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## Deviations

1. We preregistered that we would update our search every four months until we would submit the manuscript. This proved unrealistic as the study selection and data collection process for the new studies took almost as long. Instead, we concluded our search of electronic databases on April 1, 2020.
2. We preregistered that we would randomly select 100 records to be screened by both coders to calculate inter-rater agreement. We did not specify, however, what we would do if inter-rater agreement was less than acceptable. We decided to refine our coding strategy over three samples of 100 records until we achieved acceptable agreement.
3. We preregistered that we would use *Google Scholar* to find records citing eligible studies. This proved impractical as *Google Scholar* does not facilitate the electronic export of citing records. Instead, we used the *Scopus* citation database.
4. We preregistered that we would attempt to contact the authors of all papers with missing effect sizes. Instead, we decided to not contact authors for studies published before 2000 as we considered it unlikely that the authors still had access to the data.
5. We preregistered that we would a Bayesian two-level random-effects meta-analysis model, described in the main text, for all preregistered analyses. For the association between policy support and collective action, however, we had only few studies and found that the two-level model did not result in a reliable posterior distribution (as indicated by divergent transitions in the estimation algorithm). Instead, we used a Bayesian one-level random-effects model to estimate that association.

## Search Strategy

We used similar non-exclusive search terms for all databases:

1. (contact OR friendship) AND (“perceived discrimination” OR “perceived *advantage” OR “relative deprivation” OR “group discrimination” OR “personal discrimination” OR “group deprivation” OR “perception* of discrimination” OR “perception\* of group discrimination” OR “perception\* of personal discrimination” OR “rac\* discrimination”)

## Robustness Checks

As preregistered, we conducted two kinds of robustness checks. First, we assessed to what extent our findings were sensitive to choosing narrower, , or wider, , prior distributions. Choosing narrower or wider prior distribution did not affect mean effect size estimates for perceived injustice ( and ), collective action ( and ), and policy support ( and ). Second, we assessed to what extent our findings were sensitive to including or excluding influential studies by repeating the preregistered analyses times while leaving out one of studies each time and by calculating the mean absolute difference (*MAD*) for the estimated mean effect size across left-out studies. For perceived injustice (), collective action (), and policy support (), the *MAD* was small. Leaving out the most influential study, for example, did not change estimates of the mean effect size for the three outcomes (; ; ). Together, these analyses showed that our findings were robust to choosing different prior distributions and to excluding influential studies.

## Moderator Analyses
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