Entertainment Education as a Means to Reduce Anti-Muslim Prejudice – For Whom Does It Work Best?

An Extended Replication of Murrar and Brauer (2018)

Birte Siem¹, Lisa Neymeyer, and Anette Rohmann

Department of Psychology, FernUniversität in Hagen, Germany

Abstract: The present research aimed to replicate and extend findings by Murrar and Brauer (2018), who demonstrated that an entertainment education intervention (a music video) effectively reduced US residents' anti-Muslim prejudice. Using a German sample ($N = 203$), we confirmed that watching the video significantly reduced recipients' prejudice toward Muslims compared to a control condition and two alternative interventions. Unlike in Murrar and Brauer, however, the intervention's advantageous effect was driven by recipients' feelings of intergroup anxiety and perceptions of outgroup malleability rather than their identification with Muslims. Extending Murrar and Brauer's findings, our results also suggest for whom entertainment education interventions may work best, namely for recipients high in right-wing authoritarianism. The findings' theoretical and practical implications are discussed.

Keywords: entertainment education, prejudice, Muslim, right-wing authoritarianism, replication

Entertainment education (EE) interventions are designed to both entertain and educate people. They embed messages on pressing social issues into powerful stories disseminated via entertaining formats such as television soaps, comics, or music videos (e.g., Singhal & Rogers, 1999). While EE has been shown to be highly effective in changing recipients' health-related attitudes and behaviors (e.g., Pappas-DeLuca et al., 2008), its potential to reduce prejudice has been relatively underresearched. In fact, only a handful of studies have addressed this issue, and of these, most show some methodological flaws (e.g., lack of a control group and/or comparison groups consisting of other interventions; Murrar & Brauer, 2018, 2019), despite showing support overall for the intervention's effectiveness (e.g., Paluck, 2009; Schiappa et al., 2006).

One notable exception is a study by Murrar and Brauer (2018, Study 2; hereafter referred to as MB) that experimentally investigated the effectiveness of a short pro-diversity YouTube music video portraying Muslims as relatable and likeable for reducing anti-Muslim prejudice in a non-Muslim US-based sample. They compared the video to a control condition and to two established alternative prejudice reduction interventions – an imagined contact exercise (Crisp & Turner, 2009) asking participants to

imagine a positive interaction with a Muslim, and a group malleability reading (Halperin et al., 2011) emphasizing that groups can change over time. Watching the video should hold advantages over the two alternative interventions, because it not only serves as a form of indirect contact with Muslims, but also triggers psychological processes that are unique to EE. For instance, more than alternative interventions, EE is highly absorbing, leaving recipients with little cognitive capacity to counter-argue the persuasive message embedded in the entertaining elements (e.g., Slater & Rouner, 2002). Moreover, recipients of EE should become highly involved with the story's protagonists, helping them identify with the protagonists (e.g., Cohen, 2001; Murrar & Brauer, 2018). Increased identification, in turn, has been shown to make recipients more receptive to the persuasive message embedded in the story (e.g., Moyer-Gusé et al., 2011). In line with this reasoning, MB assumed that, compared to the control condition and to the two alternative interventions, exposure to the video should be more effective in reducing anti-Muslim prejudice because it should increase recipients' identification with members of the portrayed outgroup, that is, with Muslims. Their results confirmed these assumptions. Notably, the positive effect of EE on prejudice reduction was mediated by increased levels

of identification only, while none of a set of plausible alternative mediators – perceived group malleability (e.g., Halperin et al., 2011), perceived outgroup variability (e.g., Brauer & Er-rifiy, 2011), and feelings of intergroup anxiety (e.g., Stephan & Stephan, 1985) – proved to be significant.

The aims of the present research are threefold. First and foremost, we sought to replicate MB's finding that watching the video significantly reduced recipients' prejudice toward Muslims compared to a control condition and two alternative interventions in the German context, which differs from the US context on relevant dimensions. For instance, Muslims make up a considerably higher percentage of the total population in Germany than in the US (e.g., Mohamed, 2018; Pew Research Center, 2017). The German context might thus provide more opportunities for positive contact between Non-Muslims and Muslims, but might also fuel perceptions of intergroup threat (e.g., Schmid et al., 2014; Wagner et al., 2020). In line with the latter reasoning, recent opinion poll data suggest that Germany in fact faces stronger anti-Muslim prejudice than the US (Decker et al., 2018; Sahgal & Mohamed, 2019). A successful replication of MB's findings in the German, perhaps even more prejudice-laden, context would thus provide clear support for the robustness and generalizability of the positive effects of a brief, low-cost EE intervention that can reach numerous people worldwide.

Second, we aimed to explore the mediating processes that underlie EE's prejudice-reducing effect. In keeping with MB, in addition to identification with Muslims, we included also alternative potential mediators, namely perceived group malleability, perceived outgroup variability, and feelings of intergroup anxiety. Given the differences between the German and the US context noted above, we did not necessarily expect to replicate the central mediating role of identification with Muslims observed in MB, though, and decided to keep this part of our analyses exploratory in nature.

Third, and extending MB's findings, we aimed to investigate the boundary conditions of EE's prejudice-reducing effects by considering an individual difference variable, recipients' levels of right-wing authoritarianism (RWA) as a potential moderator. RWA reflects a person's willingness to adhere to societal conventions and to aggress against deviant people (e.g., Altemeyer, 1981), and is one of the most robust predictors of prejudice (e.g., Sibley & Duckitt, 2008). We focus on this specific variable, because, compared to alternative individual difference predictors of prejudice (e.g., social dominance orientation, Pratto et al., 1994), RWA seems to be uniquely related to people's prejudice against outgroups perceived as "dangerous", that is, as threats to safety or to conventional norms and values (e.g., terrorists; see Duckitt & Sibley's dual process model, 2007). In Western countries, Muslims are often stereotypi-

cally associated with these forms of threat (e.g., Cook et al., 2018), and are therefore often perceived as a "dangerous" outgroup.

With regard to the moderating role of RWA, two competing predictions seem plausible. In line with the basic notion of intergroup contact research (e.g., Allport, 1954) that strong personal prejudice-related variables likely override the effects of situational variables like intergroup contact (which, especially in its indirect form, shares some similarities with EE), one might expect EE to reduce prejudice primarily among individuals "lower" in RWA. However, the subtle, nonprescriptive, and highly absorbing nature of EE (e.g., Slater & Rouner, 2002; Vaughan & Rogers, 2000) might enable it to reach precisely those who oppose more obvious attempts to prejudice reduction. Accordingly, EE actually might be most effective for individuals "higher" in RWA. Studies on prejudice reduction reflect these competing predictions: While some show that interventions are most effective among higher-RWA individuals (e.g., Dhont & Van Hiel, 2009), others suggest that they work best for lower-RWA individuals (e.g., Kauff et al., 2013), or that the benefit of prejudice-reducing interventions for high vs. low RWA individuals depends on the respective target outgroup (Maunder et al., 2020).

Method

We report how we determined our sample size, all data exclusions, all manipulations, and all measures used in the study (Simmons et al., 2012). Materials (including all measures and items), data, and the preregistration can be assessed under <https://osf.io/b2j5h/>. Unless noted otherwise, methods were adopted from MB, who generously provided all necessary information (see <https://osf.io/c25ms/>). Materials were translated from English into German.

Participants

An a priori power analysis ($1 - \beta = .80$, $\alpha = .05$, $\eta^2 = .06$) yielded a suggested sample size of 200 participants. Out of the 204 participants from across Germany who completed our online study, we excluded one person who self-categorized as Muslim, leading to a final N of 203 (70.94% female, 81.28% between 18 and 35 years of age, 83.74% self-categorized as German).

Design and Procedure

The study was introduced to participants as concerning their impression of how people from different cultural backgrounds are getting along in Germany. After providing

sociodemographic information, participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions.

Participants assigned to the “entertainment education condition” ($n = 43$) viewed the same music video as in MB (“A Land Called Paradise”, <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=sbcmPeOz3Sc>; with German subtitles), which portrays Muslim-Americans as a heterogeneous group of relatable and likeable individuals. Participants in the “imagined contact condition” ($n = 51$) were instructed to imagine a positive interaction with a Muslim and write about it (Husnu & Crisp, 2010; Stathi & Crisp, 2008). In the “group malleability condition” ($n = 54$), participants read a fictitious article adapted from Halperin et al. (2011) describing the alleged results of scientific research showing that ethnic and religious groups change over time. Participants in the “control condition” ($n = 55$) did not receive any information.

Participants then completed a questionnaire, and were fully debriefed afterwards.

Measures

For multiple-item measures, the items were averaged to form a single composite score. Unless otherwise noted, we used 7-point Likert scales. To increase comparability, we kept MB’s measure labels.

Prejudice

Prejudice was assessed with several different measures. First, participants indicated their prejudice toward Germans and Muslims (embedded among eight other groups, e.g., women) on feelings and liking thermometers on 101-point sliding scales. As feelings and liking scores were highly correlated, $r(201)s \geq .70$, $ps \leq .001$, we created one composite score reflecting positive “attitudes toward Germans”, and one reflecting positive “attitudes toward Muslims”. We also calculated an “attitude difference” measure reflecting participants’ preference for Germans by subtracting their attitudes toward Muslims from their attitudes toward Germans. Participants also indicated their attitudes toward Muslims on “semantic differentials” (Cronbach’s $\alpha = .93$) and on a modified version of the “Modern Racism Scale” (McConahay, 1986; $\alpha = .86$).

Mediators

In keeping with MB, we measured not only “identification with Muslims” ($\alpha = .80$), but also five additional plausible mediators: “Perceived group malleability” (Halperin et al. 2011; $\alpha = .72$); perceived variability within the outgroup “Muslims” via two measures (both on 101-point sliding

scales): “Perceived Variability 1” (based on Judd et al., 1995; $\alpha = .94$; see Electronic Supplemental Material [ESM 1] for more information), and “Perceived Variability 2” (single-item measure); and intergroup anxiety via two measures (both on 5-point scales): “Intergroup Anxiety 1” (Britt et al., 1996; $\alpha = .81$), and “Intergroup Anxiety 2” (Stephan & Stephan, 1985; $\alpha = .83$).

Moderator

At the end of the questionnaire, extending the measures assessed in MB, we included a 9-item measure assessing participants’ levels of RWA on 5-point scales (Beierlein et al., 2014; $\alpha = .86$).

Results

Table 1 presents means and standard deviations per experimental condition for all theoretically relevant variables, while Table 2 presents their bivariate correlations.¹ Preliminary analyses are reported in ESM 1.

Manipulation Effects on Prejudice

To test the predictions that EE reduces prejudice toward Muslims and that it is more effective than an imagined contact exercise and a group malleability reading, we created three orthogonal contrasts. The critical contrast (C1) compared the EE condition against the other three conditions (1, 1, 1, -3). Two other contrasts controlled for possible alternative effect patterns (Abelson & Prentice, 1997), and compared the two other prejudice reduction conditions against the control condition (C2: 2, -1 , -1 , 0) or against each other (C3: 0, 1, -1 , 0). As Table 1 shows, the two alternative interventions neither differed from each other (C3) nor from the control condition (C2) in their effects on the four prejudice measures. More important, and in line with our predictions and MB’s findings, the results of the critical contrast analyses (C1) showed that participants in the EE condition reported significantly more positive attitudes toward Muslims, less modern racism, and evaluated Muslims more positively on the semantic differentials than participants collapsed across the remaining three conditions. Unlike in MB, however, the EE condition and the remaining three conditions did not differ with regard to the attitude difference score. This deviation is probably due to the fact that in our sample, EE significantly increased attitudes not only toward Muslims but also toward Germans, albeit to a lesser extent.

¹ We imputed missing values on our theoretically relevant variables (less than 1%) by replacing the missings with the respective variable’s mean. Analyses with and without imputed values yielded virtually identical results.

Table 1. Means and standard deviations for prejudice variables, mediators, and the moderator per experimental condition, and inferential statistics from contrast analyses

	Control <i>n</i> = 55	Group malleability <i>n</i> = 54	Imagined contact <i>n</i> = 51	Entertainment education <i>n</i> = 43	Contrast 1 (1, 1, -3)	Contrast 2 (-2, 1, 1, 0)	Contrast 3 (0, -1, 1, 0)
Prejudice variable							
Attitudes toward Germans	61.27 (13.26)	70.05 (14.49)	64.94 (14.42)	70.97 (15.66)	$F(1, 199) = 5.02$, $p = .026$, $\eta^2_p = .03$, 95% CI [.00, .08]	$F(1, 199) = 6.73$, $p = .010$, $\eta^2_p = .03$, 95% CI [.00, .09]	$F(1, 199) = 3.29$, $p = .071$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95% CI [.00, .07]
Attitudes toward Muslims	53.49 (16.25)	59.38 (21.81)	53.79 (20.22)	66.29 (19.34)	$F(1, 199) = 10.25$, $p = .002$, $\eta^2_p = .05$, 95% CI [.01, .12]	$F(1, 199) = 0.91$, $p = .342$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, 95% CI [.00, .04]	$F(1, 199) = 2.15$, $p = .144$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, 95% CI [.00, .06]
Attitude difference score	7.78 (18.71)	10.67 (21.07)	11.15 (21.78)	4.67 (14.86)	$F(1, 199) = 2.41$, $p = .122$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, 95% CI [.00, .06]	$F(1, 199) = 0.93$, $p = .336$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, 95% CI [.00, .04]	$F(1, 199) = 0.02$, $p = .900$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI [.00, .00]
Semantic differential	4.69 (1.01)	4.84 (1.18)	4.81 (1.11)	5.42 (1.05)	$F(1, 199) = 11.65$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2_p = .06$, 95% CI [.01, .13]	$F(1, 199) = 0.59$, $p = .444$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI [.00, .04]	$F(1, 199) = 0.02$, $p = .892$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI [.00, .00]
Modern Racism Scale	2.83 (1.03)	2.98 (1.25)	3.11 (1.27)	2.47 (1.00)	$F(1, 199) = 6.56$, $p = .011$, $\eta^2_p = .03$, 95% CI [.00, .09]	$F(1, 199) = 1.21$, $p = .273$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, 95% CI [.00, .05]	$F(1, 199) = 0.30$, $p = .583$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI [.00, .03]
Mediating variable							
Identification	39.22 (17.72)	39.65 (16.64)	33.55 (15.80)	38.38 (18.02)	$F(1, 199) = 0.10$, $p = .758$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI [.00, .02]	$F(1, 199) = 0.85$, $p = .358$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI [.00, .04]	$F(1, 199) = 3.36$, $p = .068$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95% CI [.00, .07]
Perceived Variability 1	44.98 (37.78)	45.45 (36.93)	54.93 (38.77)	51.33 (39.58)	$F(1, 199) = 0.19$, $p = .662$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI [.00, .03]	$F(1, 199) = 0.67$, $p = .414$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI [.00, .04]	$F(1, 199) = 1.62$, $p = .205$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, 95% CI [.00, .05]
Perceived Variability 2	74.60 (22.17)	73.22 (24.40)	76.65 (22.88)	81.81 (20.90)	$F(1, 199) = 3.21$, $p = .075$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95% CI [.00, .07]	$F(1, 199) = 0.01$, $p = .930$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI [.00, .00]	$F(1, 199) = 0.60$, $p = .441$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI [.00, .04]
Group malleability	4.27 (0.75)	4.45 (0.81)	4.02 (0.82)	4.61 (0.95)	$F(1, 199) = 6.52$, $p = .011$, $\eta^2_p = .03$, 95% CI [.00, .09]	$F(1, 199) = 0.06$, $p = .806$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI [.00, .01]	$F(1, 199) = 6.96$, $p = .009$, $\eta^2_p = .03$, 95% CI [.00, .10]
Intergroup Anxiety 1	2.16 (0.69)	1.93 (0.58)	2.23 (0.81)	1.91 (0.62)	$F(1, 199) = 2.89$, $p = .091$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, 95% CI [.00, .06]	$F(1, 199) = 0.45$, $p = .502$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI [.00, .03]	$F(1, 199) = 5.02$, $p = .026$, $\eta^2_p = .03$, 95% CI [.00, .08]
Intergroup Anxiety 2	2.51 (0.79)	2.54 (0.74)	2.71 (0.81)	2.36 (0.72)	$F(1, 199) = 3.28$, $p = .072$, $\eta^2_p = .02$, 95% CI [.00, .07]	$F(1, 199) = 0.74$, $p = .392$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI [.00, .04]	$F(1, 199) = 1.01$, $p = .316$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, 95% CI [.00, .04]
Moderating variable							
Right-wing authoritarianism	2.16 (0.66)	2.17 (0.66)	2.30 (0.82)	2.06 (0.71)	$F(1, 199) = 1.56$, $p = .213$, $\eta^2_p = .01$, 95% CI [.00, .05]	$F(1, 199) = 0.47$, $p = .494$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI [.00, .03]	$F(1, 199) = 0.85$, $p = .359$, $\eta^2_p < .01$, 95% CI [.00, .04]

Note. The values reported in columns 2–5 are means; standard deviations are reported in parentheses. The 95% confidence intervals of effect sizes are reported in columns 6–8.

Table 2. Correlations between all theoretically relevant variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12
1. Identification		-.03	.07	.26***	-.43***	-.49***	-.22**	.08	.54***	-.49***	.44***	-.35***
2. Perceived Variability 1	-.01		.19**	.13 ⁺	-.13 ⁺	.00	-.06	-.08	-.04	-.02	.06	-.16*
3. Perceived Variability 2	.07	.19**		.21**	-.23***	-.17*	-.23**	-.10	.04	-.12 ⁺	.08	-.26***
4. Group malleability	.24***	.15*	.21**		-.47***	-.39***	-.54***	-.02	.36***	-.39***	.35***	-.64***
5. Intergroup Anxiety 1	-.42***	-.14 ⁺	-.23***	-.44***		.65***	.49***	.08	-.39***	.46***	-.37***	.53***
6. Intergroup Anxiety 2	-.48***	-.00	-.17*	-.37***	.64***		.35***	-.08	-.47***	.42***	-.43***	.44***
7. RWA	-.21**	-.06	-.23**	-.53***	.49***	.33***		.19**	-.27***	.42***	-.31***	.62***
8. Attitudes toward Germans	.08	-.08	-.12 ⁺	-.07	.13 ⁺	-.06	.21**		.41***	.35***	.24**	.12 ⁺
9. Attitudes toward Muslims	.55***	-.05	.02	.33***	-.36***	-.46***	-.26***	.37***		-.72***	.69***	-.44***
10. Attitude difference score	-.50***	-.02	-.11	-.38***	.46***	.41***	.42***	.37***	-.73***		-.53***	.54***
11. Semantic differential	.45***	.05	.05	.32***	-.36***	-.42***	-.30***	.20**	.67***	-.53***		-.49***
12. Modern Racism Scale	-.34***	-.17*	-.24***	-.63***	.53***	.43***	.62***	.15*	-.42***	.53***	-.47***	

Note. Values below the diagonal are bivariate correlations, values above the diagonal are partial correlations (statistically controlling for C1, C2, and C3).

⁺ $p < .10$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

Results from additional analyses further corroborating that, in the present context, the EE intervention is more effective in reducing anti-Muslim prejudice than two established alternative interventions are reported in ESM 1.

Mediations

To investigate the underlying processes of the EE effect, we first regressed each of the potential mediators on the three contrast variables. The results (see Table 1; see also the a paths in Figures 1A–1D) revealed that, in contrast to MB, the critical contrast C1 was not significantly related to identification or to Perceived Variability 1 (the only two mediators for which MB could show indirect effects). Instead, it was (marginally) significantly related to the remaining four potential mediators, indicating that EE was more effective in increasing participants' perceptions of how different Muslims are from each other (Perceived Variability 2) and how malleable groups are (group malleability), and in decreasing their feelings of intergroup anxiety (Intergroup Anxiety 1² and 2).

We then regressed each of the outcome variables measuring prejudice (attitudes toward Muslims, attitude difference score, semantic differential, Modern Racism Scale) on C1, C2, and C3 as well as on each of the four mediators that were found to be (marginally) significantly related to C1. For each prejudice measure, the indirect effect of C1 via group malleability was significant (95% CI), all four β s $\geq$ |.06|, and the indirect effects via Intergroup Anxiety 1 and

2 were marginally significant (90% CI), all eight β s $\geq$ |.04| (for the full mediation models, see Figure 1). Perceived Variability 2 emerged as a marginally significant mediator only of the effect of C1 on the Modern Racism Scale, $\beta = .03$.

RWA as a Moderator

To examine the moderating role of RWA, we conducted four separate moderated regression analyses with each of the four prejudice measures as the criterion, C1 as the predictor, and RWA (mean-centered) as the moderator (while controlling for C2 and C3 as well as their relevant interactions, $C2 \times RWA$ and $C3 \times RWA$). Three of these analyses yielded significant $C1 \times RWA$ interaction terms (see Table 3A–3D). First, the analysis on attitudes toward Muslims revealed a significant $C1 \times RWA$ interaction, indicating that EE is particularly advantageous over the remaining three conditions in improving participants' attitudes toward Muslims among participants higher in RWA (i.e., who scored 1 SD above the mean), while it exhibits no advantage among participants scoring relatively low on RWA (i.e., who scored 1 SD below the mean) (see Figure 2A). Virtually the same results pattern emerged for analogous analyses with the attitudes difference score and the semantic differential as criterion (see Figures 2B and 2C). The analysis with the Modern Racism Scale as criterion revealed no significant $C1 \times RWA$ interaction (see

² For Intergroup Anxiety 1, variances were unequal between C3 levels, Levene's $F(2, 200) = 3.55$, $p = .030$. However, results from a robust post hoc test (Tamhane) were comparable to those reported in Table 1.

Figure 1. Separate mediation models of the effect of C1 on the four prejudice variables measuring prejudice via group malleability (A), Intergroup Anxiety 1 (B), Intergroup Anxiety 2 (C), and Perceived Variability 2 (D). Coefficients are standardized regression weights. The total effects are presented in parentheses. $^+p < .10$; $^*p < .05$; $^{**}p < .01$; $^{***}p < .001$.

Table 3D). Still, simple slopes (see Figure 2D) indicated a trend in the expected direction.³

Discussion

The present research successfully replicated the central findings of a study by Murrar and Brauer (2018, Study 2), who demonstrated that an EE intervention, a short music video, effectively reduced US residents' anti-Muslim prejudice. Specifically, we could confirm in a German sample that watching the video significantly reduced recipients' prejudice toward Muslims compared to a control condition and two alternative interventions (imagined contact exercise, group malleability reading). Our findings thus further corroborate the usefulness of brief, web-based EE interventions as low-cost alternatives with an extremely broad reach.

While our findings on the prejudice measures were very consistent with MB's, findings on the mediating processes differed. Most notably, while MB depicted recipients' identification with Muslims as the central underlying process behind the EE effect, our findings suggest that the effect

is primarily due to an increase in perceived malleability and a decrease in intergroup anxiety. These differences might be partly explained by the fact that the music video portrayed Muslim-Americans which could have increased the salience of a superordinate common identity (i.e., American) for US participants but not for German participants. Consequently, it might have been easier for US participants to identify with Muslims. Another possible explanation comes from opinion poll data suggesting that Germany faces stronger anti-Muslim prejudice than the US (Decker et al., 2018; Sahgal & Mohamed, 2019). Consequently, in the German context, negative processes (intergroup anxiety) might be more susceptible to an EE intervention than positive processes (identification with Muslims). Investigating the influence of such (macro-level) contextual variables is in line with recent calls for a stronger consideration of "hidden moderators" as explanations for "failed" replications (e.g., Van Bavel et al., 2016), and should be addressed in future research.

A second aim of the present research was to investigate RWA's moderating role in the prejudice-reducing effects of EE, a variable that has, to our knowledge, received virtually no empirical attention in previous research on the effects of EE on prejudice. Our findings clearly confirm

³ We also explored potential mediators of these moderation effects in a series of moderated mediation analyses. Given that only two of these analyses yielded evidence of a moderated mediation, we refrained from interpreting these weak and inconsistent findings.

Table 3. Results from moderated regression analyses with RWA as moderator and attitudes toward Muslims (A), attitude difference score (B), semantic differential (C), and Modern Racism Scale (D) as criterion

Predictors	β	t	p	95% CI of β
(A) Attitudes toward Muslims as criterion				
Step 1				
C1	-.20	-2.95	.004	[-.33, -.07]
C2	.08	1.17	.243	[-.05, .21]
C3	-.08	-1.19	.234	[-.21, .05]
RWA	-.25	-3.68	<.001	[-.38, -.12]
C2 $\times$ RWA	-.16	-2.36	.019	[-.29, -.03]
C3 $\times$ RWA	.03	0.51	.610	[-.10, .17]
$R^2 = .15, F(6, 196) = 5.82, p < .001$				
Step 2				
C1 $\times$ RWA	-.21	-3.27	.001	[-.34, -.09]
$\Delta R^2 = .04, F(1, 195) = 10.69, p = .001$; overall $R^2 = .20, F(7, 195) = 6.76, p < .001$				
(B) Attitude difference score as criterion				
Step 1				
C1	.07	1.09	.278	[-.06, .20]
C2	.05	0.70	.484	[-.08, .17]
C3	-.03	-0.41	.684	[-.15, .10]
RWA	.40	6.17	<.001	[.27, .53]
C2 $\times$ RWA	.09	1.44	.152	[-.04, .22]
C3 $\times$ RWA	.05	0.75	.453	[-.08, .18]
$R^2 = .20, F(6, 196) = 8.13, p < .001$				
Step 2				
C1 $\times$ RWA	.15	2.32	.021	[.02, .28]
$\Delta R^2 = .02, F(1, 195) = 5.40, p = .021$; overall $R^2 = .22, F(7, 195) = 7.90, p < .001$				
(C) Semantic differential as criterion				
Step 1				
C1	-.21	-3.14	.002	[-.34, -.08]
C2	.07	1.04	.300	[-.06, .20]
C3	.02	0.25	.802	[-.11, .15]
RWA	-.29	-4.27	<.001	[-.42, -.15]
C2 $\times$ RWA	-.13	-1.89	.060	[-.26, .01]
C3 $\times$ RWA	-.01	-0.13	.894	[-.14, .12]
$R^2 = .16, F(6, 196) = 6.25, p < .001$				
Step 2				
C1 $\times$ RWA	-.17	-2.56	.011	[-.30, -.04]
$\Delta R^2 = .03, F(1, 195) = 6.57, p = .011$; overall $R^2 = .19, F(7, 195) = 6.45, p < .001$				
(D) Modern Racism Scale as criterion				
Step 1				
C1	.12	2.24	.026	[.02, .23]
C2	.05	0.87	.388	[-.06, .16]
C3	-.004	-0.07	.944	[-.11, .11]
RWA	.61	10.90	<.001	[.50, .72]
C2 $\times$ RWA	.09	1.55	.122	[-.02, .20]
C3 $\times$ RWA	-.02	-0.40	.687	[-.13, .09]
$R^2 = .41, F(6, 196) = 23.10, p < .001$				
Step 2				
C1 $\times$ RWA	.05	0.83	.409	[-.06, .16]
$\Delta R^2 = .002, F(1, 195) = 0.69, p = .409$; overall $R^2 = .42, F(7, 195) = 19.87, p < .001$

Figure 2. Attitudes toward Muslims (A), attitudes difference score (B), semantic differential (C), and Modern Racism Scale (D) as a function of entertainment education versus other conditions (C1: 1, 1, 1, -3) and levels of RWA (graphed at 1 SD below and above the mean). Coefficients are standardized regression weights. Criterion variables were z-standardized for ease of comparison. * $p < .05$; *** $p < .001$.

the assumption that EE works best among individuals higher in RWA. In fact, watching the short video reduced the prejudice levels of higher-RWA individuals to levels comparable to those of lower-RWA individuals. Whether this effect is due to the unique features of EE (e.g., its subtle, nonprescriptive, and highly absorbing nature; Slater & Rouner, 2002; Vaughan & Rogers, 2000) remains to be tested in future research. Still, it seems that EE can be more effective in reducing prejudice in high-RWA individuals than other well-established interventions. The present research thus offers important insights on how interventions might be tailored to the (groups of) people who are most prejudice-prone and adds to the growing body of research emphasizing the importance of audience characteristics when designing prejudice interventions (e.g., Halperin & Schori-Eyal, 2020; Mansoori-Rostam & Tate, 2017).

Electronic Supplementary Material

The electronic supplementary material is available with the online version of the article at <https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000432>

ESM 1. Information about the computation of the “Variability 1” measure as well as result reports of preliminary and additional analyses

References

- Abelson, R. P., & Prentice, D. A. (1997). Contrast tests of interaction hypothesis. *Psychological Methods*, 2(4), 315–328. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.2.4.315>
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice*. Addison-Wesley.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. University of Manitoba Press.

- Beierlein, C., Asbrock, F., Kauff, M., & Schmidt, P. (2014). *Die Kurzskala Autoritarismus (KSA-3): Ein ökonomisches Messinstrument zur Erfassung dreier Subdimensionen autoritärer Einstellungen* [Short Scale Authoritarianism (KSA-3): An economic scale to assess three subdimensions of authoritarian attitudes]. GESIS – Leibniz-Institut für Sozialwissenschaften. (GESIS-Working Papers, 2014/35).
- Brauer, M., & Er-rafiy, A. (2011). Increasing perceived variability reduces prejudice and discrimination. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 47(5), 871–881. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.03.003>
- Britt, T. W., Boniecki, K. A., Vescio, T. K., Biernat, M. R., & Brown, L. M. (1996). Intergroup anxiety: A Person $\times$ Situation approach. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 22(11), 1177–1188. <https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672962211008>
- Cohen, J. (2001). Defining identification: A theoretical look at the identification of audiences with media characters. *Mass Communication & Society*, 4(3), 245–264. https://doi.org/10.1207/S1532782MCS0403_01
- Cook, C. L., Li, Y. J., Newell, S. M., Cottrell, C. A., & Neel, R. (2018). The world is a scary place: Individual differences in belief in a dangerous world predict specific intergroup prejudices. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 21(4), 584–596. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430216670024>
- 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>
- Decker, O., Kiess, J., Schuler, J., Handke, B., & Brähler, E. (2018). Die Leipziger Autoritarismus-Studie 2018: Methode, Ergebnisse und Langzeitverlauf [The Leipzig authoritarianism study 2018: Method, results, and long-term course]. In O. Decker & E. Brähler (Eds.), *Flucht ins Autoritäre. Rechtsextreme Dynamiken in der Mitte der Gesellschaft. Leipziger Autoritarismus-Studie 2018* (pp. 65–116). Psychosozial.
- Dhont, K., & Van Hiel, A. (2009). We must not be enemies: Interracial contact and the reduction of prejudice among authoritarians. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 46(2), 172–177. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2008.09.022>
- Duckitt, J., & Sibley, C. G. (2007). Right wing authoritarianism, social dominance orientation and the dimensions of generalized prejudice. *European Journal of Personality*, 21(2), 113–130. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.614>
- Halperin, E., Russell, A. G., Trzesniewski, K. H., Gross, J. J., & Dweck, C. S. (2011). Promoting the Middle East peace process by changing beliefs about group malleability. *Science*, 333(6050), 1767–1769. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1202925>
- Halperin, E., & Schori-Eyal, N. (2020). Towards a new framework of personalized psychological interventions to improve intergroup relations and promote peace. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 14(5), 255–270. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12527>
- Husnu, S., & Crisp, R. J. (2010). Elaboration enhances the imagined contact effect. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(6), 943–950. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.05.014>
- Judd, C. M., Park, B., Ryan, C. S., Brauer, M., & Kraus, S. (1995). Stereotypes and ethnocentrism: Diverging interethnic perceptions of African American and White American youth. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(3), 460–481. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.69.3.460>
- Kauff, M., Asbrock, F., Thörner, S., & Wagner, U. (2013). Side effects of multiculturalism: The interaction effect of a multicultural ideology and authoritarianism on prejudice and diversity beliefs. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 39(3), 305–320. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167212473160>
- Mansoori-Rostam, S. M., & Tate, C. C. (2017). Peering into the “black box” of education interventions and attitude change: Audience characteristics moderate the effectiveness...and then only toward specific targets. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 157(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2016.1152211>
- Maunder, R. D., Day, S. C., & White, F. A. (2020). The benefit of contact for prejudice-prone individuals: The type of stigmatized outgroup matters. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 160(1), 92–104. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.2019.1601608>
- McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence, and the modern racism scale. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism* (pp. 91–125). Academic Press.
- Mohamed, B. (2018). *New estimates show U.S. Muslim population continues to grow*. Pew Research Center.
- Moyer-Gusé, E., Chung, A. H., & Jain, P. (2011). Identification with characters and discussion of taboo topics after exposure to an entertainment narrative about sexual health. *Journal of Communication*, 61(3), 387–406. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1460-2466.2011.01551.x>
- Murrar, S., & Brauer, M. (2018). Entertainment-education effectively reduces prejudice. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 21(7), 1053–1077. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430216682350>
- Murrar, S., & Brauer, M. (2019). Overcoming resistance to change: Using narratives to create more positive intergroup attitudes. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 28(2), 164–169. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0963721418818552>
- Paluck, E. L. (2009). Reducing intergroup prejudice and conflict using the media: A field experiment in Rwanda. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 96(3), 574–587. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0011989>
- Pappas-DeLuca, K. A., Kraft, J. M., Galavotti, C., Warner, L., Mooki, M., Hastings, P., Koppenhaver, T., Roels, T. H., & Kilmarx, P. H. (2008). Entertainment-education radio serial drama and outcomes related to HIV testing in Botswana. *AIDS Education & Prevention*, 20(6), 486–503. <https://doi.org/10.1521/aeap.2008.20.6.486>
- Pew Research Center. (2017). *Europe's growing Muslim population*. <https://www.pewforum.org/2017/11/29/europes-growing-muslim-population/>
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(4), 741–763. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.4.741>
- Sahgal, N., & Mohamed, B. (2019). *In the U.S. and Western Europe, people say they accept Muslims, but opinions are divided on Islam*. Pew Research Center.
- Schiappa, E., Gregg, P. B., & Hewes, D. E. (2006). Can one TV show make a difference? Will & Grace and the parasocial contact hypothesis. *Journal of Homosexuality*, 51(4), 15–37. https://doi.org/10.1300/J082v51n04_02
- Schmid, K., Ramiah, A. A., & Hewstone, M. (2014). Neighborhood ethnic diversity and trust: The role of intergroup contact and perceived threat. *Psychological Science*, 25(3), 665–674. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797613508956>
- Sibley, C. G., & Duckitt, J. (2008). Personality and prejudice: A meta-analysis and theoretical review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 12(3), 248–279. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868308319226>
- Simmons, J. P., Nelson, L. D., & Simonsohn, U. (2012). A 21 word solution. *Dialogue*, 26(2), 4–7. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2160588>

- Singhal, A., & Rogers, E. M. (1999). *Entertainment-education: A communication strategy for social change*. Erlbaum.
- Slater, M. D., & Rouner, D. (2002). Entertainment-education and elaboration likelihood: Understanding the processing of narrative persuasion. *Communication Theory*, 12(2), 173–191. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ct/12.2.173>
- Stathi, S., & Crisp, R. J. (2008). Imagining intergroup contact promotes projection to outgroups. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 44(4), 943–957. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2008.02.003>
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41(3), 157–175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1985.tb01134.x>
- Van Bavel, J. J., Mende-Siedlecki, P., Brady, W. J., & Reinero, D. A. (2016). Contextual sensitivity in scientific reproducibility. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 113(23), 6454–6459. <https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1521897113>
- Vaughan, P. W., & Rogers, E. M. (2000). A staged model of communication effects: Evidence from an entertainment-education radio soap opera in Tanzania. *Journal of Health Communication*, 5(3), 203–227. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730050131398>
- Wagner, U., Tachtsoglou, S., Kotzur, P. F., Friehs, M.-T., & Kemmesies, U. (2020). Proportion of foreigners negatively predicts the prevalence of xenophobic hate crimes within German districts. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 83(2), 195–205. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0190272519887719>

History

Received June 2, 2020

Revision received August 27, 2020

Accepted August 27, 2020

Published online November 18, 2020

Conflict of Interest

The authors declare that there are no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article. Authors also confirm that this article adheres to the ethical guidelines specified in the APA Code of Conduct as well as the authors' national ethics guidelines.

Authorship

The study was conducted by Lisa Neymeyer as part of her master's thesis under the joint supervision of Anette Rohmann and Birte Siem. Anette Rohmann developed the study concept, and Anette Rohmann and Birte Siem designed the research. Lisa Neymeyer collected the data. Birte Siem and Lisa Neymeyer analyzed the data, and all authors discussed the results. Birte Siem wrote the manuscript, which was revised by Anette Rohmann.

Open Data

Materials (including all measures and items), data, and the preregistration can be assessed under <https://osf.io/b2j5h/>. Unless noted otherwise, methods were adopted from MB, who generously provided all necessary information (see <https://osf.io/c25ms/>). Materials were translated from English into German.

ORCID

Birte Siem

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-4697-7856>

Birte Siem

Department of Psychology

FernUniversität in Hagen

Universitätsstraße 33

58084 Hagen

Germany

birte.siem@fernuni-hagen.de