

**Supplementary analysis for Study 1 –
differences between indirect effects**

Below, in Table S2.1, we report bias-corrected bootstrapped 95% and 90% confidence intervals for the differences between indirect effects. When the 95% CI does not include zero, the difference between the effects is statistically significant, while we interpret 90% CIs that do not include zero as providing some evidence for a trend.

How the confidence intervals were obtained

To obtain them, we (1) created 5,000 bootstrap samples with *lavaan*, (2) calculated the indirect effects in each sample, (4) calculated the difference in each sample, and then (5) used the implementation of the efficient algorithm proposed by DiCiccio and Efron (1996) as implemented in the *coxed* package (Kropko & Harden, 2020) to calculate the bias-corrected confidence interval for that difference. In that, we recoded the data so that all estimated indirect effects were positive, since we were interested in differences between the size rather than direction of effects.

Table S2.1. *Differences between indirect effects (Study 1)*

Effect 1	Effect 2	Positive contact		Negative contact	
		95% CI	90% CI	95% CI	90% CI
Anxiety					
Cognitive prejudice	Bystander intervention	[-0.09, 0.05]	[-0.08, 0.04]	[-0.09, 0.06]	[-0.07, 0.04]
Cognitive prejudice	Affective prejudice	[-0.16, 0.00]	[-0.15, -0.01]	[-0.15, 0.01]	[-0.14, -0.00]
Policy support	Bystander intervention	[-0.09, 0.05]	[-0.07, 0.04]	[-0.08, 0.04]	[-0.07, 0.03]
Policy support	Affective prejudice	[-0.16, -0.01]	[-0.15, -0.02]	[-0.15, -0.00]	[-0.14, -0.01]
Bystander intervention	Affective prejudice	[-0.14, 0.02]	[-0.13, 0.01]	[-0.14, 0.02]	[-0.12, 0.01]
Policy support	Cognitive prejudice	[-0.07, 0.06]	[-0.05, 0.05]	[-0.07, 0.05]	[-0.06, 0.04]
Empathy					
Cognitive prejudice	Bystander intervention	[-0.12, 0.03]	[-0.11, 0.02]	[-0.09, 0.03]	[-0.08, 0.02]
Cognitive prejudice	Affective prejudice	[-0.18, -0.00]	[-0.17, -0.02]	[-0.12, 0.02]	[-0.11, 0.00]
Policy support	Bystander intervention	[-0.10, 0.04]	[-0.09, 0.03]	[-0.08, 0.03]	[-0.07, 0.02]
Policy support	Affective prejudice	[-0.16, 0.00]	[-0.15, -0.01]	[-0.11, 0.03]	[-0.10, 0.02]
Bystander intervention	Affective prejudice	[-0.13, 0.04]	[-0.12, 0.03]	[-0.10, 0.05]	[-0.08, 0.04]
Policy support	Cognitive prejudice	[-0.06, 0.08]	[-0.05, 0.07]	[-0.04, 0.06]	[-0.03, 0.05]
Valuing diversity					
Cognitive prejudice	Bystander intervention	[0.01, 0.26]	[0.03, 0.24]	[-0.01, 0.20]	[0.00, 0.18]
Cognitive prejudice	Affective prejudice	[0.06, 0.29]	[0.08, 0.27]	[0.02, 0.23]	[0.03, 0.21]
Policy support	Bystander intervention	[0.05, 0.29]	[0.07, 0.28]	[0.01, 0.24]	[0.02, 0.22]
Policy support	Affective prejudice	[0.09, 0.33]	[0.11, 0.31]	[0.03, 0.26]	[0.05, 0.24]
Bystander intervention	Affective prejudice	[-0.07, 0.16]	[-0.05, 0.13]	[-0.06, 0.11]	[-0.04, 0.10]
Policy support	Cognitive prejudice	[-0.09, 0.16]	[-0.07, 0.14]	[-0.10, 0.17]	[-0.08, 0.14]

Notes. Confidence intervals that do not include zero are **bolded**. Comparisons that were not included in the hypotheses are shown in grey.