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Abstract

The current research examines the relations between the Greek majority group and the Muslim minority group of Thrace and western Macedonia, regarding prejudiced attitudes, discriminatory behavior, use of stereotypes and manifestation of racism. In particular, the study examines how representations of racism, self-reported experiences of discrimination and the perception of prejudice either through media portrayal of minorities or individual cognitive processes influence the Muslim minority groups’ intents for avoidance and/or collective action, as well as its general perception of the outgroup.

For this purpose, this research conducted two separate studies: one aiming to monitor the beliefs of the majority group (Greeks) and one to monitor the beliefs of the minority group (Muslims) through distribution of questionnaires. Upon collecting the separate data, the researcher performed a comparative analysis and discussion of the results, in order to highlight how the perception of prejudice by both groups affects them in conjunction with one another.
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Prejudice, stereotypical perceptions and the concept of "Other" have been researched and practiced by social psychologists for many years. In an ever-evolving (technologically and ideologically) globalized world, the elements that may influence the attitudes of individuals and give birth to (or trigger) certain stereotypical constructs have multiplied and transformed.

Rooted in their perception of the separate ideologies between East and West, Greeks' views of the Muslim minority living and working in the country are still affected by prejudice and often ignorance. Thusly, while a general overview of historical contexts may provide an initial (though not exhaustive) idea of the reasons for the unequal treatment of the Muslim minority, a multi-factor interpretation effort is needed to reach any conclusions.

Therefore, it is crucial to study the perception of perceived prejudice: a prejudice based both on the view of the dominant cultural group and on the portrayal of minorities by that group's media.

The usefulness of this research will be to better consolidate the already rich literature concerning prejudiced behavior and its perception, while zooming in into the case of the Muslim minority residing in Greece and particularly in western Macedonia and Thrace. The researcher's hope is that findings of the present paper will contribute to social psychology's attempt to map the levers that trigger stereotypical perceptions in a geopolitical context such as Greece.

The present paper has three parts: The first two cover the theoretical base that will be utilized in explaining and analyzing the data in the third one. Part 1 covers theories of prejudice, discrimination, racism and stereotypes. Part 2 covers theories about media influence and provides information about the Muslim minority residing in Greece and specifically Thrace and western Macedonia. Finally, Part 3 contains the 2 studies that were conducted for this thesis, alongside their analysis and discussion of the results.

The study of prejudice, stereotyping, discrimination and generally intergroup bias represents a well-established field that encompasses traditional and emerging perspectives, utilizing both empirical and theoretical researches of many academics and scholars throughout the years. Studying the phenomenon of perceived prejudice, however, constitutes a relatively new field, and adds a new layer to the research of bias: do members of an ingroup and outgroup respectively believe that they
themselves are racist towards the other? And does that belief transform in any way their attitudes and behaviors towards the ingroup or outgroup?

Prejudice and its ties with ethnicity, nationality and language, has been previously discussed and assessed in many studies, yielding different results and definitions. One such large-scale study examined the relationship between national identification and anti-immigrant prejudice in a multilevel analysis from 37,030 individuals in 31 countries (Pehrson, Vignoles & Brown 2009). The correlation between national identification and prejudice was found to be significantly stronger in countries where people on average endorsed a definition of national belonging based on language, and weaker where people on average defined the nation in terms of citizenship. This and other studies demonstrate the fact that people often rely on language traits to judge others, and often go as far as to evaluate unfairly other personal or professional characteristics based on the language that a person speaks (or does not) (Lippi-Green 2004).

Regarding racism historically, the larger portion of studies concern themselves with attitudes and behaviors against the black minorities that reside in the U.S.A., proving, in general, that white people tended to associate black people with negative stereotypes (such as associating them with slavery and/or working in fields) (LeVine & Campbell, 1972, Plous & Williams, 1995). These negatively valenced attitudes, of course, subsided a great deal after the 1930s and moving forward (Devine & Elliot, 1995, Smedley & Bayton, 1978). Nowadays, color of skin still proves to be a trait that sparks prejudice and discrimination, driving groups to disparity, strife, and conflict.

Concerning the “phenomenology” of prejudice and discrimination (Dion 2002) – the perception of prejudice – there have been substantially fewer studies, and most of them focus on the “genesis” of prejudice in children and its later resurgence in adults. One of the oldest studies by Werner & Evans (1968) held structured doll-play interviews with 40 Mexican American children aged 4 and 5 years old in order to explore whether skin discrimination and evaluation occur simultaneously. The children tended to group the dolls by sex and size before grouping them by skin color: evaluation based on skin color occurred at the same time the discrimination was made, “good” dolls being white and “bad” dolls dark.

Most of the studies on perceived prejudice focus on how media portrayal affects the self-perception of the targeted groups and not the strategies that said group employs (if any) in order to restore the view of its negative identity (Abrams & Giles, 2007; Banjo, 2013). Fujioka (2005), however, in a study about Black media images as a perceived threat to African American ethnic identity found out that awareness of media’s tendency to negatively represent African Americans was positively associated with endorsement of affirmative action.
Concerning research examining the media concern about racial threats, it began in the 1960s and 1970s. Harman and Husband (1973) have analyzed the national press between 1963 and 1970 and found that race relations coverage tended to focus on signs of racial conflict while giving very little attention to the access of black people to housing, education and employment. “Research into the media’s treatment of race over the years has suggested that its reporting has been limited in its themes and negative in its content” (Saeed, 2007).

Nowadays, approaches to understanding the concept of prejudice and stereotyping have significantly broadened (Dovidio, Hewstone, Glick & Esses, 2010). While early theorists focused on individual differences and associated prejudice with psychopathology, after the “cognitive revolution” in psychology in the 1970s and 1980s, cognitive processes and their affiliation with prejudice soon claimed the interest of many social psychologists. At the same time, European researchers began their study on how group processes and social identities affect bias. This analysis of prejudice has carried on in recent years, integrating the impact of fundamental neural processes (the non-conscious mind) and the significance of emotions in evoking sentiments of discrimination and/or racism. Naturally, this research broadened even further, seeking to explain how social structure creates and justifies biases: a shifting from the narrow focus on individuals experiencing prejudice to how institutional policies and cultural processes perpetuate disparities between groups and peoples (Dovidio, Hewstone, Glick & Esses, 2010).
1.1 Prejudice

Prejudice has oftentimes been described as the root of human conflict, a preconceived opinion that leads people to assume extreme attitudes and fuels confrontations. As such, it is similar but different from racism and discrimination, with all three being associated with social identity, intergroup relations and conflict. Most often, prejudice has been conceptualized as an attitude, possessing a cognitive, an affective, and a conative component. While psychologists focus on prejudice as an intrapsychic process (an individual exhibition of attitude), sociologists tend to emphasize on group-based functions (Blauner, 1972). Both recognize, however, that formed collective identities affect intergroup relations, where group competition is key to the development and perpetuation of social
biases (Bobo, 1999).

Throughout the years, various social psychologists have registered their own variation for the definition of prejudice: Again, for Allport, ethnic prejudice is a sentiment of antipathy based on a wrong and rigid generalization – it can be subtle or blatant, and it can be addressed towards a group or a single person, for the sole reason that this person belongs to said group (1954: 10). This is the general definition also given by Worchel, Cooper, & Goethals (1988: 449): An unexplainable negative attitude towards a person, based solely on this person's quality as a member of a specific group. Prejudice has also been described as adapting depreciating and reductive social attitudes or cognitive convictions, expressing negative sentiments or biased behavior towards members of a group, because they belong to said group (Brown 1995: 8).

For Eagly and Diekman (2005), prejudice possesses a more dynamic nature: it is a mechanism that maintains status and role differences between groups, with people having positive reactions for those who reinforce the status quo with their behavior and negative reactions for those who defy or transgress it. This, of course, ties in with the importance that members attribute to the image of their own group identity, as it reflects their own individual identity and personal achievement (or lack thereof).

Social psychologists suggest three main reasons that lead people to assume prejudiced attitudes: the first (and most criticized in its methodology) (Altemeyer 1981) correlates prejudice with human character, suggesting that some people are more susceptible to forming prejudiced opinions than others. The base for the second one suggests that competitiveness for the ownership of the de facto limited resources fuels ethnocentrism and intergroup favoritism (Chryssochoou 2011: 123) – this corresponds to prejudice as a means for enhancing self-esteem (Fein & Spencer, 1997) and a means to acquire material advantages (Sherif and Sherif, 1969). Finally, the third approach presents an explanation at a cognitive level, reasoning that sentiments of ethnocentrism and intergroup favoritism will indubitably surface when two (or more) distinct groups are present (this suggestion stems from the research of Tajifel and his theory of “Social Identity”, which will be discussed later on).

Of course, wherever and whenever two different groups in a society co-exist (one majority and one minority group), it goes without saying that prejudice can be harbored by both groups, not just the majority one: oftentimes, the minority group will “shield” itself from anticipatory forms of prejudice by assuming reactive prejudiced attitudes and exhibiting prejudiced behaviors themselves (targeting the majority group) (Johnson & Lecci, 2003; Monteith & Spicer, 2000). This phenomenon is more salient when the majority group is clearly advantaged and the minority one suffers from a disadvantaged position.
Analyzing the various definitions, we can deduce that prejudice has a dynamic nature: it is both a negative sentiment/conviction and a biased action towards a person for the sole reason that they belong to a specific group of people. In turn, prejudice can lead to discrimination (treating people with a different and/or unfair manner because they belong to a group), which can finally lead to intergroup conflict. Conflict then breeds stereotypes, which fuel prejudice and begin the cycle anew.

**Emotions and prejudice**

Whilst most social psychologists tend to reach the general consensus that prejudice is a largely negative evaluation of a person or group, there is little research on how different action tendencies in inter-group context manifest in a plethora of various negative reactions towards the out-group (Mackie, Devos & Smith, 2000). For example, what cognitive processes dictates that one out-group should be the target of anger, while another the target of pity or contempt? Emotional theorists argue that personal emotions (complex reactions to specific situations or events) are triggered by appraisals of whether an individual or a group and their corresponding actions could prove to be harmful or beneficial towards the perseverance or goals of another individual or group. In other words, if an individual decides (through cognition or interpretation) that another individual could in any way limit their own pool of resources or hamper their personal goals, they then exhibit and project personal feelings (such as anger) towards them, which in turn may fuel prejudiced behavior.

This occurrence becomes more apparent when we take into consideration that, according to “self-categorization theory” (Allport, 1954), when social identity is salient, group members tend to relinquish their unique personality traits and perceive themselves as exemplars of the group. This of course tends to lead those “exemplars” to assume vastly extreme attitudes and exhibit hostile feelings towards outgroups in order to protect and/or maintain their ingroup’s resources, validity and overall status quo.

According to emotional theorists, emotional reactions hold equal significance in instilling a sense of prejudice as cognitive beliefs do (Talaska, Fiske & Chaiken, 2008), with emotions proving to be predictors of discrimination through their intrinsic value of automatic evaluation (Zajonc, 1980). Automatic evaluation assuming here the role of an automatic process that operates outside of an individual’s awareness and without conscious intent (Payne, 2001). Once set in motion, such a process cannot be interrupted and operates in a timely fashion, without competing with any other
As social psychologist Zajonc explains: “emotion is the motor for behavior” (1988), meaning that emotions precipitate evaluations, oftentimes bypassing cognition altogether.

Mandler (1992) believes that emotions evolved in order to direct behavior (even before cognition came into play), and with him agree a great deal of emotional theorists, arguing that emotion and behavior are part of a single unit (Frijda, 1998): emotions triggering immediate responses and thus behaviors having priority over the slow cognitive evaluation. This translates in a person exhibiting a behavior based on emotions (such as anger and contempt) before having time to properly assess the situation and rationalizing, thus prompting prejudice and discrimination based proactively on preliminary feelings towards a person or group.

Therefore, we considered it paramount that our research included “emotion variables” in its questionnaires, taking into consideration both emotional and cognitive factors regarding prejudiced attitudes.

**The reason behind prejudice**

Prejudice is not an attitude assumed solely by a certain group or a phenomenon that occurred during specific times: it transgresses geographical and historical boundaries – nonetheless, it is most often directed towards very specific groups that prove to be victims of intense social categorization. According to many researches, the most common groups that fall victim to such rigid categorization are those based on age, sex, and race (Mackie, Hamilton, Susskind & Rosselli, 1996).

At the beginning of the 20th century, it was widely acknowledged that prejudice was an instinctive reaction to certain categories of people (e.g. certain races), much like animals would react to other animals (Klineberg, 1940). Nowadays, of course, this theory is considered outdated and scientifically unsound, but it did suggest a fundamental “component” for prejudice: an innate fear for the unknown and unnatural, shared by many mammals, which could then be regarded as a basis for more complex negative reactions (attitudes and behaviors) aimed at groups that are perceived different in any way or form (Hebb & Thompson, 1968).

On the other hand, according to the “mere exposure phenomenon” (Zajonc, 1968), people tend to change their behaviors from negative to less negative if exposed multiple times and for a great duration to the same stimulus (e.g. other people), given that their preliminary reaction to said stimulus was not negative (Perlman & Oskamp, 1971). This leads individuals to flock among others.
that were positive towards them from the get go (and only increasing their affection in regards to higher exposure), but also arms them with general feelings of antipathy and/or disdain if the preliminary impression of the stimulus was negative (which, in turn, only increases the negative attitudes that they assume).

Another theoretical approach suggests that forms of prejudice can be taught. Indeed, Tajfel (1981) argues that hatred and suspicion against certain groups can be taught relatively soon, even before a child obtains any knowledge regarding the target group, which in turn provides an emotional basis that filters any subsequent information or attempts in communication with said group (Durkin 1995; Milner 1996). Nurture and education can play a vital role in this “passing of the torch” of prejudiced attitudes: indeed, children are prone to assume prejudiced behavior through parental standardization (mimicking their parents’ attitudes and therefore behavior), effective learning (the encouragement of discriminatory behavior and the discouragement of non-prejudiced approaches) and the classic dependent learning (negative feedback when exhibiting behavior that does not correspond with the parental approach). When we take into consideration that children who are being taught to exhibit prejudiced behavior from a young age towards a certain group co-exist with this group in the same society, it is clear that they will struggle to maintain and balance their own beliefs with those instilled and bred into them, resulting in a perpetuation of standardized prejudiced behavior and stereotypes.

**Prejudice and violence**

Despite the various definitions and attributes that prejudice possesses, this attitudinal reaction can be analyzed both as an interdisciplinary behavior based on the socio-psychological processes that are employed during the categorization of people into groups, and, as a mass expression of aggression towards certain people. Aggression and acts of violence walk often hand in hand with prejudice, discrimination and racism, thus a brief review of some theories that explain violent behavior linked with prejudice is considered a mandate.

One such theory correlates prejudiced behavior and violent outbursts against specific groups (outgroups) with the sudden and forced cancellation of a group’s goals (ingroup), which subsequently leads to aggression and finally to seeking available targets to receive said aggression (scapegoats) (Dollard, 1939). This theory was first introduced after the rise of antisemitism in Europe and specifically Germany, as a possible explanation for the war atrocities and the rise of extreme right parties. In more detail, this theory explains that people seek psychological catharsis
by completing personal tasks and goals, with the abrupt cancellation of those leading to frustration and then aggression, “a psychological imbalance” that can be set right with the use of force. And because the real culprit behind this cancellation may be, in fact, too strong or abstract for the target to handle or confront (such as bureaucracy), he/she seeks others to vent his/her frustration – the scapegoats, often completely irrelevant with the real source of the crisis. Although this theory found some application and support (Hovland & Sears, 1940), there were many criticisms about the focused frustration being broader in scope (Miller & Bugelski, 1948), the presence of aggression in spite the absence of frustration (Bandura, 1973) and the absence of personal interaction as a huge factor in determining theories about prejudice and discrimination (which were deemed irrelevant) (Billig, 1976).

While Dollard argued that anyone could eventually become aggressive and address prejudice towards other groups (by being frustrated of incomplete goals), Adorno and his team of researches (1950) supported that only people with predisposed prejudiced attitudes and violent tendencies could perform such atrocities and acts of violence. This span their theory of the “authoritarian personality”, wherein they described a person that exhibits intolerance and prejudice against all minorities. Such a personality would usually show a strong compliance with power and authority, an obsession with status and hierarchical structures, a tendency to shift and focus their anger and malaise to other, “weaker” people, an absence of tolerance in ambiguity and uncertainty, a drive for a strictly organized environment and problems in achieving intimacy. Adorno and his team argued that such a personality developed in a person’s early years, supplementing its various tendencies by their parents’ authoritarian practices – in a way, the child of a suppressive parent would compress his/her guilt, fear and anger whilst idolizing the parent figure and seeking a meeker target for his/her inevitable outburst. This theory tied in with the general belief that prejudice had strong affiliations with nurture and sparked strong interest among other researchers (Bray & Noble, 1978; Titus & Hollander, 1957). Of course, there is a great deal of criticisms regarding a theory for prejudiced attitudes based on personality (Pettigrew, 1958; Brown, 1995; Hogg & Abrams, 1988). Simply put, Adorno’s argument that prejudice was established during childhood as a personality trait failed to explain the radical and dramatic changes of heart that the same people felt for the same groups in a span of ten or fifteen years (e.g. the rise and fall of antisemitism in Germany).

Another personality-based theory for prejudice was given by Rokeach (1948, 1960), who suggested the personality trait of “dogmatism or mental stiffness” as a lever that enabled such behaviors. A dogmatic person, according to Rokeach, would strongly separate contradictory systems of belief, would resist to change his/her opinions when new information was presented and would invoke authoritarian figures in order to validate, explain and defend his/her convictions. In a sense, this
theory shares many similarities (and criticisms) with that of Adorno’s, while broadening the definition to a more flexible and encompassing term.

Rokeach also developed another theory that dealt with prejudice (1960), wherein he described that social beliefs are a more decisive factor in social discrimination than social segregation and group belonging – prejudice and antipathy is cultivated when people don’t agree on ideas and beliefs, and not just by people belonging to different groups. This theory stemmed from the basis that common beliefs and opinions among the members of a society tends to strengthen their bonds, pull them together and overall urge them to assume positive attitudes – at the same time, a disparity between social beliefs would invoke feelings of antipathy and prejudice. However, many researchers found that beliefs do not yield greater stimuli for prejudiced behavior than the simple fact that people belong to different cultural/ethnic/racial groups (Hendrick, Bixenstine & Hawkins, 1971; Byrne & Wong, 1962).

Ideology plays a significant role in prejudiced behavior according to Sidanius, Pratto and their team of researches (1999), who proposed the “social dominance theory”. In it, it is described that social hierarchies that produce economic surplus divide and organize people into different groups (a hegemonic group at the top and negative reference groups at the bottom, with people stratified according to age, sex, race and so on). The acceptance or refusal of the social ideologies that legitimize those social hierarchies decide the level of discrimination that a given group exhibits. In other words, people who discard the theory of equality and social justice and embrace myths that canonize authoritarian dominance tend to be more prejudiced than those who lack such beliefs.

On the same page, Altemeyer (1981) considered ideology a significant factor in determining prejudiced behavior in a society. He proposed that the authoritarianism of the right-wing parties was an attitudinal aggregation of compatibility (adherence to social norms that are perpetuated by authorities), aggressiveness and submission: the more an individual would prescribe to these prescripts, the more he/she would develop prejudiced tendencies.

Prejudice and violent tendencies are closely related, with many researches and academics seeking to explain both attitude and behavior throughout the years of historic and social turmoil. While they are indeed correlated, it is integral to examine prejudice not only from its mass culmination of collected behaviors (that “explodes” in violence), but also as an interpersonal mechanism between individuals and groups within a society.
Prejudice and its consequences

While discrimination may have more potent and severe effects on members of a minority group, prejudice, nonetheless, assists in laying the path to processes that are bound to escalate negatively. Stigma is the characteristic of a group that leads other people to evaluate it in a negative way, with stigmatized people often unable to escape this “imposed imprisonment” and left to suffer the consequences (Crocker, Major & Steele, 1998). Stigmatized groups hold a disadvantaged position and status quo in a society, which in turn leads to a lower self-concept and self-evaluation. This is partly because of the stereotypical assault phenomenon (Steel, Spencer & Aronson, 1995), which holds that members of a disadvantaged group are prepared to be evaluated and judged based on the negative stereotypes concerning their group. Even when receiving positive feedback and behavior, they tend to question whether they were favored because of their subscription to a disadvantaged group (ambiguity in perceiving behavior).

Another factor that lowers the self-perception of minority groups is the phenomenon of self-fulfilled prophecies, which states that stereotypes can create a tangible reality that evidently confirms the stereotype from which it came from (Jussim, Eccles & Madon, 1996). Put differently, members of a stereotyped group believe to such an extent these stereotypes about them, that when given an opportunity to confirm them they do without cognitive assessment.

Perceiving prejudice

While prejudice and its multiple consequences have been researched a great deal, it is usually a study in why and if the individual or group experiences prejudice, and not what it believes of it or whether it believes that the ingroup or outgroup is in fact racist or entitled to its opinion. Being able to acknowledge and pinpoint prejudiced behavior aimed at an individual in conjunction with that individual’s perspective of his own group’s prejudiced predispositions may, in fact, help buffer and protect certain aspects of the self-concept of a specific group (Dion, 2002). On the other hand, Dion highlights that perceived prejudice can also be a goad to protest, agitation and militancy for social change by the receivers of intolerance.

Dion describes that one of the main dilemmas that members of a minority group encounter when facing a negative experience is the attribution viewpoint: since prejudice and discrimination are ambiguous and hard to identify, they find themselves wondering whether this experience stems
from their own lack of abilities/resources/capabilities, or from genuine prejudice on the part of those who they are interacting with. Evidently, when they attribute the negative experience to prejudiced behavior, Dion suggests that they buffer, mitigate and/or protect certain aspects of the self-concept – which contradicts previous studies on the same matter that correlate perceived prejudice with negative effects on the self-esteem (Karon, 1975). Those previous studies suggest that upon having a negative experience and attributing it to prejudiced behavior, the receiver accepts, confirms and surrenders in a way to the negative stereotypes surrounding his/her group. Contrariwise, Dion explains that upon attributing the experience to prejudice, the receiver empowers and strengthens his/her rightful convictions, as he/she denies the stereotypes surrounding his/her group. Of course, Dion underlines that this buffering effect on self-esteem varies and does not appear in every group.

This does not mean, of course, that perceiving and identifying prejudice is without downsides. Dion addresses the perception of prejudiced behavior as a potential uncontrollable psychological stressor, as it elicits cognitive appraisals of threat, with the perceivers understanding that they are the target of negative attitudes and behaviors. This is also connected with the “race-based rejection sensitivity”, which suggest that stigmatized minority groups that perceive prejudice experience negative mental and physical effects (underperformance, depression, stress) because the believe that they are rejected and/or mishandled purely on account of their group membership (Mendoza-Denton et al., 2002).

Simultaneously, however, upon perceiving prejudice, the receivers of said behavior heighten identification with their own group (Dion, 1973, 2000), which in turn strengthens the groups cohesion and sense of support and belonging and reduces stress. So, in a way, perceived prejudice, in some cases, not only produces psychological consequences derived from stress (anxiety, frustration, low self-esteem, aversion, negative affect), but also combats these very effects with ingroup support and bonding. This enhanced identification with the group may be the reason that respondents of perceived prejudice report considerably more group than personal discrimination, as described in the “personal/group discrimination discrepancy” (Crosby, 1982).

While studies show that perceiving ethnic discrimination did lead to higher exhibition of the stressful consequences, Hannah (1974) argues that discrimination against any arbitrary trait or characteristic can lead to stress and negative feelings.

Upon facing this negative impact, in the form of stress, anxiety and agitation, people who perceive prejudice need to employ something in order to alleviate some of the consequences – to buffer and to protect the self-concept against the negative effects. It is here that the personality trait of “hardiness” comes into play: “a sense of personal efficiency and control over one’s environment
which is associated with greater resilience in the face of stressors” (Dion, 2002). This personality composite, then, acts as a moderator between said stressful events and mental/physical illness, with “hardy” people being able to withstand the severe negative impact of such events while keeping an optimistic and determined outlook on life (Kobasa, 1979). This personality trait may be one of the “tools” that minority groups possess and employ when dealing with prejudiced majority groups in a regular fashion (while, at the same time, aggregating together and bolstering their social identity as a unique minority group).

When faced with deprivation, disadvantage, oppression and overall negativity, members of a minority group seldom seek redress or a call to arms – this, according to Dion, poses an interesting paradox, which can be explained by introducing two conceptual frameworks in order to determine when and why oppressed groups become militant or resort to active violence in order to achieve social change.

The “relative deprivation theory” suggests that an individual or group will always compare their situation to that of another individual or group, feeling less deprived if the situation is mutual and more deprived if they suffer alone. This means that one’s beliefs about the social and economic status quo are not absolute but always relevant to that of others. Theorists of the model propose four “classes” (two concerning comparison and two concerning affection and cognition) of relative deprivation: the egoistic deprivation (that occurs whenever an individual/group feels more deprived in comparison with other members of their group), the fraternalistic deprivation (that occurs when an ingroup perceives itself to be in a more disadvantaged position that the outgroup), the cognitive deprivation (which is affiliated with the perception of inequality) and the affective deprivation (which is correlated with the resentment and remorse over said inequalities) (Dion, 2002). Dion found out that the affective fraternalistic deprivation seems as a more likely predictor for militancy and protest reactions.

On the other hand, the second conceptual framework, “discrimination theory”, is an empirical generalization that stems from a plethora of studies, which finds no correlation between perceived prejudice and relevant deprivation, stating that perceived discrimination is powerful enough a predictor for exhibitions of violent behavior and militancy.

In conclusion, perceived prejudice may buffer and/or protect the self-image and boost the self-esteem of an individual if that individual has a clear-cut positive image of their group, it may act as a stressor that can be combated by “hardiness” of personality and it may predict tendencies of corrective social actions or militancy (McCoy & Major, 2003).
1.2 Discrimination

Whilst many social psychologists choose to use the terms prejudice and discrimination interchangeably, it is integral that we disentangle the terms (alongside the term “stereotypes”) and provide a comprehensive definition to each. As we discussed, prejudice refers to unjustifiable attitudes (be it positive or negative) towards an individual or group – discrimination, on the other hand, refers to unjustifiable behavior addressed to an individual or group (Al Ramiah, Hewstone, Dovidio, & Penner, 2010). According to another definition by Correll et. al. (2010), discrimination is a behavior directed towards specific members of a group for the sole reason that they belong to said group. It is the factor of deservingness – the notion whether an individual “deserves” to be discriminated against – that sparks controversy and confrontation, as it is not an objective reality rooted in a historic truth.

Much like racism, discrimination can be manifested overtly or blatantly and subtly, unconsciously or automatically. It can be expressed in many ways: from verbal and non-verbal violence (Word, 1974), to avoidance of contact (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) to aggression (Cuddy et. al., 2007) and unequal treatment. Throughout the years, there have surfaced many different theories about discrimination and its ties with social identity, prejudice and stereotyping.

The social identity theoretical framework, by Tajifel and Turner (1979), proposes that members of a group are motivated to bolster and enhance their self-concept and subsequently uphold a positive social identity. Different scenarios highlight different aspects of an individual’s social identity and force them to make certain attributes of their group salient. Upon doing so, they inevitably “choose” a role to play and identify as in this specific scenario – this drive for positive priming of social identity can lead to discrimination, which manifests either by eliciting negative behavior towards the outgroup or positive treatment to the ingroup (ingroup bias).

The Behaviors from Intergroup Affect and Stereotypes (BIAS) is an extensive form of the Stereotype Content Model by Fiske et. al. (2002) and holds that “relative status and competitiveness of groups determine the stereotype content of competence attributed to the outgroup” (Al Ramiah, Hewstone, Dovidio, & Penner, 2010). The combination of warmth and competence attributes that group stereotypes contain predicts affect towards an outgroup, which in turn predicts actions and behaviors.

Complementing the social identity and the BIAS theoretical frameworks, the aversive racism theory
by Dovidio and Gaertner (2004) helps identify when discrimination will be manifested and explains the internal conflict that arises when an individual struggles to balance their discriminatory behavior with attempts to appear as not prejudiced against minorities. This inner conflict erupts because social norms increasingly brand prejudiced and discriminatory behavior against stigmatized groups as unethical, immoral and outright wrong (Crandall et. al., 2002), while at the same time, a multitude of social factors rooted in social bias reinforce and perpetuate discrimination, resulting in a continuous attempt for individuals to suppress their own biases. Whenever such a clash takes place, an individual will not discriminate when right and wrong are clearly defined and identified, as they would not like to appear as racists to others and to themselves but will continue to systematically and automatically discriminate when appropriate behaviors are unclear.

Finally, the system justification theory explains that ingroup bias manifests through the belief that “low status groups abiding in an environment that perpetuates inequality internalize a sense of personal or collective inferiority” (Jost, 2001). In the same vein, high-status groups tend to believe that their privileged position is a reward for their worthiness (group justification), whereas low-status groups believe that their disadvantaged position is a deserved punishment for their unworthiness, which calls for retributory actions (Jost & Banaji, 1994). In this fashion, the system justification theory explains how discrimination filtered through social identity is not only perpetuated, but also tolerated.

Forms of discrimination

Discrimination can be manifested through many ways, most of which are not raw exhibitions of negative evaluation but subtle processes that indicate prejudiced predispositions.

Reluctance to offer help to a disadvantaged group, by active or passive abstention from bolstering their collective efforts ensures, in a way, that these groups will retain their non privileged position. This strategy can be employed not only by individual people but whole societies, if they seem reluctant to accept and reform parts of their structure and form (Hogg & Vaughan, 1995). This reluctance to offer help may be the result of racial stress and antipathy and manifests mainly when it can be attributed to any other reason but prejudice. Consequently, the more other people are present when an individual belonging to a disadvantaged group requires assistance, the more these people will exhibit reluctance to offer their help (leaving others to perform their duty) (Gaertner & Dovidio, 1977).

Tokenism is a pre-emptive concession practice, which translates to a minor positive act (a token
gesture of good will) offered to members of a minority group, in order to later on use this act as justification of possible prejudiced behavior or justification of refusal to offer greater and more substantial help to these very groups. Various studies (Dutton & Lake, 1973; Rosenfield, Greenberg, Folger & Borys, 1982) highlight that when White respondents offered a small favor to disadvantaged members of the Black community (such as offering money to a beggar), they would later on not only be extremely reluctant to offer more help but also use this act to prime themselves as non-prejudiced. Tokenism can be used by governmental organizations, resulting in damaging effects on the self-perception of minority groups (Chacko, 1982).

A more subtle form of tokenism, which in a short term may yield some beneficial effects (bolstering of self-esteem) to members of a minority group, is reverse discrimination. This approach entails a conscious effort on behalf of people who have residual prejudiced attitudes towards a group to nonetheless favor certain members inside of this group – this way, they can protect and justify their self-concept as non-prejudiced while at the same time masking true convictions or tendencies of prejudice (Carver, Glass & Katz, 1997). As mentioned above, while there may be some preliminary beneficial effects on certain members of a minority group (who receive a temporary boost of confidence), in the long term, reverse discrimination may have long lasting damaging effects on the group as a whole (Fajardo, 1985).

The measures and extends of discrimination

Measuring discrimination revolves around self-report instances where an individual describes his attitudes and behaviors towards a specific other, which means that when called to consciously map their actions addressing another individual or group, respondents tend to temper and “water down” their prejudiced responses (socially desirable responding). However, since bias is not always conscious and intentional but oftentimes manifests through automatic processes, many researchers have overcome the socially desirable responding and found that, despite people’s best intentions, their ethically based cognitions and association may persist (Crosby et. al., 1980).

Most often than not, the consequences of discrimination are long-lasting, cumulative and pervasive (Al Ramiah, Hewstone, Dovidio, & Penner, 2010). First and foremost, discrimination leads to segregation, with groups enclosed inside encapsulated enclaves (ghettos) (Peach, 1996) and set to deny any form of further integration. This, of course, can have cumulative negative effects on the group, which in time will be stranded and excluded in many aspects of everyday life (education, health care, employment). This cumulative disadvantage only gets more severe when considering
people who prescribe to multiple disadvantaged groups (e.g. African American woman with mental disabilities) (Crisp & Hewstone, 1999). Overall performance, as well as mental and physical health is in risk of taking damage to those who experience prolonged discriminatory behavior, with stress, anxiety, frustration, and symptoms of depression and victimization surfacing and piling up (Waldo, 1999; Pascoe & Richman, 2009). Steele and Aronson (1995) argue that these negative effects are amplified if an individual fears that he/she will be evaluated on the basis of the negative stereotypes regarding his/her group. To combat these negative effects, Major (1988) believes that an individual responds by actively withdrawing their efforts and disengaging from situations where they are stereotyped in a negative way. On the other hand, Biernat and Kobrynowicz (1997) suggest that members of a disadvantaged group may need to overperform in order to be considered “better” and more potent than members of an advantaged group.

Clearly, prejudice and discrimination are linked together (prejudice as a root of discrimination), although the relationship between implicit and explicit measures and discriminatory behavior was found, in many instances, to be modest. This is explained if we consider the plethora of other variables that may influence an individual’s perception of discrimination, such as a norm of equal opportunity and an a more economical oriented approach to human communication.

**The social identity model**

Seeking to better understand the roots of discriminatory behavior and ethnocentrism, Tajifel (1974) theorized that inclusion in a social group and perception of self were the two core elements required in order for prejudice to manifest. Social identity theory explains that every society consists of social categories with different levels of power and authority, and that those categories are defined by economic and historic factors. Individual identity, then, stems largely from the social categories that every person is subscribed to, retaining, however, its unique traits. Tajifel proposes the existence of two different identities, an individual (personal) one and a social one, with people having both. When social identity is salient, people tend to exhibit behaviors with a less personal connotation – they perceive themselves as parts of a collective, and they behave as one.

Intergroup behavior, according to the social identity model, is defined by the process of social categorization and the social comparison.

Social categorization is two-fold: first, an individual processes through cognition his/her environment, and orients himself/herself using self-defined terms and definitions conjured for
simplifying the information that he/she receives. Then, the individual divides into categories the people within his/her society, seeking to bolster and enhance his/her own groups’ self-perception. Social comparison adds to social categorization the element of constant comparison: people tend to compare themselves on every level in order to better understand their goals, to confirm their beliefs and, to analyze their environment and to boost their self-esteem. It is the tool with which people can pinpoint reference points so as to better define their perceived reality.

1.3 Stereotypes

For some social psychologists, a stereotype is the cognitive component of prejudiced attitudes (Harding, Proshansky, Kutner & Chein, 1969; Secord & Backman, 1974) – other theorists argue that stereotypes function individually for every person, providing a rational explanation for his/her prejudiced opinions towards a group (LaViolette & Silvert, 1951; Saenger, 1953). It was Lippman (1992), however, that borrowed the word “stereotype” from the vocabulary of typography and introduced it to the world of social psychology. In typography, the term is used to describe the printing of many identical copies of an original (Chryssochoou, 2011), and originated from the Greek words “στερεό” (solid) and “τύπος” (press/printing). According to Lippman (1922), stereotypes are “fixed, identical images in a man’s mind”. For him, these hardy cognitive images created a twisted and misshaped view of reality and its domains, an approach that was later tied with prejudice and discrimination and their way of perceiving reality.

In social psychology, stereotypes are often considered a result of limited cognitive abilities when processing information, much alike a flawed calculation or bias. Fiske & Neuberg (1990), for example, explain that attributing stereotypes to immigrants and refugees is a result of human inability to properly assess and process vast amounts of personal information regarding those individuals. Some scholars, however, firmly believe that in stereotypes, there resides a kernel of truth (Triandis & Vassiliou, 1967). Others, again, view stereotypes as a way to perceive and understand certain aspects of reality, with people creating and perpetuating a collective new domain of subjective truth in order to achieve their own personal goals and bolster their self-perception and self-improvement (Tajfel, 1981). By contrasting an ingroup’s positive stereotypes with an outgroup’s negative ones, members of the first group reward themselves for their subscription to their group which leads to appeasement and thusly higher self-esteem. Aside from gaining positive evaluation, however, stereotypes may be manifested in order to justify the existing social relationships within a multicultural society (Leyens, Yzerbyt & Schandron, 1994). This translates to
people using stereotypes as a means to canonize, normalize and legitimize the unequal treatment of certain groups within a society.

In time, research moved from the definition of stereotypes to the way they are manifested, formed and transformed, as well as to their impact on those who use, receive and perceive them.

Regarding the manifestation of stereotypical process, Hamilton and Gifford (1976) argue that it is closely linked with cognitive processing of information and the “heuristic principles”, a set of cognitive techniques employed to quickly assess and identify loads of information. Sherif (1966), Tajfel and Wilkes (1963) have linked stereotypes with social categorization, proposing that they are products of a group that interacts with another group and aspires to create intergroup relations and behaviors. According to the self-categorization theory (Turner et. al., 1987; Oakes, Haslam, & Turner, 1994; McGarty, 1999), social categories are defined on the basis of perceived similarities and differences between individuals and groups within a society. In other words, when people identify as members of a specific group, they perceive themselves as its exemplars and accept any stereotypes associated with this group – in turn, upon interacting with members of other groups, they will perpetuate stereotypes that view in a positive way their ingroup but also perpetuate stereotypes that view in a negative way other groups. Of course, subscribing to a social category is not only a matter of identifying similarities (Murphy & Medin, 1985), with many social psychologists arguing that social categorization is the result and not the reason of stereotypic behavior. In addition, group stereotypes may be activated outside of awareness and may influence behavior without the knowledge or intent of the perceiver (Devine, 1989; Witterbrink, Judd & Park, 1997).

Tajfel (1981) supported that stereotypes perform four distinct actions: they help people to understand and better adjust to their social environment, they help people to protect and to safeguard their personal value, they create and perpetuate ideologies of groups, which are then used to explain and justify certain actions and finally they create and perpetuate positively evaluated differences. According to this definition, stereotypes are a tool that is utilized by a specific group within certain socioeconomic frames in order to achieve and expand its goals and aspirations, irrelevant and regardless of another groups’ well-being.

Spears (2002) proposed another four basic rules concerning the manifestation of stereotypes: in order to create stereotypes, people use knowledge related to certain social interactions, then, to the extend that oneself is involved, they use stereotypes to clearly define the boundaries and fields of action of every social group, which leads to multiple efforts to view and present their own social group as better that the others. As the fourth rule, Spears highlights the various processes and
domains that may influence stereotypes and intergroup communications within a specific society that abides in a certain geographical location on a specific era.

Concerning the process of identifying with a group through stereotypic association, Molina, Phillips & Sidanius (2015) suggest that perceived group respect and perceived group discriminations act as predictors of ethnic and national identification. Group respect describes that “what allows people of certain ethnic backgrounds to feel a certain ethnicity or nationality, is the experience with social institutions”. Thus, by perceiving that an individual is treated fairly by the jurisdiction of a society, a member of a racial group can identify more easily with the majority group. One the other hand, perceived discrimination has a negative result on national identification.

But what is the reason behind stereotypes? Stereotypes reflect the relationships between members of various groups within a society: they are representations of individuals and groups shared by many people (Haslam et. al., 2002), which allows hose very people to coordinate their actions and exhibit similar behaviors. This means that the manifestation of stereotypes abides to the processes of social interaction and social influence. By creating their own subjective collective meaning, stereotypes help people to understand their social environment: by categorizing and defining others according to specific personality traits and characteristics, members of a society can clearly “pinpoint” those beings and give them meaning and reason. As a result, the relationships between those categories of others are also legitimized and regarded as reality, and there is a real threat that these categories and their intergroup relations will be reificated (Chryssochoou, 2000). This holds tremendous value for further analysis and research, as differences between ethnicities, cultures and religions tend to be perceived as products of stereotyping and thusly man-made, but differences between social categories are often viewed as natural and default. This has many negative connotations, because if the dissimilarities between those social categories are considered as something natural, then the relationships and interactions between them will also be considered as natural and unchangeable.
1. 4 Racism

Racism is most commonly defined as discrimination that is based on a subjective belief that races are definite and natural social categories, and, as a normalization of discriminatory behavior that stems from that very approach. As such, racism is socially constructed and corresponds with behaviors and actions that are defined by the social and historical environment in which it is framed and in which it manifests. It is linked with social practices that perpetuate inequality and racial superiority, boiling down to a concession that pragmatic and tangible differences between human beings in not only perceivable and real, but also justifies certain approaches regarding those human beings.

Racism was in the forefront of fields of study for social psychologists for many a year, with many theories (both for and against it) being formulated, regurgitated and perpetuated. The difference of color in human skin (and other phenotypical characteristics) has sparked a great deal of biology theories speaking about the natural inferiority of certain races and the need not only to exclude them from society’s structures but, in some cases, eliminate them as a whole (genocide). Evidently, the largest bulk of psychological research was conducted in the U.S.A., and it concerned the highly prejudiced behavior against the Black minorities there (Eberhardt & Fiske, 1998). In many ways, prejudice, discrimination and racism was unified in a single term.

According to Pettigrew and Meertens (1995), there are two separate forms of racism: Subtle (or unconscious/automatic) and blatant (or explicit). Blatant racism manifests through sentiments of threat, dismissal towards minorities, and a general opposition to interact with racial outgroups. Subtle racism is more indirect, manifesting through highlighting cultural differences, defending the traditional values and denying positive sentiments towards racial outgroups. This distinction led the two researches to cross those dimensions in order to asses people according to their score on those forms of racism, resulting in four categories: Intolerant (high score on both dimensions), advocates of social equality (low score on both dimensions), subtle racists (high score on subtle and low score on blatant racism) and blatant racists (high score on blatant and low score on subtle racism). It should also be noted that blatant and subtle forms of prejudice can co-exist within the same person.

Detecting and measuring racism is a challenge for modern social psychologists. Schofield (1986) argues that one way to measure racism is by correlating it with social distance: how close, physically or psychologically, are people willing to get to one another? School environments are a prime example of this paradigm. Rogers and Prentice-Dunn (1981) found out that racial tendencies can surface even when the initial behavior was seemingly unprejudiced. In his experiment, he put
White and Black associated to offend the White participants, who were then given the opportunity to apply electric shock to the offenders. The White participants applied more intensive electric shock to the Black offender.

**Classic studies of racism**

In their research, Hopkins, Reicher and Levine (1997) argued that racial social categories are constructed in a specific strategic fashion in order to push and perpetuate certain beliefs about social conflict. Maintaining these beliefs would undoubtedly favor specific groups that held a privileged and advantageous position beforehand. Operario and Fiske (1998) support the idea as well, suggesting that “prejudice based on racial attributes is the result of social and historical forces that signify and give meaning to intergroup boundaries, setting them in a constant state of confrontation. Because of this, race has become a canon term that is used to justify behaviors that “must be addressed” towards that race.

Katz and Braly (1933) were amongst the first ones to link prejudiced behavior with stereotypes. In their research, they used the “catalogue selection” technique and asked pre-graduate students of the Princeton University to choose 5 adjectives from a catalogue of 84, in order to better describe different social groups (Americans, Chinese, Blacks, English, Germans, Jewish, Italians, Japanese, Turks). The results showed clear homogenous and determined convictions about the characteristics of each group (the Americans were hard working, the Blacks were lazy etc.), which acted as a clear indication for the researches that these opinions were not based on personal experience with the characterized groups but rather a collective of generalized opinions that categorized and defined the members of said groups.

Sherif (1936) approached stereotypes from a different perspective: his aim was to identify the method with which fundamental rules were created, so he performed a study wherein respondents were asked to observe and evaluate the movement of a bright dot inside of a very darkened room. In reality, the dot remained still and unmoving, but the perceiver was under the delusion that it was moving forward. When Sherif abstained from giving the respondents a reference point, the people, nonetheless, found their own – in fact, they created a shared and accepted reference point with which to evaluate the bright spot and its movement. What’s more, others, who had created their own theories about a reference point abandoned them and accepted the collective idea. This goes to show that people are in need to progressively create rules and reference points with which they orient themselves in a certain environment – according to Sherif, the same principle is applied during the
creation of stereotypes.

Adorno and his colleagues argued that stereotypes are characteristics of rigid authoritarian personalities, with their research examining the correlation between stereotypes and prejudice with personality as a vehicle (1950).

Allport was among the first social psychologists to highlight the importance of social categorization in the creating process of stereotypes, supporting that cognitive processing was integral for the embracement and perpetuation of biases (1954).

Among others, Hamilton and Gifford (1976) hypothesized that stereotypes were the false perception of people about specific individuals and groups (false correlation theory).

Modern racism, or neo-racism, is the current and modernized version or discriminatory behavior based on perceived racial characteristics, and while not so explicit and obvious it is still perceivable and, in many ways, dangerous. While reported cases of explicit racism against Black minority groups have become gradually more sparse as years passed, Devine and Elliot (1995) have shown in a research that the majority of respondents still believe that African Americans are lazy – the stereotypes have not been vanquished but transformed, together with the methods of concealing racist attitudes.

**Modes of latent racism**

Many theorists propose that modern multicultural societies not only shun but also condemn and discard direct forms of racism, with people (and institutions/governmental organizations) developing modes of latent racism: a subtle yet powerful method of assuming prejudiced attitudes and exhibiting discriminatory behavior towards certain disadvantaged groups. Most people do not want to be viewed as racist and prejudiced against other groups and individuals, although they may still harbor strong negative feelings about them, they want to protect their self-concept and self-esteem.

Ambiguous racism is term coined by Katz and Hass (1988) and is based on the hypothesis that attitudes and beliefs concerning a certain group of people is irrevocably linked with a plethora of different systems of value. According to this theory, people realize that disadvantaged groups are in dire need of assistance, positive evaluation and overall support in order to better co-exist within the boundaries of a society. However, contradictory and highly personalized values of self-reliance, individualism, meritocracy and personal freedom counter these preliminary values, resulting in a
prolonged clash of systemic values that perpetuates racism and its various effects on the outgroup.

A similar theory was also developed by Gartner and Dovidio (1977), who spoke of aversion racism. Aversion racism is a type of ambiguous racism, with people who exercise it being oblivious of their own prejudiced predispositions. In fact, they strongly believe that they are not racist, and deny any such accusations. These people choose to show tolerance and capacity for understanding only when they encounter a situation that has clear, apparent and not ambiguous connotations. Contrariwise, whenever they experience a situation that can be explained and justified by a plethora of reasons (many of which are completely irrelevant with prejudice and racism), they choose to use explanations based on partiality, ingroup bias and racism.

The detachment model (Devine, 1989) suggests that the ambiguous forms of racism exist in an unconscious level and are in constant collision with the conscious efforts of the individual to surpass them. This unconscious form of racism is the result of nurture, education, intergroup relations, imposed social values and cultural experiences.

Sears and McConahay (1973) speak of a modern or symbolic racism, which is not expressed through blatant acts of intolerance and hatred but relies on values of equality, constructed meritocracy, individualism, self-perseverance and self-reliance. Modern racists tend to believe, for example, that minority groups violate and transgress the boundaries of traditional values and should not receive any positive benefits or support for their historical or otherwise misuse and discrimination. People who perceive the difference between the unconscious ambiguous forms of racism and their “real” cognitive beliefs and opinions may overcome the first ones and strive to correct their future actions and behavior, if those beliefs are dissimilar and contradict each other. On the other hand, if these approaches towards specific members of a group align, then these people tend to exhibit more direct forms of racism.

Finally, the Implicit Association Test – IAT is a commonly used method to measure via time-related tasks attitudes (and especially attitudes that people are consciously concealing, such as prejudiced ones) and behaviors. Many researches argue that stereotypic characteristics are linked with memory and can be accessed when performing tests that require less cognitive processing and more spontaneous tasks. This way, “sleeper” tendencies of prejudice and racism may be activated and identified.
The language of racism

Most modern social psychologists regard race as a socially constructed category with the criteria that classify individuals and match them to a specific race abiding to social and historical demands. Seeking to explore how and why racism is vocalized so fervently throughout the ages with the societies of man as conduits, Wetherell and Potter (1992) tried to “map the language of racism”. They cared to explain how racism is manifested through its various forms using language as a modus operandi, and how it is used in order to justify, categorize, rationalize, condemn, suppress and exalt certain actions and behaviors. Using the method of speech analysis, they researched a great deal of interviews, newspaper articles and news shows in order to discern the communication strategies employed by the White Anglo-Saxons in New Zealand in regards with the local populace (the tribe of Maori). Their findings suggest that the co-existence of these groups is based on racial and ethnicity terms, with the White Anglo-Saxons justifying the colonial and expansive history of the White population, whilst, at the same time, using demeaning characterizations to describe the local population of the Maori. Social categorization was, in their research, very much discernable and salient.

Words, as well as images, hold great power in their potency to perpetuate racism and prejudice. According to political advisor Frank Luntz, the message of every transmitter is transformed by the receiver’s own feelings, prejudices and predispositions of their already well-founded opinions. Speaking about the use of propaganda, Luntz argues that what matters is not the actuality of truth or the technical expertise of the speaker, but the capacity with which the receiver must understand the meaning of this quantic information, as well as the reason and drive behind it.

The suggestion of meaning through words, its transmutation to a cohesive and understandable story and its incorporation to a meaningful frame is usually the work journalists, academics and historians, argue Luntz. For him, the use of words by those people refers to the result and not the process, creating a very specific frame of an image that the receiver recalls when experiencing a similar stimulus. Because of this, and by this method, racism and prejudiced attitudes can be perpetuated and legalized, as they are spoken by figures of authority and the very “gatekeepers of information”.

Many researches have shown that racism can be subtly and imperceptibly integrated and imbued onto words people use, onto the way they express themselves and onto the means with which they choose to communicate with other groups (van Dijk, 1993). Franco and Maass (1996) found out
that people tend to employ a very specific language and vocabulary when called to describe the positive facets of an outgroup and the negative ones of an ingroup, but also tend to use arbitrary and general terms when speaking about the negative aspects of an outgroup and the positives of an ingroup. In a sense, people try to conceal their inner prejudiced opinions by being vaguer with the selection of their words. DePaulo and Friedman (1998) added to this by proposing that people can also express racial opinion and tendencies by non-verbal communication.

**Brutalization and Dehumanization**

Using words, people can reduce a human being to something that lacks any human qualities and is akin to a beast: this is called brutalization or dehumanization and was employed by various individuals, groups and governments throughout history in order to justify amplified racial biases and discriminatory behaviors that concluded with violent outbursts. The less someone is considered as human, the easier it is for them to be the target of hatred but also of adoration (in the case of sainthoods and martyrdoms).

Neuhauser (2006) ponders if it is possible to violate the collective human dignity of a group, arguing that individual and interpersonal dignity pales in comparison with an unanimously accepted collective one. According to him, this dignity is threatened when the individual becomes the target of humiliation by another individual or group, with humiliation translated as a “behavior that offers to its target a valid reason to evaluate their self-worth as damaged or reduced” (Margalit, 1996). This humiliation, then, aspires to dehumanize an individual or group. Neuhauser notes three methods of humiliation: active humiliation, symbolic humiliation and humiliation of an exemplar.

The first method refers to the collective humiliation of a group, solely on the basis that, it is, in fact, that very group, and can of course be extended to each member individually. Neuhauser argues that is it possible for it is possible for groups that receive humiliation to be created on the spot, with only an arbitrary assortment of characteristics needed in order to be included (he gives the example of an airport that conducts usual checks on people with green eyes and over 1.80cm tall – this discrimination creates a group which will be treated differently by others exclusively on the basis of their unique characteristics).
Symbolic humiliation is a metaphorical assault against a symbol of a group, which holds great significance for that group’s self-evaluation and dignity. Thusly, its spoiling and blemishing humiliates by extension the members of the group, as they were the ones that made it so important and highly regarded among them.

Finally, humiliation of an exemplar of a group is the exhibition of negative behavior against someone who is considered to be an exemplar of the group. In this method, both other techniques are employed: the personal humiliation of a human being and the humiliation of a symbol, as exemplars are usually held in high esteem amongst their group.

In conclusion, brutalization or dehumanization is proven to be an extremely effective method to “bleed” racism into the collective consciousness of others, by removing the human traits from a group and replacing them with demeaning categorizations and racial slurs that empower violent tendencies and the image of “an opponent/enemy”.
PART 2

Media Influence, Multiculturism and the Muslim Minority

2.1 Media Influence: its perception and its presumption

Journalists assume the roles of teachers, entertainers, educators and mediators: they are the “gatekeepers” of information, jacks of all trades but masters of none. Reality filtered through media portrayal is a reality of its own, a subjective construction which affects people in the same way. Media organizations can be ambassadors of prejudice and discrimination, choosing when to glorify and when to dehumanize individuals or groups according not only to specific biases but also political and social agendas.

Vallone, Ross and Lepper (1985) suggest that receivers of information tend to perceive coverage of media as unjustly biased and in conflict with their own beliefs and opinions: the “hostile media phenomenon”. In their research, they exposed two different groups (pro-Israeli and pro-Arab American students) to a coverage of the Beirut massacre and concluded that both groups perceived the same parts of the coverage to be biased against their side. According to research by Gunther and Liebhart (2005), “ego involvement with the specific topic is linked with more potent perceptions of bias in news articles”. In other words, people usually process a story covered by media as more hostile and opposed to their point of view.

Perception of prejudice against minorities in media coverages may influence how those minorities perceive the stigmatization of their own group. Fujioka (2005) probed into this matter and found
that African Americans tend to perceive that Whites hold in lower esteem Blacks because they perceived prejudiced behavior against their group in the media. Consequently, it is relatively safe to assume that the more minority groups perceive prejudice in media targeting their group, the more they tend to believe that the outgroup is more prejudiced against them (Tsfati, 2007). This may be because media organizations are often linked with political agendas and governmental services and are staffed with members of the majority group (often seen as “elite”). Moreover, media coverage, in a way, canonizes an event (as it is, presumably, researched and cross-referenced by people who strive to achieve objectivism and transparency), resulting in a strong belief about the influence of media.

Van Dijk (1993) links the idea of ‘primary definers’ to the notion that media constitute an ‘elite’ in society. According to him, in terms of race and ethnicity an ethnic consensus is prevalent. The media elite are predominately white, possess many forms of power are in control of the decisions that directly affect the daily lives of ethnic minority individuals.

Davison (1983) first introduced the “third person effect”, which proposes that “in some cases, a communication leads to action not because of its impact on those to whom it is ostensibly directed, but because others think it will have an impact on the audience”. This was also analyzed by Gunther and Storey (2003), who described “the influence of presumed media influence”, a process in which people perceive that others are affected by media coverage and that they tailor their attitudes and behaviors accordingly. This perception of media impact is closely linked with the perception of media bias (Perloff, 1989).

Steele, Spencer and Aronson (2002) suggest that situation cues which indicate that a group is negatively evaluated can also affect the behavior of the perceiver, with media representations of minorities acting as powerful indicators about how “the society” views their group (Davies et. Al., 2002). Literature of minority groups that feel under-represented and negatively evaluated by media is extensive, “especially regarding media portrayals of Muslims, Arabs and people from the Middle East” (Saleem & Ramasubramanian, 2019). As highlighted and above, the perception of the media portrayal of minorities can influence the attitude and behavior of the minority group towards the majority and vice versa.
Multiculturism

As described above, representation of minority and majority groups in media has an impact not only on the attitudes and behaviors of the ingroups and outgroups of a society but also on the collective assortment of ideas known as public opinion. In order to better understand how perceived prejudice through cognition, personal experience and perception of media coverage affects the relation between groups and their intergroup communication, we first have to view the modern societies of the 21st century in a broader frame: multiculturism.

The term multiculturism has a wide range of definitions in the fields of social psychology, philosophy and sociology. It is often likened to ethnic pluralism and defined as the co-existence and collaboration of different groups within a society, where all groups retain their cultural uniqueness and character without having to sacrifice their identity.

For Cuperus (2007:158) “the indigenous population is nothing more than one of the 'many cultures', a minority among minorities”. For van den Berghe (2002:442), “a multicultural democracy faces two major problems: The ideological conflict with the idea of a 'nation-state', which is inextricably linked to liberal democracy” and the likelihood of social disfunction, as multicultural democracy often rewards the various minority groups and thus widens the discrimination that it is supposed to minimize.

Multiculturalism proposes the principles of a secular state as the ideal model, a secular state that is forged on the anvil of western societies (liberalism and Christianity). Thus, the implementation of multicultural policies requires a state to be de-privatized and “de-Christianized” (Διαλεκτόπουλος, 2017). In many multicultural societies, opposition to Christian practices and traditions is increasingly evident. Sartori (1996) argues that "relativism is a catastrophic situation: if everything has the same value, nothing has”.

Multicultural models suggest that recognition of subgroup identities encourage unifying effects such as identification with the common group (Taylor, 1994). This perceived recognition of subgroup identities may prepare racial minorities to identify with the nation, as they feel that their unique and distinct group characteristics are identified and accepted (Tyler, Degoe & Smith, 1996). Moreover, there are is no evidence that the canonization of minority groups contradicts national identification (unlike assimilation) (Molina, Phillips & Sidanius, 2015).
Multicultural societies are, in their core, a “melting pot” of different people, races, culture, ethnicities, languages and social values. Undeniably, there will be instances of prejudice, discrimination, racism and stereotypes between the various groups that abide within it, and it falls upon the government to regulate and the people to develop an understanding that in this modern era of globalization there they have to co-exist with one another.

2. 2 West and East: Orientalism and Islamophobia

Said (1985) studied the relations between West and East and argued that “the European domination took political, economic and cultural form, creating the discourse of ‘Orientalism’ that promoted the disparity and dissension between two distinct ideologies, the familiar (West) and the strange (East)”. Islam and Arabs were not only regarded as exotic, unfamiliar, alien and foreign, but also as savage, barbaric, warmongering and inferior. The division between West and East, according to Miles (1989), was primarily based on color of skin and culture. The Europeans are described and viewed in western literature as chivalrous, rational, enlightened, empirical, virtuous and civilized, juxtaposed with the cunning, gullible, irrational and reckless Orientals (Donald, 1992). The West has an affinity for self-government and regulation through democracy and discourse, while the Orient favors usurpers, warlords and despots. West is “us”, East is “them”.

The terms “Islam” and “Islamic” are continuously used in western and eastern literature not in context with religion, but politics. Many authors have noted that Muslims are oftentimes treated with a stereotypical and homogenous way by western media, with modern European media organizations having an array of “Orient experts” who can comment and offer their insight regarding this “very distinct subject” (just like a travel journalist or a sports caster is specialized in his/her subject). Again, Said, believes that this massive generalization has led to predominantly negative definitions with Islam.

Sardar (1999) explains that by refusing to comply and abide by the western ideals and structural systems, and share the same views on globalization, Islam has been branded as something archaic and a source of fear, threat and disdain: the spread of “Islamophobia” in western civilization. Indeed, proceeding the numerous terrorist attacks and that many groups that claimed to be Muslim and exalt Islam took credit for, Islamophobia spread through mainstream media even more.
Evidently, post 9/11 has seen a dramatic increase in newspaper coverage about Islam and Muslims. For Poole (2002), Islamophobia is “the contemporary manifestation of the Orientalist discourse and construction of the ‘other’”. In a sense, Islamophobia had been equated to “anti-Musinism”. Halliday (1996) however against this, arguing that “anti-Muslimism’ is almost a new form of racism that discriminates not only on physical traits but also religious characteristics, while the term ‘Islamophobia’ is too inaccurate because it is too uniform”.

The context: The Muslim Minority of Greece

The Muslim minority of Greece (Yunanistan müslüman azınlığı in Turkish) is the only explicitly recognized minority in the country, according to article 45 of the Treaty of Lausanne (Oran, 2007). It is also worthy of note that it is the only recognized religious minority in the country. The Muslims of Greece number approximately 120,000 people, as noted by the population census of 2011. It consists of three main ethnic groups: The Turks of Turkish Speakers, the Pomaks (Bulgarian Speaking Turks) and the Roma (Heper & Sayari, 2013). There are also approximately 3,000 Alevites (North Pomaks). Each of these groups possesses its own culture, social values and traditions.

The first and largest subgroup, the Turks or Turkish Speakers, have also been consistently noted in Greek literature as “Turkish-born”, which may be perceived as an effort to minimize the characterization of the minority as purely Turkish (Tsitselikis, 2012).

This research focused mainly on the Muslim minority of Thrace and Western Macedonia, and is concerned namely with the cities of Ksanthi, Alexandroupolis and Komotini. According to Turkish data that describes the numbers of the Muslim minority after the treaty of Lausanne, there resided 59,967 in Komotini, 42,671 in Ksanthi and 11,744 in Alexandroupolis. The Greek majority group that resided at the time at these cities runs as follows: 8834 in Komotini, 8728 in Ksanthi and 4800 in Alexandroupolis. It is clear that, population-wise, these cities were not Greek, and the Muslim minority was actually a majority. If we compare now these numbers with the Greek data from the same population census, the Muslim minority in Komotini numbers 50,081 people, in Ksanthi 17,882 people and in Alexandroupolis 2,705 people. Respectively, the Greeks numbered 11,386 in Komotini, 18,242 in Ksanthi and 9,228 in Alexandroupolis. From this comparison, we can deduce that the Greek census numbers considerably more Greek people than the Turkish one, which we can
assume is an effort to show that these cities were actually “more” Greek than shown at first.

**From the treaty of Lausanne to modern day**

According to the treaty of Lausanne in 1923, Greece and Turkey performed an exchange of population: all Christian orthodox citizens of Turkey that answered to the Greek Ecumenical Patriarch of Constantinople would emigrate to Greece (with the exception of those communities that lived in Constantinople, Imbros and Tenedos), and all Muslims that lived in Greek soil would emigrate to Turkey (with the exception of those who lived in Thrace) (Aarbakke, 2000).

Of course, the populations that were exchanged were not homogenous – the Christians were not exclusively speakers of Greek, as well as any Muslims that returned to Turkey knew Greek, Bulgarian, Vlach and even Greek). This was the result of the organizational system of the Ottoman Empire, and namely the ottoman “millet”, wherein the distinction and separation of people was done according to religion and not ethnicity or language (Kolluoğlu, 2013). The Muslims that resided in western Thrace was a majority at the time, before the Greek government began systematically installing Greek population from the Asia Minor and eastern Thrace (Clogg, 2002).

From the treaty of Lausanne (1923) up until 1954, Greece acknowledged the minority as a Muslim minority. In spring of 1954, however, it acknowledged the schools of the minority as Turkish. This changed again in 1972, with the schools once again renamed as Muslims (Poulton, 1997).

Greece has enforced an assimilation policy of the Muslim minority, which violated key rights of the minority’s members, such as: removal of citizenship, prohibition to by land or a residence and prohibition to start an enterprise, restrictions in freedom to express their religion (Whitman, 1990: i). In 1990, the Greek government and later nationalistic parties supported the distinction of Pomaks and Turks.

Today, Greece acknowledged the minority only as Muslim, although the three very different sub-groups identify as Turkish, Pomak and Roma respectively.
2. 3 Thrace and western Macedonia as multicultural hubs

Greece, in light of recent events, has become a hub of multiculturism: the immigrants, emigrants and refugees that pass through the country have created a new dynamic between the Greek ingroup and the “Others” outgroup. Of course, Greece has always had multiple ethnic and religious groups (albeit not recognized and acknowledged), and the relations between the Greek majority group with the other outgroups has seldom been recorded and researched.

The Muslim minority in Thrace and western Macedonia has been perceived, in the span of many years, as a separate group of people living within the same society. Elements of multiculturism seem unable to penetrate the impervious shell of ingroup distinction, with both populations living together but having little to no interactions with each other. This “fissure” that separates the two groups has only increased in diameter since the relatively recent resurgence and rise of ethnocentric far-right parties in Europe. Indeed, the nationalist far-right party of “Golden Dawn”, which has perpetuated fascist ideologies and has taken blame for multiple assaults on migrants during the past years, only recently lost its ever rising popularity (only two years ago, it was the third largest political party in Greece). During the 2019 European Parliament election, Golden Dawn managed to secure only 4.88% of the votes and has taken only two seats at the European Parliament (compared to a percentage of 9.8% and three seats in 2014).

Incidentally, as of writing this paper, the Muslim Association of Greece has made open complaints about the far-right group “Crypteia”, which, according to the Association, has contacted and openly threatened members of the Muslim minority (In.gr editorial team, 2018). In its official statement, the Association claims that this far-right group is an organization that was formed for the sole purpose of beating up and killing migrants, and especially Muslims. According to the Muslim Association, the group “Crypteia”, which confessed an assault on a young Muslim’s house, “will not threaten the Muslim minority with acts of hatred and hate crimes”.

This is but one of many instances of racial hatred that the Muslim minority faces on a regular basis in a multicultural Greece that oftentimes appears to tolerate and not co-exist with the minority group. Thrace is situated at the Greek-Turkish borders, and as such not only receives migrants, immigrants and refugees that pass through on a daily basis but also tourists from Turkey, Bulgaria and Russia. However, the Muslim minority still appears underappreciated and under-represented. For example, during both services of Alexandroupolis’ former mayor, Evaggelos Lampakis, not a single Muslim citizen of the city was elected to the administrative council. Indeed, the newly elected mayor of Alexandroupolis, Ioannis Zaboukis, still has no members of the Muslim minority in his
council, while having four members of the minority in his party roster of sixty-two. While it can be argued that the few members of the minority who elected to join the roster mirror the total Muslim population of the city, it still poses questions in regard to group representation and underdeveloped perceptions of multiculturism, as well as underlying forms of ambiguous and aversion racism.

**Education in Muslim minority schools of Thrace**

Education plays an integral part in cultivating attitudes and behaviors, through its curriculum and relations between teachers and students. As Muslim minority schools in Thrace possess some unique qualities, it is considered valuable to mention some facts about the educational system.

Regarding education, in 2011-2012 there were 174 primary schools for the Muslim minority in Thrace, with a total of 6,199 students. The unique trait of these schools is that they teach in both languages, with the educational program split into a Greek and a Turkish section (with teaching staff split into two groups as well). The Greek part teaches Greek language, history, geography, environmental studies and social and political education. The Turkish part teaches Turkish language, arithmetic, physics, religion, aesthetics and gymnastics. Each part has its own teachers and textbooks. Up until 2000, minority schools used Greek textbooks (which were inefficient because they were written in Greek), with new textbooks commissioned in 2001 by the Educational Program for Muslim children, made exclusively for this purpose (Ασκούνη, 2006).

Since the treaty of Lausanne supported the operation only of primary schools, there are but two minority high schools in all of Thrace (in Komotini and Ksanthi). Of course, Muslim children have the right to study at a Greek school if they so choose, which becomes an increasingly popular choice as years go by. There are no minority kindergartens.

Until 1990, an extremely small number of members of the Muslim minority continued to college, as they did not possess the adequate language skills in order to attend Greek universities. In 1995, however, a law passed that allowed members of the Muslim minorities of Thrace to pass to universities at a separate rate, which practically means that it was easier for them to achieve college. Upon the first application of the law in 1996, 98 candidates managed to get into higher education.

As of writing this paper, five schools for the Muslim minority in Thrace will be shut down because of small attendance (Protothema editorial team, 2019).

The issue began when accusations against Greece were launched by a Turkish NGO for the suspension of five Turkish minority schools in western Thrace, a district of about 150,000 Muslims. The
Greek Ministry of Education has decided, according to the head of the Union of Turks in Rhodes, Kos and the Dodecanese, Mustafa Kaimaktsi, to shut down five minority schools on July 31, on the grounds that the number of enrollments was extremely low.

The suspension of these schools has followed a trend of decline in recent years, due to the ever-decreasing number of students in Thrace and western Macedonia. According to the decisions to suspend them, if the minimum number of students required is resumed, they will reopen.

Kaimaktsi said that, under Greek law, the independent school board must consent to any shutdown, but that was not the case in minority schools of western Thrace, with Greece in breach of its own laws. He added that Turkey holds that having schools for the education of the Greek-Orthodox children in Turkey is a fundamental human right, even if the number of students is relatively small.

“We call on Greece to present all cultural rights established for minorities by the Council of Europe, the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe, the United Nations and its own constitution and to reopen these schools, which provide education in Turkish language ” reported Kaimaktsi, stressing out that the total number of Muslim minority schools that have been shut down by the Greek government has reached 65.
PART 3

3. Measuring the perceived prejudice of the Greek in-group and the Muslim outgroup of Thrace and western Macedonia

Studies overview

The current research examines the relations between the Greek majority group and the Muslim minority group of Thrace and western Macedonia, regarding prejudiced attitudes, discriminatory behavior, use of stereotypes and manifestation of racism. In particular, the study examines how representations of racism, self-reported experiences of discrimination and the perception of prejudice either through media portrayal of minorities or individual cognitive processes influence the Muslim minority groups’ intents for avoidance and/or collective action, as well as its general perception of the outgroup. For this purpose, this research conducted two separate studies: one aiming to monitor the beliefs of the majority group and one to monitor the beliefs of the minority one. Upon collecting the separate data, the researcher did a comparative analysis and discussion of the results, in order to highlight how the perception of prejudice by both groups affects them in conjunction with one another.

Hypotheses and Research Questions

These were the main predictions for the studies:

The more salient the majority ingroup’s social identity is (Greeks belonging to the majority group), the more likely it is for them to assume prejudiced attitudes and/or exhibit discriminatory behavior against the minority outgroup of Muslims (Hypothesis 1).
The more salient the minority ingroup’s social identity is (Muslims belonging to the minority group), the more likely it is for them to perceive prejudiced attitudes and/or discriminatory behavior against them from the majority outgroup (Greeks belonging to the majority group) (Hypothesis 2). The more likely that the minority group (Muslims) perceives that it is the target of prejudiced attitudes and/or discriminatory behavior from the majority group (Greeks), the more likely it is to desire collective action or avoidance with members of the majority group (Hypothesis 3).

Considering those hypotheses, the researcher poses the following research questions:

Do participants belonging to the Muslim minority group show higher motivation to avoid contact or seek collective action if they perceive that they are being prejudiced against by the Greek majority group and/or the media? (RQ 1)

Comparing the mean values of the completed questionnaires for each group, what are the measures for prejudiced attitudes, perceived prejudice and evaluation of media overall? (RQ 2)

Will the members of the minority group, if they perceive threat of negative evaluation, identify more with the social identity of their ingroup? (RQ 3)

**Study 1: The Greek majority group**

**Methodology**

**Participants**

Regarding study 1 that examined the Greek majority group, 202 (N=202) total participants completed the questionnaires manually or via internet (Google Docs). It must be noted that a total of 24 questionnaires were deemed invalid, either due to missing responses or due to responding to each measure using the same one key. Among the respondents 123 self-identified as male, 76 as female and 3 as other. The mean age of the sample group was 25.9 years old (SD= 25.910891), with the youngest respondent being 20 and the oldest 53. 98% of the respondents noted Greek as their mother tongue.
Procedure

For study 1, the researcher distributed questionnaires with 7 scales for measurement (Likert type) and a demographic section. The 7 scales Likert-type measurement was chosen because the researcher thought that it was necessary to offer a greater selection of choices for measuring the attitudes of the respondents, while retaining the option for them to be completely neutral. The questionnaire prototype was a modified version of the Perceived Ethic Discrimination Questionnaire (PEDQ) which was originally developed by Contrada et al. (2001) to assess perceived exposure to ethnic discrimination in college students from any ethnic/racial background. Measures were also adapted from the studies of Molina, Phillips & Sidanius (2015) for the identification of presumed prejudice. In addition, the questionnaire was based on some corrections that Simeoni (2005) made to determine the efficiency of prejudice measures. Finally, some extra measures were added by the researcher. The questionnaires were distributed manually in the city of Alexandroupolis and via internet (Google Docs) in all of Greece between the months of March and May of 2019. Every questionnaire was filled with consent, was anonymous, and explained clearly the purposes of the research.
Measures

Descriptive statistics and standard deviations for each of the key measures are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Scales, Means and Standard Deviations for the Greek Majority Group that had impactful correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek identification</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How racist are Greeks (majority group)</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prejudiced attitudes</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief of opposition</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek perception of Muslims</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>1.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotions</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative intentions</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media stereotypes of Muslims</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek perception of media</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every item in this questionnaire used 7 scales, with 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree.

Greek Identity

To measure how much the respondents identified with the Greek majority group, the researcher used the following 5 items:

I love Greece (i), I am proud to be Greek (ii), I am proud of Greek history (iii), The Greek flag means a lot to me (iv), I am proud of my history (v).
Perception of Greek majority group racism against Muslims (4 items)

To assess the perception of the respondents about the racist tendencies of the Greek majority group against the Muslim minority group, they were asked if “Greek people belonging to the majority group” and had fill these 4 items:

Are racists against Muslims (i), Exhibit racist behavior against Muslims (ii), Exhibit extreme behavior (iii), Are racists (iv).

Greek racism against Muslims (7 items)

To assess whether the respondents harbored any racism against the Muslim minority, they were asked if Muslims:

Exhibit extreme behavior (i), are racists (ii), are racists against the Greek people belonging to the majority (iii), exhibit racists behavior against Greek people belonging to the majority (iv), are discriminated against because they belong to this group (v), deserve the discrimination that they are experiencing (vi), whatever they do, they will be discriminated against by the Greek state (vii).

Beliefs of opposition (2 items)

To assess what the respondents believe about the division between Greeks and Muslims, they were asked if “they believed that”:

Turkey and Greece are historic enemies (i), Christians and Muslims are historic enemies (ii).

Perception of how the Greek majority group views Muslims (3 items)

To assess how the respondents think that the Greek majority group perceives Muslims, they were asked “Greek people belonging to the majority view Muslims as”:

Racist (i), racist against Greek people (ii), Extreme in their behavior (iii).
Negative emotions against Muslims (6 items)

To assess whether the respondents harbored any negative emotions against the Muslim minority group, they were asked “whether Muslims made them feel”:

Furious (i), nervous (ii), disappointed (iii), afraid (iv), vexed (v), anxious (vi). Note all these were separate items and the respondents had to indicate from 1 to 7 (1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree) in each one.

Negative intentions against Muslims (4 items)

To assess whether the respondents had any negative intentions against the Muslim minority group, they were asked “whether Muslims made them want to”:

Confront them (i), quarrel with them (ii), abstain from them (iii), have no affiliation whatsoever with them (iv).

Perception of media stereotypes against Muslims (6 items)

To assess whether the respondents believed that the Greek media employed stereotypes and racist terms to describe members of the Muslim community, they were asked “whether they believe that the Greek media”:

Influence the views of the Greeks towards the Muslims (i), ignore the Muslim people (ii), do not trust Muslims as law-abiding citizens of the state (iii), portray Muslim citizens in a negative way (iv), portray the citizens of the Greek majority in a positive way (v), portray Muslims in a way that is not true (vi), have employed people who belong to groups hostile to Muslims (vii).

Media trust (2 items)

Finally, to assess whether the respondents believed that the Greek majority group trusted the Greek media, the were asked “whether Greek people belonging to the majority group”:

Trust Greek media (i), trust Greek media concerning their portrayal of the Muslim minority (ii).
Demographics

Respondents were asked to fill in their age, their income, whether they were employed or not, their profession, their mother tongue, their mother’s education and to pinpoint their position in a ladder that represented and signified their condition and status in life.

To measure their family (added with personal) income (total euros per month), the respondents were given 10 items:

Up to 300 euro (i), 301 – 630 euro (ii), 631 – 800 euro (iii), 801 – 1000 euro (iv), 1001 – 1220 euro (v), 1221 – 1500 euro (vi), 1501 – 1800 euro (vii), 1801 – 2300 euro (viii), 2301 – 3700 euro (ix), 3701 euro and more (x)

To measure their mother’s education, they were given 5 items:
None/primary school (i), high school (ii), graduate school (iii), higher education degree (iv), master’s degree (v), holder of a PhD (vi).

Finally, to assess their position on the ladder, the respondents were given this line of text:

“Consider that this staircase represents where people are situated in our society. At the top of the ladder, are those who are more privileged - those who possess the most money, higher education, and the best jobs. At the bottom of the ladder are those who are in worse shape or condition - those who have the least money, the lowest education, and the worst jobs. Put a circle on the number that best represents where you are on the ladder.

The respondents were then given 10 items representing the steps of the ladder.
Analysis

Greek identity
To begin with, as hypothesized (H1), the statistical analysis showed a reverse correlation between Greek identity and the perceived racism of the Greek majority group ($r = -0.31, p < 0.01$), which means that the more the respondents identified with their group, the less they believed that the Greek majority group expressed racism towards others. In other words, as long as the respondents subscribed to the social identity of the ingroup (Greeks), they strived to protect this social identity from negative evaluations (such as characterizations of being prejudiced). In the same vein, there was found a positive correlation between Greek identity and expression of racism against the Muslim minority ($r = 0.24, p < 0.01$), meaning that the more fervently the respondents identified as Greeks, the more likely they were to assume prejudiced attitudes against the Muslim minority. This can be explained again as an effort to preserve the social identity of the ingroup by de-evaluating the outgroup, although salience of national identity can also be linked to strong opinions about race and connotations of far-right ideologies. Finally, the statistical analysis found a positive correlation between Greek identity and beliefs about Muslims as enemies ($r = 0.28, p < 0.01$), meaning that the more the respondents identified as members of their ingroup, the more they believed in the adversarial relations between groups and intergroup opposition. Again, this is linked with theories about the status quo of modern societies and the salient and unbreakable boundaries between the multicultural countries on the 21st millennia. Items in this measure had Alpha= .83.

Perception of Greek majority group racism against Muslims
There was only one notable finding regarding this measure, which described a positive correlation between the perception of Greek majority group racism against Muslims and the perception of media stereotypes against Muslims ($r = 0.19, p < 0.01$), meaning that the more the respondents thought of the Greek majority group as prejudiced, the more they believed that media evaluated negatively the Muslim minority. This can be explained if we take into account that media organizations are often perceived as elite and corrupt instruments of political interests and agendas, and thusly perpetuate the racist ideologies of the majority group (which they represent). Some contradictory facts were assimilated in a research conducted by the Laboratory of Peace Journalism of the Aristotle University of Thessaloniki for the Charter of Idomeni, where the author of this paper assisted with the data.
collecting and mapping. According to this research, which analyzed for 3 months articles concerning refugees, migrants and immigrants in greek printed and digital press, 62% were “clean” of racial terminology, and 19.2% referred to these people as “threat”. Although quite different in nature, these findings frame (in a way) the media coverage of minorities. Items in this measure had Alpha= .72.

Greek racism against Muslims

Apart from the aforementioned correlation between Greek identity and prejudiced attitudes against the Muslim minority, the statistical analysis showed that there was a positive correlation between the racist tendencies of the respondents and their belief that Muslims and Christians, as well as Greece and Turkey were historic enemies (r= .16, p <0.05). This means that beliefs of historic or religious opposition and enmity between the two groups, as well as beliefs about an ancestral feud that divides the two peoples apart is translated in prejudiced approaches regarding the minority group. This can be attributed to Islamophobia and anti-Muslimism, as both are prevalent and quite topical as of writing this paper. Finally, the analysis showed a positive correlation between the racist tendencies of the respondents with the perception of how the Greek majority group views Muslims (r= .18, p <0.01), meaning that the more the respondents thought that the Greek majority in-group viewed the Muslim minority as racist and discriminatory against the Greek majority, the more the respondents themselves assumed prejudiced attitudes. Again, in regard to previous findings about the high identification the Greek ingroup, it can be assumed that the respondents share the beliefs and notions of their fellow members of the group, thus wanting to protect their social image through de-evaluation. Moreover, it can be attributed to a defense mechanism, with respondents being in denial and assuming psychological activity to mask their subtle prejudice. It is important to note that only two items in this measure had an Alpha= .55 (ii: Muslims are racist and iii: Muslims are racists against the Greek people belonging to the majority).

Beliefs of opposition

Apart from the former correlations, the analysis showed a positive correlation between the respondents’ belief about A Greek-Muslim historic opposition and the perception of how the Greek majority group views Muslims (r= .24, p <0.01), meaning that the stronger the conviction of historical enmity, the stronger the notion that the Greek majority group views Muslims in a negative way. Since the belief of historic opposition, is, in its core, a prejudice, which paints the
Greeks/Christians as a separate group, it is clear that the respondents will also think that this group will view Muslims as racist and extreme. Another positive correlation was found between the belief of a history opposition and negative emotions against the Muslim minority \( (r=24, \ p <0.01) \), meaning that the more the respondents think that there exists a clear division between these two groups, the more they feel negatively about the outgroup (and vice-versa). As stated in Part 1 of this paper, emotional reactions hold equal significance in instilling a sense of prejudice as cognitive beliefs do (Talaska, Fiske & Chaiken, 2008), with emotions proving to be predictors of discrimination through their intrinsic value of automatic evaluation (Zajonc, 1980). In other words, the respondents may experience feelings of contempt, anger and disdain towards the minority group because they have cognitively processed the fact that Greeks and Turks are enemies, or they have come to this conclusion because they had their emotions direct their attitudes and behavior (emotions triggering immediate responses and thus behaviors having priority over the slow cognitive evaluation) (Mandler, 1992; Frijda, 1998).

**Negative emotions against Muslims**

The statistical analysis of the questionnaires showed a positive correlation between negative emotions against the Muslim minority and negative intentions against them \( (r= .38, \ p <0.01) \), meaning that the stronger feelings of anger, disappointment and vexation that the respondents felt towards the Muslim minority, the greater their intention for collective action against them was. Examining the completed questionnaires in more detail, the researcher deduced that the respondents leaned more towards items iii (abstain from them) and iv (have no affiliation whatsoever with them), rather than wanting to take action against them or confront them. This can be explained partly because explicit acts of discrimination and violence are discouraged and condemned in modern multicultural societies (as well as punishable), so the manifestation of subtle and unconscious prejudice (as indicated by the negative feelings) takes the form of abstaining and distancing oneself from the out-group. Items in the measure of Negative emotion had Alpha= .97 and items in Negative intentions against Muslims had Alpha= .94.
Perception of how the Greek majority group views Muslims; Perception of media stereotypes against Muslims; Media Trust

Apart from the aforementioned correlations, these measures yielded no further important result. The items in Perception of media stereotypes had Alpha= .91), although items i, vii and viii were yielded insignificant value.

Demographics

Moving on to demographics, the statistical analysis detected a positive correlation between age of the respondents and prejudiced opinions against the Muslim minority group (r= .14, p <0.05), meaning that older respondents were had clearer racist tendencies towards the minority group. This might stem from their upbringing in a more conservative age, as well as their resilience to evaluate new ideas and adopt new perspectives. Age was also found to have a reverse correlation with the perception of media stereotypes against Muslims (r= -.27, p <0.01), meaning that the older respondents were less likely to believe that Greek media covered in a negative way the minority. Again, this indicates that older generations firmly believed that journalists were the mediators between government and the vox populi, with media organizations defending and championing values of objectivism and transparency. Thus, they hold media in high esteem and tend to refuse to accept that they can assume prejudiced attitudes. Finally, age was found to be positively correlated with income (r= .19, p <0.01), meaning that, naturally, older respondents received larger monthly incomes.

Education yielded no relevance to any measures, while income was found to be positively correlated to the ladder positioning of the respondents (r= .22, p <0.05), meaning that the wealthier respondents perceived themselves as higher up in society and overall quality of life.

Finally, apart from the aforementioned positive correlation with income, the position that a respondent noted on the ladder was found to be reversely correlated with Greek identity (r= -.19, p <0.01), belief of Greek-Turkish opposition (r= -.24, p <0.01) and media trust (r= -.17, p <0.05), meaning that the higher a respondent perceived himself/herself on the ladder, the less he/she identified with the majority group of Greeks, the less he/she believed that there is an historic enmity between Greece and Turkey (and their respective groups) and the less he/she trusted the media overall and the media representations of the minority group. The respondents that positioned themselves higher on the ladder are most likely the ones who feel good about themselves and have a highly positive
self-perception, which could relate to them accepting themselves as citizens of a modern multicultural world and relinquishing the narrow national identity of Greeks. It could also indicate that this cosmopolitical point of view pushes away beliefs about group segregation and opposition but increases distrust in modern media and journalists (a notion that is backed by many modern researches regarding media distrust among modern audiences).

**Study 2: The Muslim minority group**

**Methodology**

**Participants**

Before describing the participants of study 2, it is important to mention that the questionnaires were mainly distributed to the cities of Alexandroupolis, Ksanthi and Komotini. While the Greek people living there are all part of the same majority group, members of the Muslim minority groups are subscribed to three subgroups: Roma in Alexandroupolis, Pomaks in Ksanthi and Turks in Komotini. In spite of their cultural and language differences, all three share the same tag of “Muslim minority of Thrace”, but the researcher considered it important to have respondents represented by all three distinct groups.

Regarding study 2 that examined the Muslim minority group, 196 (N=196) total participants completed the questionnaires manually or via internet (Google Docs). It must be noted that a total of 19 questionnaires were deemed invalid, either due to missing responses or due to responding to each measure using the same one key. Among the respondents 156 self-identified as male, 39 as female and 1 as other. The mean age of the sample group was 25.7 years old (SD= 25.7295918), with the youngest respondent being 16 and the oldest 64. Out of 196 respondents, 181 had both Turkish and Greek as their mother tongues, 15 had only Greek and 1 had only Turkish.
Procedure

For study 2, the researcher distributed questionnaires with 7 scales for measurement (Likert type) and a demographic section. The 7 scales Likert-type measurement was chosen because the researcher thought that it was necessary to offer a greater selection of choices for measuring the attitudes of the respondents, while retaining the option for them to be completely neutral. The questionnaire prototype was a modified and extended version of the Perceived Ethic Discrimination Questionnaire (PEDQ) which was originally developed by Contrada et al. (2001) to assess perceived exposure to ethnic discrimination in college students from any ethnic/racial background. Measures were also adapted from the studies of Molina, Phillips & Sidanius (2015) for the identification of presumed prejudice. In addition, the questionnaire was based on some corrections that Simeoni (2005) made to determine the efficiency of prejudice measures. Finally, some extra measures were added by the researcher. The questionnaires were distributed manually in the city of Alexandroupolis and Komotini, and via internet (Google Docs) in all of Greece between the months of March and early June of 2019. Every questionnaire was filled with consent, was anonymous, and explained clearly the purposes of the research.
Measures

Descriptive statistics and standard deviations for each of the key measures are shown in Table 2.

Table 2: Scales, Means and Standard Deviations for the Muslim Minority Group that had impactful correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek identity</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim identity</td>
<td>4.76</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived racism</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How prejudiced are Muslims (minority group)</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>0.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Muslim collective action</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belief of opposition</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feelings of belongingness and discrimination</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greek perception of Muslims</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotions</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative intentions</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Media stereotypes of Muslims</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived racism</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Every item in this questionnaire, except the Perceived stereotypes, used 7 scales, with 1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree. The Perceived stereotypes item used 7 scales as well, with 1 = never and 7 = all the time.
Greek identity (4 items)

To measure how much the respondents identified with the Greek majority group, the researcher used the following 4 items:

I love Greece (i), I am proud to be Greek (ii), I am proud of Greek history (iii), The Greek flag means a lot to me (iv).

Muslim identity (4 items)

To measure how much the respondents identified with the Muslim majority group, the researcher used the following 4 items:

I am proud of my history (i), I identify a lot with other members of my group (eg Muslims, Turkish speakers) (ii), I feel great companionship with other members of my group (eg Muslims, Turkish speakers) (iii), I feel like I belong to my group (eg Muslims, Turkish speakers) (iv).

Perceived racism (2 items)

To assess whether the respondents were targets of prejudiced attitudes and discriminatory behavior, they were asked to note how much they agree with the following items:

I experience prejudice because of my ethnicity / religion (i), My group is experiencing prejudice (ii)

Perception of racism tendencies of Muslims (4 items)

To assess if the respondents thought that the Muslim minority group assumed prejudiced attitudes of its own, they were asked whether “Muslims:”

Exhibit extreme behaviors (i), are racists (ii), are racists against the Greek people belonging to the majority (iii), exhibit racists behavior against Greek people belonging to the majority (iv).

Perception about the collective action of the Muslim minority group (2 items)

To assess what the respondents thought of the collective action of the minority group, they were asked “whether the Muslim citizens of Greece:”

Are not united (i), can change their negative image if they unite (ii).
Beliefs of opposition (2 items)

To assess what the respondents believe about the division between Greeks and Muslims, they were asked if “they believed that”:

Turkey and Greece are historic enemies (i), Christians and Muslims are historic enemies (ii).

Feelings of belongingness and discrimination (4 items)

To assess if the respondents experienced feelings of segregation and discrimination, they were asked “if they felt”:

As an alien in Greek society (i), that they don’t belong in Greek society (ii), that the Greek state discriminates against them and their group (iii), that no matter what Muslim citizens try to do, they will still get discriminated against by the Greek state (iv).

Perception of how the Greek majority group views Muslims (3 items)

To assess how the respondents think that the Greek majority group perceives Muslims, they were asked “Greek people belonging to the majority view Muslims as”:

Racist (i), racist against Greek people (ii), Extreme in their behavior (iii).

Negative emotions against Greeks (6 items)

To assess whether the respondents harbored any negative emotions against the Greeks majority group, they were asked “whether greeks made them feel”:

Furious (i), nervous (ii), disappointed (iii), afraid (iv), vexed (v), anxious (vi). Note all these were separate items and the respondents had to indicate from 1 to 7 (1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree) in each one.
Negative intentions against Greeks (4 items)

To assess whether the respondents had any negative intentions against the Greek majority group, they were asked “whether Greeks made them want to”:

Confront them (i), quarrel with them (ii), abstain from them (iii), have no affiliation whatsoever with them (iv).

Perception of media stereotypes against Muslims (6 items)

To assess whether the respondents believed that the Greek media employed stereotypes and racist terms to describe members of the Muslim community, they were asked “whether they believe that the Greek media”:

Influence the views of the Greeks towards the Muslims (i), ignore the Muslim people (ii), do not trust Muslims as law-abiding citizens of the state (iii), portray Muslim citizens in a negative way (iv), portray the citizens of the Greek majority in a positive way (v), portray Muslims in a way that is not true (vi), have employed people who belong to groups hostile to Muslims (vii).

Perceived racism (3 items)

To assess the perceived racism of the respondents against them, they were asked “how often did somebody assume that because of their ethnicity/religion they must be:

Violent (i), not sincere/truthful (ii), dirty (iii). Note that these items are distinct from one another and do not create one measure but three separate ones (each measuring a different aspect of perceived racism).

Demographics

Respondents were asked to fill in their age, their income, whether they were employed or not, their profession, their mother tongue, their mother’s education and to pinpoint their position in a ladder that represented and signified their condition and status in life.
To measure their family (added with personal) income (total euros per month), the respondents were given 10 items:

Up to 300 euro (i), 301 – 630 euro (ii), 631 – 800 euro (iii), 801 – 1000 euro (iv), 1001 – 1220 euro (v), 1221 – 1500 euro (vi), 1501 – 1800 euro (vii), 1801 – 2300 euro (viii), 2301 – 3700 euro (ix), 3701 euro and more (x)

To measure their mother’s education, they were given 5 items:

None/primary school (i), high school (ii), graduate school (iii), higher education degree (iv), master’s degree (v), holder of a PhD (vi).

Finally, to assess their position on the ladder, the respondents were given this line of text:

“Consider that this staircase represents where people are situated in our society. At the top of the ladder, are those who are more privileged - those who possess the most money, higher education, and the best jobs. At the bottom of the ladder are those who are in worse shape or condition - those who have the least money, the lowest education, and the worst jobs. Put a circle on the number that best represents where you are on the ladder.

The respondents were then given 10 items representing the steps of the ladder.

Analysis

Greek identity

To begin with, as expected, the statistical analysis showed a reverse correlation between Greek identity and Muslim identity, meaning that the more the respondents identified as members of the Muslim group, the less they identified as members of the Greek group (r= -.28, p <0.01). Barring total integration or assimilation, members of a minority group tend to strongly identify with its values and structure, not only because they perceive their social identity and cultural values to be threatened by the outgroup, but because they harbor feelings of safety, belongingness and comfort among other members of their group, not risking exposure to possible negative evaluation and discrimination. If we now perceive the means of what the respondents identified as in each measure
(Table 3), it is clear (although not by much) that the Muslim minority has an average social identification with its group. This may be because, as mentioned when describing the participants of study 2, three different subgroups participated in this research, with each one of them at different stages of living within a Greek society. The analysis also showed a reverse correlation between the Greek identity and the Perception of racism tendencies of Muslims ($r = -.19, p < 0.01$), meaning that the more the respondents identified as Greeks the less they believed that Muslims exhibited discriminatory behavior against Greeks. This may be the case because members of the Muslim minority do in fact receive less discrimination by other members of their group, in spite the fact that they identify more as Greeks. Moreover, they could still desire to retain both social identities (Muslim and Greek) or protect their former one out of compassion or kindness, thus electing to believe that Muslims were not prejudiced against Greeks (seeking a delicate balance and not opposition of clashing social identities). Finally, the analysis found a negative correlation between Greek identity and perception of how the Greek majority group views Muslims ($r = -.21, p < 0.01$), meaning that the more the respondents identified as Greeks the less they thought that the Greek majority group was prejudiced against Muslims. This can again be explained by Tajife’s social identity theory and confirms the previous statement about wanting to balance both (when present) identities and protect each one of them from negative evaluation. The items in this measure had Alpha$= 9.0$, while the items in “perception of racism tendencies of Muslims had Alpha$= .83$.

Table 3: The means of Greek ID and Muslim ID

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greek identity</td>
<td>3.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslim identity</td>
<td>4.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Muslim identity**

Apart from the reverse correlation with Greek identity, Muslim identity scored a positive correlation with perceived racism ($r = .28, p < 0.01$), meaning that the more the respondents identified with the Muslim minority group the more they thought that they were prejudiced against. This was hypothesized by the researcher (H2). This correlation can be explained if we consider that members of the minority group tend to view their group as stigmatized, disadvantaged by definition, and many
times victimized. A plethora of studies shows that just by perceiving the distinction between majority and minority, the latter will develop feelings of insecurity and opinions of unfair and unjust treatment. This is not to say, however, that these opinions are not very often confirmed. Another explanation can be offered in the form of personal de-evaluation of the outgroup (Greeks being prejudiced) leads to social comparison with the ingroup (Muslims) and results in bolstering the social identity and self-perception. Finally, according to Dion and the effects of perceived prejudice on identity, the perception of discriminatory behavior might have buffered and bolstered the identification of the respondents with their group. The items in this measure had Alpha= .85.

**Perceived racism**

The statistical analysis showed a positive correlation between perceived racism and the perception about the collective action of the Muslim minority group (r= .15, p <0.01), meaning that the more the respondents thought that they and their group was discriminated against, the more they believed that collective action could change the situation. This confirmed the final hypothesis of the researcher (H3). Collective action is one of many ways with which a minority group can react when receiving negative evaluation and mishandling, with prejudice reduction and collective action participation both being plainly implicated in a number of social psychological theories (such as social categorization). The practical application of this is also testified by the numerous unions and association groups that uphold the Muslim values and culture in Thrace and western Macedonia (e.g. the Muslim Association of Greece).

**Demographics**

Moving on to demographics, the analysis found a reverse correlation between age and negative intentions (r= -.14, p <0.05), meaning that the older the respondents were the less likely they were to possess intentions to harm them or abstain from every interaction. Older members of the minority group are more likely to have developed stronger relations with the majority group, either through personal or professional relations. This is also an indication of integration but not assimilation and can be analyzed as an effort of the more “mature” members of the minority group to co-exist with the majority group. Age was also reversely correlated with negative media stereotypes against Muslims, (r= -.14, p <0.05), meaning that the older the respondents were the less they perceived that media coverage bore prejudiced images of their group. Again, this is an indication of older members of the minority group feeling more integrated and less threatened than younger ones. The analysis also showed a positive correlation between age and income (r= .41, p <0.01), meaning that the
older respondents had better monetary compensations, which is self-explanatory, regarding the unemployment rates not only in the minority but also the majority group in Greece.

Concerning education, the analysis found a positive correlation between Greek identity and level of education ($r = .15$, $p < 0.05$), meaning that the more the respondents identified as Greek citizens the more likely it was for their mothers to have achieved higher levels of education. This indicates the practically impossible chances for a member of the minority group before 1990 to achieve higher education because of the lack of minority schools specialized in Greek language and overall preparation for college and university requirements. This can also be explained if we take into account that one of the respondents parents may be of Greek origin. A reverse correlation was also found between education and perceived racism against the Muslim minority ($r= -.15$, $p <0.05$), meaning that the higher the level of education of a respondents’ mother was the less likely he/she was to perceive prejudiced attitudes towards his/her group. Again, this is correlated with group integration and the assumption of a multicultural identity through education.

Regarding income, the statistical analysis found that it was reversely correlated with negative intentions ($r= -.18$, $p <0.01$) and perceived prejudice ($r= -.24$, $p <0.01$), meaning that the more monetary compensation a respondent possessed the less likely he/she was to confront of abstain from the majority group, and the less likely she/he was to perceive prejudiced attitudes against the Muslim group. Economic stability is a level of a well-organized and structured society, wherein members of the minority group exist and need to continue doing so in order to sustain themselves. Frequenting their economic and social transactions and relations with members of the majority group will consequently decrease their perception of prejudice against them (as they continue having an income) and decrease their intention to confront or abandon those with whom they work together. Income was also positively correlated with the position that a respondent marked on the ladder ($r= .30$, $p <0.01$), meaning that the more monetary compensation a respondent had the higher he/she would position himself/herself on the ladder. Again, according to the definition that every respondent was given about that it meant to be higher on the ladder, it is clear why this correlation is positive.

Finally, moving on to the ladder, apart from the positive correlation with income, the analysis showed positive correlations between the position that a respondent marked on the ladder with the perception of racism tendencies of Muslims ($r= .18$, $p <0.01$) and with the belief of opposition ($r= 19$, $p <0.01$), meaning that the higher respondents put themselves on the ladder the more they perceived Muslims to be racist against Greeks and the more likely they believed that Greeks and Turks are historic enemies. Both deductions indicate strong affiliations with the majority group and can be attributed to effective integration to the extent of accepting the other group’s beliefs about historic opposition. Higher self-evaluation of the individual identity is here translated in de-evaluating the
minority identity, which may indicate a crisis or roles in a modern multicultural society. I must be noted that items in “negative intentions” had Alpha= .84.

Discussion and conclusion

The present research was divided into two studies: study 1 examined how the Greek majority group perceived the Muslim minority group and the media portrayal of its members, while study 2 examined if the Muslim minority experienced prejudiced attitudes/discriminatory behavior and if they believed such attitudes and behaviors to be rooted in real events or they perceived them in media coverages. The research’s aim was to collect data from the perspective of both sides regarding the same subject, in order to compare them and highlight the different or similar approaches of the respondents.

Results from both studies showed that when Greeks respondents identified highly with their group, they tended to exhibit more racial tendencies against the Muslim minority – in the same vein, when Muslim respondents identified highly with their own group, they tended to perceive that Muslims were highly prejudiced against. This confirmed both hypotheses (H1, H2) regarding the prejudiced attitudes of both minority and majority group, and highlights the many theories of social psychology concerning social categorization: when social identity was salient, and the respondents subscribed to their according groups, they tended to protect their group’s self-perception while evaluating negatively the outgroup. As individuals living in a modern multicultural society which continuously brings to the forefront issues of race and origin, members of both groups solidify their position and use it as a reference point to measure and orient themselves in an ever-changing world. Greece, now more than ever, and especially Thrace which is situated on the borders of Turkey, receives daily dozens of migrants and refugees that are kept in close quarters until transported yet again. In a city like Alexandroupolis, which is home to one of the largest communities of Muslim minority in Thrace, still has a ghetto-like neighborhood for the Muslim minority (the “Avantas neighborhood”) which consists of debilitating houses and poor sewer plumbing. The separation of groups is not only evident but also extremely rooted in the collective consciousness of the citizens.

If we compare the identification of each group with their majority, the Greek respondents have a mean of 5.3 while the Muslims 4.7. The reason that the mean of the Muslim identification is lower might be correlated with identity crisis and the clash of different roles which they have to assume in order to uphold relations and execute economic transactions. In other words: in order for them to
co-exist with the majority, they have to balance their social values and integrate themselves to the requirements of a society that oftentimes is neglectful and prejudiced.

Greek people, especially the baby boomers who subscribe to the majority group fervently, tend to have beliefs of historic opposition between Turkey and Greece, Muslims and Christians, assuming prejudiced attitudes and exhibiting discriminatory behavior when they perceive that that is what the majority does. But even when prejudiced tendencies were reported, their manifestation was mainly a want to abstain from the minority group, to keep on living as separate groups. This intent to keep their distance off of the minority was also noted in respondents who didn’t assume prejudiced attitudes, meaning that subtle and automatic forms of racism did manifest through their intentions after all. It must also be noted that a researcher cannot be sure when a respondent adjusts his/her “true” level of prejudice as his/her answers are reported, and because he/she tries to retain the concept of non-prejudiced in a modern society where even the slightest form of racism is condemned and shut down (in theory).

Islamophobia and anti-Muslimism widespread through western media, with current affairs and links with terrorist attacks only adding up to the negative evaluation of Muslims.

“Many European countries are adjusting to a recent increase of Muslim immigrants and are involved in conversations regarding the successful integration of these immigrants within host societies” (Chryssochoou & Lyons, 2011). As extensive literature has shown, perceived prejudice leads to the stigmatized group assuming prejudiced attitudes of its own, which leads them to collective action or avoidance. Tendencies for collective action and avoidance were indeed reported in study 2, confirming the third hypothesis (H3). In addition, the Greek respondents strongly associated media representation of minorities with the opinions of the majority, with the younger ones strongly mistrustful of the media organizations’ truthfulness. Journalists, in many countries, continuously lose their credibility as mediators and instead are branded as influencers and governmental instruments. Their portrayal of minorities, consequently, might not influence the opinions of those who disregard or discredit its objective value. As noted by Madianoy (2005), “the media, both national and transnational, often create boundaries for inclusion and exclusion, and eventually participation in a ‘common culture’.” This common culture is the reality that both Greeks and Muslims seek to balance out.

One limitation that deserves attention is that study 1 had a large sample of students, which in a way portrays the opinions of younger Greeks but should nonetheless addressed in future studies. In addition, another limitation is the different subgroup identities within the larger Muslim minority that should, in hindsight, be examined separately. Finally, future studies should incorporate larger and
more focused samples, and shorten the featured questionnaires to the items that yielded significant results.

These two studies confirmed previous theories of salient social identity and discrimination and suggested that media portrayal of minorities influences prejudiced behaviors of both majority and minority groups.

**CLOSING REMARKS**

For more than half a century, social psychologists have sought to explain the reason of human behavior, the notion behind attitudes and the idea that constructs a uniform pool of “objective” reality in a subjective world.

Theories about the various forms of prejudice, the multiple manifestations of discrimination, the modes of racism and the tools of stereotypes and stigmatization have tried to explain why people tend to separate and categorize themselves in groups and narrow themselves with definitions. Words used as weapons of propaganda and dehumanization, theories that perpetuated inherent biological dissimilarities as weakness and indicative reason for mass murders and genocide, the research for the quintessential reason that explains why humans behave as they do still persists.

A plethora of theoretical overviews proposed emotion as indicator of prejudice and the perception of discrimination as “a motor for behavior”. This led to studies of media portrayal of minorities and media trust, and the correlation between perception of information and actual manifestation of behavior based on presumed events and opinions. The canonization and legitimization of media coverage slowly subsides, with Web 3.0 in its way and the user/receiver of information assuming a most active role not only in their entertainment but also in the creation of a personalized reality.

Islamophobia, terrorist attacks and violent outburst against innocent people: this modern age of globalization and the shifting of the immaterial borders between countries and ideas is still firmly rooted in theories of threat, fear and hatred, despite its multicultural connotations.

In this new modern era of technological advancements and digital evolution that knows no predecessor, no equal, it is left upon the individuals and their self-defined social identities to navigate through events and terminologies about equality, in order to finally conclude that their similarities far outweigh their differences.
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**Questionnaires**

**Questionnaire distributed to Greek people belonging to the majority group (translated to English):**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

Thank you for your participation in this study. Its goal is to record and register the opinions of the Greek majority and Muslim minority of Greece.

This study is conducted for purely scientific reasons and all responses will remain anonymous and confidential. Please answer using the appropriate measures. Completing the questionnaire will take less than 10 minutes.

*School of Journalism and Mass Media Communication*

[78]
Read the following sentences. For each of them, indicate from 1 to 7 according to how much you agree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all</th>
<th>Very little</th>
<th>little</th>
<th>Moderately</th>
<th>Much</th>
<th>Very Much</th>
<th>Extremely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I love Greece
I am proud to be Greek
I am proud of the Greek history
The Greek flag means a lot to me
I am proud of my history

**Greek people belonging to the majority:**

Are racist against Muslims
Exhibit racist behavior against Muslims
Exhibit extreme behavior
Are racists

**The Muslims:**

Exhibit extreme behaviors
Are racists
Are racists against the Greek people belonging to the majority
Exhibit racists behavior against Greek people belonging to the majority
Are discriminated against because they belong to this group
Deserve the discrimination that they are experiencing

Whatever they do, they will be discriminated against by the Greek state

**I believe that:**

Turkey and Greece are historic enemies
Christians and Muslims are historic enemies

**Greek people belonging to the majority view Muslims as:**

Racist
Racist against Greek people
Extreme in their behavior

**Muslims make me feel:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furious</th>
<th>Nervous</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Disappointed</td>
<td>Afraid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vexed</td>
<td>Anxious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Muslims make me want to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confront them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quarrel with them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abstain from them</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have no affiliation whatsoever with them</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Greek media:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence the views of the Greeks towards the Muslims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ignore the Muslim people</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not trust Muslims as law-abiding citizens of the state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portray Muslim citizens in a negative way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portray the citizens of the Greek majority in a positive way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portray Muslims in a way that is not true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have working people who belong to groups hostile to Muslims</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greek people belonging to the majority:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trust Greek media</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Trust Greek media concerning their portrayal of the Muslim minority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please fill in the following elements:**
Demographic elements

Please fill in your age ________ and your sex, __________.
Are you employed? Yes ____, No _____, if yes, what is your profession? __________,
Mother tongue: ____________________.

Your mother’s educational level (note the upper grade your mother has completed)

- none/primary school
- high school
- graduate school
- higher education degree
- master’s degree
- holder of a PhD

Monthly family income (calculate individual added with your family)

- Up to 300 euro
- 301 – 630 euro
- 631 – 800 euro
- 801 – 1000 euro
- 1001 – 1220 euro
- 1221 – 1500 euro
- 1501 – 1800 euro
- 1801 – 2300 euro
- 2301 – 3700 euro
- 3701 euro and more

Finally, consider that this staircase represents where people are in our society. At the top of the ladder are those who are better off - those who possess the most money, higher education, and the best jobs. At the bottom of the ladder are people who are in worse shape or condition - those who have the least money, the lowest education, and the worst jobs. Put a circle on the number that best represents where you are on the ladder.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Thank you for your cooperation

**Questionnaire distributed to Muslim citizens of Thrace and W. Macedonia in Greece (translated to English):**

**QUESTIONNAIRE**

Thank you for your participation in this study. Its goal is to record and register the opinions of the Greek majority and Muslim minority of Greece.

This study is conducted for purely scientific reasons and all responses will remain anonymous and confidential. Please answer using the appropriate measures. Completing the questionnaire will take less than 10 minutes.

_School of Journalism and Mass Media Communication_  
_Aristotle University of Thessaloniki_

Read the following sentences. For each of them, indicate from 1 to 7 according to how much you agree:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all 1</th>
<th>Very little 2</th>
<th>little 3</th>
<th>Moderately 4</th>
<th>Much 5</th>
<th>Very Much 6</th>
<th>Extremely 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

I love Greece
I am proud to be Greek
I am proud of the Greek history
The Greek flag means a lot to me
I am proud of my history
I identify a lot with other members of my group (eg Muslims, Turkish speakers)
I feel great companionship with other members of my group (eg Muslims, Turkish speakers)
I feel like I belong to my group (eg Muslims, Turkish speakers)
I experience prejudice because of my ethnicity / religion

My group is experiencing prejudice

**Greek people belonging to the majority:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are racist against Muslims</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit racist behavior against Muslims</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit extreme behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are racists</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Muslim citizens of Greece:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Are not united</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Can change their negative image if they unite together</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I want to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change the image that Muslim citizens of Greece have</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stay out of the way</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**The Muslims:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Exhibit extreme behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Are racists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are racists against the Greek people belonging to the majority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhibit racists behavior against Greek people belonging to the majority</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I believe that:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Turkey and Greece are historic enemies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Christians and Muslims are historic enemies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I feel:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>As an alien in Greek society</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>That I don’t belong in Greek society</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That the Greek state discriminates against me and my group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
That no matter what Muslim citizens try to do, they will still get discriminated against by the Greek state.

**Greek people belonging to the majority view Muslims as:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Racist</th>
<th>Racist against Greek people</th>
<th>Extreme in their behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Greek people belonging to the majority make me feel:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Furious</th>
<th>Nervous</th>
<th>Disappointed</th>
<th>Afraid</th>
<th>Vexed</th>
<th>Anxious</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Greek people belonging to the majority make me want to:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Confront them</th>
<th></th>
<th>Quarrel with them</th>
<th></th>
<th>Abstain from them</th>
<th>Have no affiliation whatsoever with them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**The Greek media:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Influence the views of the Greeks towards the Muslims</th>
<th>Ignore the Muslim people</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Do not trust Muslims as law-abiding citizens of the state</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portray Muslim citizens in a negative way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portray the citizens of the Greek majority in a positive way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portray Muslims in a way that is not true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have working people who belong to groups hostile to Muslims</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greek people belonging to the majority:

- Trust Greek media
- Trust Greek media concerning their portrayal of the Muslim minority

Now we would like you to think about the last 5 months. For each question, indicate from 1 to 7 according to how often you experienced the situations that are mentioned below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely often 1</th>
<th>Very often 2</th>
<th>Often 3</th>
<th>Sometimes 4</th>
<th>Rarely 5</th>
<th>Very rarely 6</th>
<th>Never 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

How often did somebody assume that because of your ethnicity/religion you must be:

- Violent
- Not truthful
- Dirty

How often:

- Have you been called with an abusive term (eg gypsy)
- Have you received racist comments related to stereotypes against Muslims?
- Have felt that you were shunned/avoided because of your ethnicity/religion?
- Has anyone made you feel that you don't belong here because of how you dress, your language, or any other feature of your group?
- Have you been denied access to a public service?
- Have you felt that you were treated unequally because of your ethnicity / religion?
- Have they had low expectations for you because of your nationality / religion?
- Have threatened you with violence because of your ethnicity/religion?
- Has somebody assumed that you are violent because of your ethnicity/religion?
- Has somebody assumed that you are not trustworthy because of your ethnicity/religion?
Has somebody assumed that you are unclean because of your ethnicity/religion?

Please fill in the following elements:

**Demographic elements**

Please fill in your age _______ and your sex, ________.
Are you employed? Yes _____, No _____, if yes, what is your profession? ___________,
Mother tongue: __________________.

Your mother’s educational level (note the upper grade your mother has completed)

none/primary school ☐
high school ☐
graduate school ☐
higher education degree ☐
master’s degree ☐
holder of a PhD ☐

Monthly family income (calculate individual added with your family)

Up to 300 euro ☐
301 – 630 euro ☐
631 – 800 euro ☐
801 – 1000 euro ☐
1001 – 1220 euro ☐
1221 – 1500 euro ☐
1501 – 1800 euro ☐
1801 – 2300 euro ☐
2301 – 3700 euro ☐
3701 euro and more ☐

Finally, consider that this staircase represents where people are in our society. At the top of the ladder are those who are better off - those who possess the most money, higher education, and the best jobs. At the bottom of the ladder are people who are in worse shape or condition - those who have the least money, the lowest education, and the worst jobs. Put a circle on the number that best represents where you are on the ladder.

<p>| | | | | | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for your cooperation