Evidence-Based Methods to Effectively Combat Antigypsyism in the Changing Political Climate of Europe

PolRom

Contents

Foreword

In PolRom, social psychologists from five European countries came together with a commitment to help decision makers and practitioners deal with antigypsyism more effectively with the help of social psychological science. This commitment was rooted in a growing concern about political processes that give way to increased discrimination, expression of hate and segregation all over Europe and obstruct efforts of inclusion. However, it also stemmed from an awareness that many bottom-up, NGO level initiatives, as well as top-down, state-level efforts of Roma inclusion do not build on the robust evidence about the effectiveness of antidiscrimination interventions that social psychology can offer (what works, why, for whom and in which contexts). Although there are many practical reasons why this is the case, an important one is that a systematic application of this knowledge to the context of Roma–non-Roma relations in Europe is missing. Therefore, this toolkit aims to provide information about antidiscrimination interventions with a clear reference to the importance of the social-political context and how this can be applied to addressing antigypsyism. We present social psychological theory of prejudice reduction interventions, review the concept of antigypsyism, explain the relevance of the social-political context, and offer best practice examples from each of the five participating countries of PolRom in the area of reducing antigypsyism in society. Additionally, the toolkit contains an annotated bibliography of scientific publications about prejudice reduction interventions and those targeting antigypsyism specifically as additional resources for designing and evaluating interventions.

Who is this toolkit for

This toolkit builds upon evidence from previous social psychological research and evidence from the [PolRom project](#) to offer directions for effective interventions and, therefore, aims to inform a broad range of professionals, stakeholders, and interested individuals.

European, national, local policy and decision makers can benefit from this toolkit as it outlines directions for responsible antidiscrimination decision making and explains the importance of the social and political context and the role of authorities.

Representatives of NGOs engaged in prejudice reduction, antidiscrimination interventions and Roma inclusion can rely on the toolkit to design interventions taking into account the necessary conditions of achieving change in terms of prejudice reduction and expression of solidarity with the Roma and Traveller communities and in terms of Roma engagement.

We recommend the toolkit for **representatives of donor and sponsor organisations,** as it offers information about how to create environments for designing and implementing effective interventions.

Representatives of the media who report on issues related to antigypsyism and Roma/Traveller groups more generally can benefit from this toolkit as they provide the platform for public and political discourse that in turn determines the outcome of interventions by creating supportive or inhibiting normative contexts.

The toolkit also aims to inform all **people who work with Roma and non-Roma people in schools and community centres** toward non-discrimination and **academics** interested in understanding the psychological mechanisms and boundary conditions of antidiscrimination interventions.

Why do we need social psychology to fight antigypsyism?

Antigypsyism is a key factor in the maintenance of the marginalised position of Roma people in [Europe](#). Antigypsyism refers to the biased, generalized perception of Roma people (e.g. stereotypes), negative emotions (such as indifference, threat, fear), and negative intentions (e.g. discrimination, verbal expression of hostility, unequal treatment and the absence of helping and benevolent intentions) towards them. The problem is that efforts for the economic and social integration of Roma remain futile, if the majority society opposes their integration and prefers either that Roma people live in segregation or completely assimilate into the majority society.[1] In this context, politicians tend to be reluctant to take on issues to improve the situation of Roma people, especially if it requires efforts and resources from members of the majority population, and in the presence of the electorate's prejudicial attitudes. In short, this social-political context enables that individual level antigypsyism concurs with institutional levels of discrimination.[2] Furthermore, public actors and politicians often use anti-Roma sentiments for political mobilization, creating a context in which antigypsyism is accepted and acceptable. Within this normative context the expressions of both solidarity and social change in favour of the Roma are hindered.

Social psychological interventions with an understanding of the connection between individual level processes and structural aspects of discriminatory practices (both in person-to-person interactions and institutionally) have real potential to tackle antigypsyism in Europe today. Where structural change is needed, individual agency becomes the drive for larger societal changes. Social psychological science explains how individuals experience everyday contacts and intergroup reality, as well as how they can use their group memberships to start and engage in efforts for social change. There are important historical examples that highlight the intricate relationship between individual and societal level social psychological interventions. For example, in the US, Allport's contact hypothesis[3] was not only a powerful justification for school desegregation policies following the Brown v. Board of Education decision, it also clearly outlined the conditions of creating psychologically inclusive environments for Black children in the early years of desegregation (see Pettigrew[4]). Therefore, we firmly believe that understanding the individual level psychological processes that need to be targeted in antidiscrimination interventions and learning what really works and why, can offer substantial contribution to

---

[1] Stewart, M. S. (2012). *The Gypsy menace: Populism and the new anti-Gypsy politics*. London, UK: Hurst & Company.
[2] FRA (2018). *A persisting concern: anti-Gypsyism as a barrier to Roma inclusion*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Retrieved from: https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2018/roma-inclusion/fra-opinions
[3] Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
[4] Pettigrew, T. F. (1961). Social psychology and desegregation research. *American Psychologist*, *16*(3), 105-112. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0041995

creating effective interventions, regardless whether they target smaller groups of children or whether they are large scale national campaigns.

Psychological interventions to reduce prejudice

Prejudice reduction methods can be distinguished by their scope, as they aim to achieve change at different levels, by targeting individual, intergroup, or societal level change.

Individual level interventions aim to change people's attitudes, biased perceptions and emotions toward members of other groups. Individual interventions do not usually require direct contact with members of the other group. They work with the assumption that prejudice is a result of how we process information (motivated information processing) and it is a normal part of human cognition that serves our basic motivation to understand and control our environment, and to connect with others. However, given our limited cognitive capacities and tendency to simplify and categorise social information, we often generalise our experiences and create shortcuts dividing the world into "us" and "them". We develop biased perceptions that put "us" (ourselves and others similar to us) in a more positive light and categorize "them" as more negative. Other cognitive shortcuts lead to reinforce these generalizations (stereotypes): for example, we have a tendency to select and process information that confirms our existing knowledge, making our biased perceptions highly resistant to change. Therefore, interventions that target negative stereotypes about outgroups ("them") will be more difficult to implement, compared to interventions that focus on our more varied and immediate emotional responses or potential behaviours in the presence of "them".

Intergroup-level interventions concentrate directly on groups and group-level processes, and most often involve contact between members of different groups. These interventions build on the assumption that prejudice is not a mere consequence of individual-level bias, the cognitive ways of processing information and relating to the world. Instead, people's prejudices are assumed to be connected to the psychological consequences of group membership, specifically, to the comparison between groups that we belong to (so called in-groups) and those that we do not (so called out-groups). In other words, we live in a world defined by multiple groups that we all belong to, and we navigate our society by making group-based comparisons. We aim to see ourselves in a more positive light (gain self-esteem from these intergroup comparisons), and thus are motivated

to value our own group at the cost of derogating other groups (as described in the Social Identity Theory[5]).

Another important assumption of the intergroup-level interventions is that we are active in evaluating and constructing our world and our relationship with it, as opposed to being on the "automatic pilot" of stereotypes. This means that the biased, negative and often homogenising perception of out-groups can change when people obtain new and positive experiences with members of other groups. Therefore, in interaction (having contact, making friends, working together with people from different groups) we come to re-evaluate our own groups, or become aware of the fact that we all belong to many distinct but overlapping social categories. This blurs the distinction between the previous "us versus them" and allows for recategorizations in the new "us".

Societal-level interventions take broader social processes, structural inequalities and social norms into consideration. They do not focus directly on prejudice reduction, but on status differences between groups, injustice in society, values like cultural diversity and potential for structural and social change. In everyday encounters people rarely take a broader perspective and reflect on structural inequalities, therefore societal-level interventions work by raising awareness of the connection between individual attitudes and societal processes or use a more indirect approach and create conditions for developing more favourable attitudes.

Different Intergroup Contexts

Most social psychological interventions are applied both to intergroup contexts in which the groups are or had been in conflict and to contexts in which the groups occupy different societal positions and therefore, one of the groups can be considered a higher-status advantaged group, whereas the other, a lower-status disadvantaged group. The main reason that most interventions do not distinguish between the two contexts is that these intergroup situations tend to overlap in real life. The case of hate-crimes against historically disadvantaged groups clearly attests to the connection between the two. Although Roma people are affected by structural inequalities in society, the level of antigypsyism in society suggests that effective interventions need to include elements both of conflict reduction and antidiscrimination. Roma people are treated as a "dissident" outgroup and not as a "derogated" group according to a study conducted in Hungary, which suggests that they are viewed as challenging the status quo, referring to the possibility of open conflict, not just structural inequalities (see Hadarics & Kende[6]). Therefore, the following summary includes intervention techniques that either focus predominantly on solving intergroup

---

[5] Tajfel, H. (1978). The achievement of inter-group differentiation. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation Between Social Groups* (pp. 77-100). London: Academic Press.
[6] Hadarics, M., & Kende, A. (2018). The dimensions of generalized prejudice within the dual-process model: The mediating role of moral foundations. *Current Psychology, 37*(4), 731-739. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-016-9544-x

conflicts or problems arising from structural inequalities. Both foci may be applicable to the situation of Roma people in Europe.

The effectiveness of interventions is highly influenced by the social-political normative context that can both facilitate and hinder the desired outcome. While the theoretical insights from decades of prejudice reduction interventions are extremely important, their application to the situation of Roma people in Europe needs to be carefully considered as well, and preferably tested empirically. Therefore, in the following table, we present interventions that address individual, intergroup and societal levels. We further explain why they are effective, how they work for members of the majority or advantaged group in terms of reducing prejudice and increasing solidarity, how they work for members of minority or disadvantaged groups in terms of social integration and positive identity, and discuss their applicability in the context of Roma and non-Roma relations. In this analysis, we take into account the specific characteristics of antigypsyism and the social-political context.

1 Individual level interventions

1.1 Perspective taking interventions

Description

In these interventions participants are directly instructed or indirectly led to step in the shoes of a member of a different group and perceive a particular social situation as if they were members of the other group (target group, out-group). They typically use engaging personal stories for this goal. Participants can also be directly instructed to try to empathize with members of the target group.

Why it works for members of majority and advantaged groups

Perspective taking conveys its effect on attitudes via both affective and cognitive processes. Research demonstrated that perspective taking induced both parallel and reactive empathy (feeling the same emotion as the other or feeling concerned about the other's situation). This method can also affect how people explain situations, specifically, it increases the recognition of contextual factors, so it reduces blaming members of the target group. Furthermore, participants can recognize the similarities between themselves and members of the out-group.

How members of minority and disadvantaged groups are affected

Minorities are not directly involved in the intervention. (They might be affected indirectly and partially - in case the intervention results in lowering the prejudice towards Roma among participants.)

Applicability for Roma–non-Roma context

This method has been effectively used in the context of Roma–non-Roma relations.[7] In a so-called "Gypsy Maze" intervention, participants took part in a role-playing activity, and put themselves in the place of a young Roma boy from the countryside who tried to make his way in Budapest. Participants learned about the challenges and difficulties a disadvantaged Roma boy had to go through. The interactive online game made it possible for them to actively engage in the perspective-taking task. This method was effective in decreasing their prejudice toward the Roma.

---

[7] Simonovits, G., Kezdi, G., & Kardos, P. (2018). Seeing the world through the other's eye: An online intervention reducing ethnic prejudice. *American Political Science Review, 112*(1), 186-193. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000478

Related publications in social psychological journals

Galinsky, A. D., & Moskowitz, G. B. (2000). Perspective-taking: Decreasing stereotype expression, stereotype accessibility, and in-group favoritism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*(4), 708–724. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.708

Paolucci, M. P. (2003). Perspective taking and prejudice reduction: The mediational role of empathy arousal and situational attributions. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*(4), 455-472. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.163

Simonovits, G., Kezdi, G., & Kardos, P. (2018). Seeing the world through the other's eye: An online intervention reducing ethnic prejudice. *American Political Science Review, 112*(1), 186-193. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000478

Vescio, T. K., Sechrist, G. B., & Stephan, W. G., & Finlay, K. (1999). The role of empathy in improving intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*(4), 729-743. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00144

1.2 Providing counter-stereotypical information

Description

In these interventions participants receive counter-stereotypical images, examples, and narratives concerning a group. The examples are often provided in the form of entertainment (by stories or films). They can be used directly or indirectly: interventions may have the goal to directly persuade participants to change their attitudes, or they can provide them with an experience where participants themselves collect counter-stereotypical information.

Why it works for members of majority and advantaged groups

The method of providing counter-stereotypical information builds on cognitive dissonance reduction, in which the previously held beliefs and prejudice are contrasted to new information. Participants are motivated to change their original attitude to resolve the discrepancy between previously held beliefs and the counter-stereotypical information that they received during the intervention. Attitude change is more likely if participants repeatedly meet with counter-stereotypical information, as it can be more easily generalised to the whole out-group. Furthermore, attitude change is more stable if it is reinforced by group discussions as a follow-up of the intervention. However, when prejudice is high, the counter-stereotypical information may be neglected by the participants, therefore this method is more efficient among people with moderate attitudes who are motivated to change.

How members of minority and disadvantaged groups are affected

Learning about counter-stereotypical examples can have a secondary function of presenting alternative role models for minority members which either help coping (see the theory of social creativity) or can offer a genuine change in identity content.

Applicability for Roma–non-Roma context

This method can potentially be an effective tool for reducing antigypsyism, because it challenges the homogenising perception of Roma people in society, the deep-rooted stereotypes about the Roma, and the tendency to view Roma people simply as a social category (i.e. underclass). Showing counter-stereotypical examples can therefore disrupt these views. However, because so few Roma people are shown in leadership or other non-stereotypical positions in the media, there is also the risk of subtyping (i.e., considering the counter-stereotypical example as an exception) that would curb the generalisation effect and therefore limit attitude change.

A photo campaign contrasted Roma people in their own clothes and Roma people in clothes representing stereotypes of the Roma, which aimed to contrast the way how homogenous and stereotypical Roma are depicted by the media and the public discourse, and how heterogenous Roma people actually are as individuals.

Related publications in social psychological journals

Dasgupta, N., & Greenwald, A. G. (2001). On the malleability of automatic attitudes: combating automatic prejudice with images of admired and disliked individuals. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 81*(5), 800-814. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.5.800

Jackson, L. A., Sullivan, L. A., Harnish, R., & Hodge, C. N. (1996). Achieving positive social identity: Social mobility, social creativity, and permeability of group boundaries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(2), 241-254. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.2.241

Vasiljevic, M., & Crisp, R. J. (2013). Tolerance by surprise: Evidence for a generalized reduction in prejudice and increased egalitarianism through novel category combination. *PloS One, 8*(3), e57106. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0057106

1.3 Changing unconscious bias (Cognitive reappraisal and emotion regulation interventions)

Description

These interventions teach participants that they are unconsciously influenced by biases in information processing (i.e. in selecting, remembering and interpreting the available information) which lead to biased and discriminatory behaviour. However, learning about these biases can help people change their perceptions. People can also change their emotions by consciously reframing their understanding of situations and groups.

For example, an evidence-based "prejudice habit-breaking" intervention had three levels: raising awareness about the bias, motivating people to act against the negative consequences of bias, and learning about strategies on how to do that.[8] These strategies include, for example, "stereotype replacement", which means that participants have to be aware when stereotypes are activated, and try to look for non-stereotypical information to replace them. Another strategy is "individuation", when people try to look for specific, individual information when meeting a member of another group, and consciously do not rely on group membership as the source of information. There is evidence that teaching such techniques can reduce prejudice.

Another technique is emotion-regulation: participants are instructed to approach anger-inducing pictures (related to an intergroup conflict) in a cold and analytical manner as if they were scientists. This appraisal made participants actually feel less anger toward another group, compared to the control group who did not practice emotion regulation.[9]

Why it works for members of majority and advantaged groups

People experience cognitive dissonance (an unpleasant tension between one's attitudes, opinions and values on the one hand, and acts on the other) when they realize that their perception is distorted by cognitive bias, hostile emotions and prejudice, because these are in conflict with their idea that they treat others with fairness. To decrease dissonance, people are motivated to learn about these processes and ways to deal with them.

---

[8] Devine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Austin, A. J., & Cox, W. T. (2012). Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*(6), 1267-1278. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.06.003

[9] Halperin, E., Porat, R., Tamir, M., & Gross, J. J. (2013). Can emotion regulation change political attitudes in intractable conflicts? From the laboratory to the field. *Psychological Science, 24*(1), 106-111. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612452572

They can learn that prejudice appears on both explicit and implicit levels. Handling explicit prejudice entails the awareness and less restricted expression of negative stereotypes about members of other groups, so people can more easily make decisions about expressing such prejudice or not. Implicit prejudice, on the other hand, is less controllable, and part of our need to put people automatically in "boxes." Learning about implicit prejudice and strategies to cope with it can question the justification of these practices and lead to behavioural change to decrease the appearance of this bias in everyday life.

Members of the majority who are motivated to learn about these skills and change their attitudes could benefit a lot from this approach. However, highly prejudiced individuals may be relieved by the notion that prejudice is normal and widespread which can lead to a potential backfire effect.

How members of minority and disadvantaged groups are affected

The intervention does not target minorities.

Applicability for Roma–non-Roma context

This approach is not necessarily context specific, although participants are led to recognise prejudice in specific intergroup contexts, therefore it can potentially be applied to Roma–non-Roma relations. However, this method only works if participants consider antigypsyism a problem and have some motivation to change, therefore, this method is not applicable for highly prejudiced individuals. Additionally, the method can encourage participants to justify their prejudice and put the blame on the targets of prejudice, therefore the prejudice reduction effect can even backfire.

Related publications in social psychological journals

Devine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Austin, A. J., & Cox, W. T. (2012). Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*(6), 1267-1278. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.06.003

Halperin, E., Porat, R., Tamir, M., & Gross, J. J. (2013). Can emotion regulation change political attitudes in intractable conflicts? From the laboratory to the field. *Psychological Science, 24*(1), 106-111. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612452572

2 Group and intergroup level interventions

2.1 Contact hypothesis: direct and indirect (extended, imagined) contact

When members of different groups meet, merely based on the quantity of the encounters, prejudice and hostility can decrease. It is especially true if contact is positive and it happens under optimal conditions (as described by Allport[10]):

- Participants are of equal status
- They have a common goal
- They cooperate and interact with each other
- The society and institutions support their contact

The content of the contact experience can be:

- Cooperative learning, task interdependence (for a common goal)
- Fun activities (e.g. playing football together)
- Discussions about commonalities (e.g. self-disclosure), building intimacy, harmony
- Discussions about differences and conflict (e.g. mediated group discussion)

Contact interventions are most effective when they involve repeated positive contact experiences in a variety of social settings.

An example for contact-based interventions is the Living Library. Within this intervention, members of stigmatised or minority groups (mainly trained volunteers) share their personal stories and experiences of discrimination with others. Participants can ask questions without taboos. This method can effectively raise empathy toward the other person, which can be transferred to the entire group. Generalisation is more likely when the minority group membership is emphasized during the contact, so the encounter is not framed as an interpersonal contact, but as an intergroup one.

Besides direct personal contact, indirect forms of contact also proved to be efficient in decreasing prejudice. For example, extended contact, which means that someone learns about the positive contact experience (personal relationship or friendship) of another member of their group, can effectively reduce prejudice.[11]

---

[10] Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
[11] Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social psychology, 73*(1), 73-90. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.73

Imagined contact simply requires to imagine a positive contact experience with a member of another group, and it can also have prejudice-reduction effect.[12] Although imagined contact cannot replace real contact experiences, it is a good alternative in case actual contact is not feasible or too difficult to achieve and can prepare the participants for direct contact in future, by reducing anxiety.

Why it works for members of majority and advantaged groups

Positive contact interventions with minority members can increase empathy, liking and perspective-taking and decrease anxiety and prejudice toward the minority group. Furthermore, contact even increases the awareness of unjust treatment of the minority group, so majority members become more motivated to engage in acts of solidarity and join social movements for change. However, in the absence of the optimal conditions of contact or when contact is a negative experience, the opposite effect can be even stronger, and prejudice may increase.

How members of minority and disadvantaged groups are affected

Intergroup contact has a controversial influence on minority group members. Positive emotions toward the majority increase as a result of positive contact, but at the same time the awareness of unjust treatment of their own group decreases and consequently their willingness to stand up for their own group, which is a risk of such interventions (also called as the irony of harmony, or the sedative effect of contact). This effect can be overcome if a contact-based intervention includes awareness raising about injustice.

In the Living Library intervention, minority members appear as storytellers and educators who represent their groups and highly identify with their own group. This can be an empowering experience for minority group members.

Applicability for Roma–non-Roma context

As many Roma people live in geographically segregated settings and experience institutional segregation (e.g. in schools), the ideal circumstances for positive contact between Roma and non-Roma people are not always easy to achieve. Therefore, when contact takes place within an intervention programme, the optimal conditions of contact can be difficult to ensure.

---

[12] Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2009). Can imagined interactions produce positive perceptions? Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. *American psychologist, 64*(4), 231-240. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014718

Furthermore, in order to avoid the sedative effect of contact, it is also important that the focus is not only on seeking harmony and commonalities between groups, but discussing injustice between groups, and the Roma identity and empowerment. Nevertheless, there is some empirical evidence that contact based interventions (such as the Living Library and the so-called fast-friends method) can be used to reduce prejudice toward Roma people and increase liking to some degree.[13] [14] However, there is also evidence that these interventions may have limited effect: for example, the Living Library method was found ineffective in decreasing antigypsyism in Poland.[15]

Related publications in social psychological journals

Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2009). Can imagined interactions produce positive perceptions? Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. *American psychologist*, *64*(4), 231-240. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014718

Groyecka, A., Witkowska, M., Wróbel, M., Klamut, O., & Skrodzka, M. (2019). Challenge your stereotypes! Human Library and its impact on prejudice in Poland. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 29*(4), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2402

Kende, A., Tropp, L., & Lantos, N. A. (2017). Testing a contact intervention based on intergroup friendship between Roma and non-Roma Hungarians: reducing bias through institutional support in a non-supportive societal context. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *47*(1), 47-55. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12422

Orosz, G., Bánki, E., Bőthe, B., Tóth-Király, I., & Tropp, L. R. (2016). Don't judge a living book by its cover: effectiveness of the living library intervention in reducing prejudice toward Roma and LGBT people. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 46*(9), 510-517. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12379

Vezzali, L., Stathi, S., Giovannini, D., Capozza, D., & Trifiletti, E. (2015). The greatest magic of Harry Potter: Reducing prejudice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 45*(2), 105-121. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12279

Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social psychology*, *73*(1), 73-90. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.73

---

[13] Kende, A., Tropp, L., & Lantos, N. A. (2017). Testing a contact intervention based on intergroup friendship between Roma and non-Roma Hungarians: reducing bias through institutional support in a non-supportive societal context. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 47*(1), 47-55. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12422

[14] Orosz, G., Bánki, E., Bőthe, B., Tóth-Király, I., & Tropp, L. R. (2016). Don't judge a living book by its cover: effectiveness of the living library intervention in reducing prejudice toward Roma and LGBT people. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 46*(9), 510-517. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12379

[15] Groyecka, A., Witkowska, M., Wróbel, M., Klamut, O., & Skrodzka, M. (2019). Challenge your stereotypes! Human Library and its impact on prejudice in Poland. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 29*(4), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2402

2.2 Common ingroup identity

Description

This intervention aims to activate social categories that both the members of the majority and the minority group belong to and identify with. The experience with the psychological overlap between the groups can decrease bias and conflict between groups. These common ingroup categories can be so-called superordinate categories, such as the nation or even humanity as a whole, or it can be a category that both members of the majority and the minority belong to, for example parents in a school, that can be a common ingroup identity for both Roma and non-Roma parents.

There are different ways to make such a common ingroup salient: people can be instructed to work for a common goal, they can be reminded that they share a common fate with the other group, or they can be instructed to find similarities between their own group and the other group.

For example, in an experiment, participants read a newspaper article about potential victims of terrorist attacks.[16] When potential victims were referred to by the common group as "Americans", White people indicated less prejudice and more solidarity toward Blacks, compared to the condition when the group categories "White versus Black" were mentioned. When the common ingroup category was mentioned, people felt more that they shared a common fate with the other group, so they were less biased toward them. There is compelling evidence that such methods efficiently decrease intergroup bias from the angle of the majority, however, there are controversial effects on behalf of minority groups.

Why it works for members of majority and advantaged groups

This approach is built on the idea that identity boundaries are flexible, and people belong to social categories on different levels of abstraction (from small and personal groups, such as the family, to large social categories, such as the nation). An intervention can make those identities salient that are common for both groups.

Majority participants usually like this intervention, because focusing on similarities can reduce anxiety about meeting a person from a different group. Such interventions usually provoke positive emotions such as empathy. This method does not draw attention to unearned privileges and guilt that would put members of the advantaged group in a potentially uncomfortable position. This is also a limitation of this method that it does not necessarily motivate participants to take responsibility and initiate structural-level change.

---

[16] Dovidio, J. F., Ten Vergert, M., Stewart, T. L., Gaertner, S. L., Johnson, J. D., Esses, V. M., ... & Pearson, A. R. (2004). Perspective and prejudice: Antecedents and mediating mechanisms. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(12), 1537-1549. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271177

Another limitation could be that the method of merging different groups to one common in-group may be threatening to group members who identify highly with their own subgroup, as people have a natural motivation to distinguish their own group from similar other groups. However, this can be overcome in variations of the intervention that acknowledge the multiple specific identities of groups members.

How members of minority and disadvantaged groups are affected

Although the emphasis on a common ingroup identity can be an important element of antidiscrimination interventions and is an important aspect of social inclusion, this intervention can also run the risk of disregarding diversity, overlooking minority identification and experiences of discrimination. Therefore, this intervention can potentially support a colourblind approach and create an illusion of harmony and lack of cultural recognition, rather than offer real solutions. Evidence shows that the most favourable outcome for minority participants is ensured by those common ingroup identity interventions that also emphasize dual identification.

Applicability for Roma–non-Roma context

Roma people across Europe identify differently within the context of the states that they live in: in some countries, they have a dual identity as Roma people and as citizens of the nation, in other contexts, identification with the ethnic majority vs. the minority group tends to be more exclusive, and in other countries, Roma people are more recent immigrants and are therefore double minorities. The applicability of this intervention is dependent on making a common in-group category salient that is psychologically important for the both majority and minority participants in the specific context of the intervention. Importantly, these interventions must respect the dual identification of Roma people, and ensure their cultural recognition.

Related publications in social psychological journals

Crisp, R. J., & Beck, S. R. (2005). Reducing intergroup bias: The moderating role of ingroup identification. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 8*(2), 173-185. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430205051066

Dovidio, J. F., Ten Vergert, M., Stewart, T. L., Gaertner, S. L., Johnson, J. D., Esses, V. M., ... & Pearson, A. R. (2004). Perspective and prejudice: Antecedents and mediating mechanisms. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(12), 1537-1549. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271177

2.3 Changing the perception of the ingroup: self-affirmation and inclusive identity

Description

In these interventions, different methods are used to change the way participants see themselves as members of different groups. For example, in a study when participants were asked to recall memories that made them proud personally, they were more likely to take responsibility and support reparation policies in a conflict with another group. However, this was not the case when pride was attached to the group and not the individual, which in fact had a backfire effect and increased intolerance.[17]

Interventions can also alter the perception of their nation to be more inclusive. This can be achieved using relatively simple techniques: by reminding participants about historical generosity toward other groups, by attaching value to diversity and tolerance, and by emphasizing the civic definition of the nation as opposed to the ethnic one. These changes can reduce prejudice and intergroup hostility because they no longer feel that they need to devalue the other group for their own positive self-image.

Why it works for members of majority and advantaged groups

People maintain a positive self-esteem by downward comparison with other groups. Prejudice is therefore functional in the sense that it contributes to seeing the ingroup in a positive light. People show these biased perceptions especially when their group identity and group image is threatened. Therefore, interventions that offer an identity reinforcement (by for example self-affirmation) without the need for downward comparison, can reduce identity threat and consequently prejudice among members of majority groups.

How members of minority and disadvantaged groups are affected

It does not target minority participants.

---

[17] Čehajić-Clancy, S., Effron, D. A., Halperin, E., Liberman, V., & Ross, L. D. (2011). Affirmation, acknowledgment of in-group responsibility, group-based guilt, and support for reparative measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(2), 256-270. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023936

Applicability for Roma–non-Roma context

This intervention may be applicable to Roma–non-Roma contexts for several reasons. In East-Central Europe, national identities can be fragile due to the historically unstable position of these countries, and nationalist movements tend to be strong and anti-Roma. Therefore, in these contexts, people may be especially sensitive to threat reducing positive identity reinforcement which can subsequently reduce prejudice against Roma people, if national identity content is presented as inclusive of the Roma. However, it is also possible that such interventions work better in contexts in which national identity already contains elements of openness and tolerance that can be made salient during the intervention, and therefore, it may work more effectively in those contexts. One study has shown that the same group affirmation technique was more effective in increasing solidarity action toward Roma people in France than in Romania because people adjusted their behavioural intentions to the perceived norms of behaviours in their country due to the intervention, and these norms were seen as more hostile in Romania.

Related publications in social psychological journals

Čehajić-Clancy, S., Effron, D. A., Halperin, E., Liberman, V., & Ross, L. D. (2011). Affirmation, acknowledgment of in-group responsibility, group-based guilt, and support for reparative measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(2), 256-270. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023936

Kende, A. K., Lantos, N. A., & Krekó, P. (2018). Endorsing a civic (vs an ethnic) definition of citizenship predicts higher pro-minority and lower pro-majority collective action intentions. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, 1402-1419. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01402

3 Societal level interventions

3.1 Awareness raising about structural inequalities

Description

These interventions emphasize the structural causes of status differences between majority and minority groups and aim to increase engagement in efforts for social change. Importantly, they do not aim to reach harmony between groups, but rather discuss issues such as privilege, social hierarchies and injustice. For example, thematic discussions about inequality and conflict between groups with the participation of both minority and supportive majority participants can serve this goal. Workshops about possible ways to take responsibility and initiate change belong to this type of intervention. Most importantly, these interventions work with the assumption that a more just society can be reached not only by efforts for social cohesion (e.g. interventions focusing on prejudice reduction and harmony), but by engagement in more confrontative political activism as well in which members of the majority can also engage.

Why it works for members of majority and advantaged groups

This method is based on increasing awareness among members of the majority about intergroup status hierarchies and injustices. By the process of social comparison, they need to learn about the disadvantages of lower status groups and recognize their own group's privilege. This intergroup comparison between their own group and other groups can lead to the recognition of their own responsibilities in changing the status quo and their potential to contribute to social change as allies of disadvantaged groups. Intergroup emotions such as outrage, empathy, sympathy and even guilt can occur as a response to the recognition of injustice, and these emotions can mobilize members of the majority to engage in supportive behaviour (become volunteers, donate money, or engage in activism).

However, as this confrontation with intergroup injustices is highly unpleasant for members of the majority, they may have a preference for interventions that seek similarities between groups and create intergroup harmony without a focus on structural inequalities. They may even feel threatened by this approach because it questions their privilege and higher status. Therefore, it is more likely to be an effective intervention for relatively open-minded individuals who are not threatened by criticism of their own group. Although they may not be the target group for prejudice reduction with an already low level of prejudice, this method has the potential to mobilize them as allies for the minority group. Importantly, members of the majority group may have grievances as well (for example, in the form of perceived threat and lack of resources). Such grievances, especially if they are not acknowledged, can hamper the effectiveness of this type of intervention.

How members of minority and disadvantaged groups are affected

Minority participants are more motivated to discuss intergroup differences and intergroup conflict, and this approach can empower them to stand up for their rights and get engaged in activism. When the awareness raising intervention entails contact with members of majority groups, these contact experiences can make majority allies more acceptable and supportive for minority participants. At the same time, such supportive contact (when majority participants acknowledge injustice) was demonstrated to counter the demobilization effect of positive contact on minority members and motivate them for collective action on behalf of their group.

Applicability for Roma–non-Roma context

Although this intervention could be a highly desirable method for social change in Roma–non-Roma relations, there may be obstacles to its widespread use in social-political contexts that are permissive with prejudice and among participants who are highly prejudiced. These interventions work with the assumption that people are motivated to change their attitudes and engage in social change when unjust relations are made visible, because such confrontations are emotionally distressful. However, members of the majority may resist or explain away this information in the presence of high prejudice and blame Roma people for their disadvantages. They may also be less motivated to acknowledge their own group's privileges, if they have grievances themselves. These grievances need to be considered when designing an intervention and promote solidarity based on shared experiences of grievances, not only based on the distinction between privileged and disadvantaged groups. Nevertheless, the intervention has the potential to influence institutional policies for more equal treatment and to encourage Roma engagement. However, there is no evidence so far that tested the effectiveness of this intervention in connection with Roma people.

Related publications in social psychological journals

Powell, A. A., Branscombe, N. R., & Schmitt, M. T. (2005). Inequality as ingroup privilege or outgroup disadvantage: The impact of group focus on collective guilt and interracial attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*(4), 508-521. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271713

Reason, R. D., Roosa Millar, E. A., & Scales, T. C. (2005). Toward a model of racial justice ally development. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*, 530–546. doi: 10.1353/csd.2005.0054

3.2 Changing norms

Description
These interventions target the majority by exposing them to specific norms and values.

For example, groups of students were instructed to discuss the important issue of poverty in developing countries. Their task was to design a campaign that made people angry and outraged about the problem. The norm that people should be angry about was the focus of the discussion, and the interactions among participants contributed to their higher engagement in the cause. Similarly, discussion groups are often used in interventions and workshops to educate and persuade people to deal with a societal problem and actively contribute to solving the problem.

Interventions may address different values and norms, such as:

- Promoting values of diversity (multicultural approach);
- Promoting values of harmony, universalism, human rights and similarity between groups (colourblind approach);
- Promoting values of being non-prejudiced.

Social norms can emerge in group discussions, but individuals have different potentials in creating and altering the norms within a group. The behaviour of well-connected and salient actors, so called social referents, can provide cues for other members of the group about norms more strongly than others.

Why it works for members of majority and advantaged groups
This method builds on the idea that groups can develop new norms through a discussion that gives them guidance how to think, feel and behave about a specific issue. If the group discussion is designed in a way that it creates norms to reduce prejudice and increase engagement in social change, it can have an impact on individual attitudes and behaviour. Additionally, it can break pluralistic ignorance: the belief that people with non-prejudiced attitudes are in a minority.

How members of minority and disadvantaged groups are affected
These types of interventions may also encourage minority participants to speak up for their rights and empower them in their minority identities.

Applicability for Roma–non-Roma context

As prejudice expression toward the Roma is prevalent and normative, this intervention is particularly important in the context of Roma–non-Roma relations. Influential members of particular social contexts, such as local or national political leaders or school teachers can become social referents and set norms to reduce antigypsyism. However, it is extremely difficult to establish new norms that go against the norms of the broader societal context, as the norms of different reference groups contradict each other in these contexts.

Related publications in social psychological journals

Thomas, E. F., & McGarty, C. A. (2009). The role of efficacy and moral outrage norms in creating the potential for international development activism through group-based interaction. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 48*(1), 115-134. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466608X313774

Váradi, L. (2014). *Youths trapped in prejudice: Hungarian adolescents' attitudes towards the Roma*. Wiesbaden: Springer Science & Business.

The unique characteristics of antigypsyism

Antigypsyism is most commonly expressed as blatant prejudice and in the form of prejudice denial. The coexistence of these two forms of prejudice expression may seem contradictory, but they can be explained by the motivation that people would like to appear non-prejudiced, and consider the endorsement of negative stereotypes as justified by personal experiences and not the result of prejudice. Therefore, people may agree with overgeneralised negative statements about Roma people, but would still not consider themselves prejudiced. In fact, the more prejudiced an individual is, the more likely they would deny even the existence of prejudice in society against a group.

Blatant prejudice means the endorsement of traditional negative stereotypes about the lifestyle of Roma people from a moral perspective (depicting them as lazy or as criminals[18,19]), and depicting Roma people as less than human (i.e. dehumanizing them[20,21]). The problem with blatant antigypsyism is that on the one hand, it creates a direct obstacle to equal treatment and harmonious relations between individuals, and on the other hand, it promotes explicit social norms in which maltreatment and discrimination of Roma people appear acceptable and justified by the characteristics associated with the group.

In contrast, **prejudice denial** is a more invisible form of antigypsyism that nonetheless contributes to the maintenance of the status quo. Importantly, prejudice denial not only denies discriminatory practices, it also fuels the idea that Roma people receive too much undeserved benefits whenever efforts are made to enhance Roma inclusion.[22] Prejudice denial might not lead to direct violence, but it can maintain individual and institutional practices and policy decisions that perpetuate inequality. This form of prejudice is invisible for those who are motivated to maintain the current status quo (typically the non-Roma population) which makes it difficult to address the problem by those who are affected by it. Prejudice denial is directly reflected in colourblind policy decisions that also deny the existence of historical disadvantages, structural discrimination and is manifested as

---

[18] Kende, A., Lantos, N. A., & Krekó, P. (2018). Endorsing a civic (vs an ethnic) definition of citizenship predicts higher pro-minority and lower pro-majority collective action intentions. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9*, 1402-1419. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01402

[19] Villano, P., Fontanella, L., Fontanella, S., & Di Donato, M. (2017). Stereotyping Roma people in Italy: IRT models for ambivalent prejudice measurement. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 57*, 30-41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2017.01.003

[20] Pérez, J. A., Moscovici, S., & Chulvi, B. (2007). The taboo against group contact: Hypothesis of Gypsy ontologization. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 46*(2), 249-272. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466606X111301

[21] Kteily, N., Bruneau, E., Waytz, A., & Cotterill, S. (2015). The ascent of man: Theoretical and empirical evidence for blatant dehumanization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 109*(5), 901-931. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000048

[22] Kende, A., Hadarics, M., & Lášticová, B. (2017). Anti-Roma attitudes as expressions of dominant social norms in Eastern Europe. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 60*, 12–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2017.06.002

attempting to solve problems merely as social issues (for example, addressing school dropout without tackling racism as a reason for this; see Weinerová[23]).

While antigypsyism is prevalent in all countries of Europe, the distribution of blatant prejudice and prejudice denial varies across the continent. Blatant antigypsyism is present all over Europe, albeit to a different degree, but the combination of blatant antigypsyism and prejudice denial, and specifically the idea that Roma people receive too many benefits is only common in East-Central Europe. In these countries Roma people represent a relatively large and growing percentage of the population, and therefore are often perceived as a threat to the welfare of the country.[24, 25] Therefore, prejudice reduction should mainly focus on altering negative stereotypes about the Roma in European countries with a small Roma population where the main obstacle is blatant prejudice, while it needs to address both the issue of negative stereotypes and threat perceptions that derive from the belief in a competition over limited resources in East-Central Europe.

However, antigypsyism has a third element that is equally relevant to address in intervention programs but is less connected to prejudice research which is mainly concerned with negative stereotypes and discrimination. **The absence of cultural recognition**, or the misrecognition of Roma people creates barriers for inclusion on top of more traditional forms of prejudice. Cultural recognition is not identical to folklorising Roma culture, equating Roma people with an innate talent for music or maintaining a romantic image of the carefree life of "nomadic" Roma people.[26, 27] Even if these images tend to be positive, they tie Roma people to the past and culturally distance them.[28, 29] Cultural recognition, on the other hand, acknowledges the cultural autonomy of Roma people, encouraging, rather than ignoring cultural heritage without assuming identities

[23] Weinerová, R. (2014). Anti-Gypsyism in the Czech Republic: Czechs' perception of Roma in cultural stereotypes. *Acta Ethnographica Hungarica, 59*(1), 211– 221. http://doi.org/10.1556/AEthn.59.2014.1.10

[24] Kende, A., Hadarics, M., & Lášticová, B. (2017). Anti-Roma attitudes as expressions of dominant social norms in Eastern Europe. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 60*, 12–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2017.06.002

[25] Kende, A., Hadarics, M., Bigazzi, S., Boza, M., Kunst, J. R., Lantos, N. A., Lášticová, B., Minescu, A., Pivetti, M., & Urbiola, A. (2020). The last acceptable prejudice in Europe? Anti-Gypsyism as the obstacle to Roma inclusion. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. (advance online publication) https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430220907701

[26] López Catalán, Ó. (2012). The genesis of a "Romanian Roma issue" in the metropolitan area of Barcelona: Urban public spaces, neighbourhood conflicts and local politics. *Revista de Estudios Urbanos y Ciencias Sociales, 2*, 95–117.

[27] Villano, P., Fontanella, L., Fontanella, S., & Di Donato, M. (2017). Stereotyping Roma people in Italy: IRT models for ambivalent prejudice measurement. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 57*, 30-41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2017.01.003

[28] Kligman, G. (2001). On the social construction of "otherness": Identifying "the Roma" in postsocialist communities. *Review of Sociology, 7*(2), 61–78. https://doi.org/10.1556/revsoc.7.2001.2.4

[29] Sigona, N. (2005). Locating "the Gypsy problem." The Roma in Italy: Stereotyping, labelling and "nomad camps." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 31*(4), 741–756. http://doi.org/10.1080/13691830500109969

that they do not identify with, or do not identify with in every context (see Hopkins & Blackwood[30]).

Based on representative surveys in five countries (Hungary, Slovakia, Romania, France, Ireland) we found that antigypsyism contains negative stereotypes, the idea of Roma receiving undeserved benefits, and the absence of cultural recognition (https://polrom.eu/cross-country-comparisons-of-the-connection-between-political-discourse-intergroup-attitudes-and-collective-action/). Although statements connected to antigypsyism are more acceptable in Hungary, Slovakia and Romania than in Ireland and France, the majority of respondents tend to give answers that reflect undecidedness and the lack of strong opinions about the Roma, choosing answers around the midpoint regarding negative stereotypes, the idea of Roma people receiving too much undeserved benefits, and regarding the cultural recognition of Roma people. In addition, there is low level of empathy across the countries, and therefore, indifference is the predominant attitude among the majority populations with a small percentage of people who clearly reject antigypsyism or clearly endorse it.

Normative context and political discourse: What is "normal", acceptable and accepted when it comes to Roma and Traveller groups

Prejudice reduction interventions are most effective in social contexts in which the positive change is supported by norms. Such support can be offered by authorities that prescribe appropriate behaviours, for example by legal measures and public discourse and by so-called descriptive norms, which is a reflection of what most people think and do.[31] As we have seen, antigypsyism is often expressed in blatant forms, and therefore it creates a non-supportive context for any kind of change. This normative context becomes a unique challenge for interventions in the area of antigypsyism. One study, for example, found that awareness raising can most easily be done through group discussions which is easy to implement in schools. The method works because participants can influence and encourage each other in endorsing positive attitude change and supportive norms for behaviours on behalf of groups in need.[32] However, this method could be less effective in the absence of consensus about values of diversity and the norms of non-prejudice. Therefore, in countries with weaker egalitarian norms and the lack of endorsement of

---

[30] Hopkins, N., & Blackwood, L. (2011). Everyday citizenship: Identity and recognition. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 21*(3), 215-227. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.1088

[31] Cialdini, R. B., Kallgren, C. A., & Reno, R. R. (1991). A focus theory of normative conduct: A theoretical refinement and reevaluation of the role of norms in human behavior. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 24, pp. 201-234). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60330-5

[32] Thomas, E. F., McGarty, C., & Mavor, K. I. (2009). Transforming "apathy into movement": The role of prosocial emotions in motivating action for social change. *Personality and social psychology review, 13*(4), 310-333. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868309343290

diversity and multiculturalism, such methods may even backfire, as members of a group can reinforce each other's prejudicial views about the outgroup, which appear as the norm.

Dominant social norms regarding the ways antigypsyism is perceived and enacted are co-constructed in political discourse – the ways politicians and public figures talk about the Roma. Empirical evidence from the PolRom project shows that political and institutional discourses are mostly characterized by open [hostility towards the Roma](), by an [ambivalent form of discourse]() contrasting the situation of the Roma minority with the situation of immigrants, or by [benevolent antigypsyism]() which communicates a positive and helpful attitude, but reinforces the subordinate position of Roma people in society. In several countries, the political discourse depicts antigypsyism as happening ["somewhere else, but not here"]() and the Roma are used in political communication as a tool to promote political stances. However, even positive discourse does not necessarily promote inclusion. In [Ireland,]() for example, condemnation of the discriminatory comments by politicians indicates support for the Travelling community, but this is not translated into policy and legislation. In summary, dominant forms of political discourse about Roma people in Europe create a social and political climate in which social psychological interventions need to be adopted with caution, considering potential backfire effects and scrutinising their effectiveness for reducing antigypsyism.

Best practice examples

Interventions in the field are determined by many different factors. They may be theory-driven taking into account the processes described by psychological sciences and a result of careful designing and testing, they may stem from institutional traditions and experiences building on (sometimes substantial) anecdotal evidence, they may develop in a bottom-up, iterative process as a result of the dialogue between local communities and NGOs, or they may be a combination of all of these. However, whether an intervention achieves the desired impact, especially whether it achieves genuine and lasting change in social relations, is not easy to determine. **Impact assessment in the form of field experiments, especially measuring long term effect is rare.[33]**

Therefore, best practice examples cannot always be identified based on a scientific impact assessment, but rather on a combination of different forms of assessments:

- identifying the psychological processes targeted by the intervention and connecting them to the theoretical foundations and corresponding experimental results;
- taking into account the qualitative assessment of the intervention by different actors;
- critically assessing the method from the different aspects of antigypsyism and the particular social and political context both from the perspective of the majority population and Roma people.

Below you will find Table 2 which contains examples of best practice interventions from five countries (Hungary, Romania, Ireland, Slovakia and France) of the PolRom project. While Table 1 contains a comprehensive list of relevant psychological prejudice reduction interventions from the academic literature, Table 2 provides real life examples of best practices interventions based on our project. Each best practice example is linked back to the theoretical table using the outlined categories; individual, intergroup and societal level interventions. Based on a Scottish review of prejudice and discrimination reduction[34], the interventions are presented into 3 categories focusing on activity type: **(1) Educational Interventions (General Diversity Training), (2) Interactive, Experiential, and Intergroup Interventions, and (3) Public Showcasing Interventions.**

---

[33] Paluck, E. L., & Green, D. P. (2009). Prejudice reduction: What works? A review and assessment of research and practice. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60,* 339-367. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163607
[34] MacBride, M. (2015). *What works to reduce prejudice and discrimination? A review of the evidence* (ISBN: 9781785447235). Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research. https://www.gov.scot/publications/works-reduce-prejudice-discrimination-review-evidence/

Best Practice Examples

Category 1. Educational Interventions (General Diversity Training)

This category contains interventions with procedures that are mainly educational, and information based and frequently aim at communicating expectations about norms of behaviour. They are frequently, but not exclusively, carried out in school settings. Included in this category are general diversity interventions, diversity training for law enforcement, training the trainer, training NGO's in human rights etc. To increase the impact of these interventions, the information is combined with discussion, peer-based learning, and cooperative learning. These interventions can use both direct and indirect contact (such as use of peer-stories) to reduce prejudice and induce empathy and perspective taking in participants.

The Yellow Flag Program (Ireland)
http://yellowflag.ie/

Description of the intervention	This intervention is government financed, run by the Irish Traveller Movement, to be implemented in secondary schools (Civic, Social Political Education - CSPE Curricula).

A practical series of 8 steps brings issues of interculturalism, equality and diversity into the whole-school programme. It works with students, staff, management, parents and wider community groups so that issues can be understood and taken outside the school setting into everyone's personal lives. It is an award scheme, on successfully completing the 8 steps and being evaluated externally, the school is awarded its Yellow Flag. The 8 steps are as follows; Goal Setting, the Diversity Committee, Equality and Diversity Training, The Intercultural Review, The Action Plan, Going Beyond School Walls, Classroom Work and finally, The Diversity Code and Policy Review. On completion of the 8 steps the award is granted once an assessor evaluates the outcome.

The programme provides **historical and sociological information** about the situation of Irish Travellers, which makes people understand the larger picture, and structural causes of inequality and marginalization. Guidance is provided on how to **engage in collective action to fight discrimination** ("Going beyond the School Walls"; school diversity policies)

The intervention is aimed at secondary school children in the junior cycle, aged from 12-15.

Why it should be considered as best practice	This is a ready-to-use learning curriculum which includes both students and teachers actively in the running of the project. It is developed in collaboration with a Traveller organisation, as an example of intergroup respect and inclusion of the Traveller minority. The programme is based both on social psychology and educational theory.
How this intervention works	The programme works on both the individual and societal levels. On the individual level it provides counter-stereotypical information, information on the experience Travellers have with prejudice (perspective taking) and promotes awareness and respect for Traveller culture as prejudice reduction methods. It also provides intercultural training and an understanding of **social psychological processes** such as stereotyping, stigma and discrimination. On a societal level, Yellow Flags aims to raise awareness about structural inequalities and change norms to value and include diversity. It provides a baseline for political solidarity with the Irish Travellers.
Scope and Limitations	**Scope:** It is aimed at educators and it is best implemented in an educational setting. There is a special set of pedagogical and psychological skills required in teaching about diversity. Therefore, either the teachers need training or facilitators should be brought in.

Limitations: Bureaucratic process of funding; part of a curriculum that is not adequately and consistently taught across Ireland.

Institutionalized racism against Irish Travellers is difficult to overcome in the implementation of this program.

In the absence of the required intercultural skills, some of these lessons can backfire. When people feel threatened in their identity, they could harden rather than dismantle their stereotypes about a minority. |

Stories that Move (Slovakia, international)
https://www.storiesthatmove.org/

Description of the intervention	Stories that Move (STM) is an educational project inspired by the Project Zero (Harvard University) concept of visible thinking, coordinated by Anne Frank House in Amsterdam and run in Slovakia by Milan Šimečka Foundation. The target group are students aged 14 years and older.

This online learning tool consists of authentic stories of young people from across Europe who have experienced prejudice and discrimination. It offers **teachers and students** educational materials and a safe environment to learn about diversity and discrimination, as well as to reflect on their own views and decisions. The ready-to-use learning units can be used primarily in history, civics and ethics classes, as well as in foreign languages teaching. It is available in 7 languages.

STM consists of 5 learning paths that use a blended learning methodology, including information on diversity and discrimination and many assignments. In short clips, young people talk about their positive experiences, but also about exclusion and discrimination. The learning paths can be seen as modules, consisting of several lessons.

Seeing & being learning path explores how we see ourselves and others, reflects on the multiple identities people have, and the need for a positive approach to diversity.

Facing discrimination learning path focuses on understanding how prejudices and discrimination function by showing multiple examples of antigypsyism, antisemitism and other forms of discrimination that young people face.

Life stories learning path explores the personal stories of individuals from different periods of history, and helps learners reflect on the continuity and discontinuity of discrimination.

Mastering the media learning path looks at how propaganda, stereotyping, prejudices and hate speech are part of the online domain.

Taking action learning path stimulates reflection on what taking action means and empowers young people by sharing examples of youth initiatives on different scales throughout Europe.

Why it should be considered as best practice	The learning activities have been developed in close collaboration with young people, educators and educational experts from the participating countries. Although they are inspired by country specific cases/stories, the activities stimulate reflection on diversity and discrimination in general. The learning paths are based both on best practice and educational theory. The online portal offers ready-to-use didactic materials that can be used both collectively in the classroom, as well as individually for home assignments. The activities are flexible, and the learning paths can be applied both together, as well as singular activities. The program is free of charge.
How this intervention works	STM targets **individual** (by stimulating critical reflection and attitude change), **intergroup** (by engaging learners in indirect contact with outgroup members via peer stories) as well as **societal** level (by challenging discriminatory social norms and stimulating action on behalf of the disadvantaged groups).

Each educational track begins with tasks that lead students to **think critically** about their own attitudes and decisions. The following key points are subsequently highlighted by the developers: **(1) Listening:** to those who experience discrimination and intolerance; **(2) Dialogue:** a powerful way to raise awareness; **(3) Sensitivity:** educators need to be prepared to discuss different forms of discrimination on an analytical level and to handle the topic with sensitivity, taking into account the vulnerability of their learners.

STM combines **sensitivity raising** and **perspective taking** based on **indirect contact** through peer-stories with **information** about vulnerable groups and **critical reflection** on activities. It also encompasses activities focusing on counter stereotypical information, challenging unconscious bias and discriminatory norms, and activities based on common ingroup identity. The activities do not aim to reduce prejudice towards one specific group, but to make the learners sensitive towards diversity and discrimination in general. By doing this, they facilitate **the secondary transfer** of positive attitudes from one societal out-group to the others.

As the learning process can be carried out both online and offline (blended learning approach), there are no technical barriers to participate except for the need of IT devices and internet connection to access the STM portal.

Lack of impact assessment: There has not been a systematic evaluation of the programme in terms of impact assessment, but a follow up project has been submitted to carry out the assessment. The organisations involved in the project have used multiple ways to get feedback from the participants on the learning activities throughout the project development and implementation. In Slovakia, several stories from STM portal were used in an academic research project and were proven to partly reduce anti-Roma prejudice.

Barriers: The general learning environment in Slovakia is performance oriented, with focus on factual information. There is little room for educators to involve students in activities that include perspective taking or experiential learning. Therefore, the use of the learning tool depends on the motivation of teachers to engage in innovative teaching methods. As reflection of activities is an important part of the process, it requires that teachers are truly engaged in the activities, able to listen and work with emotions, different perspectives and experiences of learners.

Category 2: Interactive, experiential, and intergroup interventions

This category contains interventions where the procedures are focused around explicit contact and interactions between the majority group and the Roma population. Here, intergroup contact is the key. The interventions often focus on stimulating perspective taking and raising awareness about group inequalities. They involve interactive activities such as role playing and discussions with Roma/Traveller community members. Experiential learning techniques include discussing group norms, fostering a spirit of cooperation rather than competition, and planning meaningful roles that allow participants to extend their learning in a supportive environment. These principles intuitively match the optimal conditions of intergroup contact theory. In some cases, outgroup members step in the shoes of educators and become role models for the learners (for more information see Seaman et al.[35]).

Equal access to justice for Roma people (Romania)
https://www.romanicriss.org/

Description of the intervention	Romani CRISS is an NGO established in April 1993. Their mission is to protect the rights of the Roma population, fight discrimination in all aspects of life such as education, health or social life and provide legal assistance in abuse cases. The project is aimed to fight racism by training lawyers and district attorneys, offering support to Roma victims of abuse and also raising awareness within the Roma communities related to their own rights.
	The first step of the project was curriculum development for training district attorneys, judges and lawyers in fighting racism. It was followed by the organization of four **training courses** for **judges, prosecutors and lawyers** aimed at fighting racism, especially through criminal law.
	Within the programme they also **investigated cases of abuse** by the law enforcement officials' and provided psychological and medical support for victims.
	They **raised awareness** related to discrimination within the Roma communities by informing them about their procedural and fundamental rights: right to life, right to fair trial, the right not to be subjected to torture or inhuman treatment on punishment; the right to liberty and security.

---

[35] Seaman, J., Beightol, J., Shirilla, P., & Crawford, B. (2010). Contact Theory as a Framework for Experiential Activities as Diversity Education: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Experiential Education, 32*(3), 207–225. https://doi.org/10.1177/105382590903200303

The key elements of the program were to fight discrimination in a twofold manner. Firstly, to reduce abuse **starting at the top** with the persons in power positions such as judges, prosecutors, district attorneys and lawyers. Secondly, to inform the **Roma communities** related to their own rights so that they might be aware of any violation, report it and know how to ask for help and support.

Why it should be considered as best practice

The intervention illustrates a best practice as it addresses antigypsyism at an individual level and societal level phenomenon among members of the majority (in position of power) and focuses on Roma communities as well to reduce victimisation and increase empowerment. This project highlights the importance of designing more complex interventions to tackle the problem of antigypsyism in one field.

How this intervention works

The programme focuses on both representatives of the majority society and Roma people and relies on theoretical assumptions to reduce antigypsyism among judges, prosecutors and lawyers and empower Roma communities to reduce victimisation.

On societal level, the programme raises awareness about structural inequalities by engaging people in the position of power in learning about Roma discrimination and cases of violation of Roma rights.

On the individual level, the main method is awareness raising and learning about unconscious biases among legal representatives and awareness of structural inequalities directly and creating new norms for behaviour. The programme also aims to raise awareness within the Roma community on their own rights which can increase awareness of structural inequalities and engagement and decrease victimisation.

Scope and Limitations

The project requires institutional level cooperation and commitment and can most effectively run in collaboration with state institutions. In order to work effectively with Roma communities, the involvement of local NGOs and representatives may be needed to gain enough trust to share experiences of rights violations.

Platform for dialogue between Roma and non-Roma by UCCU Roma Informal Education NGO (Hungary)

Description of the intervention

The NGO is run by Roma employees and volunteers and engaged in various prejudice reduction intervention programmes mainly for non-Roma secondary school students and members of the community.

Within this intervention, two Roma group leaders spend 1.5 hours with a school class to engage in an informal and interactive dialogue about the situation of Roma people in Hungary and the topic of prejudice. The main method is **storytelling**: Roma volunteers share their personal stories and opinions as Roma people. Although the intervention has a script, it is always tailored to the questions and expectations of the school group/group of students. The programme gives the opportunity for Roma students who participate in the programme to share their own experiences and initiate discussions about antigypsyism within their own class.

Why it should be considered as best practice

This intervention is relatively simple and requires little time and investment on behalf of institutions, therefore it can be suitable to implement in any school setting. The intervention builds on the theory of intergroup contact and provides thought-provoking information that can be deliberated to achieve long-term effect. It offers the opportunity for non-Roma members of the majority to confront their own prejudices, and although it provides only an initial step, it can be the basis for any larger scale social transformations. The programme empowers Roma volunteers and offers contact experiences that are empowering, rather than demobilising.

How this intervention works

Discussion educates students by sharing their own stories as Roma people on inter-personal level. They encourage students to speak without taboo about prejudice, so they can respond with their own stories, presenting **counter-stereotypical** examples. They give a chance for students to get to know Roma people better, encourage them to ask questions and start **discussing** these issues among themselves.

The programme provides the opportunity for **positive personal contact** to reduce prejudice, which can demonstrate that Roma people are **diverse**, and that generalization is not okay. As the main topic of discussion are social inequalities, the contact does not entail the risk of demobilisation among Roma participants.

Scope and Limitations

The programme is usually a single occasion which can have limited long-term impact. Furthermore, the effectiveness of such small-scale interventions is hampered by the political context which enables antigypsyism (especially during times when politicians take advantage of rising anti-Roma sentiments). However, within the hostile political context, some teachers take it on themselves to make room for such programmes, but it is difficult to reach new schools without the strong drive of individual teachers.

Compulsory programmes are less effective and can result in reactance among students.

Those groups who consider themselves non-prejudiced are more difficult to work with. This is often a barrier to working with teachers, as prejudice among teachers is considered a taboo subject.

Category 3: Public Showcasing Interventions

This category contains one-off public events that involve the general population and aim to reach a wide audience. There may be intergroup contact, and it can be implicit, indirect, as well as explicit. The contact may be superficial without any real engagement between the groups. In spite of this, it is often implicitly assumed that contact at these events automatically reduces anti-Roma prejudice. These events typically include festivals, concerts and other cultural events.

Traveller Pride Week/Events (Ireland)

https://itmtrav.ie/strategic-priorities/anti-racism-interculturalism/traveller-pride/

Description of the intervention	This intervention is a festival, organised at a national level by the Irish Traveller Movement and run every year, with events spanning two weeks. The festival includes a range of events taking place around the country which are run by several different organisations.
	It is funded and supported by The Traveller Roma Inclusion Unit of the Department of Justice.
	This intervention is aimed at both the Travelling Community and the settled communities. It aims to instil pride in Traveller culture and highlight achievements within the Travelling community, strengthening their identity and self-esteem. The festival concludes with an awards ceremony.
	The events of the festival are open to the settled community and are used to showcase the Traveller culture and achievements of the community. Additionally, outputs from intergroup projects between both communities are showcased at these events, displaying the power of contact and cooperation in forming relationships between groups.
Why it should be considered as best practice	This intervention was chosen as best practice mainly due to its effects on the Traveller community itself, while also promoting the value and uniqueness of Traveller culture. This intervention operates on the societal level. First, it promotes Traveller culture to all society and showcases the achievements of the Travelling community. It also raises awareness about structural inequalities, that can have effects on both the majority and minority groups. Raising awareness on hierarchies and structural inequalities is shown to encourage majority group members to engage in collective action to aid minority group members. The literature also shows that this kind of intervention can motivate to discuss

intergroup differences and intergroup conflict, and this approach can empower minorities to stand up for their rights and get engaged in activism. It can also encourage them to accept majority group allies and provide opportunities to create political solidarity.

How this intervention works	The purpose of the event is foremost to showcase Traveller Pride, expressing **intrinsic pride** in one's group, increase self-esteem and strengthen **ingroup identity** which in turn offers psychological protection for members of the minority.

It also allows membership of the Travelling community to display their **agency**, creating a platform to demonstrate the political, cultural and healthcare activities taking place within the community. Previous studies show the importance of **majority group acknowledgment of and respect for the agency of the minority group.** This respect for agency is important in generating **allyship collective action** (solidarity) rather than helping-based collective action (donations, etc.).

It raises awareness and provides the settled community (members of majority) with information surrounding some of the **inequalities** faced by Travellers.

Showcasing the unique qualities of Traveller culture and the things that can be achieved in communities through cooperation can lead to changes in social psychological processes such as stereotyping, stigma and discrimination. Decreases in these negative processes may increase one's openness to engage the Irish Travellers.

Scope and Limitations

The event offers a unique opportunity for awareness raising and empowerment of Traveller communities, however, prejudice towards Irish Travellers may deter people from attending these events. Lack of attendance from the settled community may diminish the opportunities for using information to dismantle stereotypes, prejudice reduction and engage in intergroup contact.

Intergroup contact at these events is not certain and members of both communities may not engage with each other of their own accord. Merely observing the results of the previous intergroup projects may not be sufficient in decreasing prejudice and encouraging people to engage in future interventions.

Rencont'Roms nous Week/Events (France)

Description of the intervention

The interventions of this association are composed of several events throughout the year and several times a month. They aim to bring together members of the Roma community and other groups through art tanks to a network of institutional, associative, cultural and educational partners (Region leader, General Department for Equality of Territories, Family Allowances, Regional Council, SNCF [National Transports], Banque populaire, Place of Diversity and Laïcité, etc.). They are cultural, artistic and educational events to fight discrimination and racism against the Roma. These cultural events allow meetings, exchanges and debates.

The aim is to "do together", "create together" in order to "share together" and "be together". These interventions are carried out to give a new voice to the Roma inhabitants, to promote their inclusion and participation in society. They are divided into four categories of interventions:

1. Disseminating of Gypsy and Balkan cultures;

2. Meetings and sharing around the topics of inclusion, citizenship and access to education;

3. Promoting education of Roma children through interventions in schools (with the 'School for All' movement);

4. Promoting the professional integration of young Roma by offering personalised and individual support (through the civic service in France, which is a type of contract that enables young people in difficulty to be hired to participate in social projects).

Examples of events:

- Gypsy culture day
- Balkanica Festival
- Languages Forum
- Gypsy dance classes
- Afterworks
- Exhibition of Roma photographer
- Theatre show
- Summer workshops
- Meetings

Why it should be considered as best practice	This intervention offers empowerment and cultural recognition of Roma communities in France, but it also builds on intergroup contact theory to bring members of the majority and the minority closer together. The intervention can raise awareness about the diversity within the Roma communities and offer direct help for disadvantaged communities.
How this intervention works	The association Rencont'Rom Nous underlines the fact that the events are organized to help **develop group identity and collective pride**. The idea is to **strengthen identification with the Roma group** through events presenting the Gypsy culture and by offering language, dance or history classes to the Roma. These classes are also offered to non-Roma people to introduce the Gypsy culture in order to reduce prejudices against Roma. Through the workshops, the association **promotes intergroup contacts to reduce negative attitudes** towards Roma people.
	It is visible from the professional integration and educational aspects of the program that it **promotes the integration of Roma people in society.**
	Finally, by creating collective pride and helping the integration of Roma, the association can also reduce the feeling of exclusion, rejection and thus help to increase self-esteem as well as promote a more **inclusive common identity** for Roma and non-Roma members of the community.
Scope and Limitations	These events can offer positive experiences for the Roma and non-Roma members of the communities. The strength of these events is that they bring members of the community together. As these interventions build on the experience of positive contact, they do not necessarily address the issues of structural inequalities and can therefore lead to demobilization among members of the Roma community. Events that emphasize the traditional culture of Roma communities always run the risk of folklorising the group and placing them in the "past", which can become an obstacle for inclusion. Finally, the events are closely linked to local institutions and therefore highly dependent on the commitment of local politicians.

Recommendations

In this toolkit we provided an overview of social psychological interventions to reduce prejudice, explained why and under which conditions they work. We also outlined the specific characteristics of antigypsyism in Europe and presented best practice examples with explanations why they were selected. This information was structured in a way to provide directions to any actors planning to implement programmes to reduce antigypsyism, however, we now briefly summarise our recommendations for specific actors.

Our recommendations for **European, national and local level policy and decision makers** is to understand their role *as social referents*. Social referents are well-connected and influential people who set collective norms. Accordingly, if their actions reflect a firm stance against antigypsyism as a principle in all decision-making processes, other members of society, both individuals and institutions, will adjust their attitudes and actions to these norms. These norms can also ensure a supportive environment for all antidiscrimination interventions, ensuring their long-term effects that are otherwise impossible to attain. The power of norms has been identified in many different social contexts and it also revealed to have a connection with antigypsyism within the PolRom project.

Norms can effectively counter antigypsyism with the recognition that antigypsyism emerges in three predominant forms: (1) endorsement of blatantly expressed traditional negative stereotypes; (2) the denial of prejudice; and (3) the absence of cultural recognition. Therefore, only those norms can be effective against antigypsyism that simultaneously dismantle old stereotypes, promote the value of diversity and non-discrimination, but do not use a colourblind approach.

Considering the scope of the problem of antigypsyism, stakeholders need to support systematic institutionalized interventions to directly address the structural problems and offer institutional support for interventions, educate various professional groups, enable intergroup contact through desegregation policies in housing, labour market and education, but also encourage the implementation of smaller scale interventions that address individual level change, such as the introduction of innovative school methods and curricula and the work of NGOs. Importantly, they need to support interventions with scientific foundations that also respond to local needs, as neither theory, nor practice can provide solutions alone.

The work of **NGOs** is essential in reducing antigypsyism in society. However, their engagement represents different levels of interventions from small-scale local projects to large international programmes and address problems on different levels (individual, intergroup and societal). Therefore, specific recommendations cannot fit the work of all NGOs, but our toolkit can offer something for all NGOs working in the area of reducing

antigypsyism and Roma inclusion. NGOs have the responsibility and the potential to rely both on scientific knowledge and grassroots experiences in particular social settings and local communities. Taking into account that the applicability of interventions is strongly context dependent, in the following, we highlight the most important general suggestions for NGOs:

- Understand the different layers of antigypsyism in the given context before identifying the goals of an intervention.
- Antigypsyism is a form of prejudice that has cognitive, emotional, and behavioural components. Consider that changing cognitive processes is more challenging than influencing emotions and altering behaviour, and not all cognitive biases can be eliminated. However, acknowledging that cognitive biases are normal mental processes does not mean that prejudice is justified and cannot be changed.
- Interventions should be tailored to the particular context and not implemented without adaptations. In this adaptation process, Roma people and members of the specific target group should be included in an active role to avoid making assumptions about Roma people and communities and reinforcing stereotypes.
- While some interventions target specifically members of the majority society or specifically Roma people, interventions have some effect on both communities. These unintended effects should be considered in advance when designing and implementing programmes. Most importantly, seeking intergroup harmony in a colourblind way can lead to positive changes among members of the majority, but it conveys false messages about structural inequalities and can potentially reduce Roma engagement.
- Determine the scope of the intervention (individual, intergroup, or societal), and design the programme accordingly. Be aware of the connection between the different levels, and how they can modify the expected outcome of an intervention, notably, how individual level change is limited by the lack of societal changes.
- The effectiveness of an intervention depends on the scale of the intervention. Interventions can be more effective if they target more levels of antigypsyism simultaneously, they are long term and repeated over time. Nevertheless, single interventions can potentially initiate or contribute to larger changes as well.
- Consider that interventions can be effective for some individuals, but not for others. In fact, interventions can sometimes backfire and increase the problem. Furthermore, some interventions can be effective in some contexts, but not in others. Therefore, when designing interventions, the conditions under which they work effectively should be established based on previous scientific evidence and assessed during implementation.
- The effectiveness of an intervention can and should be measured and not assumed. However, the scope of change is dependent on several factors. For example, individual level attitude change may become greater and more lasting if it contributes to formation of new group norms and is supported by institutional norms.
- Choose feasible interventions given the context and target audiences, rather than an ideal one. For example, when the conditions of contact are not possible, choose indirect contact as an initial step.
- Interventions should be built on scientific evidence, and ideally realise the cooperation between academics and practitioners, specifically, in the phase of planning and design, and in the impact assessment.

Our main recommendation for **donor and sponsor organisations** is to acknowledge the complexity of the problem of antigypsyism and to support interventions that are based on scientific evidence as well as the thorough knowledge of the local social-political context and the target groups as outlined in the recommendations for NGOs. Impact assessment should be incorporated in grant schemes (whether local, national, international level) dedicated to projects targeting prejudice change. Donors should provide support (financial, methodological and other) for carrying out impact assessment on all levels of the interventions, but also acknowledge the difficulties of measuring long term effect.

Representatives of the media have the tools and, therefore, the responsibility of shaping the norms regarding antigypsyism that in turn profoundly influence the effectiveness of interventions. Our analysis in PolRom has shown that Roma voices are largely absent in commenting on issues about Roma people and their experiences are rarely presented as embedded into historically evolved unequal social structures. The inclusion of Roma perspectives and adequate representations of the structural problems are necessary for changing stereotypes, making invisible prejudice visible and showing that Roma inclusion requires structural changes in society.

References

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

Čehajić-Clancy, S., Effron, D. A., Halperin, E., Liberman, V., & Ross, L. D. (2011). Affirmation, acknowledgment of in-group responsibility, group-based guilt, and support for reparative measures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 101*(2), 256-270. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023936

Cialdini, R. B., Kallgren, C. A., & Reno, R. R. (1991). A focus theory of normative conduct: A theoretical refinement and reevaluation of the role of norms in human behavior. In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 24, pp. 201-234). Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60330-5

Crisp, R. J., & Beck, S. R. (2005). Reducing intergroup bias: The moderating role of ingroup identification. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *8*(2), 173-185. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430205051066

Crisp, R. J., & Turner, R. N. (2009). Can imagined interactions produce positive perceptions? Reducing prejudice through simulated social contact. *American Psychologist, 64*(4), 231-240. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014718

Dasgupta, N., & Greenwald, A. G. (2001). On the malleability of automatic attitudes: combating automatic prejudice with images of admired and disliked individuals. *Journal of personality and social psychology, 81(*5), 800-814. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.81.5.800

Devine, P. G., Forscher, P. S., Austin, A. J., & Cox, W. T. (2012). Long-term reduction in implicit race bias: A prejudice habit-breaking intervention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48*(6), 1267-1278. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.06.003

Dovidio, J. F., Ten Vergert, M., Stewart, T. L., Gaertner, S. L., Johnson, J. D., Esses, V. M., ... & Pearson, A. R. (2004). Perspective and prejudice: Antecedents and mediating mechanisms. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *30*(12), 1537-1549. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271177

FRA (2018). *A persisting concern: anti-Gypsyism as a barrier to Roma inclusion*, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union, Retrieved from: https://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2018/roma-inclusion/fra-opinions

Galinsky, A. D., & Moskowitz, G. B. (2000). Perspective-taking: decreasing stereotype expression, stereotype accessibility, and in-group favoritism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78*(4), 708-724. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.78.4.708

Groyecka, A., Witkowska, M., Wróbel, M., Klamut, O., & Skrodzka, M. (2019). Challenge your stereotypes! Human Library and its impact on prejudice in Poland. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 29*(4), 1-12. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2402

Hadarics, M., & Kende, A. (2018). The dimensions of generalized prejudice within the dual-process model: The mediating role of moral foundations. *Current Psychology, 37*(4), 731-739. https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-016-9544-x

Halperin, E., Porat, R., Tamir, M., & Gross, J. J. (2013). Can emotion regulation change political attitudes in intractable conflicts? From the laboratory to the field. *Psychological Science, 24*(1), 106-111. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797612452572

Hopkins, N., & Blackwood, L. (2011). Everyday citizenship: Identity and recognition. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 21(*3), 215-227. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.1088

Jackson, L. A., Sullivan, L. A., Harnish, R., & Hodge, C. N. (1996). Achieving positive social identity: Social mobility, social creativity, and permeability of group boundaries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *70*(2), 241-254. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.70.2.241

Kende, A., Lantos, N. A., & Krekó, P. (2018). Endorsing a civic (vs an ethnic) definition of citizenship predicts higher pro-minority and lower pro-majority collective action intentions. *Frontiers in Psychology, 9,* 1402-1419. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01402

Kende, A., Hadarics, M., & Lášticová, B. (2017). Anti-Roma attitudes as expressions of dominant social norms in Eastern Europe. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 60*, 12–27. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2017.06.002

Kende, A., Tropp, L., & Lantos, N. A. (2017). Testing a contact intervention based on intergroup friendship between Roma and Non-Roma Hungarians: Reducing bias through institutional support in a non-supportive societal context. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 47*(1)*,* 47-55. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12422

Kende, A., Hadarics, M., Bigazzi, S., Boza, M., Kunst, J. R., Lantos, N. A., Lášticová, B., Minescu, A., Pivetti, M., & Urbiola, A. (2020). The last acceptable prejudice in Europe? Anti-Gypsyism as the obstacle to Roma inclusion. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. (advance online publication) https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430220907701

Kligman, G. (2001). On the social construction of "otherness": Identifying "the Roma" in postsocialist communities. *Review of Sociology, 7*(2), 61–78. http://doi.org/10.1556/RevSoc.7.2001.2.4

Kteily, N., Bruneau, E., Waytz, A., & Cotterill, S. (2015). The ascent of man: Theoretical and empirical evidence for blatant dehumanization. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 109*(5), 901-931. https://doi.org/10.1037/pspp0000048

López Catalán, Ó. (2012). The genesis of a "Romanian Roma issue" in the metropolitan area of Barcelona: Urban public spaces, neighbourhood conflicts and local politics. *Revista de Estudios Urbanos y Ciencias Sociales, 2*, 95–117.

MacBride, M. (2015). What works to reduce prejudice and discrimination? A review of the evidence (ISBN: 9781785447235). Scottish Centre for Crime and Justice Research. https://www.gov.scot/publications/works-reduce-prejudice-discrimination-review-evidence/

Orosz, G. B., Bánki, E., Bőthe, B., Tóth-Király, I., & Tropp, L. R. (2016). Don´t judge a living book by its cover: Effectiveness of the living library intervention in reducing prejudice toward Roma and LGBT people. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 46*(9), 510-517. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12379

Paluck, E. L., & Green, D. P. (2009). Prejudice reduction: What works? A review and assessment of research and practice. *Annual Review of Psychology, 60,* 339-367. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163607

Paolucci, M. P. (2003). Perspective taking and prejudice reduction: The mediational role of empathy arousal and situational attributions. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 33*(4), 455-472. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.163

Pérez, J. A., Moscovici, S., & Chulvi, B. (2007). The taboo against group contact: Hypothesis of Gypsy ontologization. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, *46*(2), 249-272. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466606X111301

Pettigrew, T. F. (1961). Social psychology and desegregation research. *American Psychologist, 16*(3)*,* 105-112. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0041995

Powell, A. A., Branscombe, N. R., & Schmitt, M. T. (2005). Inequality as ingroup privilege or outgroup disadvantage: The impact of group focus on collective guilt and interracial attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*(4), 508-521. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204271713

Reason, R. D., Roosa Millar, E. A., & Scales, T. C. (2005). Toward a model of racial justice ally development. *Journal of College Student Development, 46*, 530–546. doi: 10.1353/csd.2005.0054

Seaman, J., Beightol, J., Shirilla, P., & Crawford, B. (2010). Contact Theory as a Framework for Experiential Activities as Diversity Education: An Exploratory Study. *Journal of Experiential Education, 32*(3), 207–225. https://doi.org/10.1177/105382590903200303

Sigona, N. (2005). Locating "the Gypsy problem." The Roma in Italy: Stereotyping, labelling and "nomad camps." *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies, 31*(4), 741–756. http://doi.org/10.1080/13691830500109969

Simonovits, G., Kezdi, G., & Kardos, P. (2018). Seeing the world through the other's eye: An online intervention reducing ethnic prejudice. *American Political Science Review*, *112*(1), 186-193. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000478

Stewart, M. S. (2012). *The Gypsy menace: Populism and the new anti-Gypsy politics*. London, UK: Hurst & Company

Tajfel, H. (1978). The achievement of inter-group differentiation. In H. Tajfel (Ed.), *Differentiation Between Social Groups* (pp. 77-100). London: Academic Press.

Thomas, E. F., & McGarty, C. A. (2009). The role of efficacy and moral outrage norms in creating the potential for international development activism through group-based interaction. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 48*(1), 115-134. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466608X313774

Thomas, E. F., McGarty, C., & Mavor, K. I. (2009). Transforming "apathy into movement": The role of prosocial emotions in motivating action for social change. *Personality and social psychology review*, *13*(4), 310-333. https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868309343290

Váradi, L. (2014). Youths trapped in prejudice: Hungarian adolescents' attitudes towards the Roma. Wiesbaden: Springer Science & Business.

Vasiljevic, M., & Crisp, R. J. (2013). Tolerance by surprise: Evidence for a generalized reduction in prejudice and increased egalitarianism through novel category combination. *PloS one, 8*(3), e57106. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0057106

Vescio, T. K., Sechrist, G. B., & Stephan, W. G., & Finlay, K. (1999). The role of empathy in improving intergroup relations. *Journal of Social Issues, 55*(4), 729-743. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00144

Vezzali, L., Stathi, S., Giovannini, D., Capozza, D., & Trifiletti, E. (2015). The greatest magic of Harry Potter: Reducing prejudice. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 45*(2), 105-121. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12279

Villano, P., Fontanella, L., Fontanella, S., & Di Donato, M. (2017). Stereotyping Roma people in Italy: IRT models for ambivalent prejudice measurement. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *57*, 30-41. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2017.01.003

Weinerová, R. (2014). Anti-Gypsyism in the Czech Republic: Czechs' perception of Roma in cultural stereotypes. *Acta Ethnographica Hungarica, 59*(1)*,* 211– 221. http://doi.org/10.1556/AEthn.59.2014.1.10

Wright, S. C., Aron, A., McLaughlin-Volpe, T., & Ropp, S. A. (1997). The extended contact effect: Knowledge of cross-group friendships and prejudice. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 73*(1), 73-90. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.73.1.73

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atherton, G., Sebanz, N., & Cross, L. (2019). Imagine All The Synchrony: The effects of actual and imagined synchronous walking on attitudes towards marginalised groups. *Plos one. 14*(5): e0216585. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0216585

Stereotyping is a pervasive societal problem that impacts not only minority groups but subserves individuals who perpetuate stereotypes, leading to greater distance between groups. Social contact interventions have been shown to reduce prejudice and stereotyping, but optimal contact conditions between groups are often out of reach in day to day life. Therefore, the authors investigated the effects of a synchronous walking intervention, a non-verbal embodied approach to intergroup contact that may reduce the need for optimal contact conditions. They studied attitude change towards the Roma group in Hungary following actual and imagined walking, both in a coordinated and uncoordinated manner. Results showed that coordinated walking, both imagined and in vivo, led to explicit and implicit reductions in prejudice and stereotyping towards both the Roma individual and the wider Roma social group. This suggests that coordinated movement could be a valuable addition to current approaches towards prejudice reduction.

Asbrock, F., Gutenbruner, L., Wagner, U. (2013). Unwilling, but not unaffected–Imagined contact effects for authoritarians and social dominators. *European Journal of Social Psychology 43*(5), 404–412. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.1956

According to a dual process model perspective, intergroup contact should be particularly effective for people high in right-wing authoritarianism (RWA), but not for those high in social dominance orientation (SDO), because of different underlying motivational goals. The present studies tested the hypothesis that imagined contact, that is, the mental representation of a positive intergroup encounter, improves intergroup relations for high RWAs. Two experimental studies showed that high RWAs, compared with low RWAs, show fewer negative emotions toward Turks (Study 1; N = 120) and more willingness to engage in future contact with Romani people (Study 2; N = 85) after imagined contact. As expected, people high in SDO did not benefit from imagined contact. Instead, people low in SDO showed fewer negative emotions after imagined contact in Study 1, but this effect was not replicated in the second study. Theoretical implications and the role of imagined contact as a possible intervention for highly biased individuals are discussed.

Cernat, V. (2011). Extended contact effects: Is exposure to positive outgroup exemplars sufficient or is interaction with ingroup members necessary?. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, *151*(6), 737-753. 10.1080/00224545.2010.522622

Previous research does not inform us if exposure to positive outgroup exemplars is sufficient to explain the observed prejudice reduction effect of extended contact or if interaction with ingroup members is necessary. An experiment (*N* = 108) in which Romanian students read identical stories about the friendship between a Roma and a Romanian/Bulgarian found that, while information about close outgroup-outgroup relationships is sufficient to improve outgroup attitudes and reduce intergroup anxiety, information about close ingroup-outgroup relationships has stronger and broader positive effects. Mediational analyses revealed that group emotions rather than intergroup anxiety, ingroup norms, or outgroup norms mediated the effect of extended contact on outgroup perception. A core affect perspective of group emotions is used to explain the results.

Groyecka, A., Witkowska, M., Wróbel, M., Klamut, O., & Skrodzka, M. (2019). Challenge your stereotypes! Human Library and its impact on prejudice in Poland. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, *29*(4), 311-322. https://doi.org/10.1002/casp.2402

Human Library is a public event aimed at reducing stereotypes and prejudices, in the form of an interactive, contact-based intervention. It employs the logic of a regular library yet with readers "borrowing" Living Books, which are real people representing various minority groups. Readers engage in 30-min conversations, during which they can challenge their stereotypes and widen their scope of knowledge and understanding. This pre-post intervention study examined the effectiveness of the Human Library (held in Wrocław, Poland) in reducing

social distance towards Roma, Muslims, dark-skinned, and transgender people, as well as in decreasing homonegativity. Also, the study investigated whether participation in the Human Library changes individual attitudes towards diverse workgroups. It was found that the Human Library decreased social distance towards Muslims, but not towards the Roma. Also, the more Living Books that the participants "read," the bigger the shift in their social distance towards Muslims. Furthermore, an increase in positive affective attitude towards working in diversified groups was observed as a result of participation in the event. The study serves as partial support for the effectiveness of the Human Library in altering one's attitude towards minority groups and diversity. The intervention is discussed as a promising but not yet entirely understood tool to improve intergroup relations.

Kende, A., Lantos, N. A., & Krekó, P. (2018). Endorsing a civic (vs. an ethnic) definition of citizenship predicts higher pro-minority and lower pro-majority collective action intentions. *Frontiers in psychology*, *9*, 1402-1419. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01402

This study presents experimental evidence to show that civic and ethnic citizenship affected collective action tendencies. Contents of national identity were manipulated as either emphasizing an inclusive civic versus an exclusive ethnic character, and its effect was tested on supportive collective action intentions on behalf of the Roma. The authors found that the manipulation influenced pro-Roma collective action intentions especially in the presence of high empathy and low fear in the expected direction, that is, pro-minority collective action intentions were higher in the civic citizenship condition than in the ethnic citizenship condition.

Kende, A., Tropp, L., & Lantos, N. A. (2017). Testing a contact intervention based on intergroup friendship between Roma and non-Roma Hungarians: reducing bias through institutional support in a non-supportive societal context. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *47*(1), 47-55. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12422

The authors conducted a quasi-experiment (*N* = 61) to test whether a contact-based intervention based on intergroup friendship could reduce bias against Roma people among non-Roma Hungarians. The so-called fast friends method – in which participants get to know each other through a conversation that facilitates increasing mutual self-disclosure and can thus create a relationship resembling close friendships – was used to reduce antigypsyism among Hungarian university students.

Through pre- and post-test questionnaires, the authors observed significant positive change in attitudes and contact intentions among participants in the contact condition, while these effects were not observed among participants in the control condition. Positive change was moderated by perceived institutional norms: the belief that the university would expect participants to behave in a non-prejudiced way, suggesting the importance of supportive authorities.

Kuchenbrandt, D., Eyssel, F., & Seidel, S. K. (2013). Cooperation makes it happen: Imagined intergroup cooperation enhances the positive effects of imagined contact. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, *16*(5), 635–647. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430212470172

Imagined intergroup contact represents a new indirect contact strategy to reduce intergroup bias. Extending the literature on imagined contact, the study tested whether the inclusion of cooperation into the imagination task would outperform the standard imagined contact scenarios used in previous research. 87 participants were instructed to imagine a neutral versus a positive versus a cooperative interaction with an out-group member (a Roma stranger). As predicted, after imagining a cooperative intergroup interaction, participants showed more empathy and trust toward the out-group than participants in the remaining experimental conditions. Furthermore, they also reported reduced prejudice and intergroup anxiety. Taken together, implementing cooperation in the imagined contact paradigm reduced intergroup bias, above and beyond basic imagined contact effects. Finally, the perceived quality of the imagined interaction with an out-group member mediated the experimental effects.

Prati, F. & Loughnan, S. (2018). Imagined intergroup contact promotes support for human rights through increased humanization, *European Journal of Social Psychology, 48*(1) O51–O6, https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2282

Dehumanization concerns the denial of others' human uniqueness (animalistic dehumanization) or human nature (mechanistic dehumanization). Imagined intergroup contact has been suggested to be an effective technique for reducing dehumanization. The study examined whether this intervention might primarily work by increasing the type of humanness the group specifically lacks. Study 1 revealed that after imagining contact with an animalized out-group (i.e., Gypsy people), participants attributed higher levels of human uniqueness. Study 2 replicated this finding, eliminating improved intergroup attitudes as an alternative explanation. Further, it demonstrated that imagined contact increased support for human rights, and that this was mediated by increased description of human uniqueness. Study 3 confirmed previous evidence by showing that after imagining contact with a mechanized out-group (i.e., Japanese people), participants attributed higher levels of human nature that explains support for human rights. Overall, imagined contact specifically works at increasing the type of humanness the group is typically denied.

Simonovits, G., Kézdi, G., & Kardos, P. (2018). Seeing the World Through the Other's Eye: An Online Intervention Reducing Ethnic Prejudice. *American Political Science Review, 112*(1), 186-193. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055417000478

The study presents the results of an intervention that targeted anti-Roma sentiment in Hungary using an online perspective-taking game. The authors evaluated the impact of this intervention using a randomized experiment in which a sample of young adults played this perspective-taking game, or an unrelated online game. Participation in the perspective-taking game markedly reduced prejudice, with an effect-size equivalent to half the difference between voters of the far-right and the center-right party. The effects persisted for at least a month, and, as a byproduct, the intervention also reduced antipathy toward refugees, another stigmatized group in Hungary, and decreased vote intentions for Hungary's overtly racist, far-right party by 10%. The study offers a proof-of-concept for a general class of interventions that could be adapted to different settings and implemented at low costs.

Orosz, G., Bánki, E., Bőthe, B., Tóth-Király, I., & Tropp, L. R. (2016). Don't judge a living book by its cover: effectiveness of the living library intervention in reducing prejudice toward Roma and LGBT people. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 46*(9), 510-517. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12379

The "living library" method is a contact-based intervention with trained partners directly focusing on the experiences of discrimination among minority group members. The present study examined the effectiveness of the Living Library prejudice reduction intervention—in which participants as "Readers" have engaging contact with living "Books" who are trained volunteers from the Roma and LGBT communities. In a pre-post intervention study with high school students (N = 105), results suggest that the Living Library intervention reduced participants' scores on multiple measures of prejudice. The Living Library intervention appeared to be effective among both those participants whose friends endorsed prejudice or more tolerant attitudes toward Roma and LGBT people. In sum, Living Library appears to be a useful method for reducing prejudice in contexts which are characterized by strong negative attitudes toward these different groups. This intervention could therefore be potentially suitable for the East-Central European context.