**Supplementary Analyses: School-Level Perceptions of Discrimination**

To investigate the potential role of perceived discrimination at the school-level, we conducted two additional multilevel moderation analyses. First, perceived discrimination was modeled as a Level 2 moderator of the association between emotional fit and each outcome variable, replacing the original Level 1 moderator. This school-level interaction was not significant for any of the outcomes, except for non-compliant behavior.

In a second analysis, we re-examined the original individual-level interaction and added the school-level interaction as an additional control. In these models, the pattern of significance for the interaction between emotional fit and individual-level perceived discrimination was consistent with the primary analyses: outcomes for which the interaction was significant remained so and those for which it was not significant remained nonsignificant. The school-level interaction did not reach significance in any of these models.

**Majority Contact**

The school-level moderation model did not fit the data better than the predictor model (*∆-2LL*(2) = 0.80, *p* = .670), and did not fit the data better than the individual-level moderation model (*∆-2LL*(0) = 0.00, *p* = 1.000). The combined moderation model did not fit the data better than the predictor model (*∆-2LL*(4) = 3.40, *p* = .493), and did not fit the data better than the individual-level moderation model (∆*-2LL*(2) = 0.43, *p* = .809). No significant interaction effect was found between minorities’ emotional fit and school-level perceptions of discrimination on the one hand, and individual-level perceptions of discrimination on the other, on their majority contact over time (see Table 1, Combined moderation model).

**Table 1**

*Predicting Minorities' Majority Contact at Wave 2: Effects of Emotional Fit at Wave 1 and the Interaction with Perceived Discrimination at the Individual and School Level, Controlling for Age, Gender, and Contact at Wave 1*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Effect | Predictor model | | Individual-level moderation model | | School-level moderation model | | | Combined moderation model | |
|  | Estimate | *p* | Estimate | *p* | Estimate | *p* | | Estimate | *p* |
| **Fixed effects** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Intercept | 3.56  [3.43, 3.70] | < .001 | 3.57  [3.44, 3.71] | < .001 | 3.89  [2.87, 4.98] | < .001 | | 3.73  [2.69, 4.89] | < .001 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Gender | -0.14  [-0.31, 0.02] | .09 | -0.15  [-0.32, 0.02] | .082 | -0.15  [-0.32, 0.02] | .076 | | -0.15  [-0.32, 0.02] | .074 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Age | 0.04  [-0.03, 0.10] | .308 | 0.04  [-0.03, 0.11] | .295 | 0.04  [-0.03, 0.11] | .254 | | 0.04  [-0.03, 0.11] | .261 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Majority contact at wave 1 | 0.62  [0.55, 0.70] | < .001 | 0.61  [0.54, 0.69] | < .001 | 0.62  [0.55, 0.70] | < .001 | | 0.61  [0.54, 0.69] | < .001 |
| Emotional fit at wave 1 | 0.18  [0.01, 0.36] | .041 | 0.17  [0.00, 0.35] | .051 | -0.53  [-2.63, 1.57] | .622 | | -0.44  [-2.62, 1.73] | .690 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Perceived discrimination at wave 1 |  |  | -0.09  [-0.19, 0.02] | .113 |  |  | | -0.08  [-0.19, 0.03] | .130 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| School-level perceptions of discrimination at wave 1 |  |  |  |  | -0.14  [-0.62, 0.31] | .534 | | -0.08  [-0.58, 0.39] | .729 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Perceived discrimination at wave 1 \* Emotional fit at wave 1 |  |  | 0.07  [-0.15, 0.30] | .515 |  |  | | 0.06  [-0.18, 0.29] | .621 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| School-level perceptions of discrimination at wave 1 \* Emotional fit at wave 1 |  |  |  |  | 0.32  [-0.63, 1.27] | .507 | | 0.28  [-0.70, 1.26] | .577 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| **Random effects** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Intercept (school) | 0.10  [0.00, 0.26] |  | 0.13  [0.00, 0.28] |  | 0.11  [0.00, 0.26] |  | | 0.13  [0.00, 0.28] |  |
| Residual | 0.92  [0.86, 0.98] |  | 0.91  [0.85, 0.97] |  | 0.91  [0.86, 0.98] |  | | 0.91  [0.85, 0.97] |  |
| **Fit statistics** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| -2\*loglikelihood | 1317.9 |  | 1314.9 |  | 1317.1 | |  | 1314.5 |  |
| AIC | 1331.9 |  | 1332.9 |  | 1335.1 | |  | 1336.5 |  |
| BIC | 1361.3 |  | 1370.7 |  | 1372.9 | |  | 1382.7 |  |

*Note.* Results from four linear mixed-effects models predicting minorities' majority contact at wave 2. Unstandardized regression coefficients are presented for the fixed effects. Standard deviations are reported for the random intercept and residuals. Confidence intervals are shown in square brackets. All models include 49 schools (grouping variable) and 493 students.

**Motivation at School**

The school-level moderation model did not fit the data better than the predictor model (*∆-2LL*(2) = 1.85, *p* = .397), and did not fit the data better than the individual-level moderation model (∆*-2LL*(0) = 0.00, *p* = 1.000). The combined moderation model did not fit the data better than the predictor model (∆*-2LL*(4) = 9.30, *p* = .054), and did not fit the data better than the individual-level moderation model (∆*-2LL(2)* = 0.57, *p* = .752). A significant interaction effect was found between minorities’ emotional fit and perceived discrimination on their motivation over time, and remained significant when controlled for the interaction effect between minorities’ emotional fit and school-level perceptions of discrimination (see Table 2, Combined moderation model). A plot of the interaction (see Panel A of Figure 1) and simple slopes analyses showed that minorities’ emotional fit negatively predicted minorities’ motivation at school only when the discrimination at school at wave 1 was perceived to be moderate (β = -.18, *p* = .010, 95% CI [-.30, -.05]) and high (β = -.35, *p* < .001, 95% CI [-.53, -.17]), but not when the discrimination at wave 1 was perceived to be low (β = -.010, *p* = .95, 95% CI [-.19, .18]).

**Table 2**

*Predicting Minorities' Motivation at Wave 2: Effects of Emotional Fit at Wave 1 and the Interaction with Perceived Discrimination at the Individual and School Level, Controlling for Age, Gender, and Motivation at Wave 1*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Effect | Predictor model | | Individual-level moderation model | | School-level moderation model | | | Combined moderation model | |
|  | Estimate | *p* | Estimate | *p* | Estimate | *p* | | Estimate | *p* |
| **Fixed effects** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Intercept | 3.58  [3.46, 3.69] | < .001 | 3.57  [3.45, 3.68] | < .001 | 3.99  [3.06, 4.95] | < .001 | | 3.89  [2.96, 4.85] | < .001 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Gender | -0.01  [-0.14, 0.11] | 0.849 | 0.00  [-0.13, 0.12] | .938 | -0.01  [-0.14, 0.11] | .814 | | -0.01  [-0.13, 0.12] | .888 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Age | 0.04  [-0.01, 0.10] | 0.085 | 0.05  [0.00, 0.10] | .064 | 0.05  [-0.01, 0.10] | .076 | | 0.05  [0.00, 0.10] | .058 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Motivation at wave 1 | 0.44  [0.35, 0.52] | < .001 | 0.43  [0.34, 0.51] | < .001 | 0.43  [0.35, 0.52] | < .001 | | 0.43  [0.34, 0.51] | < .001 |
| Emotional fit at wave 1 | -0.17  [-0.30, -0.04] | 0.008 | -0.17  [-0.30, -0.05] | .007 | 0.58  [-0.92, 2.07] | 0.450 | | 0.04  [-1.50, 1.57] | .964 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Perceived discrimination at wave 1 |  |  | -0.05  [-0.13, 0.03] | .216 |  |  | | -0.04  [-0.12, 0.03] | .270 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| School-level perceptions of discrimination at wave 1 |  |  |  |  | -0.19  [-0.61, 0.23] | .373 | | -0.15  [-0.57, 0.27] | .489 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Perceived discrimination at wave 1 \* Emotional fit at wave 1 |  |  | -0.23  [-0.39, -0.07] | .006 |  |  | | -0.22  [-0.38, -0.05] | .010 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| School-level perceptions of discrimination at wave 1 \* Emotional fit at wave 1 |  |  |  |  | -0.34  [-1.02, 0.34] | .325 | | -0.10  [-0.79, 0.60] | .787 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| **Random effects** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Intercept (school) | 0.20  [0.09, 0.33] |  | 0.20  [0.08, 0.32] |  | 0.20  [0.08, 0.32] |  | | 0.19  [0.08, 0.32] |  |
| Residual | 0.65  [0.61, 0.70] |  | 0.65  [0.61, 0.69] |  | 0.65  [0.61, 0.70] |  | | 0.65  [0.61, 0.69] |  |
| **Fit statistics** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| -2\*loglikelihood | 1040.8 |  | 1032.1 |  | 1039.0 | |  | 1031.5 |  |
| AIC | 1054.8 |  | 1050.1 |  | 1057.0 | |  | 1053.5 |  |
| BIC | 1084.5 |  | 1088.2 |  | 1095.1 | |  | 1100.1 |  |

*Note.* Results from four linear mixed-effects models predicting minorities' motivation at wave 2. Unstandardized regression coefficients are presented for the fixed effects. Standard deviations are reported for the random intercept and residuals. Confidence intervals are shown in square brackets. All models include 50 schools (grouping variable) and 508 students.

**Figure 1**

*Interaction Between Perceived Discrimination at Wave 1 and Emotional Fit at Wave 1 as Predictor of Outcomes at Wave 2, Controlling for the Interaction Between School-Level Perceptions of Discrimination at Wave 1 and Emotional Fit at Wave 1, Age, Gender, and Outcome Variable Measured at Wave 1*

A screenshot of a graph

AI-generated content may be incorrect.

*Note.* This figure shows the interaction between emotional fit at wave 1 (x-axis) and individual-level perceived discrimination at school at wave 1 (moderator) on school motivation at Wave 2 (Panel A), behavioral engagement at wave 2 (Panel B), behavioral disengagement at wave 2 (Panel C), and non-compliant behavior at wave 2 (Panel D), controlling for age, gender, the outcome variables at wave 1, and the interaction between school-level perceptions of discrimination and emotional fit at wave 1. The lines represent simple slopes of emotional fit at three levels of individual-level perceived discrimination.

**Behavioral Engagement at School**

The school-level moderation model did not fit the data better than the predictor model (∆-2LL(2) = 1.19, p = .552), and did not fit the data better than the individual-level moderation model (∆-2LL(0) = 0.00, p = 1.000). The combined moderation model did fit the data better than the predictor model (∆-2LL(4) = 17.46, p = .002), but did not fit the data better than the individual-level moderation model (∆-2LL(2) = 1.29, p = .525). A significant interaction effect was found between minorities’ emotional fit and perceived discrimination on their behavioral engagement over time, and remained significant when controlled for the interaction effect between minorities’ emotional fit and school-level perceptions of discrimination (see Table 3, Combined moderation model). A plot of the interaction (see Panel B of Figure 1) and simple slopes analyses showed that minorities’ emotional fit negatively predicted minorities’ behavioral engagement at school only when the discrimination at school at wave 1 was perceived to be moderate (β = -.15, *p* = .010, 95% CI [-.26, -.04]) and high (β = -.36, *p* < .001, 95% CI [-.52, -.21]), but not when the discrimination at wave 1 was perceived to be low (β = .06, *p* = .450, 95% CI [-.10, .22]).

**Table 3**

*Predicting Minorities' Behavioral Engagement at Wave 2: Effects of Emotional Fit at Wave 1 and the Interaction with Perceived Discrimination at the Individual and School Level, Controlling for Age, Gender, and Behavioral Engagement at Wave 1*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Effect | Predictor model | | Individual-level moderation model | | School-level moderation model | | | Combined moderation model | |
|  | Estimate | *p* | Estimate | *p* | Estimate | *p* | | Estimate | *p* |
| **Fixed effects** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Intercept | 3.56  [3.46, 3.66] | < .001 | 3.54  [3.45, 3.64] | < .001 | 4.00  [3.19, 4.84] | < .001 | | 3.84  [3.03, 4.68] | < .001 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Gender | -0.02  [-0.13, 0.09] | .753 | -0.01  [-0.12, 0.10] | .864 | -0.02  [-0.13, 0.09] | .675 | | -0.02  [-0.12, 0.09] | .780 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Age | 0.04  [-0.01, 0.08] | .093 | 0.04  [0.00, 0.09] | .062 | 0.04  [0.00, 0.09] | .074 | | 0.05  [0.00, 0.09] | .047 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Behavioral engagement at wave 1 | 0.50  [0.42, 0.57] | < .001 | 0.49  [0.42, 0.57] | < .001 | 0.50  [0.42, 0.57] | < .001 | | 0.49  [0.42, 0.57] | < .001 |
| Emotional fit at wave 1 | -0.15  [-0.26, -0.04] | 0.008 | -0.16  [-0.27, -0.05] | .006 | -0.09  [-1.41, 1.23] | .895 | | -0.77  [-2.11, 0.57] | .262 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Perceived discrimination at wave 1 |  |  | -0.07  [-0.14, -0.01] | .034 |  |  | | -0.07  [-0.14, 0.00] | .043 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| School-level perceptions of discrimination at wave 1 |  |  |  |  | -0.20  [-0.57, 0.16] | .284 | | -0.13  [-0.50, 0.23] | .471 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Perceived discrimination at wave 1 \* Emotional fit at wave 1 |  |  | -0.26  [-0.39, -0.12] | < .001 |  |  | | -0.27  [-0.41, -0.13] | < .001 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| School-level perceptions of discrimination at wave 1 \* Emotional fit at wave 1 |  |  |  |  | -0.03  [-0.63, 0.57] | .924 | | 0.28  [-0.33, 0.89] | .370 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| **Random effects** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Intercept (school) | 0.17  [0.09, 0.27] |  | 0.17  [0.09, 0.26] |  | 0.17  [0.10, 0.27] |  | | 0.17  [0.09, 0.26] |  |
| Residual | 0.58  [0.54, 0.62] |  | 0.57  [0.53, 061] |  | 0.58  [0.54, 0.61] |  | | 0.57  [0.53, 0.60] |  |
| **Fit statistics** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| -2\*loglikelihood | 909.8 |  | 893.6 |  | 908.6 | |  | 892.3 |  |
| AIC | 923.8 |  | 911.6 |  | 926.6 | |  | 914.3 |  |
| BIC | 953.4 |  | 949.7 |  | 964.6 | |  | 960.8 |  |

*Note.* Results from four linear mixed-effects models predicting minorities' behavioral engagement at wave 2. The Null model only accounts for the grouping variable (schools). The Control model additionally controls for age, gender, and behavioral engagement at wave 1. Unstandardized regression coefficients are presented for the fixed effects. Standard deviations are reported for the random intercept and residuals. Confidence intervals are shown in square brackets. All models include 50 schools (grouping variable) and 508 students.

**Behavioral Disengagement at School**

The school-level moderation model did not fit the data better than the predictor model (∆*-2LL*(2) = 1.25, *p* = .535), and did not fit the data better than the individual-level moderation model (∆-*2LL*(0) = 0.00, *p* = 1.000). The combined moderation model did fit the data better than the predictor model (∆*-2LL*(4) = 10.83, *p* = .029), but did not fit the data better than the individual-level moderation model (∆*-2LL*(2) = 2.79, *p* = .248). A significant interaction effect was found between minorities’ emotional fit and perceived discrimination on their behavioral disengagement over time, and remained significant when controlled for the interaction effect between minorities’ emotional fit and school-level perceptions of discrimination (see Table 4, Combined moderation model). A plot of the interaction (see Panel C of Figure 1) and simple slopes analyses showed that minorities’ emotional fit positively predicted minorities’ behavioral disengagement at school only when the discrimination at school at wave 1 was perceived to be high (β = .20, *p* = .030, 95% CI [.02, .39]), but not when the discrimination at wave 1 was perceived to be moderate (β = .03, *p* = .670, 95% CI [-.10, .16]) or low (β = -.15, *p* = .130, 95% CI [-.34, .04]).

**Table 4**

*Predicting Minorities' Behavioral Disengagement at Wave 2: Effects of Emotional Fit at Wave 1 and the Interaction with Perceived Discrimination at the Individual and School Level, Controlling for Age, Gender, and Behavioral Disengagement at Wave 1*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Effect | Predictor model | | Individual-level moderation model | | School-level moderation model | | | Combined moderation model | |
|  | Estimate | *p* | Estimate | *p* | Estimate | *p* | | Estimate | *p* |
| **Fixed effects** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Intercept | 3.00  [2.90, 3.11] | < .001 | 3.01  [2.91, 3.12] | < .001 | 3.45  [2.65, 4.25] | < .001 | | 3.64  [2.82, 4.46] | < .001 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Gender | -0.02  [-0.14, 0.11] | .785 | -0.02  [-0.15, 0.10] | .714 | -0.03  [-0.15, 0.10] | .695 | | -0.03  [-0.16, 0.09] | .618 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Age | -0.02  [-0.07, 0.03] | .465 | -0.02  [-0.07, 0.03] | .418 | -0.01  [-0.07, 0.04] | .567 | | -0.02  [-0.07, 0.03] | .504 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Behavioral disengagement at wave 1 | 0.49  [0.42, 0.57] | < .001 | 0.48  [0.41, 0.56] | < .001 | 0.50  [0.42, 0.57] | < .001 | | 0.49  [0.41, 0.56] | < .001 |
| Emotional fit at wave 1 | 0.03  [-0.10, 0.16] | .653 | 0.03  [-0.09, 0.16] | .597 | -0.02  [-1.57, 1.53] | .982 | | 0.56  [-1.03, 2.15] | .491 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Perceived discrimination at wave 1 |  |  | 0.07  [-0.01, 0.15] | .077 |  |  | | 0.08  [0.00, 0.16] | .042 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| School-level perceptions of discrimination at wave 1 |  |  |  |  | -0.20  [-0.55, 0.15] | .265 | | -0.28  [-0.64, 0.09] | .132 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Perceived discrimination at wave 1 \* Emotional fit at wave 1 |  |  | 0.20  [0.04, 0.37] | .018 |  |  | | 0.22  [0.05, 0.40] | .011 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| School-level perceptions of discrimination at wave 1 \* Emotional fit at wave 1 |  |  |  |  | 0.02  [-0.68, 0.72] | .955 | | -0.24  [-0.96, 0.48] | .514 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| **Random effects** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Intercept (school) | 0.10  [0.00, 0.21] |  | 0.11  [0.00, 0.21] |  | 0.09  [0.00, 0.20] |  | | 0.10  [0.00, 0.21] |  |
| Residual | 0.69  [0.65, 0.74] |  | 0.68  [0.64, 0.73] |  | 0.69  [0.65, 0.74] |  | | 0.68  [0.64, 0.73] |  |
| **Fit statistics** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| -2\*loglikelihood | 1075.3 |  | 1067.3 |  | 1074.0 | |  | 1064.5 |  |
| AIC | 1089.3 |  | 1085.3 |  | 1092.0 | |  | 1086.5 |  |
| BIC | 1118.9 |  | 1123.3 |  | 1130.1 | |  | 1133.0 |  |

*Note.* Results from four linear mixed-effects models predicting minorities' behavioral disengagement at wave 2. Unstandardized regression coefficients are presented for the fixed effects. Standard deviations are reported for the random intercept and residuals. Confidence intervals are shown in square brackets. All models include 50 schools (grouping variable) and 508 students.

**Non-Compliant Behavior at School**

The school-level moderation model did fit the data better than the predictor model (∆*-2LL*(2) = 6.22, *p* = .045), but did not fit the data better than the individual-level moderation model (*∆-2LL*(0) = 0.00, *p* = 1.000). The combined moderation model did fit the data better than the predictor model (*∆-2LL*(4) = 11.18, *p* = .025), but did not fit the data better than the individual-level moderation model (*∆-2LL*(2) = 4.18, *p* = .124). A significant interaction effect was found between minorities’ emotional fit and perceived discrimination on their non-compliant behavior over time, and remained significant when controlled for the interaction effect between minorities’ emotional fit and school-level perceptions of discrimination (see Table 5, Combined moderation model). A plot of the interaction (see Panel D of Figure 1) and simple slopes analyses showed that minorities’ emotional fit positively predicted minorities’ non-compliant behavior at school only when the discrimination at school at wave 1 was perceived to be high (β = .16, *p* < .001, 95% CI [.05, .26]), but not when the discrimination at wave 1 was perceived to be moderate (β = .07, *p* = .070, 95% CI [-.01, .15]) or low (β = -.02, *p* = .760, 95% CI [-.13, .09]).

**Table 5**

*Predicting Minorities' Non-compliant Behavior at Wave 2: Effects of Emotional Fit at Wave 1 and the Interaction with Perceived Discrimination at the Individual and School Level, Controlling for Age, Gender, and Non-compliant Behavior at Wave 1*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Effect | Predictor model | | Individual-level moderation model | | School-level moderation model | | | Combined moderation model | |
|  | Estimate | *p* | Estimate | *p* | Estimate | *p* | | Estimate | *p* |
| **Fixed effects** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Intercept | 1.65  [1.59, 1.72] | < .001 | 1.66  [1.60, 1.73] | < .001 | 1.26  [0.67, 1.79] | < .001 | | 1.24  [0.64, 1.79] | < .001 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Gender | -0.05  [-0.12, 0.02] | .188 | -0.05  [-0.13, 0.02] | .158 | -0.05  [-0.12, 0.03] | .213 | | -0.05  [-0.12, 0.03] | .199 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Age | 0.00  [-0.03, 0.03] | .966 | 0.00  [-0.03, 0.03] | .937 | 0.00  [-0.03, 0.03] | .928 | | 0.00  [-0.03, 0.03] | .873 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Non-compliant behavior at wave 1 | 0.65  [0.58, 0.73] | < .001 | 0.65  [0.57, 0.73] | < .001 | 0.65  [0.57, 0.72] | < .001 | | 0.65  [0.57, 0.72] | < .001 |
| Emotional fit at wave 1 | 0.06  [-0.01, 0.14] | .104 | 0.06  [-0.01, 0.14] | .102 | -0.83  [-1.72, 0.06] | .069 | | -0.57  [-1.49, 0.35] | .224 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Perceived discrimination at wave 1 |  |  | 0.00  [-0.04, 0.05] | .904 |  |  | | 0.00  [-0.05, 0.04] | .860 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| School-level perceptions of discrimination at wave 1 |  |  |  |  | 0.18  [-0.06, 0.44] | .142 | | 0.19  [-0.06, 0.46] | .133 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Perceived discrimination at wave 1 \* Emotional fit at wave 1 |  |  | 0.13  [0.03, 0.23] | .008 |  |  | | 0.11  [0.01, 0.21] | .028 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| School-level perceptions of discrimination at wave 1 \* Emotional fit at wave 1 |  |  |  |  | 0.41  [0.00, 0.81] | .049 | | 0.29  [-0.13, 0.71] | .174 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| **Random effects** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| Intercept (school) | 0.09  [0.02, 0.16] |  | 0.10  [0.04, 0.17] |  | 0.10  [0.04, 0.17] |  | | 0.11  [0.05, 0.18] |  |
| Residual | 0.40  [0.37, 0.42] |  | 0.39  [0.37, 0.42] |  | 0.39  [0.37, 0.42] |  | | 0.39  [0.37, 0.42] |  |
| **Fit statistics** |  |  |  |  |  |  | |  |  |
| -2\*loglikelihood | 520.2 |  | 513.2 |  | 514.0 | |  | 509.0 |  |
| AIC | 534.2 |  | 531.2 |  | 532.0 | |  | 531.0 |  |
| BIC | 563.8 |  | 569.3 |  | 570.1 | |  | 577.6 |  |

*Note.* Results from four linear mixed-effects models predicting minorities' non-compliant behavior at wave 2. Unstandardized regression coefficients are presented for the fixed effects. Standard deviations are reported for the random intercept and residuals. Confidence intervals are shown in square brackets. All models include 50 schools (grouping variable) and 508 students.