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Introduction
Chapter 1

1.1 Introduction

In recent decades, most Western countries have become ethnically more diverse as a result of labour and family migration and the influx of asylum seekers (Cornelius & Rosenblum, 2005; Hooghe, Trappers, Meuleman, & Reeskens, 2008; OECD, 2013). As this trend is expected to continue in the near future (OECD, 2013), it raises questions how Western societies (should) deal with these demographic changes, so that diversity "[…] becomes a source of mutual enrichment rather than a factor of division and conflict" (Council of Europe, 2004, p. 3).

During the twentieth century, scholars started to address the consequences of ethnic diversity for social cohesion in Western countries. Initially, research mainly focused on (often attitudinal) indicators of social cohesion related to ethnic out-groups, like interethnic tolerance, out-group derogation, or discrimination (e.g., Blalock, 1967; Fossett & Kiecolt, 1989; Giles, 1977; Pettigrew, 1957; Quillian, 1995, 1996). At the turn of the millennium, attention has shifted to other indicators of social cohesion. Scholars became increasingly interested in the crucial question whether living in an ethnically diverse environment would also influence people’s level of (generalised) trust, involvement in voluntary organizations, or informal social ties with friends, relatives or neighbours (e.g., Alesina & La Ferrara, 2000, 2002; Costa & Kahn, 2003; Knack & Keefer, 1997; Leigh, 2006; Putnam, 2007). Putnam’s (2007) seminal study attracted much attention, as he claimed that, at least in the short run, ethnic diversity would have an all-encompassing negative effect on a broad range of indicators of social cohesion, including "[…] attitudes and behaviors, bridging and bonding social capital, public and private connections" (Putnam, 2007, p.151). According to Putnam, people living in ethnically more diverse areas would tend to "hunker down" (Putnam, 2007, p. 149), meaning that they would be less trusting, would have less informal social ties and would be less likely involved in voluntary organizations. These negative consequences would not only hold with regard to ethnic out-group members, though even regarding one’s own ethnic in-group. This outcome has been considered the most remarkable finding of Putnam’s contribution (Hagendoorn, 2009).

Putnam’s findings spurred strong debates among scholars, resulting in a sharp increase in recent years of the number of studies addressing the consequences of ethnic diversity (see reviews by Portes & Vickstrom, 2011 and Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014). Also among policy-makers, findings illustrating a pernicious influence of ethnic diversity (predominantly in the U.S.), raised attention for the possible threat that (migration-based) diversity could pose to social cohesion (Cheong, Edwards, Goubourne, & Solomos, 2007; Hallberg & Lund, 2005; Laurence & Heath, 2008; Portes & Vickstrom, 2011). As social cohesion is identified as "[…] one of the foremost needs of the wider Europe" (Council of Europe/Committee of Ministers, 2001, p. 1) and is therefore considered as a key priority for the coming years (Council of Europe, 2004), this might be reasonable.
The question is, however, whether ethnic diversity indeed reduces social cohesion as generally as claimed by Putnam (2007). Moreover, it remains unclear how ethnic diversity affects social cohesion. In their review of studies, Van der Meer and Tolsma (2014, p. 27) conclude that “[...] literature calls for a focus on mechanisms in our empirical models”. In this study, we will not only disentangle whether living in ethnically more diverse environments erodes informal and formal social capital (cf. Pichler & Wallace, 2007; Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014) in a large number of Western societies, though, will also focus on underlying explanations for a relationship between ethnic diversity and indicators of social capital. The consequences of ethnic diversity will be studied from a perspective of natives. Several studies have emphasized the differential effect of ethnic diversity on majority and minority populations, usually highlighting a larger, and sometimes an exclusive effect for native majority populations (Dawkins, 2008; Soroka, Hellwell, & Johnston 2007; Stolle, Soroka, & Johnston, 2008).

Specific attention will be paid to interethnic contact (i.e., interethnic informal social capital). Whereas previous research elaborately addressed the question who has more informal and formal social capital in general and why (e.g., Gesthuizen, Van der Meer, & Scheepers, 2008; Wilson, 2000), relatively less is known about whether and why people differ in their level of interethnic informal social capital. Next to these individual-level differences in interethnic contact, this study will also address the role of ethnic diversity (see e.g., Pettigrew, 2008; Wagner, Christ, Pettigrew, Stellmacher, & Wolf, 2006).

In the next paragraphs of this chapter, an introduction to this book will be given. Paragraph 1.2 starts with a brief overview of earlier research on the influence of ethnic diversity on social capital. In particular, attention will be paid to lacunae in this line of research, which this study aims to fill. This culminates in the formulation of the overarching research questions that this study aims to answer. Finally, in paragraph 1.3, the organization of the remainder of this book will be discussed. For each empirical chapter, the specific research questions will be introduced and formulated and a brief overview will be given of the geographical context and datasets used to answer these research questions.2

1.2 Lacunae, aims and research questions

In a relatively short period of time, a fast growing body of research emerged, addressing the relationship between ethnic diversity and social capital. In particular Putnam’s (2007) claim that living in ethnically diverse environments would trigger people to generally withdraw from social life, reducing levels of informal and formal social capital, with both the out-group and in-group, attracted much attention and spurred scholarly interest in this relationship. So far, the emerging picture remains, however, unclear. Portes and Vickstrom conclude in their review of studies that Putnam’s thesis “[...] has awakened a great deal of attention and produced a veritable mountain of research with mostly contradictory results” (Portes & Vickstrom, 2011, p. 469). A second, more elaborative, review reaches similar conclusions, showing that earlier findings on the influence of ethnic diversity appear to be mixed (Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014). Bearing in mind, however, that previous studies largely vary on, for instance, indicators of social cohesion or the geographical context, differential outcomes might not necessarily be surprising.

1.2.1 Indicators of cohesion

Earlier research addressed the consequences of ethnic diversity on a broad range of social capital indicators, ranging from attitudinal measurements like trust (e.g., Alesina & La Ferrara, 2002; Hooghe, Reeskens, Stolle, & Trappers, 2009; Putnam, 2007; Stolle et al., 2008) to evaluations of neighbourhood cohesion (e.g., Andrews, 2009; Guest, Kubrin, & Cover, 2008; Laurence, 2011), to behavioural outcomes like involvement in voluntary associations (e.g., Alesina & La Ferrara, 2000; Costa & Kahn, 2003; Kesler & Bloemraad, 2010; Tolsma, Van der Meer, & Gesthuizen, 2009) or informal social ties with, for instance, neighbours, friends or relatives (e.g., Letki, 2008; Gesthuizen, Van der Meer, & Scheepers, 2009; Gijsberts, Van der Meer, & Dagevos, 2012; Lancee & Dronkers, 2011). Of this plethora of studies, a majority appears to focus on the relationship between ethnic diversity and attitudinal indicators of social capital, in particular (generalised or social) trust (Hagendoorn, 2009; Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014). According to Hooghe (2007, p. 711), as a result of increasing dissimilarities in societies, “[...] it can be expected that trust probably is most vulnerable for the effects of increasing diversity, much more so than other components of social capital”.

In this study, we will focus on the consequences of living in an ethnically diverse environment for behavioural aspects of social capital, rather than on the consequences for already frequently studied attitudinal indicators. In line with Pichler and Wallace (2007), we will make a distinction between formal and informal social capital. Whereas formal social capital refers to involvement in formally constituted (voluntary) organizations, informal social capital reflects informal social ties with or providing informal support to, for instance, friends, neighbours or relatives.3

Although attention of previous studies was mainly devoted to the impact of ethnic diversity on attitudinal indicators of social capital (Hagendoorn, 2009; Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014), this study is not the first to address the consequences of living in ethnically diverse areas for informal and formal social capital. Evidence of earlier research appears, however, to be mixed. Whereas several studies found support for a negative influence of ethnic diversity on informal contact with neighbours (Gijsberts et al., 2012; Lancee & Dronkers, 2011; according to Tolsma et al., 2009; only for higher educated residents), others found no effect on informal social capital (Letki, 2008) or a positive effect for residents with income levels above average (Tolsma et al., 2009).
Gesthuizen et al. (2009) found that ethnic diversity at the country level increases informal helping. This study will address the relationship between ethnic diversity and two dimensions of informal social capital (cf. Pichler & Wallace, 2007). In line with Gesthuizen et al. (2009), we will make a distinction between informal meeting (e.g., with friends, colleagues or relatives) and informal helping.

Also with regard to formal social capital, the emerging picture based on earlier studies appears to be less conclusive than claimed by Putnam. Whereas some scholars found a negative relationship (e.g., Alesina & La Ferrara, 2000; Putnam, 2007; Rotolo & Wilson, 2012; Tolsma et al., 2009), others found no (e.g., Gijsberts et al., 2012; Letki, 2008) or even a positive relationship (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2009; Kesler & Bloemraad, 2010; see also Wilson, 2012, for a review of studies). Although findings of earlier studies are largely inconsistent, these studies have one thing in common: so far only the influence of ethnic diversity on associational involvement in general has been addressed, not taking into account that different types of voluntary organizations largely vary regarding the goals their members aim to fulfill, and (thus) differ regarding the people they attract and serve (see Van der Meer, te Grotenhuis, & Scheepers, 2009). Moreover, even within one type of voluntary organization, people can be involved in different ways (e.g., actively or passively). This aspect has also been hardly considered systematically so far (for an exception, see Gesthuizen et al., 2009).

Finally, voluntary associations might vary extensively with regard to their ethnic composition, ranging from organizations with only in-group members to highly mixed associations. This is related to the ‘bonding/bridging’ dimension of social capital (Putnam, 2007). Whereas bonding social capital refers to the (ethnic) in-group, bridging social capital is related to (ethnic) out-groups. According to Putnam (2007), ethnic diversity would reduce both bonding and bridging social capital. However, he only presented evidence with regard to trust, focusing on in-group (bonding) and out-group (bridging) trust. Other studies either neglected the bonding/bridging distinction, or focused exclusively on attitudinal measures, related (only) to the out-group, e.g., out-group trust (Lancee & Dronkers, 2011) or interethic tolerance (Laurence, 2011; Tolsma et al., 2009). This lacuna is rather surprising, as predominantly the fact that ethnic diversity would even undermine bonding social capital, with one’s ethnic in-group, was considered as the “[…] most spectacular finding” (Hagendoorn, 2009, p. 12). This study aims to build on earlier research by focusing on the influence of ethnic diversity on more fine-grained measures, reflecting subdimensions of formal and informal social capital. Moreover, we take into account (if possible) the distinction between bonding and bridging social capital.

### 1.2.2 Theoretical mechanisms

Although the use of more specific indicators of informal and formal social capital might help to come to grips with the inconsistent findings of earlier research, it does not explain how ethnic diversity affects social capital. Putnam’s (2007) study is, unfortunately, not very helpful in this respect. He argued that ethnic diversity reduces “[…] both in-group and out-group solidarity – that is, both bonding and bridging social capital” (Putnam, 2007, p. 144), and labelled this outcome ‘constrict theory’. However, according to Dawkins (2006, p. 210), this theory is “[…] not developed beyond its expected empirical outcome”, while Van der Meer and Tolsma (2014) conclude that “[…] the constrict proposition lacks theoretical substantiation”. In fact, it remains unclear why or how ethnic diversity would have such an all-encompassing negative influence on social capital. Gesthuizen and colleagues (2009) have pointed to the role of the homophily principle in this respect. According to McPherson, Smith-Lovin and Cook (2001), people have a preference for homogeneous networks, consisting of people who are alike, for instance, regarding their ethnicity. As a consequence, living in an ethnically diverse context, surrounded by fewer people of one’s kind, might induce people to become uncertain (Hagendoorn, 2009) and to feel less comfortable with others in general, not just with members of one’s out-group (Gesthuizen et al., 2009). Consequently, living in such mixed environments could encourage people to withdraw from social life entirely.

So far, previous research largely neglected the question why living in an ethnically diverse area influences people’s informal social capital or their likelihood to be involved in voluntary associations. Earlier studies mainly addressed direct effects of ethnic diversity on social capital, without empirically testing underlying explanations for this relationship. Consequently, Van der Meer and Tolsma (2014) conclude that this field of research still remains rather under-theorized. Putnam (2007) mentioned, however, two intergroup theories which could explain how ethnic diversity might affect social capital, i.e., conflict theory (e.g., Blalock, 1967; Bobo, 1999; Coser, 1956; Scheepers, Gijsberts, & Coenders, 2002) and contact theory (e.g., Allport, 1954; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Hewstone, 2009; Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006, 2011). Hitherto, these theories have been predominantly applied to explain interethic tolerance or out-group derogation. Note, that Putnam (2007) only referred to both intergroup theories, without deriving and empirically testing underlying explanations for the relationship between ethnic diversity and social capital.

This study aims to build on earlier research, by focusing on underlying explanations for the relationship between ethnic diversity and informal and formal social capital. We will derive and empirically test more specific hypotheses from both intergroup theories mentioned before (i.e., conflict and contact theories). Both theories propose contradictory underlying explanations for the relationship between ethnic diversity and social capital. Whereas conflict theory (e.g., Blalock, 1967; Coser, 1956; Scheepers et al., 2002) stresses the importance of perceptions of ethnic threat, contact theory (e.g., Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) points at the role of interethic contact. In this study, we will focus on indirect effects of ethnic diversity, via both explanatory
mechanisms, on social capital. Unlike earlier studies, we will empirically test whether and how perceptions of ethnic threat as well as interethnic contact affect informal and formal social capital. Figure 1.1 shows the conceptual framework, which will be central in a large part of this study. We will elaborate on these underlying explanations to the level of hypotheses in the forthcoming chapters. Here, we will argue that the use of more specific measures of social capital, distinguishing bonding and bridging social capital, is also relevant when it comes to explain the relationship between ethnic diversity and social capital.

![Conceptual framework: (In-)direct relationship between ethnic diversity and (in-)formal social capital](image)

1.2.3 Sites of study
As argued before, the body of research on the relationship between ethnic diversity and social capital is very diverse, not only regarding the indicators of social capital used, though also with regard to the geographical context and level of analysis. Studies on the consequences of ethnic diversity within Western societies mainly focused on North-American (e.g., Alesina & La Ferrara, 2000; 2002; Costa & Kahn, 2003; Putnam, 2007; Stolle et al., 2008) and European countries (Gesthuizen et al., 2009; Gijsberts et al., 2012; Hooghe et al., 2009; Letki, 2008; Sturgis, Brunton-Smith, Read, & Allum, 2010). However, also other countries, like Australia (Healy, 2007; Leigh, 2006) and New-Zealand (Clark & Kim, 2012) have been considered. Although evidence is often mixed, even within single countries, so far, findings of earlier research appear to indicate that the negative influence of ethnic diversity can be found predominantly in the U.S. and less in European countries (Hagendoorn, 2009; Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014).

Studies also vary considerably regarding their unit of analysis, ranging from the ethnic composition of neighbourhoods (e.g., Gijsberts et al., 2012; Letki, 2008; Stolle et al., 2008; Tolsma et al., 2009), municipalities (e.g., Kazemipur, 2006; Tolsma et al., 2009), or regions/states (e.g., Alesina & La Ferrara, 2000; Gustavsson & Jordahl, 2008; Rotolo & Wilson, 2012), to ethnic diversity at the country level (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2009; Hooghe et al., 2009; Kesler & Bloemraad, 2010). Some scholars have pointed at the importance of proximity, as people’s direct living environment reflects their actual interaction setting and is therefore more likely to influence people’s attitudes and behaviour, as compared to more remote levels of analysis, like the country level (Stolle et al., 2008; Tolsma et al., 2009). In their review of studies, Van der Meer and Tolsma (2014) conclude that most support for a negative influence of ethnic diversity is found at the regional and neighbourhood level, rather than at the country and municipality level. So far, studies either addressed the ethnic composition of smaller contextual areas within single countries, or focused on country-level ethnic diversity in cross-national research, thereby neglecting the fact that both ethnic diversity and social capital might vary extensively within countries.

This study addresses the relationship between ethnic diversity and informal and formal social capital in a large number of countries at both sides of the Atlantic. Moreover, in the consecutive empirical chapters, we will consider the ethnic composition of many different contextual units, ranging from neighbourhoods to countries. Unlike earlier cross-national research, we take into account the regional level, next to the country level, which enables us to consider within-country variance. Note, that the regional level is considered to be highly relevant for studying the relationship between ethnic diversity and social capital (Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014).

1.2.4 Zooming in on interethnic contact
A subdimension of informal social capital which deserves specific attention, is interethnic informal social capital (i.e., bridging informal social capital, hereafter: ‘interethnic contact’ or ‘intergroup contact’). As has been argued before, next to perceptions of ethnic threat, interethnic contact might be a crucial factor for understanding how ethnic diversity relates to social capital in general. However, as compared to other, more general, indicators of formal and informal social capital, as well as perceived ethnic threat, relatively less is known about what drives interethnic contact, both at the individual and contextual level.

In the past decades, a large body of research emerged, addressing the question whether and why people differ in their level of social capital, focusing on individual-level determinants of informal and formal social capital (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2008; Van Oorschot & Arts, 2005; Wilson, 2000, 2012). These studies pointed at the crucial role of, for instance, educational attainment, age and gender. Moreover, earlier research elaborately focused on the question which social groups perceive more ethnic threat...
and why (e.g., Hjerm, 2007; McLaren, 2003; Quillian, 1995; Schippers et al., 2002; Schneider, 2008). Again, educational attainment turns out to be a crucial determinant, next to, for instance, occupational status and gender.

Remarkably, less is known about differences among natives in their level of interethnic contact (i.e., interethnic informal social capital). Although some exceptional studies in this field indicate that social groups differ substantially in their level of interethnic contact, they fail to explain these differences (Savelkoul, Schippers, Tolinsma, & Hagendoorn, 2011; Schlueter & Schippers, 2010; Schlueter & Wagner, 2008; Semyonov & Glikman, 2009; however, see also Martinovic, 2013). This study aims to build on earlier research by describing and explaining differences in interethnic contact among natives in a large number of European countries, building on Kalmijn’s (1998) overarching explanatory framework (see also Martinovic, 2013). Unlike earlier research, two types of interethnic contact will be distinguished: contact at work and with friends.

Coming back to the core of this study (i.e., the influence of ethnic diversity on social capital), earlier studies have shown repeatedly that higher levels of ethnic diversity in people’s living environment increase their likelihood to have contact with ethnic minorities. In fact, the propinquity of immigrants in people’s surrounding can be regarded as a precondition for interethnic contact; only if immigrants are present in one’s living environment, one can (choose to) have actual interethnic contact (e.g., Blau, 1977; Schlueter & Schippers, 2010; Sigelman, Bledsoe, Welch, & Comb, 1996; Wagner et al., 2006). It remains unclear, though, whether this relationship is equal for different social groups and under different economic circumstances in the context. As argued before, interethnic contact might play a crucial role in linking ethnic diversity to informal and formal social capital (see Figure 1.1). Focusing on such conditional relationships (i.e., conditions influencing the arrow from ethnic diversity to interethnic contact in Figure 1.1), might therefore shed more light on whether, how and when ethnic diversity affects social capital in general. Note, that for the alternative explanatory mechanism, i.e., perceptions of ethnic threat, earlier research already focused repeatedly on conditional effects of ethnic diversity (e.g., Hjerm, 2007; Hjerm & Nagayoshi, 2011; Quillian, 1995; Schneider, 2008). In this study, we aim to build on previous studies by explicitly considering conditional influences of ethnic diversity on interethnic contact with friends and colleagues.

1.2.5 Overarching research questions

Summarizing, this study aims to build on earlier research in four important ways. First, more specific, substantially comparable, behavioural indicators of social capital will be used, taking into account that social capital is a broad concept with many subdimensions, which might be affected differently by ethnic diversity. Second, unlike earlier studies, we will derive and empirically test hypotheses on underlying explanations for the relationship between ethnic diversity and social capital, based on conflict and contact theories. Third, the influence of ethnic diversity will be considered at different contextual levels (ranging from neighbourhoods to countries) in a large number of Western societies, both in Europe as well as the U.S. Unlike earlier cross-national studies, the regional level will be distinguished to take into account possible within-country variance. Fourth, differences between natives in their level of interethnic contact (i.e., interethnic informal social capital) will be disentangled and explained more profoundly, also taking into consideration conditional influences of ethnic diversity.

Overall, two overarching research questions are formulated, which this study aims to answer:

RQ I: (a) To what extent does ethnic diversity (at different contextual levels) within Western countries affect natives’ level of formal and informal social capital, and (b) how can relationships between ethnic diversity and formal and informal social capital be explained by mechanisms derived from conflict and contact theory?

RQ II: (a) To what extent do natives differ in their level of interethnic contact, (b) how can these differences be explained, and (c) for which social groups and under which circumstances does ethnic diversity influence interethnic contact?

1.3 Outline of the book

In this paragraph, a brief outline of the book will be given. The remainder of the book consists of two parts: the first part focuses on formal social capital, whereas the second part concentrates on informal social capital. In the latter part, we will zoom in on a specific subdimension of informal social capital, i.e., interethnic contact (or interethnic informal social capital). For all empirical chapters, the central research question(s), the geographical context of the study, as well as the contextual level of analysis will be briefly discussed. Moreover, information will be provided regarding the data and methods used to answer the research questions.

1.3.1 Part A - Formal social capital

The first part of this book focuses on the influence of ethnic diversity on formal social capital. Previous research largely considered general measures of formal social capital (e.g., Kesler & Bloemraad, 2010; Letki, 2008; Putnam, 2007; Tolinsma et al., 2009), neglecting the fact that people can be involved differently in voluntary organizations (e.g., actively or passively) and voluntary organizations might vary largely both with regard to the goals they pursue and their ethnic composition.

Van der Meer and colleagues (2009) pointed at the importance of distinguishing different types of voluntary organizations and differentiate between leisure, interest and
activist organizations, which largely differ regarding the goals their members aim to fulfill, and, consequently, vary regarding the people they attract and serve. Whereas leisure organizations (e.g., sports or hobby organizations) predominantly serve their members’ personal interests with regard to socializing and recreational activities, interest organizations (e.g., trade unions, consumer organizations or neighbourhood associations) mainly focus on the socio-economic interests of their members (Van der Meer et al., 2009). Activist organizations (e.g., environmental or humanitarian organizations) address broader societal interests, not directly related to their members’ socio-economic interests and are thus less self-interested in nature. Van der Meer et al. (2009) show that the three types of organizations are differently linked to the (supposed) predictors and outcomes of involvement in voluntary organizations. They argue that in some cases, opposite individual-level effects would cancel each other out if the distinction between the three types of voluntary associations would be neglected.

This could also be the case if one considers the relationship between ethnic diversity and associational involvement. As previous studies only used general measures of formal social capital, one might risk overlooking differential effects of ethnic diversity on different types of voluntary organizations. Therefore, in this study a more fine-grained measure of formal social capital will be used, making a distinction between involvement in leisure, interest and activist organizations within Western societies.

Chapter 2: Ethnic diversity and formal social capital in Europe
The first chapter on formal social capital uses a cross-national perspective, focusing on ethnic diversity within European countries and regions. Earlier cross-national studies (e.g., Gessethuizen et al., 2009; Kesler & Bloemraad, 2010; Reekers & Wright, 2013) solely focused on the country level, thereby neglecting possible within-country variance in associational involvement, e.g., at the regional level. In line with Van der Meer et al. (2009), involvement in leisure, interest and activist organizations will be distinguished. Moreover, a distinction will be made between active modes of involvement (e.g., active participation or volunteering) which reflect more opportunities for face-to-face contacts, and passive modes of involvement (e.g., donating money) lacking such opportunities.

In addition, this chapter aims to build on earlier research by disentangling underlying explanations for a relationship between ethnic diversity and formal social capital. So far, research has only addressed direct effects, neglecting these explanations. Conflict theory (e.g., Bilalock, 1967; Bobo, 1999; Coser, 1956; Scheepers et al., 2002) and contact theory (e.g., Allport, 1954; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Hewstone, 2009; Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) will be used to derive more specific hypotheses on the relationship between ethnic diversity and formal social capital. In this chapter, we will take advantage of high quality data from the first wave of the European Social Survey (2002/2003; Jowell & The Central Co-ordinating Team, 2003). We will conduct hierarchical (logistic/multinomial) regression analyses to answer the following research questions:

RQ 2.1 To what extent does ethnic diversity within (a) European countries, and (b) regions across European countries affect involvement in leisure, interest and activist organizations?

RQ 2.2 To what extent can these relationships be explained by mechanisms derived from conflict and contact theory?

Chapter 3: Ethnic diversity and bonding and bridging formal social capital in the U.S.
In this chapter, the focus will shift to the other side of the Atlantic, addressing the influence of ethnic diversity in U.S. neighbourhoods on associational involvement. Research on the influence of ethnic diversity was largely initiated in the U.S. (e.g., Alesina & La Ferrara, 2000, 2002; Costa & Kahn, 2003; Putnam, 2007) and as U.S. neighbourhoods display more segregation as compared to European neighbourhoods, ethnic diversity reaches much higher levels in the U.S. (Mustard, 2005; Uslaner, 2011). Simultaneously, the U.S. has, on average, relatively high levels of associational involvement (Dekker & Van den Broek, 2005). As such, this geographical context reflects an interesting case for studying the relationship between the ethnic composition of people’s neighbourhood and their involvement in voluntary organizations.

Again, a distinction will be made between involvement in leisure, interest and activist organizations. However, unlike earlier studies, also the ethnic composition of these organizations will be taken into account, distinguishing bonding (i.e., with in-group members) and bridging (i.e., with out-group members) formal social capital. As the radically distinctive finding of Putnam (2007) was that ethnic diversity not only reduces bridging, though also bonding social capital, it is remarkable that this distinction has been largely neglected so far. However, scarcity of available data might have played a role in this respect.

The distinction between bonding and bridging formal social capital is also relevant when it comes to underlying explanations for the relationship between ethnic diversity and associational involvement (Savelkoul, 2011). Using conflict and contact theories, more specific hypotheses will be derived and tested regarding direct and indirect effects of ethnic diversity on bonding and bridging formal social capital. In this chapter, unique and high quality data from the U.S. Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy (CID; Howard, Gibson, & Stolle, 2005) survey will be used. Hierarchical (multinomial) regression analyses will be conducted to answer the following research questions:

RQ 3.1 To what extent does ethnic diversity within U.S. neighbourhoods affect involvement in bonding, respectively bridging leisure, interest and activist organizations?

RQ 3.2 To what extent can these relationships be explained by mechanisms derived from conflict and contact theory?
Chapter 4: Ethnic diversity and bonding and bridging formal social capital in the Netherlands

This empirical chapter addresses the relationship between ethnic diversity and formal social capital in the Netherlands. Similar to the U.S., the Netherlands are known for their high levels of (informal and formal) social capital among citizens, which exceed levels of most European countries (Dekker & Van den Broek, 2005; Gesthuizen et al., 2009). However, as compared to the U.S., the Netherlands have faced a very different and more recent migration history and display lower levels of ethnic segregation (Musterd, 2005).

In line with the previous chapters, a distinction will be made between involvement in three types of voluntary organizations, i.e., leisure, interest and activist organizations. Once again, the ethnic composition of these organizations will be considered, which enables differentiation between bonding and bridging formal social capital, as well as a direct comparison with our study on the U.S. (see Chapter 3). Moreover, conflict and contact theories will be used to derive and test hypotheses on the direct and indirect relationships between ethnic diversity and bonding and bridging formal social capital. In this chapter, two contextual levels, i.e., the neighbourhood and municipality level, will be considered simultaneously (cf. Huijts, Sluiter, Scheepers, & Kraaykamp, 2014; Tolma et al., 2009). Using data from the first wave of the Netherlands Longitudinal Lifecourse Study (NELLS; De Graaf, Kalmijn, Kraaykamp, & Monden, 2010), hierarchical (multinomial) regression analyses will be conducted to answer the following research questions:

RQ 4.1 To what extent does ethnic diversity within Dutch (a) neighbourhoods and (b) municipalities affect involvement in bonding, respectively bridging leisure, interest and activist organizations?
RQ 4.2 To what extent can these relationships be explained by mechanisms derived from conflict and contact theory?

1.3.2 Part B - Informal social capital and explaining interethnic contact

The second part of this book focuses on informal social capital. In line with the first part, we start with addressing and explaining the relationship between ethnic diversity and informal social capital. In the final empirical chapter, we will focus on a specific subdimension of informal social capital, i.e., interethnic contact.

Chapter 5: Ethnic diversity and informal social capital in Europe

The first empirical chapter of Part B addresses the relationship between ethnic diversity and informal social capital within a large number of European countries. Unlike earlier cross-national studies on informal social capital (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2009), two contextual levels of analysis will be considered, i.e., the country and regional level. In this way, variance within countries (see for instance Schlueter & Wagner, 2008) can be taken into account. In line with Gesthuizen et al. (2009), two indicators of informal social capital will be distinguished, reflecting the ‘density’ and ‘strength’ dimensions of informal social capital (Pichler & Wallace, 2007, p. 427). Whereas the first dimension refers to the frequency of meetings, the latter relates to the extent to which people provide informal support. We will consider how often people meet socially with friends, relatives or colleagues and how often people provide informal help to others (apart from work, voluntary organizations and family members).

As was the case for formal social capital, previous studies on the relationship between ethnic diversity and informal social capital only focused on direct effects of ethnic diversity. This chapter will build on earlier research, addressing underlying explanations for this relationship. Again, conflict and contact theories will be used to derive more specific hypotheses on indirect relationships. Using the first wave of the European Social Survey (2002/2003), we will conduct hierarchical linear regression analyses to answer the following research questions:

RQ 5.1 To what extent does ethnic diversity within (a) European countries, and (b) regions across European countries affect informal social capital?
RQ 5.2 To what extent can these relationships be explained by mechanisms derived from conflict and contact theory?

Chapter 6: Explaining differences in interethnic contact in Europe

The final chapter will zoom in on a specific type of informal social capital: interethnic contact. In the previous chapters, we considered interethnic contact as a potential explanatory mechanism, linking ethnic diversity to general indicators of social capital. The perspective of this chapter differs slightly, as we will focus on underlying determinants of interethnic contact. So far, earlier studies have hardly addressed the questions whether and why natives differ in their level of interethnic contact. Exceptional studies in this field indicate that social groups vary substantially in their level of interethnic contact, but fail to explain these differences (Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schlueter & Wagner, 2008; Semyonov & Glikman, 2009; however, see also Martinovic, 2013).

This chapter aims to build on earlier research, by describing and explaining differences in interethnic contact among natives in a large number of European countries. We will generalize Kalmijn’s (1998) overarching explanatory framework (see also Martinovic, 2013) for interethnic marriage to interethnic contacts, examining the role of (1) meeting opportunities, (2) preferences and (3) third parties. Two types of interethnic contact will be distinguished (i.e., interethnic friendships and interethnic contact at work), which is – as will be argued – important for testing the underlying explanations more profoundly. Additionally, the influence of ethnic diversity will be studied more elaborately. While earlier studies only considered general effects of ethnic diversity (e.g., Pettigrew, Wagner, & Christ, 2010; Wagner et al., 2006), assuming that
these hold equally for all citizens in the contextual unit of interest, we will argue that this influence might differ among diverse social groups, or under different economic circumstances in the context. In this chapter, hierarchical logistic regression analyses will be conducted, using data from the first wave of the European Social Survey (2002/2003). The central research questions which will be addressed, read:

RQ 6.1 To what extent do social groups among natives in European regions differ in their level of interethnic contact with friends and colleagues?

RQ 6.2 To what extent do meeting opportunities, preferences and third parties explain interethnic contact with friends and colleagues and thereby differences in interethnic contact between social groups?

RQ 6.3 For which social groups and under which circumstances does ethnic diversity in European regions increase interethnic contact with friends and colleagues?

Table 1.1 Schematic overview empirical chapters

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Research questions (brief)</th>
<th>Dependent variables</th>
<th>Explanatory mechanisms</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Geographical area and level of analysis</th>
<th>Type of analysis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part A - Formal social capital</td>
<td>To what extent does ethnic diversity affect formal social capital and how can this be explained by conflict and contact theories?</td>
<td>Involvement in: (i) leisure, (ii) interest and (iii) activist organizations</td>
<td>- Interethnic contact - Perceived ethnic threat</td>
<td>ESS (2002/2003)</td>
<td>European countries and regions</td>
<td>Hierarchical linear, logistic and multinomial regression analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CID (2005)</td>
<td>U.S. neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Hierarchical linear and multinomial regression analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>NELLS (2010)</td>
<td>Dutch municipalities and neighbourhoods</td>
<td>Hierarchical linear and multinomial regression analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part B - Informal social capital</td>
<td>To what extent does ethnic diversity affect informal social capital and how can this be explained by conflict and contact theories?</td>
<td>- Informal meeting with friends, relatives and colleagues - Informal helping apart from work, voluntary org. and family</td>
<td>- Interethnic contact - Perceived ethnic threat</td>
<td>ESS (2002/2003)</td>
<td>European countries and regions</td>
<td>Hierarchical linear regression analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ESS (2002/2003)</td>
<td>European regions</td>
<td>Hierarchical logistic regression analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For full research questions, please refer to sections 1.3.1 and 1.3.2.

1.3.3 Summary outline

The final chapter of this book will summarize the main findings of this study. Based on the empirical findings, the overarching research questions of this book will be answered and general conclusions will be drawn. Moreover, we will discuss some limitations of this study, which could not be dealt with and formulate directions for future research. Finally, societal implications of our findings will be discussed. A schematic overview of the remainder of this book (i.e., the empirical chapters) is presented in Table 1.1.
1.4 Notes

1 Throughout this book, ‘ethnic diversity’ is used as a generic term, reflecting the ethnic composition of contextual units, and referring to two commonly used indicators, i.e., migrant stock and ethnic fractionalisation (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2009; Hooghe et al., 2009; Putnam, 2007). In the forthcoming chapters, we will see that both indicators of ethnic diversity are highly correlated (see also Huijts, Sluiter, et al., 2014; Schaeffer, 2013). Note, that the ethnic fractionalisation measure (based on the Herfindahl index; see Alesina, Devleeschauwer, Easterly, Kurlat, & Wacziarg, 2003, p. 159) is heavily criticized, due to its colour-blindness (Dawkins, 2008; Gijsberts et al., 2012; Hagendoorn, 2009). In the remainder of this book, the prevailing indicators of ethnic diversity in the specific fields of research will be used.

A more elaborate description of the datasets used, as well as the theoretical framework of this book, will be provided in the empirical chapters of this book.

3 Pichler and Wallace (2007) also consider social trust as an indicator of formal social capital. In this study, we will only focus on behavioural indicators of formal (and informal) social capital.

4 However, a related field of research, focusing on the relationship between ethnic diversity and out-group derogation, consistently revealed evidence for the mediating role of interethnic contact (Pettigrew et al., 2010; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Wagner et al., 2006). Here, ethnic diversity appears to increase intergroup contact, which in turn effectively reduces negative attitudes toward ethnic out-groups. These interethnic ties could be regarded as a behavioural measurement of bridging social capital. Only very recently, two exceptional studies addressed the influence of ethnic diversity on bonding and bridging informal social capital in the Netherlands (Huijts, Sluiter, et al., 2014; Huijts, Kraaykamp, & Scheepers, 2014). To the best of our knowledge, such studies have not yet been conducted with regard to formal social capital.

5 Rotolo and Wilson’s (2012) study is exceptional in this respect as they differentiate between involvement in secular and religious voluntary organizations. In this study, involvement in church or religious organizations will not be taken into consideration, as this type of participation might be somewhat less ‘voluntary’ as compared to involvement in other types of voluntary associations (cf. Van der Meer et al., 2009; see also Curtis, Grabb, & Baer, 1992; Van Oorschot & Arts, 2005).
Part A

Formal social capital
Chapter 2

The impact of ethnic diversity on participation in European voluntary organizations: Direct and indirect pathways*

* A slightly different version of this chapter is forthcoming in Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly (Savelkoul, Gesthuizen, & Scheepers, 2013). A previous draft of this chapter has been presented at the ‘Dag van de Sociologie’ of the Dutch and Flemish Sociology Association in Gent, Belgium, May 2011 and at the 64th Annual Conference of the World Association for Public Opinion Research (WAPOR) in Amsterdam, the Netherlands, September 2011.
2.1 Introduction

Increasing migration and its expected future rise (Cornelius & Rosenblum, 2005; Hooghe et al., 2008) made politicians and scholars increasingly interested in the consequences of ethnic diversity for social cohesion (e.g., Cheong et al., 2007). Recently, attention for this topic intensified because research findings from the U.S. indicated that people living in ethnically diverse settings tend to withdraw from social life, or to ‘hunker down’ (Putnam, 2007, p. 149). Putnam claimed this pattern to be visible in attitudes and behaviour, covering informal and formal social ties as well as bridging and bonding social capital. In this study we will focus on the consequences of living in an ethnically diverse environment for the likelihood to be involved in voluntary organizations, often referred to as formal social capital (cf. Pichler & Wallace, 2007). As this dimension reflects less strong ties than informal social capital (i.e., informal social ties with family members, friends or colleagues), one might expect ethnic diversity to most strongly influence formal social capital.

Earlier research found inconsistent effects of ethnic diversity on associational involvement. Whereas some scholars found negative effects (e.g., Alesina & La Ferrara, 2000; Putnam, 2007; Rotolo & Wilson, 2012), others found no effect (e.g., Letki, 2008; Gijsberts et al., 2012) or even a positive relationship (e.g., Gasthuizen et al., 2009; Kesler & Bloemraad, 2010). For two recent reviews of studies see Wilson (2012) and Van der Meer and Tolsma (2014). The emerging picture appears to be less conclusive than claimed by Putnam. So far, however, the research mainly has focused on rather general indicators of associational involvement (e.g., Kesler & Bloemraad, 2010; Letki, 2008; Putnam, 2007; Tolsma et al., 2009), without systematically differentiating modes of involvement (i.e., active and passive involvement) and not considering that organizations differ strongly in the goals they pursue. Our aim is to test the generalizability of Putnam’s claim, distinguishing different types of voluntary organizations and different modes of involvement. We build on Van der Meer and colleagues’ study, which identified three types of voluntary organizations based on their main goals: leisure organizations (offering socializing and recreational activities to their members), interest organizations (protecting the socio-economic interests of their members) and activist organizations (with activist goals, advocating broader societal interests) (Van der Meer et al., 2009). For each type we will differentiate between active involvement (e.g., active participation or volunteering) and passive involvement (e.g., donating money).

In addition, we will go one step further, by disentangling underlying mechanisms to increase our understanding of how ethnic diversity relates to formal social capital. Previous research (e.g., Gijsberts et al., 2012; Letki, 2008; Putnam, 2007) only addressed the direct relationship between ethnic diversity and involvement in voluntary organizations, leaving unaddressed the indirect effects of ethnic diversity at the macro level on individual involvement in voluntary associations. These indirect effects are
both theoretically interesting and empirically important. If ethnic diversity has contradictory indirect effects on people’s involvement in voluntary organizations, these effects may cancel each other out, thus producing an overall absent direct effect of ethnic diversity. Putnam (2007) referred to conflict as well as contact theory, which both suggest different mediating mechanisms. He did not, however, elaborate on nor empirically test the proposed indirect relationships. We will use both theories to derive expectations regarding the relationship between ethnic diversity and formal social capital and test the individual-level mechanisms empirically.

We will build on earlier studies by distinguishing ethnic diversity at the country as well as the regional level simultaneously. Previous research on the relationship between ethnic diversity and formal social capital mainly focused on the municipality or neighbourhood level (e.g., Letki, 2008; Putnam, 2007; Tolisma et al., 2009). As it is difficult, or even impossible, to find valid data at these levels for all countries in cross-national research, these studies have only been conducted within single countries. Cross-national studies are rather scarce and do not take into account variation within countries (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2009; Kesler & Bloemraad, 2010).

Although participation in voluntary organizations often pertains to local participation, we propose that the regional level might be of interest as well. Social life will partly take place outside people’s direct neighbourhood or even outside people’s municipality. Not only may people work outside their municipality, they may compete against teams from other municipalities in a sporting match or participate in regional interest regions within these countries will reduce the likelihood that people will be involved in leisure, interest and activist organizations. Hence, we propose that the negative influence of ethnic diversity will generally reduce people’s likelihood to be involved in voluntary organizations. However, if living in ethnically diverse environments makes people feel less comfortable with others (Gesthuizen et al., 2009), they might predominantly avoid face-to-face contacts, i.e., active involvement, while passive involvement will be less strongly affected.

Simultaneously, previous research shows that different types of organizations vary with respect to the most prevalent mode(s) of involvement. Whereas leisure organizations are characterized by relatively high levels of active involvement with many people having face-to-face contact, activist organizations are characterized by passive modes of involvement, with many people donating money, without having face-to-face contacts (i.e., ‘checkbook members’) (Gesthuizen, Scheepers, Van der Veld, & Völker, 2013; Putnam, 2000; Van der Meer et al., 2009; see also descriptive statistics, Table 2.1). Interest organizations can be positioned in between both other types of organizations, displaying lower levels of actively involved members as compared to leisure organizations. Hence, we propose that the negative influence of ethnic diversity on associational involvement is most likely for organizations predominantly characterized by active modes of involvement, i.e., leisure organizations.

In sum, we expect that: (1a) Ethnic diversity within European countries as well as (1b) regions within these countries will reduce the likelihood that people will be involved in leisure, interest and activist organizations.

### 2.2.1 Constrict theory

Putnam’s (2007) constrict theory states that ethnic diversity reduces social capital: ethnic diversity triggers “[...] anomie or social isolation,” fostering people to withdraw from social life, or as Putnam formulated it “[...] pull in like a turtle” (Putnam, 2007, p. 149). He proposed that this negative impact of ethnic diversity is rather general. However, his theoretical reasoning behind this effect remains rather implicit. We suspect that the line of thought underlying his statement might be related to the homophily principle (McPherson et al., 2001): people prefer homogeneous environments, with people who are alike, for instance, regarding their ethnicity. As proposed by Gesthuizen et al. (2009), in ethnically diverse contexts, there will be less people of one’s own kind with whom one feels familiar with. As a result, people will feel less comfortable with others and therefore will more likely withdraw from social life, including voluntary associations. Based on Putnam’s general claim, we expect that: (1) Ethnic diversity within (1a) European countries as well as (1b) regions within these countries will reduce the likelihood that people will be involved in leisure, interest and activist organizations.

### 2.2 Theories and hypotheses

We will set out to explore three general theories – constrict, conflict and contact theories – which propose contradictory effects of ethnic diversity on formal social capital.

#### RQ 2.1 To what extent does ethnic diversity within (a) European countries, and (b) regions across European countries affect involvement in leisure, interest and activist organizations?

#### RQ 2.2 To what extent can these relationships be explained by mechanisms derived from conflict and contact theory?
In contrast, the focus is on the direct influence of ethnic diversity on associational involvement, without addressing underlying explanations. Although Putnam did not elaborate on these indirect effects, he mentioned two theories which are important in this respect: conflict and contact theories.

2.2.2 Conflict theory
Conflict theory is based on realistic group conflict theory (e.g., Blalock, 1967; Bobo, 1999; Coser, 1956) and ethnic competition theory (e.g., Scheepers et al., 2002; Coenders, Gijbers, Hagendoorn, & Scheepers, 2004). According to conflict theory, ethnic diversity fosters actual competition between the ethnic majority group and ethnic minority groups over scarce resources or cultural values, thus inducing perceptions of ethnic threat among members of the (majority) in-group. Previous research showed that these perceptions of ethnic threat are an important determinant of intergroup derogation (e.g., Pettigrew et al., 2010; Scheepers et al., 2002; Schlueter & Wagner, 2008). We propose that perceptions of ethnic threat might explain why people living in ethnically more diverse environments will withdraw from social life. People perceiving ethnic threat will be more anxious to become confronted with unknown others in general, and with ethnic minority members within voluntary organizations in particular. Consequently, they will be less likely actively involved in these organizations. Additionally, they might be less inclined to become passively involved in organizations with ethnic out-group members, or in organizations (also) promoting the interests of ethnic minorities. Summarizing, we expect that (3a) Ethnic diversity within European regions will increase people’s level of perceived ethnic threat in that region, (3b) which in turn will reduce the likelihood that people will be actively involved in leisure, interest and activist organizations.

2.2.3 Contact theory
The second theory to which Putnam (2007) referred, is (intergroup) contact theory (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011), which boils down to the proposition that interethnic contact effectively reduces out-group derogation. Previous research repeatedly showed that ethnic diversity increases the likelihood of intergroup contacts, which in turn reduce levels of out-group derogation (e.g., Savelkoul, Scheepers et al., 2011; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schlueter & Wagner, 2008). Moreover, ethnic diversity may also increase interethnic contacts through which social networks might become larger and more diverse. According to Wilson (2000), the larger the social network is quantitatively, the more likely people will become (actively or passively) involved in voluntary organizations. As intergroup contact involves different role models and examples of spending (leisure) time, people’s social networks will also become qualitatively different. This nicely links with Pettigrew’s (1998) deprovincialisation effect: intergroup contact reduces provincial views of the social world and contact with ethnic minorities widens one’s perspective, thereby increasing empathy, also for people belonging to other ethnic groups. Hence, interethnic contact might foster people’s awareness of general problems and, consequently, increase the likelihood of becoming (actively or passively) involved in voluntary organizations addressing these problems. Moreover, having intergroup contact might reduce people’s anxiety to become confronted with ethnic minorities in voluntary associations (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008), which might take away a psychological threshold to become actively involved in such organizations. Therefore, we hypothesize that (4a) Ethnic diversity within European regions will increase the likelihood that people living in these regions have interethnic contact. Moreover, we expect that: (4b) Interethnic contact, in turn, will increase the likelihood that people will be involved in leisure, interest and activist organizations.

Figure 2.1 shows our theoretical framework. The numbers refer to our hypotheses.

![Theoretical framework: Relationship between ethnic diversity and formal social capital](image-url)

Note: we will control for relevant determinants at the individual, regional and country level (not shown). Hypotheses 3a and 4a only formulated at the regional level due to data limitations.

* hypotheses 2a and 2b refer to distinction between active and passive involvement and different types of organizations.
In three categories, according to the goals they pursue. Leisure organizations include regarding one or more types of organizations were excluded from the analyses. They were involved. Respondents with missing values (i.e., ‘refusal’ or ‘no answer’) regarding one or more types of organizations were excluded from the analyses. For four countries (i.e., Czech Republic, Finland, Italy and Switzerland), the questions regarding associational involvement were not asked as multiple response questions or were answered differently due to translation, instruction or interpretation differences (see Van der Meer et al., 2009). We decided to exclude these countries from the analyses based on these categorical measures, as we do not know whether people are involved in only one or in different modes simultaneously.

Second, for each type of organization we made a subdivision of those respondents being involved. We distinguished respondents who said to be (1) not involved, (2) actively involved or (3) passively involved. For each type, respondents who ‘participated actively in’ and/or ‘volunteered for’ at least one such voluntary association were considered to be actively involved. Respondents who were a ‘member of’ and/or ‘donated money to’ at least one such organization, while not simultaneously participating actively or volunteering, were considered passively involved. For four countries (i.e., Czech Republic, Finland, Italy and Switzerland), the questions regarding associational involvement were not asked as multiple response questions or were answered differently due to translation, instruction or interpretation differences (see Van der Meer et al., 2009). We decided to exclude these countries from the analyses based on these categorical measures, as we do not know whether people are involved in only one or in different modes simultaneously.

We only included respondents who were born in the survey country and who indicated that they had the citizenship of the country and, moreover, whose parents were both born in the survey country as well (i.e., the majority group). After list-wise deletion of missing values and eliminating influential cases (which was only Vienna), our dataset contains 21,326 respondents living in 125 regions located in 15 European countries. Due to data limitations, part of our analyses will be conducted using a subsample, which includes 16,408 respondents living in 88 regions in 11 countries.

2.3.2 Dependent variable: Formal social capital

Formal social capital refers to involvement in voluntary associations (cf. Pichler & Wallace, 2007) and was constructed from measures of types of organizations and modes of associational involvement (e.g., membership, active volunteering or donating money). Respondents were given a list of voluntary organizations and asked whether and how they were involved. Respondents with missing values (i.e., ‘refusal’ or ‘no answer’) regarding one or more types of organizations were excluded from the analyses.

In line with Van der Meer et al. (2009), we grouped several types of organizations in three categories, according to the goals they pursue. Leisure organizations include ‘sports’, ‘culture/hobby’ and ‘social’ organizations. Interest organizations encompass ‘trade unions’, ‘professional/business’ and ‘consumer’ organizations. Activist organizations include ‘environmental/peace/animal rights’ and ‘humanitarian aid/human rights’ organizations. For more detailed information on the types of organizations, we refer to the main questionnaire of the ESS.

First, we constructed dichotomous measures of involvement in the three types of voluntary organizations, comparing respondents who were involved in a certain type of organization, with respondents who were not (reference category). We determined for each type separately whether respondents were involved in at least one such organization, irrespective of the mode(s) of associational involvement. For this reason, we considered whether respondents (1) were a member of, (2) participated actively in, (3) volunteered for, and/or (4) donated money to at least one such voluntary association.

We only selected European countries for which ethnic diversity at the regional level could be measured. We used a country-specific indicator to group respondents into regional units that correspond to the Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics classification scheme (NUTS; see Eurostat, 2003). The NUTS-2 level was the smallest regional level available for a large number of countries. This level refers to medium scale regions (ranging from 800,000 to 3 million inhabitants) and is comparable across European countries. The countries in our final dataset include: Austria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland. Four countries (i.e., Czech Republic, Finland, Italy and Switzerland) will only be included in a subset of our analyses. For Denmark, the NUTS-2 level was introduced in 2007 which coincided with a restructuring of the NUTS-3 levels. We decided to use the 2007 NUTS-2 classification for Denmark for grouping the previous NUTS-3 regions.

We used data derived from the first wave of the European Social Survey (ESS 2002/2003) (Jowell & The Central Co-ordinating Team, 2003), which are archived and distributed by the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD). This dataset contains a fine-grained measurement of associational involvement across a fairly large number of European countries and regions. Samples were drawn randomly for 21 European countries and Israel. The data were collected by face-to-face interviews with people living in private households, aged 15 years and over.

Due to data limitations, part of our analyses will be conducted using a subsample, which includes 16,408 respondents living in 88 regions in 11 countries. We only selected European countries for which ethnic diversity at the regional level could be measured. We used a country-specific indicator to group respondents into regional units that correspond to the Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics classification scheme (NUTS; see Eurostat, 2003). The NUTS-2 level was the smallest regional level available for a large number of countries. This level refers to medium scale regions (ranging from 800,000 to 3 million inhabitants) and is comparable across European countries. The countries in our final dataset include: Austria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland. Four countries (i.e., Czech Republic, Finland, Italy and Switzerland) will only be included in a subset of our analyses. For Denmark, the NUTS-2 level was introduced in 2007 which coincided with a restructuring of the NUTS-3 levels. We decided to use the 2007 NUTS-2 classification for Denmark for grouping the previous NUTS-3 regions.

We only included respondents who were born in the survey country and who indicated that they had the citizenship of the country and, moreover, whose parents were both born in the survey country as well (i.e., the majority group). After list-wise deletion of missing values and eliminating influential cases (which was only Vienna), our dataset contains 21,326 respondents living in 125 regions located in 15 European countries. Due to data limitations, part of our analyses will be conducted using a subsample, which includes 16,408 respondents living in 88 regions in 11 countries.

We only selected European countries for which ethnic diversity at the regional level could be measured. We used a country-specific indicator to group respondents into regional units that correspond to the Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics classification scheme (NUTS; see Eurostat, 2003). The NUTS-2 level was the smallest regional level available for a large number of countries. This level refers to medium scale regions (ranging from 800,000 to 3 million inhabitants) and is comparable across European countries. The countries in our final dataset include: Austria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland. Four countries (i.e., Czech Republic, Finland, Italy and Switzerland) will only be included in a subset of our analyses. For Denmark, the NUTS-2 level was introduced in 2007 which coincided with a restructuring of the NUTS-3 levels. We decided to use the 2007 NUTS-2 classification for Denmark for grouping the previous NUTS-3 regions.

We only included respondents who were born in the survey country and who indicated that they had the citizenship of the country and, moreover, whose parents were both born in the survey country as well (i.e., the majority group). After list-wise deletion of missing values and eliminating influential cases (which was only Vienna), our dataset contains 21,326 respondents living in 125 regions located in 15 European countries. Due to data limitations, part of our analyses will be conducted using a subsample, which includes 16,408 respondents living in 88 regions in 11 countries.

2.3.1 Data

We used data derived from the first wave of the European Social Survey (ESS 2002/2003) (Jowell & The Central Co-ordinating Team, 2003), which are archived and distributed by the Norwegian Social Science Data Services (NSD). This dataset contains a fine-grained measurement of associational involvement across a fairly large number of European countries and regions. Samples were drawn randomly for 21 European countries and Israel. The data were collected by face-to-face interviews with people living in private households, aged 15 years and over.

We only included respondents who were born in the survey country and who indicated that they had the citizenship of the country and, moreover, whose parents were both born in the survey country as well (i.e., the majority group). After list-wise deletion of missing values and eliminating influential cases (which was only Vienna), our dataset contains 21,326 respondents living in 125 regions located in 15 European countries. Due to data limitations, part of our analyses will be conducted using a subsample, which includes 16,408 respondents living in 88 regions in 11 countries.

We only included respondents who were born in the survey country and who indicated that they had the citizenship of the country and, moreover, whose parents were both born in the survey country as well (i.e., the majority group). After list-wise deletion of missing values and eliminating influential cases (which was only Vienna), our dataset contains 21,326 respondents living in 125 regions located in 15 European countries. Due to data limitations, part of our analyses will be conducted using a subsample, which includes 16,408 respondents living in 88 regions in 11 countries.

We only included respondents who were born in the survey country and who indicated that they had the citizenship of the country and, moreover, whose parents were both born in the survey country as well (i.e., the majority group). After list-wise deletion of missing values and eliminating influential cases (which was only Vienna), our dataset contains 21,326 respondents living in 125 regions located in 15 European countries. Due to data limitations, part of our analyses will be conducted using a subsample, which includes 16,408 respondents living in 88 regions in 11 countries.
Lubbers, & Scheepers, 2004). We excluded respondents with missing values on more than two of the six items list-wisely. Subsequently, we substituted missing values on items with the value on the highest or second highest correlating item. Finally, we calculated the average score on the six items (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.82). Note, that our measure of perceived ethnic threat largely approximates realistic group threat as proposed by Stephan, Renfro and Davis (2002).

We used two items to measure interethnic contact, reflecting the private, respectively occupational domain of interethnic contact (cf. Schlueter & Wagner, 2008): ‘do you have any friends who have come to live in [country] from another country?’ and ‘do you have any colleagues who have come to live in [country] from another country?’. For both items the answer categories are: ‘no, none at all’, ‘yes, a few’ and ‘yes, several’. With regard to the item referring to immigrant colleagues, respondents could also answer that they were not currently working, which was combined with the category referring to no immigrant colleagues. We excluded respondents with missing values on one or both items list-wisely. Finally, both items were coded so that higher values reflect more interethnic contact and were used to construct a five-point scale: 0’ (both items: ‘no, none at all’), ‘1’ (one item: ‘no, none at all’; other item: ‘yes, a few’), ‘2’ (both items: ‘yes, a few’; or: one item ‘no, none at all’; other item ‘yes, several’), ‘3’ (one item ‘yes, several’; other item ‘yes, a few’) and ‘4’ (both items: ‘yes, several’).

2.3.4 Ethnic diversity at the country and regional level
We constructed two commonly used measures of ethnic diversity (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2009; see also Hooghe et al., 2009), both at the country and the regional level: migrant stock and ethnic fractionalisation. Both measures are based on figures derived from the 2001 census provided by Eurostat (2010a), containing information on the number of natives and non-natives at both contextual levels. To construct ethnic fractionalisation, we distinguished the following nine ‘ethnic’ groups based on their citizenship of the survey country who are born abroad or whose country of birth is Europe, mainly referring to Turks), ‘other citizenship’ (also referring to people with no citizenship and country of birth: natives (citizenship in the survey country as well as born in the country), Western countries (i.e., EU countries, countries of the European Free Trade Association, North America and Oceania), Africa, Asia, South and Central America, former communist countries (i.e., Central and Eastern Europe and European Republics (excluding Baltic) of the former USSR), other European countries (i.e., ‘rest of Europe’, mainly referring to Turks), ‘other citizenship’ (also referring to people with no citizenship, e.g., asylum seekers) and, finally, naturalized immigrants (i.e., people with the citizenship of the survey country who are born abroad or whose country of birth is unknown).

To construct migrant stock, we considered the first two groups (i.e., natives and Western countries) as ‘Western’ and all other groups as ‘non-Western’. Migrant stock thus refers to the percentage of non-natives with a non-Western citizenship compared to the total population. Ethnic fractionalisation is based on the complement of the Herfindahl index (HI) (see e.g., Alesina et al., 2003, p. 159) and indicates the probability that two randomly selected individuals from a population belong to different (ethnic) groups. For our analyses, we centered both measures at their mean. As both measures turned out to be highly correlated at the country and regional level (r > 0.90), including them simultaneously in our analyses would lead to multicollinearity. Hence, we decided only to include our migrant stock measures and to use the ethnic fractionalisation measures in additional sensitivity analyses.

2.3.5 Control variables at the country and regional level
We controlled for the level of unemployment at the country and regional level in 2002. The unemployment rate reflects competition over scarce resources, thereby determining perceptions of ethnic threat, but is also shown to be inversely related with wealth, which was previously used as control variable for formal social capital (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2009, Kesler & Bloemraad, 2010).

Figures on country-level unemployment rates were derived from Eurostat (2010b), except for Switzerland (OECD, 2010). For most countries in our dataset, information on regional-level unemployment rates could also be obtained from Eurostat (2010b). Again, Switzerland is an exception (OECD, 2010). For Slovenia, unemployment rates were only obtainable from 2005 onwards and for the Danish regions from 2007 onwards (when the NUTS-2 classification was introduced). We centered our unemployment measures at their mean.

2.3.6 Control variables at the individual level
Finally, we controlled for several individual-level determinants, in line with previous research on formal social capital, ethnic threat perceptions and intergroup contact (e.g., Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schneider, 2008; Wilson, 2000; Wilson & Musick, 1997). We used information on the number of years of full-time education to assess educational attainment. For respondents with a missing value, we used information based on the categorical ISCED measure (for all countries except Austria where no ISCED was available). For each country we used the mean years of fulltime education corresponding with the particular level of education. For students who were still studying at the time of survey, the study length at the time of the interview was used. Respondents with extreme values on the scale of educational attainment (i.e., more than 20 years: N = 313 / N = 238 for the full sample, respectively subsample) were coded as the maximum value of 20 years. Employment status was measured by asking respondents about their main activity in the last seven days. Next to a condensed version of the EGP-classification (Erikson, Goldthorpe, & Portocarero, 1979) of social classes for respondents who were in paid employment, we distinguished five categories for respondents who were not in paid employment (see Table 2.1). Religiosity was measured by asking respondents how often they attend religious services (apart from...
Table 2.1 Descriptive statistics individual- and contextual-level variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Full sample</th>
<th>Subsample</th>
<th>N_{individual} = 21,326; N_{region} = 125; N_{country} = 15</th>
<th>Subsample</th>
<th>N_{individual} = 16,408; N_{region} = 88; N_{country} = 11</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent variables - dichotomous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement – Leisure organizations</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>47.29%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>47.11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement – Interest organizations</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>40.80%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>40.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement – Activist organizations</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>23.44%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>24.34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependent variables - categorical</td>
<td>not applicable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure org. – not involved</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>52.89%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>52.89%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure org. – actively involved</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>27.47%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>27.47%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leisure org. – passively involved</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>19.64%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>19.64%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest org. – not involved</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>59.38%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>59.38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest org. – actively involved</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>8.84%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>8.84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest org. – passively involved</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>31.78%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>31.78%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activist org. – not involved</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>75.66%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>75.66%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activist org. – actively involved</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>5.06%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>5.06%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activist org. – passively involved</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>19.28%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>19.28%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediating variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived ethnic threat</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interethnic contact</td>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables individual level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (15=0)</td>
<td>0 - 88</td>
<td>31.16</td>
<td>17.79</td>
<td>0 - 87</td>
<td>30.87</td>
<td>17.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age squared</td>
<td>0 - 7,744</td>
<td>1,287.62</td>
<td>1,220.50</td>
<td>0 - 7,569</td>
<td>1,269.60</td>
<td>1,216.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment (years)</td>
<td>0 - 20</td>
<td>11.72</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>0 - 20</td>
<td>11.80</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance never (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>29.45%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>29.67%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance rarely</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>40.77%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>37.98%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance once a month</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>10.15%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>10.59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance once a week or more</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>19.32%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>21.40%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance missing</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.31%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.36%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not married / never been married (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>29.02%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>29.42%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>55.20%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>55.59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced / living separated</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>6.68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow(er)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>8.09%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>8.05%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status missing</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.28%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big city</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>14.27%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>14.84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs or outskirts of big city</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>14.68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town or small city (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>29.85%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>29.68%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country village</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>32.31%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>32.50%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm or home in the countryside</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>9.43%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>9.02%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation missing</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.23%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
We condensed the original seven-point measurement to four categories ranging from never to once a week or more and included a fifth category for respondents with a missing value. Marital status and (self-reported) level of urbanisation were measured distinguishing four, respectively five categories (see Table 2.1). For those respondents with no information, an additional category was distinguished. Finally, we used straightforward measures of gender (with males as reference category) and age (including a squared term of age). To enable a meaningful interpretation of the intercept, we subtracted the minimum age (i.e., 15) for all respondents. For descriptive statistics we refer to Table 2.1.

### 2.4 Analyses

As individuals are nested within regions, which in turn are nested within countries, we employed hierarchical random intercept regression analyses (Snijders & Bosker, 2012), using the Mixed and Genlinmixed procedures in SPSS 20. First, we conducted hierarchical logistic regression analyses, to address the influence of ethnic diversity at the country and regional level on our dichotomous measure of associational involvement (Table 2.2). Next, we employed hierarchical multinomial regression analyses, addressing the regional-level effect of ethnic diversity on active and passive involvement (Table 2.3 and Table 2.4). Here, we considered the likelihood to be actively or passively involved as compared to not being involved. Moreover, we addressed the likelihood to be actively involved as compared to passively involved. This reflects people’s choice of how they want to be involved, for those who are involved. To test the effects of ethnic diversity at the regional level on perceived ethnic threat and intergroup contact, we conducted hierarchical linear regression analyses. As we only have cross-sectional data, causal relationships should be interpreted carefully. Yet, prior evidence and theoretical reasoning suggests that the causal order that we assume, is quite plausible. We will come back to this issue in our discussion.

Before we will discuss our results, we first address some methodological issues. First, attention should be paid to the importance of distinguishing between two contextual levels: the country level and the regional level. Additional sensitivity analyses (available upon request) revealed that if one does not control for the nesting of regions within countries, the regional-level effect of migrant stock on some dependent variables becomes significant or would be overestimated, whereas for other dependent variables the effect would be no longer significant after controlling for the nesting of regions within countries. Hence, if we only consider one of both contextual levels, next to the individual level, this would lead to different, erroneous, conclusions. As the number of countries in our hierarchical multinomial regression analyses is limited, care is needed in interpreting the country-level findings. Hence, we only present our findings at the

### Table 2.1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean / %</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean / %</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service class (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>18.30%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>18.24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine non-manuals</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>11.20%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>11.18%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employed</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>3.99%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>3.79%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual workers</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>16.52%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>16.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status missing (employed)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>1.58%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>9.36%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>8.97%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.56%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.60%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other employment situation</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>4.75%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>5.14%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender Male (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>48.53%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>48.56%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>51.47%</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>51.44%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock</td>
<td>0.50 - 20.25</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>1.45 - 16.15</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>3.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic fractionalisation</td>
<td>0.03 - 0.58</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03 - 0.34</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>2.00 - 26.30</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>6.39</td>
<td>2.00 - 26.30</td>
<td>8.27</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock</td>
<td>0.50 - 18.30</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>2.62 - 12.42</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>3.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic fractionalisation</td>
<td>0.03 - 0.58</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.03 - 0.34</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>2.00 - 19.90</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>2.00 - 19.90</td>
<td>6.65</td>
<td>4.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Note, that for further analyses we will use mean centered measures of migrant stock, ethnic fractionalisation and unemployment rate.
the impact of ethnic diversity would be most strongly negative for leisure organizations (which are largely characterized by active modes of involvement) and less so for interest and activist organizations. As shown in Table 2.3, regional ethnic diversity does not negatively influence people’s likelihood of being involved in leisure organizations, neither actively, nor passively. This underlines our findings presented in Table 2.2. We do find, however, a negative effect of migrant stock at the regional level on both active \((b = -0.045)\) and passive \((b = -0.034)\) involvement in interest organizations. Again, this pattern corresponds with our results shown in Table 2.2. Living in ethnically diverse regions, moreover, increases the odds of passive involvement \((b = 0.043)\), while it did not affect active involvement in activist organizations. The positive effect of ethnic diversity on involvement in activist organizations, which we found earlier (Table 2.2) is, thus, due to an increased likelihood to be passively (rather than actively) involved.

Overall, we found limited support for our expectations that ethnic diversity would predominantly have a negative effect on active involvement (hypothesis 2a), or on involvement in leisure organizations which are characterized by active modes of involvement (hypothesis 2b). We only found a negative effect of the regional-level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country level</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Migrant stock</strong></td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unemployment rate</strong></td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>-0.134</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Table 2.2 Results: hierarchical logistic regression analyses – formal social capital**

---

2.5 Results

Based on Putnam’s constrict theory, we expected direct negative effects (both at the country and regional level) on involvement in all types of voluntary organizations. As shown in Table 2.2, we found no significant effect of the national level migrant stock on involvement in any type of voluntary organization. At the regional level, we only found a direct negative effect of migrant stock on the odds of involvement in interest organizations \((b = -0.029)\). We found a positive effect of migrant stock at the regional level on the odds of involvement in activist organizations \((b = 0.029)\). People living in European regions with larger proportions of non-Western ethnic minorities are, thus, more likely to be involved in activist organizations, whereas they are less likely to be involved in interest organizations. Based on these findings, we have to refute hypothesis 1a on the country-level effect of migrant stock for all types of voluntary organizations. Only for involvement in interest organizations, our findings corroborate hypothesis 1b on the regional-level effect of migrant stock.

Next, we expected that ethnic diversity would predominantly reduce active modes of involvement, with high levels of face-to-face contacts. Moreover, we proposed that regional level, though include the country-level determinants in our analyses for a more accurate estimation of regional-level effects of ethnic diversity.

Second, our theoretical framework (see Figure 2.1) calls, ideally, for hierarchical structural equation modeling. However, as these techniques allow us to consider only two hierarchical levels, and our preliminary analyses already stressed the importance of distinguishing two contextual levels next to the individual level, we decided to conduct separate hierarchical regression analyses. First, we used the three types of formal social capital as dependent variables. Next, we considered interethnic contact and perceived ethnic threat as dependent variables. Finally, we included both interethnic contact and perceived ethnic threat as predictors of formal social capital. To control for the assumed negative relationship between our mediating variables (cf. Savelkoul, Schepers et al., 2011; Schlueter & Schepers, 2010), we included interethnic contact as determinant of perceived ethnic threat and vice versa.

Third, we conducted several sensitivity analyses to determine the robustness of our findings (results are available upon request). First, we used our alternative measure of ethnic diversity (i.e., ethnic fractionalisation). Moreover, we considered the effects of migrant stock on involvement in each type of voluntary organization separately. Although our distinction between leisure, interest and activist organizations provides a clear guideline for grouping several types of voluntary associations (cf. Van der Meer et al., 2009), we are aware that some organizations in one category might vary on some aspects. Overall, the sensitivity analyses revealed substantially similar results, indicating the robustness of our findings.

---
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Table 2.3 Results: hierarchical multinomial regression analyses – formal social capital (direct effects contextual-level determinants) 
\( N_{\text{individual}} = 16,408; N_{\text{region}} = 88; N_{\text{country}} = 11 \)^a,b

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1 – Formal social capital – Leisure</th>
<th>Model 2 – Formal social capital – Interest</th>
<th>Model 3 – Formal social capital – Activist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>M1a PAS/NI ( b (S.E.) )</td>
<td>M1b ACT/NI ( b (S.E.) )</td>
<td>M1c ACT/PAS ( b (S.E.) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-1.786 *** (0.261)</td>
<td>-1.693 *** (0.263)</td>
<td>-0.091 (0.183)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M2a PAS/NI ( b (S.E.) )</td>
<td>M2b ACT/NI ( b (S.E.) )</td>
<td>M2c ACT/PAS ( b (S.E.) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3.014 *** (0.360)</td>
<td>-4.683 *** (0.362)</td>
<td>-1.680 *** (0.243)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M3a PAS/NI ( b (S.E.) )</td>
<td>M3b ACT/NI ( b (S.E.) )</td>
<td>M3c ACT/PAS ( b (S.E.) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-3.550 (0.298)</td>
<td>-1.311 *** (0.335)</td>
<td>-1.311 *** (0.335)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Regional level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Migrant stock</th>
<th>Unemployment rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-0.000 (0.014)</td>
<td>0.014 (0.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.017 (0.015)</td>
<td>0.016 (0.019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.014 (0.016)</td>
<td>0.002 (0.022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.034 ** (0.011)</td>
<td>0.014 (0.018)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.045 * (0.021)</td>
<td>0.028 (0.027)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.009 (0.020)</td>
<td>0.020 (0.022)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.043 ** (0.021)</td>
<td>-0.046 * (0.021)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.008 (0.021)</td>
<td>-0.001 (0.028)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.032 (0.021)</td>
<td>0.046 (0.033)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*** significant at \( p < 0.001 \); ** significant at \( p < 0.01 \); * significant at \( p < 0.05 \) (one-sided test of significance).

^a^ Controlled for all individual-level control variables (educational attainment, employment status, religiosity, marital status, gender, age, age squared and urbanisation) as well as migrant stock and unemployment rate at the country level (results available upon request). Not controlled for perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact.

^b^ PAS = passively involved; ACT = actively involved; NI = not involved.

For interethnic contact we found support for a direct effect of migrant stock on formal social capital. The positive impact of migrant stock on formal social capital is in line with our expectations (hypothesis 4a). For interethnic contact, in turn, increases the odds of active involvement in activist organizations. Hence, hypothesis 4b is supported for all dimensions of associational involvement. Obviously, the influence of ethnic threat on associational involvement is conditioned by perceived ethnic threat (Table 2.4, Model 1). We did not find a significant effect of individual-level variables (Table 2.4, Model 1 and 2). When we included both control variables in a specification for (active and passive) involvement in voluntary organizations, the relationship between perceived ethnic threat and involvement in activist organizations is attenuated (hypothesis 3b). However, we controlled for perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact as dependent variables in the last two models. We found support for indirect effects of migrant stock on formal social capital. The positive effect of migrant stock on formal social capital is significant when we consider perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact as dependent variables in the last two models. We found support for an indirect effect of migrant stock on formal social capital. The positive effect of migrant stock on formal social capital is significant when we consider perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact as dependent variables in the last two models. We found support for an indirect effect of migrant stock on formal social capital. The positive effect of migrant stock on formal social capital is significant when we consider perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact as dependent variables in the last two models.

We also found significant effects of migrant stock on formal social capital. The positive impact of migrant stock on formal social capital is in line with our expectations (hypothesis 4a). For interethnic contact, in turn, increases the odds of active involvement in activist organizations. Hence, hypothesis 4b is supported for all dimensions of associational involvement. Obviously, the influence of ethnic threat on associational involvement is conditioned by perceived ethnic threat (Table 2.4, Model 1). We did not find a significant effect of individual-level variables (Table 2.4, Model 1 and 2). When we included both control variables in a specification for (active and passive) involvement in voluntary organizations, the relationship between perceived ethnic threat and involvement in activist organizations is attenuated (hypothesis 3b). However, we controlled for perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact as dependent variables in the last two models. We found support for indirect effects of migrant stock on formal social capital. The positive effect of migrant stock on formal social capital is significant when we consider perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact as dependent variables in the last two models. We found support for an indirect effect of migrant stock on formal social capital. The positive effect of migrant stock on formal social capital is significant when we consider perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact as dependent variables in the last two models. We found support for an indirect effect of migrant stock on formal social capital. The positive effect of migrant stock on formal social capital is significant when we consider perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact as dependent variables in the last two models. We found support for an indirect effect of migrant stock on formal social capital. The positive effect of migrant stock on formal social capital is significant when we consider perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact as dependent variables in the last two models.
Table 2.4 Results: hierarchical linear / multinomial regression analyses – formal social capital, perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact (direct and indirect effects contextual-level determinants) (N\textsubscript{individual} = 16,408; N\textsubscript{region} = 88; N\textsubscript{country} = 11). b, c

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3 – Formal social capital – Leisure</th>
<th>Model 4 – Formal social capital – Interest</th>
<th>Model 5 – Formal social capital – Activist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived ethnic threat</td>
<td>Interethnic contact</td>
<td>M3a PAS/NI</td>
<td>M3b ACT/NI</td>
<td>M3c ACT/PAS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>6.468 ***</td>
<td>1.503 ***</td>
<td>-1.704 ***</td>
<td>-1.393 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived ethnic threat</td>
<td>-0.090</td>
<td>-0.030 ***</td>
<td>-0.074 ***</td>
<td>-0.044 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interethnic contact</td>
<td>-0.213 ***</td>
<td>0.113 ***</td>
<td>0.0176 ***</td>
<td>0.064 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>0.043 ***</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.027 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>-0.018</td>
<td>-0.012 *</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>0.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


**Significant at p < 0.001; *** significant at p < 0.01; * significant at p < 0.05 (one-sided test of significance).

- Controlled for all individual-level control variables (educational attainment, employment status, religiosity, marital status, gender, age, age squared and urbanisation) as well as migrant stock and unemployment rate.

at the country level (results available upon request). Empty cells: parameters not estimated due to model specifications.

+ PAS = passively involved; ACT = actively involved; NI = not involved.

b Model 1 and 2: Hierarchical linear regression analyses. Model 3, 4 and 5: Hierarchical multinomial regression analyses.

2.6 Conclusions and discussion

Interest in the relationship between ethnic diversity and social capital has increased since Putnam (2007) claimed that people living in ethnically more diverse contexts would be more likely to withdraw from social life and, consequently, display lower levels of social capital. In this contribution we focused on the influence of ethnic diversity on formal social capital, which encompasses involvement in formally constituted voluntary associations (cf. Pichler & Wallace, 2007). We tested whether Putnam’s general claim holds for different modes of involvement (i.e., active and passive) in three types of voluntary organizations: leisure, interest and activist organizations (cf. Van der Meer et al., 2009). The effects of ethnic diversity turned out to be less general than expected based on Putnam’s construct theory. Only at the regional level, we found clear influences of living in ethnically diverse regions on the likelihood to be involved in voluntary organizations weakened. The absent regional level effect on (active) involvement in leisure organizations turned into a negative effect. And for interest organizations we found that the negative effects of migrant stock on passive and active involvement became stronger. Overall, considering our very consistent results regarding the effects of perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact on associational involvement, and their relationships with ethnic diversity, our understanding of the relationship between ethnic diversity and involvement in voluntary organizations has been greatly improved by including these mechanisms.

Finally, although it is not the focus of our study, we would like to mention that most of the effects of our individual-level control variables on involvement in voluntary organizations, interethnic contact and perceived ethnic threat (results available upon request), are in line with previous research (e.g., Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schneider, 2008; Tolsma et al., 2009; Van der Meer et al., 2009; Wilson & Musick, 1997).
organizations. These influences vary, however, across the three types of organizations and the different modes of involvement. Ethnic diversity at the regional level only decreased active and passive involvement in interest organizations, but increased rather than decreased passive involvement in activist organizations, and did not affect involvement in leisure organizations at all.

We expected that ethnic diversity would predominantly decrease the likelihood to be actively involved and to be involved in organizations characterized by relatively high levels of face-to-face contact, i.e., leisure organizations (Geesthuizen et al., 2013; Van der Meer et al., 2009). We found no support for this expectation. However, we found that living in regions with larger proportions of ethnic minorities decreases the likelihood of involvement in interest (not leisure) organizations, reducing both active and passive involvement. We argue that, as involvement in leisure organizations may reflect basic social needs, referring to the importance that people attach to socializing and recreating, people might less easily avoid involvement in leisure organizations, whereas they do withdraw from interest organizations, which promote goals that are more remote from their basic needs.

In this study, we also aimed to improve the understanding of the relationship between ethnic diversity and associational involvement. To address our second research question, we incorporated mechanisms derived from conflict theory (Blalock, 1967; Scheepers et al., 2002) and from contact theory (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2011). Whereas ethnic diversity proved to be unrelated to perceived ethnic threat, we found that the more people perceive ethnic threat, the less likely they are to be involved in leisure, interest or activist organizations, either actively or passively. As perceptions of ethnic threat might induce people to feel anxious about confronting unknown others in general, and ethnic minorities in particular, such perceptions may induce these people to withdraw from social life, including involvement in voluntary organizations.

Moreover, our results showed that ethnic diversity at the regional level increased the likelihood of majority group members to have contact with people belonging to ethnic minority groups. Intergroup contact, in turn, increased (both active and passive) involvement in all types of voluntary organizations very consistently. These findings support crucial previous insights. Intergroup contact changes people’s social network both quantitatively and qualitatively: larger and more diverse social networks may reduce provincial views and anxiety (Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008) and increase the likelihood to participate in voluntary associations (Wilson, 2000).

We are aware that the causal order between both mediating variables and formal social capital might be disputable to some extent. Future research should, preferably, use panel data to address these causality issues more profoundly. Nevertheless, our results provide initial evidence for the proposed causal order. We found a positive effect of intergroup contact and a negative effect of perceived ethnic threat on passive associational involvement. As these modes of involvement do not involve face-to-face contacts, reversed causality is largely ruled out. Furthermore, additional analyses revealed substantially similar effects for interethnic contact with friends as well as colleagues (results available upon request). If associational involvement would increase intergroup contact, one would only expect this effect for interethnic contact with friends.

Another direction that future research could take is to focus on the (direct and indirect) influence of ethnic diversity at lower aggregate levels (e.g., municipalities or neighbourhoods) within single countries: earlier studies pointed at the importance of proximity (e.g., Tolsma et al., 2009) and (particularly active) participation in voluntary organizations is to a large extent a local type of participation.

In sum, our findings show differential effects of ethnic diversity on associational involvement for different types of organizations or modes of involvement. As different types of voluntary organizations vary in their goals and most prevalent modes of involvement (see Van der Meer et al., 2009) and only some modes of involvement are linked with face-to-face contact, while others are not, it is quite understandable that the influence of ethnic diversity is far more mixed than supposed by Putnam. As such, our findings imply that generalisations suggested by Putnam (2007) are not warranted and future research should preferably use more fine-grained rather than general measurements of formal social capital to disentangle these differentiated effects. Our results stress, moreover, the need to incorporate individual-level mechanisms, i.e., ethnic threat perceptions and intergroup contact, which both show very consistent effects on both active and passive involvement in all types of voluntary organizations. As such, we believe that we have reached a higher level of understanding as to how ethnic diversity translates into more or less associational involvement in European regions.

2.7 Notes

1 Active associational involvement might also involve informal social ties with co-members in an organization. This does not hold for passive involvement (i.e., ‘checkbook membership’; Putnam, 2000).

2 Additionally, we will control for the (self-reported) level of urbanisation of the respondents’ living environment. This enables us to control for influences at a lower aggregate level than the regional level, which might otherwise be reflected in the regional-level effects.

3 Note, that Van der Meer et al.’s (2009) terminology – based on the organizations’ goals – is somewhat confusing in this respect, as activist organizations pursue activist goals, whereas they are largely characterized by passive modes of involvement.
We assume that it is indeed more likely to find effects of ethnic diversity at the regional level rather than the country level, due to proximity (e.g., Tolsma et al., 2009). Ideally, one would, therefore, prefer to include ethnic diversity at lower contextual levels (e.g., municipalities or neighbourhoods) as well. Unfortunately, data at these levels are not available for all countries in cross-national research. By controlling for the level of urbanisation of the respondents' living environment, we aim to control for effects at these lower contextual levels. Additional analyses, excluding our measure of urbanisation, reveal that several regional-level effects of ethnic diversity become (slightly) stronger (results available upon request). Controlling for the level of urbanisation, we can prevent that effects at lower contextual levels will be reflected in the regional-level effects, and – consequently – can estimate the regional-level effects more accurately.

We reach similar conclusions with regard to hypothesis 1b, if we use the full sample (with 15 countries) or the subsample (with 11 countries).

As the absence of a direct positive relationship between ethnic diversity and perceived ethnic threat could be the result of a (positive) curvilinear effect of ethnic diversity (i.e., a so-called ‘familiarisation’ effect; see Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schneider, 2008), we additionally included a squared term of our ethnic diversity measure, though, without finding support for this assumption. Moreover, it might be the case that the presence of ethnic minorities in regions only increases perceptions of ethnic threat for social groups competing directly with ethnic minorities, for instance, at the labour or housing market (e.g., Scheepers et al., 2002). Focusing on general effects for all respondents might not disclose such relationships. As our model is, however, already rather complex, we leave it to future research to disentangle these relationships more profoundly, taking into account cross-level interaction effects (cf., for instance, Quillian, 1995; Schneider, 2008).
Chapter 3

Does ethnic diversity in U.S. neighbourhoods drive down associational life? Testing constrict, conflict and contact theories*

* A slightly different version of this chapter is currently under review. Co-authors are Miles Hewstone, Peer Scheepers and Dietlind Stolle. A previous draft of this chapter has been presented at the 'Dag van de Sociologie' of the Dutch and Flemish Sociology Association in Nijmegen, the Netherlands, May 2013 and at the Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association in New York, United States, August 2013.
3.1 Introduction

During the past decades, many Western countries have become ethnically more diverse, and they are expected to become even more so in the future (Cornelius & Rosenblum, 2005). Consequently, both politicians and social scientists show interest in the societal impact of these changes. Whereas scholarly work was, initially, mainly devoted to the consequences of diversity for intergroup attitudes or out-group derogation (e.g., Blalock, 1967; Quillian, 1995, 1996; Scheepers et al., 2002; Semyonov, Rajman, & Gorodzeisky, 2006), in the past decade research started to address the influence on indicators of social capital (Alesina & La Ferrara, 2000; Costa & Kahn, 2003; Fieldhouse & Cutts, 2010; Putnam, 2007; Reeskens & Wright, 2013; Vermeulen, Tillie, & Van de Walle, 2012; see also recent review articles by Portes & Vickstrom, 2011, and Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014). Focusing initially on the U.S., several studies claimed that people living in ethnically more diverse environments are less trusting, participate less in voluntary organizations and have fewer informal social ties compared to people living in ethnically homogeneous areas. Putnam’s research, especially, attracted sustained attention, as he asserted the all-encompassing nature of this impact, stating that, in the short run at least, ethnic diversity negatively influences “[…] attitudes and behaviors, bridging and bonding social capital, public and private connections” (Putnam, 2007, p. 151). The breadth of his claim – which he labelled ‘constrict theory’ – triggered widespread debate and controversy.

While Putnam’s claim about the negative effects of ethnic diversity has received only mixed support in the European context (Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014), these previous studies have one thing in common. So far, with regard to social ties, a test of the consequences of diversity for ‘bonding’ relations (i.e., with in-group members) has largely been neglected. Putnam (2007) only presented evidence with regard to trust, focusing on in-group (bonding) and out-group (bridging) trust. Other studies either neglected the bonding/bridging distinction, or focused exclusively on attitudinal measures, related (only) to the out-group, e.g., out-group trust (Lancee & Dronkers, 2011) or interethnic tolerance (Tolsma et al., 2009).

In this study, we focus on the impact of the ethnic composition of people’s neighbourhood (i.e., U.S. census tracts) on their behavioural involvement in voluntary organizations, often referred to as formal social capital (cf. Pichler & Wallace, 2007). Voluntary associations are often seen as indicators of weak ties in comparison to informal social capital (i.e., usually but not always strong social ties with family members, friends or colleagues). Our aim is to build on earlier research in three ways.

First, unlike previous studies, we explicitly take into account the bonding/bridging dimension of behavioural associational involvement. The data from the 2005 U.S. ‘Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy’ (CID) survey, which offers the unique possibility to consider whether respondents are involved in (a large number of different) voluntary
organizations in combination with the perceived ethnic composition of these associations, is an ideal source for testing whether neighbourhood ethnic diversity, i.e., the relative out-group size, is negatively associated with the likelihood of bridging and bonding social ties alike, as Putnam claims.

Second, this study focuses on underlying explanations for the relationship between neighbourhood ethnic diversity and associational involvement. Considering the ethnic composition of voluntary organizations might be essential for further testing the generalizability of Putnam’s claim; it might be even more crucial when it comes to understanding why living in an ethnically heterogeneous environment might affect people’s likelihood of being involved in different types of voluntary organizations. Two contradictory sets of predictions, derived from conflict theory (e.g., Blalock, 1967; Bobo, 1999; Coser, 1956; Scheepers et al., 2002) and contact theory (e.g., Allport, 1954; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Hewstone, 2009; Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) are tested. Unlike earlier research, we empirically examine the role of intergroup contact and perceived ethnic threat for explaining bonding and bridging formal social capital.

Third, this study tries to understand whether Putnam’s (2007) claim regarding the negative relationship between ethnic diversity and (bonding and bridging) formal social capital holds for different types of voluntary organizations. In line with earlier studies (Van der Meer et al., 2009; Gesthuizen et al., 2013), we consider three types of organizations (i.e., leisure, interest and activist) that largely differ regarding the goals their members aim to fulfill, and also vary regarding the people they attract and serve. Van der Meer and colleagues (2009) have shown that for the European context, individual-level determinants have sometimes contradictory influences on associational involvement in these three types of organizations. In this study, we exploratorily take into account this differentiation of organizations which enables us to test the generalizability of Putnam’s claim more profoundly. Overall, the following research questions are addressed:

RQ 3.1 To what extent does ethnic diversity within U.S. neighbourhoods affect involvement in bonding, respectively bridging leisure, interest and activist organizations?

RQ 3.2 To what extent can these relationships be explained by mechanisms derived from conflict and contact theory?

3.2 Theories and hypotheses

Addressing the relationship between ethnic diversity and formal social capital, we focus on the neighbourhood level, which refers to people’s direct living environment. As has been argued before, this contextual unit of analysis reflects people’s actual interaction settings and is therefore more likely to affect people’s attitudes and behaviour, as compared to more remote levels of analysis, like the country or state level (Stolle et al., 2008; Tolsma et al., 2009).

3.2.1 Constrict theory

Focusing on the influence of neighbourhood ethnic diversity on bonding and bridging formal social capital, we start from Putnam’s general claim, labelled ‘constrict theory’. The core statement can be summarized as follows: higher levels of ethnic diversity trigger ‘[…] anomie or social isolation’, leading people to withdraw from social life, or as Putnam formulates it ‘[…] “hunker down”’ (Putnam, 2007, p. 149). According to Putnam, this pernicious influence of ethnic diversity must have general effects, including on informal and formal, bridging and bonding social ties. However, the reasons for this effect remain unexplored. Gesthuizen and colleagues (2009) have pointed to the role of the homophily principle in this respect. According to McPherson et al. (2001), people have a preference for homogeneous environments, consisting of people who are alike, for instance, regarding their ethnicity. As a consequence, living in an ethnically diverse context, surrounded by fewer people of one’s kind, might induce people to feel less comfortable with others in general, not just with members of one’s out-group (Gesthuizen et al., 2009). Consequently, living in such mixed environments could encourage people to withdraw from social life entirely, including voluntary organizations, irrespective of their ethnic composition. Based on this reasoning and Putnam’s general claim, we formulate the following prediction regarding the direct effect of ethnic diversity on associational involvement: (1) Higher levels of ethnic diversity within U.S. neighbourhoods will reduce the likelihood that people are involved in any type of voluntary association, either bonding or bridging.

We now use two intergroup theories introduced earlier to derive more fine-grained predictions regarding the underlying explanations, i.e., conflict and contact theory.

3.2.2 Conflict theory

The first theoretical tradition – often labelled ‘conflict theory’ – is based on realistic group conflict theory (Blalock, 1967; Bobo, 1999; Coser, 1956) and ethnic competition theory (Coenders, Gijsberts, Hagendoorn, et al., 2004; Scheepers et al., 2002). According to this line of reasoning, ethnic diversity is considered to increase competition between the ethnic in-group and ethnic out-groups over economic and cultural issues. Not only will a larger proportion of ethnic out-group members increase the (perceived) competition over scarce jobs or affordable housing, but conflicting values might also become more apparent with larger numbers of out-group members. As a result, higher levels of ethnic diversity are proposed to increase perceptions of ethnic threat among members of the ethnic (majority) in-group, which in turn will increase both in-group solidarity as well as out-group derogation (Coenders, Gijsberts, Hagendoorn, et al.,
involvement in bonding and bridging organizations is contact theory (Allport, 1954; Allport, 2010; Rajman, 2013; Scheepers et al., 2002; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010).

Based on conflict theory, we expect that these increased levels of in-group solidarity as well as out-group derogation – triggered by ethnic diversity and perceptions of ethnic threat – might also be reflected with regard to associational involvement. If conflict theory holds, we should see that people who perceive more ethnic threat will, on the one hand, be less likely to be involved in bridging voluntary organizations. On the other hand, however, due to increased in-group solidarity, people will be more likely to be involved in bonding voluntary organizations, where they will mix exclusively with ethnic in-group members. Summarizing, we expect that: (2) Higher levels of ethnic diversity in U.S. neighbourhoods will increase perceptions of ethnic threat (2a), which, in turn, will increase the likelihood of being involved in bonding voluntary associations (2b), while decreasing the likelihood of being involved in bridging voluntary associations (2c).

Although conflict theory sheds more light on how living in an ethnically diverse neighbourhood might affect people’s engagement in bonding and bridging voluntary organizations, it leads to different predictions as compared to Putnam’s (2007) constrict theory. Whereas constrict theory predicts withdrawing socially from in-group and out-group associations (‘hunkering down’), conflict theory predicts at least more involvement in in-group associations (‘hunkering with us’).

The underlying ‘threat mechanism’ might, however, be more complex. We propose that the ‘threat mechanism’ might simultaneously increase a general tendency to withdraw from social life, while evoking a focus on one’s in-group as well. In other words, in general, people perceiving (more) ethnic threat will be less likely to be involved in voluntary organizations (irrespective of the ethnic composition of these organizations), which is in line with Putnam’s constrict theory. Based on conflict theory, one could expect that this negative effect is stronger for bridging as compared to bonding associations. Those people who perceive more ethnic threat, and do decide to become involved in voluntary organizations, will be less likely to be involved in bridging as compared to bonding organizations. In sum, we alternatively expect that: Perceptions of ethnic threat generally decrease the likelihood of being involved in both bonding and bridging voluntary associations (2d); and people who perceive ethnic threat and are involved in voluntary associations are expected to be less engaged in bridging as compared to bonding associations (2e).

3.2.3 Contact theory

The second theory that can explain the relationship between ethnic diversity and involvement in bonding and bridging organizations is contact theory (Allport, 1954; Hewstone, 2009; Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Contact theory boils down to the idea that positive intergroup contact reduces out-group prejudice. Earlier studies consistently revealed that larger proportions of out-group members in one’s environment increase the likelihood of having positive intergroup contact, which in turn reduces negative attitudes toward out-groups (e.g., Fralund Thomsen, 2012; Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schlueter & Wagner, 2008; Wagner et al., 2006).

Having contact with ethnic out-group members might, however, also be important for explaining people’s likelihood of being involved in voluntary organizations. As intergroup contact changes the composition of people’s social network, this might affect their likelihood of being involved in bonding or bridging organizations in different ways. According to Wilson (2000), people can, via their social networks, come to know about the existence of a voluntary organization or can be recruited to participate or volunteer. Via one’s ethnic out-group friends, one might predominantly come to know of the existence of bridging voluntary organizations or even become recruited into these organizations. Therefore, we propose that the likelihood of being involved in bridging organizations will increase due to intergroup contact.

Having intergroup contact is especially likely to affect one’s attitudes toward ethnic out-groups, and may even change attitudes toward one’s ethnic in-group (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998). Research has consistently shown that intergroup contact reduces anxiety about interacting with out-group members (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). Consequently, we expect that people who have more intergroup contact will feel less anxious about encountering ethnic out-group members during activities of these voluntary organizations, and will, therefore, be less likely to avoid involvement in bridging organizations.

Simultaneously, intergroup contact can reshape one’s view of the in-group to become more inclusive, as the norms and customs of one’s own ethnic group turn out not to be the only way to deal with the social world (Pettigrew, 1998). Pettigrew termed this reassessment of the customs and values of one’s own ethnic group a ‘deprovincialisation’ effect. According to the principle of homophily (McPherson et al., 2001), people might naturally prefer involvement in bonding organizations, in which they are surrounded by similar others. Following the argument of deprovincialisation, having intergroup contact might reshape these preferences, making people focus less strongly on bonding voluntary associations. Additionally, having more intergroup contact, i.e., having a larger share of ethnic out-group members in one’s social network, might make people less likely to come to know about the existence of or to become recruited into bonding organizations. Although interactions with in-group and out-group members are not mutually exclusive, due to time restrictions, spending more time with (more) out-group members might reduce contact with in-group members and, consequently, the likelihood to be involved in bonding organizations.
Based on these lines of reasoning, we also expect that for those people who are involved in voluntary associations, having intergroup contact increases the likelihood to be involved in bridging as compared to bonding organizations.

In sum, based on contact theory, we expect that: (3a) Higher levels of ethnic diversity in U.S. neighbourhoods will increase the likelihood of intergroup contact (3a), which in turn will increase the likelihood of being involved in bridging voluntary associations (3b), while decreasing the likelihood of being involved in bonding voluntary associations (3c). Moreover, we expect that: (3d) People who have intergroup contact and are involved in voluntary organizations, are more likely to be involved in bridging as compared to bonding associations. For an overview of our theoretical framework, see Figure 3.1. The numbers refer to our hypotheses.

**3.3 Data and measurements**

**3.3.1 Data**

To test our hypotheses we use data derived from the U.S. ‘Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy’ (CID) survey, which was conducted by International Communications Research between mid-May and mid-July of 2005 under the direction of the Center for Democracy and Civil Society (CDACS) at Georgetown University (Howard et al., 2005). The CID-survey is matched to the biannual European Social Survey 2002/03 (ESS) and contains a large number of associational involvement items. These items were expanded by additional measures of the ethnic composition of voluntary organizations.

To the best of our knowledge, the ethnic composition of voluntary associations has not been considered in earlier studies addressing the influence of ethnic diversity on associational involvement. To the best of our knowledge, the ethnic composition of voluntary associations has not been considered in earlier studies addressing the influence of ethnic diversity on associational involvement.

The data were collected by face-to-face interviews with a representative sample of 1,001 respondents aged 18 years and over, living in households throughout the contiguous United States. As we examined both individual as well as contextual factors, we merged the survey-data with contextual level data at the census tract level, derived from the 2000 U.S. Census. We only selected respondents belonging to the ethnic (White) majority (N = 725), living in 188 census tracts. This is because many studies have emphasized the differential effect of ethnic diversity on majority and minority populations, usually highlighting a larger, and sometimes an exclusive effect for majority populations (Soroka et al., 2007; Stolle et al., 2008).

**3.3.2 Dependent variables: Bonding and bridging formal social capital**

Several measures regarding types of organizations, modes of associational involvement, attendance at meetings, and ethnic composition of organizations are used to construct the dependent variables. First, respondents were shown a list of voluntary organizations and asked whether and how they were involved in these organizations. In line with Van der Meer and colleagues (2009), who used the matched ESS dataset, several types of organizations were grouped in three categories based on their primary goals: leisure, interest and activist organizations. Whereas leisure organizations (i.e., ‘sports’, ‘culture / hobby’ and ‘social’ organizations) predominantly serve their members’ personal interests with regard to socializing and recreational activities, interest organizations (i.e., ‘trade unions’, ‘professional / business’, ‘consumer’ and ‘neighbourhood / homeowner / block club’ organizations) mainly focus on the socio-economic interests of their members (Van der Meer et al., 2009). Activist organizations (i.e., ‘environmental / peace / animal rights’ and ‘humanitarian’ organizations, as well as ‘organizations that provide social services to the needy’) address broader societal interests, not directly related to their members’ socio-economic interests and are thus less related to people’s self-interest.

![Figure 3.1 Theoretical framework: Relationship between ethnic diversity and bonding and bridging formal social capital](image-url)
For each organization, respondents were asked whether they (i) were a member of, (ii) participated actively in, (iii) volunteered for, and/or (iv) donated money to at least one such voluntary organization. Only respondents who were involved in an organization (i.e., at least one of these modes of associational involvement) were subsequently asked whether they attend meetings of this organization. Note, that the majority of respondents who are involved, also attend meetings. Respondents who stated that they attend meetings were asked about the ethnic composition of their organization(s).

For each type of organization, respondents who were not involved (in any mode of associational involvement) were considered as reference category. For respondents who were involved, we distinguished between involvement in bonding and bridging leisure, interest and activist organizations. Here, respondents were asked to indicate the ethnic composition of their voluntary organization(s) based on the percentage of out-group members. The answer categories are ‘0%', ‘5%', ‘10%', ‘25%', ‘50%', ‘75%', ‘90%', ‘95%' and ‘100%’. The vast majority of respondents is involved in organizations with 25% or less out-group members. Bonding formal social capital refers to organizations in which all members belong to the same ethnic group as the respondent (i.e., Whites). Organizations in which any (i.e., 5% or more) members belong to ethnic out-groups are considered as bridging organizations. For leisure and interest organizations, about 25% of the respondents associated with these organizations are involved in bonding organizations, whereas for activist organizations this is about 50% (see Table 3.1). As the distinction between bonding and bridging organizations is rather strict and might be to some extent arbitrary, we conducted additional robustness analyses, using different cut-off points for bonding and bridging organizations (see results section). Moreover, we conducted additional analyses to take into account the possibility that the distinction between bonding and bridging organizations is rather strict and might be to some extent arbitrary, we conducted additional robustness analyses, using different cut-off points for bonding and bridging organizations (see results section). Thus, for each type of organization, we considered the percentage of out-group members, the percentage of participants with at least four valid answers. For respondents with at least four valid answers, missing values on our scale (2.3%) are substituted by the mean score of perceived ethnic threat. Note, that our measure of perceived ethnic threat largely approximates realistic and symbolic threat as proposed by Stephan, Diaz-Loving and Duran (2000) and Stephan et al. (2002).

Second, intergroup contact is measured by the ethnic composition of the respondents’ network of close friends. In the CID-survey, close friends refer to people (including family members) respondents ‘feel at ease with, can talk to about whatever is on their mind or call on for help’. Respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of close friends they had contact with in the past month who belong to a different ethnic/racial group (e.g., Asians, Blacks or Hispanics). The original nine-point scale, ranging from 0% to 100%, is used to construct a continuous measure of the percentage of (close) ethnic out-group friends. A higher percentage reflects more ethnic out-group friends and vice versa less ethnic in-group friends. Respondents lacking valid information regarding the percentage of out-group close friends (2.3%) were treated as having no intergroup contact. As close friendship ties can be considered to be rather intimate and voluntary in nature, this type of intergroup contact is supposed to meet the key conditions of the contact hypothesis (Alport, 1954; Davies, Tropp, Aron, Pettigrew, & Wright, 2011; Pettigrew, 1998).

3.3.3 Mediating variables: Perceived ethnic threat and intergroup contact

To test our hypotheses derived from conflict theory and contact theory, we include two mediating variables in our analyses. First, we measure perceptions of ethnic threat, using two items that were asked with regard to three groups separately (i.e., Asians, Blacks and Hispanics). The first item taps into symbolic or cultural threat, asking respondents if they ‘find it difficult to understand the customs and ways of [GROUP]’. The second item refers to physical threat, asking respondents whether they agree or disagree with the following statement: ‘more than most groups, [GROUP] are likely to engage in crime’. For all items respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement on a five-point scale, ranging from 0 (disagree strongly) to 4 (agree strongly). Higher scores reflect a higher level of perceived ethnic threat. We use these six items (two items with regard to three ethnic groups) to construct a scale of perceived ethnic threat (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.77), calculating the mean score of all items, for respondents with at least four valid answers. Missing values on our scale (2.3%) are substituted by the mean score of perceived ethnic threat. Note, that our measure of perceived ethnic threat largely approximates realistic and symbolic threat as proposed by Stephan, Diaz-Loving and Duran (2000) and Stephan et al. (2002).

Second, intergroup contact is measured by the ethnic composition of the respondents’ network of close friends. In the CID-survey, close friends refer to people (including family members) respondents ‘feel at ease with, can talk to about whatever is on their mind or call on for help’. Respondents were asked to indicate the percentage of close friends they had contact with in the past month who belong to a different ethnic/racial group (e.g., Asians, Blacks or Hispanics). The original nine-point scale, ranging from 0% to 100%, is used to construct a continuous measure of the percentage of (close) ethnic out-group friends. A higher percentage reflects more ethnic out-group friends and vice versa less ethnic in-group friends. Respondents lacking valid information regarding the percentage of out-group close friends (2.3%) were treated as having no intergroup contact. As close friendship ties can be considered to be rather intimate and voluntary in nature, this type of intergroup contact is supposed to meet the key conditions of the contact hypothesis (Alport, 1954; Davies, Tropp, Aron, Pettigrew, & Wright, 2011; Pettigrew, 1998).

3.3.4 Relative out-group size at the census tract level

In line with earlier studies (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2009; Stolle et al., 2008), we use the relative out-group size as an indicator of ethnic diversity at the neighbourhood level. The percentage of ethnic out-group members at the census tract level is based on figures from the national census 2000, conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012a). For each census tract the percentage of out-group members is calculated, subtracting the percentage of ‘Whites, non-Hispanic’ from the total population. The percentage non-Whites ranges from 0.9% in Boonville (Oneida County; NY) to 96.0% in a census tract in New York City (New York County; NY).

3.3.5 Control variable at the census tract level

As earlier research illustrates the importance of adequately controlling for the socio-economic status of contexts when addressing the influence of ethnic diversity on social capital (e.g., Letki, 2008), we include a measure of poverty at the census tract level. The figures are derived from the national census 2000 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012b) and refer to the percentage of the population in a census tract whose income is below the poverty level (for more information see Bishaw & Iceland, 2003). This percentage ranges from 1.4% in a census tract in Feasterville Trevose (Bucks County; PA) to 61.2% in a census tract in Fresno (Fresno County, CA).
3.3.6 Control variables at the individual level

Finally, we control for several individual-level determinants previously found to affect formal social capital, intergroup contact or perceptions of ethnic threat (e.g., Curtis et al., 1992; Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schneider, 2008; Wilson, 2000; Wilson & Musick, 1997). To assess respondents’ level of educational attainment, and to keep our model as parsimonious as possible, we distinguish three categories referring to the highest grade of school or years of college respondents have completed: ‘high school graduate/GED or lower level of educational attainment’ (reference category), ‘business, technical or vocational school after high school or college started (no 4-year degree)’, and ‘college graduate or post-graduate training/professional schooling after college’. To measure respondents’ level of religiosity, an item asking respondents how often they attend religious services (apart from special occasions such as weddings and funerals) is used. For reasons of parsimony, the original seven-point scale is condensed to four categories: ‘never’ (reference category), ‘less than once a month’, ‘once a month’ and ‘once a week or more’. The level of urbanisation of the respondents’ living environment is measured by four categories as judged by the respondent: ‘big city’, ‘suburbs of big city’, ‘town or small village’ (reference category), ‘country village or farm/home in the countryside’. We use an item asking respondents about the main activity in the last seven days, to determine their employment situation, distinguishing six categories: ‘paid work’ (reference category), ‘student’, ‘unemployed’, ‘retired’, ‘housekeeping’ and ‘other situation’.

The respondents’ social network size was also controlled. This is a strong predictor for people’s level of informal sociability. We use an item asking respondents about the number of people one is very close to. A continuous measure ranging from 0 to 25 was developed.

Marital status is measured by distinguishing four categories: ‘married’, ‘divorced or separated (legally married)’, ‘widowed’ and ‘never married’ (reference category). Finally, gender (using males as reference category) and age are also included. The respondents’ age is calculated by subtracting the respondents’ year of birth from the year the interview was conducted (2005). In order to get a meaningful interpretation of the intercept, the minimum age (i.e., 18) is set to zero for all respondents. Missing values on measures for religiosity, urbanisation and marital status are substituted by the modal categories. For age and social network size, missing values are substituted by the mean score. Descriptive statistics are presented in Table 3.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean / %</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement – Leisure organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved leisure organization</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>66.48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved bonding leisure organization</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>8.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved bridging leisure organization</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>25.38%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement – Interest organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved interest organization</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>74.62%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved bonding interest organization</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved bridging interest organization</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>18.48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement – Activist organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved activist organization</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>78.48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved bonding activist organization</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>10.07%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved bridging activist organization</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>11.45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediating variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived ethnic threat</td>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergroup contact</td>
<td>0 - 100</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>19.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variables individual level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate or GED or lower (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>40.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business, technical or vocational school completed or college started</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>35.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate or post-graduate training</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>24.69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance never (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>17.24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance rarely (incl. missing)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>36.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance once a month</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>13.52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance once a week or more</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>33.24%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big city</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>15.59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs or outskirts of big city (incl. missings)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>35.59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town or small city (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>33.52%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country village / Farm or home in countryside</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>15.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As a next step, the indirect effects via perceptions of ethnic threat and intergroup contact with friends are considered. First, using hierarchical linear regression analyses, we address the effect of the percentage non-Whites on intergroup contact, respectively perceptions of ethnic threat. In addition, both intergroup contact and perceived ethnic threat are included as predictors in the hierarchical multinomial regression analyses to address associational involvement. Once again, the three abovementioned contrasts are considered, distinguishing involvement in bonding and bridging organizations, respectively being not involved.

### 3.5 Results

#### 3.5.1 Main results

One aim of this study is to test whether the ethnic composition of U.S. neighbourhoods affects the likelihood that ethnic majority members are involved in any voluntary organizations (i.e., formal social capital). Table 3.2 shows for each type of voluntary organization separately, the influence of the percentage non-Whites at the census tract level on the likelihood to be involved in bonding, respectively bridging organizations, as compared to not being involved. Additionally, the influence on the likelihood to be involved in bridging organizations as compared to bonding organizations is presented. Focusing on the direct influence of ethnic diversity, there is no support for a negative impact on associational involvement overall (see Table 3.2). Living in ethnically more diverse census tracts does not affect the odds of involvement in bonding leisure, interest and activist organizations, while it positively affects the odds of involvement in bridging interest organizations ($b = 0.013$). The latter effect is not found for leisure and activist organizations. This means that there is no support for a general negative impact of ethnic diversity on associational involvement in the U.S. as claimed by Putnam. Hence, we have to refute hypothesis 1.

Although considering the ethnic composition of voluntary organizations is important to test Putnam’s claim more accurately, it is even more crucial when it comes to understanding why living in an ethnically diverse neighbourhood might affect people’s associational involvement. Based on conflict theory (Bialock, 1967; Bobo, 1999; Scheepers et al., 2002) and contact theory (Allport, 1954; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), we argue that ethnic diversity might affect involvement in bonding and bridging voluntary organizations indirectly, via perceptions of ethnic threat, or intergroup contact.

To address these indirect relationships, we first consider the effect of ethnic diversity on the level of perceived ethnic threat, respectively intergroup contact (see Table 3.3). Next, we include both explanatory mechanisms as predictors of the odds of involvement in bonding and bridging voluntary organizations. Contrary to the expectations based on conflict theory, and refuting hypothesis 2a, living in an ethnically

### Table 3.1 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean / %</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Employment situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paid work (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>60.41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>3.59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>4.69%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>15.86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>7.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other employment situation (incl. missing)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>8.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social network size</td>
<td>0 - 25</td>
<td>8.43</td>
<td>6.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not married / never been married (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>19.59%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married (incl. missings)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>54.90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced / living separated</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>18.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow(er)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>7.31%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>44.28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>55.72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (18=0)</td>
<td>0 - 72</td>
<td>28.89</td>
<td>16.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood level (census tract)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage non-Whites</td>
<td>0.90 - 96.00</td>
<td>23.61</td>
<td>22.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage below poverty level</td>
<td>1.40 - 61.20</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>8.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy (CID) survey (2005), U.S. Census Bureau (2012a/b).

### 3.4 Analyses

To test our hypotheses and to take into account the hierarchical structure of our data, with individuals nested within census tracts, we employ hierarchical regression analyses (Snijders & Bosker, 2012). First, hierarchical multinomial regression analyses are conducted addressing the direct effect of the percentage non-Whites at the census tract level on involvement in bonding, respectively bridging voluntary organizations. For each type of organization (i.e., leisure, interest and activist), we compare respondents who are involved in bonding, respectively bridging organizations with respondents who are not involved. Additionally, we include the contrast between respondents who are involved in bridging organizations versus respondents who are involved in bonding organizations. This way, the likelihood of involvement in bonding or bridging organizations is compared for those respondents who are involved.
### Table 3.2 Results: hierarchical multinomial regression analyses – bonding and bridging formal social capital (direct effects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contextual level</th>
<th>Bonding</th>
<th>Bridging</th>
<th>Bond/NI</th>
<th>Brid/Bond</th>
<th>Bond/NI</th>
<th>Brid/Bond</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.818(0.011)</td>
<td>0.876(0.007)</td>
<td>0.885(0.012)</td>
<td>0.930(0.012)</td>
<td>0.808(0.012)</td>
<td>0.709(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census tract level</td>
<td>-0.003(0.002)</td>
<td>0.002(0.007)</td>
<td>-0.001(0.011)</td>
<td>0.013(0.008)</td>
<td>0.003(0.012)</td>
<td>0.009(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Whites</td>
<td>0.002(0.003)</td>
<td>0.026(0.008)</td>
<td>0.007(0.012)</td>
<td>0.024(0.008)</td>
<td>0.020(0.010)</td>
<td>0.023(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty rate</td>
<td>0.009(0.003)</td>
<td>0.030(0.008)</td>
<td>0.005(0.012)</td>
<td>0.018(0.008)</td>
<td>0.028(0.010)</td>
<td>0.023(0.009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Sources: Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy (CID) survey (2005); U.S. Census Bureau (2012a/b).

| Significant at b < 0.01; * significant at p < 0.05 (one-sided test of significance). |

With regard to involvement in bonding voluntary organizations, two competing hypotheses are tested. Based on conflict theory, perceiving ethnic threat is expected to induce people to focus on their ethnic in-group and make them more likely to be involved in bonding voluntary organizations (hypothesis 2b). On the other hand, perceiving ethnic threat only induces people to refrain from being involved in ethnically bridging voluntary organizations, where they encounter ethnic minorities. Perceiving ethnic threat is not related to withdrawing from bonding voluntary organizations, nor does it stimulate involvement in such organizations.

So far, we only considered whether the odds of being involved versus not being involved in bonding respectively bridging voluntary organizations are influenced by people’s level of perceived ethnic threat. These comparisons reflect the first step, as people initially have to decide whether they want to become involved in voluntary organizations or not. Those people who become involved, additionally have to decide whether they choose a bonding or bridging organization. Again, according to conflict theory, those who perceive ethnic threat will be less likely to be involved in bridging rather than bonding voluntary organizations (hypothesis 2a). Comparing involvement in bonding and bridging organizations, we only find support for this hypothesis for activist organizations (b = -0.742). For leisure and interest organizations, the negative effect of ethnic threat perceptions does not reach significance, indicating that perceiving ethnic threat is not necessarily related to higher levels of formal in-group socializing.

Contact theory predicts that living in ethnically more diverse neighbourhoods increases people’s level of intergroup contact (hypothesis 3a). As is shown in Table 3.3, our results (b = 0.145) confirm this prediction, and are in line with earlier findings in the U.S. (e.g., Dixon, 2006; Sigelman et al., 1996) and Europe (e.g., Pettigrew et al., 2010; Semyonov & Glikman, 2009; Wagner et al., 2006). Based on contact theory (Allport, 1954; Hewstone, 2009) and the argument of deprovincialisation (Pettigrew, 1998), we propose that having intergroup contact should decrease people’s likelihood of being involved in bonding voluntary organizations, while increasing the likelihood of being involved in bridging voluntary organizations (hypotheses 3b, 3c and 3d). There is only limited support for these hypotheses, as only for leisure organizations having intergroup contact decreases the odds of involvement in bonding organizations (b = -0.080), more diverse neighbourhood is not related to increased levels of perceived ethnic threat. However, as expected (hypothesis 2c), perceiving more ethnic threat decreases the odds of involvement in all bridging voluntary organizations. This effect is consistent across all types of voluntary organizations (b = -0.318 for leisure organizations; b = -0.403 for interest organizations and b = -1.062 for activist organizations).
Table 3.3 Results: hierarchical linear / multinomial regression analyses – bonding and bridging formal social capital, perceived ethnic threat and intergroup contact (direct and indirect effects contextual-level determinants)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3 – Formal social capital – Leisure</th>
<th>Model 4 – Formal social capital – Interest</th>
<th>Model 5 – Formal social capital – Activist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perceived ethnic threat</td>
<td>Intergroup contact</td>
<td>M3a BOND/NI</td>
<td>M3b BRID/NI</td>
<td>M3c BRID/BOND D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.673</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-3.879 ***</td>
<td>-1.244 **</td>
<td>2.564 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.109)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.925)</td>
<td>(0.533)</td>
<td>(0.990)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived ethnic threat</td>
<td>-3.303</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>0.037 (0.238)</td>
<td>-0.318 *</td>
<td>-0.350 (0.262)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.044)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.165)</td>
<td>(0.262)</td>
<td>(0.262)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergroup contact</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
<td>***</td>
<td>-0.080 (0.026)</td>
<td>-0.002 (0.026)</td>
<td>0.079 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.001)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
<td>(0.026)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census tract level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.003 (0.011)</td>
<td>-0.002 (0.011)</td>
<td>-0.004 (0.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.002)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.011)</td>
<td>(0.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty rate</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.017 (0.025)</td>
<td>0.004 (0.016)</td>
<td>0.022 (0.027)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.004)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.016)</td>
<td>(0.027)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy (CID) survey (2005); U.S. Census Bureau (2011a/b).

*** significant at p < 0.001; ** significant at p = 0.01; * significant at p < 0.05 (one-tailed test of significance).

- Controlled for all individual-level control variables (educational attainment, religiosity, employment situation, level of urbanisation, marital status, gender, age and social network size), as well as percentage below poverty level at the census tract level (results available upon request). Empty cells: parameters not estimated due to model specifications.

while increasing the likelihood of involvement in bridging as compared to bonding organizations for those people who are involved (b = 0.079). For both other types of organizations we did not find such influences of intergroup contact. Moreover, intergroup contact does not affect involvement in bridging leisure, interest or activist organizations. However, the causal direction between intergroup contact and involvement in voluntary organizations is not unambiguous. If bridging association membership induces intergroup contact though, we should find a strong positive relationship between intergroup contact and involvement in bridging voluntary organizations, which is not the case. We will come back to this issue in our conclusion.

Finally, most of the effects of the individual-level control variables (results available upon request) on intergroup contact, perceptions of ethnic threat and associational involvement are in line with previous studies (e.g., Curtis et al., 1992; Savelkoul, 1997; see also Wilson, 2012).
3.5.2 Robustness analyses
Several additional analyses are conducted to determine the robustness of our findings. First, we consider involvement in leisure, interest and activist organizations irrespective of their ethnic composition (see Appendix 3.1). Ethnic diversity has no effect on involvement in any type of voluntary organization. People perceiving more ethnic threat are also less likely to be involved in interest and activist organizations. Obviously, these effects are caused by a decreased likelihood of being involved in bonding voluntary organizations (see Table 3.3).

Second, we use different cut-off values for bonding and bridging voluntary organizations. In the analyses so far a rather strict measurement of bonding voluntary organizations is used, referring to such organizations with only in-group members. To test the robustness of our findings, we additionally consider organizations as bonding if 5% or less, 10% or less, respectively 25% or less of the members belong to an ethnic out-group. Vice versa, organizations are considered to be bridging organizations if the percentage of out-group members exceeds these thresholds (i.e., respectively 5%, 10%, or 25%).

Overall, our results are rather robust, with some minor exceptions (see Appendix 3.2 and 3.3). If our measure of bonding organizations involves a (substantial) percentage of out-group members, perceiving ethnic threat also reduces the odds of involvement in bonding voluntary organizations (see Appendix 3.3), which underlines the idea that people perceiving ethnic threat will avoid involvement in voluntary organizations with (more) out-group members. Simultaneously, in that case, intergroup contact is positively related with involvement in bridging voluntary organizations. One should bear in mind, however, that the causal order is not unambiguous here.

Third, as people might be involved in several types of voluntary organizations simultaneously, we additionally address involvement in bonding, respectively bridging voluntary associations, without distinguishing types of organizations (see Appendix 3.4). We consider respondents as involved in bridging organizations if they are involved in at least one of them. Again, we use different category boundaries for bonding and bridging organizations. We reach substantially similar conclusions; however, the effect of intergroup contact was only detected with less strict measures of bonding voluntary organizations, including 5%, 10% or 25% out-group members.

3.6 Conclusions and discussion
This study had two major goals. First, we examined whether living in ethnically more diverse U.S. neighbourhoods drives down associational involvement. Second, the analysis attempted to disentangle the theoretical accounts for any detected relationship between diversity and associational involvement. According to Putnam (2007), ethnic diversity has a general negative effect on involvement in both bonding and bridging voluntary organizations. However, he only presents empirical evidence for the negative effect of ethnic diversity on trust. Other studies are mainly based on rather old surveys and overall show mixed effects of ethnic diversity on associational involvement (e.g., Alesina & La Ferrara, 2000; Costa & Kahn, 2003). Unlike earlier studies, here we take into account the ethnic composition of voluntary organizations, which enables us to test whether ethnic diversity really affects both bonding and bridging social capital as constriction theory predicts.

Our results indicate that there is no support for a general negative effect of ethnic diversity in U.S. neighbourhoods on associational involvement of White respondents overall; nor is there any evidence that the percentage of non-Whites in neighbourhoods affects both the membership in bonding and bridging associations simultaneously as Putnam’s constriction theory would predict. This pattern is robust, whether distinctions between different types of voluntary organizations are made or not, and even when disregarding the ethnic composition of these organizations. The findings are, moreover, rather consistent across types of voluntary organizations. Moreover, neighbourhood ethnic diversity has a positive, rather than negative, influence on the odds of involvement in bridging organizations, but only for interest organizations. Our additional analyses reveal that this effect becomes stronger, if we consider bridging interest organizations with a larger percentage of out-group members. Future research could explore this relationship more profoundly.

Although these findings already shed more light on the relationship between ethnic diversity and associational involvement, our aim has been to go one step further, disentangling possible indirect effects of ethnic diversity. Two contrary sets of predictions were tested, which are derived from conflict (e.g., Blalock, 1967; Bobo, 1999; Coser, 1956; Scheepers et al., 2002) and contact (e.g., Allport, 1954; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) theories. As both theories predict different effects of ethnic diversity on bonding, respectively bridging social capital, this further underlines the necessity of taking into account the ethnic composition of voluntary organizations.

Contrary to predictions based on conflict theory, living in neighbourhoods with a larger percentage of non-Whites does not increase perceptions of ethnic threat. However, perceiving ethnic threat consistently decreases the likelihood of being involved in ethnically bridging voluntary organizations for all types of organizations. Perceptions of ethnic threat are not related to involvement in bonding organizations. These findings indicate that perceiving ethnic threat does not reduce associational involvement per se, but rather it seems to induce people to avoid involvement in bridging organizations. These findings are overall consistent with an essential part of conflict theory: those who perceive out-groups as a threat to the in-group will exclude them (e.g., Bobo, 1999; Quillian, 1995; Scheepers et al., 2002) and, moreover, avoid them in bridging organizations.

As we expected, living in neighbourhoods with larger proportions of out-group members increases people’s level of intergroup contact. This is in line with earlier
findings from the U.S. and Europe (e.g., Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Sigelman et al., 1996; Wagner et al., 2006). However, contrary to our expectations, having intergroup contact hardly affects associational involvement. Only for leisure organizations, having intergroup contact reduces people’s likelihood of being involved in bonding organizations. People with intergroup contact who are involved in leisure organizations, are also more likely to be engaged in bridging organizations as compared to bonding organizations. With a stricter measure of bridging organizations (referring to a larger percentage of out-group members), intergroup contact is also positively related with involvement in bridging leisure and interest organizations. As compared to activist organizations with many passive members (i.e., checkbook members), leisure (and interest) organizations are characterized by higher levels of active participation (Putnam, 2000; Van der Meer et al., 2009). For these organizations, becoming informed or even recruited by active members might play a larger role, explaining why intergroup contact influences predominantly involvement in leisure (and interest) organizations. This evidence shows that having intergroup contact does not only improve intergroup relations by reducing out-group prejudice (cf. Allport, 1954; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), but also by promoting involvement in bridging leisure and interest organizations.

The causal order between intergroup contact and involvement in bridging voluntary organizations is not unambiguous: people might come into contact with ethnic out-group members via their membership in bridging associations. In that case one would, however, expect a general positive relationship between intergroup contact and involvement in bridging voluntary organizations, which we do not find. Future research should investigate this causal relationship more rigorously, preferably using panel data. Overall, intergroup contact hardly affects associational involvement directly. However, intergroup contact with friends might have an indirect influence, as people with more positive intergroup contact perceive less ethnic threat, which in turn influences their membership in bridging voluntary organizations. Using panel data, future research should address this indirect relationship further.

While we are unable to directly consider the availability of bonding and bridging associations in people’s living environment, we assume that people can actually choose whether they want to become involved in either bonding or bridging organizations. Future research should try to disentangle such supply-side factors more profoundly. However, as information on the availability of voluntary organizations might be far from complete for the U.S., one could focus on smaller geographical areas, for instance, neighbourhoods in a single municipality. Future research should also substantiate these findings for various ethnic minority groups in the U.S. population.

To conclude, we found no evidence for a general negative effect of ethnic diversity in U.S. neighbourhoods on associational involvement, thus raising (further) doubts about the pervasiveness of Putnam’s (2007) pessimistic predictions. Distinguishing different types of voluntary organizations reveals that some factors (e.g., intergroup contact) only affect involvement in specific organizations, while for other determinants (e.g., perceived ethnic threat) the strength of the effect varies across different types of organizations. Our results stress the importance of including both an assessment of the ethnic composition of very different voluntary organizations and measures of underlying explanations when testing the relationship between ethnic diversity and associational involvement.

3.7 Notes

1 We are aware of the fact that the causal order is not unambiguous here. We will come back to this in our discussion.

2 The classification introduced by Van der Meer and colleagues (2009) was based on the first wave of the European Social Survey. Next to the organizations listed in the ESS-survey, the CID-survey contains five additional organizations. We only considered ‘neighbourhood/homeowners organizations’ and ‘organizations that provide social services to the needy’ as interest, respectively activist, organizations, as the other organizations could not be clearly classified as either leisure, interest or activist organizations, and only a relatively small percentage of respondents was involved in these organizations.

3 We considered respondents with missing information regarding involvement (leisure: 1.0%; interest: 1.9%; activist: 1.7%) as not involved. Additional analyses, excluding these respondents, led to substantially similar findings (results available upon request). Respondents who never attend meetings or with missing values regarding their level of attendance (leisure: 2.2%; interest: 3.4%; activist: 6.2%) are considered as being involved in bonding organizations. As respondents who do not attend meetings are involved, though, will have no opportunity to have contact with out-group members in their organization, we assume that they can be compared with respondents involved in bonding organizations, lacking this opportunity for intergroup contact as well. Additional sensitivity analyses, excluding these respondents from our analyses, resulted in substantially similar findings (results available upon request).

4 Additionally, the answer category ‘just one’ was given. This option has not been chosen by any respondent. Respondents who are involved and attend meetings though lack valid information regarding the ethnic composition of their organization (leisure: 0.6%; interest: 1.1%; activist: 2.1%) are considered as being involved in bonding organizations. Additional analyses, excluding these respondents, led to substantially similar conclusions (results available upon request).
Applying mean substitution for respondents with missing values yields similar findings.

Additionally, we control for people’s network size, to which the item on intergroup contact refers. In this way we were able to control for any influence of general sociability.

As the figures (U.S. Census Bureau, 2012a) regarding ‘Blacks’ and ‘Asians’ on the one hand, and ‘Hispanics’ on the other hand, are not mutually exclusive, we were unable to construct an ethnic fractionalisation index of ethnic diversity (Alesina & La Ferrara, 2000; Putnam, 2007), distinguishing Whites, Blacks, Asians and Hispanics. As this measure has been repeatedly criticized due to its colour-blindness (Tolsmo et al., 2009) and the arbitrary distinction between ethnic/racial groups (Stolle et al., 2008) we decided to use the relative out-group size as indicator for neighbourhood ethnic diversity.

Our reference category includes respondents with no grade, grades 1-8, grades 9-11 (incomplete high school), as well as high school graduates. Respondents with missing values (0.1%) are also included in this category.

The last category refers to people who are permanently sick or disabled, people who are in community or military service as well as a category referring to other situations. Respondents lacking valid information on this item are also included in this category.

For our continuous measurement of the respondents’ social network size, we use the values in between the scores of each category: ‘one or two’ (1.5), ‘three to five’ (4), ‘six to ten’ (8), ‘eleven to twenty’ (15.5) and ‘more than twenty’ (25). We are aware of the fact that the value for the final category is arbitrary, however, this category is relatively small (10.2%).

In some cases our models did not converge normally. As this is most likely due to the fact that no (significant) variance was found at the census tract level, we also estimated these models conducting single level multinomial regression analyses. These models converged normally and showed substantially similar results.

Due to the small numbers of respondents who are involved in organizations with 75% or more out-group members, it is not possible to consider more ‘extreme’ category boundaries, considering bridging organizations with more than 50% out-group members (i.e., 75% or more) and bonding organizations with 50% or less out-group members. From a theoretical point of view, it is also arbitrary whether such organizations can still be considered as ‘bonding’.

The negative effect of ethnic threat perceptions on involvement in bridging leisure and interest organizations (with more than 25% out-group members) was no longer significant.

Only a minority of the respondents (24.3%) turned out to be involved in more than one type of voluntary organization.

We additionally included a squared term of the relative out-group size to test for the possibility of a (positive) curvilinear relationship (i.e., a familiarisation effect; see Savelkoul, Schepers, et al., 2011; Schneider, 2008). We did not, however, find support for such relationship. Moreover, it is possible that a large percentage of non-Whites in people’s neighbourhood only fosters perceptions of ethnic threat for those people who compete directly with out-group members on economic and non-economic issues (see Schepers et al., 2002). Focusing on general effects might not reveal such relationships. However, given the complexity of our models, we leave it to future research to consider such cross-level interaction effects (cf. Quillian, 1995; Schneider, 2008).
Chapter 4

Involvement in bridging and bonding leisure, interest and activist organizations. The impact of ethnic diversity in Dutch municipalities and neighbourhoods*

* A slightly different version of this chapter is currently under review. Co-authors are Maurice Gesthuizen and Peer Scheepers. A previous draft of this chapter has been presented at the European Consortium for Sociological Research (ECSR) Conference in Tilburg, the Netherlands, October 2013.
4.1 Introduction

In recent decades, changing ethnic compositions of many Western countries have spurred strong debates among scholars and politicians about the societal consequences of ethnic diversity (Cheong et al., 2007; Cornelius & Rosenblum, 2005). Especially Putnam’s (2007) study on the consequences of ethnic diversity in the U.S. attracted much attention, as he claimed that, in the short run at least, ethnic diversity would have an all-encompassing negative impact on “[…] attitudes and behaviors, bridging and bonding social capital, public and private connections” (Putnam, 2007, p. 151). According to Putnam, people living in ethnically more diverse neighbourhoods would tend to ‘hunker down’ (Putnam, 2007, p. 149), meaning that they are less trusting, have less informal social ties and are less likely to be involved in voluntary organizations.

In recent years, a rapidly growing body of research addressed the impact of ethnic diversity in Western societies on a broad range of indicators of social cohesion (see recent review articles by Portes & Vickstrom, 2011, and Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014). In particular for European countries, findings regarding the impact of ethnic diversity are rather mixed, raising doubts about the pervasiveness of Putnam’s pessimistic predictions.

In this study, we focus on the consequences of living in ethnically more diverse environments for associational involvement among natives. This dimension of social capital is often referred to as formal social capital (cf. Pichler & Wallace, 2007) and has been linked to several positive societal outcomes, like the success of democracy, and wealthier, healthier and less criminal societies (Halpern, 2005; Putnam, 1993; Wilson, 2000; but see also Portes & Vickstrom (2011) for a critical review regarding this claim). As this dimension refers to less strong ties than informal social capital (i.e., informal social ties with, for instance, family members or friends), ethnic diversity might be most likely to subvert formal social capital. This study aims to build on earlier research in three important ways.

First, we explicitly take into account the ethnic composition of voluntary organizations. According to Putnam (2007), ethnic diversity would have a detrimental impact on both bridging social capital (i.e., with ethnic out-group members) and bonding social capital (i.e., with one’s ethnic in-group). It was predominantly Putnam’s claim that ethnic diversity would even hamper social ties with people’s in-group, which instigated furore. So far, however, earlier research failed to incorporate this distinction, mainly focusing on general indicators of formal social capital without considering the ethnic composition of the voluntary organizations. This study addresses the influence of ethnic diversity on formal social capital in the Netherlands, which is one of the countries with the highest levels of associational involvement in Europe (Gesthuizen et al., 2009; Van der Meer et al., 2009). We will explicitly take into account the ethnic composition of voluntary organizations to distinguish bonding and bridging formal social capital. This enables
us to consider the likelihood of being involved in bonding, respectively, bridging organizations as compared to not being involved. Moreover, we aim to explain the likelihood of involvement in bridging versus bonding organizations, for those people who are involved.

Second, we focus on underlying explanations for the relationship between ethnic diversity and formal social capital. Earlier studies mainly considered direct relationships between ethnic diversity and associational involvement. We propose that taking into account the ethnic composition of voluntary organizations is not only important for testing the generalizability of Putnam’s claim, it might be pivotal when it comes to understand how living in ethnically diverse environments affects people’s associational involvement. Based on conflict theory (e.g., Blalock, 1967; Coser, 1956; Scheepers et al., 2002) and contact theory (e.g., Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) we derive two contrary sets of expectations on underlying mechanisms. We empirically test these mechanisms for bonding and bridging formal social capital.

Third, we (exploratorily) test the generalizability of the influence of ethnic diversity on associational involvement, distinguishing different types of voluntary organizations: i.e., leisure, interest and activist organizations (cf. Gesthuizen et al., 2013; Van der Meer et al., 2009). These organizations attract and serve different people and aim to fulfill different goals for their members. Van der Meer and colleagues (2009) stressed the importance of distinguishing different types of organizations, showing that individual-level determinants of associational involvement (e.g., gender, marital status or having children) have contradictory influences on involvement in leisure, interest and activist organizations. Savelkoul et al. (2013; see also Chapter 2) showed that living in ethnically diverse European regions affects involvement in these various types of voluntary organizations very differently. In this study, a more fine-grained distinction of associational involvement will be made, considering involvement in bonding and bridging, leisure, interest and activist organizations. In this way, we can test whether Putnam’s general claim of the negative consequences of ethnic diversity holds equally for different types of voluntary organizations.

We will use data from the first wave of the Netherlands Longitudinal Life Course Study (NELLS; De Graaf et al., 2010), complemented with information on the level of ethnic diversity in municipalities and neighbourhoods to address the following research questions:

RQ 4.1 To what extent does ethnic diversity within Dutch (a) neighbourhoods and (b) municipalities affect involvement in bonding, respectively bridging, leisure, interest and activist organizations?

RQ 4.2 To what extent can these relationships be explained by mechanisms derived from conflict and contact theory?

4.2 Theories and hypotheses

We set out to explore three general theories (i.e., constrict, conflict and contact theories), which put forward contradictory (in-)direct effects of ethnic diversity on bonding and bridging formal social capital. We focus on the influence of ethnic diversity at the municipality and neighbourhood level in the Netherlands (cf. Tolsma et al., 2009), which reflects people’s direct living environment. Earlier research pointed at the fact that— as compared to more distant levels of analysis, like the country or state level—such relatively small units of analyses better cover people’s actual interaction settings, influencing people’s attitudes and behaviour (Stolle et al., 2008). Although, from this point of reasoning one would expect stronger effects at the neighbourhood level, earlier research on general associational involvement in the Netherlands, focusing on the municipality and neighbourhood level simultaneously, found an effect of ethnic diversity only at the municipality level (Tolsma et al., 2009). In line with previous studies in the Netherlands (Tolsma et al., 2009; Huijs, Sluiter, et al., 2014), we decided to formulate similar hypotheses for the influence of ethnic diversity at the neighbourhood and municipality level.

4.2.1 Constrict theory

Although the underlying theoretical rationale of Putnam’s ‘constrict theory’ remains implicit, one can summarize its core statement as follows: higher levels of ethnic diversity cause “[...] anomie or social isolation”, inducing people to withdraw from social life (Putnam, 2007, p. 149). According to Putnam (2007), this effect would be rather general, reducing formal and informal, bonding and bridging social capital.

Gesthuizen et al. (2009) pointed at the importance of the principle of homophily. Based on the general assumption that people prefer social ties with people who are alike, for instance, regarding their ethnicity (see McPherson et al., 2001), living in ethnically diverse neighbourhoods or municipalities can cause people to feel less comfortable. The more diverse their living environment is, the less people are surrounded by similar others, raising feelings of discomfort (Gesthuizen et al., 2009) and uncertainty (Hagendoorn, 2009). Such feelings could cause people to withdraw from social life entirely or at least partly, including bonding and bridging voluntary organizations.

According to Putnam (2007), the negative influence of ethnic diversity would be very general, irrespective of the type of voluntary organization. We will test the generalizability of Putnam’s claim by distinguishing three types of organizations (i.e., leisure, interest and activist organizations), which attract and serve different people and aim to fulfill different goals for their members. Whereas leisure organizations offer recreational and socializing activities to their members, interest organizations aim to protect their members’ socio-economic interests. Activist organizations advocate broader societal interests, not directly linked to their members’ interests. Savelkoul et al. (2013) argued
that ethnic diversity would be more likely to reduce involvement in organizations characterized by high levels of face-to-face contacts, which is predominantly the case for leisure organizations and less for interest and activist organizations (Gesthuizen et al., 2013; Van der Meer et al., 2009). However, findings from cross-national research (Savelkoul et al., 2013; see also Chapter 2) seem to suggest that involvement in organizations that serve basic social needs in terms of socializing and recreating (i.e., leisure organizations) is less likely to be (negatively) affected by ethnic diversity as compared to involvement in organizations which promote goals more remote from people’s basic needs (e.g., interest organizations). In this study, we will not formulate explicit hypotheses, though we will test the generalizability of Putnam’s claim, by distinguishing involvement in bonding and bridging (i) leisure, (ii) interest, and (iii) activist organizations. Based on Putnam’s constrict theory we expect that: (1) Higher levels of ethnic diversity within Dutch neighbourhoods and municipalities will decrease the likelihood that people are involved in any type of voluntary organization, either bonding or bridging.

As our aim is particularly to understand how living in ethnically diverse environments affects people’s likelihood to be involved in bonding or bridging organizations, we will apply two intergroup theories (i.e., conflict and contact theories), to derive more explicit hypotheses on underlying explanations.

4.2.2 Conflict theory

According to conflict theory (Blalock, 1967; Bobo, 1999; Coser, 1956; Coenders, Gijsberts, Hagendoorn, et al., 2004; Scheepers et al., 2002), ethnic diversity is considered to foster ethnic competition between natives and ethnic minorities regarding economic and cultural issues. With higher levels of ethnic diversity, natives have to compete more strongly with ethnic minorities for scarce jobs or affordable housing. Likewise, conflicting values or competition about privileges become more prevalent if the proportion of ethnic minorities becomes larger. Consequently, higher levels of ethnic diversity are expected to increase perceptions of ethnic threat, which in turn increase both in-group solidarity as well as out-group derogation (Coenders, Gijsberts, Hagendoorn, et al., 2004; Scheepers et al., 2002). It is particularly the latter effect which has been subject to numerous studies in the past and has been corroborated time and again: people who perceive more ethnic threat, hold more negative attitudes toward ethnic out-group members (e.g., Scheepers et al., 2002; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Pettigrew et al., 2010).

Based on conflict theory, we expect that ethnic diversity might also influence associational involvement by inducing both in-group solidarity and out-group derogation. On the one hand, people perceiving more ethnic threat might be less likely to be involved in bridging voluntary organizations. These people hold more negative attitudes toward ethnic minorities and might consequently avoid involvement in voluntary organizations with (many) out-group members. On the other hand, due to increased in-group solidarity, people who feel threatened by the presence of ethnic minorities might become stimulated to focus completely on bonding voluntary organizations, where they will be surrounded exclusively with ethnic in-group members. Hence, we expect that: (2) Higher levels of ethnic diversity within Dutch neighbourhoods and municipalities will increase perceptions of ethnic threat (2a), which, in turn, will decrease the likelihood of being involved in any type of bridging voluntary organizations (2b), while increasing the likelihood of being involved in any type of bonding voluntary organizations (2c).

Although conflict theory might be useful to understand how living in ethnically diverse environments might influence associational involvement, it leads to different expectations as compared to constriction theory. Whereas constriction theory predicts that ethnic diversity generally erodes involvement in voluntary organizations, irrespective of the ethnic composition, based on conflict theory one would expect ethnic diversity to reduce only bridging formal social capital.

We propose that the ‘threat mechanism’ might also be the underlying explanation for a general negative influence of ethnic diversity, as predicted by constriction theory (Putnam, 2007). In that case, we derive an opposite expectation for the influence of ethnic threat perceptions on bonding associational involvement: the more people perceive ethnic threat, the less likely they will be involved in any voluntary organization, either bridging or bonding. Earlier cross-national European research provided some initial evidence for this line of thought, showing that people who perceive more ethnic threat are less likely to be involved in different types of voluntary organizations (Savelkoul et al., 2013; see also Chapter 2). Note, however, that the ethnic composition of the voluntary organizations was not considered. In sum, and contradictory to hypothesis 2c, we expect that: (2d) Perceptions of ethnic threat will decrease the likelihood of being involved in any type of bonding voluntary organizations.

The ‘threat mechanism’ might; however, be more complex and might also affect the choice for bonding or bridging organizations for those people who decide to become involved. While perceiving ethnic threat might induce a general tendency to withdraw from social life, meaning that people with higher levels of perceived ethnic threat are less likely to be involved in voluntary organizations, irrespective of their ethnic composition (cf. constriction theory), based on conflict theory, one would expect that perceiving ethnic threat might simultaneously foster feelings of in-group solidarity (Coenders, Gijsberts, Hagendoorn, et al., 2004). Therefore, we propose that for those people who decide to become involved in voluntary associations, perceptions of ethnic threat make them less likely to be involved in bridging as compared to bonding voluntary organizations. Summarizing, we expect that: (2e) People who are involved in voluntary organizations, while perceiving ethnic threat, are less likely to be involved in any type of bridging as compared to bonding organizations.
4.2.3 Contact theory
According to contact theory (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), positive interethnic contact effectively reduces negative attitudes toward ethnic minorities. Previous research repeatedly showed that larger proportions of ethnic minorities in people’s living environment increase the likelihood of interethnic contact, which in turn reduces out-group derogation (e.g., Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schlueter & Wagner, 2008; Wagner et al., 2006).

We propose that interethnic contact might also be important for explaining people’s likelihood to be involved in bonding and bridging voluntary organizations. Wilson (2000) argued that people’s social networks are important for coming to know about the existence of a voluntary organization or for becoming recruited to participate or to volunteer. If one’s social network is ethnically more diverse — due to higher levels of interethnic contact — one might predominantly come to know of the existence of bridging voluntary organizations or even become recruited into such organizations.1 However, interethnic contact might stimulate bridging formal social capital in a different way as well. Earlier studies have consistently shown that interethnic contact increases empathy and reduces negative attitudes toward ethnic minorities as well as anxiety about interacting with them (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). Consequently, interethnic contact might make people feel less anxious about encountering ethnic out-group members during activities of these voluntary organizations, taking away a psychological threshold to become involved in ethnically mixed organizations. Based on this argumentation, we expect that interethnic contact will be positively related to people’s likelihood of being involved in bridging organizations.

Simultaneously, having intergroup contact can also reshape people’s view of their ethnic in-group. In this respect, Pettigrew (1998) points at a ‘deprovincialisation’ effect, meaning that intergroup contact stimulates people to reassess the customs and values of their own ethnic group as these turn out not to be the only way to deal with the social world. Based on the homophily principle (McPherson et al., 2001), we expect people to generally prefer involvement in bonding organizations, as in such organizations they are surrounded by similar others. Having intergroup contact might, however, reshape these preferences, as people might become less strongly focused on bonding voluntary associations. Additionally, having more interethnic contact might reduce contact with ethnic in-group members. Although inter- and intra-group contacts are not completely mutually exclusive, due to time restrictions, one might expect at least some negative correlation. Having less contact with in-group members might, consequently, decrease the likelihood to become recruited into bonding organizations. Summarizing, we expect that:

(3) Higher levels of ethnic diversity within Dutch neighbourhoods and municipalities will increase the likelihood of interethnic contact (3a), which in turn will increase the likelihood of being involved in any type of bridging voluntary organizations (3b), while decreasing the likelihood of being involved in any type of bonding voluntary organizations (3c).

Additionally, we expect that interethnic contact might also influence the choice for bonding or bridging organizations for those people who are involved. Based on the considerations related to recruitment, psychological thresholds to become involved in bridging organizations, as well as the supposed ‘deprovincialisation’ effect of interethnic contact, we expect that: (3d) People who are involved in voluntary organizations, while having interethnic contact, are more likely to be involved in any type of bridging as compared to bonding organizations. For a summary of our theoretical framework, see Figure 4.1. The numbers refer to our hypotheses.

![Figure 4.1 Theoretical framework: Relationship between ethnic diversity and bonding and bridging formal social capital](image)

Note: all relationships are controlled for relevant control variables at the individual, neighbourhood and municipality level (not shown).
* Hypotheses 2e and 3d refer to contrast bridging versus bonding formal social capital.

4.3 Data and measurements
4.3.1 Data
To test our hypotheses, we use data from the first wave of the Netherlands Longitudinal Lifecourse Study (NELLS; De Graaf et al., 2010). The NELLS is a large-scale survey of the Dutch population aged 15-45. Our conclusions pertain to this age selection. The fieldwork was conducted between December 2008 and May 2010 under the direction
of Tilburg University and Radboud University Nijmegen, applying a two-stage stratified sampling design. First, 35 municipalities were selected quasi-randomly by urbanisation and region. Second, a random selection was drawn from the population registry based on age and country of birth of the respondent and the respondent’s parents. The questionnaire consisted of two parts: face-to-face interviews and self-completion questionnaires.

We only included native Dutch respondents, of whom both parents were born in the Netherlands. Earlier studies have emphasized the differential effect of living in an ethnically diverse environment on majority and minority populations, usually stressing a larger, and occasionally only an, effect for majority populations (Soroka et al., 2007; Stolle et al., 2008). Moreover, including ethnic minority respondents is impossible as we cannot construct our measures of bonding and bridging formal social capital in a similar way as has been done for native respondents. Unless stated differently, we excluded respondents (6.14%) with missing values on one or more variables list-wise, resulting in a working sample of 2,399 respondents living in 238 neighbourhoods (i.e., districts or ‘wijken’), located in 35 municipalities in the Netherlands.

4.3.2 Dependent variables: Bonding and bridging formal social capital

*Formal social capital* refers to involvement in ‘formally constituted organizations and activities’ (Pichler & Wallace, 2007, p. 424). The NELLS-survey includes a fine-grained measurement of involvement in different types of voluntary associations, including the ethnic composition of these organizations, which is rather unique and enables us to differentiate between bonding and bridging formal social capital.

In line with earlier studies (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2013; Savelkoul et al., 2013; Van der Meer et al., 2009), we distinguish involvement in three types of organizations: leisure (‘sport organizations’ and ‘associations for hobby, music or culture’), interest (‘trade unions, professional or consumer associations’, and ‘neighbourhood or community associations or tenants organizations’) and activist organizations (‘associations for nature, environment and international solidarity’). Only respondents who are a member of an organization, were asked about the ethnic composition of this organization.2

For each type of organization, respondents were asked whether they are involved in an organization with (i) no, (ii) some, (iii) many, or (iv) almost only ethnic out-group members. For leisure, interest and activist organizations separately, we distinguish respondents who are not involved (reference category), respondents who are involved in *bonding* organizations (with only in-group members) and respondents who are involved in bridging organizations (also including out-group members).2 Of those respondents who are involved, the ratio of involvement in bonding versus bridging organizations varies across types of organizations and ranges from more than 50% involved in bonding leisure organizations to about 25% involved in bonding activist organizations (see Table 4.1).

4.3.3 Mediating variables: Interethnic contact with friends and perceived ethnic threat

To assess whether respondents have interethnic contact with friends, we used four dichotomous items asking respondents whether or not they have ethnic minority friends from (i) Turkish, (ii) Moroccan, (iii) Surinamese/Antillean, or (iv) other non-Western descent. Interethnic contact with friends can be regarded as voluntary in nature and rather intimate and is, therefore, supposed to meet the key conditions of the contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998). We constructed a dichotomous measure of intergroup friendship, referring to interethnic friendship ties with members of any ethnic minority group.

As the NELLS-survey does not contain direct measures of ethnic threat perceptions as commonly used in earlier studies (e.g., Scheepers et al., 2002; Schneider, 2008), we use the following three items as a proxy for the respondents’ level of perceived ethnic threat: ‘It is better for a country if almost everyone shares the same customs and traditions’, ‘it is better for a country if there are a variety of different religions’ (reversed coded) and ‘if a country wants to reduce tensions it should stop immigration’. The answer categories range from ‘disagree strongly’ to ‘agree strongly’ on a five-point scale. The perceived ethnic threat scale is calculated by the mean score on the three items, for respondents with at least two valid answers (Cronbach’s alpha: 0.687).4 Higher scores reflect higher levels of perceived ethnic threat. Although the measures included in the NELLS-survey are not ideal for measuring perceived ethnic threat, we propose that these can be used as an approximation for ethnic threat perceptions. We used the first wave of the European Social Survey (Jowell & The Central Co-ordinating Team, 2003), which contained the same items, next to more traditional measures of ethnic threat, commonly used in earlier research (e.g., Schlueter & Wagner, 2008; Schneider, 2008). Considering a similar selection of Dutch respondents, both scales turned out to be moderately correlated (r = 0.42).

4.3.4 Ethnic diversity at the municipality and neighbourhood level

To measure ethnic diversity at the neighbourhood and municipality level, we constructed two commonly used measures: migrant stock and ethnic fractionalisation (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2009; Hooghe et al., 2009; Putnam, 2007). Both measures are based on figures derived from Statistics Netherlands (2013a).

First, migrant stock refers to the percentage of ethnic minorities from non-Western descent. Second, we calculated the level of ethnic fractionalisation, distinguishing native Dutch, Western immigrants and non-Western immigrants. Ethnic fractionalisation is based on the complement of the Herfindahl index (HI) (see e.g., Alesina et al., 2003, p. 159) and reflects the probability that two randomly chosen individuals in a municipality or neighbourhood belong to a different (ethnic) group. Note, that this measure has been repeatedly criticized for its colour-blindness (Hagendoorn, 2009; Toltsma et al.,
2009). As both indicators are strongly correlated (at the municipality level: \( r = 0.90 \); at the neighbourhood level: \( r = 0.73 \)) we will test our hypotheses using the migrant stock measure and will use the ethnic fractionalisation measure for additional robustness analyses.

### 4.3.5 Control variables at the municipality and neighbourhood level

Earlier research pointed at the importance of adequately controlling for the socio-economic status of the context when addressing the influence of ethnic diversity on social capital (e.g., Letki, 2008; Tolsma et al., 2009). In line with earlier studies (e.g., Huijts, Sluiter, et al., 2014; Savelkoul et al., 2013), we control for the unemployment rate at the contextual level. We use the number of unemployment benefit recipients per 1,000 inhabitants aged 15-64 in 2006 at the municipality and neighbourhood level (Statistics Netherlands, 2013b).

### 4.3.6 Control variables at the individual level

At the individual level, we control for several determinants which have been found to influence associational involvement, interethnic contact or perceived ethnic threat (e.g., Curtis et al., 1992; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schneider, 2008; Wilson, 2000; Wilson & Musick, 1997). The level of educational attainment was measured by the highest level of education completed by the respondent. For respondents who are still in education, we used the current level of education. We decided to condense the original twelve categories (ranging from no education to a PhD degree) and distinguished five levels of education: (i) at most primary education, (ii) lower secondary education, (iii) higher secondary/intermediate vocational education, (iv) vocational college and (v) university (reference category). Additionally, we considered whether respondents were still studying and/or working at least 12 hours a week, distinguishing four categories: ‘only working’ (reference category), ‘only studying’, ‘both working and studying’ and ‘neither working nor studying’. For measuring the respondent’s income, we used an item referring to the monthly income of the respondent and his/her partner. Four income categories were distinguished: ‘less than 1,000 euro’, ‘1,000 – 2,499 euro’, ‘2,499 – 3,499 euro’ and ‘more than 3,500 euro’ (reference category). Religiosity was measured asking respondents how often they attend religious services. We distinguished three categories: ‘never’ (reference category), ‘less than once a month’, and ‘once a month or more’. Additionally, we control for having a partner (reference category: ‘no partner’) and having children (reference category: ‘no children’). Finally, we use straightforward measures of gender (with males as reference category) and age (subtracting the minimum age for a meaningful interpretation of the intercept). Descriptive statistics are summarized in Table 4.1.

### Table 4.1 Descriptive statistics individual- and contextual-level variables

\( N_{\text{individual}} = 2,399; N_{\text{neighbourhood}} = 238; N_{\text{municipality}} = 35 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean / %</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal social capital</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement – Leisure organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved leisure organization</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved bonding leisure organization</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved bridging leisure organization</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement – Interest organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved interest organization</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>76.7%</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved bonding interest organization</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>7.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved bridging interest organization</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement – Activist organizations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not involved activist organization</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>92.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved bonding activist organization</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involved bridging activist organization</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediating variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived ethnic threat</td>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interethic contact</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>39.27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variables individual level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary education or lower</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>4.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower secondary education</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>15.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher secondary/intermediate vocational educ.</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>42.44%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational college</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>25.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>12.96%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>65.45%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both working and studying</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Studying</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>16.05%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither working nor studying</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>10.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income per month</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1,000 euro</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>22.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 1,000 and 2,499 euro</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>28.39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between 2,499 and 3,499 euro</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>22.51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 3,500 euro (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>16.84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income missing</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>9.46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
First, we estimated null models, only including random intercepts, to estimate the variance at the neighbourhood and municipality level (see Table 4.2, Model 0). In Model 1 in Table 4.2, we additionally included our individual-level predictors to test whether any variance at the contextual level is explained by composition effects of individual-level determinants. For leisure and activist organizations, most variance is found at the municipality level. The same holds for both mediating variables (not shown), i.e., interethnic contact and perceived ethnic threat. For interest organizations the picture is somewhat different as compared to both other types of voluntary organizations: for these organizations relatively more variance is found at the neighbourhood level. Apparently, the most important level of analysis depends on the relevant dependent variable. We will come back to this in our results section. In some cases the variance is rather small, or even estimated as zero (i.e., redundant). In line with Snijders and Bosker (2012, p. 106), who argued that a positive and significant random intercept variance is not necessary, if one has a theoretical justification for testing the effect of contextual-level variables, we will conduct three-level multinomial regression analyses to test our hypotheses.

We will test our hypotheses in three steps and will present our findings based on the migrant stock measure. First, we estimate the direct effects of migrant stock on bonding and bridging voluntary organizations, considering the three contrasts mentioned before (Table 4.3): the odds of involvement in bonding organizations versus not being involved (Models a), the odds of involvement in bridging organizations versus
not being involved (Models b), and the odds of involvement in bridging versus bonding organizations (Models c). Next, we will address the influence of the percentage of non-Western minorities on both mediating variables, i.e., interethnic contact and perceived ethnic threat (Table 4.4, Models 4 and 5). Finally, we will test the indirect effect of migrant stock on associational involvement, taking into account the influence of both mediating variables (Table 4.4, Models 6-8).

Note, that using an ethnic fractionalisation measure, or including an alternative measure of intergroup contact (i.e., interethnic contact at work/school) yields substantially similar conclusions as presented in Tables 4.3 and 4.4 (results available upon request).

### 4.5 Results

The first aim of this study is to test whether living in ethnically more diverse neighbourhoods and municipalities negatively influences involvement in bonding and bridging voluntary organizations, as claimed by Putnam (2007). For leisure organizations, migrant stock has an influence only at the municipality level (Table 4.3). Living in municipalities with a larger percentage of non-Western minorities decreases the odds of involvement in bonding leisure organizations (Table 4.3, Model 1a).

However, higher levels of migrant stock in municipalities do not influence the odds of involvement in bridging leisure organizations as compared to not being involved (Table 4.3, Model 1b), whereas the odds of involvement in bridging as compared to bonding organizations increase (Table 4.3, Model 1c).

For interest organizations our results reveal a similar picture, though at the neighbourhood rather than the municipality level. This is because our measure of involvement in interest organizations (partly) refers to neighbourhood organizations. Again, living in neighbourhoods with higher percentages of non-Western minorities decreases the odds of involvement in bonding interest organizations (Table 4.3, Model 2a), while we did not find an effect on the odds of involvement in bridging interest organizations as compared to not being involved (Table 4.3, Model 2b). Higher levels of migrant stock, moreover, increase the odds of involvement in bridging as compared to bonding interest organizations (Table 4.3, Model 2c).

For activist organizations, the picture is slightly different, as we, initially, found no significant effect of migrant stock neither at the municipality level nor at the neighbourhood level (Table 4.3, Models 3a-c). As most of the variance was found at the municipality level (see null model, Table 4.2), we decided to rerun our analyses for involvement in activist organizations, only including migrant stock as a predictor at the municipality level. In that case, positive effects of migrant stock on the odds of involvement in bridging organizations as compared to not being involved (Table 4.3, Model 3b), and as compared to involvement in bonding organizations (Table 4.3, Model 3c) become significant.

### Table 4.3 Results: hierarchical multinomial regression analyses – bonding and bridging formal social capital (direct effects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>M1a</th>
<th>M1b</th>
<th>M1c</th>
<th>M2a</th>
<th>M2b</th>
<th>M2c</th>
<th>M3a</th>
<th>M3b</th>
<th>M3c</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bond/NI</td>
<td>BOND</td>
<td>BRID/BOND</td>
<td>BRID/NI</td>
<td>BOND</td>
<td>BRID/BOND</td>
<td>BRID/NI</td>
<td>BOND</td>
<td>BRID/BOND</td>
<td>BRID/NI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interception</td>
<td>-0.559</td>
<td>-0.59</td>
<td>-0.278</td>
<td>-0.455</td>
<td>-1.826</td>
<td>-1.816</td>
<td>-0.278</td>
<td>-0.455</td>
<td>-1.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.066</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>-0.057</td>
<td>0.0117</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
<td>-0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighbourhood level</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.0015</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>-0.013</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: NELLS Longitudinal Survey (NELLS 2010), Statistics Netherlands (CBS). Results are available upon request.

**Notes:**
- BOND = involved in bonding organization; BRID = involved in bridging organization; NI = not involved.
So far, we considered the influence of migrant stock on the odds of involvement in bonding or bridging organizations. Figure 4.2 shows the predicted probabilities to be (i) not involved, (ii) involved in bonding organizations and (iii) involved in bridging organizations for leisure, interest and activist organizations separately. Only for leisure organizations, the influence of ethnic diversity is substantial, whereas for both other types of organizations this impact is relatively small, though significant. This corresponds with Table 4.2, where we found the largest variance at the contextual level for leisure organizations. The probability to be involved in bonding leisure organizations is about 20 percentage points lower for people living in municipalities with the highest percentage of non-Western minorities, as compared to people living in municipalities with the lowest level of migrant stock. Simultaneously, the probability to be involved in bridging leisure organizations increases only slightly if the percentage of non-Western minorities increases from its minimum to its maximum. This means that, overall, with a higher percentage of non-Western minorities in municipalities, the probability to be not involved in leisure organizations increases.

Our second research question focuses on underlying explanations for a relationship between ethnic diversity and associational involvement derived from conflict (Blalock, 1967; Bobo, 1999; Scheepers et al., 2002) and contact theory (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). If we include both mediating mechanisms (i.e., perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact) in our models (Table 4.4), the influence of migrant stock on associational involvement remains substantially similar as compared to Table 4.3. Note, that both mediating mechanisms are negatively related (Table 4.4, Models 4 and 5). Contradictory to what we expected, we did not find a positive relationship between migrant stock and perceived ethnic threat, neither at the municipality, nor at the neighbourhood level. At the municipality level, migrant stock has even a negative influence on perceptions of ethnic threat (Table 4.4, Model 4). Perceiving ethnic threat, in turn, decreases the odds of involvement in bridging interest (Table 4.4, Model 7b) and activist organizations (Table 4.4, Model 8b). For activist organizations, we found, additionally, a negative effect on the odds of involvement in bonding organizations (Table 4.4, Model 8a), whereas perceptions of ethnic threat do not affect involvement in leisure organizations at all.

Living in municipalities with more minorities from non-Western descent increases the likelihood to have interethnic contact with friends (Table 4.4, Model 5). We did not find support for this relationship at the neighbourhood level. Having interethnic contact, in turn, decreases the odds of involvement in bonding organizations, only for leisure organizations (Table 4.4, Model 6a). Additionally, having interethnic contact increases the likelihood to be involved in bridging as compared to bonding organizations for those respondents who are involved in leisure or interest organizations (Table 4.4, Models 6c and 7c).
To what extent do these findings corroborate our expectations derived from constrict, conflict and contact theories? Based on constrict theory, we hypothesized that higher levels of migrant stock would decrease the likelihood of associational involvement, irrespective of the ethnic composition (hypothesis 1). We only found partial support for this expectation: migrant stock only decreases the odds of involvement in bonding organizations, and only for leisure and interest organizations. Merely for leisure organizations, this detrimental impact of migrant stock is substantial.

If constrict theory holds, one would expect also (or at least) a negative influence on the odds of involvement in bridging organizations, which is not the case.

Our findings lend only partial support to our hypotheses derived from conflict theory. Migrant stock decreases, rather than increases perceptions of ethnic threat (hypothesis 2a). However, as we expected (hypothesis 2b), perceiving ethnic threat, in turn, decreases the odds of involvement in bridging (interest and activist) organizations. Contrary to our expectations (hypotheses 2c and 2d), perceiving ethnic threat hardly influences involvement in leisure organizations, and only for interest and activist organizations.
in bonding organizations: only for activist organizations, we found a negative influence of perceiving ethnic threat (in line with hypothesis 2d). Moreover, perceptions of ethnic threat do not affect the odds of involvement in bridging as compared to bonding organizations, for those people who are involved, refuting hypothesis 2e.

Finally, we found partial support for our hypotheses derived from contact theory. In line with our expectations (hypothesis 3a), living in municipalities with more non-Western minorities increases the likelihood to have interethnic contact with friends. However, contradictory to what we expected (hypothesis 3b), having interethnic contact, in turn, does not increase the odds of involvement in bridging organizations versus non-involvement, whereas we only found a negative effect on bonding associational involvement for leisure organizations (hypothesis 3c). Finally, hypothesis 3d was supported only for leisure and interest organizations: for respondents involved in these organizations, having interethnic contact increases the likelihood to be involved in bridging as compared to bonding organizations.

4.6 Conclusions and discussion

With rising levels of ethnic diversity in many Western countries, both scholars and politicians became increasingly interested in the consequences for social cohesion in general, and social capital in particular (Portes & Vickstrom, 2011; Van der Meer & Tolsa, 2014). The aim of our study was twofold. First, we examined whether living in ethnically more diverse Dutch neighbourhoods and municipalities influences people’s likelihood to be involved in bonding and bridging organizations. Second, our aim was to gain more insight in underlying explanations for a relationship between ethnic diversity and associational involvement. Building on earlier studies on associational involvement (Gesthuizen et al., 2013; Van der Meer et al., 2009), we distinguished three types of organizations (i.e., leisure, interest and activist organizations) that largely differ in their goals as well as people attracted and served.

The impact of the ethnic composition of people’s living environment on their involvement in bonding and bridging voluntary organizations is limited and varies across different types of organizations. Only for leisure organizations, living in municipalities with a larger percentage of non-Western minorities substantially decreases the likelihood to be involved in bonding organizations. Based on Putnam’s constrict theory, we would expect a similar detrimental influence of migrant stock on involvement in bonding and bridging organizations, which we did not find. Those respondents who are involved in leisure organizations and live in ethnically more diverse municipalities, are more likely to be involved in bridging as compared to bonding leisure organizations. For involvement in interest organizations we found a similar, though less substantial, influence of ethnic diversity at the neighbourhood level, rather than the municipality level.

We conclude that there is no support for a general negative influence of ethnic diversity on involvement in both bonding and bridging organizations as expected based on constrict theory (Putnam, 2007). Rather, our findings might (partly) point at a supply-side effect. If municipalities (or neighbourhoods) become ethnically more diverse, this becomes reflected in the ethnic composition of the voluntary organizations available. As a consequence, it might become more difficult or even impossible to find an organization with only in-group members, while there are more possibilities to become involved in bridging organizations.

In this study, we were unable to directly consider the availability of bonding and bridging organizations in people’s neighbourhood and municipality. Future research should incorporate the supply side in this respect more profoundly. However, as no data are available covering the availability of different types of voluntary organizations including their ethnic composition in the Netherlands, focusing on smaller geographical areas could be a fruitful direction to proceed.

Our aim was also to shed more light on underlying explanations for a relationship between ethnic diversity and associational involvement. Based on conflict (e.g., Blalock, 1967; Bobo, 1999; Scheepers et al., 2002) and contact (e.g., Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) theories we empirically tested the role of perceived ethnic threat, respectively interethnic contact. Living in municipalities with more minorities from non-Western descent decreases, rather than increases, perceptions of ethnic threat. This means that we have to refute a central part of conflict theory. Earlier research pointed at a so-called ‘familiarisation effect’ (Savelkou, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schneider, 2008), boiling down to the idea that people living in ethnically more diverse environments get used to the presence of ethnic minorities and, consequently, perceive less ethnic threat.

Perceiving ethnic threat, in turn, decreases the odds of involvement in bridging interest and activist organizations as well as bonding activist organizations, whereas we found no effect on involvement in leisure organizations. Earlier European research (Savelkou, et al., 2013) already revealed that perceptions of ethnic threat are negatively related with associational involvement, however, without considering the ethnic composition of these organizations. The present study shows that this negative influence of ethnic threat perceptions predominantly holds for involvement in bridging organizations. This is in line with our findings in the U.S. (Chapter 3), as well as with an essential part of conflict theory: those people who perceive the presence of ethnic minorities as a threat, hold more negative attitudes toward them (e.g., Bobo 1999; Scheepers et al., 2002) and will stay away from bridging voluntary organizations.

As we expected, living in municipalities with a larger percentage of non-Western minorities, increases the likelihood to have interethnic contact with friends. This corresponds with earlier findings in Europe as well as the U.S. (e.g., Martinovic, 2013; Schlueter & Scheepers 2010; Sigelman et al., 1996; Wagner et al., 2006). Our results
indicate, moreover, that those people who are involved in leisure or interest organizations and have interethnic contact, are more likely to be involved in bridging rather than bonding organizations. This means that interethnic contact not only influences attitudes, reducing prejudice and anxiety (Alport, 1954; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008), it also has behavioural consequences in terms of being more likely to be involved in bridging as compared to bonding voluntary organizations. Additionally, interethnic contact influences associational involvement indirectly, via reduced levels of perceived ethnic threat.

However, contradictory to our expectations as well as earlier European findings (Savelkoul et al., 2013), having interethnic contact hardly affects (bonding and bridging) associational involvement directly. Only for leisure organizations, having interethnic contact with friends reduces the likelihood to be involved in bonding organizations. Note, that this corresponds with our findings in the U.S. (Chapter 3). This might reflect a deprovincialisation effect (i.e., a reassessment of one’s ethnic in-group) as proposed by Pettigrew (1998), though could also be explained by the influence of recruitment (Wilson, 2000). Although contacts with out-group and in-group members are not completely mutually exclusive, due to time constraints having more intergroup contact might result in less intragroup contact. Consequently, the likelihood to become informed about or even recruited into bonding organizations might decrease. This might hold in particular for leisure organizations, as these organizations are characterized by relatively high levels of active participation (with members spending more time on informing or recruiting potential members) as compared to, for instance, activist organizations with many ‘checkbook members’ (Putnam, 2000; Van der Meer et al., 2009).

The causal order between interethnic contact and involvement in bridging organizations is not uncontested, as involvement in ethnically mixed voluntary associations could also lead to interethnic contact. In that case, one would expect, however, a strong positive relationship between interethnic contact and the odds of involvement in bridging organizations versus not being involved, which we do not find. Using an alternative measure of interethnic contact at work/school yields largely comparable results. As this type of contact is less voluntary in nature, a reversed causal order is largely ruled out. Future research could test these relationships more profoundly, preferably using panel data.

Our findings illustrate the necessity to distinguish involvement in different types of voluntary organizations. The influences of ethnic diversity and interethnic contact are predominantly found for leisure (and interest) organizations, whereas perceptions of ethnic threat mainly affect involvement in activist organizations. As organizations largely differ regarding the goals they pursue as well as the members they attract and serve, differential effects might be more likely to be expected than general patterns. Perceiving ethnic threat might more easily induce people to withdraw from activist organizations with more general altruistic goals, as compared to leisure (and interest) organizations with goals directly related to people’s self-interest. This pattern corresponds with earlier European findings (Savelkoul et al., 2013; see also Chapter 2). Simultaneously, recruitment factors might predominantly have an influence on organizations with relatively active types of participation (e.g., leisure organizations) as compared to organizations, characterized by more passive modes of involvement (e.g., activist organizations).

Summarizing, we found only limited support for a general negative influence of living in ethnically more diverse environments on people’s associational involvement: ethnic diversity only negatively influences involvement in leisure and interest organizations and only reduces involvement in bonding organizations. This might point at a supply-side effect, rather than at a general pattern of ‘hunkering down’ (Putnam, 2007, p. 149). Our findings empirically underline the importance of distinguishing different types of voluntary organizations and including underlying explanations (i.e., perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact), to shed more light on the relationship between the ethnic composition of people’s living environment and involvement in different types of voluntary organizations.

4.7 Notes

1 The causal order is not unambiguous here. We will come back to this in our results and discussion sections.

2 The item referring to involvement in sport organizations was asked differently compared to the items regarding all other types of associations. First, respondents were asked which sport(s) they practice in general and which sport most frequently. Only for this type of sport, respondents were subsequently asked whether they practice this sport in an organization or not. These organizations included formal sports organizations, but also fitness centres or sport accommodations for students or at work. Solely respondents who are involved in an organization, were asked about the ethnicity of other members. We will restrict our analyses to respondents involved in formal sports organizations. Robustness analyses, also taking into account respondents involved in other types of sport accommodations (e.g., fitness centres) lead to substantially similar conclusions (results available upon request).

3 For leisure and interest associations, respondents were separately asked about their involvement in two different subtypes of organizations. We considered respondents to be involved in bridging leisure respectively interest organizations, if they were involved in at least one bridging organization. Respondents were considered as involved in bonding leisure respectively interest organizations if they were involved in at least one bonding organization while not simultaneously in a bridging organization.
The NELLS-survey includes two additional items in the same section (‘It is better for a country if almost everyone is able to speak at least one common language’ and ‘Communities of people who have come to live here should be allowed to educate their children in their own separate schools if they wish’). We decided not to include both items as this would decrease the Cronbach’s alpha of our scale (0.595) and factor analysis revealed that both items have low communalities (<0.20).

The original twelve categories referring to the Dutch educational tracks were condensed as follows: (1) primary education or lower; (2) lower secondary education (LBO/MAVO/VMBO); (3) higher secondary education (HAVO/VWO) or intermediate vocational (MBO); (4) vocational college (HBO); (5) university (WO, bachelor, master, PhD).

For interethnic contact: \( \text{Var}_{\text{municipality}} = 0.125; \text{Var}_{\text{neighbourhood}} = 0.020 \). For perceived ethnic threat: \( \text{Var}_{\text{municipality}} = 0.024; \text{Var}_{\text{neighbourhood}} = 0.011 \). Additionally, we estimated our final models including random intercepts at only one of both levels as well as single-level models, which leads to substantially similar conclusions (results available upon request).

Note, that our null models (Table 4.2) already indicated that for interest organizations the variance was relatively large at the neighbourhood level. One of both items used to construct our measure of involvement in interest organizations, explicitly refers to the neighbourhood level (i.e., ‘neighbourhood or community associations or tenants’ organizations’). Conducting our analyses for both subtypes of interest organizations (see data and measurements section) separately, we find similar effects at the neighbourhood level as presented in Table 4.3, however, only for ‘neighbourhood or community associations or tenants’ organizations’.

Only for involvement in activist organizations, considering the level of migrant stock at only one of both levels leads to slightly different conclusions, as some effects reach the boundary of significance. If we only consider the influence of migrant stock at the municipality level for leisure organizations, or at the neighbourhood level for interest organizations, we reach similar findings as presented in Table 4.3.

We estimated the probabilities to be in one of the three categories for all dependent variables separately. The models refer to respondents in modal categories of our categorical determinants (see Table 4.1), as well as respondents with an average age. We considered the influence of migrant stock at the municipality or neighbourhood level (dependent on the findings in Table 4.3), for municipalities and neighbourhoods with average levels of unemployment. For activist organizations, the predicted probabilities are based on the model in which we included migrant stock only at the municipality level. Random intercepts are set to zero.
Part B

Informal social capital
Chapter 5

Explaining relationships between ethnic diversity and informal social capital across European countries and regions: Tests of constrict, conflict and contact theory*

* A slightly different version of this chapter has been published in Social Science Research (Savelkoul, Gesthuizen, & Scheepers, 2011). A Dutch version has been published in K. Aarts & M. Wittenberg (Eds.), Nederland in de jaren nul. Proceedings derde Nederlandse workshop European Social Survey. Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press (Savelkoul, Gesthuizen, & Scheepers, 2012). A previous draft of this chapter has been presented at the Third Workshop European Social Survey, in The Hague, the Netherlands, November 2010.
5.1 Introduction

With many Western countries becoming ever more ethnically heterogeneous (Cornelius & Rosenblum, 2005; Hooghe et al., 2008; Zick, Pettigrew, & Wagner, 2008), the impact of migration and increasing ethnic diversity on social cohesion has become extensively discussed throughout public, political and scientific arenas (e.g., Cheong et al., 2007). Interest in this relationship has increased even more by Putnam’s (2007) recent study “E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-First Century”. His results indicated that ethnic diversity in the United States not only increased distrust in out-groups, moreover, Putnam (2007, p. 149) stated that “[...] people living in ethnically diverse settings appear to ‘hunker down’”, increasing social isolation. He suggested that inhabitants of diverse communities tend to withdraw from social life, a pattern which encompasses “[...] attitudes and behavior, bridging and bonding social capital, public and private connections” (Putnam, 2007, p. 151).

In this study we aim to describe and explain the relationship between ethnic diversity and informal social capital (cf. Pichler & Wallace, 2007), i.e., informal ties with one’s direct social environment. These ties refer to private connections with, for instance, family members and close friends. Hence, we assume informal social capital to reflect rather strong ties in the intimate domain and propose that a focus on informal social capital is a rather strict test of Putnam’s proposition: if ethnic diversity even reduces informal social ties in the intimate domain, as proposed by Putnam (2007), this might indeed be considered an indicator for declining levels of social cohesion.

Yet, we would like to go a step further. Previous studies on the relationship between ethnic diversity and informal social capital (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2009) are, to our knowledge, not only rather scarce, they also share one major lacuna: they addressed only the direct relationship between ethnic diversity and informal social capital without disentangling the underlying mechanisms, that is, the indirect relationships. Although a direct effect of ethnic diversity on informal social capital was not always found, it might be the case that ethnic diversity has indirect effects on people’s private connections. Theoretically, it is possible that indirect effects of ethnic diversity on informal social capital cancel each other out. This would be an explanation for the absence of a direct effect, if the indirect effects are not taken into account. In this study, we will therefore explicitly focus on these underlying mechanisms. Putnam (2007) referred to two theories, i.e., conflict and contact theories, which might be useful starting points for explaining this relationship, since both suggest different underlying mechanisms. However, he did not elaborate on nor empirically test the proposed mediating mechanisms.

In this study we will build on and improve previous research in two ways. First, we will disentangle and test the underlying mechanisms in order to describe and explain the relationship between ethnic diversity and informal social capital more profoundly.
Second, we will distinguish ethnic diversity on both country as well as regional levels. According to Gesthuizen et al. (2009), cross-national research on the effect of ethnic diversity on different dimensions of social cohesion should distinguish an additional aggregate level between the country and the individual level, preferably the municipality level. Previous studies on the effect of ethnic diversity on several dimensions of social capital at the municipality or even neighbourhood level have only been conducted within single countries (e.g., Leigh, 2006; Letki, 2008; Laurence, 2011; Tolsma et al., 2009). Although these levels are important, it is rather difficult, or even impossible to find valid data at these levels for all countries in cross-national research. Since social life (e.g., work, school and leisure activities) will partly take place outside of people’s direct neighbourhood or even outside of people’s municipality, we assume that the regional level is an interesting and important level to consider, where the distinguished mechanisms may play a role. Previous research on out-group derogation (e.g., Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schluter & Wagner, 2008) showed already that several effects, which we will also address in our present study and will discuss more elaborately in our theory section, can be found at the regional level. Note, that in Chapter 2 we saw that ethnic diversity affected formal social capital only at the regional level. Unlike previous cross-national studies, we will simultaneously address the effect of ethnic diversity at the regional and country level. At the country level one may expect other mechanisms to be at work, for instance, differences in countries’ previous and current immigration policies, which might be reflected in the composition of ethnic minority groups across countries. Moreover, media coverage on ethnic minorities might differ across countries and therefore result in different perceptions of the present out-groups across countries (Ter Wai, 2002).

Using data from the European Social Survey (2002/2003), supplemented with data on both contextual levels, we will test the effect of ethnic diversity on informal social capital at the regional and country level simultaneously, which enables a more accurate test of the effect of ethnic diversity at both levels (see e.g., Tolsma et al., 2009). The research questions we set out to answer, are:

RQ 5.1 To what extent does ethnic diversity within (a) European countries, and (b) regions across European countries affect informal social capital?

RQ 5.2 To what extent can these relationships be explained by mechanisms derived from conflict and contact theory?

5.2 Theories and hypotheses

To explain the influence of ethnic diversity on informal social capital, we will set out to incorporate the core propositions of three general theories (i.e., constrict, conflict and contact theories), which actually propose contradictory effects of ethnic diversity on informal social capital. We will distinguish two dimensions of informal social capital, i.e., informal meeting and informal helping (cf. Pichler & Wallace, 2007). We will come back to this distinction in more detail in our data and measurement section and will formulate our hypotheses on informal social capital in general.

5.2.1 Constrict theory

The first theory to derive hypotheses on the effect of ethnic diversity on informal social capital is Putnam’s (2007) constrict theory. His core statement is that ethnic diversity reduces social cohesion with regard to both ethnic out-groups as well as the in-group. He argued that ethnic diversity triggers “[...] anomie or social isolation”, fostering people to withdraw from social life, or as he formulated it “[...] pull in like a turtle” (Putnam, 2007, p. 149). As a result, people’s level of informal social capital will decline. His theoretical reasoning behind these effects remains, however, rather implicit. Although previous research could not find support for Putnam’s claim at the country level (Gesthuizen et al., 2009), we will partly replicate this study using different data and extend it by additionally taking into account the regional level. Based on Putnam’s proposition, we formulate the following hypothesis: (1) Ethnic diversity within (1a) European countries as well as (1b) regions within these countries will reduce people’s level of informal social capital.

Putnam’s (2007) constrict theory proposes a direct negative effect of ethnic diversity on informal social capital. It remains unclear, however, how ethnic diversity actually influences informal social capital. In order to come to grips with the puzzling theoretical explanation, it appears necessary to pay closer attention to the underlying mechanisms of this relationship. Here, Putnam merely gives a start, referring to two theories: conflict and contact theory.

5.2.2 Conflict theory

The first theoretical tradition is based on realistic group conflict theory (e.g., Blalock, 1967; Bobo, 1999; Coser, 1956) and ethnic competition theory (e.g., Coenders, Gijsberts, Hagendoorn, et al., 2004; Scheepers et al., 2002) and is often referred to as ‘conflict theory’ (e.g., Putnam, 2007; Tolsma et al., 2009). Conflict theory proposes that ethnic diversity fosters actual competition between the ethnic majority group and ethnic minority groups over scarce resources (e.g., on the labour market) and cultural values. As a result, ethnic diversity is assumed to increase perceptions of (ethnic) threat among members of the (majority) in-group. Regarding the subsequent effect of ethnic threat perceptions on informal social capital, two competing hypotheses can be formulated. According to conflict theory, these ethnic threat perceptions are supposed to increase levels of out-group derogation, and, moreover also to increase in-group favouritism (Coser, 1956; Coenders, Gijsberts, Hagendoorn, et al., 2004; Coenders, Gijsberts, & Scheepers, 2004). Based on this line of reasoning, we expect that
perceptions of ethnic threat will foster people to focus on their intimate domain. In other words, informal social capital with people’s (largely self-defined) private connections will be increased as a result of perceptions of ethnic threat.

Although conflict theory sheds more light on a possible underlying mechanism (i.e., the mediating effect of ethnic threat perceptions) between ethnic diversity and informal social capital, the proposed direction of this effect is contradictory to the expectations derived from constrict theory. Scholars pointed, however, to the fact that perceiving ethnic threat could also generally erode social cohesion (e.g., Hooghe et al., 2009; Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014). According to this line of reasoning, feelings of threat resulting from ethnic diversity can easily turn into generalised attitudes of discomfort and even discomfort with regard to all intimate connections, which in turn may reduce informal social capital. As such, perceptions of ethnic threat could explain the negative relationship between ethnic diversity and informal social capital as proposed by constrict theory.

Summarizing, we expect that (2) Ethnic diversity within (2a) European countries as well as (2b) regions within these countries will foster people’s level of perceived ethnic threat in that country/region. Based on conflict theory, we subsequently expect that (2c) Perceptions of ethnic threat will increase people’s level of informal social capital. According to Hooghe et al.’s (2009) as well as Van der Meer and Tolsma’s (2014) proposition, we expect, however, an opposite effect: (2d) Perceptions of ethnic threat will reduce people’s level of informal social capital.

5.2.3 Contact theory

The second theory which Putnam (2007) referred to as a take-off point is (intergroup) contact theory (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Contact theory proposes that (positive) interethnic contact effectively reduces out-group derogation. Previous research repeatedly showed that ethnic diversity increases the likelihood of intergroup contact, which in turn reduces levels of out-group derogation (e.g., Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schlueter & Wagner, 2008; Wagner et al., 2006). Contact theory might be important in two different ways, as interethnic contact might affect informal social capital both indirectly as well as directly.

Previous research showed that interethnic contact is not only negatively related to out-group derogation, but moreover, also to perceptions of ethnic threat. Pettigrew and Tropp’s (2006) meta-analytical study revealed that contact reduces negative attitudes toward out-groups in several ways, including a reduction of intergroup anxiety: it reduces feelings of threat and uncertainty that people experience in intergroup contexts. Empirical evidence regarding this negative relationship between intergroup contact and perceptions of ethnic threat was recently provided by e.g., Pettigrew et al. (2010), Schlueter and Scheepers (2010) and Schneider (2008), as well as in the previous empirical chapters of this book. Hence, ethnic threat perceptions might be considered an important mechanism, mediating the effect of ethnic diversity on informal social capital. In order to be able to accurately estimate the effect of interethnic contact, it will therefore be essential to take the effect of ethnic threat perceptions into consideration.

Next to this indirect effect, intergroup contact might also be directly related with informal social capital. However, to our knowledge, empirical evidence for a direct relationship between intergroup contact and informal social capital is conspicuous by absence. Nevertheless, previous research provides some useful indications. As ethnic minorities attach more importance to informal help (e.g., Kaniasty & Norris, 2000), intergroup contact might involve different role models and values with regard to how to interact with one’s social network. This might be reflected in a positive relationship between intergroup contact and informal social capital.

In sum, we hypothesize that: (3) Ethnic diversity within (3a) European countries as well as (3b) regions within these countries will increase the likelihood that people living in these countries/regions have interethnic contact. Moreover, we expect that: (3c) Interethnic contact is positively related to people’s level of informal social capital. Figure 5.1 shows our theoretical framework. The numbers refer to our hypotheses.

Figure 5.1 Theoretical framework: Relationship between ethnic diversity and informal social capital

Note: we will control for relevant determinants at the individual, regional and country level (not shown).
5.3 Data and measurements

5.3.1 Data
For testing our hypotheses, we used data derived from the first wave of the European Social Survey (ESS 2002/2003) (Jowell & The Central Co-ordinating Team, 2003). These data offer the unique possibility to focus on informal social capital and to simultaneously take both mediating variables (i.e., ethnic threat perceptions and intergroup contact) into consideration, across a large number of European countries. The data were collected by face-to-face interviews with people aged 15 years and over living in private households. Samples were drawn randomly for 21 European countries and Israel.

We only selected European countries for which relevant secondary data regarding ethnic diversity at the regional level were obtainable, which are: Austria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland. We used a country-specific indicator available in the ESS to group respondents into regional units that correspond to the Nomenclature of Territorial Units for Statistics classification scheme (NUTS; see Eurostat, 2003). We decided to use the NUTS-2 level, which refers to medium scale regions (ranging from 800,000 to 3 million inhabitants).

We only included respondents who were born in the survey country, who indicated that they had the citizenship of the country and whose parents were both born in the survey country as well. After list-wise deletion of respondents with missing values and excluding influential cases (which was only Vienna), our analytical dataset comprises 21,468 respondents, living in 125 regions, across 15 European countries.

5.3.2 Dependent variable: Informal social capital
According to Pichler and Wallace (2007), three aspects of informal social capital are important to consider, i.e., the density, strength and extensiveness of social networks. The ‘density’ dimension of people’s informal social capital was measured as follows: ‘How often do you meet socially with friends, relatives or work colleagues?’. It was further stated that ‘meet socially’ implies meeting by choice instead of for reasons of work or pure duty, emphasizing the voluntary or self-selected nature of these social ties. We labelled this dimension ‘informal social capital – meeting’.

The ‘strength’ dimension of people’s informal social capital was measured using the following item: ‘Not counting anything you do for your family, in your work, or within voluntary organisations, how often, if at all, do you actively provide help for other people?’ This dimension was labelled ‘informal social capital – helping’. For both items a 7-point scale was used: ‘every day’, ‘several times a week’, ‘once a week’, ‘several times a month’, ‘once a month’, ‘less often’ and ‘never’. We excluded respondents with missing values (including the answer category ‘don’t know’) on one or both dimensions of informal social capital list-wisely. We constructed both dependent variables in a way that higher values reflect higher levels of informal social capital.

As the dataset does not contain separate items referring to informal social capital with different groups (e.g., family, friends, colleagues etc.), we were not able to measure the ‘extensiveness’ dimension of informal social capital.

5.3.3 Mediating variables: Perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact
To test our hypotheses derived from conflict theory and contact theory, we included two mediating variables in our analysis. First, we measured perceived ethnic threat on a scale of 0 to 10, using six items referring to economic and non-economic issues related to immigrants, for instance: ‘immigrants take jobs away in [country]’, ‘immigrants are bad for [country’s] economy’ or ‘the [country’s] cultural life is undermined by immigrants’ (see also paragraph 2.3.3; Chapter 2). Higher scores reflect a higher level of perceived ethnic threat. Previous research showed that perceived ethnic threat can be equivalently measured by these items across all countries in the ESS (Coenders, Lubbers, et al., 2004). Respondents with missing values on more than two of the six items were excluded list-wisely. Next, missing values on items were substituted with the value on the highest or second highest correlating item. Finally, we calculated the average score on the six ‘perceived ethnic threat’ items (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.82).

Note, that our scale of perceived ethnic threat largely approximates realistic group threat (cf. Stephan et al., 2002).

Second, we used the following two items to measure interethnic contact, reflecting the private, respectively occupational domain of interethnic contact (cf. Schlueter & Wagner, 2008): ‘do you have any friends who have come to live in [country] from another country?’ and ‘do you have any colleagues who have come to live in [country] from another country?’. The answer categories for both items are: ‘no, none at all’, ‘yes, a few’ and ‘yes, several’. With regard to the item referring to immigrant colleagues, respondents could also answer that they were not currently working. This answer category was combined with the category referring to no immigrant colleagues. Both items were coded in a way that higher values reflect more intergroup contact and were used to construct a five-point scale of intergroup contact, similar to our approach in Chapter 2.

5.3.4 Ethnic diversity at the country and regional level
Using figures derived from the census 2001 provided by Eurostat (2010a), we calculated two commonly used measures of ethnic diversity (see Hooghe et al., 2009), both at the country level and regional level. Our first measure of ethnic diversity is often labelled as ‘migrant stock’ and refers to the percentage of non-natives with a non-Western citizenship compared to the total population. Our second measure of ethnic diversity is labelled ‘ethnic fractionalisation’ and is based on the complement of the Herfindahl

[1] For both items a 7-point scale was used: ‘every day’, ‘several times a week’, ‘once a week’, ‘several times a month’, ‘once a month’, ‘less often’ and ‘never’. We excluded respondents with missing values (including the answer category ‘don’t know’) on one or both dimensions of informal social capital list-wisely. We constructed both dependent variables in a way that higher values reflect higher levels of informal social capital.

[2] As the dataset does not contain separate items referring to informal social capital with different groups (e.g., family, friends, colleagues etc.), we were not able to measure the ‘extensiveness’ dimension of informal social capital.

[3] We only included respondents who were born in the survey country, who indicated that they had the citizenship of the country and whose parents were both born in the survey country as well. After list-wise deletion of respondents with missing values and excluding influential cases (which was only Vienna), our analytical dataset comprises 21,468 respondents, living in 125 regions, across 15 European countries.

[4] According to Pichler and Wallace (2007), three aspects of informal social capital are important to consider, i.e., the density, strength and extensiveness of social networks. The ‘density’ dimension of people’s informal social capital was measured as follows: ‘How often do you meet socially with friends, relatives or work colleagues?’. It was further stated that ‘meet socially’ implies meeting by choice instead of for reasons of work or pure duty, emphasizing the voluntary or self-selected nature of these social ties. We labelled this dimension ‘informal social capital – meeting’.

[5] The ‘strength’ dimension of people’s informal social capital was measured using the following item: ‘Not counting anything you do for your family, in your work, or within voluntary organisations, how often, if at all, do you actively provide help for other people?’ This dimension was labelled ‘informal social capital – helping’. For both items a 7-point scale was used: ‘every day’, ‘several times a week’, ‘once a week’, ‘several times a month’, ‘once a month’, ‘less often’ and ‘never’. We excluded respondents with missing values (including the answer category ‘don’t know’) on one or both dimensions of informal social capital list-wisely.
index (HI) (see e.g., Alesina et al., 2003, p. 159). This measure indicates the probability that two randomly selected individuals from a population belong to different (ethnic) groups. Based on the information provided by Eurostat (2010a), we distinguished nine ‘ethnic’ groups (for more information on the measurement of both indicators of ethnic diversity, see paragraph 2.3.4; Chapter 2).

As both measures of ethnic diversity were highly correlated at both contextual levels (r > 0.90), we decided not to include them simultaneously in our analyses as this would lead to multicollinearity. For that reason, we will include our migrant stock measures in the main analyses and use the ethnic fractionalisation measures in additional sensitivity analyses. For our analyses, both measures were centered at their mean.

5.3.5 Control variables at the country and regional level
At the contextual level we controlled for the level of unemployment at the country and regional level in 2002. Figures on unemployment rates at the country level were derived from Eurostat (2010b), except for Switzerland (OECD, 2010). For most countries in our dataset, information on the level of unemployment could also be obtained from Eurostat (2010b) at the regional level. For Slovenia, figures on unemployment at the NUTS-2 level were only obtainable from 2005 onwards (Eurostat, 2010b). For Switzerland we used figures obtained from OECD (2010) on the unemployment rates in NUTS-2 regions in 2002. Finally, we used figures on the unemployment rates in the Danish regions from 2007 (when the NUTS-2 classification was introduced in Denmark), which are derived from OECD (2010) as well. We centered our unemployment measures at their mean.

5.3.6 Control variables at the individual level
In line with previous research on informal social capital, ethnic threat perceptions and interethnic contact (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2009; Putnam, 2007; Schneider, 2008), we controlled for several determinants at the individual level. To assess respondents’ level of educational attainment we used information on the number of years of full-time education. For respondents with a missing value we used (if available) information on their level of educational attainment based on the categorical ISCED measure (for all countries except Austria). For each country separately, we used the mean years of fulltime education equivalent to the particular level of education. For respondents who were still studying at the time of survey, we used the study length at the time of the interview. Respondents with extreme values on the scale of educational attainment (i.e., more than 20 years; N = 326) were coded to a maximum value of 20 years. Employment situation was measured, asking respondents about their main activity in the last seven days. In order to keep our model as parsimonious as possible, we used a condensed version of the EGP-classification (Erikson et al., 1979) to assess the occupational status of those respondents who were in paid employment (see Table 5.1). Next to these categories, we distinguished another five categories for respondents who were not in paid employment. Marital status was measured using five categories (see Table 5.1). Religiousness was measured, asking respondents how often they attend religious services (apart from special occasions as weddings and funerals). The original measurement using a seven-point scale was condensed, distinguishing four (dummy) categories. A fifth category was included for respondents with a missing value on this item (see Table 5.1). The level of urbanisation of the respondent’s living environment was measured by five categories as judged by the respondent. Moreover, a sixth category was included for those respondents with no information regarding their level of urbanisation. Finally, we included straightforward measures of gender (with male as reference category) and age (including a squared term of age).4 For descriptive statistics of our individual- and contextual-level variables, see Table 5.1.

5.4 Analyses
In order to test our hypotheses, we employed multilevel random intercept regression analyses (with maximum likelihood estimation), which enabled us to take the hierarchical data structure into account (Snijders & Bosker, 2012). First, we estimated empty models (see Appendix 5.1, Model A) which provide insight in the variances at the individual level and both contextual levels. The variances of our dependent variables (informal social capital) are by far the highest at the individual level, which is in line with previous studies (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2009). Moreover, the variances at the country level turned out to be higher than the variances at the regional level, which is also reflected in the intraclass correlations on both levels. The same pattern can be noticed with regard to both mediating variables, i.e., perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact.

As the variances of both mediating variables as well as dependent variables are significant at both contextual levels, and thus justify employing multilevel analysis distinguishing three aggregate levels, next we included all individual-level variables (Appendix 5.1, Model B). Finally, we included our contextual-level variables at both levels in order to explain differences across regions and countries and test our hypotheses. However, before we will discuss our results, we would like to point out three methodological issues.

First, attention needs to be drawn to the importance of distinguishing the regional and country level. Results of additional sensitivity analyses (available upon request) show that if one does not take into account the nesting of regions within countries, some contextual-level effects (at the country or regional level) would be overestimated, whereas other contextual-level effects (at the country or regional level) would be underestimated. In some cases, the influence of regional-level determinants were even
no longer significant once we controlled for the nesting within countries. This means that if we would only consider one of both contextual levels next to the individual level, this would lead to different, incorrect, conclusions.

Second, our theoretical framework (see Figure 5.1) is rather complex. Not only both dependent variables can be assumed to be (positively) correlated, but both mediating variables are proposed to be (negatively) related as well (cf. Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011). Ideally, this would call for hierarchical structural equation modelling. However, as such analysis techniques only allow to consider two hierarchical levels and our preliminary analyses have indicated the importance of distinguishing two contextual levels and one individual level, we decided to employ separate multilevel regression analyses. In order to control for the proposed relationship between our mediating variables, we decided to include perceived ethnic threat as predictor for interethnic contact and vice versa.

Table 5.1 Descriptive statistics individual- and contextual-level variables
(N\textsubscript{individual} = 21,468; N\textsubscript{region} = 125; N\textsubscript{country} = 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean / %</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal social capital – Meeting</td>
<td>0 - 6</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal social capital – Helping</td>
<td>0 - 6</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mediating variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived ethnic threat</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interethnic contact</td>
<td>0 - 4</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variables individual level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (15=0)</td>
<td>0 - 88</td>
<td>31.27</td>
<td>17.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age squared</td>
<td>0 - 7,744</td>
<td>1,293.60</td>
<td>1,220.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment (years)</td>
<td>0 - 20</td>
<td>11.74</td>
<td>3.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religiosity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance never (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>29.42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance rarely</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>40.77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance once a month</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>10.19%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance once a week or more</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>19.40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance missing</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Employment status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service class (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>18.64%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine non-manuals</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>11.17%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employed</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>3.95%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual workers</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>16.39%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status missing (employed)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>1.56%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>3.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>8.84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>11.66%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>19.28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other employment situation</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>4.71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not married / never been married (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>28.90%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>55.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced / living separated</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>8.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status missing</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.26%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urbanisation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big city</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>13.91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs or outskirts of big city</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>14.09%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town or small city (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>29.57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country village</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>32.63%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm or home in the countryside</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>9.58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation missing</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.22%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>48.57%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>51.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regional level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock</td>
<td>1.22 - 20.25</td>
<td>6.09</td>
<td>4.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic fractionalisation</td>
<td>0.03 - 0.58</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>2.00 - 26.30</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Country level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock</td>
<td>2.48 - 18.30</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>4.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic fractionalisation</td>
<td>0.06 - 0.48</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment rate</td>
<td>2.80 - 19.90</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>4.39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


* Note, that for further analyses we will use mean centered measures of migrant stock, ethnic fractionalisation and unemployment rate.
Third, in order to determine the robustness of our findings, we conducted several sensitivity analyses (available upon request). As both measurements of ethnic diversity (i.e., migrant stock and ethnic fractionalisation) turned out to be highly correlated both at the regional and the country level ($r > 0.90$), we used our migrant stock measures in our main analyses and used the ethnic fractionalisation measures in additional sensitivity analyses. Results turned out to be substantially similar for both measurements of ethnic diversity. Additionally, we used different control variables at the country level. Previous research (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2009) indicated that other determinants, like wealth (i.e., GDP) and income inequality, also have an influence on (informal) social capital. As these determinants were only available at the country level, we decided to use them only for our sensitivity analyses. Here, we included them separately instead of unemployment rate. The effect of migrant stock on our dependent as well as mediating variables remained substantially similar.

### 5.5 Results

We will first consider the direct effect of ethnic diversity on both dependent variables, without considering the role of perceived ethnic threat and intergroup contact. Table 5.2 shows the effect of migrant stock (both at the regional and country level) on our dependent variables. We found a direct positive effect of migrant stock at the country level on giving informal help ($b = 0.053$). However, as this effect is in the opposite direction as predicted from Putnam’s constrict theory and we did not find an effect on the other dimension of informal social capital, meeting, we have to reject hypothesis 1a for both dependent variables. Moreover, a direct (negative) effect of migrant stock at the regional level on both dimensions of informal social capital was absent, leading us to refute hypothesis 1b as well for both dimensions.

Next, we took perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact into account, employing several multilevel regression analyses successively. After considering both mediating variables as dependent variables in Model 3 and 4, we included them as predictors of our dependent variables in Model 5 and 6. Since we only found a direct effect of migrant stock at the country level on informal helping, strictly speaking, we can only examine mediating mechanisms for this relationship. Nevertheless, a closer examination of the results presented in Table 5.2 shows a rather interesting picture.

First, we will focus on the mediating role of perceived ethnic threat. Both hypotheses 2a and 2b consider ethnic threat perceptions as a mediating mechanism between ethnic diversity on the one hand and informal social capital on the other hand. However, as one can see in Table 5.2, migrant stock (both at the regional and country level) has no effect on perceived ethnic threat. Hence, we have to reject hypotheses 2a and 2b. Yet, perceived ethnic threat consecutively turned out to reduce the extent to which
people meet socially \( (b = -0.032) \), corroborating hypothesis 2d only for this dependent variable. Hypothesis 2c, proposing a positive effect of perceived ethnic threat on informal social capital, has to be refuted for both dependent variables.

Next, we considered the mediating role of interethnic contact between ethnic diversity and informal social capital. Interethnic contact and perceived ethnic threat turned out to be negatively related as we expected (given the negative effect of perceived ethnic threat on intergroup contact and vice versa). With regard to the expected positive effect of migrant stock on interethnic contact, we only found support at the regional level \( (b = 0.044) \), corroborating hypothesis 3b. At the country level, we found no positive effect of migrant stock on interethnic contact, which refutes hypothesis 3a. Our results point out that interethnic contact is positively related to both dimensions of informal social capital \( (b = 0.100 \) for informal meeting; \( b = 0.203 \) for informal helping), supporting hypothesis 3c for both dependent variables.

Although we did not find clear support for the mediating effect of interethnic contact and perceived ethnic threat between migrant stock and informal social capital, our results indicate that both mediating variables do influence informal social capital. Finally, we would like to mention that the effects of our individual-level control variables on informal social capital, perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact (Appendix 5.2) are largely in line with findings from previous studies (e.g., Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schneider, 2008; Wilson & Musick, 1997).

People with a lower socio-economic status (in terms of education and employment status) display higher levels of perceived ethnic threat, while males and higher educated people show higher levels of intergroup contact. Moreover, females, higher educated people as well people attending church more frequently, turned out to provide informal help more often. For a general overview of our findings, see Figure 5.2.

5.6 Conclusions and discussion

In this study we focused on the relationship between ethnic diversity and informal social capital. Interest in the relationship between ethnic diversity and social capital more in general has been increased since Putnam (2007) proposed that ethnic diversity would foster people to withdraw from social life and consequently would decrease social capital. In our present study we focused on informal social capital which is of particular interest as it refers to rather strong, mainly self-selected ties in the intimate domain and therefore reflects a strict test of Putnam’s claim.

Unlike previous studies we considered three levels: individuals nested within regions, which in turn are nested within countries. Although the share of variance at the regional level was rather low for our dependent variables, our results revealed that it is necessary to distinguish this level in order to accurately disentangle the mediating mechanism of interethnic contact. Addressing our first research question regarding the direct effect of ethnic diversity on informal social capital, we found no support for Putnam’s constrict theory proposing a negative effect of ethnic diversity on this type of social capital. We found a direct positive effect of ethnic diversity at the country level (both migrant stock and ethnic fractionalisation) on informal helping. Note that this positive effect of migrant stock is in line with Gesthuizen et al.’s (2009) findings, who included both measurements of ethnic diversity simultaneously in their analyses, but used the Eurobarometer instead of the European Social Survey. At the regional level we did not find a direct effect of ethnic diversity on informal social capital, which is explicable given the rather low intra-class correlations of our dependent variables at this level. At this point, the picture seems to be more positive than was expected from Putnam’s proposition, at least for Europe.

In this study, however, our aim was to go a step further, by focusing on underlying mechanisms to explain the relationship between ethnic diversity and informal social capital. Based on conflict theory (e.g., Blalock, 1967; Scheepers et al., 2002) and
contact theory (e.g., Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), we used perceptions of ethnic threat and interethnic contact to explain this relationship. Addressing our second research question, we found no support for a mediating effect of intergroup contact or perceived ethnic threat between on the one hand ethnic diversity and, on the other hand, informal social capital. We only found a direct effect of ethnic diversity at the country level on giving informal help, yet no indirect effect at this level via the mediating variables. However, taking a closer look at the indirect effects of ethnic diversity at the regional level, the picture appeared to be more complex. Our results showed a direct positive effect of ethnic diversity on intergroup contact which, in turn, was positively related to both informal social meeting and helping. In other words, there is an indirect effect of ethnic diversity at the regional level on informal social capital, via interethnic contact.

Focusing on the indirect effects of ethnic diversity on informal social capital via perceived ethnic threat and intergroup contact, our findings turned out to only partly corroborate our expectations. We did not find a (positive) effect of ethnic diversity, at the country level nor at the regional level, on perceived ethnic threat. Nevertheless, our results showed that perceptions of ethnic threat play a role in explaining informal social capital, since they reduced informal social meeting. Although we did not, contradictory to previous research (e.g., Schlueter & Wagner, 2008), find a positive effect of ethnic diversity on perceived ethnic threat, the negative effect of ethnic threat perceptions on informal meeting might shed light on the underlying mechanisms of Putnam’s (2007) constrict theory. As perceived ethnic threat turned out only to reduce informal social meeting, this mechanism is, however, less general than proposed by constrict theory. We assume that our finding that only informal meeting turned out to be affected by perceptions of ethnic threat, might be explained by the fact that informal helping reflects stronger ties than informal meeting, as the first presupposes the latter. This assumption is supported by our findings in Chapter 2. Here, we found very consistent negative relationships between perceived ethnic threat and (active and passive) involvement in leisure, interest and activist organizations. These subdimensions of formal social capital might pertain to less strong ties as compared to informal social capital.

Moreover, our results revealed a positive effect of ethnic diversity at the regional level on interethnic contact, which we did not find at the country level. We assume that this is rather understandable as proximity might play an important role in this respect: the likelihood of intergroup contact will be only increased if ethnic minority members are present in people’s direct environment. In other words, a large number of ethnic minority members in a country will hardly influence people’s possibility to come into contact with these ethnic minorities, if they are concentrated in different regions in the country. Interethic contact, consequently, turned out to be positively related to both dimensions of informal social capital. We proposed that intergroup contact might involve different role models or values regarding how to interact with one’s social network, as ethnic minorities attach more importance to informal help (e.g., Kaniasty & Norris, 2000). Research using panel data is warranted to disentangle the underlying mechanisms more profoundly. Using longitudinal data would, moreover, enable a more strict test of Putnam’s proposition in general, as one could address to what extent informal social ties disintegrate with increasing ethnic diversity over time.

A different, but also important alley for future research, is the use of more specific, ethnicity-related indicators of (informal) social capital. Previous research on the relationship between ethnic diversity and (in-)formal social capital has mainly used general measures, not referring to the ethnic majority or minority groups (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2009; Letki, 2008). This distinction might be interesting when it comes to the underlying mechanisms of perceived ethnic threat and, in particular, interethnic contact (as was discussed in Chapter 3 and 4). Although both determinants are (as we have shown) also important to explain informal social capital in general, other mechanisms might play a role as well with regard to informal social ties with the ethnic majority in-group. Pettigrew (1998, p. 72) mentioned in this respect a depromotionisation mechanism: intergroup contact is supposed to reshape people’s view of their own (ethnic) group as in-group customs and norms turn out to be not the only alternative to cope with the social world. He argued that, “part of this process involves having less contact with the ingroup as a result of more contact with the outgroup” (Pettigrew, 1998, p. 73). Although we assume that, given our selection of only natives and based on the “homophily principle” (McPherson et al., 2001), our measurements of informal social capital will (mainly) refer to connections with the ethnic in-group, the available data do not allow us to actually make this distinction. More fine-grained measures of informal social capital, taking into account ethnicity, should be included in (cross-national) surveys to disentangle the effects of ethnic diversity more profoundly.

Finally, our results do not only indicate the complexity of the mechanisms determining informal social capital, they also emphasize the importance of taking into account different aggregate levels. As our results point out, different mechanisms can be found at different contextual levels. Unfortunately, due to data limitations, we were not able to take even lower contextual levels into account as well. Although, at the country level, our results contradict Putnam’s findings and present a more encouraging picture, it might be the case that different mechanisms play a role at the municipality or even the neighbourhood level, supporting Putnam’s constrict theory. Evidence from previous studies focusing on the relationship between ethnic diversity at the municipality and/or neighbourhood level on different dimensions of social capital in general is, however, rather mixed (see e.g., Laurence, 2011; Letki, 2008; Tolksma et al., 2009). As data limitations will probably restrict possibilities to conduct cross-national research at municipality or even neighbourhood levels, future research can build on our study by testing hypotheses on the mediating role of perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact in municipalities and neighbourhoods within single countries.
5.7 Notes

1 We are aware of the fact that conflict theory mainly distinguishes between the ethnic majority in-group and ethnic minority out-groups, i.e., bonding and bridging social capital. We assume, however, that one's intimate domain or (mainly self-chosen) private connections, can also be considered as a (self-defined) in-group.

2 The causal order between interethnic contact and perceived ethnic threat is not undisputed. Although previous research mainly considered interethnic contact to be causally antecedent to perceived ethnic threat (e.g., McLaren, 2003; Pettigrew et al., 2010; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2009; Schneider, 2008), the opposite causal order is not inconceivable: people who feel threatened by ethnic out-groups might avoid contact with them (if this is possible, e.g., friendship relations). To our knowledge, this relationship has not yet been tested adequately, using panel data. In line with the previous empirical chapters, we will, therefore, not suppose any causal order between interethnic contact and perceived ethnic threat (cf. Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011).

3 For Denmark, the NUTS-2 level was introduced in 2007 which coincided with a restructuring of the NUTS-3 levels. We decided to use the 2007 NUTS-2 classification for Denmark (see for more information, paragraph 2.3.1; Chapter 2).

4 Unless stated differently, we excluded missing values list-wisely. As we used a limited number of countries and regions, we additionally tested for outliers and influential cases. We decided to exclude Vienna (displaying the highest level of migrant stock) as only this region appeared to influence our results strongly.

5 The correlation between both measurements of informal social capital is positive and significant ($r = 0.145$). As both measurements tap into rather different dimensions (i.e., meeting and helping) of the overarching concept of 'informal social capital', this correlation is in line with our expectations. We decided to exclude 684 respondents (less than 3%) due to missing values on one or both variables.

6 The respondent’s age was calculated by subtracting the respondent’s year of birth from the year the interview was conducted. For 55 respondents the year the interview was conducted was not known. For these respondents, we decided to use the year (either 2002 or 2003) in which most other respondents in their country were interviewed. Finally, we subtracted the minimum age (i.e., 15) for all respondents to get a meaningful interpretation of the intercept.

7 Additionally, we excluded our control variable ‘urbanisation level’, which might control for effects on an even lower (e.g., municipality) level, leading to substantially similar conclusions.

8 Additionally, we re-ran our models using two separate measurements of interethnic contact: contact with friends and contact with colleagues (results available upon request). Previous research (Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011) has shown that both types of contact are differently influenced by contextual- and individual-level determinants, while simultaneously showing differential effects on out-group derogation. Our results showed that interethnic contact with friends is more strongly negatively related to perceived threat than interethnic contact with colleagues (in line with Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011), while our control variable unemployment rate at the country level only affects intergroup contact with colleagues. Interestingly, both types of contact still have a positive effect on giving informal help, while only interethnic contact with friends turned out to be positively related with our other dependent variable, informal meeting. For reasons of complexity of our model, we decided to use the contact scale instead of both separate measurements of intergroup contact. Depending on the availability of relevant data, future research could disentangle these mechanisms more profoundly, using more reliable measurements of both, and maybe more types of interethnic contact.

9 Additionally, we included a squared term of our ethnic diversity measures to test whether the relationship between ethnic diversity and perceived ethnic threat is curvilinear (i.e., a familiarisation effect; see Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schneider, 2008). We did not find support for this assumption. Moreover, it is possible that ethnic diversity only increases perceptions of ethnic threat for those people who compete most directly with ethnic minorities, for instance, at the labour market (e.g., Scheepers et al., 2002). As our models are already rather complex, we leave it to future research to disentangle such conditional influences of ethnic diversity more profoundly (cf. Quillian, 1995; Schneider, 2008).
Chapter 6

Explaining natives’ interethic contact with friends and colleagues in European regions*

* A slightly different version of this chapter is currently under review. Co-authors are Jochem Tolsma and Peer Scheepers. A previous draft of this chapter has been presented at the European Consortium for Sociological Research (ECSR) 20th Anniversary Conference in Dublin, Ireland, December 2011 and at the ‘Dag van de Sociologie’ of the Dutch and Flemish Sociology Association in Utrecht, the Netherlands, May 2012.
6.1 Introduction

Contact between natives and non-natives positively affects intergroup relations. For ethnic minority members, interaction with natives can be valuable for their structural and cultural integration (Tolsma, Lubbers, & Gijsberts, 2012); contact with natives helps immigrants to learn the language of the host country (Chiswick & Miller, 2001) and to gain access to the labour market (Lin, 1999). For natives, interethnic contacts reduce out-group derogation (e.g., Allport, 1954; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Moreover, natives with interethnic contacts offer more informal help to others (Savelkoul, Gesthuizen, et al., 2011; see Chapter 5) and are more likely to be involved in voluntary associations (Savelkoul et al., 2013; see Chapter 2). During the past decades, the vast majority of studies on interethnic contact focused on these positive consequences of interethnic contact, while the determinants of interethnic contact have received less attention.

The few studies that addressed the question ‘Who is more likely to have interethnic contact?’ focused predominantly on interethnic contact of ethnic minorities, rather than of natives (e.g., Brown, 2006; Fong & Isajiw, 2000; Martinovic Van Tubergen, & Maas, 2009a, 2009b). The exceptional studies on differences in interethnic contact among natives indicate that social groups differ substantially in their level of interethnic contact, but fail to explain these differences (Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schlueter & Wagner, 2008; Semyonov & Glikman, 2009; however, see also Martinovic, 2013). In this study, it is our aim to describe differences in interethnic contact among natives in many European countries and regions and to shed more light on underlying explanations for these differences. We will generalize Kalmijn’s overarching explanatory framework (1998; Martinovic, 2013) for interethnic marriage to interethnic contacts and scrutinize the role of (1) meeting opportunities, (2) preferences and (3) third parties. We will empirically test underlying explanations of natives’ level of interethnic contact, across a large number of European countries and regions.

Whereas previous research merely focused on intergroup friendship, we make a distinction between interethnic contact with friends and with colleagues, to disentangle differences between social groups regarding their level of interethnic contact. We expect that determinants underlying both types of contact differ: as interethnic friendship is voluntary in nature, while interethnic contact with colleagues is less so, we expect that meeting opportunities might be relevant for both dimensions of interethnic contact, while preferences and third party influences will be predominantly important for understanding differences in the level of interethnic friendship ties.

The propinquity of immigrants in people’s surrounding is a precondition for interethnic contact; only if immigrants are present in one’s living environment, one can (choose to) have actual interethnic contact (e.g., Blau, 1977; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Sigelman et al., 1996; Wagner et al., 2006). Pettigrew (2008, p. 193) refers to this
as the ‘first selection process’. So far, however, research only addressed general effects of the propinquity of ethnic out-group members in people’s social environment. We argue that the strength of the positive relationship between the presence of immigrants and interethnic contact may vary across social groups and may depend on the economic situation of the locality. In this contribution, we will address the following research questions:

RQ 6.1  To what extent do social groups among natives in European regions differ in their level of interethnic contact with friends and colleagues?

RQ 6.2  To what extent do meeting opportunities, preferences and third parties explain interethnic contact with friends and colleagues and thereby differences in interethnic contact between social groups?

RQ 6.3  For which social groups and under which circumstances does ethnic diversity in European regions increase interethnic contact with friends and colleagues?

Summarizing, we aim to build on previous research in several ways. We will focus on interethnic contact of natives. We will not only describe differences between social groups in their likelihood to have interethnic contact, but aim to explain differences in interethnic contact by considering the role of meeting opportunities, preferences and third parties. Unlike earlier studies (e.g., Martinovic, 2013; Schlüter & Wagner, 2008; Semyonov & Glikman, 2009), we will distinguish two dimensions of interethnic contacts: intergroup contact with friends versus colleagues. Moreover, we will address whether the presence of immigrants in European regions affects interethnic contact of natives differently for various social groups and under varying circumstances. Finally, we will not test our theoretically deduced hypotheses in ‘just’ one country, but, using data from the first wave of the European Social Survey, will disentangle differences between social groups in their level of interethnic contact, across 126 European regions (i.e., NUTS-2 administrative units) in 15 countries.

6.2 Theories and hypotheses

6.2.1 General explanations of interethnic contact among natives

Before we will derive explicit hypotheses on determinants of interethnic contact, we will first briefly introduce the three underlying mechanisms which are central in this study: meeting opportunities, preferences and third party influences (cf. Kalmijn, 1998). We will argue that meeting opportunities are crucial for interethnic contact with both friends and colleagues, whereas preferences and third parties will predominantly affect interethnic friendship ties, as this dimension of contact is more voluntary in nature.

Meeting opportunities

According to Blau’s macro sociological theory of social structure, “[...] physical propinquity increases the probability of social association” (Blau, 1977, p. 42). Blau argued that, consequently, higher levels of heterogeneity are expected to increase the likelihood of intergroup relations. In recent years, studies have provided empirical support for this theoretical rationale time and again, showing that a larger proportion of out-group members in people’s living environment increases their likelihood of having intergroup contact (Pettigrew et al., 2010; Schlüter & Scheepers, 2010; Schlüter & Wagner, 2008; Sigelman et al., 1996; Wagner et al., 2006).

However, meeting opportunities not only depend on the mere size of the ethnic out-group in one’s region. According to Blau (1977, p. 46), people sharing social attributes are more likely to have (some) common interests, which increases the likelihood that instrumental activities bring them together. We propose that opportunities to meet and mingle are more likely when people share socio-demographic characteristics such as sex, age and educational level, as these will affect people’s position at the labour market and, moreover, affect their leisure activities. Natives sharing more social attributes with immigrants will – consequently – have more meeting opportunities than natives displaying larger differences in these social attributes. Meeting opportunities, thus, depend on the size and composition of the immigrant population in people’s living environment, and whether there is an overlap in attributes between natives and immigrants living in their proximity.

Preferences

Earlier studies pointed at the fact that people prefer social ties with similar others, for instance, with regard to age, gender, but also race/ethnicity (e.g., Marsden, 1988; Verbrugge, 1977; see McPherson et al., 2001, for a review of studies). According to this homophily principle, people would, thus, naturally prefer friendship ties with ethnic in-group members (McPherson et al., 2001).

The body of research on interethnic attitudes has revealed, however, large differences between social groups in preferences for interethnic contact, due to, for instance, people’s social position or educational background (e.g., Coenders, Lubbers, & Scheepers, 2007; Hello, Scheepers, & Gisberts, 2002; Tolksma, Lubbers, & Coenders, 2008; Vogt, 1997). Preferences influence interethnic contact and natives with positive interethnic attitudes are more likely to make contact with immigrants than natives with negative interethnic attitudes.

Third parties

Third parties, such as one’s family, direct social networks and neighbourhoods set norms of behaviour which affect the formation and stability of interethnic contacts (Kalmijn, 1998; Pettigrew, 1998). Although such parties are not involved in the actual
interethnic contact, they can encourage or discourage it (Kalmijn, 1998). Studies on indirect or extended contact effects (e.g., Pettigrew, Christ, Wagner, & Stellmacher, 2007; Pettigrew, Tropp, Wagner, & Christ, 2011; Turner, Hewstone, Voci, & Vonolakou, 2008; Wright, Aron, McLaughlin-Volpe, & Ropp, 1997) emphasize the importance of norms within one’s social network: having a friend who has close contact with an ethnic minority member “[...] helps to make it normatively acceptable” (Pettigrew et al., 2011, p. 277).

Other studies pointed at the role of people’s family in explaining attitudes and preferences later in life. Jaspers, Lubbers and De Vries (2008) showed that parents’ attitudes toward ethnic minorities strongly influenced their children’s attitudes toward ethnic minorities. More recently, Huijnk and Liefbroer (2012) revealed that children of parents with lower education and lower social status reported more resistance to interethnic contact (see also Tolsma et al., 2008). This influence turned out to be mediated by parental interethnic attitudes.

6.2.2 Explaining interethnic contact at work
We propose that meeting opportunities will be the most important mechanism explaining people’s likelihood of having interethnic contact at work. As (superficial) contact with colleagues is hard to avoid, preferences for this type of interethnic contact may be less relevant. Since relevant third parties (e.g., family and close friends) are not likely to be able to sanction norm violations with respect to interethnic contact at work, the third party mechanism is not expected to play a substantial role either. Naturally, the necessary conditions to have interethnic contact with colleagues is to have a job and moreover to have colleagues from different ethnic groups. With larger proportions of immigrants in regions, the supply of immigrant workers will increase and, consequently, the opportunities for natives to have interethnic contact as well.

However, not only the mere size of the immigrant population is important for meeting opportunities. The composition of the immigrant population will play a role as well. More male than female immigrants live in Europe and immigrant men (predominantly of non-Western descent) display higher levels of labour market participation compared to women (Münz, 2007; Rubin et al., 2008). Given that labour markets are largely segmented by sex (e.g., Charles, 1992; Estévez-Abe, 2008), we thus expect that employed native men have more meeting opportunities than employed native women. Given this line of thought, we also expect that higher proportions of immigrants in European regions will increase the likelihood to have interethnic contacts at work predominantly for native men and less for women.

Non-Western immigrants in Europe have in general low levels of educational attainment and perform jobs with a relatively lower occupational status. Western-immigrants, on the other hand, are generally relatively highly educated and perform jobs with comparatively higher occupational status (Münz, 2007). As a result, natives with medium levels of educational attainment, performing medium status jobs (i.e., routine non-manual workers) will be less likely to have contact with immigrant colleagues, as compared to natives at the lower and upper end of the labour market. Similarly, we expect that living in European regions with higher proportions of immigrants will generally increase the likelihood to have interethnic contact at work, though less for natives with a medium educational background, performing medium status jobs.

Immigrants are also more likely to be unemployed compared to the native population (Haug, Compton, & Courbage, 2002; Münz, 2007). This holds for both immigrants of Western and non-Western descent, although the difference with the native population is larger for the latter. In times of economic downturn, immigrants will be more likely to get hit by unemployment than natives. In regions facing high levels of unemployment, especially the demand for non-native employees declines and ceteris paribus, meeting opportunities for employed natives at work decrease. Next to the relative size of the immigrant population in European regions, the regional level of unemployment might, thus, be regarded as an important indicator of meeting opportunities at the labour market. From this rationale we also derive that an increase of the relative size of the immigrant population in regions will be less strongly reflected in natives’ likelihood to have interethnic contact at work if unemployment levels are high.

In sum, our hypotheses with regard to interethnic contact with colleagues read:

1. Women (1a), people with a medium level of education (1b) and routine non-manual workers (1c) are less likely to have interethnic contact with colleagues.

2. Meeting opportunities will explain why (2a) women, (2b) people with a medium level of education and (2c) routine non-manual workers are less likely to have interethnic contact with colleagues.

3. A larger proportion of immigrants in European regions will generally increase the likelihood to have interethnic contact with colleagues (3a). This effect will be less strong for women, people with a medium level of education, routine non-manual workers as well as under conditions of high unemployment rates at the regional level (3b).

6.2.3 Explaining interethnic friendship
Meeting opportunities are likely to play a role with regard to interethnic contact with friends, but, as interethnic contact with friends is voluntary in nature, preferences and third parties may also explain why specific social groups have more interethnic contact.

Immigrants living in Europe are, in general, relatively young (Coleman, 2008; Haug et al., 2002). Consequently, we expect that particularly young natives have more opportunities to meet (same-age) immigrants: youngsters meet each other at school, or during leisure activities. Younger people are, in general, more tolerant toward ethnic minorities (e.g., Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Semyonov & Glikman, 2009). And, as
younger cohorts are raised in times with increasing migrant stocks, they may have become more familiarised with ethnic minorities (Schneider, 2008). Consequently, we assume that interethnic contact has become normatively more acceptable for younger residents of Europe than for older. As people generally prefer same-age friendship ties (McPherson et al., 2001), the social network of younger cohorts might, moreover, contain relatively tolerant network members. We thus expect that younger people will have more interethnic contact with friends than older people, because of more meeting opportunities, more favourable interethnic attitudes (i.e., more favourable preferences for interethnic contact) and because they face less restrictive norms from relevant third parties. This also implies that higher proportions of immigrants in European regions will be positively related to interethnic contact as friends particularly among young natives.

As males are overrepresented in the European immigrant population (Haug et al., 2002), native men will have more opportunities to meet (same-sex) immigrants than native women. We, thus, expect that men will have more interethnic contact with friends compared to women. Similarly, we expect that with higher proportions of immigrants in European regions, especially men are more likely to have interethnic contact with friends. However, native women are, in general, more tolerant toward ethnic out-groups than men (Scheepers et al., 2002; Schlüter & Wagner 2008; Semyonov & Glikman, 2009). Thus, preferences would drive women to have more interethnic contact. This could explain why previous evidence is inconsistent: some studies showed that women have less interethnic contacts than men (e.g., Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schlüter & Wagner, 2008; Semyonov & Glikman, 2009), others did not find differences between men and women (e.g., Martinovic, 2013; Schlüter & Scheepers, 2010; Sigelman et al., 1996).

Higher educated people have more favourable attitudes (i.e., preferences) toward ethnic out-groups (Hello et al., 2002) and, consequently, more interethnic contact with friends (Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schlüter & Scheepers, 2010; Schlüter & Wagner, 2008). Vice versa, previous research showed that lower educated people prefer to avoid contacts with ethnic out-groups (e.g., Coenders et al., 2007; Semyonov & Glikman, 2009; Vogt, 1997). On top of that, the social network of lower educated individuals may consist of more (similarly) lower educated contacts than social networks of higher educated people (cf. McPherson et al., 2001). Since the level of education is the strongest determinant of people’s norms regarding interethnic tolerance in many European countries (e.g., Hello et al., 2002), we suppose that the general norm discouraging interethnic contact is likely to prevail rather strongly in social networks of lower educated people. In other words, for lower educated people, third party influences might decrease their likelihood to have interethnic contact with friends. In sum, we expect that higher educated natives will have more interethnic contact with friends than lower educated natives. Moreover, we expect that a larger proportion of immigrants in people’s living environment will generally increase interethnic contact but even more strongly for higher educated people as they prefer to have such interethnic contacts and might be less restricted by third party influences. As such, higher educated people are expected to ‘profit’ more in terms of actual interethnic contact if objective meeting opportunities increase.

As immigrants are largely concentrated in more urbanised areas within European regions (e.g., Scheepers et al., 2002; Wagner et al., 2006), we expect that natives in these areas have more opportunities to meet immigrants, as compared to natives living in more rural areas.1 We expect that predominantly for natives in urbanised areas, meeting opportunities and consequently interethnic contact with friends will increase if the relative size of the immigrant population in regions becomes larger.

The above considerations and findings of previous research lead us to formulate the following hypotheses on interethnic contact with friends:

1. Younger people (4a), men (4b), higher educated people (4c) and people living in more urbanised areas (4d) are more likely to have interethnic contact with friends.
2. Meeting opportunities, preferences and third parties will explain why younger people are more likely to have interethnic contact with friends. (5a) Meeting opportunities will explain why men are more likely to have interethnic contact with friends, while preferences will suppress the difference between men and women. (5b) Preferences and third parties will explain why higher educated people are more likely to have interethnic contact with friends, while (5d) meeting opportunities will explain why people living in more urbanised areas are more likely to have interethnic contact with friends.
3. A larger proportion of immigrants in European regions will generally increase the likelihood to have interethnic contact with friends (6a). This effect will be stronger for younger people, men, higher educated people and people living in more urbanised areas (6b).

6.3 Data and measurements

6.3.1 Data

To test our hypotheses, we used the first wave of the European Social Survey (ESS 2002/2003; version 6.3) (Jowell & The Central Co-ordinating Team, 2003). The data were collected by face-to-face interviews with people living in private households aged 15 years and over. Samples were randomly drawn for 21 European countries and Israel. We clustered respondents in medium scale (NUTS-2) regions, which are comparable across European countries (Eurostat, 2003). We only included European countries in our analysis for which information on the ethnic composition of these regions was available; i.e., Austria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden and Switzerland.2
This contribution focuses on interethnic contact of natives. Therefore, we only included respondents who were born in, and had the citizenship of, the survey country, and of whom both parents were born in the survey country. Finally, only respondents between the age of 18 and 65, active at the labour market in paid employment, were included in our analyses, as only these respondents can have interethnic contact with colleagues at work. To compare findings between both dimensions of interethnic contact, we will use the same sample. Our findings pertain, thus, to this selection of respondents.

### 6.3.2 Dependent variables: Interethnic contact with colleagues and friends

For measuring interethnic contact with colleagues, respondents were asked whether they have ‘[…] any colleagues who have come to live in [country] from another country?’. Interethnic contact with friends was measured, using the following item: ‘Do you have any friends who have come to live in [country] from another country?’. Both items have been used repeatedly to measure interethnic contact (e.g., Savelkoul, Gesthuizen, et al., 2011; Schlueter & Wagner, 2008; Semyonov & Glikman, 2009). We are aware of the fact that our measure of interethnic contact at work partly reflects opportunities for contact and might, therefore, refer to more superficial contact as compared to (more intimate) interethnic friendship ties. We will come back to this in the discussion. For both items the answer categories are: ‘no, none at all’, ‘yes, a few’ and ‘yes, several’. As the distribution of both variables was skewed, we constructed dichotomous measures of both dimensions of contact and will compare respondents with and without interethnic contacts.

### 6.3.3 Socio-demographics

For sex we used males as reference category. The respondents’ level of educational attainment was measured distinguishing three levels of educational background based on the ISCED measure: low (i.e., ‘not completed primary education’, ‘primary or first stage of basic’ or ‘lower secondary or second stage of basic’; ISCED 0-2); middle (i.e., ‘upper secondary’ or ‘post secondary, non-tertiary’; ISCED 3-4; reference category); and high (‘first stage of tertiary’ or ‘second stage of tertiary’; ISCED 5-6). Social class was measured using a condensed version of the EGP-classification (Erikson et al., 1979). We distinguished the following categories: ‘service class’ (EGP-class I and II), ‘routine non-manuals’ (EGP-class III) (reference category) and ‘manual workers’ (EGP-class V, VI, Villa and VIlb). Age was calculated, by subtracting the respondent’s year of birth from the year the interview was conducted. To determine the level of urbanisation of the respondent’s living environment, respondents had to choose between five categories: ‘farm or home in the countryside’, ‘country village’, ‘town or small city’ (reference category), ‘suburbs or outskirts of big city’ and ‘big city’.

### 6.3.4 Opportunities, preferences and third parties

Two of our indicators of meeting opportunities are (objective) characteristics of the regions in which respondents live. Our migrant stock measure refers to the (objective) proportion of foreign-born people of the total population within each NUTS-2 region. We used figures derived from the 2001 census provided by Eurostat (2010a), which distinguish several (‘ethnic’) groups based on their citizenship and country of birth. Unemployment rates were obtained from Eurostat (2010b), as immigrants are more likely to be unemployed than natives (e.g., Haug et al., 2002; Münz, 2007), this indicator is used as an approximation of meeting opportunities at work. Note, that more direct (and cross-national equivalent) measures of meeting opportunities at work (e.g., the percentage of immigrants in the labour force) were not available for all regions in our study. For Slovenia, unemployment rates were only obtainable from 2005 onwards and for the Danish regions from 2007 onwards (when the NUTS-2 classification was introduced). Figures on unemployment rates in Swiss regions were obtained from OECD (2010). Our third indicator of meeting opportunities is measured via the respondents themselves and is based on a (subjective) measure of the presence of immigrants in the respondent’s living area. Respondents were asked whether they live in an area in which ‘almost nobody’, ‘some people’ or ‘many people’ are of a different race or ethnic group from the majority in-group. We will include this item as a proxy for the respondents’ meeting opportunities at a lower aggregate level than the country or region. We labelled this variable as subjective perception of local immigrants.

Respondents’ preferences were measured using an ethnic social distance scale like in previous research (Coenders et al., 2007, Martinovic, 2013), based on two items (r = 0.73; Cronbach’s alpha = 0.84). Respondents were asked how much they would mind if immigrants who are of a different race or ethnic group from the majority in-group would (i) be appointed as their boss and (ii) marry a close relative. The answer categories of both items range from 0 (not mind at all) to 10 (mind a lot). We calculated the average score for respondents with at least one valid answer. Respondents with high values, tend to object to have interethnic contacts.

To measure the influence of third parties, one would – ideally – like to know the prevalent norm for interethnic contact in people’s relevant social network. Unfortunately, such information has not been collected in cross-national research to the best of our knowledge. As argued before, we assume that the level of education is a good proxy for people’s norms regarding interethnic contact, as it is the strongest predictor for interethnic attitudes (e.g., Hello et al., 2002; Vogt, 1997). We consider one’s father and partner (if present) to be members of someone’s relevant social network. Thus as our best approximation for the third party mechanism we used educational attainment of the father of the respondent and, when available, educational attainment of the partner of the respondent. We distinguished three levels of educational attainment, similar to the way we measured the level of education of the respondents: low (ISCED 0-2);
middle (ISCED 3-4); and high (ISCED 5-6). For our measure of the level of educational attainment of the partner, we included an additional category for those respondents without a partner.6

6.3.5 Control variables
In line with previous research (e.g., Semyonov & Gilman, 2009; Sigelman et al., 1996), we additionally controlled for marital status and religiosity. Although the relationships of these controls with interethnic contact may be explained by differences in meeting opportunities, preferences and influences of third parties, for reasons of parsimony, we did not formulate explicit hypotheses. Marital status consists of the following categories: ‘not married/never been married’, ‘married’, ‘divorced/living separated’ and ‘widow(er)’. Religiosity refers to attendance of religious services (apart from special occasions as weddings and funerals) with answer categories ranging from ‘never’ to ‘once a week or more’.

6.3.6 Missing values and centering
Respondents with missing values on our dependent variables and/or continuous covariates (2.1%) were deleted list-wisely. We constructed additional ‘missing’ categories for categorical explanatory variables. To facilitate interpretation of our interaction effects we centered all continuous variables at their sample mean. Our working sample consists of 10,475 respondents living in 126 regions located in 15 European countries. Descriptive statistics are summarized in Table 6.1.

6.4 Analyses
To take the hierarchical structure of our data, with individuals nested in regions, which in turn are nested within countries into account, we employed hierarchical logistic regression analyses (Snijders & Bosker, 2012), using R 2.15.2. In this study, we are interested in the regional level, as we expect that the proximity of immigrants in people’s close living environment will strongly influence people’s likelihood to have interethnic contact, as shown in previous studies (e.g., Schlueter & Wagner, 2008; Wagner et al., 2006). As we only have information about the regional ethnic composition of a limited number of countries (15), which might strongly differ with regard to migration history, we decided to conduct hierarchical logistic regression analyses with individuals nested in regions, while including fixed effects (using country dummies with a deviation contrast). In this way, we are able to control for the nesting of regions within countries and prevent country-level variance to become reflected at the regional level. Moreover, using fixed country effects, we can rule out other influences at the country level (e.g., migration history or naturalisation policies), which we are unable to directly control for in a three-level model.

Table 6.1 Descriptive statistics individual- and contextual-level variables – employed respondents (age 18-65) (N\text{individual} = 10,475; N\text{region} = 126; N\text{country} = 15)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>Mean / %</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dependent variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interethnic contact with friends</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>50.86%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interethnic contact with colleagues</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>46.84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual-level variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (/10)</td>
<td>1.80 - 6.50</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level low</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>21.33%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level mid (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>49.72%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level high</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>28.65%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level missing</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>54.51%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>45.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual workers</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>33.89%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine non-manuals (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>23.77%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service class</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>39.14%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class missing</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>3.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big city</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>15.50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs or outskirts of big city</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>15.49%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town or small city (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>29.80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country village</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>30.43%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm or home in the countryside</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>8.58%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation missing</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanisms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity – Subjective perception of local immigrants</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost no ethnic minorities (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>54.08%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some ethnic minorities</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>38.21%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many ethnic minorities</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>6.84%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective perception of local immigrants missing</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>0.87%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferences – Social distance scale</td>
<td>0 - 10</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third parties – Educational level father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level father – low (ref.)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>46.40%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level father – middle</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>30.83%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level father – high</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>10.41%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level father – missing (incl. Sweden)</td>
<td>0/1</td>
<td>12.36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The results for interethnic contact with colleagues are summarized in Table 6.2 and for interethnic contact with friends in Table 6.3. To compare findings between our two dependent variables we included the same set of predictors and used the same sample. We started with a model only including socio-demographic characteristics (Model a). In Models b, c and d, we introduced our three explanatory mechanism separately: meeting opportunities, preferences and third parties. Next, we estimated a model in which all three mechanisms were included (Model e). In the final model (Model f), we furthermore included (significant) cross-level interaction terms between the socio-demographic variables and our migrant stock measure.

### 6.5 Results

#### 6.5.1 Interethnic contact with colleagues

There are clear differences between social groups in their likelihood to have interethnic contact at work (Table 6.2, Model 1a). Women are less likely to have interethnic contact at work as compared to men (\(b = -0.093; \text{Exp}(b) = 0.911\)), which is in line with our expectations (hypothesis 1a). Only people with the highest level of education were found to be more likely to have interethnic contact at work (\(b = 0.386; \text{Exp}(b) = 1.471\)), as compared to people with medium levels of education. This only partly corroborates our expectations (1b), as we also expected that lower educated people would be more likely to have interethnic contact with colleagues. We expected that routine non-manual workers would be less likely to have intergroup contact at work as compared with manual workers and service class employees (1c). Our results only lend support for our expectations with regard to manual workers: manual workers are more likely to have interethnic contact at work as compared to routine non-manual workers (\(b = 0.178; \text{Exp}(b) = 1.195\)). Service class employees did not differ significantly from routine non-manual workers.

In Model 1b (Table 6.2), we added our indicators for meeting opportunities. In line with our expectation, a larger (objective) proportion of immigrants in people's region as well as a larger subjective perceptions of local immigrants in one's living environment increase the odds to have interethnic contact at work. Our results only lend support for our expectations with regard to manual workers: manual workers are more likely to have interethnic contact at work as compared to routine non-manual workers (\(b = 0.178; \text{Exp}(b) = 1.195\)). Service class employees did not differ significantly from routine non-manual workers.

In Model 1b (Table 6.2), we added our indicators for meeting opportunities. In line with our expectation, a larger (objective) proportion of immigrants in people's region as well as a larger subjective perceptions of local immigrants in one's living environment increase the odds to have interethnic contact at work. Our results only lend support for our expectations with regard to manual workers: manual workers are more likely to have interethnic contact at work as compared to routine non-manual workers (\(b = 0.178; \text{Exp}(b) = 1.195\)). Service class employees did not differ significantly from routine non-manual workers.

In Model 1b (Table 6.2), we added our indicators for meeting opportunities. In line with our expectation, a larger (objective) proportion of immigrants in people's region as well as a larger subjective perceptions of local immigrants in one's living environment increase the odds to have interethnic contact at work. Our results only lend support for our expectations with regard to manual workers: manual workers are more likely to have interethnic contact at work as compared to routine non-manual workers (\(b = 0.178; \text{Exp}(b) = 1.195\)). Service class employees did not differ significantly from routine non-manual workers.

In Model 1b (Table 6.2), we added our indicators for meeting opportunities. In line with our expectation, a larger (objective) proportion of immigrants in people's region as well as a larger subjective perceptions of local immigrants in one's living environment increase the odds to have interethnic contact at work. Our results only lend support for our expectations with regard to manual workers: manual workers are more likely to have interethnic contact at work as compared to routine non-manual workers (\(b = 0.178; \text{Exp}(b) = 1.195\)). Service class employees did not differ significantly from routine non-manual workers.

In Model 1b (Table 6.2), we added our indicators for meeting opportunities. In line with our expectation, a larger (objective) proportion of immigrants in people's region as well as a larger subjective perceptions of local immigrants in one's living environment increase the odds to have interethnic contact at work. Our results only lend support for our expectations with regard to manual workers: manual workers are more likely to have interethnic contact at work as compared to routine non-manual workers (\(b = 0.178; \text{Exp}(b) = 1.195\)). Service class employees did not differ significantly from routine non-manual workers.

In Model 1b (Table 6.2), we added our indicators for meeting opportunities. In line with our expectation, a larger (objective) proportion of immigrants in people's region as well as a larger subjective perceptions of local immigrants in one's living environment increase the odds to have interethnic contact at work. Our results only lend support for our expectations with regard to manual workers: manual workers are more likely to have interethnic contact at work as compared to routine non-manual workers (\(b = 0.178; \text{Exp}(b) = 1.195\)). Service class employees did not differ significantly from routine non-manual workers.
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### Table 6.2: Results: Hierarchical Logistic Regression Analyses – Intercultural Contact with Colleagues – Employed Respondents (Age 18-65) (N\textsubscript{individual} = 10,475; N\textsubscript{region} = 126)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1a</th>
<th>Model 1b</th>
<th>Model 1c</th>
<th>Model 1d</th>
<th>Model 1e</th>
<th>Model 1f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.503</td>
<td>-0.853</td>
<td>-0.514</td>
<td>-0.590</td>
<td>-0.956</td>
<td>-0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.116</td>
<td>0.118</td>
<td>0.119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual-level variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level (ref.: educ. mid.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level low</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.062</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level high</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.360</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level missing</td>
<td>0.944</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>0.911</td>
<td>0.920</td>
<td>0.891</td>
<td>0.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>0.388</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.389</td>
<td>0.392</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age/10 (centered)</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>-0.033</td>
<td>-0.030</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.019</td>
<td>-0.020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>0.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (ref.: males)</td>
<td>-0.093</td>
<td>-0.105</td>
<td>-0.101</td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>-0.109</td>
<td>-0.108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class (ref.: routine non-manuals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual workers</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.181</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.194</td>
<td>0.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service class</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class missing</td>
<td>-0.388</td>
<td>-0.367</td>
<td>-0.374</td>
<td>-0.399</td>
<td>-0.365</td>
<td>-0.361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>0.129</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.130</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td>0.132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation (ref.: town or small city)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation – big city</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.394</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation – suburbs or outskirts of big city</td>
<td>0.467</td>
<td>0.393</td>
<td>0.474</td>
<td>0.470</td>
<td>0.401</td>
<td>0.400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation – country village</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.045</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.108</td>
<td>0.089</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation – farm or home in the countryside</td>
<td>-0.280</td>
<td>-0.159</td>
<td>-0.258</td>
<td>-0.264</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
<td>-0.136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.086</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation – urbanisation missing</td>
<td>-0.686</td>
<td>-0.692</td>
<td>-0.685</td>
<td>-0.692</td>
<td>-0.698</td>
<td>-0.737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td>0.485</td>
<td>0.487</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*** significant at p < 0.001; ** significant at p < 0.01; * significant at p < 0.05 (one-sided test of significance).
- Models are controlled for religiosity, marital status as well as country dummies (results available upon request).
- Empty cells: parameters not estimated due to model specification.
- Contextual-level variable.
## Table 6.2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Models</th>
<th>Model 1a</th>
<th>Model 1b</th>
<th>Model 1c</th>
<th>Model 1d</th>
<th>Model 1e</th>
<th>Model 1f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>b</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>b</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanisms</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity (objective) – Migrant stock region/100 (centered)</td>
<td>4.891</td>
<td>0.715</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td>4.799</td>
<td>0.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity (objective) – Unemployment rate region (centered)</td>
<td>-0.069</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity – Subjective perception of local immigrants (ref.=almost nobody)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective perception – some ethnic minorities</td>
<td>0.384</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.368</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective perception – many ethnic minorities</td>
<td>0.499</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.493</td>
<td>0.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective perception – missing</td>
<td>0.437</td>
<td>0.236</td>
<td>*</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.429</td>
<td>0.236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferences – Social distance</td>
<td>-0.052</td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>***</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third parties – Educational level father (ref.=low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level father – middle</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level father – high</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.078</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>0.145</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level father – missing (incl. SE)</td>
<td>-0.085</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.091</td>
<td>0.113</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third parties – Educational level partner (ref.=low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level partner – middle</td>
<td>-0.088</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.076</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level partner – high</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.028</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level partner – no partner</td>
<td>0.094</td>
<td>0.090</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level partner – missing (incl. SE)</td>
<td>0.180</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.214</td>
<td>0.273</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cross-level interactions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock region/100 * manual workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock region/100 * service class</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock region/100 * educational level low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock region/100 * educational level high</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** European Social Survey (2002/2003), Eurostat (2010a/b), OECD (2010).

*** significant at $p < 0.001$; ** significant at $p < 0.01$; * significant at $p < 0.05$ (one-sided test of significance).

Models are controlled for religiosity, marital status as well as country dummies (results available upon request).

Empty cells: parameters not estimated due to model specification.

Contextual-level variable.
Exp(β) = 0.949). Preferences even suppress in part the observed differences between social groups. Although men and manual workers are in general more likely to have migrant colleagues at work, they also have more negative preferences. Once we control for preferences, the initial differences between men and women, respectively between manual workers and routine non-manual employees become slightly larger (Model 1c; ∆β = 8.6% for men; ∆β = 6.7% for manual workers). The difference between people with medium and higher levels of education becomes smaller, once we take into account differences in preferences (Model 1c; ∆β = 6.7%).

The influence of third parties is included in Model 1d. We hardly found support for a direct positive influence of third parties on interethnic contact at work: only the level of education of the respondents’ father turned out to positively influence the odds to have intergroup contact at work, which was, however, only found for high levels of education (β = 0.150; Exp(β) = 1.161). The three different explanatory mechanisms do not affect each other; parameter estimates are not substantially different when all three mechanisms are included simultaneously (Model 1e).

Finally, we tested whether the positive effect of migrant stock at the regional level on the odds of interethnic contact at work, differs between social groups or under different regional conditions (Model 1f). We only found support for our expectations (3) that the positive effect of migrant stock on the odds of interethnic contact at work is stronger for lower educated people as compared to people with medium levels of education. Particularly for lower educated people, the presence of immigrants in their region translates, thus, into meeting opportunities and interethnic contact at work. We did not find such conditional effects for higher educated people, nor (in the expected direction) for other social groups.

### 6.5.2 Interethnic contact with friends

Social groups clearly differ in their likelihood to have interethnic contact with friends (Table 6.3; Model 2a). Age decreases the odds of having interethnic contact with friends (β = -0.128; Exp(β) = 0.880), which corroborates our expectation (hypothesis 4a). As we expected (4b), the odds for men to have interethnic contact with friends are about 16% larger compared to women (β = -0.176; Exp(β) = 0.839; for women). We also found support for our expectations that higher levels of educational attainment (4c), and living in more urbanised areas (4d) increase the odds of having interethnic contact with friends.

In Model 2b, we included our indicators of meeting opportunities in the baseline model. As expected, larger proportions of immigrants in European regions as well as higher levels of subjective perceptions of local immigrants increase the odds of interethnic contact with friends. The regional unemployment rate does marginally influence the odds of interethnic contact with friends. Note, that once we take into account all mediating mechanisms simultaneously, this influence was no longer significant (Model 2e), supporting our line of reasoning that this measure largely reflects meeting opportunities at the labour market.

Subsequently, we included preferences (Model 2c) and third party influences (Model 2d) to our model. Negative preferences decrease the odds of interethnic contact with friends (β = -0.115; Exp(β) = 0.881). The influence of third parties becomes clearly visible with regard to the respondents’ father. Father’s education is related to a higher probability to have interethnic contact with friends. Partner’s education does also positively affect interethnic friendship, though only for respondents with highly educated partners. Parameter estimates remain substantially similar when all three explanatory mechanisms are included simultaneously, except for the effects of unemployment rate and highly educated partners, which are no longer significant (Model 2e).

The impact of preferences as well as the third party mechanism on the odds to have interethnic contact is stronger with respect to friends than with respect to colleagues. For preferences, for instance, the parameter estimate is more than twice as large for interethnic friendship as compared to interethnic contact at work. These findings underline the difference between both dimensions of interethnic contact. As interethnic contact with friends is voluntary in nature, we expected preferences and third parties predominantly to influence this dimension of interethnic contact.

As we expected (5a), the effect of age on the odds of interethnic contact with friends becomes smaller once we take into account the role of meeting opportunities (Model 2b; ∆β = 3.1%), preferences (Model 2c; ∆β = 15.6%) and third parties (Model 2d; ∆β = 13.3%). Contradictory to our expectations (5b), meeting opportunities do not explain the difference between men and women in their likelihood of interethnic contact with friends. In contrast, the difference between men and women turned out to be suppressed by meeting opportunities as well as by preferences. In line with our expectations (5c), the positive effect of education on the odds of interethnic contact with friends becomes smaller once we consider the influence of preferences (Model 2c; ∆β = 18.8% for high levels of education) and third parties (Model 2d; ∆β = 34.3% for high levels of education). Introducing meeting opportunities to our baseline model, the influence of educational attainment (slightly) increases (for high levels of education). As we expected (5d), the influence of the level of urbanisation on the odds of interethnic contact with friends becomes smaller if we incorporate our measures of meeting opportunities in the model (Model 2b; ∆β > 34% for living in big cities or suburbs).

Summarizing, our results show that meeting opportunities, preferences and third parties clearly influence interethnic contact (particularly interethnic friendship). Moreover, our findings indicate that these explanatory mechanisms partly explain differences between social groups in their level of interethnic contact. Unfortunately, however, a formal test of this influence is not straightforward given the measurement level of our dependent and explanatory variables as well as the hierarchical structure of the data. Making an attempt to draw conclusions on the explanatory power of our
Table 6.3 Results: hierarchical logistic regression analyses – interethnic contact with friends – employed respondents (age 18-65)
\( (N_{\text{individual}} = 10,475; N_{\text{region}} = 126) \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 2a</th>
<th>Model 2b</th>
<th>Model 2c</th>
<th>Model 2d</th>
<th>Model 2e</th>
<th>Model 2f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( b )</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>( b )</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>( b )</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.081</td>
<td>-0.296</td>
<td>0.084 ***</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Individual-level variables

Educational level (ref. = educ. mid.)
- Educational level low: -0.206 0.059 *** -0.206 0.059 ***
- Educational level high: 0.303 0.056 *** 0.308 0.057 ***
- Educational level missing: 0.571 0.386

Age/10 (centered): -0.128 0.023 *** -0.124 0.023 ***

Females (ref. = males): -0.176 0.044 *** -0.187 0.044 ***

Social class (ref. = routine non-manuals)
- Manual workers: -0.135 0.059 * -0.136 0.060 *
- Service class: 0.259 0.059 *** 0.262 0.059 ***
- Social class missing: -0.031 0.126

Urbanisation (ref. = town or small city)
- Urbanisation – big city: 0.376 0.069 *** 0.248 0.069 ***
- Urbanisation – suburbs or outskirts of big city: 0.238 0.068 *** 0.157 0.068 *
- Urbanisation – country village: -0.121 0.055 * -0.049 0.056
- Urbanisation – farm or home in the countryside: -0.288 0.083 *** -0.140 0.084 *
- Urbanisation – urbanisation missing: -0.223 0.459 -0.221 0.460

*** significant at \( p < 0.001; ** \) significant at \( p < 0.01; * \) significant at \( p < 0.05 \) (one-sided test of significance).
Cities and empty cells: parameters not estimated due to model specification.
Empty cells: parameters not estimated due to model specification.
### Table 6.3 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mechanisms</th>
<th>Model 2a</th>
<th>Model 2b</th>
<th>Model 2c</th>
<th>Model 2d</th>
<th>Model 2e</th>
<th>Model 2f</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b S.E.</td>
<td>b S.E.</td>
<td>b S.E.</td>
<td>b S.E.</td>
<td>b S.E.</td>
<td>b S.E.</td>
<td>b S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity (objective) – Migrant stock region/100 (centered)</td>
<td>4.136 0.708 ***</td>
<td>3.913 0.718 ***</td>
<td>3.995 0.721 ***</td>
<td>3.913 0.718 ***</td>
<td>3.995 0.721 ***</td>
<td>3.995 0.721 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity (objective) – Unemployment rate region (centered)</td>
<td>-0.016 0.009 *</td>
<td>-0.014 0.010</td>
<td>-0.014 0.010</td>
<td>-0.014 0.010</td>
<td>-0.014 0.010</td>
<td>-0.014 0.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity – Subjective perception of local immigrants (ref.=almost nobody)</td>
<td>0.509 0.047 ***</td>
<td>0.479 0.047 ***</td>
<td>0.479 0.047 ***</td>
<td>0.479 0.047 ***</td>
<td>0.479 0.047 ***</td>
<td>0.479 0.047 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective perception – some ethnic minorities</td>
<td>0.449 0.088 ***</td>
<td>0.448 0.091 ***</td>
<td>0.446 0.091 ***</td>
<td>0.446 0.091 ***</td>
<td>0.446 0.091 ***</td>
<td>0.446 0.091 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjective perception – many ethnic minorities</td>
<td>0.087 0.227</td>
<td>0.063 0.231</td>
<td>0.061 0.231</td>
<td>0.061 0.231</td>
<td>0.061 0.231</td>
<td>0.061 0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferences – Social distance</td>
<td>-0.115 0.008 ***</td>
<td>-0.109 0.008 ***</td>
<td>-0.109 0.008 ***</td>
<td>-0.109 0.008 ***</td>
<td>-0.109 0.008 ***</td>
<td>-0.109 0.008 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third parties – Educational level father (ref.=low)</td>
<td>0.170 0.055 ***</td>
<td>0.173 0.056 ***</td>
<td>0.177 0.056 ***</td>
<td>0.177 0.056 ***</td>
<td>0.177 0.056 ***</td>
<td>0.177 0.056 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level father – middle</td>
<td>0.500 0.079 ***</td>
<td>0.482 0.080 ***</td>
<td>0.484 0.080 ***</td>
<td>0.484 0.080 ***</td>
<td>0.484 0.080 ***</td>
<td>0.484 0.080 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level father – high</td>
<td>-0.042 0.111</td>
<td>-0.020 0.113</td>
<td>-0.019 0.113</td>
<td>-0.019 0.113</td>
<td>-0.019 0.113</td>
<td>-0.019 0.113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third parties – Educational level partner (ref.=low)</td>
<td>-0.056 0.070</td>
<td>-0.055 0.071</td>
<td>-0.052 0.071</td>
<td>-0.052 0.071</td>
<td>-0.052 0.071</td>
<td>-0.052 0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level partner – middle</td>
<td>0.157 0.082 *</td>
<td>0.131 0.084</td>
<td>0.133 0.084</td>
<td>0.133 0.084</td>
<td>0.133 0.084</td>
<td>0.133 0.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level partner – high</td>
<td>-0.030 0.090</td>
<td>0.012 0.091</td>
<td>-0.007 0.091</td>
<td>-0.007 0.091</td>
<td>-0.007 0.091</td>
<td>-0.007 0.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level partner – no partner</td>
<td>-0.485 0.277 *</td>
<td>-0.499 0.283 *</td>
<td>-0.500 0.283 *</td>
<td>-0.500 0.283 *</td>
<td>-0.500 0.283 *</td>
<td>-0.500 0.283 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cross-level interactions

| Migrant stock region/100 * age/10 (centered) | -0.483 | 0.311 |


*** significant at p < 0.001; ** significant at p < 0.01; * significant at p < 0.05 (one-sided test of significance).

Models are controlled for religiosity, marital status as well as country dummies (results available upon request).

Empty cells: parameters not estimated due to model specification.

Contextual-level variable.
mechanisms and the substantiality of the differences in effect sizes of the socio-demo-
graphics in our analyses, we conducted a conservative test of significance. These 
analyses indicate that the differences found do not reach significance and should be 
interpreted carefully. As this is a rather conservative test we, additionally, considered 
the relative change of parameter estimates on interethnic contact. Although any cut-off 
value might be arbitrary, it is worth mentioning that in several cases the relative change 
in parameter estimates exceeds 10%. If we consider, for instance, the combined 
influence of preferences and third parties on interethnic contact with friends, the 
parameter estimate for higher educated people even decreases with 47.9% (compare 
Models 2a and 2e; Table 3), which can be regarded as a substantial decrease.

In the final model, we tested whether the positive effect of migrant stock at the 
regional level on the odds of interethnic contact with friends, differs across social 
groups (Model 2f). In our preliminary analyses (see Appendix 6.1), the effect of migrant 
stock on the likelihood to have intergroup contact with friends was only conditional on 
age. However, once we take into account our mediating mechanisms (Table 6.3; Model 
2f), this cross-level interaction effect was no longer significant. Contrary to what we 
expected (6), living in European regions with larger proportions of immigrants increases 
the odds to have intergroup friendship ties rather equally across social groups.

6.5.3 Robustness analyses
We conducted several additional analyses to test the robustness of our findings. First, 
we estimated our final models (1f/2f) distinguishing three hierarchical levels: individuals, 
regions and countries, reaching similar conclusions as compared to our models using 
fixed country-effects (results available upon request). Interestingly, the proportion of 
immigrants only affects interethnic contact at the regional level, not at the country level, 
if we include this predictor at both contextual levels simultaneously.

Second, we included interethnic contact at work as predictor for interethnic contact 
with friends (in line with Wagner et al. 2006), as we are aware of the fact that both 
dimensions of interethnic contact are positively related. As expected, interethnic 
contact with colleagues has a strong positive effect on the odds of interethnic contact 
with friends ($b = 1.001; \text{Exp}(b) = 2.721$; see Appendix 6.2). Differences between social 
categories with respect to interethnic friends are in part related to differences in the 
likelihood to have interethnic contact at work. The difference between, for instance, 
men and women in their likelihood to have interethnic contact with friends becomes 
slightly smaller once we take into account that women are less likely to have immigrant 
colleagues as compared to men.

Third, we tested for influential cases at the regional level, using the influence.ME 
package in R (Nieuwenhuis, Te Grotenhuis, & Pelzer, 2012). The direction of the effects 
remains stable, though some effects do no longer reach the boundary of significance, 
while other effects become significant at conventional levels (see Appendix 6.3).

6.6 Conclusions and discussion
Studies repeatedly indicated that for natives having contact with ethnic out-group 
members positively affects interethnic relations (e.g., Allport, 1954; Brown & Hewstone, 
2005; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). However, very few studies focused on the determinants 
of natives’ interethnic contact. Our aim was to shed more light on underlying 
determinants of interethnic contact of natives within a large number of European 
regions. We generalized Kalmijn’s (1998) ‘opportunities-preferences-third parties’ 
framework on interethnic marriages to shed more light on differences between social 
groups in their likelihood to have interethnic contact.

Unlike earlier studies, we distinguished interethnic contact with colleagues from 
interethnic contact with friends. Interethnic contact with friends is completely voluntary 
in nature, while this is less so for interethnic contact at work. Moreover, interethnic 
contact at work might be more superficial as compared to (more intimate) interethnic 
friendship contacts. The distinction between both dimensions of interethnic contact 
enabled us to test the theoretical framework more profoundly. We expected that 
interethnic contact at work would predominantly be influenced by meeting opportunities, 
whereas interethnic contact with friends would also be affected by people’s preferences 
and third parties. Overall, our findings support this proposition. However, the picture is 
more nuanced than we initially expected.

We found clear differences between social groups in their level of interethnic 
contact. Men and higher educated people are more likely to have interethnic contact 
with friends and colleagues, as compared to women and lower educated people. 
Other determinants turned out to influence both dimensions of interethnic contact 
differently. Manual workers are more likely to have interethnic contact at work, whereas 
they are less likely to have interethnic contact with friends. Age decreases the likelihood 
of having interethnic contact with friends, whereas it hardly influences interethnic 
contact at work. These findings are largely in line with earlier, more exploratory research 
(Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011), and underline the importance of distinguishing 
both types of interethnic contact. Studies only focusing on one dimension or combining 
different dimensions of interethnic contact in one measure (e.g., Martinovic, 2013; 
Savelkoul, Gesthuizen, et al., 2011; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schlueter & Wagner, 
2008; Semyonov & Glikman, 2009) have not been able to detect these nuances.

We included several measures of meeting opportunities, preferences and third 
parties, to test whether these mechanisms affect interethnic contact and can explain 
why social groups differ in their level of interethnic contact. In line with our expectations, 
we found strong support for the importance of meeting opportunities. Living in regions 
with larger proportions of immigrants increases the odds of interethnic contact at work 
and with friends. The same holds for people’s subjective perception of the presence of 
local immigrants in their direct living environment. Higher unemployment rates in
regions most strongly decrease the odds of interethnic contact at work, once again underlining the importance of distinguishing both dimensions of interethnic contact. Unemployment rates hit ethnic minorities harder than natives (Haug et al., 2002; Münz, 2007) which drives down natives’ possibilities to have immigrant colleagues at work.

As expected, preferences and third parties predominantly influence people’s likelihood to have interethnic contact with friends. The nature of these relationships should, however, be dealt with carefully. There is a heated debate whether interethnic contact predominantly reduces prejudice or prejudice induces avoidance of interethnic contacts (Binder et al., 2009; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Brown, Eller, Leeds, & Stace, 2007). So far, empirical evidence revealed that these relationships are likely to run in both directions. Future research should preferably use panel data to disentangle these and other relationships addressed in this study more profoundly.

Our results show that people who hold more positive preferences are more likely to have interethnic contact with both friends and colleagues. Although the influence is stronger for interethnic friendship, apparently, ‘soft’ explanations like preferences, do also affect the odds of interethnic contact at work. This indicates that people also have options to choose whether they want to work in an environment with few or many immigrant colleagues.

Taking into account the influence of meeting opportunities only substantially explains differences in interethnic friendship between people living in more rural, respectively urbanised areas. Considering the impact of preferences and third parties reveals an interesting picture. Once we took into account the role of both explanatory mechanisms, differences between, for instance, younger and older residents, or between higher and lower educated people in their likelihood to have interethnic contact with friends, became slightly smaller. The difference between men and women regarding interethnic contact with friends and colleagues, turned out to be suppressed by preferences. Once we took into account people’s preferences, women were even less likely to have interethnic contact as compared to men. A similar pattern was found for manual workers. Once we controlled for preferences, manual workers became even more likely to have interethnic contact at work as compared to routine non-manual workers. Interestingly, if manual workers are completely free to choose their contacts – which is the case with interethnic contact with friends – they are less likely to have interethnic contact as compared to routine non-manual workers. This is (partly) related to their negative preferences. Although, taking into account the role of our explanatory mechanisms influenced the differences between social groups substantially in some cases (in terms of the relative change of parameter estimates), using a conservative test of significance showed that these differences do not reach the boundary of significance. While meeting opportunities, preferences and third parties clearly have a direct influence on interethnic contact, their explanatory power might be limited, meaning that differences between parameter estimates should be interpreted carefully.

To better explain differences between social groups in their level of interethnic contact, future survey research should include more precise measures, for instance, of third party influences and meeting opportunities. With regard to the influence of third parties, measures referring to norms within people’s relevant network (also including friends) should ideally be considered. However, even with our suboptimal measures of third party influences (reflecting an underestimation of these effects), we found support for a direct influence on the likelihood to have interethnic contact with friends. Future research should use more precise measures of prevalent norms within people’s network to improve our understanding of differences between social groups. Moreover, more specific indicators of meeting opportunities in different domains of social life are needed. Our measures mainly tap into general meeting opportunities in people’s living environment. Future research could, for instance, include measures of meeting opportunities during leisure activities or in specific sectors of the labour market, related to the facilitating conditions derived from classic insights (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), in order to better explain differences between social groups.

Our measures of both dimensions of interethnic contact differ substantially. Whereas interethnic contact with friends reflects actual and more intimate contact (more likely to meet Allport’s (1954) optimal contact conditions), having immigrant colleagues might partly reflect meeting opportunities at work and, thus, more superficial contact. Previous research has shown, however, that even superficial contact at work can reduce out-group derogation (Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011) and is positively related with associational involvement (Savelkoul et al., 2013). Interethnic contact at work might also reflect actual contact, as both dimensions of interethnic contact turned out to be positively related (in line with Wagner et al., 2006). Taking into account whether people have interethnic contact at work reduces differences between social groups regarding their likelihood to have interethnic contact with friends. Manual workers, for instance, become even less likely to have interethnic contact with friends once we consider that they are more likely to have interethnic contact at work.

Future research could use more precise measures of interethnic contact, rather than measures referring to immigrants in general. Future studies should preferably use more fine-grained measures referring to different groups of immigrants to further test the underlying explanations. However, as such detailed measures are not available for cross-national research, and if available, would be incomparable across countries, focusing on interethnic contact with different groups of immigrants within single countries could be a fruitful direction for future research.

Our results clearly illustrate that people’s likelihood to have interethnic contact is also influenced by contextual-level factors. In line with earlier studies (e.g., Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Sigelman et al., 1996; Wagner et al., 2006), we found support for Pettigrew’s (2008) first selection process: larger proportions of immigrants in European regions increase people’s likelihood to have interethnic contact, both with friends and
at work. Surprisingly, this effect holds rather similarly for different social groups and under different circumstances. Although social groups largely differ in their likelihood to have interethnic contact, they ‘profit’ rather equally in terms of increased interethnic contact if objective meeting opportunities rise in their region.

Given the positive consequences of interethnic contact for both natives and minorities (e.g., Alport, 1954; Lin, 1999; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), policymakers can build on these findings by stimulating meeting opportunities, in terms of ethnically mixed neighbourhoods, schools but also workplaces. Our findings show that with increased objective meeting opportunities, people rather evenly become more likely to have interethnic contact, both with friends and colleagues. Although we acknowledge that practicalities may hinder the implementation of such policy, stimulating ethnically mixed workplaces might be a fruitful direction, as interethnic contact with colleagues not only directly reduces out-group derogation (Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011), but also indirectly via interethnic friendship (Wagner et al., 2006). Therefore, focusing on anti-discrimination policies at the labour market to encourage labour market participation for immigrants and their descendants as well as permitting asylum seekers to enter the labour market might both increase ethnic minorities’ economic independence, as well as natives’ interethnic tolerance.

Summarizing, our findings not only reveal clear differences between social groups in their likelihood to have interethnic contact, they also underline the importance to distinguish interethnic contact at work from interethnic contact with friends. Although this study clearly stresses the importance of meeting opportunities, preferences and third parties, all influencing people’s likelihood to have interethnic contact, the explanatory role of these mechanisms deserves more attention in future research.

6.7 Notes

1 For interethnic contact with colleagues this relationship might be less straightforward, as people may work and live in different areas.

2 For Denmark we decided to use the 2007 NUTS-2 classification, as the NUTS-2 level was introduced in 2007 simultaneously with a restructuring of the NUTS-3 levels (for more information, see paragraph 2.3.1; Chapter 2).

3 Our migrant stock measure was constructed by subtracting the proportion of natives (born in country and citizenship of country) from the total population. Unfortunately, data regarding second or third generation immigrants are – to the best of our knowledge – not available for all regions in our analyses. In that sense, our migrant stock measure refers strictly to the immigrant population (both from Western and non-Western descent) and might (to some extent) underestimate the total share of ethnic minorities. As such, our analyses reflect a conservative test of the impact of objective meeting opportunities.

4 The respondents’ assessment of the ethnic composition of their living environment might be influenced by their attitudes toward ethnic minorities. By explicitly controlling for the respondents’ preferences in our final models, we suppose that such influences can be largely ruled out.

5 The causal order between interethnic attitudes and interethnic contact is not undisputed (see e.g., Binder et al., 2009; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Brown et al., 2007). We will come back to this in the discussion.

6 As data on the educational level of the respondents’ father and partner was not available for Sweden due to harmonization problems, Swedish respondents were included in an additional category.

7 For testing our interaction hypotheses with migrant stock, we conducted separate hierarchical logistic regression analyses, including the different (cross-level) interaction terms one by one (Appendix 6.1). The presented estimated interaction terms may be interpreted as ‘interaction effects’ on the logit. Interaction effects on the probability are conditional on the covariates. One therefore has to be cautious while interpreting the estimates of interaction terms in logistic regression models (Ai & Norton, 2003). Hence, we estimated the interaction effect on the probability for all observations in our data as well, but reached substantially similar conclusions.

To keep our models as parsimonious as possible, we decided only to include significant cross-level interaction terms in our final model. Note, in the final model, the relevant socio-demographic variables are modelled as both fixed effects and random effects (i.e., random slopes). We did not allow for any covariance components.

8 For testing whether parameter estimates in two models (with and without considering specific explanatory mechanisms) differ significantly, we conducted a conservative test of significance. This test is based on an estimation of the highest possible value of the standard error (s.e.\textsubscript{max}) of the difference between two parameter estimates, with s.e.\textsubscript{max} = √(var(b1) + var(b2) + 2 * s.e.1 * s.e.2). Here, b1 and b2 refer to the parameter estimate of a specific predictor in model 1, respectively model 2, whereas s.e.1 and s.e.2 refer to the corresponding standard errors. Consequently, the corresponding t-value will be estimated conservatively, using the following formula: t = (b1 - b2) / s.e.\textsubscript{max}. As a formal test of significance in a multi-level logistic regression model is not straightforward, we will use this conservative test to draw conclusions on significance.

9 We excluded all regions for which the Cook’s distance exceeded the cut-off value (4/n) and repeated this procedure once for each model (1f and 2f).
Chapter 7

Conclusions and discussion
7.1 Introduction

Increasing ethnic diversity and its expected future rise in many Western countries (Cornelius & Rosenblum, 2005; Hooghe et al., 2008; OECD, 2013), have made scholars and politicians ever more interested in the consequences for social cohesion (e.g., Cheong et al., 2007; Hallberg & Lund, 2005; Laurence & Heath, 2008; Portes & Vickstrom, 2011; Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014). In particular Putnam’s (2007) seminal study attracted much attention, as he stressed that – at least in the short run – ethnic diversity would generally undermine social cohesion. According to Putnam (2007), this pattern would be very consistent: living in ethnically diverse environments would affect both attitudes and behaviours and would drive down informal and formal social capital, both with one’s ethnic in-group members (i.e., bonding) and with ethnic out-group members (i.e., bridging).

In recent years, a large body of research emerged, addressing the consequences of ethnic diversity in a large number of different contexts, on a broad range of indicators of social cohesion. Two recent reviews of the literature show that the relationship between ethnic diversity and social capital is far from consistently negative (Portes & Vickstrom, 2011; Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014), raising doubts about the pervasiveness of Putnam’s pessimistic predictions. In this study, our aim was to build on earlier research in four important ways.

First, we considered the influence of ethnic diversity on more specific, substantially comparable, behavioural indicators of social capital. In line with Pichler and Wallace (2007), we made a distinction between formal and informal social capital. We argued, however, that even within these broad categories, several subdimensions can be distinguished, which might be affected differently by ethnic diversity. Therefore, we considered whether living in ethnically diverse environments affects informal meeting and helping, as well as (active and passive) involvement in leisure, interest and activist organizations. In two empirical chapters, we also took into account the ethnic composition of voluntary organizations, differentiating between involvement in bonding and bridging organizations.

Second, unlike previous studies, we focused on underlying explanations for a relationship between ethnic diversity and social capital. In their review of the literature, Van der Meer and Tolsma (2014) conclude that it remains largely unclear how ethnic diversity affects social capital. We used two intergroup theories, i.e., conflict theory (Blalock, 1967; Bobo, 1999; Cox, 1956; Scheepers et al., 2002) and contact theory (Allport, 1954; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Hewstone, 2009; Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), to derive and empirically test hypotheses on underlying explanations, i.e., indirect relationships between ethnic diversity and formal and informal social capital.

Third, we considered the influence of ethnic diversity on social capital at different contextual levels in a large number of Western countries and – unlike earlier cross-national studies – distinguished the regional level, next to the country level. In this way,
we were able to take into account differences in ethnic diversity and social capital within very different countries simultaneously.

Fourth, we paid specific attention to interethic informal social capital, or interethnic contact. As we have seen throughout this book, interethnic contact plays a crucial role for linking ethnic diversity to formal and informal social capital. However, as compared to general indicators of formal and informal social capital, relatively less is known about whether and why people differ in their level of interethnic contact. In this study, we built on earlier research on interethnic contact by explicitly addressing and explaining differences between social groups in their level of interethnic contact. Moreover, we tested whether the influence of ethnic diversity on interethnic contact holds equally for different social groups and under different societal conditions, as often implicitly assumed, however, not tested empirically.

To test our hypotheses, we used individual-level data derived from several high quality data sources. For the cross-national studies focusing on the European context (Chapters 2, 5 and 6), data from the first wave of the European Social Survey (ESS; 2002/2003) were used. For the study on the U.S. (Chapter 3), we used data derived from the Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy survey (CID; 2005), whereas for the study on the Netherlands (Chapter 4), data from the Netherlands Longitudinal Life course Study (NELLS; 2010) were used. These data were complemented with official information on the relevant contextual unit(s) of interest, derived from national or European statistical offices.

In the remainder of this chapter, we draw conclusions based on the findings presented in the empirical chapters. First, in paragraph 7.2, we will address the first overarching research question, regarding the relationship between ethnic diversity and social capital. We will summarize the main findings of each chapter separately and draw conclusions on the scientific implications of our findings. In paragraph 7.3, we will summarize the main findings of our final empirical chapter and give an answer to the second overarching research question related to interethnic informal social capital. In paragraph 7.4, we will discuss some limitations of our approach and will mention several directions for future research. Finally, we will briefly address the societal implications of our findings in paragraph 7.5.

### 7.2 Ethnic diversity and social capital

The first overarching research question of this book is related to the direct and indirect relationships between ethnic diversity and social capital, and reads:

**RQ I:** (a) To what extent does ethnic diversity (at different contextual levels) within Western countries affect natives’ level of formal and informal social capital, and (b) how can relationships between ethnic diversity and formal and informal social capital be explained by mechanisms derived from conflict and contact theory?

Before we will answer this overarching research question, we will first briefly summarize the findings of the first four empirical chapters. These chapters addressed the relationship between ethnic diversity in different sites on different indicators of formal and informal social capital. In all chapters, we focused on underlying explanations derived from two intergroup theories. Whereas conflict theory (e.g., Blalock, 1967; Bobo, 1999; Coser, 1956; Scheepers et al., 2002) stresses the importance of perceptions of ethnic threat, contact theory (e.g., Allport, 1954; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew, 1998; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) points at the role of interethnic contact. Figure 7.1 shows the conceptual framework, which is central in these empirical chapters.

![Conceptual framework](image)

**Figure 7.1** Conceptual framework: (in-)direct relationship between ethnic diversity and (in-)formal social capital

#### 7.2.1 Chapter 2: Ethnic diversity and formal social capital in Europe

In the first chapter of Part A, we focused on the relationship between ethnic diversity and formal social capital in European countries and regions. We differentiated between involvement in three types of voluntary organizations: leisure, interest and activist organizations (cf. Van der Meer et al., 2009) and considered both active and passive involvement. In this chapter, we addressed the following research questions:

**RQ 2.1** To what extent does ethnic diversity within (a) European countries, and (b) regions across European countries affect involvement in leisure, interest and activist organizations?
RQ 2.2 To what extent can these relationships be explained by mechanisms derived from conflict and contact theory?

Focusing on the relationship between ethnic diversity and formal social capital, without considering the influence of interethnic contact and perceptions of ethnic threat, findings for the European context lent only limited support for a negative effect of ethnic diversity on associational involvement, as proposed by constrict theory (Putnam, 2007). Whereas the ethnic composition of European countries was unrelated with involvement in different types of voluntary organizations, living in ethnically more heterogeneous European regions only decreased the odds of active and passive involvement in interest organizations. Simultaneously, people living in regions with more ethnic minorities from non-Western descent were more, rather than less, likely to be passively involved in activist organizations.

Although there was only limited support for a negative relationship between ethnic diversity and associational involvement, once we took into account the role of interethnic contact and perceived ethnic threat, our findings revealed very consistent indirect relationships. Living in ethnically more diverse regions increased interethnic contact, which, in turn, was positively related with the odds of active and passive involvement in leisure, interest and activist organizations. While ethnic diversity did not affect perceptions of ethnic threat, neither at the country, nor at the regional level, people perceiving more ethnic threat were less likely to be involved (actively and passively) in leisure, interest and activist organizations. Interethnic contact and perceptions of ethnic threat were, moreover, negatively related. However, the relationship between ethnic diversity and associational involvement hardly changed, once we took into account the role of interethnic contact and perceived ethnic threat.

7.2.2 Chapter 3: Ethnic diversity and bonding and bridging formal social capital in the U.S.

In the second chapter of Part A, we focused on the consequences of living in ethnically more heterogeneous neighbourhoods on associational involvement in the United States. In line with the previous chapter, we distinguished involvement in three types of voluntary organizations, i.e., leisure, interest and activist organizations. Additionally, we took into account the ethnic composition of these organizations, enabling us to differentiate between involvement in bonding (with in-group members) and bridging (with out-group members) organizations. We addressed the following research questions:

RQ 3.1 To what extent does ethnic diversity within U.S. neighbourhoods affect involvement in bonding, respectively bridging leisure, interest and activist organizations?

RQ 3.2 To what extent can these relationships be explained by mechanisms derived from conflict and contact theory?

We found no support for a direct negative relationship between living in ethnically more diverse U.S. neighbourhoods and associational involvement. This holds for the different types of voluntary organizations (i.e., leisure, interest and activist organizations) as well as for involvement in both bonding and bridging organizations. Only for the odds of involvement in bridging interest organizations, living in neighbourhoods with a larger percentage of non-Whites had a positive, rather than negative, influence.

As was the case for Europe, after we took into account the role of intergroup contact and perceived ethnic threat, we did find, however, support for an indirect relationship between ethnic diversity and associational involvement in U.S. neighbourhoods. Living in ethnically more diverse U.S. neighbourhoods increased intergroup contact, which was negatively related with the odds of involvement in bonding leisure organizations. Although a larger percentage of ethnic out-group members in people’s neighbourhood did not foster perceptions of ethnic threat, perceiving ethnic threat consistently reduced the odds of involvement in bridging voluntary organizations. This pattern was very consistent for leisure, interest and activist organizations. In line with our European findings, interethnic contact was, moreover, negatively related with perceptions of ethnic threat. Taking into account both explanatory mechanisms, the positive relationship between ethnic diversity and the odds of involvement in bridging interest organizations no longer reached significance.

7.2.3 Chapter 4: Ethnic diversity and bonding and bridging formal social capital in the Netherlands

In the third chapter of Part A, we addressed the relationship between ethnic diversity and formal social capital in the Netherlands. Similar to the previous chapter, we considered involvement in bonding and bridging, leisure, interest and activist organizations. However, in this chapter we focused on ethnic diversity at the neighbourhood and municipality level, to address the following research questions:

RQ 4.1 To what extent does ethnic diversity within Dutch (a) neighbourhoods and (b) municipalities affect involvement in bonding, respectively bridging leisure, interest and activist organizations?

RQ 4.2 To what extent can these relationships be explained by mechanisms derived from conflict and contact theory?

Not taking into account any influences of perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact, we found only limited support for a general direct negative influence of living in ethnically heterogeneous Dutch neighbourhoods and municipalities on associational involvement. Only at the municipality level, ethnic diversity decreased the odds of involvement in bonding leisure organizations. We did not find a negative relationship between ethnic diversity and involvement in bridging leisure organizations. For interest organizations, we only found an influence of ethnic diversity at the neighbourhood level. Living in ethnically more diverse neighbourhoods decreased the odds of
involvement in bonding interest organizations, while we did not find an influence on involvement in bridging interest organizations. Our findings indicated, though, that the effect of ethnic diversity was only substantial for involvement in leisure organizations.

In line with both previous chapters of Part A, we also considered indirect relationships, taking into account the role of interethnic contact and perceived ethnic threat. Contradictory to our expectations, we found a negative, rather than positive relationship between ethnic diversity and perceptions of ethnic threat. In line with our findings in the U.S., perceiving ethnic threat decreased the odds of involvement in bridging interest and activist organizations. Note, that we did not find support for the detrimental impact of ethnic threat perceptions for leisure organizations. Additionally, for the Netherlands, we found that perceiving ethnic threat decreased the odds to be involved in bonding activist organizations.

Living in ethnically more diverse municipalities increased the likelihood to have interethnic contact, which, in turn, was only negatively related with the odds of involvement in bonding leisure organizations. This corresponds with the findings from the previous chapter. While interethnic contact and perceptions of ethnic threat were negatively related (in line with our European and American studies), taking into account both explanatory mechanism hardly influenced the relationship between ethnic diversity and associational involvement.

7.2.4 Chapter 5: Ethnic diversity and informal social capital in Europe
In the first chapter of Part B, we addressed the relationship between ethnic diversity and informal social capital and differentiated between informal meeting and informal helping. Similar to the first chapter of Part A, we focused on ethnic diversity in European countries and regions, to address the following research questions:

RQ 5.1 To what extent does ethnic diversity within (a) European countries, and (b) regions across European countries affect informal social capital?

RQ 5.2 To what extent can these relationships be explained by mechanisms derived from conflict and contact theory?

As was the case for formal social capital in Europe, we hardly found any significant positive or negative relationships between ethnic diversity in European countries and regions and informal social capital. Only at the country level, we found a positive, rather than negative, relationship between ethnic diversity and informal helping. We did not find a similar effect on informal meeting, nor did we find an influence on informal meeting and helping at the regional level.

Once again, we did find, however, support for indirect relationships between ethnic diversity and informal social capital. Living in regions with a larger percentage of ethnic minorities from non-Western descent increased interethnic contact, which, in turn, was positively related with informal meeting and informal helping. Although living in ethnically more heterogeneous countries or regions did not foster perceptions of ethnic threat, we found a negative relationship between perceiving ethnic threat and meeting informally. Those people who perceived more ethnic threat, met others less often informally. The negative influence did not pertain to stronger informal ties, in terms of informal helping.

Just like in all previous chapters, we found a negative relationship between interethnic contact and perceptions of ethnic threat. The relationship between ethnic diversity at the country level and informal helping hardly changed, once we took into account both explanatory mechanisms.

7.2.5 Answer to first overarching research question and scientific implications
Based on the findings of our consecutive empirical chapters, we will formulate an answer to the first overarching research question of this book and will draw general conclusions on the scientific implications of our findings.

Relationship between ethnic diversity and (in-)formal social capital

First, we will discuss the relationship between the ethnic composition of people’s living environment and their level of formal and informal social capital, without considering the role of perceptions of ethnic threat and interethnic contact. The corresponding overarching research question reads:

RQ t: (a) To what extent does ethnic diversity (at different contextual levels) within Western countries affect natives’ level of formal and informal social capital?

In this study, we considered the influence of ethnic diversity at different contextual levels in different geographical areas on more specific, substantially comparable, behavioural indicators of formal and informal social capital. The main findings are summarized in Table 7.1. Overall, ethnic diversity affects formal and informal social capital only in rather specific contexts. For the majority of the relationships we considered, ethnic diversity is not (significantly) related with social capital. If we found a relationship between ethnic diversity and social capital, this was far from consistently negative. For each negative relationship we revealed, we found another positive relationship (cf. Portes & Vicktrom, 2011; Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014). Our findings raise, thus, further doubts about the generalizability of Putnam’s claim.

Our aim was to build on previous research by using more specific behavioural measures of social capital. The choice to focus exclusively on behavioural indicators of social capital might explain why we hardly found any influences of ethnic diversity. In their review of studies, Van der Meer and Tolsma (2014) conclude that (negative) influences of ethnic diversity might be most likely to be found for attitudinal indicators of social cohesion rather than for behavioural indicators (see also: Hooghe, 2007). Nevertheless, ethnic diversity turned out to affect several subdimensions of social
capital, as shown in Table 7.1. We conclude that, although a more fine-grained distinction between subdimensions of formal and informal social capital is conceptually and empirically relevant, the puzzle becomes more complex, as no consistent pattern was revealed. Even though we hardly found any significant relationships between ethnic diversity and social capital, for those relationships that we did find, the direction of these effects differed largely across the subdimensions of social capital. Using general indicators of formal and informal social capital would not have enabled us to disentangle such differentiated effects.

Underlying explanations for these contradictory findings still remain to be further explored. For informal social capital, we only found a positive effect of ethnic diversity at the country level on informal helping, which is in line with earlier findings using different data on a larger number of countries (Gesthuizen et al., 2009). Future research could further unravel why this influence only holds for informal helping and not for informal meeting. For formal social capital, we found contradictory influences of ethnic diversity on involvement in diverse types of voluntary organizations. In Chapter 2, we proposed that people who feel less comfortable due to the ethnic composition of their living environment, might predominantly avoid situations with face-to-face contacts, where they risk becoming confronted with ethnic out-group members. We expected that this would predominantly hold for active modes of involvement, as well as for involvement in organizations which are characterized by active modes of participation (i.e., predominantly leisure, but also interest organizations). Our results showed, however, that ethnic diversity in European regions was only negatively related with involvement in interest (and not leisure) organizations, while this effect holds for both active and passive involvement. In Chapter 2, we eventually argued that ethnic diversity might decrease involvement in organizations with active modes of involvement, only if these organizations promote goals which are more remote from people’s basic needs. As people might attach more importance to socializing and recreating, this might explain why involvement in leisure organizations was not affected by ethnic diversity. Further disentangling the role of self-interest as well as the value people attach to different goals of organizations might be an important direction for future research. It remains, moreover, to be further explored why people living in ethnically more diverse European regions are more, rather than less, likely to be involved in activist organizations.

In both national studies on the U.S. and the Netherlands, we additionally differentiated between involvement in bonding (with in-group members) and bridging (with out-group members) organizations, which enables a more strict test of Putnam’s constrict theory. If constrict theory holds, one would expect ethnic diversity to erode involvement in both bonding and bridging associations. Remarkably, this distinction has been largely neglected so far with regard to behavioural indicators of social capital. Only very recently, Huijts, Stuiter, et al. (2014) and Huijts, Kraaykamp, et al., (2014) considered the influence of ethnic diversity in Dutch municipalities and neighbourhoods.
on bonding and bridging informal social capital. In our studies on the U.S. and the Netherlands, we did not find a general negative influence of ethnic diversity, as proposed by Putnam. Only in the Netherlands, ethnic diversity reduced involvement (only) in bonding organizations. In Chapter 4, we argued that this might point at a supply-side effect, meaning that in ethnically more heterogeneous neighbourhoods or municipalities, less bonding voluntary organizations might be available. We will come back to this in paragraph 7.4, where we will address some limitations of this study and directions for future research.

Next to the use of more specific indicators of social capital, we also considered the influence of ethnic diversity in different geographical areas, at different contextual levels. However, our results revealed no clear pattern in this respect. Our findings on the U.S. do not underline conclusions from scholars stressing that a negative influence of ethnic diversity can be found predominantly in the U.S. and less in European countries, i.e., ‘American exceptionalism’ (Hagendoorn, 2009; Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014, p. 23). Moreover, those relationships between ethnic diversity and social capital that we did find, are not related to one specific contextual level. We found partial support for the relevance of the regional level, which is in line with conclusions from a recent review of the literature (Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014). Unlike earlier cross-national studies on formal and informal social capital (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2009; Keslier & Bloemraad, 2010), we considered the regional level, next to the country level. Regional-level ethnic diversity turned out to affect only formal social capital. However, also at all other contextual levels we considered (ranging from neighbourhoods to countries), we found some effects of ethnic diversity. As such, our findings do not underscore the line of reasoning in previous studies, arguing that relatively small units of analyses (like the neighbourhood) would be most relevant for influencing people’s attitudes and behaviour, as these would better cover people’s actual interaction settings as compared to more remote levels of analysis, like the country or state level (e.g., Stolle et al., 2008; Tolsma et al., 2009). In both national studies on the U.S. and the Netherlands, we did find an influence of neighbourhood ethnic diversity on associational involvement, however, only for interest organizations. These organizations referred to, among others, neighbourhood or tenants organizations, directly connected to the neighbourhood. Neighbourhood ethnic diversity might, thus, predominantly affect indicators of social capital, directly connected to the neighbourhood (cf. Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014).

The role of perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact

So far, we only discussed the direct relationship between the ethnic composition of people’s living environment and their level of formal and informal social capital, leaving unaddressed how ethnic diversity affects social capital, i.e., possible indirect relationships. To shed more light on these indirect relationships, we tested hypotheses derived from two intergroup theories, i.e., conflict theory and contact theory, stressing the importance of perceived ethnic threat, respectively interethnic contact. Both theories put forward contradictory expectations regarding the influence of ethnic diversity on social capital. Not taking into account the influence of ethnic threat perceptions and interethnic contact, one could risk that both explanatory mechanisms cancel each other out, resulting in an overall absence of an influence of ethnic diversity. The role of interethnic contact and perceptions of ethnic threat is addressed in the second part of our first overarching research question, reading:

RQ I:  (b) How can relationships between ethnic diversity and formal and informal social capital be explained by mechanisms derived from conflict and contact theory?

Our results clearly indicate that interethnic contact is most important in this respect. As shown in Table 7.2, and supporting a crucial part of our expectations regarding the role of interethnic contact (cf. Wagner et al., 2006; Pettigrew, 2008), living in ethnically more diverse environments – either European regions, U.S. neighbourhoods or Dutch municipalities – consistently increased people’s likelihood to have interethnic contact. This is in line with previous studies (e.g., Martinovic, 2013; Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Sigelman et al., 1996; Wagner et al., 2006) and corresponds with the idea that the propinquity of immigrants in people’s surrounding can be regarded as a precondition for interethnic contact (e.g., Blau, 1977; Pettigrew, 2008): only if ethnic minorities are present in their living environment, people can (choose to) have actual interethnic contact.

Living in ethnically more heterogeneous environments did not induce people’s level of perceived ethnic threat, neither in Europe, nor in the U.S. (see Table 7.2). Only in the Netherlands, people living in ethnically more heterogeneous municipalities...
perceive less, rather than more, ethnic threat. In Chapter 4, we argued that this might be caused by a familiarisation effect (cf. Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schneider, 2008), boiling down to the idea that people get familiarised with the presence of ethnic minorities in their living environments and, thus, perceive less ethnic threat if the proportion of ethnic minorities is larger. As this familiarisation effect might also be reflected in a positive curvilinear relationship between ethnic diversity and perceptions of ethnic threat (see e.g., Schneider, 2008), this could, theoretically, explain the absence of a direct relationship in our European and American studies. Additional analyses did not, however, provide support for a curvilinear effect of ethnic diversity.

Our findings refute an important part of conflict theory (Blalock, 1967; Bobo, 1999; Scheepers et al., 2002). Obviously, living in ethnically more diverse environments does not generally induce actual competition between the ethnic majority and ethnic minority groups over scarce resources and cultural values, which would be reflected in higher levels of perceived ethnic threat among the majority. It might be the case, though, that ethnic diversity fosters perceptions of ethnic threat, only for some social groups or under some societal conditions. Although Hjerm (2007) and Schneider (2008) did not find support for conditional effects of ethnic diversity, Quillian (1995) showed that ethnic diversity induces perceptions of ethnic threat predominantly for lower educated people.

Hjerm and Nagayoshi (2011) further unravelled the conditional influences of ethnic diversity, stressing the importance of considering the composition of the immigrant population: a large share of manual workers among the immigrant population increases perceptions of ethnic threat predominantly among natives belonging to the working class.

Although we did not find a clear relationship between ethnic diversity and perceptions of ethnic threat, perceiving ethnic threat rather consistently reduces formal and informal social capital (see Table 7.3). Our cross-national European studies showed that people who perceive more ethnic threat, meet others less often informally, and are generally less likely involved in leisure, interest and activist organizations. Only for informal helping, we did not find support for a negative influence of ethnic threat perceptions. In Chapter 5, we argued that this might be explained by the fact that providing informal help reflects rather strong ties which presupposes informal meeting. As formal social capital might pertain to less strong ties, this could explain the very consistent negative relationship between perceived ethnic threat and associational involvement. In both national studies on associational involvement in the U.S. (Chapter 3) and the Netherlands (Chapter 4), we also distinguished whether people are involved in bonding (with in-group members) or bridging (including also out-group members) organizations. Ethnic threat perceptions were (predominantly) negatively related with involvement in bridging organizations. This is in line with a central part of conflict theory (e.g., Bobo, 1999; Coser, 1956; Scheepers et al., 2002): those people who perceive the presence of ethnic minorities as a threat, will hold less favourable attitudes toward them and will, moreover, avoid them in bridging voluntary associations.
However, based on conflict theory (i.e., ethnic competition theory; see: Coenders, Gijsberts, Hagendoorn, et al., 2004; Scheepers et al., 2002), we expected that perceiving ethnic threat would, simultaneously, induce in-group solidarity. In other words, people who display higher levels of ethnic threat perceptions, are expected to be more likely to be involved in bonding organizations, in which they are surrounded by ethnic in-group members. Here, conflict theory predicts different outcomes as compared to construct theory. Whereas construct theory proposes that ethnic diversity induces people to ‘hunker down’, meaning less involvement in bonding and bridging organizations, conflict theory predicts more involvement in bonding organizations, i.e., ‘hunkering with us’. As is shown in Table 7.3, our findings lend no support for this latter part of conflict theory: perceiving ethnic threat does not significantly influence involvement in bonding organizations, neither negative, nor positive.3

The importance of interethnic contact becomes clearer if we consider the relationship between interethnic contact and (in-)formal social capital (see Table 7.3). In our European studies, we found very consistent positive relationships between interethnic contact and all indicators of informal and formal social capital. People who have more interethnic contact, informally meet and help others more often and are generally more likely to be involved in voluntary organizations, either actively or passively, irrespective of the type of organization. The underlying explanations for these consistent positive relationships might, however, vary across the different indicators of social capital in our study. We argued that having interethnic contact might confront people with different role models and values concerning how to interact with their social network or how to spend their leisure time. With regard to associational involvement, also information and recruitment might play a role (Wilson, 2000). People with (more) interethnic contact might be more likely to become informed about the existence of, or recruited into, different voluntary organizations, as compared to people lacking interethnic contact. Above and beyond, interethnic contact might reduce anxiety and increase empathy (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008): having interethnic contact might make people less anxious to become confronted with ethnic minorities in voluntary organizations, while making people more aware of general problems and consequently more likely to become involved in organizations addressing such problems (e.g., activist organizations).

Considering involvement in bonding and bridging voluntary organizations in the U.S. and the Netherlands (Chapter 3 and 4), we found very consistent influences of interethnic contact: having intergroup contact only decreased people’s likelihood to be involved in bonding leisure organizations. We found no influence of interethnic contact (neither negative, nor positive) on involvement in bridging organizations, nor on involvement in bonding interest and activist organizations. Although our finding might be related to Pettigrew’s (1998) argument of deprovincialisation – meaning that interethnic contact induces a reassessment of one’s own ethnic group and, consequently, reduces one’s focus on involvement in bonding associations – in Chapter 3 and 4, we argued that also the recruitment argument might play a role (Wilson, 2000). Although interethnic and intra-ethnic contact are not completely mutually exclusive, due to time restrictions, however, people with more interethnic contact might have less intra-ethnic contact. Hence, these people might be less likely to become recruited into bonding organizations. It remains to be further explored why this is only the case for leisure organizations. Possibly, recruitment plays a role particularly for leisure organizations as these are characterized by relatively active modes of involvement (Gesthuizen et al., 2013; Van der Meer et al., 2009).

Overall, future research could further disentangle underlying explanations for the influence of interethnic contact on formal and informal social capital, i.e., specifying the processes of interethnic contact (cf. Pettigrew, 2008). In this respect, also the influence of personality traits, such as extroversion, might be relevant (Wilson, 2000): people who are more extrovert and display a higher level of sociability, will get in touch with other people (including ethnic minorities) more easily, resulting in larger networks and higher levels of associational involvement. Future research could consider the possibility of such spurious influences more accurately. Note, however, that our findings regarding the influence of interethnic contact in Chapter 3 – in which we also considered people’s network size as an indicator of sociability – are substantially similar as compared to Chapter 4, in which we could not take into account this aspect. Moreover, in several chapters we found similar effects of interethnic contact with friends and colleagues, while extroversion will be less important for (more superficial) contact at work.

Before we will come back to our first overarching research question, we would like to draw attention to the interrelationship between both explanatory mechanisms, i.e., ethnic threat perceptions and interethnic contact. In all empirical chapters discussed so far, we found a very consistent negative relationship, which is in line with earlier findings (e.g., Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schlueter & Wagner, 2008; Schneider, 2008). The nature of the relationship between both mediating mechanisms is, however, unclear. Previous studies repeatedly considered interethnic contact to be causally antecedent to perceptions of ethnic threat (e.g., Pettigrew et al., 2010; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schmid, Al Ramiah, & Hewstone, 2014; Schneider, 2008). This would mean that, although our findings revealed no direct relationship between ethnic diversity and perceived ethnic threat, living in ethnically diverse environments might indirectly reduce perceptions of ethnic threat, via interethnic contact (cf. Pettigrew et al., 2010; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schmid et al., 2014).

This could also explain findings from previous research, showing that ethnic diversity reduces social trust less strongly for people who have (more) contact with their (immigrant) neighbours (Stolle et al., 2008, 2013). Interethnic contact might
dampen the negative influence of living in ethnically more heterogeneous environments by reducing perceptions of ethnic threat. This mitigating influence of interethnic contact can also be found in the line of reasoning underlying the argument of segregation (Uslaner, 2011; Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014): ethnic diversity more strongly undermines social capital if people have no (possibility for) interethnic contact, i.e., when areas are highly segregated.

Coming back to the second part of our first research question – referring to the indirect relationships between ethnic diversity and social capital – the answer is more complex than we initially expected. First, without considering the role of interethnic contact and perceptions of ethnic threat, we hardly found any direct significant relationships between ethnic diversity and social capital, meaning that only few relationships can be explained, to begin with. Note, that we did not find any evidence for contradictory indirect effects of ethnic diversity on social capital cancelling each other out. Second, those relationships between ethnic diversity and social capital that we did find, could only be explained to a limited extent, once we took into account both explanatory mechanisms. Third, we did find, however, rather consistent indirect effects. Living in ethnically more diverse environments increases interethnic contact, which in turn, not only directly affects formal and informal social capital, but also indirectly, via perceptions of ethnic threat. While earlier research has revealed such indirect influences of ethnic diversity on attitudinal indicators of social cohesion (e.g., Pettigrew et al., 2010; Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schlueter & Wagner, 2008; Schmid et al., 2014), to the best of our knowledge, this study is the first to disentangle these indirect relationships for behavioural indicators of social cohesion.

Other determinants of formal and informal social capital

Although this was not the main focus of this study, and we only addressed this issue indirectly in our empirical chapters, we would like to draw attention to the role of other determinants of formal and informal social capital, both at the individual as well as the contextual level. Previous studies repeatedly stressed the importance of adequately taking into account alternative explanations when considering the influence of ethnic diversity on (in-)formal social capital. At the contextual level, scholars predominantly pointed at the role of economic characteristics (e.g., Laurence, 2011; Letki, 2008; Phan, 2008; Tolsma et al., 2009). As high levels of ethnic diversity often coincide with low levels of prosperity, it is essential to rule out such alternative explanations and possible spurious influences. For this reason, we took into account the influence of economic prosperity at the different contextual levels, measured by unemployment rates or poverty rates.

Interestingly, we found very consistent influences of these economic characteristics on formal and informal social capital, predominantly in both cross-national studies (Chapter 2 and 5). People living in environments characterized by higher unemployment rates, are less likely to be involved in leisure, interest and activist organizations and, moreover, informally meet and help others less often. This is largely consistent with findings from earlier studies (e.g., Laurence, 2011; Letki, 2008; Tolsma et al., 2009). As compared to the influence of ethnic diversity, these economic characteristics reduced formal and informal social capital much more consistently. At lower contextual levels, like the municipality or neighbourhood, we found less negative influences of economic characteristics.

In line with earlier studies (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2008; Putnam, 2007; Van der Meer et al., 2009; Van Oorschot & Arts, 2005; Wilson, 2000, 2012), our findings also revealed very consistent differences between social groups in their level of formal and informal social capital, providing strong evidence for the impact of, for instance, age and gender. The most consistent pattern we found, though, is the relationship between educational attainment and social capital. Corresponding with earlier findings (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2008; Van der Meer et al., 2009; Wilson, 2000, 2012), higher-educated people are more likely to be involved in all types of voluntary associations and, moreover, informally meet and help others more often. Note, that educational attainment turned out to be also a crucial determinant of perceptions of ethnic threat and interethnic contact (cf. Pettigrew et al., 2010; Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schlueter & Wagner, 2008). As such, educational attainment additionally affects formal and informal social capital indirectly via both explanatory mechanisms.

7.3 Explaining interethnic contact in Europe

The second overarching research question of this book is related to a specific dimension of informal social capital, i.e., interethnic or intergroup contact. As we saw in the previous chapters, interethnic contact turned out to be an important link between ethnic diversity and formal and informal social capital. However, unlike more general indicators of social capital, less is known about whether and why social groups differ in their level of interethnic contact. Moreover, it remains unclear whether the positive relationship between ethnic diversity and interethnic contact holds generally across social groups and under different societal conditions. In the final empirical chapter, we used an European perspective to explain interethnic contact in two domains, i.e., interethnic contact with friends and colleagues. Although interethnic contact with colleagues might be more superficial as compared to (more intimate) interethnic friendship ties, previous research has shown that both dimensions of interethnic contact reduce out-group derogation (Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011) and are positively related with associational involvement (Savelkoul et al., 2013). As the research questions we addressed in Chapter 6 correspond with the second overarching research question of this book, we will summarize the main findings of this chapter, while
simultaneously drawing conclusions on the scientific implications of these findings. The second overarching research question reads:

RQ II: (a) To what extent do natives differ in their level of interethnic contact, (b) how can these differences be explained, and (c) for which social groups and under which circumstances does ethnic diversity influence interethnic contact?

We found clear differences between social groups in their likelihood to have interethnic contact. Men and higher educated people were more likely to have interethnic contact with both friends and colleagues, as compared to women and lower educated people. Other determinants influenced both dimensions of interethnic contact differently. Manual workers were less likely to have interethnic contact with friends, whereas they were more likely to have interethnic contact at work. Older people were less likely to have interethnic contact with friends. Overall, these findings are largely in line with earlier, explorative studies (e.g., Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schlueter & Wagner, 2008; Semyonov & Glikman, 2009).

Based on Kalmijn’s (1998; see also Martinovic, 2013) overarching theoretical framework on interethnic marriage, we considered the role of meeting opportunities, preferences and third parties for explaining why social groups differ in their level of interethnic contact. Whereas meeting opportunities are reflected, for instance, in the presence of ethnic minorities in people’s living environment and at the labour market, preferences refer to natives’ readiness for interethnic contact. Third parties, such as one’s family and direct social network, set norms of behaviour influencing the formation and steadiness of interethnic contacts (Pettigrew, 1998). As interethnic friendship is voluntary in nature, while this holds less for (superficial) interethnic contact with colleagues, we could test the theoretical framework more thoroughly. We expected that interethnic contact at work would be particularly affected by meeting opportunities, whereas interethnic contact with friends would, moreover, be influenced by preferences and third parties. In general, our findings support this line of reasoning, though, the picture turned out to be more nuanced. Meeting opportunities were positively related with both interethnic contact with friends and colleagues. Although preferences and third parties predominantly affected interethnic friendships, we also found some (minor) influences on interethnic contact at work.

Taking into account the role of meeting opportunities could only partly reduce differences between social groups in their level of interethnic contact. Although younger European residents as well as people living in more urbanised areas were more likely to have interethnic contact with friends as compared to older residents and people living in less urbanised areas, once we considered the role of meeting opportunities, these differences became smaller. However, differences in interethnic friendships between men and women, as well as between higher and lower educated people, turned out to be suppressed by meeting opportunities and became even slightly larger once we ruled out the influence of meeting opportunities.

Preferences reduced differences between lower and higher educated people in their level of interethnic contact with both colleagues and friends. Simultaneously, differences between men and women in their level of interethnic contact in both domains turned out to be suppressed by preferences. Once we ruled out the influence of preferences, men became even more likely, as compared to women, to have interethnic contact at work and with friends. Moreover, our results revealed that the difference between younger and older European residents in their likelihood to have interethnic contact with friends, becomes smaller once we consider the role of preferences.

Influences of third parties turned out to reduce differences between social groups only with regard to interethnic friendships. Younger people as well as higher educated residents, for instance, were more likely to have interethnic contact with friends as compared to older and lower educated people. Once we took into account the role of third parties, these differences became slightly smaller.

Our findings shed more light on differences between social groups as well as the importance of meeting opportunities, preferences and third parties, influencing people’s level of interethnic contact. So far, studies either neglected differences between social groups or failed to incorporate explanatory mechanisms for these differences (Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schlueter & Wagner, 2008; Semyonov & Glikman, 2009; for an exception, see Martinovic, 2013). Although we found clear influences of meeting opportunities, preferences and third parties on people’s likelihood to have interethnic contact, the explanatory power of these mechanisms turned out to be limited and findings should, thus, be interpreted carefully. Future research should further disentangle the role of these mechanisms, using additional, more elaborate indicators of meeting opportunities, preferences and third party influences.

Finally, we considered whether objective meeting opportunities (in terms of migrant stock in European regions) influence interethnic contact equally for different social groups and under different societal conditions. Our findings indicate that this is the case: ethnic diversity induced interethnic contact with both friends and colleagues rather equally across social groups and under different societal conditions. This has also implications for our theoretical framework (Figure 7.1). Obviously, the link between ethnic diversity and interethnic contact is quite universal, at least for the European and American contexts: ethnic diversity is positively related with interethnic contact at different contextual levels, while (at least in Europe) this relationship holds equally across social groups and under different societal conditions.
7.4 Limitations and directions for future research

The approach we used in this book has certain limitations, which we were unable to deal with in our empirical studies. We offer several suggestions for scholars how to move forward in order to validate our findings and further increase our understanding about whether, when and how ethnic diversity relates to social capital.

7.4.1 Causality

Unlike previous research regarding the influence of ethnic diversity on social capital, this study focused on underlying explanations, empirically testing indirect effects of ethnic diversity, via perceptions of ethnic threat and interethnic contact, on formal and informal social capital (see Figure 7.1). Overall, we found rather consistent relationships between both explanatory mechanisms (i.e., interethnic contact and perceptions of ethnic threat) and formal and informal social capital. Although prior evidence and theoretical reasoning underlines the plausibility of the causal order which we consistently assume, one should bear in mind that all relationships are tested using cross-sectional data. Strictly speaking, our findings reflect (partial) correlations and should be interpreted carefully in terms of causal relationships. This might be relevant for the following relationships.

First, informal and formal social capital might affect interethnic contact and perceptions of ethnic threat. This might hold in particular for involvement in (bridging) voluntary associations. Although we cannot completely rule out the possibility of reversed causality, our findings seem to indicate that this is not very likely. In our national studies on the U.S. and the Netherlands (Chapter 3 and 4), we did not find a positive relationship between interethnic contact and involvement in bridging organizations, whereas here a reversed causal order might be most likely. In Chapter 2, we found similar relationships regarding interethnic contact and perceptions of ethnic threat for active and passive involvement, while in the case of passive involvement a reversed causal order is ruled out, near to being impossible. We also found clear relationships between interethnic contact as well as perceived ethnic threat and involvement in activist organizations, which are characterized by passive modes of involvement (Putnam, 2000; Van der Meer et al., 2009). Finally, we even found a positive relationship between interethnic contact with colleagues and (in-)formal social capital. It is unlikely that this less voluntary dimension of interethnic contact will be influenced by (in-)formal social capital. Based on our findings, we conclude that a reversed causal order between both explanatory mechanisms and social capital is rather unlikely, although we acknowledge that some relationships might run in both directions. Future research could further validate our findings, preferably using panel data or applying an experimental design (see for instance Koopmans & Veit, 2013).

Second, the causal order between interethnic contact and perceived ethnic threat is disputable. Although previous research repeatedly considered interethnic contact to be causally antecedent to perceptions of ethnic threat (e.g., Pettigrew et al., 2010; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schmid et al., 2014), so far, the causal order has not yet been disentangled rigorously using panel data. In this study, we decided to incorporate both explanatory mechanisms, without proposing a causal order beforehand. Future research should further disentangle the causal order of this crucial link.

Third, the causal order between people’s preferences and their interethnic contact (which we addressed in Chapter 6) is disputable. There is a heated debate whether interethnic contact mainly reduces prejudice (i.e., negative preferences), or whether prejudice and such preferences stimulate avoidance of interethnic contacts (Binder et al., 2009; Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Brown et al., 2007). Thus far, empirical findings indicate that these relationships most likely run in both directions. Scholars addressing underlying explanations for interethnic contact, should preferably use long-time panel data to disentangle these causal relationships more profoundly.

7.4.2 Conditional effects

Testing the generalizability of ethnic diversity’s influence on social capital is possible in several ways. In this study, we considered whether the influence of ethnic diversity holds for different dimensions of formal and informal social capital, at different contextual levels, in different geographical units. Alternatively, one can test whether these influences hold generally for different social groups and under different societal conditions. Research addressing conditional effects between ethnic diversity and social capital is scarce. In their cross-national study, Kesler and Bloemraad (2010), for instance, showed that the relationship between ethnic diversity and trust as well as associational involvement, is conditional on institutional arrangements (related to economic inequality and multicultural policies). Stolle et al. (2008, 2013) demonstrated that the negative influence of neighbourhood ethnic diversity on social trust is cushioned for people who have contact with their (immigrant) neighbours, whereas Tolmsa et al. (2009) showed, for instance, that ethnic diversity at the municipality level erodes informal contact with neighbours, only for higher educated people. We propose that the theoretical framework, which was central in this study, might be helpful for further disentangling possible conditional influences (see Figure 7.2). Conditional effects might play a role with regard to four relationships, i.e., Arrows A - D (cf. Savelkoul, 2011).

First, living in ethnically diverse environments might influence perceptions of ethnic threat differently, or even solely, for specific social groups or under specific societal conditions (Arrow A). Although conditional influences regarding this part of our theoretical framework have been studied most frequently, as discussed previously, conclusions so far are mixed. An interesting direction for future research can be found in Hjerm and Nagayoshi’s (2011) study, stressing the importance of considering the specific composition of the immigrant population. A large proportion of manual workers among the immigrant population increased perceptions of ethnic threat in particular...
among working class natives. Moreover, Hjerm and Nagayoshi pointed at the relevance of the religious composition of the immigrant population. This also relates to the distinction between economic and cultural threat (see also Sniderman & Hagendoorn, 2007). Focusing on more specific indicators of ethnic diversity, considering the composition of the immigrant population, seems to be a sound strategy for future research addressing conditional influences on perceived ethnic threat.

Second, ethnic diversity might influence interethnic contact differently for diverse social groups and under different societal conditions (Arrow B). Unlike previous research, in this study we explicitly addressed such conditional relationships. Overall, we found limited support for conditional effects, meaning that the relationship between ethnic diversity in European regions and interethnic contact holds rather equally for different social groups and under different regional conditions. Future research could replicate these findings, using different data, regarding different contextual settings and more diverse domains of interethnic contact. Alternatively, scholars could explicitly take into account compositional influences of the immigrant population (cf. Hjerm & Nagayoshi, 2011). If, for instance, manual workers are overrepresented in the immigrant population, this might not only foster perceptions of ethnic threat particularly for working class natives, though, might simultaneously increase contact opportunities at work predominantly for this group. Note, that our expectations in Chapter 6 were based on assumptions regarding the composition of the immigrant population. Unfortunately, however, more specific, cross-nationally comparable measures of ethnic diversity were not available for all countries and regions. Future research could replicate our study using more specific information about the composition of immigrant populations, for instance, within single countries.

Third, conditional effects might also play a role with regard to the relationship between ethnic threat perceptions and social capital (Arrow C). As, for instance, self-interest might (partly) determine whether specific social groups become involved in voluntary organizations (Wilson, 2012), this could also influence the relationship between perceptions of ethnic threat and associational involvement. Although people who perceive the presence of ethnic minorities as a threat, are generally less likely to be involved in (bridging) voluntary associations, one might expect that the negative influence of ethnic threat perceptions is less strong for those social groups for which involvement serves their own interest more strongly. We found circumstantial evidence for this line of thought, as perceiving ethnic threat most consistently decreased the likelihood to be involved in activist organizations, which serve altruistic goals and are generally not (directly) related with people’s self-interest (Van der Meer et al., 2009). Future research could further unravel such conditional relationships between ethnic threat perceptions and formal and informal social capital.

Fourth, the influence of interethnic contact on formal and informal social capital might differ across social groups and under different societal conditions (Arrow D). To come to grips with possible conditional influences, it is important to understand why interethnic contact affects social capital. We argued that interethnic contact might, for instance, increase empathy (cf. Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008) and awareness of general societal problems, which could explain why people become involved in organizations addressing such problems (i.e., predominantly activist organizations). One could argue that social groups with generally low levels of empathy and awareness might gain more from interethnic contact in this respect, as compared to social groups which are highly aware of general problems and display high levels of empathy. For attitudinal indicators of social cohesion, previous research has addressed such conditional influences of interethnic contact, however, without finding much support (see Pettigrew, 2008; Pettigrew et al., 2011). It remains to be further explored, though, whether this also holds for behavioural indicators of social cohesion.

### 7.4.3 Alternative explanations and supply-side effects

One of the major aims of this study was to disentangle underlying explanations for the relationship between ethnic diversity and social capital. Unlike previous research, we derived and empirically tested more specific hypotheses on underlying explanations, i.e., indirect relationships between ethnic diversity and social capital. We started from both intergroup theories mentioned by Putnam (2007): conflict and contact theory. Although we hardly found any direct significant relationships between ethnic diversity and social capital, those relationships that we did find, could only be partly explained by perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact. It is possible that other mechanisms, which we could not take into account empirically, play a role as well. With regard to negative relationships between ethnic diversity and social capital, in particular feelings
of ‘anomie’ might be important (Putnam, 2007, p. 149). Also Van der Meer and Toltsma (2014, p. 11) pointed at the role of anomie, arguing that “[...] individual anxiety about the existence of shared societal norms and moral values with which to comply” could cause people to withdraw from social life, which becomes reflected in lower levels of formal and informal social capital. Although we hardly found support for a negative relationship between ethnic diversity and social capital, future research could empirically explore the influence of anomie. Additionally, scholars could further disentangle why ethnic diversity is positively rather than negatively related with some indicators of social capital (e.g., informal helping in European countries).

With regard to formal social capital, we acknowledge that also the availability of voluntary organizations in people’s living environment might affect associational involvement. This might particularly hold for smaller geographical units like municipalities or neighbourhoods. In both national studies on the U.S. and the Netherlands, we considered the influence of ethnic diversity on involvement in different types of organizations. Unlike earlier research, we were able to consider the ethnic composition of these organizations, distinguishing bonding and bridging organizations. Implicitly, we assumed that people were able to choose whether they want to become involved, and if so, whether they prefer involvement in bonding or bridging organizations. Although people might have the option to divert to other neighbourhoods or municipalities if certain organizations are not available within their own neighbourhood or municipality, such choices might come with higher costs, both in terms of (travel) time and money.

Our findings on the Netherlands, might point at the importance of such supply-side effects. We found that people living in ethnically more heterogeneous environments were less likely to be involved in bonding (leisure and interest) organization, while involvement in bridging organizations was not influenced. As in ethnically more heterogeneous environments less bonding organizations might be present, this could explain the negative relationship found. To unravel this relationship more profoundly, future research should take the supply side into account as well. It is, however, unlikely to find (cross-)national data on the availability of different types of voluntary organizations, including the ethnic composition of these organizations. Therefore, scholars could consider focusing on smaller geographical areas (for instance single municipalities) to incorporate the supply side of voluntary organizations in this line of research.

7.5 Main conclusions and societal implications

Earlier research on the consequences of ethnic diversity for social cohesion, and in particular Putnam’s apocalyptic claim regarding an all-encompassing negative influence of ethnic diversity in the U.S., attracted much attention of policy makers and the media (Cheong et al., 2007; Hallberg & Lund, 2005; Laurence & Heath, 2008). The findings of this study, as well as the picture emerging from two recent reviews of the literature (Portes & Vickstrom, 2011; Van der Meer & Toltsma, 2014), indicate, however, that empirical evidence for this comprehensive negative impact of ethnic diversity is largely lacking, raising doubts about the generality of Putnam’s negative predictions. Policy makers should, thus, be careful, indiscriminately adopting and generalizing conclusions from one single study regarding one specific context to develop policies to avoid such unfavourable societal implications for social cohesion.

Our findings indicate that other determinants than ethnic diversity are more important for social cohesion in Western societies. In line with earlier studies, we found clear evidence for the negative impact of economic deprivation (in terms of unemployment) on all dimensions of social capital in Europe (cf. Laurence, 2011; Laurence & Heath, 2008; Letki, 2008; Toltsma et al., 2009). Hence, economic factors (rather than ethnic diversity) might deserve more attention from policy makers, if social cohesion is to be stimulated like the Council of Europe (2004) has proposed. Corresponding with findings from previous research (e.g., Gesthuizen et al., 2008; Van der Meer et al., 2009; Van Oorschot & Arts, 2005; Wilson, 2000, 2012), our study, moreover, clearly illustrates the importance of individual-level characteristics, and foremost educational attainment. Higher educated people meet and help others more often and are more likely to be involved in all types of voluntary organizations. Moreover, educational attainment also indirectly affects social capital: higher levels of education have been repeatedly found to be associated with less ethnic threat perceptions (e.g., Savelkoul, Scheepers, et al., 2011; Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schlueter & Wagner, 2008; Schneider, 2008) and more interethnic contact (e.g., Schlueter & Scheepers, 2010; Schlueter & Wagner, 2008; Semyonov & Glikman, 2009), which are both consistently related with formal and informal social capital. Investing in educational attainment and avoidance of school dropout deserve, thus, sustained attention from policy makers (cf. Gesthuizen, Savelkoul, & Scheepers, forthcoming).

Finally, we want to draw attention to the role of interethnic contact. While previous studies repeatedly demonstrated that interethnic contact consistently reduces out-group derogation and interethnic prejudice (Allport, 1954; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006), this study revealed very consistent positive influences on behavioural indicators of social capital: people with (more) interethnic contact are more likely to be involved in leisure, interest and activist organizations and, meet and help others more often informally (at least in Europe). In addition, interethnic contact is negatively related with ethnic threat perceptions and might, thus, also indirectly induce social capital. Stimulating (positive) interethnic contact might, therefore, be a fruitful policy goal. Our findings indicated that meeting opportunities play an important role in this respect, fostering interethnic contact in different domains rather equally across social groups and under different societal conditions. These insights might be valuable for
policymakers, as they underline the necessity of stimulating interethnic contact opportunities, or at least preventing high levels of ethnic segregation (see also Uslaner, 2011, as well as Van der Meer & Tolsma, 2014). Bearing in mind lessons learned from earlier de-segregation policies (see e.g., Bolt, Phillips, & Van Kempen, 2010), policymakers could aim at preventing high levels of ethnic segregation – for instance in neighbourhoods or schools – and thereby stimulating possibilities for interethnic contact.

7.6 Notes

1 In their review of the literature, Van der Meer and Tolsma (2014) also conclude that ethnic diversity appears not to erode interethnic social cohesion.

2 Schneider (2008) only found that ethnic diversity increases perceptions of ethnic threat less strongly for people who have immigrant friends or colleagues. Other cross-level interactions regarding differences between social groups did not reach significance.

3 Only in the Netherlands, and only for activist organizations, we found a negative effect of perceived ethnic threat on involvement in bonding activist organizations.
Appendix
### Appendix 3.1 Results: hierarchical logistic regression analyses – formal social capital (direct and indirect effects of the percentage non-Whites in census tracts ($N_{\text{individual}} = 725; N_{\text{census tract}} = 188$))

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leisure</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Activist</th>
<th>Leisure</th>
<th>Interest</th>
<th>Activist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-1.711</td>
<td>-2.790</td>
<td>3.118</td>
<td>-1.300</td>
<td>-2.297</td>
<td>2.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.411)</td>
<td>(0.506)</td>
<td>(0.548)</td>
<td>(0.474)</td>
<td>(0.575)</td>
<td>(0.620)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived ethnic threat</td>
<td>-0.208</td>
<td>-0.302</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>-0.582</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.141)</td>
<td>(0.165)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.184)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergroup contact</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Census tract level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage non-Whites</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.011</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy (CID) survey (2005); U.S. Census Bureau (2012a/b).

### Notes:
- ***** significant at $p < 0.001$; ** significant at $p < 0.01$; * significant at $p < 0.05$ (one-sided test of significance).
- All models are controlled for individual-level control variables and percentage below poverty level at the census tract level (results available upon request).
- Direct effect (i.e., not controlled for perceived ethnic threat and intergroup contact).
- Indirect effect (i.e., effect percentage non-Whites controlled for perceived ethnic threat and intergroup contact).
Appendix 3.2 Results: hierarchical multinomial regression analyses – bonding and bridging formal social capital (direct effects of the percentage non-Whites – different categories of bonding / bridging organizations (N\textsubscript{individual} = 725; N\textsubscript{census tract} = 188)\textsuperscript{a,b}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BOND (≤5%) / BRID (≥5%)</th>
<th>BOND (≤10%) / BRID (≥10%)</th>
<th>BOND (≤25%) / BRID (≥25%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOND/NI</td>
<td>b(S.E.)</td>
<td>b(S.E.)</td>
<td>b(S.E.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRID/NI</td>
<td>b(S.E.)</td>
<td>b(S.E.)</td>
<td>b(S.E.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRID/BOND</td>
<td>b(S.E.)</td>
<td>b(S.E.)</td>
<td>b(S.E.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leisure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>b(S.E.)</th>
<th>b(S.E.)</th>
<th>b(S.E.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-Whites</td>
<td>-0.002 (0.008)</td>
<td>-0.003 (0.007)</td>
<td>-0.005 (0.010)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000 (0.007)</td>
<td>-0.003 (0.007)</td>
<td>-0.003 (0.009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>b(S.E.)</th>
<th>b(S.E.)</th>
<th>b(S.E.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-Whites</td>
<td>-0.006 (0.011)</td>
<td>0.018 (0.008)</td>
<td>0.024 (0.012)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.001 (0.009)</td>
<td>0.022 (0.009)</td>
<td>0.020 (0.010)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>b(S.E.)</th>
<th>b(S.E.)</th>
<th>b(S.E.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-Whites</td>
<td>0.000 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.003 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.001 (0.011)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.000 (0.001)</td>
<td>-0.003 (0.001)</td>
<td>0.000 (0.011)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy (CID) survey (2005); U.S. Census Bureau (2012a,b).

---

Appendix 3.3 Results: hierarchical multinomial regression analyses – bonding and bridging formal social capital (direct and indirect effects of the percentage non-Whites – different categories of bonding / bridging organizations (N\textsubscript{individual} = 725; N\textsubscript{census tract} = 188)\textsuperscript{a,b}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BOND (≤5%) / BRID (≥5%)</th>
<th>BOND (≤10%) / BRID (≥10%)</th>
<th>BOND (≤25%) / BRID (≥25%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BOND/NI</td>
<td>b(S.E.)</td>
<td>b(S.E.)</td>
<td>b(S.E.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRID/NI</td>
<td>b(S.E.)</td>
<td>b(S.E.)</td>
<td>b(S.E.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRID/BOND</td>
<td>b(S.E.)</td>
<td>b(S.E.)</td>
<td>b(S.E.)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Leisure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>b(S.E.)</th>
<th>b(S.E.)</th>
<th>b(S.E.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-Whites</td>
<td>-0.074 (0.018)</td>
<td>-0.374 *</td>
<td>-0.299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.009 (0.022)</td>
<td>-0.468 *</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.371 (0.229)</td>
<td>-0.257 *</td>
<td>-0.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.134 (0.161)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>b(S.E.)</th>
<th>b(S.E.)</th>
<th>b(S.E.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-Whites</td>
<td>-0.056 (0.015)</td>
<td>-0.058 ***</td>
<td>-0.046 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.009 (0.016)</td>
<td>0.005 ***</td>
<td>0.002 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.021 (0.008)</td>
<td>0.013 *</td>
<td>0.034 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Activist

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>b(S.E.)</th>
<th>b(S.E.)</th>
<th>b(S.E.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>non-Whites</td>
<td>0.005 (0.009)</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.009</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>-0.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy (CID) survey (2005); U.S. Census Bureau (2012a,b).

---
Appendix 3.4 Results: hierarchical multinomial regression analyses – bonding and bridging formal social capital (direct and indirect effects) – Different categories of bonding / bridging organizations (N<sub>individual</sub> = 725; N<sub>census tract</sub> = 188)<sup>a</sup>  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BOND / (≤0%)</th>
<th>BRID / (≤0%)</th>
<th>BOND / (≤5%)</th>
<th>BRID / (≤5%)</th>
<th>BOND / (≤5%)</th>
<th>BRID / (≤5%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BOND/NI</td>
<td>BRID/NI</td>
<td>BRID/BOND</td>
<td>BOND/NI</td>
<td>BRID/NI</td>
<td>BRID/BOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total direct&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage non-Whites</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>-0.005</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total indirect&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived ethnic threat</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>-0.496</td>
<td>-0.499**</td>
<td>-0.051</td>
<td>-0.543***</td>
<td>-0.449*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.203)</td>
<td>(0.159)</td>
<td>(0.213)</td>
<td>(0.160)</td>
<td>(0.165)</td>
<td>(0.195)</td>
<td>(0.195)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergroup contact</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.009</td>
<td>-0.015*</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.016*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.005)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage non-Whites</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.010)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>BOND / (≤10%)</th>
<th>BRID / (≤10%)</th>
<th>BOND / (≤25%)</th>
<th>BRID / (≤25%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>BOND/NI</td>
<td>BRID/NI</td>
<td>BRID/BOND</td>
<td>BRID/BOND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total direct&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage non-Whites</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.005</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total indirect&lt;sup&gt;c&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived ethnic threat</td>
<td>-0.117</td>
<td>-0.623</td>
<td>-0.494**</td>
<td>-0.283*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.160)</td>
<td>(0.160)</td>
<td>(0.193)</td>
<td>(0.151)</td>
<td>(0.215)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergroup contact</td>
<td>-0.019**</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.025**</td>
<td>-0.012*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.006)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage non-Whites</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>-0.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.008)</td>
<td>(0.007)</td>
<td>(0.009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Citizenship, Involvement, Democracy (CID) survey (2005); U.S. Census Bureau (2012a/b).  
*** significant at p < 0.001; ** significant at p < 0.01; * significant at p < 0.05 (one-sided test of significance).  
<sup>a</sup> All models are controlled for individual-level control variables and percentage below poverty level at the census tract level (results available upon request).  
<sup>b</sup> BOND = involvement in bonding organization; BRID = involvement in bridging organization; NI = not involved.  
<sup>c</sup> Percentage out-group members in organization.  
<sup>d</sup> Direct effects (i.e., without controlling for perceived ethnic threat and intergroup contact).  
<sup>e</sup> Indirect effects (i.e., effect percentage non-Whites controlled for perceived ethnic threat and intergroup contact).

Appendix 5.1 Individual-, regional- and country-level variance (empty models and individual-level models)  
(N<sub>individual</sub> = 21,796; N<sub>region</sub> = 126; N<sub>country</sub> = 15)<sup>a</sup>  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Individual-level variance</th>
<th>Regional-level variance</th>
<th>Country-level variance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model A</td>
<td>Model B</td>
<td>Model A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal social capital – Meeting</td>
<td>2.167</td>
<td>1.919</td>
<td>0.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal social capital – Helping</td>
<td>3.019</td>
<td>2.925</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived ethnic threat</td>
<td>2.243</td>
<td>2.083</td>
<td>0.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergroup contact</td>
<td>1.030</td>
<td>0.896</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> All estimates significant at p < 0.05 (two-sided test of significance).  
<sup>b</sup> Model A: Empty model; Model B: Individual-level model. ICC: Intra class correlation model A at regional and country level.
## Appendix 5.2 Results: hierarchical linear regression analyses – informal social capital, perceived ethnic threat and interethnic contact
(results individual-level determinants) \(N_{\text{individual}}=21,468; N_{\text{region}}=125; N_{\text{country}}=15\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Informal social capital – Meeting</td>
<td>Informal social capital – Helping</td>
<td>Perceived ethnic threat</td>
<td>Interethnic contact</td>
<td>Informal social capital – Meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>4.899</td>
<td>1.770</td>
<td>0.137 **</td>
<td>0.107 **</td>
<td>6.463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.004 **</td>
<td>0.003 **</td>
<td>-0.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service class (ref.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Routine non-manuals</td>
<td>-0.080</td>
<td>-0.028</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.182</td>
<td>0.038 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self employed</td>
<td>-0.039</td>
<td>0.039</td>
<td>0.067</td>
<td>0.239</td>
<td>0.056 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual workers</td>
<td>-0.095</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.043</td>
<td>0.332</td>
<td>0.036 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.353</td>
<td>0.057 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>0.315</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>0.060 **</td>
<td>-0.213</td>
<td>0.050 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.248</td>
<td>0.043 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housekeeping</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.256</td>
<td>0.041 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other employment situation</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>0.051</td>
<td>0.063</td>
<td>0.269</td>
<td>0.052 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupational status missing (employed)</td>
<td>0.119</td>
<td>-0.086</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religiosity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance – never (ref.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance – rarely</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.020</td>
<td>0.029 **</td>
<td>-0.058</td>
<td>0.024 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance – once a month</td>
<td>0.091</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>0.044 **</td>
<td>-0.135</td>
<td>0.037 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance – once a week or more</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.040 **</td>
<td>-0.063</td>
<td>0.033 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church attendance – missing</td>
<td>-0.263</td>
<td>-0.198</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>0.377</td>
<td>0.207 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried (ref.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>-0.293</td>
<td>-0.079</td>
<td>0.036 **</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.104</td>
<td>0.054 *</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.045 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>-0.071</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.050 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital status missing</td>
<td>-0.246</td>
<td>0.347</td>
<td>0.231</td>
<td>-0.010</td>
<td>0.192</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix 5.2 Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4</th>
<th>Model 5</th>
<th>Model 6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal social</td>
<td>Informal social</td>
<td>Perceived ethnic</td>
<td>Interethnic</td>
<td>Informal social</td>
<td>Informal social</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capital – Meeting</td>
<td>capital – Helping</td>
<td>threat</td>
<td>contact</td>
<td>capital – Meeting</td>
<td>capital – Helping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$S.E.$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$S.E.$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>$S.E.$</td>
<td>$b$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Male = ref)</td>
<td>-0.067</td>
<td>0.021 **</td>
<td>0.085</td>
<td>0.026 **</td>
<td>-0.017</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.040</td>
<td>0.003 **</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.003 **</td>
<td>-0.003</td>
<td>0.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age squared</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
<td>0.000 **</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big city</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>0.061</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>-0.042</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburbs</td>
<td>-0.022</td>
<td>0.033</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>0.040</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>0.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country village</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.025</td>
<td>0.044</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.084</td>
<td>0.026 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm/countryside</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
<td>0.038 **</td>
<td>0.106</td>
<td>0.047 **</td>
<td>0.115</td>
<td>0.039 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation missing</td>
<td>-0.316</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.204</td>
<td>0.249</td>
<td>-0.244</td>
<td>0.207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


** significant at $p < 0.05$; * significant at $p < 0.10$ (two-sided test of significance).

* Empty cells: parameters not estimated due to model specifications. Migrant stock and unemployment rate (at country and regional level) were also included in all models. In Model 3 also interethnic contact was included, whereas in Model 4 perceived ethnic threat was included. In Model 5 and 6 both interethnic contact and perceived ethnic threat were included as well.
### Appendix 6.1 Results: hierarchical logistic regression analyses – Separate (cross-level) interaction coefficients – Interethnic contact friends and colleagues (Only employed - age 18-65) \(N_{\text{individual}} = 10,475; N_{\text{region}} = 126\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Intercept</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interethnic contact colleagues</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock * female</td>
<td>-0.897</td>
<td>0.714</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>0.706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock * education low</td>
<td>3.660</td>
<td>1.121</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>-0.714</td>
<td>0.976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock * education high</td>
<td>0.120</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock * manual workers</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>0.969</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock * service class</td>
<td>-1.745</td>
<td>0.742</td>
<td>**</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock * unemployment rate</td>
<td>0.072</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock * age</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>-0.544</td>
<td>0.319*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock * big city</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>1.216</td>
<td>1.161</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock * suburbs</td>
<td>N.A.</td>
<td>-0.942</td>
<td>0.976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*** significant at \(p < 0.001\); ** significant at \(p < 0.01\); * significant at \(p < 0.05\) (one-sided test of significance).

> Models include all individual-level determinants (educational level, age, gender, social class, religiosity and marital status), contextual-level determinants (migrant stock and unemployment rate), as well as country dummies.

### Appendix 6.2 Results: hierarchical logistic regression analyses – Interethnic contact with friends (including interethnic contact at work as predictor) – Employed respondents (age 18-65) \(N_{\text{individual}} = 10,475; N_{\text{region}} = 126\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment (ref.=educ. mid.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level low</td>
<td>-0.158</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level high</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level missing</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.395</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age/10 (centered)</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>0.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (ref.=males)</td>
<td>-0.191</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class (ref.=routine non-manuals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual workers</td>
<td>-0.159</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service class</td>
<td>0.207</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class missing</td>
<td>0.109</td>
<td>0.131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation (ref.=town or small city)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation – big city</td>
<td>0.178</td>
<td>0.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation – suburbs or outskirts of big city</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation – country village</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation – farm or home in the countryside</td>
<td>-0.047</td>
<td>0.088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation – urbanisation missing</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
<td>0.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity (objective) – Migrant stock region/100 (centered)</td>
<td>3.070</td>
<td>0.694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity (objective) – Unemployment rate region (centered)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity (subjective) – diversity area (ref.=almost nobody)</td>
<td>0.419</td>
<td>0.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity (subjective) – some ethnic minorities</td>
<td>0.346</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity (subjective) – many ethnic minorities</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.237</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preferences – social distance</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third parties – education father (ref.=low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education father – middle</td>
<td>0.167</td>
<td>0.057</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education father – high</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education father – missing (incl. SE)</td>
<td>0.007</td>
<td>0.116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third parties – education partner (ref.=low)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education partner – middle</td>
<td>-0.036</td>
<td>0.073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education partner – high</td>
<td>0.136</td>
<td>0.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education partner – no partner</td>
<td>-0.032</td>
<td>0.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education partner – missing (incl. SE)</td>
<td>-0.586</td>
<td>0.291</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Intergroup contact colleagues**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(b)</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cross-level interactions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migrant stock region/100 * age</td>
<td>-0.584</td>
<td>0.312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


*** significant at \(p < 0.001\); ** significant at \(p < 0.01\); * significant at \(p < 0.05\) (one-sided test of significance).

> Models are controlled for religiosity, marital status as well as country dummies (results available upon request).

b Contextual-level variable.
Appendix 6.3 Results: hierarchical logistic regression analyses – Interethnic contact with friends and colleagues – Employed respondents (age 18-65) – excluding influential regions$^a,b$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interethnic contact colleagues (Model 1f)</th>
<th>Interethnic contact friends (Model 2f)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$b$</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>-0.928</td>
<td>0.134 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational attainment (ref. = educ. mid.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level low</td>
<td>0.021</td>
<td>0.071</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level high</td>
<td>0.293</td>
<td>0.070 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational level missing</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>0.423 **</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age/10 (centered)</td>
<td>-0.031</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females (ref. = males)</td>
<td>-0.081</td>
<td>0.052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class (ref. = routine non-manuals)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual workers</td>
<td>0.267</td>
<td>0.070 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service class</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.070 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social class missing</td>
<td>-0.279</td>
<td>0.150 *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation (ref. = town or small city)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation – big city</td>
<td>0.312</td>
<td>0.080 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation – suburbs or outskirts of big city</td>
<td>0.379</td>
<td>0.082 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation – country village</td>
<td>0.083</td>
<td>0.063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation – farm or home in the countryside</td>
<td>-0.129</td>
<td>0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urbanisation – urbanisation missing</td>
<td>-0.691</td>
<td>0.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity (objective) – Migrant stock region/100 (centered)</td>
<td>6.916</td>
<td>1.541 ***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity (objective) – Unemployment rate region (centered)</td>
<td>-0.062</td>
<td>0.013 ***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Opportunity (subjective) – diversity area (ref. = almost nobody)

| Opportunity (subjective) – some ethnic minorities | 0.320 | 0.054 *** | 0.506 | 0.051 *** |
| Opportunity (subjective) – many ethnic minorities | 0.560 | 0.112 *** | 0.483 | 0.101 *** |
| Opportunity (subjective) – missing | 0.537 | 0.276 * | -0.093 | 0.267 |

Preferences – social distance

| Preferences – social distance | -0.050 | 0.009 *** | -0.110 | 0.008 *** |

Third parties – education father (ref. = low)

| Education father – middle | 0.053 | 0.064 | 0.178 | 0.059 ** |
| Education father – high | 0.171 | 0.092 * | 0.475 | 0.086 *** |

Education father – missing (incl. SE) | -0.158 | 0.137 | -0.006 | 0.122 |

Third parties – education partner (ref. = low)

| Education partner – middle | -0.118 | 0.082 | -0.039 | 0.078 |
| Education partner – high | -0.020 | 0.097 | 0.114 | 0.090 |
| Education partner – no partner | 0.075 | 0.104 | 0.032 | 0.099 |
| Education partner – missing (incl. SE) | 0.230 | 0.334 | -0.463 | 0.294 |

Cross-level interactions

| Region Migrant stock region/100 * manual workers | 1.130 | 1.564 |
| Region Migrant stock region/100 * service class | -1.204 | 1.524 |
| Region Migrant stock region/100 * educational level low | 1.971 | 1.748 |
| Region Migrant stock region/100 * educational level high | -1.398 | 1.491 |


$^a$significant at $p < 0.001$; $^b$significant at $p < 0.01$; $^c$significant at $p < 0.05$ (one-tailed test of significance).

Models are controlled for religiosity, marital status as well as country dummies (results available upon request).

$^a$Model 1f: $N_{exp.} = 109$; Model 2f: $N_{exp.} = 112$. $^b$Contextual-level variable.
Summary in Dutch / Nederlandstalige samenvatting

Etnische diversiteit en sociaal kapitaal:
Een toets van onderliggende verklaringen op basis van de conflict-, en de contacttheorie in Europa en de Verenigde Staten

Hoofdstuk 1 − Inleiding

Door arbeidsmigratie, gezinshereniging en de komst van asielzoekers is de etnische diversiteit in veel Westerse landen de afgelopen decennia toegenomen. Aangezien verwacht wordt dat deze trend zich ook de komende jaren zal voortzetten, roept dit zowel bij beleidsmakers als onderzoekers de vraag op welke consequenties dit heeft voor de sociale cohesie in deze landen.

Gedurende de tweede helft van de twintigste eeuw hebben wetenschappers uitgebreid onderzoek verricht naar de gevolgen van etnische diversiteit. Zij hebben zich hierbij met name gericht op indicatoren van sociale cohesie die gerelateerd zijn aan de aanwezige etnische minderheidsgroepen, zoals vooroordelen, (in)tolerantie en discriminatie ten aanzien van etnische minderheden. Recentelijk is de aandacht verschoven naar andere indicatoren van sociale cohesie zoals de mate van sociaal vertrouwen, het onderhouden van informele banden met vrienden, familieleden en buren of het lidmaatschap van vrijwilligersorganisaties en verenigingen (zogenaamde formele banden). Deze indicatoren worden vaak aangeduid met de term ‘sociaal kapitaal’.

In deze lijn van onderzoek trok met name de studie van Robert Putnam veel aandacht, aangezien hij stelde dat etnische diversiteit een generieke negatieve invloed zou hebben op sociale cohesie. Volgens Putnam’s ‘constricttheorie’ zouden mensen die in een omgeving wonen, die gekenmerkt wordt door een hoge mate van etnische diversiteit, zich terugtrekken uit het sociale leven; ze zouden minder vertrouwen hebben en zouden minder informele en formele banden hebben dan mensen die wonen in een omgeving met een geringere mate van etnische diversiteit. Dit zou gelden voor vertrouwen in en banden met mensen behorend tot een andere etnische groep (de zogenaamde ‘out-group’), maar zelfs voor mensen behorend tot de eigen etnische groep (de zogenaamde ‘in-group’). Met name deze laatste conclusie werd als opmerkelijk beschouwd en heeft de afgelopen jaren geleid tot een sterke toename van onderzoek naar de gevolgen van etnische diversiteit.

Ook in deze studie wordt gekeken naar de consequenties van etnische diversiteit, waarbij vanuit het perspectief van autochtonen de relatie tussen etnische diversiteit en sociaal kapitaal bestudeerd wordt. Uit de resultaten van eerder onderzoek bleek dat de negatieve gevolgen van etnische diversiteit sterker (en soms uitsluitend) gelden voor autochtonen in vergelijking met etnische minderheden. In deze studie wordt op vier manieren voortgebouwd op eerder onderzoek.

Ten tweede wordt expliciet gekeken naar onderliggende verklaringen voor een relatie tussen etnische diversiteit en sociaal kapitaal. Ondanks het grote aantal studies op dit terrein, bleef dit aspect grotendeels onderbelicht tot dusver. In deze studie worden op basis van twee intergroepstheorieën (d.w.z. de conflicttheorie en de contacttheorie) expliciete hypothesen opgesteld en getoetst. Het doel hiervan is duidelijkheid te verkrijgen met betrekking tot onderliggende verklaringen, ofwel de indirecte relaties tussen etnische diversiteit en sociaal kapitaal.

Ten derde wordt de relatie tussen etnische diversiteit en sociaal kapitaal onderzocht op verschillende contextuele niveaus in een groot aantal Westerse landen aan beide zijden van de Atlantische Oceaan. In tegenstelling tot eerder landenvergelijking onderzoek op dit terrein, wordt naast het landniveau ook het regioniveau onderscheiden. Hierdoor is het mogelijk om rekening te houden met verschillen in etnische diversiteit en sociaal kapitaal binnen landen in meerdere landen tegelijkertijd.

Ten vierde wordt specifiek aandacht besteed aan interetnisch informeel sociaal kapitaal, ofwel interetnisch contact. In dit onderzoek wordt interetnisch contact beschouwd als een belangrijke link tussen enerzijds de etnische compositie van iemands leefomgeving en anderzijds de mate van sociaal kapitaal. In tegenstelling tot veel andere indicatoren van sociaal kapitaal is er relatief weinig bekend over eventuele verschillen tussen mensen in de mate van interetnisch contact en mogelijke verklaringen hiervoor. In deze studie wordt gekeken naar verschillen tussen sociale categorieën in de mate van interetnisch contact en worden diverse verklaringen expliciet getoetst. Daarnaast wordt onderzocht in hoeverre de aanwezigheid van etnische minderheden in Europees regio’s op eenzelfde wijze van invloed is op de mate van interetnisch contact voor verschillende sociale categorieën, zoals vaak impliciet verondersteld wordt.

Hoofdstuk 2 – Etnische diversiteit en formeel sociaal kapitaal in Europa

In het eerste hoofdstuk van deel A, wordt onderzocht in hoeverre etnische diversiteit in Europese landen en regio’s invloed heeft op formeel sociaal kapitaal. In tegenstelling tot eerder onderzoek op dit terrein, wordt hierbij onderscheid gemaakt tussen betrokkenheid bij drie typen organisaties (recreatieve, belangen- en goedeedoelenorganisaties). Aangezien deze organisaties sterk verschillen wat betreft de doelen die worden nagespeeld, alsmede de leden wier behartiging wordt, kan op deze wijze worden onderzocht in hoeverre de veronderstelde negatieve invloed van etnische diversiteit generiek is, zoals verwacht kan worden op basis van de constructtheorie. Daarnaast wordt in dit hoofdstuk onderscheid gemaakt tussen actieve betrokkenheid (bijvoorbeeld actieve participatie en het verrichten van vrijwilligerswerk) en passieve betrokkenheid (bijvoorbeeld het doneren van geld). Verwacht wordt dat etnische diversiteit vooral een negatieve invloed zal hebben op actieve vormen van betrokkenheid en betrokkenheid bij organisaties die gedenkt worden door een hoge mate van betrokkenheid (met name recreatieve organisaties). Indien het wonen in een etnisch diverse omgeving ervoor zorgt dat mensen zich ongemakkelijk voelen en interactie met etnische minderheden vermijden, dan zal dit naar verwachting voornamelijk door deze vormen van betrokkenheid en typen organisaties te uiten komen.

In tegenstelling tot eerdere studies naar de invloed van etnische diversiteit op formeel sociaal kapitaal, wordt in hoofdstuk 2 ingegaan op onderliggende verklaringen voor deze relatie. Op basis van de conflicttheorie wordt gekeken naar de rol van ervaren
etnische dreiging, terwijl op basis van de contacttheorie de rol van interetnisch contact onderzocht wordt. In hoofdstuk 2 staan twee onderzoeksfragen centraal: In hoeverre beïnvloedt etnische diversiteit in Europese (a) landen en (b) regio’s betrokkenheid bij recreatieve, belangen- en goededoelenorganisaties? En: In hoeverre kunnen deze relaties worden verklaard door mechanismen afgeleid van de conflicttheorie en de contacttheorie?

In tegenstelling tot de verwachtingen op basis van de constricttheorie, blijkt uit de resultaten van hoofdstuk 2 dat een grotere mate van etnische diversiteit in Europese landen en regio’s niet generiek leidt tot een reductie van formeel sociaal kapitaal van mensen in deze landen en regio’s. Op landniveau blijkt etnische diversiteit geen enkele invloed te hebben. Op regioniveau daarentegen, blijkt de invloed van etnische diversiteit te variëren tussen de verschillende typen organisaties. Naarmate mensen wonen in een etnisch meer heterogene regio, blijken zij minder vaak actief en passief betrokken te zijn bij belangenorganisaties, terwijl ze vaker passief betrokken zijn bij goededoelenorganisaties. In tegenstelling tot onze verwachtingen blijkt een grotere mate van etnische diversiteit niet vooral te leiden tot minder actieve betrokkenheid bij verenigingen. Bovendien blijkt een grotere mate van etnische diversiteit niet te leiden tot minder betrokkenheid bij recreatieve organisaties, die in het algemeen gekenmerkt worden door een hoge mate van actieve betrokkenheid.

Aangezien een grotere mate van etnische diversiteit volgens de conflicttheorie leidt tot meer competitie omtrent schaarste goederen (bijvoorbeeld op de arbeids- of huizenmarkt) en met betrekking tot conflictrende culturele waarden of privileges, verwachten we dat indien er sprake is van meer etnische diversiteit in Europese landen en regio’s, mensen meer etnische (groeps)dreiging zullen ervaren. Verder verwachten we dat het ervaren van etnische dreiging zal leiden tot een afname van betrokkenheid bij diverse vrijwilligersorganisaties, aangezien men een mogelijke confrontatie met etnische minderheidsleden in dergelijke organisaties zal proberen te vermijden en men zich minder zal inzetten voor organisaties die mogelijk (ook) belangen van etnische minderheden behartigen. Uit de resultaten van hoofdstuk 2 blijkt dat een grotere mate van etnische diversiteit in Europese landen en regio’s niet leidt tot meer ervaren etnische dreiging. Echter, mensen die meer etnische dreiging ervaren, blijken minder betrokken te zijn (zowel actief als passief) bij recreatieve, belangen- en goededoelenorganisaties.

Op basis van de contacttheorie verwachten we dat een grotere mate van etnische diversiteit in Europese landen en regio’s zal leiden tot meer interetnisch contact. Bovendien verwachten we dat interetnisch contact vervolgens zal leiden tot een grotere mate van betrokkenheid bij vrijwilligersorganisaties. Hiervoor worden verschillende verklaringen geopperd. Via interetnisch contact kan men, bijvoorbeeld, op de hoogte worden gebracht van het bestaan van bepaalde vrijwilligersorganisaties of worden aangespoord om betrokken te worden. Interetnisch contact kan echter ook leiden tot een reductie van vooroordelen en intolerantie en kan ervoor zorgen dat mensen zich niet langer ongemakkelijk voelen wanneer zij geconfronteerd worden met etnische minderheden in vrijwilligersorganisaties. Tot slot leidt interetnisch contact tot meer empatie en dus mogelijk tot meer betrokkenheid bij organisaties die zich inzetten voor algemene belangen, waaronder belangen van etnische minderheden. Uit de resultaten in hoofdstuk 2 blijkt dat, in lijn met de verwachtingen, een grotere mate van etnische diversiteit in Europese regio’s leidt tot meer interetnisch contact. Bovendien blijkt dat mensen die meer interetnisch contact hebben, vaker (actief en passief) betrokken zijn bij recreatieve, belangen- en goededoelenorganisaties.

Daarnaast blijkt er een negatieve samenhang te bestaan tussen het hebben van interetnisch contact en het ervaren van etnische dreiging: mensen die meer interetnisch contact hebben, ervaren minder etnische dreiging en vice versa. Wanneer er rekening wordt gehouden met de invloeden van interetnisch contact en ervaren etnische dreiging, blijkt echter dat de eerder genoemde samenhang tussen etnische diversiteit en formeel sociaal kapitaal nauwelijks verandert.

In het derde hoofdstuk wordt onderzocht in hoeverre het wonen in Amerikaanse buurten met een grotere mate van etnische diversiteit invloed heeft op betrokkenheid bij vrijwilligersorganisaties. In lijn met het vorige hoofdstuk wordt hierbij onderscheid gemaakt tussen drie typen organisaties: recreatieve, belangen- en goededoelenorganisaties. Echter, in tegenstelling tot hoofdstuk 2 en eerdere studies naar de relatie tussen etnische diversiteit en formeel sociaal kapitaal, wordt ook rekening gehouden met de etnische compositie van deze organisaties. Hierdoor is het mogelijk om onderscheid te maken tussen organisaties met uitsluitend leden behorend tot de eigen etnische groep (zogenaamde ‘bonding’ organisaties) en organisaties die ook leden hebben behorend tot andere etnische groepen (zogenaamde ‘bridging’ organisaties).

In hoofdstuk 3 staan de volgende twee onderzoeksvragen centraal: In hoeverre beïnvloedt etnische diversiteit in Amerikaanse buurten betrokkenheid bij ‘bonding’ en ‘bridging’ recreatieve, belangen- en goededoelenorganisaties? En: In hoeverre kunnen deze relaties worden verklaard door mechanismen afgeleid van de conflicttheorie en de contacttheorie?

Uit de resultaten van hoofdstuk 3 blijkt dat een grotere mate van etnische diversiteit in Amerikaanse buurten niet leidt tot minderCompatible sociaal kapitaal. Dit geldt voor zowel recreatieve, belangen- als goededoelenorganisaties, ongeacht de etnische compositie. Voor ‘bridging’ belangenorganisaties blijkt dat het wonen in een buurt met een groter percentage etnische minderheden zelfs positief samenhangt met betrokkenheid bij deze organisaties.
Hoofdstuk 4 − Etnische diversiteit en ‘bonding’ en ‘bridging’ formeel sociaal kapitaal in Nederland

In het vierde hoofdstuk wordt wederom onderzocht of etnische diversiteit een invloed heeft op formeel sociaal kapitaal, dit keer in Nederlandse wijken en gemeenten. In lijn met het vorige hoofdstuk wordt hierbij onderscheid gemaakt tussen drie typen organisaties (recreatieve, belangen- en goededoelenorganisaties) en wordt rekening gehouden met de etnische compositie van deze organisaties. Hierdoor kan weer een onderscheid gemaakt worden tussen organisaties met uitsluitend leden behorend tot de eigen etnische groep (zogenaamde ‘bonding’ organisaties) en organisaties die tevens leden hebben die tot andere etnische groepen behoren (zogenaamde ‘bridging’ organisaties).

In hoofdstuk 4 wordt antwoord gegeven op de volgende twee onderzoeksvragen: In hoeverre beïnvloedt etnische diversiteit in Nederlandse (a) wijken en (b) gemeenten betrokkenheid bij ‘bonding’ en ‘bridging’ recreatieve, belangen- en goededoelenorganisaties? En: In hoeverre kunnen deze relaties worden verklaard door mechanismen afgeleid van de constricttheorie en de contacttheorie?

Uit de resultaten van hoofdstuk 4 blijkt dat er slechts in beperkte mate sprake is van een negatieve invloed van het wonen in etnisch heterogene wijken of gemeenten op betrokkenheid bij verenigingen en vrijwilligersorganisaties. Alleen op het gemeenteniveau blijkt een grotere mate van etnische diversiteit negatief samen te hangen met betrokkenheid bij ‘bonding’ recreatieve organisaties. In tegenstelling tot de verwachtingen op basis van de constricttheorie wordt deze negatieve invloed niet gevonden voor betrokkenheid bij ‘bridging’ recreatieve organisaties. Op wijkniveau blijkt de mate van behorend tot de eigen etnische groep, gereduceerd kunnen worden. Bovendien zal het hebben van meer interetnisch contact kunnen leiden tot minder contacten met mensen van de eigen etnische groep. Hierdoor neemt de kans af om gevraagd te worden om lid te worden van of zich in te zetten voor ‘bonding’ organisaties met uitsluitend leden behorend tot de eigen etnische groep. Uit de resultaten van hoofdstuk 3 blijkt dat het wonen in Amerikaanse buurten met een groter percentage etnische minderheden leidt tot meer interetnisch contact. Dit is in lijn met de bevindingen in hoofdstuk 2 op het regionale niveau in Europa. Interetnisch contact blijkt uitsluitend (negatief) samen te hangen met betrokkenheid bij ‘bonding’ recreatieve organisaties. Er blijkt geen samenhang te bestaan met betrokkenheid bij belangen- of goededoelenorganisaties in het algemeen, of met betrokkenheid bij ‘bridging’ recreatieve organisaties. Wel wordt — in lijn met de bevindingen in hoofdstuk 2 — een negatieve samenhang gevonden tussen interetnisch contact en ervaren etnische dreiging. Wanneer, tot slot, rekening wordt gehouden met de invloed van ervaren etnische dreiging en interetnisch contact, blijkt dat de positieve relatie tussen etnische diversiteit en betrokkenheid bij ‘bridging’ belangenorganisaties niet langer significant is.

Op basis van de contacttheorie wordt verondersteld dat een grotere mate van etnische diversiteit in Amerikaanse buurten zal leiden tot meer interetnisch contact. Verder verwachten we dat interetnisch contact positief zal samenhangen met betrokkenheid bij ‘bridging’ organisaties, aangezien interetnisch contact vooroordelen reduceert en ervoor zorgt dat mensen zich minder ongemakkelijk voelen wanneer zij geconfronteerd worden met leden die behoren tot een andere etnische groep. Tegelijkertijd wordt verondersteld dat interetnisch contact juist negatief zal samenhangen met betrokkenheid bij ‘bonding’ organisaties. Door interetnisch contact kan de kijk op de eigen etnische groep veranderen, waardoor kritischer wordt gekeken naar de normen en gewoonten van de eigen groep. Hierdoor zal een natuurlijke voorkeur voor betrokkenheid bij organisaties met uitsluitend of overwegend leden
etnische diversiteit negatief samen te hangen met betrokkenheid bij ‘bonding’ belangenorganisaties. Ook hier blijkt echter geen negatieve invloed te bestaan van etnische diversiteit op betrokkenheid bij ‘bridging’ belangenorganisaties. In hoofdstuk 4 wordt geconcludeerd dat uitsluitend de invloed van etnische diversiteit op betrokkenheid in recreatieve organisaties substantieel is en dat deze invloed relatief beperkt is voor belangenorganisaties.


Hoofdstuk 5 − Etnische diversiteit en informeel sociaal kapitaal in Europa

In het eerste hoofdstuk van deel B, wordt ingegaan op de relatie tussen etnische diversiteit en informeel sociaal kapitaal in Europa. Hierbij wordt onderscheid gemaakt tussen twee dimensies: het onderhouden van informele relaties en het bieden van informele hulp. In tegenstelling tot eerdere landenvergelijkingen onderzoek in dit hoofdstuk ook de nadruk op onderliggende verklaringen voor een relatie tussen etnische diversiteit en informeel sociaal kapitaal. In hoofdstuk 5 staan twee onderzoeksvragen centraal: In hoeverre beïnvloedt etnische diversiteit in Europese (a) landen en (b) regio’s informeel sociaal kapitaal? En: In hoeverre kunnen deze relaties worden verklaard door mechanismen afgeleid van de conflicttheorie en de contacttheorie?

Zoals het geval was in de studie naar de gevolgen van etnische diversiteit in Europa voor formeel sociaal kapitaal, blijkt dat de mate van etnische diversiteit in Europese landen en regio’s nauwelijks invloed heeft op de mate van informeel sociaal kapitaal. Uitsluitend op het landeniveau blijkt een hogere mate van etnische diversiteit samen te hangen met het bieden van informele hulp. In tegenstelling tot de verwachtingen gebaseerd op de conflict-theorie, blijkt deze samenhang echter positief, in plaats van negatief te zijn. De mate van etnische diversiteit in Europese regio’s blijkt niet samen te hangen met informeel sociaal kapitaal.

Ook in dit hoofdstuk wordt onderzocht in hoeverre er sprake is van indirecte relaties tussen etnische diversiteit in Europese landen en regio’s en de mate van informeel sociaal kapitaal. Hierbij wordt wederom de rol van ervaren etnische dreiging en interetnisch contact beïnvloed. Wonen in regio’s met een grotere mate van etnische dreiging en interetnisch contact, lijken een positieve invloed te hebben op de mate van interetnisch contact. Daarnaast blijken mensen met meer interetnisch contact ook meer informeel sociaal kapitaal te hebben. Dit geldt voor beide dimensies: het onderhouden van informele relaties en het bieden van informele hulp.

De mate van etnische diversiteit in Europese landen en regio’s blijkt niet samen te hangen met de mate waarin etnische dreiging wordt ervaren. Echter, uit de resultaten in hoofdstuk 5 blijkt dat mensen die meer etnische dreiging ervaren, minder informele contacten onderhouden. Deze negatieve invloed wordt niet gevonden voor het bieden van informele hulp, mogelijk doordat deze banden sterker zijn en het onderhouden van informele contacten impliciet veronderstellen.

Net als in alle voorgaande hoofdstukken blijkt dat het ervaren van etnische dreiging negatief samenhangt met het hebben van interetnisch contact. Wanneer rekening wordt gehouden met de invloed van beide verklarende mechanismen, blijkt dat de
relatie tussen de mate van etnische diversiteit in Europese landen en het bieden van informele hulp nauwelijks verandert.

Hoofdstuk 6 − Verklaringen voor interetnisch contact in Europa

In het laatste hoofdstuk van deel B wordt antwoord gegeven op de tweede centrale onderzoeksvraag die gerelateerd is aan één specifieke dimensie van informeel sociaal kapitaal, namelijk interetnisch informeel sociaal kapitaal, ofwel interetnisch of intergroep contact. Zoals uit de resultaten van de voorgaande hoofdstukken naar voren kwam, vormt interetnisch contact een cruciale link tussen de mate van etnische diversiteit in de leefomgeving van mensen en hun mate van formeel en informeel sociaal kapitaal. In tegenstelling tot meer algemene indicatoren van sociaal kapitaal was er tot dusver echter relatief weinig bekend over welke sociale categorieën meer of minder interetnisch contact hebben en waarom. Ook was het tot nog toe onduidelijk in hoeverre de positieve relatie tussen etnische diversiteit en interetnisch contact in gelijke mate geldt voor verschillende sociale categorieën of onder verschillende maatschappelijke condities.

Om meer inzicht hierin te krijgen, wordt in hoofdstuk 6 gekeken naar (verklaringen voor) interetnisch contact in Europa, waarbij onderscheid gemaakt wordt tussen interetnisch contact met vrienden en interetnisch contact met collega’s. Alhoewel interetnisch contact op het werk oppervlakkiger is vergeleken met interetnische vriendschappen, blijkt uit eerder onderzoek dat beide vormen van contact naadloos negatieve houdingen ten aanzien van etnische minderheden kunnen reduceren en positief samenhangen met betrokkenheid bij vrijwilligersorganisaties (zie ook hoofdstuk 2). In dit hoofdstuk staat een trietal onderzoeksvragen centraal: In hoeverre verschillen autochtonen in hun mate van interetnisch contact? Hoe kunnen deze verschillen worden verklaard? En: voor welke sociale categorieën en onder welke maatschappelijke condities beïnvloedt etnische diversiteit interetnisch contact?

Uit de bevindingen van hoofdstuk 6 blijkt dat sociale categorieën sterk verschillen wat betreft interetnisch contact. Voor mannen en hoger opgeleiden blijkt de kansverhouding om wel interetnisch contact versus geen interetnisch contact te hebben, groter te zijn dan voor vrouwen en lager opgeleiden. Dit geldt zowel voor interetnisch contact met vrienden als met collega’s. Andere determinanten blijken beide dimensies van interetnisch contact verschillend te beïnvloeden. Voor handarbeiders blijkt de kansverhouding voor interetnische vriendschappen kleiner te zijn, terwijl deze juist groter is voor interetnisch contact op het werk. De kansverhouding voor interetnische vriendschappen blijkt af te nemen naarmate mensen ouder zijn, terwijl leeftijd nauwelijks invloed heeft op de kansverhouding voor interetnisch contact op het werk.

Om verschillen in interetnisch contact te verklaaren, wordt gebruik gemaakt van een theoretisch raamwerk voor interetnische huwelijken en wordt specifiek gekeken naar de rol van ontmoetingsmogelijkheden, voorkeuren en de invloed van derden (zogenaamde ‘third parties’). Terwijl ontmoetingsmogelijkheden bijvoorbeeld samenhangen met de aanwezigheid van etnische minderheden in iemands (directe) leefomgeving of op de arbeidsmarkt, verwijzen voorkeuren naar de mate waarin autochtonen openstaan voor interetnisch contact. De invloed van derden kan tot uitdrukking komen in normen van bijvoorbeeld familieleden of vrienden die interetnisch contact goed- of afkeuren. Hiervoor wordt gekeken naar het opleidingsniveau van relevante netwerkleden als proxy voor normen ten aanzien van interetnisch contact binnen het netwerk.

Aangezien interetnisch contact met vrienden volledig vrijwillig is, terwijl dit voor interetnisch contact op het werk in mindere mate geldt, kan de rol van de drie eerder genoemde mechanismen beter getoetst worden dan in eerdere studies die geen onderscheid hebben gemaakt tussen verschillende dimensies van interetnisch contact. Verwacht wordt dat ontmoetingsmogelijkheden beide vormen van contact zullen beïnvloeden, terwijl de invloed van voorkeuren en derden met name bij interetnische vriendschappen tot uiting zal komen. In het algemeen worden deze verwachtingen bevestigd door de resultaten, echter het beeld blijkt genuanceerder te zijn dan verondersteld. Alhoewel voorkeuren en relevante derden met name invloed blijken te hebben op interetnisch contact met vrienden, wordt in beperkte mate ook een invloed op interetnisch contact met collega’s gevonden.

Indien rekening wordt gehouden met de invloed van ontmoetingsmogelijkheden, blijkt dat verschillen tussen sociale categorieën met betrekking tot interetnisch contact slechts ten dele verklaard kunnen worden. Jongeren en mensen die in stedelijke gebieden wonen, blijken meer interetnisch contact te hebben met vrienden, dan mensen die ouder zijn of in meer rurale gebieden wonen. Deze verschillen worden kleiner wanneer de invloed van ontmoetingsmogelijkheden in ogenschouw wordt genomen. Daarentegen blijken verschillen tussen mannen en vrouwen en tussen hoger en lager opgeleiden juist toe te nemen, wanneer rekening wordt gehouden met verschillen in ontmoetingsmogelijkheden.

Het hebben van negatieve voorkeuren blijkt negatief samen te hangen met de kansverhouding om wel versus geen interetnisch contact te hebben. Bovendien blijkt dat, wanneer rekening wordt gehouden met dergelijke voorkeuren, het verschil in interetnisch contact met vrienden en collega’s tussen hoger en lager opgeleiden kleiner wordt. Dit geldt ook voor het verschil in interetnische vriendschappen tussen jongeren en mensen die ouder zijn. Het verschil in interetnisch contact met vrienden en collega’s tussen mannen en vrouwen blijkt daarentegen toe te nemen, indien rekening wordt gehouden met het feit dat vrouwen juist vaker een positieve voorkeur hebben.

De rol van derden komt uitsluitend tot uitdrukking bij interetnische vriendschappen. Voor jongeren en hoger opgeleiden blijkt de kansverhouding om wel interetnisch contact versus geen interetnisch contact te hebben, groter te zijn dan voor mensen die ouder zijn of een lager opleidingsniveau hebben. Deze verschillen worden kleiner indien rekening wordt gehouden met de rol van derden.
Uit de resultaten van hoofdstuk 6 blijkt dat er duidelijke verschillen zijn tussen sociale categorieën met betrekking tot interetnisch contact met vrienden of collega’s. Bovendien blijken de drie mechanismen (ontmoetingsmogelijkheden, voorkeuren en derden) een belangrijke invloed te hebben op interetnisch contact (vooral met betrekking tot interetnische vriendschappen). Wanneer rekening wordt gehouden met deze mechanismen, blijken verschillen tussen sociale categorieën slechts ten dele verklaard te kunnen worden. Bovendien blijkt uit aanvullende analyses op basis van een conservatieve toets, dat de gevonden verschillen niet significant zijn en daarom voorzichtig geïnterpreteerd dienen te worden. Desondanks lijkt de procentuele verandering van effecten in sommige gevallen wel substantieel te zijn. In hoofdstuk 6 wordt gesteld dat toekomstig onderzoek meer specifieke indicatoren van ontmoetingsmogelijkheden en de invloed van derden zou moeten gebruiken om verschillen tussen sociale categorieën beter te kunnen verklaren.

Tot slot wordt gekeken naar de relatie tussen de mate van etnische diversiteit in Europese regio’s en interetnisch contact met vrienden en collega’s. In tegenstelling tot de verwachtingen blijkt dat het wonen in regio’s met meer etnische minderheden in het algemeen een generieke positieve invloed heeft op interetnisch contact, die in gelijke mate geldt voor verschillende sociale categorieën of onder verschillende regionale condities.

**Hoofdstuk 7 – Conclusies en discussie**

In hoofdstuk 7 wordt antwoord gegeven op de twee centrale onderzoeksvragen in dit boek. De eerste vraag heeft betrekking op de relatie tussen etnische diversiteit en formeel en informeel sociaal kapitaal in verschillende Westerse landen. Bovendien wordt gekeken naar onderliggende verklaringen voor een relatie tussen etnische diversiteit en sociaal kapitaal op basis van de conflict- en de contacttheorie.

Uit de resultaten van dit onderzoek blijkt dat etnische diversiteit slechts in beperkte mate invloed heeft op de onderscheiden indicatoren van sociaal kapitaal. In het merendeel van de onderzochte relaties wordt geen bevestiging gevonden voor een invloed van etnische diversiteit. Indien wel een effect wordt gevonden, is dit verre van consistent negatief voor de verschillende indicatoren van sociaal kapitaal die worden onderscheiden. De resultaten van deze studie komen daarmee overeen met het beeld dat geschept werd in twee recente overzichtsstudies. Hieruit blijkt dat Putnam’s conclusies niet zondermee gegeneraliseerd kunnen worden.

In deze studie wordt gekeken naar de invloed van etnische diversiteit op verschillende gedragsindicatoren van sociaal kapitaal. Mogelijk kan de keuze voor gedragsindicatoren verklaren waarom nauwelijks invloeden van etnische diversiteit werden gevonden. In een recente overzichtsstudie werd geconcludeerd dat etnische diversiteit met name invloed heeft op houdingen en minder op indicatoren van gedrag. Uit onze resultaten blijkt verder dat het van belang is om rekening te houden met subdimensies van sociaal kapitaal: etnische diversiteit blijkt namelijk op verschillende wijzen samen te hangen met de diverse dimensies die onderzocht werden. In hoofdstuk 7 wordt gesteld dat toekomstig onderzoek zich verder zou kunnen richten op het verklaren van deze verschillen.

Verder wordt in deze studie gekeken naar de invloed van etnische diversiteit op verschillende niveaus (van buurten tot landen) in verschillende geografische regio’s (aan weerszijden van de Atlantische Oceaan). De resultaten van deze studie stoken niet met conclusies van eerder onderzoek waarin werd gesteld dat de negatieve invloed van etnische diversiteit vooral in de Amerikaanse context zou gelden. Daarnaast worden invloeden van etnische diversiteit op verschillende contextuele niveaus gevonden, waarbij in lijn met conclusies in een recente overzichtsstudie, ook het regioniveau van belang blijkt te zijn.

In dit boek wordt niet alleen gekeken naar de directe invloed van etnische diversiteit op sociaal kapitaal, maar ook naar onderliggende verklaringen, dat wil zeggen indirecte relaties tussen etnische diversiteit en sociaal kapitaal. Op basis van de conflict- en de contacttheorie wordt hierbij specifiek gekeken naar de rol van ervaren etnische dreiging en interetnisch contact, die negatief samen blijken te hangen. Uit de resultaten van deze studie blijkt dat interetnisch contact de belangrijkste invloed heeft: naarmate de etnische diversiteit toeneemt, neemt ook de mate van interetnisch contact toe. Deze relatie wordt zowel in Europese regio’s, Amerikaanse buurten als in Nederlandse gemeenten gevonden. In tegenstelling tot de verwachtingen op basis van de conflict-theorie wordt echter geen positieve samenhang tussen de mate van etnische diversiteit en de mate van ervaren etnische dreiging gevonden. In Nederlandse gemeenten blijkt zelfs een negatieve samenhang te bestaan: naarmate mensen in gemeenten met een groter percentage etnische minderheden wonen, neemt de ervaren etnische dreiging af. Mogelijk wijst dit op zogenaamde ‘gewenningseffecten’ zoals in eerdere studies werd aangetoond. In hoofdstuk 7 wordt gesteld dat het echter ook mogelijk is dat een grotere mate van etnische diversiteit alleen voor bepaalde sociale categorieën (dat wil zeggen groepen die in sterkere mate concurreren met etnische minderheden, bijvoorbeeld op de arbeidsmarkt) leidt tot het ervaren van etnische dreiging. Alhoewel eerdere studies niet volledig eenduidig zijn op dit vlak, zijn er studies die deze gedachtegang onderstrepen. Toekomstig onderzoek zou dergelijke conditionele effecten van etnische diversiteit verder kunnen ontrafelen.

Alhoewel er geen (positieve) relatie gevonden wordt tussen etnische diversiteit en de mate van ervaren etnische dreiging, blijkt dat mensen die meer etnische dreiging ervaren, over het algemeen minder informeel en formeel sociaal kapitaal hebben. Uit beide Europese studies blijkt dat mensen die meer etnische dreiging ervaren, minder betrokken zijn bij recreatieve, belangen- en goedgedoenoorganisaties en minder informele banden hebben. In de Amerikaanse en Nederlandse studies kan daarnaast rekening gehouden worden met de etnische compositie van verenigingen, om zo
onderdelen te maken tussen betrokkenheid bij organisaties met uitsluitend leden behorend tot de eigen etnische groep (zogenaamde ‘bonding’ organisaties) en organisaties die tevens leden hebben die tot andere etnische groepen behoren (zogenaamde ‘bridging’ organisaties). Het ervaren van etnische dreiging blijkt voornamelijk een negatieve invloed te hebben op betrokkenheid bij ‘bridging’ organisaties. Dit is in lijn met een belangrijk deel van de conflicttheorie: mensen die de aanwezigheid van etnische minderheden als bedreiging ervaren, zullen meer negatieve houdingen hebben ten aanzien van etnische minderheden en zullen contact met minderheden vermijden in ‘bridging’ organisaties. In tegenstelling tot de verwachtingen, blijkt het ervaren van etnische dreiging echter nauwelijks invloed te hebben op betrokkenheid bij ‘bonding’ organisaties.

Het belang van interetnisch contact wordt onderstreept indien gekeken wordt naar de relatie tussen interetnisch contact en formeel en informeel sociaal kapitaal. In beide Europese studies worden zeer consistent effecten gevonden van interetnisch contact: namelijk mensen met meer interetnisch contact hebben, zijn ze vaker betrokken bij recreatieve, belangen- en goedgedoelde organisaties, bieden ze meer informele hulp en onderhouden ze meer informele banden. Indien rekening wordt gehouden met de etnische compositie van verenigingen, blijkt dat contact met etnische minderheden uitsluitend negatief samenhangt met betrokkenheid bij ‘bonding’ recreatieve organisaties. In hoofdstuk 7 wordt gesteld dat de onderliggende verklaringen van de − over het algemeen zeer consistente − relaties, mogelijk afhankelijk zullen zijn van de specifieke indicator van sociaal kapitaal die bestudeerd wordt. Verondersteld wordt dat interetnisch contact onder andere zou leiden tot minder gevoelens van ongemak en onzekerheid om in contact te komen met etnische minderheden in verenigingen, maar dat contact ook kan leiden tot meer informatie over het bestaan van verenigingen en kans om uitgenodigd te worden om deel te nemen aan de activiteiten van deze organisaties. Toekomstig onderzoek zou deze achterliggende verklaringen van het effect van interetnisch contact op sociaal kapitaal verder kunnen ontrafelen.

Terugkomend op de eerste centrale onderzoeksvraag, wordt in hoofdstuk 7 geconcludeerd dat er nauwelijks bevestiging wordt gevonden voor een directe relatie tussen etnische diversiteit en diverse indicatoren van sociaal kapitaal en er derhalve slechts een beperkt aantal relaties verklaard kan worden. De relaties die worden gevonden, kunnen bovendien slechts in beperkte mate verklaard worden door rekening te houden met de rol van interetnisch contact en ervaren etnische dreiging. Er worden echter wel zeer consistent indirecte relaties gevonden tussen etnische diversiteit en sociaal kapitaal: mensen die wonen in een omgeving die gekenmerkt wordt door een grotere mate van etnische diversiteit, blijken meer interetnisch contact te hebben, hetgeen zowel direct als indirect (via een reductie van ervaren etnische dreiging) invloed heeft op diverse indicatoren van sociaal kapitaal. Terwijl eerdere studies de rol van interetnisch contact en ervaren etnische dreiging reeds herhaaldelijk hebben aangetoond met betrekking tot houdingen ten aanzien van etnische minderheden, is dit de eerste studie die dergelijke indirecte relaties onderzoekt voor gedragsindicatoren van sociale cohesie.

In hoofdstuk 7 wordt gesteld dat andere factoren als etnische diversiteit mogelijk een belangrijkere rol spelen wanneer gekeken wordt naar determinanten van sociaal kapitaal. Alhoewel dit niet de centrale focus van deze studie is, blijkt uit de resultaten dat met name in Europese landen en regio’s economische factoren (dat wil zeggen werkloosheid) een veel consistentere (negatieve) invloed hebben op informeel en sociaal kapitaal. Op lagere contextuele niveaus (zoals gemeenten en buurten) wordt hier echter minder bevestiging voor gevonden. In lijn met eerdere studies blijkt daarnaast dat individuele kenmerken van groot belang zijn voor het verklaren van sociaal kapitaal. Dit geldt in het bijzonder voor het opleidingsniveau: hoger opgeleiden zijn vaker betrokken bij alle typen verenigingen, onderhouden meer informele banden en bieden meer informele hulp. Het opleidingsniveau heeft daarnaast ook een indirecte invloed op sociaal kapitaal, aangezien dit een van de belangrijkste determinanten van interetnisch contact en ervaren etnische dreiging is.

Alhoewel de nadruk in dit onderzoek ligt op de relatie tussen etnische diversiteit en diverse indicatoren van sociaal kapitaal, wordt in het laatste empirische hoofdstuk nader ingegaan op een specifieke vorm van informeel sociaal kapitaal, namelijk interetnisch informeel sociaal kapitaal, ofwel interetnisch contact. In tegenstelling tot meer algemene indicatoren van sociaal kapitaal is er relatief weinig bekend over verschillen tussen sociale categorieën met betrekking tot interetnisch contact. Dit deel heeft betrekking op de tweede centrale onderzoeksvraag, waarbij gekeken wordt naar verschillen tussen sociale categorieën en mogelijke verklaringen hiervoor. Bovendien wordt gekeken in hoeverre de (positieve) relatie tussen etnische diversiteit en interetnisch contact generiek is voor verschillende sociale categorieën of onder verschillende economische omstandigheden. Hierbij wordt onderscheid gemaakt tussen twee vormen van interetnisch contact (contact met vrienden en met collega’s) en wordt specifiek gekeken naar de rol van ontmoetingsmogelijkheden, voorkeuren en de invloed van derden.

In hoofdstuk 7 wordt geconcludeerd dat sociale categorieën sterk verschillen wat betreft interetnisch contact met vrienden en collega’s. Bovendien blijken de drie mechanismen een duidelijke invloed te hebben op interetnisch contact. Ontmoetingsmogelijkheden blijken zowel van belang voor interetnisch contact met vrienden als voor interetnisch contact op het werk. Voorkeuren en relevante derden blijken met name van belang voor interetnische vriendschappen. Indien rekening wordt gehouden met de invloed van ontmoetingsmogelijkheden, voorkeuren en derden, blijken verschillen tussen sociale categorieën met betrekking tot interetnisch contact met vrienden en collega’s slechts in beperkte mate verklard te kunnen worden. Er wordt derhalve gesteld dat toekomstig onderzoek specifieke indicatoren zou moeten
gebruiken om deze verklaringen verder te toetsen. Tot slot wordt geconcludeerd dat de
invloed van objectieve ontmoetingsmogelijkheden (dat wil zeggen het percentage
etnische minderheden in Europese regio’s) een vrij generiek positieve invloed heeft
op interetnisch contact met vrienden en met collega’s. Deze relatie blijkt in gelijke mate
to bestaan voor verschillende sociale categoriën en onder verschillende regionale
omstandigheden. Deze conclusie is van groot belang aangezien interetnisch contact
een cruciale schakel blijkt te zijn voor de relatie tussen etnische diversiteit en sociaal
kapitaal.

Tot slot worden in hoofdstuk 7 een aantal beperkingen van deze studie besproken en
worden mogelijke richtingen voor toekomstig onderzoek aangereikt, om verder
inzicht te krijgen in de vragen of, wanneer en hoe etnische diversiteit samenhangt met
sociaal kapitaal. Ten eerste wordt gesteld dat de gevonden causale relaties in deze
studie voorzichtig geïnterpreteerd dienen te worden, aangezien gebruik werd gemaakt
van cross-sectionele data. Dit geldt in het bijzonder voor de relaties tussen ervaren
etnische dreiging en interetnisch contact enerzijds en betrokkenheid bij (‘bridging’) verenigingen anderzijds. Alhoewel deze relaties ook gevonden worden voor pasieve
vormen van betrokkenheid (waarbij er geen sprake is van interactie met andere leden),
alsook voor organisaties die gerekend worden door pasieve betrokkenheid (waarbij een
omgekeerde causale volgorde grotendeels is uitgesloten), zou toekomstig onderzoek deze bevindingen kunnen repliceren, respectievelijk valideren door gebruik
te maken van panel data of experimentele designs. Dit geldt ook voor de relaties tussen
ervaren etnische dreiging en interetnisch contact en de relatie tussen voorkeuren voor
contact en interetnisch contact.

Ten tweede zou toekomstig onderzoek nader in kunnen gaan op mogelijke
conditionele effecten. In hoofdstuk 7 wordt gesteld dat deze conditionele effecten een
rol zouden kunnen spelen met betrekking tot vier relaties. Allereerst zou etnische
diversiteit slechts voor bepaalde sociale categoriën (die direct concurreren met
etnische minderheden) kunnen leiden tot het ervaren van etnische dreiging. Recente
studies op dit terrein hebben meer specifiek gekeken naar de samenstelling van de
etnische minderheidsgroep in landen (bijvoorbeeld wat betreft beroepsstatus of
religie). Een dergelijke strategie lijkt een goede optie voor het verder ontrafelen van
conditionele effecten van etnische diversiteit. Het specifiek rekening houden met de
samenstelling van etnische minderheidsgroepen zou ook relevant kunnen zijn om te
onderzoeken of etnische diversiteit generiek leidt tot meer interetnisch contact voor
verschillende sociale categoriën. Alhoewel in dit onderzoek geen bevestiging wordt
gevonden voor conditionele effecten, kan niet expliciet rekening gehouden worden met
de samenstelling van de etnische minderheidsgroep in Europese regio’s en zijn de
ge-toetste hypothesen gebaseerd op aannames op dit vlak. Toekomstig onderzoek zou
dit onderzoek ook kunnen repliceren, gebruikmakend van andere data en andere
dimensies van interetnisch contact. Daarnaast zouden toekomstige studies kunnen
kijken naar conditionele effecten van ervaren etnische dreiging en interetnisch contact
op sociaal kapitaal. Alhoewel uit de resultaten een relatief consistent beeld naar voren
komt, is het denkbaar dat deze relaties voor sommige sociale categoriën sterker zijn
dan voor andere. Hierbij zou bijvoorbeeld naar de rol van eigenbelang gekeken kunnen
worden of naar verschillen tussen sociale categoriën in de mate van empathie.

Ten derde wordt in hoofdstuk 7 gesteld dat toekomstig onderzoek ook naar
alternatieve verklaringen (zoals anomie) en (de invloed van) de aanwezigheid van
verenigingen in een bepaalde context zou kunnen kijken. Dit laatste speelt een rol bij
de studies naar de relatie tussen etnische diversiteit en sociaal kapitaal en met
name de studies waarbij onderscheid gemaakt werd tussen ‘bonding’ en ‘bridging’
verenigingen. Hierbij wordt verondersteld dat mensen de keuze hebben om betrokken
te worden bij ‘bonding’ of ‘bridging’ organisaties. Alhoewel mensen de mogelijkheid
hebben om uit te wijken naar een andere buurt of gemeente indien het door hen
gewenste type vereniging niet beschikbaar is in hun eigen buurt of gemeente, zijn hier
kosten aan verbonden. Op basis van de resultaten van de Nederlandse studie wordt
geconcludeerd dat de aanbodkant van verenigingen mogelijk een rol speelt. Mensen
in gemeenten met een grotere mate van etnische diversiteit blijken minder betrokken te
zijn bij ‘bonding’ verenigingen, mogelijk doordat in dergelijke etnisch heterogene
gemeenten minder ‘bonding’ verenigingen gevestigd zijn. Toekomstig onderzoek op
dit terrein zou kunnen proberen om de aanbodkant te betrekken. Aangezien dergelijke
informatie waarschijnlijk niet landelijk beschikbaar is, zou gekeken kunnen worden
naar de aanwezigheid van verenigingen binnen bijvoorbeeld één gemeente.

Hoofdstuk 7 wordt afgesloten met de centrale conclusies en maatschappelijke
implicaties van dit onderzoek. Uit de resultaten van dit onderzoek blijkt dat etnische
diversiteit geen generieke negatieve invloed heeft op de onderzochte indicatoren van
sociale cohesie. De resultaten onderstrepen hiermee conclusies van twee recente
overzichtsstudies. Voor beleidsmakers is het dus van belang om eerdere negatieve
bewijdingen niet eenvoudigweg te generaliseren naar andere contexten en op basis
hiervan beleid te formuleren. Uit de bevindingen blijkt dat andere factoren (zoals het
landelijke of regionale werkloosheidspeil of het opleidingsniveau van mensen) een
belangrijkere invloed hebben op de onderzochte indicatoren van sociale cohesie. Beleidsmakers zouden zich dan ook hierop kunnen richten, bijvoorbeeld door ook in
de toekomst te blijven investeren in onderwijs en het voorkomen van vroegtijdige
schoolverlatening. Tot slot, blijkt uit de resultaten van deze studie dat interetnisch contact
een belangrijke rol speelt en positief samenhangt met de verschillende indicatoren van
sociale cohesie. Aangezien ontmoetingsmogelijkheden (dat wil zeggen de aanwezigheid van etnisch minderheden in iemands leefomgeving) een grote rol blijken
to spelen, zou in toekomstig beleid verder aandacht besteed kunnen worden aan het
voorkomen van etnische segregatie, het bevorderen van etnische integratie en
daarmee het stimuleren van mogelijkheden voor interetnisch contact.
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