

Online Appendix for the paper:

Understanding the Selection Bias: Social Network Processes Mediate the Effect of Prejudice on
the Avoidance of Outgroup Friends

Tobias H. Stark

Utrecht University/ICS and Stanford University

ONLINE APPENDIX A: Descriptive Statistics of the Individual Prejudice Items

Table A1

Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum, Maximum, Skewness, Kurtosis and Correlations of all Outgroup Attitude Items at Wave 1 (N = 453)

Variables	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis	Correlations							
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1. Turks honest	4.35	1.54	1	7	-0.08	0.14	1.00							
2. Turks friendly	4.50	1.58	1	7	-0.16	-0.07	0.90	1.00						
3. Turks smart	4.40	1.50	1	7	-0.09	0.17	0.88	0.90	1.00					
4. Turks helpful	4.46	1.54	1	7	-0.15	0.10	0.84	0.90	0.89	1.00				
5. Moroccans honest	3.98	1.48	1	7	-0.15	0.44	0.50	0.45	0.48	0.42	1.00			
6. Moroccans friendly	4.16	1.52	1	7	-0.16	0.21	0.49	0.52	0.51	0.49	0.79	1.00		
7. Moroccans smart	4.06	1.43	1	7	-0.22	0.59	0.45	0.47	0.53	0.47	0.76	0.78	1.00	
8. Moroccans helpful	4.12	1.48	1	7	-0.21	0.37	0.45	0.45	0.48	0.51	0.77	0.83	0.80	1.00

Note: Pair-wise deletion of missing values in the correlation table. All correlations are significant at $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

Table A2

Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum, Maximum, Skewness, Kurtosis and Correlations of all Outgroup Attitude Items at Wave 2 (N = 453)

Variables	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis	Correlations							
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1. Turks honest	4.33	1.61	1	7	-0.15	-0.13	1.00							
2. Turks friendly	4.49	1.60	1	7	-0.16	-0.17	0.91	1.00						
3. Turks smart	4.38	1.60	1	7	-0.12	-0.12	0.92	0.91	1.00					
4. Turks helpful	4.50	1.60	1	7	-0.13	-0.22	0.89	0.94	0.91	1.00				
5. Moroccans honest	3.88	1.59	1	7	-0.05	-0.04	0.52	0.47	0.50	0.47	1.00			
6. Moroccans friendly	4.13	1.60	1	7	-0.13	-0.09	0.54	0.58	0.55	0.56	0.82	1.00		
7. Moroccans smart	4.05	1.57	1	7	-0.08	0.01	0.52	0.52	0.56	0.52	0.86	0.80	1.00	
8. Moroccans helpful	4.07	1.61	1	7	-0.14	-0.11	0.48	0.49	0.50	0.53	0.87	0.86	0.88	1.00

Note: Pair-wise deletion of missing values in the correlation table. All correlations are significant at $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

Table A3

Means, Standard Deviations, Minimum, Maximum, Skewness, Kurtosis and Correlations of all Outgroup Attitude Items at Wave 3 (N = 453)

Variables	Mean	SD	Min	Max	Skewness	Kurtosis	Correlations							
							1	2	3	4	5	6	7	
1. Turks honest	4.27	1.48	1	7	-0.11	0.42	1.00							
2. Turks friendly	4.39	1.50	1	7	-0.22	0.33	0.91	1.00						
3. Turks smart	4.27	1.45	1	7	-0.12	0.57	0.92	0.91	1.00					
4. Turks helpful	4.39	1.51	1	7	-0.15	0.30	0.89	0.91	0.91	1.00				
5. Moroccans honest	3.79	1.52	1	7	-0.16	0.21	0.48	0.44	0.48	0.43	1.00			
6. Moroccans friendly	4.05	1.49	1	7	-0.22	0.35	0.52	0.54	0.55	0.54	0.82	1.00		
7. Moroccans smart	3.93	1.48	1	7	-0.18	0.40	0.48	0.48	0.54	0.50	0.85	0.88	1.00	
8. Moroccans helpful	3.95	1.52	1	7	-0.22	0.25	0.45	0.46	0.49	0.49	0.83	0.87	0.87	1.00

Note: Pair-wise deletion of missing values in the correlation table. All correlations are significant at $p < .001$ (two-tailed tests).

ONLINE APPENDIX B: Descriptive Statistics of each Classroom

Table B1

Class Level Descriptive Statistics of Classrooms used in the Analyses presented in the Paper

Class	N students	Proportion ethnic groups			Average degree	Jaccard index	
		Dutch	Turkish /Moroccan	Other		T1-T2	T2-T3
1	26	0.27	0.58	0.15	5.64	0.42	0.34
2	25	0.13	0.35	0.52	4.62	0.38	0.38
3	24	0.50	0.33	0.17	4.02	0.46	0.47
4	27	0.54	0.23	0.23	3.41	0.38	0.48
5	21	0.62	0.29	0.10	4.80	0.44	0.42
6	24	0.52	0.30	0.17	5.10	0.36	0.36
7	24	0.50	0.29	0.21	5.09	0.39	0.46
8	23	0.52	0.26	0.22	4.83	0.58	0.52
9	25	0.54	0.25	0.21	6.00	0.31	0.43
10	22	0.50	0.18	0.32	3.29	0.49	0.49
11	20	0.65	0.10	0.25	3.49	0.34	0.52
12	29	0.86	0.07	0.07	4.75	0.43	0.39
13	27	0.59	0.15	0.26	3.85	0.38	0.50
14	23	0.78	0.13	0.09	5.13	0.44	0.48
15	21	0.75	0.10	0.15	4.46	0.45	0.56
16	20	0.53	0.24	0.24	3.28	0.38	0.51
17	19	0.53	0.24	0.24	3.64	0.46	0.51
18	13	0.58	0.33	0.08	2.48	0.41	0.54
19	12	0.58	0.17	0.25	2.67	0.58	0.57
20	28	0.58	0.12	0.31	4.28	0.43	0.18

Note: The first 10 classes include each at least two Turkish or Moroccan students of each gender. The supplementary analyses presented in Tables A5 and A6 are based on these ten classes.

ONLINE APPENDIX C: Replication of the Analyses in Classes with at least Two Turkish or Moroccan Students of each Gender

Table C1

Selection Bias and Underlying Mechanisms: Stochastic Actor-Based Multi-Group Analyses of 10 Classrooms with at least Two Turkish or Moroccan Children of each Gender (N = 241)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Est.	SE	Est.	SE	Est.	SE	Est.	SE
<i>Attitude function</i>								
Data tendency: linear shape	.04	.04	.04	.04	.04	.03	.05	.04
Data tendency: quadratic shape	.05 [†]	.03	.05 [†]	.03	.05	.03	.05	.03
Number of outgroup friends	-.02	.02	-.02	.02	-.02	.02	-.02	.02
Gender (boys)	.04	.07	.04	.07	.04	.07	.04	.08
Ethnicity Dutch ¹	.05	.10	.05	.11	.05	.10	.05	.11
Ethnicity Turk/Moroccan ¹	.10	.11	.10	.12	.10	.11	.10	.10
Social influence (av. sim.)	4.36***	1.00	4.40***	.96	4.28***	1.02	4.49***	1.04
<i>Network function</i>								
Network effects								
Outdegree	-2.46***	.12	-2.48***	.13	-2.75***	.13	-3.88***	.16
Reciprocity	–		–		1.60***	.15	.63**	.19
Triadic closure	–		–		–		.43***	.03
Time: 1 st period	.13	.11	.15	.11	.17 [†]	.10	.65***	.10
Gender								
Boys ego	.57***	.14	.55***	.13	.63***	.13	.36**	.11
Boys alter	-.46***	.09	-.46***	.09	-.51***	.09	-.59***	.09
Same gender	1.69***	.08	1.69***	.08	1.37***	.09	1.13***	.09
Negative outgroup attitude								
Negative attitude ego	.25**	.08	.19*	.08	.19*	.08	.14*	.06
Negative attitude alter	-.02	.04	-.02	.04	-.03	.05	-.05	.05
Attitude similarity	.36	.39	.43	.41	.35	.42	.29	.44
Ethnicity Dutch								
Dutch ego	-.61***	.16	-.58***	.16	-.55**	.16	-.25 [†]	.13
Dutch alter	.08	.12	.12	.13	.18	.13	.22	.15
Same Dutch	.55***	.08	.60***	.11	.54***	.11	.61***	.13
Ethnicity Turks/Moroccans								
Turks/Moroccans ego	Ref.		Ref.		Ref.		Ref.	
Turks/Moroccans alter	.08	.12	.12	.15	.06	.16	.02	.18
Same Turks/Moroccans	.45***	.09	.48***	.12	.39**	.13	.39**	.14
Ethnicity other								
Ethnicity other ego	-.40*	.20	-.36 [†]	.21	-.34 [†]	.21	-.16	.20
Ethnicity other alter	Ref.		Ref.		Ref.		Ref.	
Same other ethnicity	-.25*	.11	-.30*	.13	-.22	.14	-.17	.16
Selection bias of Dutch								
Dutch ego * negative attitude ego	–		-.42*	.17	-.43**	.15	-.39**	.12
Dutch ego * Turks/Moroccans alter	–		.15	.30	.20	.34	.24	.37
Negative attitude ego *	–		-.18 [†]	.11	-.17	.11	-.17	.12

Turks/Moroccans alter Dutch ego * negative attitudes ego * Turks/ Moroccans alter	–	–.45*	.22	–.38 [†]	.22	–.19	.26
--	---	-------	-----	-------------------	-----	------	-----

Note: Unstandardized effects.

¹Reference category is ethnicity other.

*** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$; [†] $p < .1$ (two-tailed tests).

The selection bias replicated in the smaller sample of Dutch majority group students who had at least two Turkish or Moroccan classmates of each gender ($est = -.45$, $SE = .22$, $p = .04$; Model 2 in Table C1). This effect was slightly reduced by adding reciprocity to the model (Model 3 in Table C1) but it remained significant on the $p < .1$ level. Adding triadic closure to the model cut the effect almost in half and turned it insignificant ($est = -.19$, $SE = .26$, $p = .47$; Model 4 in Table C1). This pattern closely resembles the analyses presented in the main document.

Table C2

Test of the Mediation Models: Stochastic Actor-Based Multi-Group Analyses of 10 Classrooms with at least Two Turkish or Moroccan Children of each Gender (N = 241)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Est.	SE	Est.	SE	Est.	SE	Est.	SE
<i>Attitude function</i>								
Data tendency: linear shape	.04	.04	.04	.04	.05	.04	.05	.04
Data tendency: quadratic shape	.05 [†]	.03	.05	.03	.05	.03	.05	.04
Number of outgroup friends	-.02	.02	-.02	.02	-.02	.02	-.02	.02
Gender (boys)	.03	.08	.04	.08	.04	.07	.04	.08
Ethnicity Dutch ¹	.05	.11	.05	.10	.05	.11	.05	.10
Ethnicity Turk/Moroccan ¹	.10	.11	.10	.11	.10	.12	.10	.11
Social influence (av. sim.)	4.40***	.98	4.37***	1.03	4.52***	1.12	4.46***	1.28
<i>Network function</i>								
Network effects								
Outdegree	-2.42***	.12	-2.45***	.13	-3.86***	.17	-3.90***	.18
Reciprocity	–		–		.61**	.18	.60**	.19
Triadic closure	–		–		.43***	.02	.43***	.02
Time: 1 st period	.13	.11	.14	.11	.63***	.10	.63***	.10
Gender								
Boys ego	.57***	.14	.53***	.14	.34**	.12	.34**	.12
Boys alter	-.46***	.08	-.46***	.09	-.59***	.09	-.59***	.09
Same gender	1.68***	.08	1.74***	.09	1.16***	.10	1.16***	.09
Negative outgroup attitude								
Negative attitude ego	.25**	.07	.12	.09	.08	.08	.08	.08
Negative attitude alter	-.01	.05	-.03	.04	-.05	.05	-.05	.05
Attitude similarity	.37	.43	.47	.43	.31	.45	.30	.43
Ethnicity Dutch								
Dutch ego	-.27	.19	-.71***	.19	-.35 [†]	.18	-.38*	.19
Dutch alter	.11	.19	-.03	.13	.09	.15	.15	.15
Same Dutch	.47***	.12	.29**	.10	.45***	.12	.52***	.14
Ethnicity Turks/Moroccans								
Turks/Moroccans ego	-.30	.21	Ref.		Ref.		Ref.	
Turks/Moroccans alter	Ref.		.01	.13	-.05	.16	.05	.20
Same Turks/Moroccans	.35***	.12	.37***	.09	.28*	.12	.37*	.15
Ethnicity other								
Ethnicity other ego	Ref.		-.26	.20	-.09	.18	-.16	.19
Ethnicity other alter	-.02	.13	Ref.		Ref.		Ref.	
Same other ethnicity	-.16	.14	-.20 [†]	.11	-.09	.14	-.17	.15
Test of reciprocity as mediator								
Dutch alter * negative attitude alter	-.03	.05	–		–		–	
Dutch alter * Turkish/Moroccan ego	.03	.46	–		–		–	
Turkish/Moroccan ego * negative attitude alter	.05	.09	–		–		–	
Dutch alter * Turkish/Moroccan ego	-.10	.09	–		–		–	

Moroccan ego * negative attitude alter							
Test of triadic closure as mediator							
Turkish/Moroccan alter at distance 2	–	–.51	.46	–.49	.46	–.53	.49
Dutch ego * negative attitude ego	–	–.57**	.18	–.52***	.14	–.51**	.15
Dutch ego * Turkish/Moroccan alter at distance 2	–	–2.94***	.82	–1.18	.82	–1.31	.81
Turkish/Moroccan alter at distance 2* negative attitude ego	–	–.62 [†]	.36	.65 [†]	.33	–.62	.41
Dutch ego * negative attitude ego * Turkish/Moroccan alter at distance 2	–	–1.74*	.77	–1.19	.73	–1.17	.92
Selection bias of Dutch							
Dutch ego * Turks/Moroccans alter	–	–		–		.36	.38
Negative attitude ego * Turks/Moroccans alter	–	–		–		–.05	.13
Dutch ego * negative attitudes ego * Turks/Moroccans alter	–	–		–		–.0003	.28

Note: Unstandardized effects.

[†]Reference category is ethnicity other.

*** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$; [†] $p < .1$ (two-tailed tests).

All results presented in the main paper also replicated in the smaller subsample of students with at least two Turkish or Moroccan classmates of each gender. There was no indication that Turkish or Moroccan minority group students would not selected a Dutch classmate who had more negative attitudes toward Turks or Moroccans ($est = -.10$, $SE = .09$, $p = .28$; Model 1 in Table C2). However, the more negative Dutch students' attitudes were, the more likely they were in network positions where their friends did not have outgroup friends (Model 2). Again, the test of the full mediation model remained inconclusive, as none of the main interaction effects was significant (Model 4).

ONLINE APPENDIX D: Test for the Selection Bias among Minority Group Students

Table D1

Test for Selection Bias among Turkish or Moroccan Students (Model 1 and 2) and among Students of Other Minority Groups (Model 3 and 4)

	<i>Turkish or Moroccan Students</i>				<i>Other Minority Groups</i>			
	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Est.	SE	Est.	SE	Est.	SE	Est.	SE
<i>Attitude function</i>								
Data tendency: linear shape	.03	.03	.03	.03	.03	.02	.03	.02
Data tendency: quadratic shape	.05*	.02	.05*	.03	.06**	.02	.05**	.02
Number of outgroup friends	-.04**	.02	-.04*	.02	-.04**	.01	-.04**	.01
Gender (boys)	.003	.05	.004	.05	.01	.05	.02	.05
Ethnicity Dutch ¹	.003	.09	.01	.09	.03	.08	.03	.08
Ethnicity Turk/Moroccan ¹	.17 [†]	.10	.18 [†]	.10	.18 [†]	.10	.19 [†]	.10
Social influence (av. sim.)	5.46***	.75	5.60***	.78	5.74***	.60	5.86***	.62
<i>Network function</i>								
<i>Network effects</i>								
Outdegree	-2.55***	.11	-3.51***	.11	-2.52***	.10	-3.52***	.11
Reciprocity	–		1.18***	.11	–		1.17***	.09
Triadic closure	–		.38***	.02	–		.40***	.01
Time: 1 st period	.38***	.07	.53***	.06	.43***	.05	.61***	.05
<i>Gender</i>								
Boys ego	.36***	.09	.28***	.07	.50***	.07	.31***	.06
Boys alter	-.22***	.05	-.25***	.06	-.16***	.04	-.26***	.05
Same gender	1.61***	.05	.90***	.06	1.55***	.04	.88***	.05
<i>Negative outgroup attitude</i>								
Negative attitude ego	.003	.05	.03	.04	-.04	.04	.01	.03
Negative attitude alter	-.05 [†]	.03	-.02	.03	-.05*	.02	-.04	.03
Attitude similarity	.08	.26	.30	.28	.07	.21	.31	.22
<i>Ethnicity Dutch</i>								
Dutch ego	Ref.		Ref.		Ref.		Ref.	
Dutch alter	.07	.08	.24*	.09	.03	.09	.21 [†]	.11
Same Dutch	.31**	.09	.26	.11	.37***	.08	.27**	.09
<i>Ethnicity Turks/Moroccans</i>								
Turks/Moroccans ego	.35*	.14	.23	.15	.45**	.13	.33**	.13
Turks/Moroccans alter	-.03	.13	-.002	.15	Ref.	.13	Ref.	.13
Same Turks/Moroccans	.28**	.11	.24 [†]	.12	.29**	.11	.28*	.12
<i>Ethnicity other</i>								
Ethnicity other ego	.48***	.12	.42***	.11	.47**	.13	.34**	.12
Ethnicity other alter	Ref.	.13	Ref.	.13	-.04	.14	-.07	.15
Same other ethnicity	-.21 [†]	.11	-.22 [†]	.13	-.33**	.10	-.38**	.12
<i>Selection bias of Turks/ Moroccans</i>								
Turks/ Moroccans ego *	.23*	.11	.23*	.10	–		–	
negative attitude ego								
Turks/ Moroccans ego *	-.26	.25	-.25	.29	–		–	
Dutch alter								
Negative attitude ego * Dutch	-.04	.06	-.01	.07	–		–	

alter								
Turks/ Moroccans ego * negative attitudes ego *	-.02	.13	.04	.16	-		-	
Dutch alter								
Selection bias of other ethnicity								
Other ethnicity ego * negative attitude ego	-		-		.19 [†]	.10	.17*	.08
Other ethnicity ego * Dutch alter	-		-		-.03	.24	-.25	.28
Negative attitude ego * Dutch alter	-		-		-.10 [†]	.06	-.11 [†]	.06
Other ethnicity ego * negative attitudes ego * Dutch alter	-		-		-.21	.14	-.20	.16
<i>N</i> students	649		649		992		992	
<i>N</i> school classes	28		28		41		41	

Note: Unstandardized effects.

[†]Reference category is ethnicity other.

*** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$; [†] $p < .1$ (two-tailed tests).

Two subsamples were analyzed, to test for the selection bias among students from ethnic minority groups. Model 1 and 2 in Table D1 show results from the perspective of Turkish or Moroccan students who had at least two Dutch classmates of each gender ($N = 649$, including classmates from all ethnic groups). Model 3 and 4 show results for students from all other ethnic minority groups who had at least two Dutch classmates of each gender ($N = 992$, including classmates from all ethnic groups).

Intergroup Contact

The effect of intergroup contact on prejudice reduction appeared in these supplementary analyses of larger subsamples. Students in classes with at least one Turkish or Moroccan student and at least two Dutch students of each gender developed less negative outgroup attitude over time the more outgroup friends they had ($est = -.04$, $SE = .02$, $p = .009$, Model 1 in Table D1). The same was true in classes with at least one student from another ethnic minority group and at least two Dutch students of each gender ($est = -.04$, $SE = .01$, $p = .006$, Model 3).

Network structural effects did not mediate the direct contact effect. The coefficients remained unchanged when network processes were added to the models (Model 2 and Model 4 in Table D1). Intergroup contact reduces prejudice through affective bonds in intergroup friendships that increase self-disclosure, increase empathy for the outgroup, and reduce intergroup anxiety (Pettigrew et al. 2011; Swart et al. 2011). For these processes to take place, it is not relevant whether the friendship with an outgroup member followed from a direct friendship decision or developed because an open friendship triangle was closed.

No Selection Bias

The present analyses revealed no selection bias among minority group students. Students with a Turkish or Moroccan background and more negative attitudes toward the Dutch were not less likely to nominate Dutch majority group classmates as friends than students with more positive attitudes ($est = -.02$, $SE = .13$, $p = .88$, Model 1 in Table D1). There was also no indication of a selection bias among students from other ethnic minority groups ($est = -.21$, $SE = .14$, $p = .12$, Model 3 in Table D1). As such, adding the structural network process to the models did not change the effect of outgroup attitudes (Model 3 and 4).

Minority group students may be less likely to show a selection bias because of the different opportunity structure to fulfill their friendship preferences (Moody 2001; Mouw and Entwisle 2006). By definition, there are few minority group members in a given school class. Hence, even prejudiced minority group members may not be able to find the number of friends they desire among their own ethnic group. Instead, these students may be forced to select friends from the majority group (Moody 2001). In fact, in the present study, the mean number of majority group friends among minority group members with negative attitudes toward the majority group (above the mid-point of the scale) varied between $M_{Wave 1} = 2.56$ and $M_{Wave 2} =$

1.94. The mean number of outgroup friends among majority group members with negative attitudes and who had at least one Turkish or Moroccan classmate varied only between $M_{\text{Wave 1}} = 0.23$ and $M_{\text{Wave 2}} = 0.33$.

ONLINE APPENDIX E: Complete Version of Table 3 (including omitted coefficients)

Table E1

Test of the Mediation Models: Stochastic Actor-Based Multi-Group Analyses of the Co-Evolution of 20 Classroom Friendship Networks and Students' Outgroup Attitudes (N = 453)

	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3		Model 4	
	Est.	SE	Est.	SE	Est.	SE	Est.	SE
<i>Attitude function</i>								
Data tendency: linear shape	.05 [†]	.03	.05 [†]	.03	.06 [†]	.03	.06 [†]	.03
Data tendency: quadratic shape	.06 [†]	.03	.06 [†]	.03	.06 [†]	.03	.05 [†]	.03
Number of outgroup friends	-.02	.02	-.02	.02	-.02	.02	-.02	.02
Gender (boys)	.02	.06	.02	.06	.02	.06	.02	.06
Ethnicity Dutch ¹	.07	.09	.07	.09	.07	.09	.07	.09
Ethnicity Turk/Moroccan ¹	.16	.10	.15	.10	.16	.11	.16	.10
Social influence (av. sim.)	5.24***	.85	5.24***	.89	5.38***	.92	5.35***	.97
<i>Network function</i>								
Network effects								
Outdegree	-2.47***	.10	-2.48***	.10	-3.53***	.11	-3.58***	.12
Reciprocity	—		—		.99***	.13	.98***	.13
Triadic closure	—		—		.38***	.02	.38***	.02
Time: 1 st period	.31***	.08	.32***	.08	.53***	.07	.53***	.07
Gender								
Boys ego	.42***	.11	.38***	.10	.30***	.08	.30***	.09
Boys alter	-.37***	.06	-.36***	.06	-.41***	.07	-.41***	.07
Same gender	1.63***	.06	1.65***	.06	.97***	.07	.97***	.07
Negative outgroup attitude								
Negative attitude ego	.23***	.06	.13*	.06	.10 [†]	.05	.10 [†]	.05
Negative attitude alter	.005	.04	-.005	.03	.0003	.04	-.003	.04
Attitude similarity	.09	.30	.13	.31	.30	.32	.31	.32
Ethnicity Dutch								
Dutch ego	-.41**	.14	-.53***	.14	-.39**	.12	-.45**	.13
Dutch alter	.11	.16	.14	.10	.26*	.11	.31**	.11
Same Dutch	.27**	.10	.23**	.08	.29**	.09	.37***	.10
Ethnicity Turks/Moroccans								
Turks/Moroccans ego	.13	.17	Ref.		Ref.		Ref.	
Turks/Moroccans alter	Ref.		.07	.12	.04	.13	.17	.16
Same Turks/Moroccans	.40***	.10	.45***	.08	.36***	.10	.47***	.12
Ethnicity other								
Ethnicity other ego	Ref.		-.08	.18	-.05	.16	-.14	.17
Ethnicity other alter	-.07	.12	Ref.		Ref.		Ref.	
Same other ethnicity	-.21 [†]	.11	-.30**	.09	-.27**	.10	-.36**	.12
Test of reciprocity as mediator								
Dutch alter * negative attitude alter	-.02	.04	—		—		—	
Dutch alter * Turkish/Moroccan ego	-.17	.39	—		—		—	
Turkish/Moroccan ego * negative attitude alter	.02	.08	—		—		—	
Dutch alter * Turkish/Moroccan ego	-.10	.08	—		—		—	

Moroccan ego * negative attitude alter							
Test of triadic closure as mediator							
Turkish/Moroccan alter at distance 2	–	–.13	.35	.01	.32	–.01	.32
Dutch ego * negative attitude ego	–	–.51***	.12	–.40***	.10	–.40***	.10
Dutch ego * Turkish/Moroccan alter at distance 2	–	–2.11***	.52	–.36	.51	–.46	.51
Turkish/Moroccan alter at distance 2* negative attitude ego	–	–.36	.27	.52 [†]	.27	–.45	.32
Dutch ego * negative attitude ego * Turkish/Moroccan alter at distance 2	–	–1.02*	.51	–.83 [†]	.49	–.74	.61
Selection bias of Dutch							
Dutch ego * Turks/Moroccans alter	–	–		–		.39	.30
Negative attitude ego * Turks/Moroccans alter	–	–		–		–.11	.13
Dutch ego * negative attitudes ego * Turks/Moroccans alter	–	–		–		–.10	.24

Note: Unstandardized effects.

[†]Reference category is ethnicity other.

*** $p < .001$; ** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$ (two-tailed tests).

REFERENCES

- Moody, James. 2001. "Race, School Integration, and Friendship Segregation in America." *American Journal of Sociology* 107:679–716.
- Mouw, Ted and Barbara Entwisle. 2006. "Residential Segregation and Interracial Friendship in Schools." *American Journal of Sociology* 112:394–441.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F., Linda R. Tropp, Ulrich Wagner, and Oliver Christ. 2011. "Recent advances in intergroup contact theory." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 35:271–280.
- Swart, Hermann, Miles Hewstone, Oliver Christ, and Alberto Voci. 2011. "Affective mediators of intergroup contact: A three-wave longitudinal study in South Africa." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 101:1221–1238.