Inclusion & Exclusion criteria.

In criticising the many labs replication experiment of the imagined contact, Crisp et al write “More generally, the Many Labs project did not consider the interaction between country context and outgroup identity. The original Husnu and Crisp study examined effects on prejudice when British students imagined contact with British Muslims. In line with the notion that ingroup and outgroup identity are key to the imagined contact effect, Klein et al. (2014) modified the Muslim outgroup for their Turkish sample, who instead imagined contact with Christians. However, this modification highlights the complexity of cultural context, as Christians are far less likely to be considered as an outgroup by Turkish participants than Kurds or Armenians, who are ethnic minorities with a long history of conflict within Turkey (Bikmen & Sunar, 2013).”

This criticism sounds very ad hoc. I can’t see that cultural context has been mentioned much in the previous work on imagined contact. Crisp et al. don’t describe *how* they would expect cultural context to impact the effect of imagined contact, just that it would. Nevertheless, If we take this criticism at face value, and the original study, I think we can say that studies on westerners’ stereotypes of muslims being reduced by imagined contact represents the strongest version of the imagined contact hypothesis (ICH), at least as laid out by the original authors. So, I think we should focus on this specific aspect of ICH. If we find publication bias, nobody can criticize us for not \*really\* looking at ICH, also, pragmatically, this gives us a fairly narrow set of studies – I can’t imagine there are much more than 30ish articles looking at this. So, that is my suggestion for one inclusion criteria. Then to reduce the noise, I suggest we only include healthy, adult populations. No children, no mental illness, no special population. I think