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**APPENDIX**

**Dummy Variables Versus Continuous Variables**

Exchanging the continuous skin color variables for a set of four dummies yields substantively similar results overall (Tables A1–A3). The major difference is that in the case of Black students, the dummies do not show a statistically significant relationship between skin color and reporting a close Latino friend. Considering that interviewers were verbally trained, these results give greater confidence to the validity of the skin color measure.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table A1**: Log-odds for Black respondents to have a close intergroup friendship (skin color dummies) |  |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship |
|  | (reference = Black) | (reference = Black) |
|   | White | Asian | Latino | Other | White | Asian | Latino | Other |
| **Skin Color Dummies (reference = 1-2)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3-4 | -0.660+ | -0.787 | -0.587 | -0.727+ | -0.530 | -0.646 | -0.294 | -0.495 |
|  | (0.362) | (0.528) | (0.641) | (0.417) | (0.350) | (0.534) | (0.681) | (0.427) |
| 5-6 | -1.410\*\*\* | -1.224\* | -0.936 | -1.502\*\*\* | -1.322\*\*\* | -1.206\* | -0.779 | -1.324\*\* |
|  | (0.350) | (0.497) | (0.605) | (0.405) | (0.335) | (0.519) | (0.652) | (0.414) |
| 7-8 | -1.382\*\*\* | -0.904+ | -0.714 | -1.242\*\* | -1.356\*\*\* | -1.025\* | -0.689 | -1.062\* |
|  | (0.345) | (0.481) | (0.582) | (0.395) | (0.337) | (0.508) | (0.615) | (0.420) |
| **Control Variables** | ---- | ----  | ----  | ----  | X |  X | X  | X  |
| N | 1872 |   |   |   | 1872 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.016 |   |   |   | 0.084 |   |   |   |

+ *p* < 0.1, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001 (two-tailed tests)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table A2**: Log-odds for Latino respondents to have a close intergroup friendship (skin color dummies) |  |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship |
|  | (reference = Latino) | (reference = Latino) |
|   | White | Asian | Black | Other | White | Asian | Black | Other |
| **Skin Color Dummies (reference = 1-2)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3-4 | -0.171 | -0.221 | 0.608+ | -0.0847 | -0.256 | -0.310 | 0.428 | -0.0650 |
|  | (0.201) | (0.261) | (0.347) | (0.272) | (0.211) | (0.266) | (0.363) | (0.284) |
| 5-6 | -0.432+ | -0.369 | 0.547 | -0.282 | -0.353 | -0.349 | 0.427 | -0.186 |
|  | (0.237) | (0.283) | (0.389) | (0.331) | (0.231) | (0.279) | (0.386) | (0.339) |
| 7-8 | -1.315\*\*\* | -0.570 | 0.772+ | -0.470 | -0.970\*\* | -0.350 | 0.613 | -0.259 |
|  | (0.344) | (0.405) | (0.456) | (0.401) | (0.341) | (0.401) | (0.469) | (0.410) |
| **Control Variables** | ---- | ----  | ----  | ----  | X |  X | X  | X  |
| N | 1753 |   |   |   | 1753 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.012 |   |   |   | 0.088 |   |   |   |

+ *p* < 0.1, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001 (two-tailed tests)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table A3**: Log-odds for Asian respondents to have a close intergroup friendship (skin color dummies) |  |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship |
|  | (reference = Asian) | (reference = Asian) |
|   | White | Black | Latino | Other | White | Black | Latino | Other |
| **Skin Color Dummies (reference = 1-2)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3-4 | 0.190 | 0.175 | 0.480 | 0.493 | -0.0356 | -0.0127 | 0.604 | 0.559+ |
|  | (0.183) | (0.387) | (0.343) | (0.304) | (0.178) | (0.421) | (0.379) | (0.303) |
| 5-6 | 0.345+ | 0.547 | -0.370 | 0.642+ | 0.189 | 0.426 | -0.216 | 0.944\*\* |
|  | (0.208) | (0.411) | (0.497) | (0.336) | (0.212) | (0.437) | (0.502) | (0.339) |
| 7-8 | -0.0764 | -0.218 | -0.911 | 0.306 | -0.217 | -0.395 | -0.429 | 0.708+ |
|  | (0.223) | (0.483) | (0.585) | (0.394) | (0.233) | (0.582) | (0.627) | (0.404) |
| **Control Variables** | ---- | ----  | ----  | ----  | X |  X | X  | X  |
| N | 2061 |   |   |   | 2061 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.006 |   |   |   | 0.097 |   |   |   |

+ *p* < 0.1, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001 (two-tailed tests)

**Demographic Composition of Extracurricular Clubs**

When adding measures for the ethnoracial composition of clubs -which are from the same wave as the outcome- the results are similar, yet there are certain changes to the main results (Table A4). In wave 3, respondents were asked to report what they perceive as the predominant ethnoracial group of clubs in which they participate (the options were: White, Black, Latino, Asian, and equally integrated). Respondents were allowed to give a response for each club that they report. Based on their responses, I created a series of overlapping dummies that indicated the ethnoracial composition of any club that the respondent mentions. When adding all measures simultaneously to the main models, the most notable differences are that the skin color coefficient for Black respondents is now non-significant for having a close Asian friend and marginally significant for having a close friend who identifies as “other”. For Asian respondents, the skin color coefficient for having a close “other” friend is now marginally significant. The results suggest that clubs may have some influence on how skin color relates to friendships, but it should be noted that there may be reverse causality and the sample is reduced to respondents who report being in any sort of club that year. There are 699 fewer responses for this analysis.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table A4**: Log-odds for respondents to have a close intergroup friendship (club demographics) |  |  |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship among  | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship among  |
|  | Black Respondents (reference = Black) | Latino Respondents (reference = Latino) |
|   | White | Asian | Latino | Other | White | Asian | Black | Other |
| **Skin Color Rating** | -0.204\*\*\* | -0.0961 | -0.184\* | -0.111+ | -0.139\*\* | -0.0725 | 0.0915 | -0.129+ |
|  | (0.0469) | (0.0753) | (0.0841) | (0.0600) | (0.0516) | (0.0736) | (0.0743) | (0.0768) |
| **Dominant Group in Club** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White | 0.705\*\* | -0.280 | 0.375 | 0.0855 | 0.636\*\* | 0.561+ | 0.289 | -0.0274 |
|  | (0.223) | (0.307) | (0.361) | (0.240) | (0.245) | (0.305) | (0.316) | (0.343) |
| Black | -1.683\*\*\* | -1.859\*\*\* | -1.240\*\* | -0.855\*\*\* | -0.0147 | 0.869 | 1.876\*\*\* | 0.799 |
|  | (0.194) | (0.322) | (0.394) | (0.232) | (0.493) | (0.558) | (0.556) | (0.584) |
| Latino | 0.399 | 1.328\* | 1.733\*\* | 0.239 | -1.224\*\*\* | -0.642\* | -0.115 | -0.841\*\* |
|  | (0.531) | (0.608) | (0.554) | (0.520) | (0.209) | (0.263) | (0.314) | (0.290) |
| Asian | -0.0898 | 0.609 | 0.0994 | 0.620+ | 0.615 | 0.696 | 0.826+ | 0.606 |
|  | (0.340) | (0.403) | (0.683) | (0.367) | (0.388) | (0.501) | (0.472) | (0.499) |
| Integrated | 0.108 | -0.780+ | 0.941\*\* | 0.146 | 0.296 | 0.429 | 0.425 | 0.473 |
|  | (0.216) | (0.430) | (0.346) | (0.283) | (0.274) | (0.332) | (0.384) | (0.363) |
| **Control Variables** | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| N | 1634 |   |   |   | 1517 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.152 |   |   |   | 0.126 |   |   |   |

+ *p* < 0.1, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001 (two-tailed tests)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship among  |
|  | Asian Respondents (reference = Asian) |
|   | White | Black | Latino | Other |
| **Skin Color Rating** | -0.0254(0.0434) | -0.0671(0.0950) | -0.0529(0.0968) | 0.119+(0.0674) |
|  |
| **Dominant Group in Club** |  |  |  |  |
| White | 0.752\*\*\* | -0.111 | 1.605\*\* | 0.139 |
|  | (0.213) | (0.365) | (0.536) | (0.308) |
| Black | -0.396 | 1.377\* | 0.655 | 0.296 |
|  | (0.474) | (0.590) | (1.083) | (0.578) |
| Latino | 0.0917 | 1.026 | 2.038\*\* | -1.164 |
|  | (0.543) | (0.738) | (0.698) | (1.102) |
| Asian | -0.980\*\*\* | -0.780\* | -0.185 | -0.0829 |
|  | (0.165) | (0.342) | (0.316) | (0.278) |
| Integrated | -0.197 | -0.300 | 0.507 | 0.275 |
|  | (0.232) | (0.403) | (0.484) | (0.336) |
| **Control Variables** | X | X | X | X |
| N | 1836 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.138 |   |   |   |

**Interaction Between Sex and Skin Color**

Third, in Table A5, I interact respondents’ sex and skin color due to previous research that documents differences in how skin color relates to inequality by gender (Hunter 2005). Adding the interaction to the full models supports the patterns seen in the main results. To be specific, for Black women, darker skin color is associated with lower log-odds of having close friendships with White people, Latinos, and “other”, while darker-skinned Latina women have statistically significant lower log-odds of having a close White friend and darker-skinned Asian women have marginally significant greater log-odds of having a close friend who is “other”.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table A5**: Log-odds for respondents to have a close intergroup friendship (gender and skin color interaction) |  |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship among  | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship among  |
|  | Black Respondents (reference = Black) | Latino Respondents (reference = Latino) |
|   | White | Asian | Latino | Other | White | Asian | Black | Other |
| Skin Color Rating | -0.245\*\*\* | -0.0781 | -0.210\* | -0.151\* | -0.133\* | -0.0533 | 0.134 | -0.0545 |
|  | (0.0531) | (0.0958) | (0.0988) | (0.0644) | (0.0637) | (0.0807) | (0.0905) | (0.0887) |
| Male | 0.0725 | 1.205 | -0.886 | 0.0613 | 0.109 | 0.485 | 0.437 | -0.0619 |
|  | (0.525) | (0.803) | (0.919) | (0.747) | (0.398) | (0.531) | (0.645) | (0.550) |
| Skin Color Rating \* Male | 0.0813(0.0858) | -0.149(0.131) | 0.190(0.147) | 0.0295(0.121) | -0.0442(0.0932) | -0.0651(0.127) | -0.0872(0.130) | -0.0268(0.127) |
|  |
| Control Variables | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| N | 1872 |   |   |   | 1753 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.082 |   |   |   | 0.088 |   |   |   |

+ *p* < 0.1, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001 (two-tailed tests)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship among  |
|  | Asian Respondents (reference = Asian) |
|   | White | Black | Latino | Other |
| Skin Color Rating | 0.0239 | -0.0915 | -0.0259 | 0.145+ |
|  | (0.0524) | (0.112) | (0.110) | (0.0823) |
| Male | 0.470 | -0.272 | 0.302 | -0.513 |
|  | (0.355) | (0.660) | (0.714) | (0.601) |
| Skin Color Rating \* Male | -0.0716(0.0737) | 0.0551(0.140) | -0.0698(0.169) | -0.0289(0.123) |
|  |
| Control Variables | X | X | X | X |
| N | 2061 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.093 |   |   |   |

**Attitudes Toward Other Groups**

When accounting for attitudes toward other groups, specifically the level of closeness that respondents feel towards particular ethnoracial groups (which was collected in wave 1 as a series of ten-category ordinal scales), the results suggest that closeness may play a role in the relationships between skin color and friendships, especially for Black respondents. While the results do vary depending on which group is accounted for in the model (e.g., accounting solely for “closeness to Asians” rather than accounting for “closeness to Latinos”), the consistent pattern is that the skin color coefficient among Black respondents, especially for the outcomes of having a close Asian friend and a close Latino friend, tend to lose statistical significance. For Asian respondents, the skin color coefficient for the outcome “other friend” for most models drops to marginal significance (p<0.06). The results for Latino students remain substantively robust. With these results, there is the issue of reverse causality in that previous experiences with other groups are most likely informing these attitudes (Tables A6–A8).

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table A6**: Log-odds for Black respondents to have a close intergroup friendship (feelings of closeness) |  |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship |
|  | (reference = Black) | (reference = Black) |
|   | White | Asian | Latino | Other | White | Asian | Latino | Other |
| **Skin Color Rating** | -0.158\*\*\* | -0.114 | -0.120+ | -0.104+ | -0.173\*\*\* | -0.127+ | -0.142+ | -0.131\* |
|  | (0.0431) | (0.0719) | (0.0732) | (0.0572) | (0.0421) | (0.0729) | (0.0742) | (0.0572) |
| **Closeness to…** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black People | -0.308\*\*\* | -0.165\* | -0.221\*\* | -0.228\*\*\* | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
|  | (0.0447) | (0.0680) | (0.0725) | (0.0488) |  |  |  |  |
| White People | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | 0.318\*\*\* | 0.176\*\* | 0.157\* | 0.132\*\* |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.0402) | (0.0592) | (0.0780) | (0.0492) |
| Latinos | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asians | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Control Variables** | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| N | 1851 |   |   |   | 1849 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.105 |   |   |   | 0.107 |   |   |   |

+ *p* < 0.1, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001 (two-tailed tests)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship |
|  | (reference = Black) | (reference = Black) |
|   | White | Asian | Latino | Other | White | Asian | Latino | Other |
| **Skin Color Rating** | -0.193\*\*\*(0.0427) | -0.152\*(0.0743) | -0.162\*(0.0760) | -0.132\*(0.0577) | -0.201\*\*\*(0.0422) | -0.132+(0.0768) | -0.147\*(0.0742) | -0.134\*(0.0567) |
|  |
| **Closeness to…** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black People | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White People | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Latinos | -0.0891\* | 0.0432 | 0.0673 | -0.0310 | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
|  | (0.0390) | (0.0521) | (0.0741) | (0.0440) |  |  |  |  |
| Asians | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | 0.134\*\*\* | 0.304\*\*\* | -0.0116 | 0.100+ |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.0381) | (0.0599) | (0.0812) | (0.0523) |
| **Control Variables** | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| N | 1844 |   |   |   | 1839 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.085 |   |   |   | 0.093 |   |   |   |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table A7**: Log-odds for Latino respondents to have a close intergroup friendship (feelings of closeness) |  |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship |
|  | (reference = Latino) | (reference = Latino) |
|   | White | Asian | Black | Other | White | Asian | Black | Other |
| **Skin Color Rating** | -0.143\*\* | -0.0759 | 0.0626 | -0.0688 | -0.132\*\* | -0.0800 | 0.0975 | -0.0624 |
|  | (0.0490) | (0.0635) | (0.0670) | (0.0685) | (0.0485) | (0.0626) | (0.0701) | (0.0672) |
| **Closeness to…** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black People | -0.0787+ | -0.0473 | 0.198\*\* | 0.0139 | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
|  | (0.0474) | (0.0635) | (0.0759) | (0.0704) |  |  |  |  |
| White People | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | 0.234\*\*\* | 0.0376 | 0.0715 | 0.0884 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.0427) | (0.0515) | (0.0645) | (0.0639) |
| Latinos | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asians | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Control Variables** | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| N | 1705 |   |   |   | 1701 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.095 |   |   |   | 0.102 |   |   |   |

+ *p* < 0.1, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001 (two-tailed tests)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship |
|  | (reference = Latino) | (reference = Latino) |
|   | White | Asian | Black | Other | White | Asian | Black | Other |
| **Skin Color Rating** | -0.139\*\* | -0.0734 | 0.0965 | -0.0613 | -0.150\*\* | -0.0761 | 0.0917 | -0.0681 |
|  | (0.0475) | (0.0636) | (0.0693) | (0.0682) | (0.0481) | (0.0619) | (0.0692) | (0.0675) |
| **Closeness to…** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black People | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White People | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Latinos | -0.194\*\*\* | -0.149\* | -0.0927 | -0.112 | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
|  | (0.0501) | (0.0588) | (0.0731) | (0.0691) |  |  |  |  |
| Asians | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | 0.0573 | 0.158\*\* | 0.0560 | 0.0826 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.0465) | (0.0559) | (0.0655) | (0.0669) |
| **Control Variables** | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| N | 1701 |   |   |   | 1701 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.097 |   |   |   | 0.092 |   |   |   |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table A8**: Log-odds for Asian respondents to have a close intergroup friendship (feelings of closeness) |  |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship |
|  | (reference = Asian) | (reference = Asian) |
|   | White | Black | Latino | Other | White | Black | Latino | Other |
| **Skin Color Rating** | -0.0154 | -0.115 | -0.0608 | 0.126+ | -0.0126 | -0.0880 | -0.0688 | 0.124+ |
|  | (0.0406) | (0.0894) | (0.0838) | (0.0664) | (0.0404) | (0.0882) | (0.0850) | (0.0658) |
| **Closeness to…** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black People | 0.0676+ | 0.361\*\*\* | 0.0868 | 0.128+ | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
|  | (0.0380) | (0.0955) | (0.0835) | (0.0705) |  |  |  |  |
| White People | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | 0.169\*\*\* | -0.0344 | 0.000822 | -0.0129 |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.0396) | (0.0740) | (0.0778) | (0.0617) |
| Latinos | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asians | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| **Control Variables** | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| N | 2055 |   |   |   | 2057 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.099 |   |   |   | 0.100 |   |   |   |

+ *p* < 0.1, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001 (two-tailed tests)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship |
|  | (reference = Asian) | (reference = Asian) |
|   | White | Black | Latino | Other | White | Black | Latino | Other |
| **Skin Color Rating** | -0.0162 | -0.108 | -0.0721 | 0.125+ | -0.00420 | -0.0952 | -0.0561 | 0.131\* |
|  | (0.0408) | (0.0889) | (0.0848) | (0.0656) | (0.0408) | (0.0874) | (0.0845) | (0.0664) |
| **Closeness to…** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black People | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| White People | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Latinos | 0.0224 | 0.146\* | 0.148+ | 0.0230 | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
|  | (0.0367) | (0.0738) | (0.0853) | (0.0666) |  |  |  |  |
| Asians | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- | -0.251\*\*\* | -0.257\*\*\* | -0.178\* | -0.153\* |
|  |  |  |  |  | (0.0384) | (0.0680) | (0.0829) | (0.0605) |
| **Control Variables** | X | X | X | X | X | X | X | X |
| N | 2053 |   |   |   | 2053 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.095 |   |   |   | 0.109 |   |   |   |

**Mixed Ethnoracial Self-Identification**

Lastly, I explore a second ethnoracial self-identification measure that was collected in the first wave of the survey rather than prior to the survey as was the first ethnoracial measure. This second ethnoracial variable has the following options: non-Latino Black, non-Latino White, Asian (Chinese, Japanese, Vietnamese, Korean, Filipino, other Asian), Latino Black (Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Central American, South American), Latino White (Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Dominican, Central American, South American), mixed, and other. I recode this variable in various ways depending on the ethnoracial group. For Black respondents, I create a dummy variable that distinguishes between respondents who responded solely as “non-Latino Black” versus respondents with any other response. For Latino students, there is a dummy variable that differentiates between respondents who identify as being “Latino” versus identifying as anything else but “Latino”, a racial measure that distinguishes between “Black”, “White”, and anything else, and a national origin variable with the categories “Mexican”, “South American”, “Central American”, “Caribbean” (based on those who identify as “Cuban”, “Dominican”, or “Puerto Rican”), or anything else. For Asian respondents, there is a dummy variable that separates the sample between those who identified as “Asian” versus anything else and a national origin measure to differentiate between those who identify as “Chinese”, “Indian”, “Other Asian”, or anything else. The following results should be interpreted with caution because this variable was collected in the same wave as the skin color variable.

According to Table A9, the results for Black students show that the skin color coefficient loses statistical significance for most of the outcomes and the log-odds become closer to 0 while the “Black vs. other” measure is highly significant across most outcomes. The skin color coefficients for the outcomes “White” and “Latino” remain substantively similar but are now significant at the p<.05 and p<.1 levels, respectively. According to a separate analysis, skin color and the secondary ethnoracial measure are strongly correlated to one another. This robustness check suggests that Black respondents of mixed ancestry, who tend to be lighter in skin tone, are driving some of the results for this subsample, which follows a pattern seen in the broader literature on multiracial individuals and friendship networks (Doyle and Kao, 2007; Quillian and Redd, 2009).

|  |
| --- |
| **Table A9**: Log-odds for Black respondents to have a close intergroup friendship (mixed ancestry) |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship |
|  | (reference = Black) | (reference = Black) |
|   | White | Asian | Latino | Other | White | Asian | Latino | Other |
| Skin Color Rating | -0.0949\* | 0.0672 | -0.0676 | -0.00914 | -0.114\* | 0.0101 | -0.139+ | -0.00410 |
|  | (0.0449) | (0.0636) | (0.0818) | (0.0551) | (0.0473) | (0.0745) | (0.0776) | (0.0613) |
| Other than Black | 1.001\*\*\* | 1.512\*\*\* | 0.516 | 1.317\*\*\* | 0.903\*\*\* | 1.381\*\*\* | 0.142 | 1.240\*\*\* |
|  | (0.197) | (0.257) | (0.340) | (0.230) | (0.207) | (0.292) | (0.361) | (0.241) |
| Control Variables | ---- | ----  | ----  | ----  | X |  X | X  | X  |
| N | 1872 |   |   |   | 1872 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.032 |   |   |   | 0.095 |   |   |   |

+ *p* < 0.1, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001 (two-tailed tests)

Among Latino respondents, the skin color results do not change substantively (Tables A10–A12), but Asian respondents show a different pattern. While the results do not change when the secondary variable is recoded as “Asian” vs. anything else (Table A13), when adding the variable as a national origin measure, the skin color coefficient is no longer statistically significant for the “other” outcome (Table A14). In a separate analysis, relative to being Chinese, being Indian and “other Asian” is correlated with darker skin color.

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table A10**: Log-odds for Latino respondents to have a close intergroup friendship (mixed ancestry) |  |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship |
|  | (reference = Latino) | (reference = Latino) |
|   | White | Asian | Black | Other | White | Asian | Black | Other |
| Skin Color Rating | -0.180\*\*\* | -0.0997 | 0.127+ | -0.0826 | -0.149\*\* | -0.0783 | 0.0954 | -0.0639 |
|  | (0.0497) | (0.0661) | (0.0720) | (0.0680) | (0.0475) | (0.0638) | (0.0688) | (0.0682) |
| Other than Latino | 0.876\*\*\* | 0.525\* | 0.573\* | 0.742\*\* | 0.607\*\* | 0.456+ | 0.545+ | 0.578\* |
|  | (0.174) | (0.224) | (0.281) | (0.240) | (0.190) | (0.242) | (0.282) | (0.262) |
| Control Variables | ---- | ----  | ----  | ----  | X |  X | X  | X  |
| N | 1740 |   |   |   | 1740 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.020 |   |   |   | 0.090 |   |   |   |

+ *p* < 0.1, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001 (two-tailed tests)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Table A11**: Log-odds for Latino respondents to have a close intergroup friendship (race) |  |  |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship |
|  | (reference = Latino) | (reference = Latino) |
|   | White | Asian | Black | Other | White | Asian | Black | Other |
| **Skin Color Rating** | -0.148\*\* | -0.0714 | 0.133+ | -0.0682 | -0.132\*\* | -0.0612 | 0.0926 | -0.0648 |
|  | (0.0505) | (0.0669) | (0.0713) | (0.0687) | (0.0482) | (0.0643) | (0.0703) | (0.0691) |
| **Race (reference =** **White)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Black | -0.990\*\*\* | -0.680\* | -0.181 | -0.324 | -0.629\*\* | -0.559+ | 0.00636 | 0.00820 |
|  | (0.243) | (0.329) | (0.336) | (0.318) | (0.241) | (0.332) | (0.352) | (0.333) |
| Other | 0.581\*\* | 0.358 | 0.445 | 0.628\* | 0.410\* | 0.324 | 0.453 | 0.539\* |
|  | (0.182) | (0.231) | (0.301) | (0.255) | (0.195) | (0.247) | (0.298) | (0.273) |
| **Control Variables** | ---- | ----  | ----  | ----  | X |  X | X  | X  |
| N | 1740 |   |   |   | 1740 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.025 |   |   |   | 0.092 |   |   |   |

+ *p* < 0.1, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001 (two-tailed tests)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table A12**: Log-odds for Latino respondents to have a close intergroup friendship (national origin) |  |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship |
|  | (reference = Latino) | (reference = Latino) |
|   | White | Asian | Black | Other | White | Asian | Black | Other |
| **Skin Color Rating** | -0.175\*\*\* | -0.0911 | 0.132+ | -0.0782 | -0.135\*\* | -0.0640 | 0.112 | -0.0533 |
|  | (0.0499) | (0.0662) | (0.0716) | (0.0674) | (0.0477) | (0.0626) | (0.0691) | (0.0677) |
| **National Origin** **(reference = Mexican)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Caribbean | 0.244 | -0.353 | 0.277 | 0.0758 | 0.0919 | -0.0954 | 0.110 | 0.0171 |
|  | (0.239) | (0.315) | (0.382) | (0.354) | (0.248) | (0.367) | (0.427) | (0.405) |
| Central American | 0.568 | 0.397 | 0.770 | 1.081\* | 1.048\*\* | 0.936+ | 1.077+ | 1.424\*\* |
|  | (0.377) | (0.505) | (0.550) | (0.451) | (0.398) | (0.508) | (0.564) | (0.521) |
| South American | 0.736\* | 0.454 | 0.794+ | 0.814\* | 0.843\* | 0.792\* | 0.968+ | 0.795+ |
|  | (0.298) | (0.337) | (0.436) | (0.380) | (0.335) | (0.369) | (0.516) | (0.436) |
| Other | 1.143\*\*\* | 0.566\* | 0.884\* | 1.044\*\*\* | 0.861\*\*\* | 0.643\* | 0.838\* | 0.839\* |
|  | (0.207) | (0.260) | (0.344) | (0.303) | (0.218) | (0.277) | (0.361) | (0.339) |
| **Control Variables** | ---- | ----  | ----  | ----  | X |  X | X  | X  |
| N | 1740 |   |   |   | 1740 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.026 |   |   |   | 0.096 |   |   |   |

+ *p* < 0.1, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001 (two-tailed tests)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table A13**: Log-odds for Asian respondents to have a close intergroup friendship (mixed ancestry) |  |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship |
|  | (reference = Asian) | (reference = Asian) |
|   | White | Black | Latino | Other | White | Black | Latino | Other |
| Skin Color Rating | 0.0333 | -0.00329 | -0.128+ | 0.0599 | -0.0112 | -0.0651 | -0.0610 | 0.129\* |
|  | (0.0373) | (0.0703) | (0.0742) | (0.0596) | (0.0400) | (0.0859) | (0.0833) | (0.0649) |
| Other than Asian | 1.366\*\*\* | 1.433\*\*\* | 1.150\* | 0.662\* | 0.675\* | 1.061\* | 0.279 | 0.120 |
|  | (0.232) | (0.372) | (0.508) | (0.328) | (0.311) | (0.438) | (0.583) | (0.385) |
| Control Variables | ---- | ----  | ----  | ----  | X |  X | X  | X  |
| N | 2061 |   |   |   | 2061 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.016 |   |   |   | 0.095 |   |   |   |

+ *p* < 0.1, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001 (two-tailed tests)

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Table A14**: Log-odds for Asian respondents to have a close intergroup friendship (national origin) |  |
|   | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship | Race/Ethnicity of Friendship |
|  | (reference = Asian) | (reference = Asian) |
|   | White | Black | Latino | Other | White | Black | Latino | Other |
| **Skin Color Rating** | -0.0209 | -0.0413 | -0.186\*\* | -0.0277 | -0.0418 | -0.0849 | -0.125 | 0.0472 |
|  | (0.0392) | (0.0748) | (0.0705) | (0.0628) | (0.0421) | (0.0885) | (0.0812) | (0.0707) |
| **National Origin** **(reference = Chinese)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Indian | 0.783\*\*\* | 0.668+ | 0.805\* | 1.286\*\*\* | 0.446\* | 0.433 | 0.946\* | 1.212\*\*\* |
|  | (0.200) | (0.398) | (0.374) | (0.299) | (0.207) | (0.406) | (0.427) | (0.343) |
| Other Asian | 0.102 | 0.391 | -0.0179 | 0.390 | -0.0254 | 0.306 | -0.109 | 0.327 |
|  | (0.161) | (0.352) | (0.341) | (0.269) | (0.166) | (0.345) | (0.355) | (0.264) |
| Other | 1.561\*\*\* | 1.736\*\*\* | 1.297\* | 1.120\*\* | 0.698\* | 1.294\*\* | 0.285 | 0.414 |
|  | (0.247) | (0.422) | (0.547) | (0.365) | (0.332) | (0.487) | (0.613) | (0.429) |
| **Control Variables** | ---- | ----  | ----  | ----  | X |  X | X  | X  |
| N | 2061 |   |   |   | 2061 |   |   |   |
| pseudo R-sq | 0.026 |   |   |   | 0.101 |   |   |   |

+ *p* < 0.1, \* *p* < 0.05, \*\* *p* < 0.01, \*\*\* *p* < 0.001 (two-tailed tests)
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