Study 2 were employed in this study with two differences.  
4  
5 While the three dimensions of SIICS (i.e., frequency [ $r = .73, p < .001$ ], quality [ $r = .73, p <$   
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

.001], and elaboration [see CFA below,  $r = .73, p < .001$ ]), anxiety [ $\alpha = .86$ ], empathy [ $\alpha = .77$ ], social distance [ $\alpha = .92$ ], and outgroup attitudes were included as before, direct cross-group friendships and extended contact were replaced with actual contact quality and quantity. This allowed to test the predictive role of spontaneous imagined contact against different forms of actual intergroup contact. Moreover, a contact behavioural intentions scale was added to investigate whether spontaneous imagined contact is also associated, directly or indirectly, with intended behaviours toward the outgroup as suggested by imagined contact literature (Miles & Crisp, 2014). Unless otherwise stated, 5-point scales were used with higher numbers indicating higher endorsement of the items.

**Quantity of contact.** Two items measured the quantity of contact participants had with Eastern Europeans (based on Voci & Hewstone, 2003). The items were: “How many Eastern Europeans do you know?” (1 = *None*, 5 = *More than 10*) and “How frequently do you have contact with Eastern Europeans?” (1 = *Never*, 5 = *Very frequently*),  $r = .56, p < .001$ .

**Quality of contact.** To measure quality of contact with Eastern Europeans, participants were asked to characterize the contact they have on four bipolar dimensions (based on Voci & Hewstone, 2003), for example: involuntary - voluntary, natural - forced (reverse-coded). On the 5-step scale, 1 was assigned to the negative pole and 5 to the positive one, with 3 (*neither... nor...*) as the neutral point,  $\alpha = .77$ .

**Contact intentions.** Four items assessed contact behavioural intentions toward Eastern European immigrants (based on Asbrock, Gutenbrunner, & Wagner, 2013). Example items are: “I would like to have a conversation with an Eastern European in the Italy”; “I would like to have more contact with Eastern Europeans”,  $\alpha = .90$ .

## Results

### Introductory analyses

Means, standard deviations and correlations among constructs are reported in Table 6. From the means it appears that participants have a moderate amount of contact with Eastern Europeans, and this contact is positive, since the score is significantly greater than the neutral point of the scale,  $t(275) = 15.65, p < .001$ . Moreover, respondents reported feeling a fair amount of empathy toward the outgroup and a relatively high level of anxiety when imagining being among Eastern Europeans. Scores relative to social distance were relatively low and intentions to have contact with the outgroup were relatively high. Finally, the attitudes toward Eastern Europeans were positive since the outgroup attitudes values were significantly higher than the neutral point of the scale,  $t(275) = 11.59, p < .001$ .

### Confirmatory factor analysis

As in the previous studies, a CFA was run in order to confirm the three-factor structure of SIICS. The model obtained with the EFA in Study 1 was thus replicated by estimating item loadings to the respective factor. Thus, frequency factor loaded two items, as well as the quality factor, while the elaboration dimension loaded three items (see Study 1 and Study 2). For each latent variable, one loading was fixed to one. Factor and error variances were freely estimated as well as the correlations among factors.

The three-factor model showed a good fit to the data,  $\chi^2(11) = 2.28, p < .05, \chi^2/df = 5.44, RMSEA = .07, CFI = .98, SRMR = .07$ . Factor loadings ranged from .68 to .89 ( $p < .001$ ) except for the item “When you imagine interacting with Eastern Europeans, do you share this interaction with your friends?” of the elaboration dimension ( $\lambda = .21, p < .01$ ). For this reason, this further item was excluded from the scale in the Italian sample. Thus, the final model with each factor loaded two items presented an excellent fit to data,  $\chi^2(6) = 4.12, p < .05, \chi^2/df = 0.69, RMSEA \approx .00, CFI = 1.0, SRMR = .01$ .

To further confirm the three-factor dimension of the scale, the latter model was compared to four alternative models, a monofactorial one, and three two-factor models where two dimensions were merged as a single factor while the third one remained separated, namely: a) frequency with quality vs. elaboration; b) frequency with elaboration vs. quality; c) quality with elaboration vs. frequency. Results showed that all of the four models presented a poor adaptation to data,  $\chi^2_s > 101.90$ ,  $p < .001$ ,  $\chi^2/df > 12.73$ , RMSEA  $> .19$ , CFI  $< .85$ , SRMR  $> .11$ . Thus, in line with Study 1 and 2, the three-factor solution was replicated for the Italian sample.

### **Convergent validity**

In order to examine convergent validity, a further CFA was conducted to test whether the three dimensions of SIICS were positively associated with two related constructs (i.e., quality and quantity of direct contact). For each of the five latent factors two indicators were employed. For imagined contact frequency, quality and elaboration, along with direct contact quantity, the single items were used as indicators; regarding, quality of direct contact, the two parcels were created by following Little and collaborators' (2002) instructions. The tested model presented an excellent adaptation to the data,  $\chi^2(25) = 17.32$ ,  $p = .87$ ,  $\chi^2/df = 0.69$ , RMSEA  $\approx .00$ , CFI = 1.00, SRMR = .02. Specifically, direct contact quantity was positively associated with all the three dimensions of the spontaneous imagined contact scale, namely with frequency ( $r = .62$ ,  $p < .001$ ), quality ( $r = .50$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and elaboration ( $r = .17$ ,  $p < .05$ ); on the other hand, quality of direct contact was significantly related with frequency ( $r = .30$ ,  $p < .001$ ), and quality ( $r = .69$ ,  $p < .001$ ), but not with elaboration ( $r = -.04$ ,  $ns$ ). Moreover, imagined contact frequency was significantly correlated with both quality ( $r = .49$ ,  $p < .001$ ) and elaboration ( $r = .18$ ,  $p < .05$ ), while no significant correlation emerged between quality and elaboration dimensions ( $r = .05$ ,  $ns$ ). Finally, since the 95% confidence intervals

1  
2  
3 concerning the estimated correlations did not include 1, all the relations were significantly  
4  
5 different from the perfect correlation.  
6

### 7 **Criterion validity**

8  
9  
10 A structural equation model approach with latent variables (Jöreskog & Sörbom,  
11  
12 2007) was employed in order to test criterion validity of SIICS. Specifically, in the proposed  
13  
14 model exogenous variables were the three dimensions of the imagined contact scale; first  
15  
16 level mediators were intergroup anxiety and empathy, while second level mediators were  
17  
18 social distance and outgroup attitudes (thermometer); finally, contact behavioural intentions  
19  
20 was the dependent measure; as control measure, quality and quantity of contact were included  
21  
22 in the model as exogenous variables (i.e., at the same level as the imagined contact  
23  
24 dimensions). Direct effects from the exogenous variables to the second level mediators and to  
25  
26 the dependent variable, as well the direct relations from the first level mediators to contact  
27  
28 intentions, were estimated; in addition, the correlations between the same level variables were  
29  
30 assessed. Indirect effects' significance was tested by using bootstrapping techniques with  
31  
32 5,000 resamples (Preacher & Hayes, 2008); mediation is confirmed when the 95% confidence  
33  
34 interval does not include 0.  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

40 For each latent factor, two indicators were created. In the case of the two-item scales  
41  
42 (the three dimensions of SIICS and direct contact quantity) the single items represented the  
43  
44 indicators; regarding outgroup attitudes, a single indicator was employed and the relative  
45  
46 error was fixed to 0; finally, for the variables composed of more than two items, we used the  
47  
48 item-to-construct balance method (Little et al., 2002) for building parcels (see Study 2).  
49

50  
51 Moreover, in the model direct effects from the exogenous variables to second level  
52  
53 mediators and the dependent variable, and direct effects from first level mediators to contact  
54  
55 intentions were estimated along with correlations between same-level factors.  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 The proposed model showed an excellent fit to the data,  $\chi^2(108) = 119.00, p = .22,$   
4  $\chi^2/df = 1.10, RMSEA = .02, CFI = 1.0, SRMR = .03.$  As can be seen in Figure 2, imagined  
5 contact quality was related to lower anxiety, positive attitudes toward Eastern Europeans, and  
6 with more contact intentions. Regarding first-level mediators, anxiety and empathy were  
7 associated with the second-level mediators; in particular, anxiety was related with both  
8 outgroup attitudes (negatively) and with social distance (positively); on the other hand,  
9 empathy was correlated with decreased social distance. Moreover, a positive relation between  
10 empathy and contact intentions emerged. In turn, considering second-level mediators, social  
11 distance, but not outgroup attitudes, was negatively related with contact intentions<sup>7,8</sup>.

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24 The significance of indirect effects is shown in Table 7. As can be seen, bootstrapping  
25 procedures confirmed all the mediational paths that emerged in the model. In particular,  
26 spontaneous imagined contact quality was associated with contact intentions both directly  
27 and via the indirect effect of anxiety and social distance. Interestingly, of the three imagined  
28 contact factors, quality was the only one that emerged as a significant predictor, above and  
29 beyond elaboration and frequency, as well as quantity and quality of contact. Elaboration  
30 specifically, did not correlate with any of the variables, replicating the findings of Study 2 in  
31 a different context.

### 42 **General Discussion**

43  
44 This research was driven by premises of direct intergroup contact (Allport, 1954;  
45 Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) and imagined contact (Crisp & Turner, 2009), and explored  
46 whether people's spontaneous, non-experimentally induced imagined interactions with the  
47 outgroup predict one's attitudinal stance toward the outgroup. As literature on imagined  
48 contact is rapidly growing and provides evidence that imagined interactions can affect  
49 outgroup attitudes and behavioural intentions (Miles & Crisp, 2014), questions regarding how  
50 people use their mind's eye arise. It is therefore important to understand the potential  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 outcomes of imagined contact that takes place outside the laboratory, without carefully  
4 designed experimental instructions that guide participants to think about positive and co-  
5 operative intergroup encounters. In three correlational studies conducted in three different  
6 national contexts, we explored if spontaneous imagined contact, that is intergroup contact  
7 imagery that is not experimentally-manipulated and emerges in every day conditions, predicts  
8 people's stance toward outgroups. In order to explore the role of spontaneous imagined  
9 contact we designed and validated a measure (i.e., SIICS) that, driven by the relevant theory,  
10 comprised of three dimensions of contact, frequency, quality and elaboration.  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20

21 Study 1 provided preliminary evidence of the validity of SIICS. The hypothesized  
22 three-factor structure was confirmed, and the reliability of the dimensions was good.  
23 Additionally, preliminary criterion validity was also supported, with the three dimensions  
24 significantly predicting more positive outgroup attitudes. Studies 2 and 3 further confirmed  
25 the hypothesized three-factor structure with two additional national samples. However, while  
26 the imagined contact quality presented good reliability and convergent and criterion validity  
27 across the three studies, the elaboration dimension did not. Specifically, in Study 3 two items  
28 had poor loadings and were removed from the analyses. Elaboration and frequency also  
29 revealed less robust results regarding convergent and criterion validity. Studies 2 and 3  
30 showed that of the three dimensions, it is only imagined contact quality that predicts positive  
31 intergroup attitudes, even when controlling for actual interactions, namely, friendships and  
32 extended contact in Study 2, and quantity and quality (a parallel measure with imagined  
33 contact quality) in Study 3. In other words, our studies provide evidence that it is specifically  
34 imagined contact quality (Studies 1, 2 and 3), rather than frequency (only Study 1 for  
35 outgroup attitudes and social distance) and elaboration (only Study 1 for social distance), that  
36 predicts several measures of attitudes toward immigrant groups.  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3           Importantly, to ensure the obvious and well-established relationship between actual  
4 contact and attitudes is taken into consideration, we tested and supported the predictive role  
5 of spontaneous imagined contact above and beyond extended contact and cross-group  
6 friendships (Study 2) and actual contact quality and quantity (Study 3). Furthermore, we  
7 explored whether spontaneous imagined contact also predicts behavioural contact intentions  
8 (Study 3), and found that the dimension of quality does so both directly and indirectly via  
9 anxiety and social distance. This research provides evidence that people imagine interactions  
10 with outgroups even when unprompted by experimental interventions such as imagined  
11 contact (Crisp & Turner, 2009), and that this imagery predicts attitudes and intended  
12 behaviours.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

26           In Studies 2 and 3, imagined contact frequency correlated positively with attitudes and  
27 empathy and negatively with anxiety and social distance, however it did not emerge as a  
28 predictor when tested against quality and elaboration, as well as other forms of contact. The  
29 fact that the frequency of imagined intergroup interactions did not predict how people feel  
30 toward the outgroup, but whether the interactions are perceived as positive did, is in line with  
31 contact literature that advocates the importance of positive contact (Islam & Hewstone, 1993;  
32 Tredoux & Finchilescu, 2010). In our research we did not measure explicitly how frequently  
33 participants imagine positive versus negative intergroup contact, and thus we cannot  
34 disentangle the precise valence of the imagery. Going beyond mere exposure to outgroups,  
35 scholars have long argued that contact between groups needs to take place under optimal  
36 conditions and be positive in order to ameliorate biases. Indirect support for this comes from  
37 findings that negative contact can have detrimental consequences for intergroup relations  
38 (Barlow et al., 2012; Graf & Paolini, 2017). Research on imagined contact has also  
39 recommended a more positive tone in the imagined scenario (Crisp et al., 2009, Stathi &  
40 Crisp, 2008). For example, West et al. (2011) showed that in some cases, neutral imagined  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 contact can be ineffective or even damaging, whereas explicit experimental instructions to  
4  
5 imagine positive contact can reduce anxiety and improve attitudes. Thus, positivity is also  
6  
7 essential when looking into in every-day situations when people imagine interactions with the  
8  
9 outgroup without explicit (experimental) instructions regarding the valence of the imagery.  
10  
11

12 Mixed support came for the role of imagined contact elaboration. Although in Study 1  
13  
14 elaboration was associated with reduced social distance and positive attitudes in line with the  
15  
16 imagined contact literature (Husnu & Crisp, 2010), in Studies 2 and 3 elaboration did not  
17  
18 correlate with any of the outcome variables. Driven by research on imagined contact, we had  
19  
20 hypothesised that the more people elaborate on their imagined interactions, the more  
21  
22 favourable they will be toward the outgroup (see Husnu & Crisp, 2010). However, based on  
23  
24 the results we obtained, elaboration in spontaneous, non-experimentally induced contact is  
25  
26 largely irrelevant to outgroup attitudes. Perhaps the intricate details of the imagined scripts  
27  
28 are important when people are in artificial, laboratory conditions but not particularly relevant  
29  
30 in spontaneous situations.  
31  
32  
33  
34

### 35 **Limitations and future directions**

36  
37  
38 Despite the innovative nature of examining the potential effects of spontaneous  
39  
40 contact imagery, this research has some limitations. Regarding the newly developed imagined  
41  
42 contact measure our studies consistently replicated the expected three factor structure, in  
43  
44 general with good reliabilities and supporting its convergent and criterion validity. However,  
45  
46 the elaboration dimension presented poorer reliability than frequency and quality, and also  
47  
48 less predictive power once other dimensions of imagined and actual contact were taken into  
49  
50 account. It is unlikely that unprompted, people elaborate on aspects of intergroup contact.  
51  
52 Thus, although elaboration can be a useful tool in experimental imagined contact research  
53  
54 (Husnu & Crisp, 2010), it may be less central in everyday intergroup situations. Future  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60



1  
2  
3 studies could further examine the role of elaboration on imagined contact and consider the  
4  
5 need to develop better indicators for this feature of contact.  
6  
7

8           At this point, we need to highlight a potential danger of elaborating on one's imagined  
9  
10 contact with the outgroup. Despite evidence that supports the positive role of elaboration on  
11  
12 subsequent behaviour (Husnu & Crisp, 2010; see also Gollwitzer, 1993), elaboration in  
13  
14 spontaneous mental simulation of contact may be associated with more complicated mental  
15  
16 processes. When imagining contact with people in the outgroup in non-experimental  
17  
18 conditions, elaboration could suggest that people ponder over how intergroup interactions  
19  
20 will develop. This could lead to overthinking or ruminating about details of imagined contact  
21  
22 situations, which could in turn impair positive attitudes. Research from the domain of  
23  
24 interpersonal relationships suggests that rumination can harm one's ability to handle daily life  
25  
26 stressors (Bauerband & Galupo, 2014; Lyubomirsky, Tucker, Caldwell, & Berg, 1999) and  
27  
28 ruminating about events and ambivalent attitudes is linked to aggression (Bushman, 2002;  
29  
30 Rusting & Nolen-Hoeksema, 1998) and decreased forgiveness (Worthington & Wade, 1999).  
31  
32 As such, when considering spontaneous intergroup contact imagery, it is possible that people  
33  
34 not only engage in negative imagined encounters, but also that they elaborate or ruminate on  
35  
36 these imagined encounters. Therefore, although the imagined contact literature has  
37  
38 suggested that instructions that encourage elaboration on the imagined interactions enhance  
39  
40 positive attitudes, evidence from research on rumination signals that elaboration may not  
41  
42 always yield positive effects. Future research can delve into the role of rumination in  
43  
44 spontaneous contact imagery.  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51

52           A main limitation of our research relates to the correlational design of our studies that  
53  
54 does not allow us to draw conclusions regarding causality between variables. We argue that  
55  
56 the three studies that comprise this research provide initial evidence for our hypotheses, and  
57  
58 future studies can maximise on carefully-implemented longitudinal designs to assess the  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 effects of spontaneous imagined contact. We need to also acknowledge that although the  
4 results of spontaneous imagined contact were obtained while controlling for various potent  
5 forms of actual contact (intergroup friendships, extended contact, quality and quantity of  
6 direct contact) we cannot be certain that participants did not draw upon their own existing  
7 experiences while filling in the SIICS items. Since attitudes are formed based on personal  
8 experiences, and personal experiences are important factors that drive mental imagery, then  
9 one's experiences may also influence the mental imagery of related experiences. Future  
10 research can disentangle this further by, for example, including open response questions  
11 where participants indicate details regarding their spontaneous imagery partners and  
12 interactions.  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 Our research cannot fully answer whether prevalence of general spontaneous contact  
28 imagery is high, it can however infer that when it manifests, quality of this imagery is a  
29 strong predictor of attitudes above and beyond the other dimensions of the imagery, and of  
30 actual contact. We argue that in daily situations, concepts regarding intergroup contact may  
31 become activated. Let us think, for example, of situations when one watches the news or  
32 browses newspapers; narratives around immigrants could spark contact imagery. Also,  
33 everyday actions like commuting or shopping may induce imagery regarding interactions  
34 with outgroup strangers. This may be particularly the case for some people who are more  
35 inclined to consider intergroup dimensions in social situations. Although our research did not  
36 consider individual differences and social ideology variables that may predict engagement  
37 with intergroup imagery, this can be a fruitful avenue for future research. Ashbrock et al.  
38 (2013), for example, showed that experimentally induced imagined contact is more effective  
39 for those high in right-wing authoritarianism. Future research can explore if individual  
40 difference variables also determine the frequency, quality or elaboration of spontaneous  
41 imagined contact.  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Despite focusing on some key dimensions of spontaneous contact imagery, namely  
4 frequency, quality and elaboration, there are other aspects that we did not address in this  
5 research. For example, we did not assess the role of negative imagined contact in spontaneous  
6 situations. As current literature emphasises why we need to be cautious of negative direct and  
7 extended contact (Barlow et al., 2012; Wölfer, Jaspers, Blaylock, Wigoder, Hughes, &  
8 Hewstone, 2017) it is essential to also understand whether people imagine negative  
9 interactions with the outgroup. Husnu and Paolini (2018) showed that people  
10 disproportionately chose to engage in positive rather than negative imagined contact when  
11 taking part in experimental research. Future research can explore whether this is also the case  
12 in real-life (rather than experimental) situations, while also examining potential outcomes of  
13 negative spontaneous imagined contact.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

29 We consider the generalizable role of imagined contact quality, as evidenced by  
30 research in three distinct national contexts, a considerable strength of our research. Although  
31 all studies were conducted in Europe and looked at immigration attitudes, the level of conflict  
32 between the host society and immigrants was arguably different in the three countries. Let us  
33 take the case of Study 2, which was conducted in the UK shortly after the Brexit referendum  
34 in the summer of 2016, and explore it further. Following the expansion of the European  
35 Union (EU) in 2004, Eastern Europeans are among the most prevalent minority groups in the  
36 UK (Wadsworth, Dhingra, Ottaviano, & Van Reenen, 2016). Heated social and political  
37 debates on the meaning of “Britishness” at the time surrounding the referendum placed  
38 Eastern Europeans in the centre of political propaganda. During the referendum, there were  
39 offensive leaflets found on cars and posted to homes targeting the Polish community (Vina,  
40 Tarling, & Foy, 2016). The building of the Polish Social and Cultural Association in London  
41 was vandalized with the words “Go home” written on it, while in a different part of the  
42 country, in Cambridgeshire, leaflets that said, “Leave the EU/No more Polish vermin” written  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 both in English and in Polish were distributed (Taylor, 2016). We provided evidence that in  
4  
5 these conditions of heightened dissension, people still engaged in positive spontaneous  
6  
7 imagined contact and that this positive imagery effectively predicted positive attitudes and  
8  
9 reduced social distance. Future research can explore if these associations stand in contexts of  
10  
11 conflict, or if direct forms of contact wipe out the effect of spontaneous imagery.  
12  
13  
14

15         Having established that people's spontaneous thoughts regarding interactions with the  
16  
17 outgroup predict several measures of attitudes, our research can contribute to tailoring  
18  
19 prejudice-reduction interventions such that they take into consideration people's spontaneous  
20  
21 thoughts that emerge outside the laboratory. For example, having shown that imagined  
22  
23 contact quality is particularly important suggests that prejudice-reduction interventions can  
24  
25 steer people's focus toward intergroup experiences that are of high qualitative value, such as  
26  
27 co-operation, kindness, and help.  
28  
29  
30  
31

32         In this research we explored if spontaneous, non-experimentally induced imagined  
33  
34 contact predicts outgroup attitudes and found that it does, above and beyond other potent  
35  
36 forms of contact (direct, friendships and extended). Three studies provided support for  
37  
38 imagined contact quality as a particularly strong predictor of various attitude measures, such  
39  
40 as social distance, general attitudes and intergroup anxiety. We suggest that further attention  
41  
42 should be placed on examining people's every-day, spontaneous thinking processes and  
43  
44 imagination in order to establish a more thorough understanding of the impact these  
45  
46 processes have on intergroup relations.  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Footnotes

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
1. The survey was part of a larger research project conducted by a Master student and included several measures that were not related to the goal of the current study (collective nostalgia, autochthony, perceived collective continuity and group identity representations).

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
2. All data in Studies 1, 2 and 3 were collected in accordance with the highest established (APA) ethical standards.

18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
3. Since Z-points standardization does not allow running ANOVA, we used proportions (i.e.,  $a/b = x/c$ ) in order to create composite scores of items with different response scales.

25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
4. In order to further test the associations between the SIICS dimensions with the dependent variables (i.e., social distance and outgroup evaluations), we compared regression coefficients using the method proposed by Cumming (2009). Specifically, a beta coefficient is significantly different from another if the respective 95% confidence intervals overlap by less than the 50%. Results showed that a) for African immigrants no differences emerge between imagined contact dimensions (i.e., quality [ $\beta = -.25, p < .05$ ], frequency [ $\beta = -.10, ns$ ], and elaboration [ $\beta = -.16, ns$ ]) when social distance was the dependent variable; considering outgroup attitudes, a significant difference emerged between imagined contact quality ( $\beta = .45, p < .001$ ) and elaboration ( $\beta = .02, ns$ ), while no difference was observed between frequency ( $\beta = .18, p < .06$ ) and quality; b) for Brazilian immigrants, imagined contact quality's beta ( $\beta = -.41, p < .001$ ) for social distance was significantly different from frequency ( $\beta = -.14, ns$ ) and elaboration ( $\beta = -.04, ns$ ) betas; while, for outgroup attitudes, quality ( $\beta = .43, p < .001$ ) and frequency ( $\beta = .39, p < .001$ ) were significantly different from elaboration ( $\beta = -.07, ns$ , but no differences emerged between quality and frequency). Finally, c) considering Ukrainian immigrants, imagined contact quality ( $\beta = -.32, p < .001$ ) was significantly different from frequency ( $\beta = -.15, ns$ ) and elaboration ( $\beta = -.18, p < .06$ ) when

1  
2  
3 social distance was the dependent variable; the same result was obtained for outgroup  
4 attitudes as the dependent variable ( $\beta = .48, p < .001$  for quality;  $\beta = .06, ns$ , for frequency;  $\beta$   
5 =  $.00, ns$ , for elaboration). No other significant differences emerged.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 5. Regarding the associations between control and dependent variables, only the  
11 variable of cross-group friendships was associated with anxiety ( $\beta = -.23, p < .05$ ) and with  
12 empathy ( $\beta = .25, p < .05$ ); bootstrapping procedure confirmed all the indirect paths with the  
13 exception of the relation between friendships with attitudes and social distance via anxiety  
14 (see Table 5). No significant results were obtained for extended contact (data are available  
15 upon request to the authors).  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23

24 6. As in Study 1, regression coefficients were compared in order to detect differences  
25 in the three SIICS dimensions. Similar to Study 1, imagined contact quality, compared with  
26 the other two dimensions, represented a stronger predictor for both mediators and dependent  
27 variables. No other significant differences emerged.  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32

33 7. In addition, contact quality was positively associated with empathy ( $\beta = .68, p <$   
34  $.001$ ) while contact quantity was negatively related to anxiety ( $\beta = -.28, p < .05$ ). Finally,  
35 when bootstrapping was applied, all the mediated paths were significant (data are available  
36 upon request to the authors).  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41

42 8. A further analysis was conducted in order to test differences in beta coefficients.  
43 Similar to the previous studies, significant paths of imagined contact quality generally have  
44 significantly stronger effects on mediators and on the dependent variable with the exception  
45 of the comparison between quality and frequency for outgroup evaluation which turned out to  
46 be non-significant. Nevertheless, the association between imagined contact frequency and  
47 attitudes was non-significant (see Figure 2).  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## References

- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6 Aberson, C. L. (2015). Positive intergroup contact, negative intergroup contact, and threat as  
7  
8 predictors of cognitive and affective dimensions of prejudice. *Group Processes*  
9  
10 *Intergroup Relations*, 18, 743-760. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430214556699>  
11  
12 Al Ramiah, A., & Hewstone, M. (2013). Intergroup contact as a tool for reducing, resolving,  
13  
14 and preventing intergroup conflict: evidence, limitations, and potential. *American*  
15  
16 *Psychologist*, 68, 527-542. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0032603>  
17  
18 Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.  
19  
20  
21  
22 Árnadóttir, K., Lollot, S., Brown, R., & Hewstone, M. (2018). Positive and negative  
23  
24 intergroup contact: Interaction not asymmetry. *European Journal of Social*  
25  
26 *Psychology*, 48, 784-800. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2365>  
27  
28  
29 Asbrock, F., Gutenbrunner, L., & Wagner, U. (2013). Unwilling, but not unaffected. Imagined  
30  
31 contact effects for authoritarians and social dominators. *European Journal of Social*  
32  
33 *Psychology*, 43, 404-412. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.1956>  
34  
35  
36  
37 Barlow, F. K., Paolini, S., Pedersen, A., Hornsey, M. J., Radke, H. R. M., Harwood, J., Rubin,  
38  
39 M., & Sibley, C. G. (2012). The contact caveat: Negative contact predicts increased  
40  
41 prejudice more than positive contact predicts reduced prejudice. *Personality and*  
42  
43 *Social Psychology Bulletin*, 38, 1629-1643.  
44  
45  
46 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167212457953>  
47  
48  
49 Bar-Tal, D., & Teichman, Y. (2005). *Stereotypes and prejudice in conflict: Representations of*  
50  
51 *Arabs in Israeli Jewish society*. New York: Cambridge University Press.  
52  
53  
54 Bauerband, L. A., & Galupo, M. P. (2014). The gender identity reflection and rumination  
55  
56 scale: development and psychometric evaluation. *Journal of Counseling &*  
57  
58 *Development*, 92, 219-231. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2014.00151.x>  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Binder, J., Zagefka, H., Brown, R., Funke, F., Kessler, T., Mummendey, A., Maquil, A.,  
4  
5 Demoulin, S., Leyens, J. P. (2009). Does contact reduce prejudice or does prejudice  
6  
7 reduce contact? A longitudinal test of the contact hypothesis in three European  
8  
9 countries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *96*, 843-856.  
10  
11 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0013470>  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16 Brown, R., & Hewstone, M. (2005). An integrative theory of intergroup contact. In M. Zanna  
17  
18 (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 255-343). San Diego, CA:  
19  
20 Academic Press.  
21  
22  
23  
24 Bushman, B. J. (2002). Does venting anger feed or extinguish the flame? Catharsis,  
25  
26 rumination, distraction, anger, and aggressive responding. *Personality and Social*  
27  
28 *Psychology Bulletin*, *28*, 724-731. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167202289002>  
29  
30  
31  
32 Cattell, R. B. (1978). *The scientific use of factor analysis in behavioral and life sciences*. New  
33  
34 York, NY.  
35  
36  
37 Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four  
38  
39 recommendations for getting most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, Research*  
40  
41 *& Evaluation*, *10*, 1-9.  
42  
43  
44  
45 Crisp, R. J., Stathi, S., Turner, R. N., & Husnu, S. (2008). Imagined intergroup contact:  
46  
47 theory, paradigm, and practice. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *2*, 1-18.  
48  
49 <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00155.x>  
50  
51  
52 Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2009). Can imagined interactions produce positive perceptions?  
53  
54 Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. *American Psychologist*, *64*, 231-  
55  
56 240. doi: 10.1037/a0014718  
57  
58  
59  
60



- 1  
2  
3 Dadds M. R., Bovbjerg D. H., Redd W. H., & Cutmore T. R. H. (1997). Imagery in human  
4  
5 classical conditioning. *Psychological Bulletin*, *122*, 89-103.  
6  
7  
8 De Carvalho-Freitas, M. N., & Stathi, S. (2017). Reducing workplace bias toward people with  
9  
10 disabilities with the use of imagined contact. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*,  
11  
12 *47*, 256-266. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12435>  
13  
14  
15 Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2005). Beyond the optimal contact strategy: a reality  
16  
17 check for the contact hypothesis. *American Psychologist*, *60*, 697-711. doi:  
18  
19 10.1037/0003-066X.60.7.697  
20  
21  
22 Dovidio, J. F., Eller, A., & Hewstone, M. (2011). Improving intergroup relations through  
23  
24 direct, extended and other forms of indirect contact. *Group Processes & Intergroup*  
25  
26 *Relations*, *14*, 147-160. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430210390555>  
27  
28  
29  
30 Gollwitzer, P. M. (1993). Goal achievement: The role of intentions. *European Review of*  
31  
32 *Social Psychology*, *4*, 141-185. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14792779343000059>  
33  
34  
35 Graf, S., & Paolini, S. (2017). Investigating positive and negative intergroup contact:  
36  
37 Rectifying a long-standing positivity bias in the literature. In L. Vezzali & S. Stathi  
38  
39 (Eds). *Intergroup contact theory: Recent developments and future directions (Series:*  
40  
41 *Current Issues in Social Psychology)* (pp. 92-113). London: Routledge.  
42  
43  
44  
45 Graf, S., Paolini, S., & Rubin, M. (2014). Negative intergroup contact is more influential, but  
46  
47 positive intergroup contact is more common: Assessing contact prominence and  
48  
49 contact prevalence in five Central European countries. *European Journal of Social*  
50  
51 *Psychology*, *44*, 536-547. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2052>  
52  
53  
54 Haddock, G., Zanna, M. P., & Esses, V. M. (1993). Assessing the structure of prejudicial  
55  
56 attitudes: The case of attitudes toward homosexuals. *Journal of Personality and Social*  
57  
58 *Psychology*, *65*, 1105-1118. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.65.6.1105>  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Hau, K. T., & Marsh, H. W. (2004). The use of item parcels in structural equation modelling:  
4  
5 Non-normal data and small sample sizes. *British Journal of Mathematical and*  
6  
7 *Statistical Psychology*, 57, 327-351. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044->  
8  
9 [8317.2004.tb00142.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8317.2004.tb00142.x)  
10  
11  
12 Hodson, G., & Hewstone, M. (Eds.). (2013). *Advances in intergroup contact*. New York, NY:  
13  
14 Psychology Press.  
15  
16  
17 Hoffarth, M. R., & Hodson, G. (2016). Who needs imagined contact? Replication attempts  
18  
19 examining previous contact as a potential moderator. *Social Psychology*, 47, 118-124.  
20  
21 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000258>  
22  
23  
24 Hu, L., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis:  
25  
26 Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 6, 1-55.  
27  
28  
29 Husnu, S., & Crisp, R. J. (2010). Elaboration enhances the imagined contact effect. *Journal of*  
30  
31 *Experimental Social Psychology*, 46, 943-950.  
32  
33 <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>  
34  
35  
36 Husnu, S., & Paolini, S. (2018). Positive imagined contact is actively chosen: Exploring  
37  
38 determinants and consequences of volitional intergroup imagery in a conflict-ridden  
39  
40 setting. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, 1-19.  
41  
42 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430217747405>  
43  
44  
45 Ioannou, M., Hewstone, M., & Al Ramiah, A. (2017). Inducing similarities and differences in  
46  
47 imagined contact: A mutual intergroup differentiation approach. *Group Processes and*  
48  
49 *Intergroup Relations*, 20, 427-446. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430215612221>  
50  
51  
52 Islam, M. R., & Hewstone, M. (1993). Dimensions of contact as predictors of intergroup  
53  
54 anxiety, perceived out-group variability, and out-group attitude: An integrative model.  
55  
56 *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 19, 700-710.  
57  
58 <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167293196005>  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Jöreskog, K. G., & Sörbom, D. (2007). *LISREL 8.8 for Windows* [Computer Software].  
4  
5       Lincolnwood, IL: Scientific Software International, Inc.  
6  
7  
8 Kosslyn, S. M., Ganis, G., & Thompson, W. (2001). Neural foundations of imagery. *Nature*  
9  
10       *Reviews Neuroscience*, 2, 635-642. doi: 10.1038/35090055  
11  
12  
13 Kuchenbrandt, D., Eyssel, F., & Seidel, S. K. (2013). Cooperation makes it happen: Imagined  
14  
15       intergroup cooperation enhances the positive effects of imagined contact. *Group*  
16  
17       *Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 16, 635-647.  
18  
19       <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430212470172>  
20  
21  
22 Little, T. D., Cunningham, W. A., Shahar, G., & Widaman, K. F. (2002). To parcel or not to  
23  
24       parcel: Exploring the question, weighing the merits. *Structural Equation Modeling*, 9,  
25  
26       151-173. [https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902\\_1](https://doi.org/10.1207/S15328007SEM0902_1)  
27  
28  
29 Lyubormirsky, S., Tucker, K. L., Caldwell, N. D., & Berg, K. (1999). Why ruminators are  
30  
31       poor problem solvers: Clues from the phenomenology of dysphoric rumination.  
32  
33       *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 1041-1060.  
34  
35       <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.5.1041>  
36  
37  
38  
39 Macrae, C. N., Bodenhausen, G. V., Milne, A. B., Thorn, T. M. J., & Castelli, L. (1997). On  
40  
41       the activation of social stereotypes: The moderating role of processing objectives.  
42  
43       *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 33, 471-489.  
44  
45       <https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1997.1328>  
46  
47  
48  
49 Meleady, R. & Seger, C. (2017). Imagined contact encourages prosocial behaviour towards  
50  
51       outgroup members. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 20, 447-464.  
52  
53       <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430215612225>  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Miles, E., & Crisp, R. J. (2014). A meta-analytic test of the imagined contact  
4 hypothesis. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *17*, 3-26.  
5  
6 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430213510573>  
7  
8  
9  
10 Paolini, S., Harwood, J., Rubin, M., Husnu, S., Joyce, N., & Hewstone, M. (2014). Positive  
11 and extensive intergroup contact in the past buffers against the disproportionate impact  
12 of negative contact in the present. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *44*, 548-  
13 562. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2029>  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 Pagotto, L., Visintin, E. P., De Iorio, G., & Voci, A. (2012). Imagined intergroup contact  
22 promotes cooperation through outgroup trust. *Group Processes and Intergroup*  
23 *Relations*, *16*, 209-216. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430212450057>  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29 Park, B., & Rothbart, M. (1982). Perception of outgroup homogeneity and levels of social  
30 categorization: Memory for the subordinate attributes of ingroup and outgroup  
31 members. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *42*, 1051-1068.  
32  
33 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.42.6.1051>  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory.  
39  
40 *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *90*, 751-783.  
41  
42 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751>  
43  
44  
45  
46 Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice?  
47  
48 Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, *38*,  
49 922-934. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.504>  
50  
51  
52  
53 Pettigrew, T. F., Tropp, L. R., Wagner, U., & Christ, O. (2011). Recent advances in  
54  
55 intergroup contact theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *35*, 271-  
56 280. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2011.03.001>  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Preacher, K. J., & Hayes, A. F. (2008). Asymptotic and resampling strategies for assessing  
4 and comparing indirect effects in multiple mediator models. *Behavior Research*  
5 *Methods, 40*, 879-891.  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 Ross, L., Lepper, M. R., & Hubbard, M. (1975). Perseverance in self-perception and social  
12 perception: Biased attributional processes in the debriefing paradigm. *Journal of*  
13 *Personality and Social Psychology, 32*, 880-892. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.32.5.880)  
14 [3514.32.5.880](http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.32.5.880)  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 Rusting, C. L., & Nolen-Hoeksema, S. (1998). Regulating responses to anger: Effects of  
22 rumination and distraction on angry mood. *Journal of Personality and Social*  
23 *Psychology, 74*, 790-803. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.3.790>  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28 Somerville, K., Cooper, M., & Hackmann, A. (2007). Spontaneous imagery in women with  
29 bulimia nervosa: an investigation into content, characteristics and links to childhood  
30 memories. *Journal of Behavior Therapy and Experimental Psychiatry, 38*, 435-446.  
31 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbtep.2007.09.003>  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38 Stathi, S., Cameron, L., Hartley, B., & Bradford, S. (2014). Imagined contact as a prejudice-  
39 reduction intervention in schools: The underlying role of similarity and attitudes.  
40 *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 44*, 536-546. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12245>  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46 Stathi, S., & Crisp, R. J. (2008). Imagining intergroup contact promotes projection to  
47 outgroups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 44*, 943-957.  
48 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2008.02.003>  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53 Stathi, S., Crisp, R. J., Turner, R. N., West, K., & Birtel, M. (2012). Using mental imagery to  
54 promote positive intergroup relations. In D. W. Russel & C. A. Russel (Eds.), *The*  
55 *psychology of prejudice: Interdisciplinary perspectives on contemporary issues* (pp.  
56 235-250). New York, NY: Nova Science.  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Stathi, S., Tsantila, K., & Crisp, R. J. (2012). Imagining intergroup contact can combat mental  
4 health stigma by reducing anxiety, avoidance and negative stereotyping. *The Journal*  
5 *of Social Psychology, 152*, 746-757. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2012.697080>  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10 Swart, H., Hewstone, M., Christ, O., & Voci, A. (2011). Affective mediators of intergroup  
11 contact: A three-wave longitudinal analysis in South Africa. *Journal of Personality*  
12 *and Social Psychology, 101*, 122-1238. doi: 10.1037/a0024450  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 Taylor, A. (2016). Britain's 850,000 Polish citizens face backlash after Brexit vote. Retrieved  
18 from: [https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2016/06/28/britains-](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2016/06/28/britains-850000-polish-citizens-face-backlash-after-brexit-vote/?utm_term=.293d1482b6c6)  
19 [850000-polish-citizens-face-backlash-after-brexit-vote/?utm\\_term=.293d1482b6c6](https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/worldviews/wp/2016/06/28/britains-850000-polish-citizens-face-backlash-after-brexit-vote/?utm_term=.293d1482b6c6).  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 Tredoux, C., & Finchilescu, G. (2010). Mediators of the contact-prejudice relation among  
26 South African students on four university campuses. *Journal of Social Issues, 66*, 289-  
27 308. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2010.01646.x  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32 Turner, R. N., Crisp, R. J., & Lambert, E. (2007). Imagining intergroup contact can improve  
33 intergroup attitudes. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 10*, 427-441.  
34 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430207081533>  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40 Turner, R. N., Hewstone, M., Voci, A., & Vonofakou, C. (2008). A test of the extended  
41 intergroup con- tact hypothesis: The mediating role of intergroup anxiety, perceived  
42 ingroup and outgroup norms, and inclusion of the outgroup in the self. *Journal of*  
43 *Personality and Social Psychology, 95*, 843-860. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0011434>  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49 Turner, R. N., West, K., & Christie, Z. (2013). Out-group trust, intergroup anxiety, and  
50 out-group attitude as mediators of the effect of imagined intergroup contact on  
51 intergroup behavioral tendencies. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 43*, E196-  
52 E205. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12019>  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

- 1  
2  
3 Uleman, J. S., Saribay, S. A., & Gonzalez, C. M. (2008). Spontaneous inferences, implicit  
4 impressions, and implicit theories. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *59*, 329-360. doi:  
5  
6 10.1146/annurev.psych.59.103006.093707  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11 Vezzali, L., Capozza, D., Stathi, S., & Giovannini, D. (2012). Increasing outgroup trust,  
12 reducing inhumanization, and enhancing future contact intentions via imagined  
13 intergroup contact. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*, 437-440.  
14  
15  
16 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.09.008>  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21 Vezzali, L., Crisp, R. J., Stathi, S., & Giovannini, D. (2013). The affective consequences of  
22 imagined contact: A review and some suggestions for future research. *Testing,*  
23  
24 *Psychometrics, Methodology in Applied Psychology*, *20*, 343-363. doi:  
25  
26 10.4473/TPM20.4.4  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31 Vezzali, L., Hewstone, M., Capozza, D., Giovannini, D., & Wölfer, R. (2014). Improving  
32 intergroup relations with extended and vicarious forms of indirect contact. *European*  
33  
34 *Review of Social Psychology*, *25*, 314-389.  
35  
36  
37 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10463283.2014.982948>  
38  
39  
40  
41 Vezzali, L., & Stathi, S. (Eds.). (2017). *Intergroup contact theory: Recent developments and*  
42  
43 *future directions (Series: Current Issues in Social Psychology)*. London: Routledge.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
Voci, A., & Hewstone, M. (2003). Intergroup contact and prejudice toward immigrants in  
Italy: the mediational role of anxiety and the moderational role of group salience.  
*Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *6*, 37-54.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430203006001011>

- 1  
2  
3 Wadsworth, J., Dhingra, S., Ottoviano, G., & Van Reenen, J. (2016). *Brexit and the Impact of*  
4  
5 *Immigration on the UK*. London: Centre for Economic Performance.  
6  
7  
8 West, K., Holmes, E., & Hewstone, M. (2011). Enhancing imagined contact to reduce  
9  
10 prejudice against people with schizophrenia. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*,  
11  
12 *14*, 407-428. doi: 10.1177/1368430210387805  
13  
14  
15 Wittenbrink, B., Judd, C. M., & Park, B. (2001). Spontaneous prejudice in context: Variability  
16  
17 in automatically activated attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *81*,  
18  
19 815-827. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.81.5.815  
20  
21  
22  
23 Wölfer, R., Jaspers, E., Blaylock, D., Wigoder, C., Hughes, J., & Hewstone, M. (2017).  
24  
25 Studying positive and negative direct and extended contact: Complementing self-  
26  
27 reports with social network analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *43*,  
28  
29 1566-1581. doi: 10.1177/0146167217719732  
30  
31  
32  
33 Worthington, E.L., & Wade, N.G. (1999). The social psychology of unforgiveness and  
34  
35 forgiveness and implications for clinical practice. *Journal of Social and Clinical*  
36  
37 *Psychology*, *18*, 385-418. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1521/jscp.1999.18.4.385>  
38  
39  
40  
41 Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Vope, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact  
42  
43 effect: knowledge of cross-group friendship and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and*  
44  
45 *Social Psychology*, *73*, 73-90. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.73>  
46  
47  
48  
49 Zarate, M. A., Garcia, B., Garza, A. A., & Hitlan, R. T. (2004). Cultural threat and perceived  
50  
51 realistic group conflict as dual predictors of prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social*  
52  
53 *Psychology*, *40*, 99-105. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031\(03\)00067-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031(03)00067-2)  
54  
55  
56  
57 Zhou, S., Page-Gould, E., Aron, A., Moyer, A., & Hewstone, M. (2018). The extended  
58  
59 contact hypothesis: A meta-analysis on 20 years of research. *Personality and Social*  
60  
*Psychology Review*, 1-29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868318762647>



Table 1. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) for the spontaneous imagined intergroup contact scale (SIICS), Study 1

Items	Factors		
	I	II	III
<b>I. Frequency</b>			
In everyday life, how frequently do you imagine interacting with “target-group”.	<b>-.83</b>	-.07	.04
Specifically, how often do you imagine having contact with “target-group”.	<b>.92</b>	-.04	.02
<b>II: Quality</b>			
When you imagine interacting with “target-group”, these encounters are unpleasant/pleasant.	.02	<b>-.86</b>	.01
When you imagine interacting with “target-group”, these encounters are hostile/friendly.	-.03	<b>-.64</b>	-.01
<b>III: Elaboration</b>			
When you imagine interacting with “target-group”, do you imagine the reason behind this contact?	-.09	.10	<b>.78</b>
When you imagine interacting with “target-group”, do you think about the details of where and when this contact takes place?	.06	.04	<b>.92</b>
When you imagine a interacting with “target-group”, do you share this interaction with your friends?	-.03	-.04	<b>.73</b>
On average, when you imagine having contact with “target-group”, how much time do you spend imagining the contact scene?	.02	-.05	.40
Eigenvalue	1.18	1.7	3.00
Pearson r & Cronbach’s alphas	-.77(r)	.57(r)	.79(α)

Note: Factor loadings > .40 are boldfaced.

Table 2. Means, standard deviations and correlations among the constructs, Study 1

	1	2	3	4	5
1. Imagined contact: Frequency	-				
2. Imagined contact: Quality	.25***	-			
3. Imagined contact: Elaboration	.31***	.10 <sup>†</sup>	-		
4. Social distance	-.28***	-.36***	-.23***	-	
5. Outgroup attitude	.35***	.49**	.11 <sup>†</sup>	-.61**	-
Mean	----	----	----	2.39	67.51
<i>SD</i>	----	----	----	0.82	19.09

Note: SIICS scores were standardized (*Z* points).

\* $p < .05$ , \*\*\* $p < .01$ ; <sup>†</sup> $p < .09$ .

Table 3. Regression analyses of the relation between the SIICS dimensions, and attitudes and social distance, Study 1.

	Africans	Brazilians	Ukrainians
	Social distance		
Imagined contact: Frequency	-.10	-.14	-.15
Imagined contact: Quality	-.25*	-.41***	-.32***
Imagined contact: Elaboration	-.16	-.04	-.18†
$R^2$	.09	.18	.18
$F$	3.94*	7.68***	8.12***
$df$	(3, 90)	(3, 85)	(3, 96)
	Attitudes		
Imagined contact: Frequency	.18†	.39***	.06
Imagined contact: Quality	.45***	.43***	.48***
Imagined contact: Elaboration	.02	-.07	.00
$R^2$	.30	.30	.22
$F$	14.02***	13.46***	10.35***
$df$	(3, 89)	(3, 86)	(3, 96)

Note: Standardized coefficients are reported.

\* $p < .05$ , \*\*\* $p < .01$ ; †  $p < .06$ .

Table 4. Correlations among the constructs, Study 2

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Imagined contact: Frequency	-								
2. Imagined contact: Quality	.37***	-							
3. Imagined contact: Elaboration	.20**	-.04	-						
4. Intergroup friendships	.47***	.19**	.17*	-					
5. Extended contact	.43***	.26***	.15*	.48***	-				
6. Empathy	.14*	.36***	-.08	.22**	.21**	-			
7. Anxiety	-.23**	-.40***	.07	-.28***	-.27***	-.28***	-		
8. Social distance	-.28***	-.57***	.12	-.28***	-.34***	-.62***	.52***	-	
9. Outgroup attitude	.33***	.56***	-.01	.26***	.30***	.43***	-.41***	-.62***	-
Mean	----	----	----	1.82	2.64	3.89	2.58	2.30	64.97
<i>SD</i>	----	----	----	0.94	1.01	0.96	0.94	1.10	24.87

Note: SIICS scores were standardized (Z points).

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

Table 5. Models comparison, Study 2

Model	$\chi^2$	<i>df</i>	$\chi^2/df$	SRMR	RMSEA	CFI
3 Factors	16.18	11	1.47	0.05	0.05	0.99
2 Factors (frequency with quality)	197.62	13	15.21	0.13	0.23	0.71
2 Factors (frequency with elaboration)	174.58	13	13.43	0.16	0.23	0.71
2 Factors (quality with elaboration)	192.29	13	14.79	0.18	0.25	0.66
1 Factor	355.05	14	25.36	0.20	0.32	0.43

For Peer Review

Table 6. Indirect effects in the hypothesized model, Study 2

Predictor	Mediator variable	Dependent variable	Mean bootstrap estimate	Percentile confidence interval (95%)
Imagined contact: Quality	Anxiety	Social distance	-0.1031	[-0.1926, -0.0344]
Imagined contact: Quality	Anxiety	Outgroup attitude	1.2413	[-0.5779, 3.2678]
Imagined contact: Quality	Empathy	Social distance	-0.2058	[-0.3371, -0.1052]
Imagine contact: Quality	Empathy	Outgroup attitude	2.5118	[0.8334, 4.9873]
Intergroup friendships	Anxiety	Social distance	-0.0764	[-0.2158, 0.0188]
Intergroup friendships	Anxiety	Outgroup attitude	1.0287	[-0.1749, 4.2175]
Intergroup friendships	Empathy	Social distance	-0.1546	[-0.3515, -0.0069]
Intergroup friendships	Empathy	Outgroup attitude	1.8952	[0.1197, 5.1397]

*Note:* Mean bootstrap estimates are based on 5,000 bootstrap samples.

Table 7. Correlations among the constructs, Study 3

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Imagined contact: Frequency	-									
2. Imagined contact: Quality	.43***	-								
3. Imagined contact: Elaboration	.15*	.05	-							
4. Contact quality	.25***	.57***	-.04	-						
5. Contact quantity	.47***	.39***	.12†	.46***	-					
6. Empathy	.20***	.20***	.09	.34***	.20***	-				
7. Anxiety	-.14*	-.25***	.10	-.17**	-.25***	-.05	-			
8. Social distance	-.20***	-.35***	-.02	-.42***	-.33***	-.44***	.29***	-		
9. Outgroup attitude	.26***	.49***	-.01	.46***	.26***	.29***	-.28***	-.47***	-	
10. Contact intentions	.32***	.53***	.03	.44***	.36***	.55***	-.29***	-.62***	.50***	-
Mean	----	----	----	3.69	2.91	3.86	3.39	2.77	62.75	3.36
SD	----	----	----	0.73	1.19	0.89	0.83	1.05	18.27	0.93

Note: The elaboration dimension was created by averaging the two items that emerged from the CFA (see the relevant paragraph).

\*  $p < .05$ ; \*\*  $p < .01$ ; \*\*\*  $p < .001$ ; †  $p = .051$ .

Table 8. Indirect effects in the hypothesized model, Study 3

Predictor	First level mediator	Second level mediator	Dependent variable	Mean bootstrap estimate	Percentile confidence interval (95%)
Imagine contact: Quality	Anxiety	Social distance	Contact intentions	0.0194	[0.0008, 0.0586]
Imagine contact: Quality	Anxiety	Social distance	-	-0.0763	[-0.2095, -0.0047]
Imagine contact: Quality	Anxiety	Outgroup attitude	-	1.2658	[0.0421, 3.3924]
-	Anxiety	Social distance	Contact intentions	0.1130	[0.0436, 0.2245]
-	Empathy	Social distance	Contact intentions	-0.0572	[-0.1282, -0.0086]
Contact quantity	Anxiety	Social distance	Contact intentions	0.0160	[0.0202, 0.0192]
Contact quantity	Anxiety	Social distance	-	-0.0633	[-0.0379, -0.0133]
Contact quantity	Anxiety	Outgroup attitude	-	1.0917	[0.0663, 8.4909]
Contact quality	Empathy	Social distance	Contact intentions	0.0653	[0.0234, 0.2194]
Contact quality	Empathy	-	Contact intentions	0.5515	[0.1763, 1.1882]
Contact quality	Empathy	Social distance	-	-0.3966	[-0.9258, -0.1222]

*Note:* Mean bootstrap estimates are based on 5,000 bootstrap samples.



## Figure captions

### Figure 1

Structural equation model of the effects of imagined contact measure on social distance and outgroup attitudes through the indirect effect of anxiety and empathy, controlling for direct cross-group friendships and extended contact, British sample ( $N = 185$ ). Only significant standardized coefficients are reported.

Correlations among latent factors: imagined contact frequency with imagined contact quality ( $r = .43^{***}$ ) and elaboration ( $r = .23^{**}$ ), cross-group friendships ( $r = .57^{***}$ ), and extended contact ( $r = .49^{***}$ ); imagined contact quality with cross-group friendships ( $r = .20^*$ ) and extended contact ( $r = .29^{***}$ ); imagined contact elaboration with cross-group friendships ( $r = .19^*$ ) and extended contact ( $r = .19^*$ ); cross-group friendships with extended contact ( $r = .55^{***}$ ); social distance with outgroup attitudes ( $r = -.10^*$ ).

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .


### Figure 2

Structural equation model of the effects of imagined contact measure on contact intentions through the indirect effect of anxiety and empathy, and the indirect effect of social distance and outgroup attitudes, controlling for contact quantity and quality, Italian sample ( $N = 276$ ). Only significant standardized coefficients are reported.


Correlations among latent factors: imagined contact frequency with imagined contact quality ( $r = .49^{***}$ ) and elaboration ( $r = .18^*$ ), contact quantity ( $r = .62^{***}$ ), and contact quality ( $r = .31^{***}$ ); imagined contact quality with contact quantity ( $r = .49^{***}$ ) and contact quality ( $r = .71^{***}$ ); imagined contact elaboration with contact quantity ( $r = .16^*$ ); contact quality with contact quantity ( $r = .61^{***}$ ); social distance with outgroup attitudes ( $r = -.14^{**}$ ).

\*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$ .

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46



1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46



Appendix A. Means (standard deviations) of the spontaneous imagined intergroup contact Scale (SIICS) items  
(unstandardized scores)

Items	Study		
	1	2	3
<b>I: Frequency</b>			
a) In everyday life, how frequently do you imagine interacting with “target-group”	2.16 (1.13)	2.74 (1.13)	2.16 (1.12)
b) Specifically, how often do you imagine having contact with “target-group”	3.68 (2.44)	5.19 (2.11)	4.03 (2.20)
<b>II: Quality</b>			
c) When you imagine interacting with “target-group”, these encounters are unpleasant/pleasant	3.84 (0.89)	3.85 (0.95)	3.45 (0.84)
d) When you imagine interacting with “target-group”, these encounters are hostile/friendly	3.74 (1.11)	3.85 (0.97)	3.48 (0.85)
<b>III: Elaboration</b>			
e) When you imagine interacting with “target-group”, do you imagine the reason behind this contact?	1.87 (1.06)	2.47 (1.23)	2.19 (1.15)
f) When you imagine interacting with “target-group”, do you think about the details of where and when this contact takes place?	1.67 (0.96)	2.42 (1.12)	2.06 (1.18)
g) When you imagine interacting with “target-group”, do you share this interaction with your friends?	1.75 (1.08)	2.19 (1.07)	-----

Note. For Imagined Contact: Frequency, for item a), responses ranged from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*); for item b), responses were 1 (*less than once per year*), 2 (*once or twice a year*), 3 (*once every two months*), 4 (*once or twice a month*), 5 (*approximately once per week*), 6 (*approximately twice a week*), 7 (*three to four times per week*), 8 (*at least once a day*). For Imagined Contact: Quality, items c) and d), participants provided their responses on two bipolar items ranging from 1 (negative pole) to 5 (positive pole). For Imagined Contact: Elaboration, items e), f), and g), responses ranged from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*always*).

For Peer Review

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46