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Abstract

Contact research has traditionally focused on reducing negative attitudes or emotions towards outgroups. In the current studies we focus on reduced social distance as an outcome of intergroup contact – that is a person’s desire to have increased contact with members of a group – and investigate whether outgroup evaluation in associated with these generalizing effects of contact. Drawing on data from a large sample of secondary school students in Australia gathered from majority and minority group members the findings demonstrate that having contact with an outgroup reduces social distance to the group in general. However, for majority group members, evaluation of the minority group is a strong predictor of social distance and evaluation is also improved with intergroup contact. Importantly, evaluations of the outgroup play no such role for minority group members. The findings highlight an alternate model for understanding contact effects and suggest that reduced social distance rather than improved outgroup evaluations may be more important in understanding minority responses to contact.

1. Introduction

Intergroup contact remains as one of the most widely researched avenues for reducing intergroup conflict and prejudice, with the bulk of evidence supporting its role in achieving better integrated communities (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). However, this attractively simple hypothesis has been criticized for being ‘too simple’ (Maoz, 2000) and a number of issues remain unresolved.

In this research we aim to address two such issues; how can the generalization effects of contact be better understood (Maoz, 2000; Pettigrew, 1998; Ross, 2000) and can this understanding shed light on weak (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005) or non-existent (Binder et al., 2009) effects of contact for members of low status minority groups.

We aim to investigate two issues by focusing on the role of contact or cross-group friendship in producing more integrated social environments. There has been surprisingly little work in contact research focusing on measures of social integration between groups. Instead, contact research has almost exclusively measured prejudice as a negative attitude or emotion towards another group. However this is not the only way to measure prejudice. Social distance also has a long history in prejudice research (Bogardus, 1925, 1938) and has direct implications for social integration. Understanding whether contact with one member of a group leads to a preference for increased contact with other members of the same group provides a clear indication of the generalization effects of contact. Specifically, does having some outgroup contact lead...
to a desire to have more contact? Few studies have employed this approach (for exceptions see: Ata, Bastian, & Lusher, 2009; Binder et al., 2009), and social distance may be an alternative route in understanding the prejudice reducing effects of contact.

Providing support for an increased focus on measures of social integration, recent work has demonstrated that cross-group friendship reduces avoidance of outgroups (Barlow, Louis, & Hewstone, 2009; Barlow, Louis, & Terry, 2010), and also reduces social distance between groups (Ata, Bastian, & Lusher, 2009; Binder et al., 2009). These measures are distinct from more commonly employed measures of prejudice in that they do not involve evaluative attitudes or emotions towards the outgroup. Importantly, they also go beyond evaluations of an outgroup by addressing the social consequences of contact. Thinking or feeling more positively towards an outgroup has few social implications unless those thoughts and feelings also lead to improved social integration.

Social integration appears to be positively affected by intergroup contact. Although a large body of work has focused on the link between contact and evaluation, none has investigated whether improved evaluations play a role in reducing social distance. Negative responses such as anxiety have been shown to mediate the intergroup contact–avoidance link (Barlow et al., 2009; Barlow, Louis, & Terry, 2010), however, none has focused on the effects of cognitive appraisals in reducing avoidance. Although it would seem intuitive that negative evaluations of a group should be evident where there is an expressed desire for social distance, it is conceivable that this relationship may depend on a number of factors. One factor that may influence the importance of negative attitudes in explaining the generalization effects of contact is whether a person is a member of a high or low status group.

1.1. Majority and minority group contact effects

Understanding how low status minorities respond to majority contact is an important avenue for research. Marginalization of minority group members has serious implications for intergroup conflict (Berry, 2005). Moreover, feeling separated or unidentified with the majority culture can increase identity uncertainty (Bastian & Haslam, 2008) making extremist groups appear more attractive (Hogg, Adelman, & Blagg, 2010). Given these rather serious implications, it is surprising that few studies have focused on minority perceptions. In a recent meta-analysis drawing on over 500 studies (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005), only 33 included measures from both majority and minority members. Indeed the emphasis on majority perceptions has obscured the various dynamics that may arise in minority group member’s experience of intergroup contact.

There is an emerging consensus that the effects for contact are generally weaker for members of minority groups compared to members of majority groups, suggesting an asymmetry in contacts effects for these two groups (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005). In a longitudinal test of the contact hypothesis Binder et al. (2009) tested the effects of contact on reduced prejudice on a large sample (n = 512) of minority group members across Belgium, England and Germany. Contact effects for minority group members were nonexistent, providing strong support to the asymmetry hypothesis. In short, the research to date highlights that, at the very least, different models may be required in understanding contact effects for minority group members.

A large amount of previous work has identified that majority and minority status groups differ in their focus during intergroup interactions. First, whereas majority group members are generally self-aware of their own prejudice towards minority groups within contact situations, minority group members tend to be more concerned about being the targets of such prejudice (Plant, 2004; Plant & Devine, 2003; Shelton, 2003; Stephan & Stephan, 1985; Vorauer, Main, & O’Connell, 1998). Second, minority group members tend to think of themselves in terms of their own group membership more than majority group members (Leach, Snider, & Iyer, 2002; Pinel, 1999) and tend to be aware of their group’s devalued status (Jones et al., 1984). Third, the intergroup attitudes of minority group members are often based on the anticipation of prejudice from the majority group, whereas intergroup attitudes of majority group members tend to be based on their own perceptions and beliefs (Monteith & Spicer, 2000). Fourth, the goal of contact for majority group members tends to be associated with increased inclusion and acceptance of minority group members within the dominant culture. For them, minority group friendships have little instrumental purpose. On the other hand, for minority groups, contact offers the opportunity for greater integration or assimilation to the dominant culture (Berry, 2001), serving acculturation needs. Together this work suggests that minority group members are aware of their group status, concerned about being the targets of prejudice and sensitive to indications from majority group members as to their acceptance and inclusion within the dominant culture. Conversely, majority group members are focused on their own prejudice towards minority groups and the compatibility of those groups with the dominant culture.

Overall this work highlights a number of factors that differentiate the contact experience for minority and majority group members. Specifically it suggests that minority group member’s are more self-aware and less focused on their evaluations of the outgroup compared to majority group members. As noted above, outgroup attitudes and evaluations have been a focus of much previous work; a focus that may explain the weak or non-existent findings for minority groups. While contact may have little impact on evaluations of the outgroup for minority group members, it may independently increase as sense of acceptance, familiarity and comfort with majority group interactions, leading to a desire to have more. We argue that this kind of reduced social distance may be an alternate route for explaining how contact experiences generalize for members of minority groups.
1.2. Evaluation and social distance

Although we argue that social distance is a distinct form of prejudice, it may be claimed that we are at risk of conflating one measure of prejudice with another. However, evaluation and behavioral avoidance of another group are not the same phenomena. Social distance has a long history in the study of intergroup relations and avoidance behaviors were one of the earliest measures of prejudice (Samelson, 1978). Bogardus (1925, 1938) pioneered much of this work, developing one of the best known measures of social distance – tapping a desire to avoid interaction with members of an outgroup. More recent work has focused on the cognitive components of discrimination and both are generally referred to as prejudice (Duckitt, 1992; Samelson, 1978). The study of avoidance and evaluative attitudes share the same birthplace and for this reason researchers do not generally distinguish between the two concepts (Goff, Steele, & Davies, 2008). However, recent research has begun to demonstrate that intergroup distancing and more evaluative forms of prejudice may be distinct, and that a desire not to affiliate with another group may be evident even when explicit negative attitudes are rare (Massey & Denton, 1993; Williams & Eberhardt, 2008).

1.3. The current context

The current work aimed to address this research question within the context of Muslim and non-Muslim (i.e., Christian and secular) relations in Australia. Intergroup relations between these two groups have been of increasing social and political concern over the past decade, and within Australia the potential for social division and conflict has received both national and international attention. Within this context Muslims represent a minority that has been subject to derogation and fear due to global as well as local tensions in intergroup relations. To this extent, the current context allows for an investigation of the effects of contact where fear and prejudice directed towards the minority group are salient within the public sphere. Moreover, it focuses on an intergroup context where issues of marginalization and the availability of extremist alternatives are clearly evident. In this research we report data from a large sample of secondary school students across Australia based on responses from over 1000 participants and spanning both majority group schools (Christian and secular) as well as minority group schools (Muslim).

Within this context we investigated the role of outgroup evaluation in predicting increased social integration, focusing on differences in group status. For majority status groups we argue that feeling close to members of minority groups or desiring more contact with them is associated with an improved evaluation of that group. This is particularly so where prejudice towards the minority group is salient within the public domain, such as the case of prejudice towards Muslims within Australia. For minority status groups we argue that where contact increases feelings of closeness or a desire for more contact it is largely unrelated to evaluation of the majority status group, but reliant on the sense that one is accepted and accommodated within the majority culture. Specifically, we predicted that for both groups contact would reduce social distance to the outgroup, however, we expected differences in the effects of group-based evaluation. For majority group members (Study 1), we predicted that contact would improve evaluation of the outgroup and that, in turn, improved evaluation would be associated with reduced social distance. For the minority group (Study 2) we predicted that outgroup evaluation would be less salient and would be less affected by contact and less predictive of social distance.

2. Study 1

Study 1 investigated the relationship between outgroup evaluation and social distance towards Muslims from the majority perspective. To this end we report data collected from school students at either Christian or non-religious schools and who identified as either Christian or non-religious. Both groups represent a majority within Australia and our focus on both allows for an investigation of the effects of contact between majority and minority groups independent of specific religious differences.

2.1. Method

2.1.1. Participants

The research was part of a larger study examining the attitudes of non-Muslim and non-Jewish secondary school students towards Muslims and Islam. Participating schools were either Christian or non-religious. Students from secondary schools around Australia (from 5 of 6 states and 1 of 2 territories) were administered a survey examining attitudes towards Muslims and Islam in February to July 2006. Schools were selected by first seeking permission from the relevant school agencies (state government departments, Catholic Education Offices, and Independent School Councils). In each selected school, the survey was administered to all eligible students present on the day of the survey in years 10–12 (typical ages 14–18).

There were 750 participating students from 19 schools with the following characteristics: sex (male: 233; female: 517), school gender composition (co-educational: 526; girls only: 224), school type (Catholic: 13; independent: 3; state/government: 2; other Christian school: 1), language spoken at home (English only: 607; language other than English: 143), religion (Christian: 568; non-Christian: 182), parental background (born in Australia: 625; born outside Australia: 125), and metropolitan versus rural location (urban: 240; rural: 510).
2.1.2. Materials

The research instrument was a structured questionnaire administered to students in a classroom setting. Unless otherwise specified, a mean score was derived from the items included for each scale.

2.1.2.1. Social distance. A 3-item measure of social distance to Muslim Australians based on Bogardus (1947) and Karakayali (2009) was developed. Items were selected and modified such that the measure would be meaningful and easy to answer for the school-aged population (“I would enjoy having a close Muslim friend”, “I would go out with a Muslim”, “I would marry a Muslim”; \( \alpha = .87 \)). Scores were reversed so that higher scores represent a greater desired distance from Muslims. The response scale was 1 (Strongly disagree) to 5 (Strongly agree).

2.1.2.2. Intergroup contact. A one-item measure of intergroup contact with participants responding either ‘yes’ = 1 or ‘no’ = 0 to the question “Do you have any Muslim friends?” was employed. Having a Muslim friend was indicative of direct contact (n = 169). This simplified contact measure was selected for reasons of brevity and ease of responding.

2.1.2.3. Minority group evaluation. Participants were provided with 8 adjectives selected based on pilot data from Australian schools. The adjectives were chosen as they represented unambiguously positive and negative sentiments: 4 positive (Brave, Friendly, Intelligent, and Smart) and 4 negative (Stupid, Dishonest, Rude, and Arrogant). Participants were asked to indicate either ‘yes’ (1) or ‘no’ (0) ‘whether the word described the group’. The negative words were reversed scored and added to the positive words to form a positivity index. Higher scores represent more positivity towards the minority group. Participants were asked to rate Muslims (\( \alpha = .83 \)).

2.1.2.4. Demographic characteristics. We also included a number of demographic variables in order to determine that any findings could not be accounted for by population characteristics. These were gender (female: 0, male: 1), language spoken at home (Other: 0, English only: 1), birthplace of parents (Other: 0, Australia: 1), years of education (10 = 1; 11 = 2; 12 = 3), religion (non-Christian: 0, Christian: 1) and school location (rural: 0, urban: 1). We also included a measure of socio-economic status (SES) using the Socio-Economic Index for Areas (SEIFA, Australian Bureau of Statistics ABS, 2001a,b) which was derived from the area in which the school was located. For the variable SES, higher scores represent higher socio-economic status.

2.2. Results and discussion

Having a Muslim friend was significantly associated with improved evaluation of Muslims in general (\( r = .17, p < .001 \)). In order to determine the relative influence of contact, evaluation and demographic variables on social distance we used hierarchical regression with all demographic variables entered in step 1, contact entered in step 2, and evaluation entered in step 3. This allowed us to first observe whether contact was a significant predictor of reduced social distance controlling for the effects of demographic variables, and second to observe whether evaluation made a significant contribution to predicting social distance controlling for demographics and contact (see Table 1 for correlations between all variables). In step 1 the overall regression model was significant, \( F(7,742) = 5.82, p < .001, R^2 = .052 \). Results show that males (\( \beta = .11, p = .004 \)), Christians (\( \beta = .12, p = .002 \)), and students in lower SES schools (\( \beta = -.17, p = .004 \)) indicated greater social distance. There was a marginal effect for greater social distance in urban areas (\( \beta = .11, p = .060 \)). Other demographic variables did not make any contribution to social distance (language, \( \beta = -.05, p = .319 \); years of education: \( \beta = .01, p = .948 \); parental birthplace: \( \beta = -.04, p = .470 \)).

We next entered contact in step 2 of the same regression model. This revealed that contact significantly improved the prediction of social distance, \( F(1,741) = 71.99, p < .001, R^2_{\Delta} = .084 \), such that having contact reduced social distance (\( \beta = -.32, p < .001 \)). In addition SES became a non-significant predictor (\( \beta = -.10, p = .087 \)) and school location became significant (\( \beta = .13, p = .016 \)) with students at urban schools reporting greater social distance.

### Table 1

Correlations between dependent and independent variables—Study 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Social distance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sex</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-13***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Year level</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.15**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Language</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06*</td>
<td>-.10**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Religion</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.14**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Parental birthplace</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.68***</td>
<td>-.22***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. School location</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.26***</td>
<td>.20***</td>
<td>-.38**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.37***</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. SES</td>
<td>-.12***</td>
<td>-.31***</td>
<td>.29***</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>-.22***</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Evaluation of Muslims</td>
<td>-.49***</td>
<td>-.24***</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Muslim friendships</td>
<td>-.31***</td>
<td>-.17***</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>-.22***</td>
<td>-.15***</td>
<td>-.15***</td>
<td>.31***</td>
<td>.37***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05.
** p < .01.
*** p < .001.
Finally we entered evaluation in step 3 of the same regression model. This revealed that evaluation significantly improved the prediction of social distance, \( F(1,174) = 196.57, p < .001, R^2 = .181 \), such that positive evaluation significantly reduced social distance (\( \beta = -.45, p < .001 \)). The effect of contact remained a significant predictor (\( \beta = -.25, p < .001 \)), although reduced in magnitude. In the case of the demographic variables only religion continued to make a significant independent contribution (\( \beta = .10, p < .001 \)), with Christians indicating greater social distance than non-Christians.

The findings of Study 1 support our hypotheses regarding the importance of evaluation in predicting reduced social distance for majority group members. Having a Muslim friend increased a desire to have more contact with other Muslims, contact also improved evaluation of Muslims in general and improved evaluation in turn showed a strong relationship to decreased social distance. Therefore for majority members, increased liking for the group as a whole appears to be an important factor in predicting reduced social distance.

It is also worth noting that although evaluation impacted on the contact-social distance relationship, suggesting some overlap, contact remained a significant independent predictor of reduced social distance. Importantly, this suggests that although improved evaluation is an important outcome of intergroup contact for majority group members, such contact may independently reduce social distance. Our findings suggest that social distance may be an important indicator of contacts effects even for majority group members. Not only does social distance represent a direct measure of the generalization effects of contact, but it also appears to represent a pathway in promoting social integration that operates independently of improved outgroup evaluation.

3. Study 2

Study 1 provided a model of how contact reduced social distance towards a minority group and the effects of outgroup evaluation in this process. The findings demonstrate that contact improves evaluation of an outgroup, which in turn is associated with increased integration and reduced social distance between groups. In this way we demonstrate that reduced prejudice has the socially relevant consequences of increasing social integration between groups. However, we also find that contact reduces social distance independent of the effects of improved evaluation. As we argue above there is good reason to expect that evaluation may be less important in reducing social distance for minority group members, for whom evaluation of majority outgroups may be less affected by contact. Study 2 investigated these relationships from the perspective of minority group members.

3.1. Method

3.1.1. Participants

Participants were drawn from part of a larger study examining the attitudes of Muslim secondary school students in Australia towards non-Muslims. The characteristics of the students (\( n = 277 \)) were as follows: sex (male: 127; female: 150), language spoken at home (non-English only: 16; English and other: 261), religion (Muslim: 277), and parental background (born in Australia: 27; born outside Australia: 250). All 8 participating schools were Islamic schools, and all were in metropolitan areas.

3.1.2. Materials

The research instrument was a similar structured questionnaire to that used in Study 1 and administered to students in a classroom setting. Unless otherwise specified, a mean score was derived from the items included for each scale.

3.1.2.1. Social distance. A 3-item measure of social distance to Australians from other religions (adapted from items used in Study 1) was employed (‘I would enjoy having a close friend of another religion’, ‘I would go out with someone of another religion’, ‘I would marry someone of another religion’; \( \alpha = .61 \)). Scores were reversed so that higher scores represent a greater desired distance from Australians of other religions.

3.1.2.2. Intergroup contact. As in Study 1 a one-item measure of intergroup contact was employed with participants responding to the question ‘What religious community do your friends come from’ (1 = Mostly Muslim (\( n = 190 \)), 2 = About half and half (\( n = 83 \)), and 3 = Mostly non-Muslim (\( n = 4 \))).

3.1.2.3. Majority group evaluation. As in Study 1, participants were provided with adjectives that were unambiguously positive or negative and were selected based on pretesting in Australian schools. In total 10 adjectives were used: 5 positive (Generous, Brave, Honest, Tolerant, and Clever) and 5 negative (Stupid, Greedy, Impolite, and Arrogant), and asked to indicate either ‘yes’ (=1) or ‘no’ (=0) ‘whether the word described the group’. The negative words were reversed scored and added to the positive words to form a positivity index. Higher scores represent more positivity towards the majority group. Participants were asked to rate Other Australians’ (\( \alpha = .76 \)).

3.1.2.4. Demographic characteristics. We also included the same demographic variables as in Study 1. These were gender; (female: 0, male: 1), language spoken at home (Other: 0, English only: 1), birthplace of parents (Other: 0, Australia: 1)
Table 2  
Correlations between dependent and independent variables—Study 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Social distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Year level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.25***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Language</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Parental birthplace</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. SES</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.24***</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Evaluation of other Australians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.16***</td>
<td>.22***</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Muslim friendships</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.27***</td>
<td>.14***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( p < .05 \)

\( ** p < .01 \)

\( *** p < .001 \)

and years of education (10 = 1; 11 = 2; 12 = 3). We also included a measure of socio-economic status (SES) using the Socio-Economic Index for Areas (SEIFA, Australian Bureau of Statistics ABS, 2001a,b) which was derived from the area in which the school was located. For the variable SES, higher scores represented higher socio-economic status.

3.2. Results and discussion

Having a non-Muslim friend was unrelated to evaluation of non-Muslim Australians in general \((r = .06, p > .05)\). Following the same analytical procedure as for Study 1, we used hierarchical regression with all demographic variables entered in step 1, contact entered in step 2, and evaluation entered in step 3 (see Table 1 for correlations between all variables). In step 1 the overall regression model was significant, \(F(5,271) = 4.41, p < .001, R^2 = .075\). Results show that females indicate greater social distance \((\beta = -.29, p = .004)\). Other demographic variables did not make any contribution to social distance (language, \(\beta = -0.7, p = .265\), years of education: \(\beta = -.07, p = .309\), parental birthplace: \(\beta = -.04, p = .523\), SES, \(\beta = -1.1, p = .145\)).

We next entered contact in step 2 of the same regression model. This revealed that contact significantly improved the prediction of social distance, \(F(1,270) = 19.36, p < .001, R^2 = .062\), such that contact reduced social distance \((\beta = -.26, p < .001)\). There were no changes in the effects of demographic variables.

Finally we entered evaluation in step 3 of the same regression model. This revealed that evaluation did not significantly improve the prediction of social distance, \(F(1,269) = 3.42, p = .065, R^2 = .011\), showing a non-significant relationship to social distance \((\beta = -.11, p = .065)\). The effect of contact remained significant \((\beta = -.24, p < .001)\) and there were no changes in the effects of demographic variables.

The findings of Study 2 support expectations that contact reduces social distance for minority group members and that the effects of evaluation are unrelated to social distance. Specifically, contact did not affect evaluation of the outgroup and this evaluation was unrelated to social distance to non-Muslim Australians in general. This indicates that, for minority groups, having contact with outgroup members is unrelated to evaluation of that group as a whole, however it still has the effect of increasing the desire for more contact with outgroup members (Table 2).

4. General discussion

Drawing on data from over 1000 secondary school students across Australia we find evidence that contact reduces social distance to outgroups for both a majority status group and a minority status group. In Study 1 we show that for majority group members contact is related to improved evaluation of an outgroup, and this improved evaluation is in turn related to reduced social distance. However, we also find that contact reduces social distance independent of any effects associated with outgroup evaluation, suggesting the even for majority groups social distance may be an important and independent indicator of improved social integration. In Study 2 we find that evaluation is not only unaffected by contact, but is also unrelated to social distance. Critically we find that for minority group members’ contact is an important predictor of reduced social distance. Together our data provide evidence that social distance is an important measure of the generalization effects of contact, and especially critical in considering the effects of contact on minority group prejudice. For majority groups, instances of contact with outgroup members generalize to a desire to have more contact and an improvement in positivity towards the group as a whole plays a significant role. In this way, for high status majority groups, contact offers the opportunity to reject salient perceptions of derogated outgroups, thereby improving perceptions of the group and this in turn is associated with an increased desire to have contact. On the other hand, for minority group members, instances of contact also generalize to a desire to have more contact. However improved evaluations of the majority group are not only unaffected by contact, but also are unrelated to the generalization effects of contact.

Our findings provide support to a large body of work demonstrating differences in the contact experience for majority and minority status groups. It also adds to this work in important ways. By focusing on social distance, we highlight a new route in understanding how the effects of contact generalize. Not only does social distance have direct implications for social integration, it captures a pathway in prejudice reduction that may have important implications for understanding how contact reduces minority prejudice. In this way our findings also contribute to an increasing body of work.
demonstrating that segregation between groups often remains even in the absence of explicit negative attitudes (Massey & Denton, 1993; Williams & Eberhardt, 2008). Specifically we show this independence in reverse: that contact can reduce segregation independent of changes in negative evaluation of outgroups, and this is particularly the case for minority group members.

The findings of the research are promising as they suggest that asymmetry in contacts effects for majority and minority groups may be related to the kinds of outcome measures employed. Social distance may be a more important measure of minority group responses to majority group contact. However, we also note there a number of limitations which require replication and follow-up. First, the results of our work conflict with those of Binder et al. (2009) who also employed a measure of social distance, but found no effects of contact for minority group members. These differences might reflect contextual effects which are likely to be important in majority-minority group relations. For example, how the relationship between the groups is viewed by one or both of the groups may significantly affect the impact of contact on social distance (e.g., Abu-Nimer, 2004; Halabi & Sonnenschein, 2004; Maoz, 2000). However, it is noteworthy that their study was longitudinal and diverse, whereas our was conducted at a single time-point and focused on a single contact situation. Due to our cross-sectional data, we are unable to draw causal inferences and more work needs to be conducted comparing and contrasting the effects of contact on outgroup evaluation and social distance before we could be confident that social distance is a better model of prejudice reduction for minority groups. Another limitation of our work is that the measures employed in the current study were administered as part of a larger survey and necessarily kept simple given the population characteristics. More comprehensive measures should be employed in follow-up studies. However, we also note that the specific characteristics of our population add value to our findings. Less research has focused on school students and indeed understanding how contact increases social integration in this cohort is important for the future integration of Australian society.

Overall, our findings provide promising support to the importance of social distance in understanding the contact-prejudice link for minority group members. Whereas contact improves outgroup evaluation for majority group members, this is less evident for minority group members. However contact still generalizes to a preference for more contact with other members of the outgroup and provides a different perspective from which to understand the majority–minority asymmetry in contacts effects.
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