

PDF hosted at the Radboud Repository of the Radboud University Nijmegen

The following full text is a publisher's version.

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://hdl.handle.net/2066/141660>

Please be advised that this information was generated on 2020-11-29 and may be subject to change.

Interreligious Contact, Perceived Group Threat, and Perceived Discrimination: Predicting Negative Attitudes among Religious Minorities and Majorities in Indonesia

Agnieszka Kanas¹, Peer Scheepers¹, and Carl Sterkens²

Abstract

This study examines the relationship between interreligious contact and negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup among minority Christians and majority Muslims in Indonesia. It answers two research questions: Does interreligious contact reduce negative outgroup attitudes equally for minority Christians and majority Muslims? Are mediation by perceived group threat and moderation by perceived discrimination equally important for religious minorities and majorities? The analysis is based on unique survey data collected from among Christian and Muslim students in Ambon (the Moluccas) and Yogyakarta (central Java). Results show that a higher quantity of interreligious contact reduces negative outgroup attitudes among majority Muslims but not among minority Christians. However, the quality of contact reduces negative attitudes regardless of relative group size. Perceived group threat is an important mediator of the contact-attitude relationship and is equally so for Christians and Muslims. Findings suggest that perceived discrimination does not affect the relationship between interreligious contact and negative attitudes.

Keywords

contact hypothesis, religion, discrimination, threat, conflict, Indonesia

Reconciliation programs and activities in conflict regions, including the Moluccas in Indonesia, are often based on the assumption that bringing members of different ethno-religious groups into contact with each other will improve intergroup relations (International Crisis Group 2000, 2002). The idea that intergroup contact reduces negative attitudes toward the outgroup was first introduced more

¹Department of Sociology, Radboud University, Nijmegen, the Netherlands

²Department of Empirical Religious Studies, Radboud University, Nijmegen, the Netherlands

Corresponding Author:

Dr. Agnieszka Kanas, Department of Sociology, Radboud University, PO Box 9104, 6500 HE, Nijmegen, the Netherlands.

Email: a.kanas@maw.ru.nl

than half a century ago by sociologist Robin Williams (1947) and social psychologist Gordon Allport (1954). Numerous cross-sectional, longitudinal, and experimental studies have shown a robust, highly significant negative relationship between intergroup contact and prejudice, referred to as a positive contact effect (Pettigrew et al. 2011; Pettigrew and Tropp 2006).

Despite strong evidence for the contact hypothesis, most previous research has been limited by its dominant focus on racial or ethnic groups in Western countries. Noteworthy exceptions are studies of Protestants and Catholics in Northern Ireland (Hewstone et al. 2006; Paolini et al. 2004), Muslims and Hindus in Bangladesh (Islam and Hewstone 1993) and India (Tausch, Hewstone, and Roy 2009), and ethnic groups in South Africa (for an overview, see Pettigrew 2010). One of the main findings of these studies is that intergroup contact, in particular the quality of contact, reduces negative attitudes toward the outgroup, even in contexts characterized by a high level of segregation and limited intergroup interaction (Swart et al. 2010). This study contributes to the growing research on this issue by focusing on ethnically and religiously diverse regions of Indonesia, namely, Ambon (the Moluccas) and Yogyakarta (central Java), where social cleavages exist along religious lines.

Even more important, previous research has focused almost exclusively on the effects of intergroup contact on attitudes of majority group members toward minorities, mainly on attitudes of whites toward blacks in the United States (Pettigrew and Tropp 2006). The exceptions are studies that have examined the effects of interracial or interethnic contact exclusively among minorities (Ellison and Powers 1994; Powers and Ellison 1995; Swart et al. 2011; Tropp et al. 2012). However, by focusing

exclusively on minorities, these studies tell us little about the plausible differential role of intergroup contact among minorities and majorities. In this study, we will therefore consider interreligious relations between religious minorities and majorities.

Equally important, yet insufficiently studied, are questions about mediators and moderators of contact effects among minorities and majorities. Previous research has identified a number of mechanisms that explain the contact-attitude relationship, the reduction of intergroup anxiety and perception of group threat being particularly important (Pettigrew and Tropp 2008). However, there is little evidence as to whether these well-established mediators for majority group members are equally valuable for minorities.

Likewise, little is known about the processes that contribute to weaker contact effects among minority as compared to majority group members (Tropp and Pettigrew 2005). It has been suggested that minorities perceive and experience intergroup contact more negatively than majorities, which in turn undermines the influence of intergroup contact among them (Tropp 2007). However, to our knowledge, only one study by Tropp (2007) among whites and blacks in the United States has examined this issue empirically. Our study provides further insights into the moderating role of perceived discrimination for religious minorities and majorities.

This study provides answers to the following research questions:

Research Question 1: Does interreligious contact reduce negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup equally for the Christian minority and the Muslim majority?

Research Question 2: Is mediation by perceived group threat and moderation by perceived discrimination equally

important for religious minorities and majorities?

This investigation relies on unique survey data, collected by the authors themselves, which includes large numbers of Christians and Muslims, alternating in majority and minority position, differing in power and status, and involved in specific histories of religious conflicts. This innovative design provides opportunities to test the hypotheses more rigorously, specifically among religious majority and minority groups and in different geographic regions, where group status and intergroup relations are reversed.

Research Setting

Indonesia's 238 million people are composed of about 87.2 percent Muslims, 7.0 percent Protestants, 2.9 percent Catholics, and 1.7 percent Hindus (Statistics Indonesia 2010). Christians and Muslims are not equally distributed across the country. For example, in the two regions in which we conducted the surveys, Christians account for 9 percent of the population in Yogyakarta but 60 percent in Ambon, the capital of the Moluccas province (Statistics Indonesia 2011); Muslims account for 90 percent and 39 percent, respectively.

The religious groups also differ in terms of socioeconomic status and political influence. Muslims, who in Indonesia enjoy political power, have lower socioeconomic status on average than Christians, who are a minority group with little political power. The situation is partially reversed in Ambon, where Muslims are a minority group (albeit a rather large one) and on a local level have lower socioeconomic status and no more political influence than Christians. As a consequence of these differences, both groups compete with each other over economic resources such as land, employment, and political power and feel threatened when

resources are scarce. This is particularly true in Moluccas province, which is one of the poorest in Indonesia and has experienced large internal flows of Muslim migration in recent decades (Sidel 2008).

Finally, although relations between Christian and Muslim communities in Indonesia have been generally peaceful, there have been clashes between religious communities where many people lost their lives and property (Sidel 2006; Sterkens and Hadiwitanto 2009). For instance, in the city of Ambon, where we carried out the surveys, sectarian violence between Christians and Muslims from 1999 to 2002 caused the death or displacement of hundreds of thousands of people.¹ Among many factors that facilitated religious conflict in Ambon were strong resentments caused by marginalization of Muslims in the Dutch colonial period and of Christians under Suharto's New Order regime, and competition between traditional (mainly) Christian inhabitants and more recent (mainly) Muslim settlers over employment and land. There are also political conflicts between separatists supporting the founding of Republic of the South Moluccas and nationalists that support integration with the Republic of Indonesia, and shifts in Ambon's population as a result of internal migration (Sterkens and Hadiwitanto 2009).

Clearly, this long history of religious discrimination and violence has not been without impact on Christian and Muslim relations in Indonesia, particularly in the affected areas. According to a recent survey carried out by the Center for the Study of Islam and Society at Jakarta, there is a relatively high level of intolerance toward the Christian minority in

¹For a detailed account of religious conflicts in the city of Ambon in the Moluccas province, see Sterkens and Hadiwitanto (2009) and the reports of the International Crisis Group (cf. International Crisis Group 2000, 2002, 2011).

Indonesia (Mujani 2003), in particular toward those in high-status positions of power. While only approximately 16 percent of Muslims objected to having Christian neighbors, 55 percent were opposed to Christians teaching in public schools, 75 percent objected to religious services held by and for Christians, and 85 percent were against having a Christian president (Mujani 2003: Figures 5.1, 5.2).²

Interreligious Contact and Minority-Majority Relations

Although the contact hypothesis started from and was dominated by research on ethnic and racial groups, there has been some evidence that intergroup contact reduces outgroup negativity beyond ethnic and racial contexts—toward religious outgroups (Hewstone et al. 2006; Paolini et al. 2004), homosexuals (Herek and Capitano 1996; Schmid et al. 2012), the mentally ill (Desforges et al. 1991), and the homeless (Lee et al. 2004).

According to Allport (1954), for intergroup contact to reduce outgroup negativity, four conditions must be present: (1) contact is of equal status, (2) common goals are being pursued by group members, (3) there is intergroup cooperation, and (4) there is institutional support from authorities, laws, norms, customs, and so on. However, recent meta-analyses by Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) have shown that although Allport's conditions facilitate the positive contact effect, they are not necessary. In line with this argument, it has been shown that while both the quantity and quality of intergroup contact reduce negative attitudes toward the outgroup, the quality of contact is

particularly important (Pettigrew et al. 2011; Pettigrew and Tropp 2006). This is because high-quality intergroup contact, such as in intergroup friendships, is more likely to meet most of Allport's conditions, namely, to be equal status and involve common goals and intergroup cooperation, which facilitate the positive effects of intergroup contact. Consistent with previous research, we also expect the quantity of interreligious contact to reduce negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup among Christians and Muslims in Indonesia (Hypothesis 1a). In addition, we expect the quality of contact to reduce negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup more than the quantity of contact (Hypothesis 1b).

Does interreligious contact reduce negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup equally among the Christian minority and the Muslim majority? It could be argued, purely on a numerical basis, that minorities are forced into contact with majorities more than the reverse. This "forced" contact may be less beneficial for minorities than for majorities in terms of the conditions proposed by Allport (1954), that is, because it is not of equal status or cooperative. Because of these wider opportunities to meet, minority group members may be also more susceptible to negative intergroup contact. It has recently been shown that negative intergroup contact is a much stronger predictor for outgroup attitudes than positive intergroup contact, suggesting that negative encounters could dominate experiences of intergroup contact among minorities (Barlow et al. 2012; Paolini, Harwood, and Rubin 2010). This could apply to the Christian minority in Yogyakarta—where Muslims are in the majority—but also in Ambon, where Muslims are a minority group, albeit a large one.

In line with these arguments, several studies on racial and ethnic groups in

²The surveys were carried out in 2001 and 2002 and covered approximately 87 percent (2001) and 90 percent (2002) of the national population in Indonesia. Unfortunately, the presented statistics are restricted to the Muslim population.

the United States (Tropp 2007), Europe (Binder et al. 2009), and South Africa (Finchilescu 1988; Swart et al. 2010) have shown that the positive effect of intergroup contact is indeed smaller for minorities and/or low-status group members as compared to majorities and/or high-status group members (for the same conclusion, also see the meta-analysis by Tropp and Pettigrew 2005). Based on the foregoing observations, we hypothesize that the quantity and quality of interreligious contact reduce negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup more among the Muslim majority than the Christian minority (Hypotheses 2a and 2b).

Perceived Group Threat and Perceived Discrimination

In previous contributions, an important mechanism has been proposed to explain the contact-attitude relationship via the perception of threat (McLaren 2003; Savelkoul et al. 2011; Schlueter and Scheepers 2010). The idea that perceived group threat increases negative attitudes toward the outgroup is a fundamental premise of realistic group conflict theories (Blalock 1967; Bobo 1999; Coser 1956; Scheepers, Gijssberts, and Coenders 2002). Two types of perceived threat are commonly distinguished: realistic threats to a group's power, resources, and general welfare versus symbolic threats to a group's religion, values, and belief systems (Stephan, Ybarra, and Morrison 2008). Researchers have argued and shown that intergroup contact reduces perceptions of group threat by weakening concerns about access to valued resources and differences in norms and values and therefore reduces negative attitudes toward the outgroup (McLaren 2003; Schlueter and Scheepers 2010; Stephan et al. 2002).

However, because previous research has exclusively focused on majority group

members, little has been discovered as to whether the reduction of perceived group threat is equally important for minorities (Tropp and Pettigrew 2005). The exceptions are recent studies that have examined the mediating role of perceived group threat and/or intergroup anxiety among ethnic and racial groups in Europe (Binder et al. 2009), South Africa (Swart et al. 2010, 2011), India (Tausch et al. 2009), and the United States (Stephan et al. 2002). Binder et al. (2009) found non-significant contact effects as well as non-significant mediation by intergroup anxiety for ethnic minority group members. Swart et al. (2010) have shown that while intergroup anxiety reduction is an important mechanism for explaining the contact-attitude relationship for both majority and minority group members, its influence is weaker among minorities than among majorities (for a longitudinal account of mediation via intergroup anxiety for minorities, see also Swart et al. 2011). Finally, Tausch et al. (2009) have shown that while intergroup anxiety is equally predictive of prejudice for majority Hindus and minority Muslims in India, the relative importance of realistic and symbolic threat is moderated by group membership, such that symbolic, but not realistic, threat predicted prejudice for majority Hindu respondents and realistic, but not symbolic, threat predicted prejudice among minority Muslims. These studies suggest that well-established mediators for the contact-attitude relationship may work differently according to group size.

This study extends our knowledge by examining the mediating role of perceived group threat among the Christian minority and the Muslim majority in Indonesia. Specifically, we estimate the model for mediated moderation, which combines the processes of mediation by perceived group threat and moderation by group size, to account for differential effects of

interreligious contact on negative outgroup attitudes (Muller, Judd, and Yzerbyt 2005). To start with, based on the previous research, we expect perceived group threat to mediate the relationship between the quantity and quality of interreligious contact and negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup (Hypothesis 3a). However, given the suggested weaker effect of interreligious contact on minorities than on majorities in earlier studies, we expect either the relationship between interreligious contact and perceived group threat and/or the relationship between perceived group threat and negative outgroup attitudes to be weaker for minorities than majorities. Based on the foregoing considerations, we hypothesize that the mediating role of perceived group threat will be stronger for the Muslim majority than for the Christian minority (Hypothesis 3b).

In addition, we study whether and to what extent perceived discrimination moderates the relationship between interreligious contact and negative outgroup attitudes among religious majority and minority group members. Researchers have argued and shown that minority group members are likely to experience intergroup contact less positively than majority group members (Shelton 2000; Sigelman and Welch 1993; Stephan et al. 2002; Swart et al. 2010; Tropp 2007; Verkuyten, Thijs, and Bekhuis 2010). Minorities fear becoming a target for discrimination and are more aware of their inferior status, which often remains unaltered beyond the contact setting, all of which may reduce the intergroup contact effect among minorities more than majorities (Swart et al. 2010; Tredoux and Finchilescu 2007). Sigelman and Welch (1993) have reported that while whites perceived their contact with blacks in the United States to be smooth and congenial, blacks felt their contact with whites was hostile. Moreover, it has been shown

that while perceived discrimination plays an important role in predicting the interracial attitudes of the black minority, it does not affect the interracial attitudes of the white majority in the United States (Monteith and Spicer 2000; Tropp 2007).

It could be argued that the Christian minority in Indonesia may perceive themselves to be and actually be a target of discrimination because of their smaller size and little political influence relative to Muslims. Muslims, as a majority, have no reason to perceive discrimination; certainly not in Indonesia, where many recent laws introduced by the Indonesian government, even those aiming at reducing religious tensions, have contributed to the marginalization of religious minorities (Human Rights Watch 2013; Salim 2008). We therefore hypothesize that perceived discrimination increases negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup (Hypothesis 4a). Furthermore, as earlier research has suggested that perceived discrimination is often a defining feature of intergroup relations for minorities but not for majorities, and that it is likely to worsen minority group members' attitudes toward majorities (Monteith and Spicer 2000; Tropp 2007), we expect the relationship between perceived discrimination and negative attitudes to be stronger among the Christian minority than the Muslim majority (Hypothesis 4b).

We expect this higher perception of discrimination among minorities to mar experiences of intergroup contact for minority group members, reducing its positive effect, but not for majority group members. We, therefore, hypothesize that perceived discrimination reduces the relationship between the quantity and quality of interreligious contact and negative outgroup attitudes more for the Christian minority than for the Muslim majority (Hypothesis 5a).

Finally, we consider whether the same pattern of findings emerges for both

quantity and quality of contact. It could be argued that the perception of discrimination is less important in relation to quality than to quantity. One reason for this expectation is that quality of contact is to a large extent influenced by individual preferences (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, and Cook 2001; Sigelman et al. 1996), implying that high-quality intergroup contact, such as intergroup friendship, is more resistant to the perception of discrimination. Another reason is that high-quality contact is likely to meet all of Allport's (1954) conditions for the positive contact effect, namely, equality, common goals, and cooperation, and as such increases a positive experience of intergroup contact, which in turn reduces negative attitudes toward the outgroup (Johnson and Jacobson 2005; Pettigrew et al. 2011; Powers and Ellison 1995; Sigelman and Welch 1993; Tropp 2007). Based on the foregoing, we hypothesize that moderation by perceived discrimination is *weaker* for the quality than for the quantity of contact (Hypothesis 5b).

METHODS

Sample

The analysis is based on the survey data *Ethno-Religious Conflicts in Indonesia* (Sterkerns et al. 2014). The survey was specifically designed and executed to study individual and contextual determinants of ethno-religious conflicts, ranging from negative attitudes toward the outgroup to support for ethno-religious violence. It includes a wide variety of measures for ethnic and religious identification, beliefs, practices, perceived group threat, discrimination, and political activism, namely, support for protest and violence on behalf of the religious ingroup.

The survey provides an excellent opportunity to examine the contact hypothesis. It includes large numbers of Christians and Muslims, alternating in

majority and minority position at both the local and national level, differing in power and status, and involved in specific histories of religious conflicts. In addition, it includes rich information about the quantity and quality of interreligious contact in various settings, for example, classrooms and neighborhoods. Most previous research has focused on specific types of intergroup contact (e.g., friendship) in a single setting (e.g., school). By including different types of intergroup contact and settings, this study provides a better understanding of the intergroup contact effect among minorities and majorities.

The sample used in this study was collected from second- and third-year undergraduate students in public and denominational universities in the cities of Ambon (the Moluccas) and Yogyakarta (central Java). We deliberately selected public and denominational universities to ensure a sufficient number of Christian and Muslim students in each region. In each university, a random sample of 250 students was drawn from humanities, natural sciences, and medical sciences departments, resulting in a total of 1,500 respondents. The response rate was 63.1 percent in Ambon city and 55.3 percent in Yogyakarta (Sterkerns et al. 2014). The analysis was restricted to male and female students who reported to be either Muslim or Christian (98.8 percent) and had valid observations on the variables included in the analysis (N = 1,225).

Measures of Dependent and Independent Variables

Negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup were measured by three negative statements adapted from Sterkerns and Anthony (2008) with answers ranging from 1 = totally disagree to 5 = totally agree: "Christians (Muslims) only talk about doing good deeds without practicing

them,” “When it comes to religion, Christians (Muslims) are less tolerant,” and “Christians (Muslims) are often the cause of religious conflict.” Exploratory factor analysis indicated a one-factor structure; the items were therefore averaged to form a reliable index: negative outgroup attitudes (Christians, $\alpha = .79$; Muslims, $\alpha = .81$). Higher scores indicate stronger negative attitudes. The mean comparison showed that there is no overall difference between Christians ($M = 2.70$, $SD = .88$) and Muslims ($M = 2.72$, $SD = .87$) in the extent to which they reported having negative attitudes toward the outgroup, $t(1,223) = -.50$, $p = .62$.

The respondents were asked about various types of interreligious contacts in different social settings (e.g., university, neighborhood). Building on previous research, we distinguished between quantity and quality of interreligious contact (Binder et al. 2009; Tropp 2007).

Quantity of contact was measured by three variables with answers ranging from 1 = never to 6 = several times a day. The first variable was, “In the past year, how often did you have contact with Christians (Muslims) as neighbors?” Two other variables were the same, except that they referred to the frequency of interreligious contact with classmates and people living in the same house or dormitory building. Exploratory factor analysis yielded a one-factor structure; the variables were therefore averaged to form a reliable index (Christians: $\alpha = .72$; Muslims: $\alpha = .79$). Higher values indicate more frequent interreligious contact. Christians reported on average having significantly more frequent interreligious contact ($M = 4.07$, $SD = 1.69$) than Muslims ($M = 2.99$, $SD = 1.81$), $t(1,223) = 10.66$, $p < .001$, Cohen’s $d = .62$, which indicates a medium effect size as defined by Cohen (1988).

Quality of contact was measured by sixteen items using five-point ordinal scales. The items referred to four aspects

of the quality of contact, namely: goodness, closeness, equality, and cooperativeness (Allport 1954; Pettigrew and Tropp 2006). For example, the four variables for interreligious contact with neighbors were: “How would you rate your contact with Christians (Muslims) as neighbors?” on a scale ranging from 1 = very negative to 5 = very positive; “How close are you to your Christian (Muslim) neighbors?” on a scale ranging from 1 = not close at all to 5 = very close; “How equal would you say you are to your Christian (Muslim) neighbors?” on a scale ranging from 1 = not equal at all to 5 = very equal; and “How much do you cooperate with your Christian (Muslim) neighbors?” on a scale ranging from 1 = do not cooperate at all to 5 = cooperate a lot. As in the case of quantity of contact, the questions were repeated for other types of contact (i.e., friends, classmates, dorm mates). Factor analysis with an oblimin rotation indicated a three-factor structure: goodness, closeness/cooperativeness, and equality. However, because the factors were highly correlated ($.59 < r < .76$), they were averaged to form a reliable index (Christians $\alpha = .93$; Muslims $\alpha = .97$). Higher scores indicate higher quality of interreligious contact. Interestingly, the mean comparison showed that the Christian minority have significantly higher quality of interreligious contact ($M = 4.05$, $SD = .55$) than the Muslim majority ($M = 3.57$, $SD = .85$), $t(1,111) = 11.52$, $p < .001$, Cohen’s $d = .65$, again a medium effect size (Cohen 1988). A possible explanation for our finding could be that the Christian minority has much greater opportunity for interreligious contact than the Muslim majority and can thus select more favorable contacts from this larger pool and thereby end up with more favorable evaluations of them.

Perceived group threat was measured by nine items, with answers ranging from 1 = totally disagree to 5 = totally agree, such as, “I am worried that job

prospects for members of my religious group will decline due to the presence of other religious groups,” “I am worried that security in my university will decline due to the presence of students of other religious groups,” and “I am afraid that customs of my religious group will be lost due to the presence of other religious groups” (see Appendix A for the full list of items). These variables have been successfully used in other studies to measure the perceived group threat posed by ethnic minority groups (Gijssberts, Hagendoorn, and Scheepers 2004; Scheepers et al. 2002; Schneider 2008). The factor analysis indicated one factor; we therefore averaged the items to form a reliable index (Christians and Muslims $\alpha = .92$). Higher scores indicate stronger perceived group threat. Muslims perceived significantly more group threat ($M = 2.51$, $SD = .77$) than Christians ($M = 2.35$, $SD = .75$), $t(1,158) = -3.58$, $p < .001$, although in terms of the effect size the difference between means was negligible (Cohen’s $d = .21$).

Perceived discrimination was measured by 17 items adapted from Fox (2000a, 2000b) that refer to different types of discrimination, namely, economic (i.e., labor market), political (i.e., freedom of expression), cultural (i.e., celebration of group ceremonies), and religious (i.e., building places of worship) (see Appendix A). The factor analysis indicated a one-factor structure; we therefore averaged the variables to form a reliable index ranging from 1 = totally disagree to 5 = totally agree (Christians $\alpha = .96$; Muslims $\alpha = .93$). A higher score indicates stronger perceived discrimination. Christian respondents generally perceived significantly more group discrimination ($M = 2.32$, $SD = .81$) than Muslim respondents ($M = 2.23$, $SD = .64$), $t(979) = 2.10$, $p < .05$, Cohen’s $d = .12$ indicating a small effect size.

We also controlled for demographic and socioeconomic factors that might influence the contact-attitude relationship (Coenders

and Scheepers 1998; Dixon 2006; Powers and Ellison 1995): religious group (Muslim = 1), gender (male = 1), parental education (0 = none, 1 = primary, 2 = secondary, and 3 = tertiary), and conflict region (Ambon = 1). Ranges, means, and standard deviations of responses to the measures of dependent, independent, and control variables are presented in Table 1.

Analyses

Table 2 shows the results of the multivariate regression analysis, which assesses the associations between the quantity and quality of interreligious contact, perceived group threat, and negative outgroup attitudes. Model 1a includes the quantity of interreligious contact; Model 1b adds the quality of interreligious contact. Models 2a and 2b add two-way interactions between majority status and the quantity and quality of interreligious contact, respectively.

Model 3a examines the mediation by perceived group threat, and Model 3b examines mediated moderation, which combines the processes of mediation by perceived group threat and moderation by majority status, respectively (Muller et al. 2005). The advantage of estimating a mediated moderation model is that it indicates whether the smaller contact-attitude relationship of the Christian minority in relation to that of the Muslim majority is due to differences in the association between the quantity and/or quality of contact and perceived group threat, association between group threat and negative attitudes, or both (Binder et al. 2009).

Table 4 presents the relationships between the quantity and quality of interreligious contact and perceived discrimination on the one hand and negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup on the other hand. Because Hypotheses 4b through 5b are formulated from a minority perspective, we include minority

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics

Dependent variable	Range	Christians						Muslims					
		Yogyakarta		Ambon		Total		Yogyakarta		Ambon		Total	
		Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Negative attitudes	1-5	2.62	.79	2.76	.94	2.70	.88	2.53	.81	3.02	.87	2.72	.87
Independent variables													
Quantity of contact	1-6	4.70	1.46	3.55	1.69	4.07	1.69	3.34	1.78	2.46	1.73	2.99	1.81***
Quality of contact	1-5	4.06	.43	4.04	.63	4.05	.55	3.74	.63	3.30	1.04	3.57	.85***
Perceived group threat	1-5	2.17	.63	2.50	.80	2.35	.75	2.35	.68	2.74	.83	2.51	.77***
Perceived discrimination	1-5	2.39	.83	2.26	.79	2.32	.81	2.18	.62	2.32	.66	2.23	.64*
Male	0/1	.59		.55		.57		.53		.42		.49	**
Parental education	0-3	2.35	.62	2.16	.57	2.24	.60	2.23	.70	1.63	.62	1.99	.73***
Ambon	0/1					.55						.40	***
N	1,225	238		293		531		416		278		694	

Note: Asterisks indicate that religious group means at a country level differ significantly.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

Table 2. Multivariate Regression Analyses for the Effects of Quantity and Quality of Contact and Perceived Group Threat on Negative Attitudes

	Model 1a	Model 1b	Model 2a	Model 2b	Model 3a	Model 3b
Quantity of contact	-.055*** (-3.80)	-.014 (-.84)	.016 (.69)	-.014 (-.84)	-.002 (-.15)	.016 (.76)
Quality of contact		-.247*** (-6.62)	-.236*** (-6.23)	-.223** (-3.28)	-.140*** (-3.91)	-.131*** (-3.63)
Muslim	.000 (.00)	-.062 (-1.14)	-.042 (-.76)	-.058 (-1.04)	-.074 (-1.46)	-.058 (-1.12)
Male	.093+ (1.91)	.108* (2.20)	.106* (2.15)	.108* (2.19)	.113* (2.45)	.111* (2.43)
Parental education	-.053 (-1.41)	-.036 (-.93)	-.031 (-.80)	-.035 (-.91)	-.032 (-.90)	-.027 (-.75)
Ambon	.271*** (5.08)	.237*** (4.41)	.245*** (4.56)	.235*** (4.37)	.130* (2.56)	.137** (2.69)
Quantity of contact × Muslim			-.053+ (-1.81)			-.032 (-1.14)
Quality of contact × Muslim				-.032 (-.42)		
Perceived group threat					.428*** (13.32)	.385*** (8.26)
Perceived group threat × Muslim						.075 (1.21)
Constant	2.650*** (24.28)	2.648*** (24.24)	2.612*** (23.52)	2.641*** (23.88)	1.659*** (13.17)	2.665*** (25.70)
Adjusted R ²	.051	.081	.083	.080	.203	.204
N	1225	1161	1161	1161	1161	1161

Note: *t* statistics are shown in parentheses.
+*p* < .10. **p* < .05. ***p* < .01. ****p* < .001, two-tailed test.

status (vs. majority status) in the analyses. Table 4, Model 4a includes perceived discrimination; Model 4b adds interaction between perceived discrimination and minority status. Models 5a and 5b test for three-way interactions between perceived discrimination, minority status, and the quantity and quality of contacts, respectively. In all models, we mean centered the continuous variables and included gender, parental education, and conflict region to control for potential effects of individual and contextual variables.

RESULTS

Table 2, Model 1a shows that a higher quantity of contact with religious outgroups significantly reduces negative attitudes toward them (Model 1a: $b = -.055$, $p < .001$), in line with Hypothesis 1a. Likewise, students who have higher-quality interreligious contact (i.e., good, close, equal status, and/or cooperative contact), have less negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup than those who do not (Model 1b: $b = -.247$, $p < .001$). The *quality of contact* coefficient is not only statistically significant but also meaningful in size. For example, having good quality contact with religious outgroups decreases negative attitudes toward these outgroups by one point ($4 \times [-.247] = -.988$), which is a substantial reduction on a scale ranging from 1 to 5. The quality of contact is not only more strongly related to negative attitudes than the quantity of contact, but also when it is taken into account, a significant relationship between the quantity of contact and negative attitudes disappears, in line with Hypothesis 1b, and at the expense of Hypothesis 1a. These results suggest that students with high-quality contact are more likely to have both a high quantity of contact and reduced negative outgroup attitudes, suggesting that the relationship between the

quantity of contact and attitudes is spurious. However, because we rely on cross-sectional data, we cannot exclude another scenario; namely, that the quantity of contact increases the quality of contact, which in turn reduces negative attitudes toward the outgroup.

In line with Hypothesis 2a, Table 2, Model 2a shows that the quantity of interreligious contact is a stronger and yet only marginally significant predictor for negative attitudes among the Muslim majority than among the Christian minority (Model 2a: $b = -.053$, $p = .07$). The relationship between the quantity of interreligious contact and negative outgroup attitudes is so much weaker for the Christian minority than for the Muslim majority that it does not reach statistical significance in the former group (Model 2a: $b = .016$, $p = .49$).³ Contrary to Hypothesis 2b, there is no evidence for a significant interaction between the quality of contact and relative group size however. In sum, these results suggest that while the quantity of contact reduces negative attitudes more for the Muslim majority than for the Christian minority, high-quality contact decreases outgroup negativity regardless of the religion, namely, the relative group size.⁴

³The b coefficient for the quantity of contact for Muslims is $b = -.037$, $p = .074$.

⁴To see whether our conclusions are sensitive to the use of the one-dimensional measure for quality of contact, we re-ran analyses reported in Table 2 (Models 1-2) using a tridimensional measure. Out of the three dimensions for quality of contact, only goodness of contact predicts lower negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup (cf. Table 2, Model 1b), and this is regardless of relative group size (cf. Table 2, Model 2b). We also found some evidence that equality of contact is a significantly stronger predictor for negative attitudes among the Muslim majority than among the Christian minority (Table 2, Model 2b). In fact, the relationship between the equality of contact and negative attitudes does not reach statistical significance for the Christian minority.

Table 3. Multivariate Regression Analyses for the Effects of Quantity and Quality of Contact on Perceived Group Threat

	Model 3a	Model 3b
Quantity of contact	-.026+ (-1.93)	-.012 (-.68)
Quality of contact	-.251*** (-7.87)	-.242*** (-7.41)
Muslim	.029 (.62)	.145 (1.45)
Male	-.010 (-.24)	-.009 (-.21)
Parental education	-.008 (-.25)	-.005 (-.14)
Ambon	.250*** (5.47)	.255*** (5.55)
Quantity of contact × Muslim		-.033 (-1.31)
Constant	2.312*** (24.80)	2.289*** (24.13)
Adjusted R ²	.125	.126
N	1161	1161

Note: *t* statistics are shown in parentheses.
+*p* < .10. ****p* < .001, two-tailed test.

Table 2, Model 3a provides evidence for the hypothesized mediation by perceived group threat (Hypothesis 3a). Perceived group threat increases negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup (Model 3a: $b = .428$, $p < .001$). Moreover, the coefficient of the quality of contact is significantly reduced when perceived group threat is included in the model (Model 1b: $b = -.247$, $p < .001$ vs. Model 3a: $b = -.140$, $p < .001$; $\chi^2[1] = 34.56$, $p < .001$) (Clogg, Petkova, and Haritou 1995). Finally, additional results (Table 3, Model 3a) indicate that the quality of contact is negatively and significantly related to the perception of group threat.

Table 2, Model 3b presents the results for the mediated moderation hypothesis (Hypothesis 3b). Although there is a drop in the interaction effect between the quantity of contact and majority status, namely, being Muslim between Model 2a and Model 3b ($b = -.053$, $p = .07$ vs. $b = -.032$, $p = .25$), there is no evidence that the mediation by

perceived group threat varies significantly between Christians and Muslims (Muller et al., 2005). Specifically, the interaction between perceived group threat and majority status is not statistically significant, implying no difference in the relationship between perceived group threat and negative outgroup attitudes between the Christian minority and the Muslim majority. There is also no evidence for a significant interaction effect between the quantity of contact and majority status on perceived group threat (Table 3, Model 3b).

Our last set of hypotheses is concerned with the role of perceived group discrimination. Table 4, Model 4a clearly shows that perceived group discrimination increases negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup (Model 4a: $b = .264$, $p < .001$), in line with Hypothesis 4a. Contrary to Hypothesis 4b, the positive relationship between perceived discrimination and negative attitudes is significantly weaker for the Christian minority than

Table 4. Multivariate Regression Analyses for the Effects of Quantity and Quality of Contact and Perceived Discrimination on Negative Attitudes

	Model 4a	Model 4b	Model 5a	Model 5b
Quantity of contact	-.010 (-.64)	-.011 (-.71)	-.034+ (-1.69)	-.012 (-.77)
Quality of contact	-.205*** (-5.57)	-.198*** (-5.37)	-.189*** (-5.06)	-.203*** (-4.80)
Christian	.017 (.33)	.020 (.37)	-.006 (-.12)	.004 (.07)
Male	.094+ (1.95)	.083+ (1.73)	.079 (1.63)	.084+ (1.74)
Parental education	-.034 (-.91)	-.036 (-.96)	-.028 (-.75)	-.037 (-.99)
Ambon	.246*** (4.70)	.234*** (4.47)	.245*** (4.66)	.232*** (4.42)
Perceived discrimination	.264*** (7.91)	.352*** (6.97)	.357*** (6.95)	.356*** (6.60)
Perceived discrimination × Christian		-.155* (-2.32)	-.144* (-2.08)	-.123+ (-1.68)
Quantity of contact × Christian			.054+ (1.90)	
Quantity of contact × discrimination			.029 (1.03)	
Quantity of contact × Christian × disc			-.045 (-1.19)	
Quality of contact × Christian				.042 (.54)
Quality of contact × discrimination				.016 (.31)
Quality of contact × Christian × disc				-.129 (-1.46)
Constant	2.603*** (27.76)	2.619*** (27.90)	2.600*** (27.57)	2.623*** (27.81)
Adjusted R ²	.127	.131	.132	.131
N	1161	1161	1161	1161

Note: *t* statistics are shown in parentheses.
 +*p* < .10. **p* < .05. ****p* < .001, two-tailed test.

for the Muslim majority (Model 4b: *b* = -.155, *p* = .02).⁵ Table 4, Models 5a and 5b present the results of two- and three-way interactions between the quantity and quality of contact, minority status (at the country level), and perceived discrimination. The only (marginally) significant two-way interaction is the one between

the quantity of contact and minority status, namely, being Christian, which shows that while high quantity contact predicts lower negative outgroup attitudes among the Muslim majority (Model 5a: *b* = -.034, *p* = .09), it has no significant association with negative outgroup attitudes among the Christian minority (*b* = .02 [.054 + (-.034)], *p* = .37). Taken together with our previous findings for the quantity of contact and majority status, namely, being Muslim (cf. Table 2, Model 2a), these

⁵The *b* coefficients for discrimination are *b* = .197, *p* < .001 and *b* = .383, *p* < .001 for Christians and Muslims, respectively.

results suggest that the quantity of contact is not related to negative outgroup attitudes among the Christian minority. In contrast to Hypotheses 5a and 5b, none of the three-way interactions reach statistical significance, suggesting that the relationships between the quantity and quality of interreligious contact and negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup are not affected by perceived discrimination, and this is equally the case for Christians and Muslims.

In this study, relative group size (majority vs. minority for Muslims and Christians respectively) refers to the country level, but the groups alternated in size and power relations at the local level. In order to see whether the patterns found for Muslims and Christians differ according to research location, we re-ran all analyses separately for each region (Tables B1-B3, Appendix B). Interestingly, the results reveal the same pattern in both regions; quantity of contact has no significant influence on negative outgroup attitudes, while quality contact reduces negative outgroup attitudes, regardless of the relative group size at the local level (Table B1). Perceived group threat is an important mediator of the contact-attitude relationship equally for Christians and Muslims in both regions (Table B1 and B2). Finally, in both locations, perceived group discrimination increases negative attitudes, less strongly among Christians than Muslims, although this interaction is nonsignificant in Ambon (Table B3).

CONCLUSION

Four major conclusions can be drawn from this study, each of which will be discussed in turn. First, in line with the first two hypotheses, our results show that both higher quantity and quality of contact reduce negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup. Quality of contact is not only more strongly related to

negative outgroup attitudes than quantity, but it also explains the effect of the latter: the relationship between quantity of contact and negative outgroup attitudes is reduced to insignificance once quality of contact is taken into account. This conclusion is in line with previous studies that showed that high-quality intergroup contact is particularly helpful in reducing negative attitudes toward the outgroup (Pettigrew et al. 2011; Pettigrew and Tropp 2006).

Second, there is some evidence that a higher quantity of interreligious contact reduces negative outgroup attitudes more strongly among the Muslim majority than the Christian minority (Hypothesis 2a). Contrary to our expectations, however, we find that high-quality contact reduces negative outgroup attitudes as effectively among the Muslim majority as among the Christian minority.

Unlike most previous research, our measure for the quality of interreligious contact meets two out of four of Allport's (1954) conditions for optimal contact effect, namely, equality and cooperation. We show that when meeting these conditions, interreligious contact is equally beneficial for minority and majority group members. This finding has an important policy implication: if intergroup contact is to benefit minority group members, efforts should be made to increase conditions for optimal intergroup contact.

Third, this study corroborates previous research in that it shows that perceived group threat is an important mediator of the relationship between quality of contact and negative attitudes (Hypothesis 3a). Contrary to our Hypothesis 3b, however, there is no evidence that the mediation by perceived group threat varies between minority and majority group members. That is, we do not find that a higher quantity of contact reduces the perception of threat more strongly among the Muslim majority than among the

Christian minority. Neither is there evidence that perceived group threat is more strongly related to negative attitudes among Muslims than Christians. Moreover, the fact that perceived group threat explains only part of the relationship between the quality of interreligious contact and negative attitudes suggests that other mechanisms, namely, increased knowledge about the outgroup, empathy with the outgroup, and reduction of intergroup anxiety, are important as well.

Finally, our results show that perceived discrimination increases negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup, which supports Hypothesis 4a. Contrary to Hypothesis 4b, however, perceived discrimination predicts negative outgroup attitudes less among Christians than among Muslims, nationally and in Yogyakarta. In Ambon, we find the same pattern, but the interaction effect between perceived discrimination and minority status is not significant. While in most previous studies majority group members tend to enjoy high status, which corresponds to their achieved or ascribed power position (e.g., whites in the United States), numerical size does not equate to power and status in Indonesia. It could be that the lower socioeconomic status of Muslims as compared to Christians makes the former more susceptible to perceived discrimination, despite their numerical dominance and political power. Future research should investigate whether and to what extent differences in status, power, and group size contribute to the differential role of perceived discrimination among minorities and majorities. Surprisingly, however, perceived discrimination does not affect the relationship between the quantity and quality of interreligious contact and negative outgroup attitudes for either Christians or Muslims.

Interestingly, additional analyses reveal the same pattern of findings in the two research locations. Taken together

with our previous conclusions, these results suggest again, in very different locations among very different (religious) groups, that high-quality contact can be particularly important for reducing negative attitudes toward the outgroup, regardless of relative group size and history of (hostile) intergroup relations.

A limitation of this study is that the analyses have been done on cross-sectional data. Although we argue that high-quality contact reduces negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup, because we rely on cross-sectional data, we cannot exclude the reverse scenario, namely, that people with more negative attitudes toward the religious outgroup are less likely to have high-quality contact. The meta-analytic evidence by Pettigrew and Tropp (2006) has shown that the effects of intergroup contact are robust and remain strong even in more rigorous studies using longitudinal or experimental design. Likewise, our conclusion that the relationship between quantity of contact and outgroup attitudes is spurious warrants caution, as we cannot exclude the possibility of different causal scenarios for the relationship between the quantity and quality of contact and outgroup attitudes.

Another limitation of this study is its focus on the student population in two regions of Indonesia. While this limits the generalizability of our results, there was an important reason for choosing students. While in Western countries, students tend to be relatively tolerant in their attitudes and behaviors, Indonesian students are generally more conservative and often engage in radical behaviors such as religious protest and even intercommunal violence (Noorhaidi 2005; Sidel 2006). This relative radicalization makes them particularly appropriate for a study of the contact hypothesis. There is also an advantage to focusing on a relatively homogenous student population in

cross-sectional analyses, as it significantly reduces a possible bias caused by not controlling for many unobserved characteristics—for instance, differences in exposure to interreligious contact, which are likely to affect the contact-attitude relationship, yet cannot be fully observed in the data.

The present study contributes to previous work by examining the relationship between intergroup contact and negative outgroup attitudes among religious minorities and majorities in Indonesia. By focusing on regions where intergroup relations are shaped by religious discrimination and conflict, it contributes to robustness and generalizability of findings and moreover, gives theoretical insights into the contact hypothesis. The present findings indicate that while differences in group size may alter the effectiveness of quantity of contact, high-quality contact is equally beneficial for both minorities and majorities in reducing negative outgroup attitudes. What is even more important, high-quality contact is beneficial even in regions where intergroup relations are shaped by intergroup discrimination and violence. Perceived group threat explains some of this quality of contact-attitude relationship, and this mediation is regardless of relative group size and in both geographic regions. Likewise, perceived group discrimination, although an important determinant of negative attitudes on its own, does not affect the relationship between the quantity and quality of contact and negative attitudes, and this is the same in both regions and among Christians and Muslims.

APPENDIX A: MEASURES USED IN THE ANALYSES

Perceived Group Threat

- I am worried that job prospects for members of my group would decline

due to the presence of other religious groups.

- I am worried that study grant opportunities will decline due to the presence of other religious groups.
- I am worried that security in my university will decline due to the presence of students of other religious groups.
- I am worried that the security in my neighborhood will decline due to the presence of other religious groups.
- I am afraid of increasing violence in my neighborhood due to the presence of other religious groups.
- The chances of getting space in a boarding house will decline due to the presence of other religious groups.
- The migration of people of different religious groups to my community is a threat to my own religious group.
- The religious practices of people from other religious groups threaten our own way of life.
- I am afraid that customs of my group will be lost due to the presence of other religious groups.

Perceived Discrimination

- My religious group experiences limitations on freedom of expression.
- My religious group experiences limitations on celebration of group's ceremonies.
- My religious group experiences limitations on access to government subsidy.
- My religious group experiences limitations on freedom to choose a place of residence.
- My religious group experiences limitations on dress.
- My religious group experiences limitations on participation in the local market.
- My religious group experiences limitations on behavior.
- My religious group experiences limitations on public observance of religious festivals.

- My religious group experiences limitations on access to the housing market.
- My religious group experiences limitations on marriage.
- My religious group experiences limitations on building places of worship.
- My religious group experiences limitations on access to job market.
- My religious group experiences forced observance of religious laws of other groups.
- My religious group experiences limitations on recruitment as a civil servant.
- My religious group experiences limitations on running of religious schools.
- My religious group experiences limitations on attaining higher positions in government offices.
- My religious group experiences limitations on the observance of religious laws on marriage and divorce.

APPENDIX B: ADDITIONAL RESULTS

Table B1. Multivariate Regression Analyses for the Effects of Quantity and Quality of Contact and Perceived Group Threat on Negative Attitudes, Separately by Research Location

	Yogyakarta												Ambon		
	Model 1a	Model 1b	Model 2a	Model 2b	Model 3a	Model 3b	Model 1a	Model 1b	Model 2a	Model 2b	Model 3a	Model 3b			
Quantity of contact	-.049* (-2.54)	-.016 (-.73)	.011 (.29)	-.016 (-.73)	-.011 (-.53)	.002 (.05)	-.065** (-2.94)	-.014 (-.59)	-.001 (-.03)	-.014 (-.59)	.001 (.04)	.004 (.14)			
Quality of contact		-.264*** (-4.26)	-.260*** (-4.18)	-.316** (-2.62)	-.117+ (-1.96)	-.114+ (-1.90)		-.223*** (-4.53)	-.217*** (-4.32)	-.191* (-2.24)	-.132** (-2.83)	-.131** (-2.76)			
Muslim	-.166* (-2.39)	-.200** (-2.88)	-.165* (-2.08)	-.213** (-2.87)	-.219*** (-3.37)	-.176* (-2.32)	.233** (2.70)	.160+ (1.79)	.153+ (1.69)	.162+ (1.81)	.152+ (1.83)	.151+ (1.79)			
Male	.065 (1.03)	.058 (.92)	.055 (.86)	.059 (.93)	.076 (1.28)	.069 (1.16)	.145+ (1.90)	.176* (2.26)	.176* (2.26)	.175* (2.25)	.170* (2.36)	.170* (2.34)			
Parental education	-.095* (-2.02)	-.086+ (-1.80)	-.085+ (-1.79)	-.087+ (-1.81)	-.083+ (-1.87)	-.081+ (-1.83)	.055 (.87)	.081 (1.27)	.082 (1.28)	.083 (1.29)	.089 (1.50)	.089 (1.49)			
Quantity of contact × Muslim			-.039 (-.91)			-.016 (-.41)			-.030 (-.66)			-.008 (-.17)			
Quality of contact × Muslim				.066 (.50)						-.046 (-.46)					
Perceived group threat					.443*** (9.69)	.360*** (4.70)					.418*** (9.24)	.422*** (6.89)			
Perceived group threat × Muslim						.126 (1.34)						-.010 (-.11)			
Constant	2.864*** (22.49)	2.879*** (22.51)	2.845*** (21.37)	2.894*** (22.01)	1.853*** (11.62)	2.892*** (23.10)	2.572*** (16.71)	2.526*** (16.26)	2.521*** (16.21)	2.515*** (16.00)	1.449*** (7.81)	2.465*** (17.03)			
Adjusted R ²	.020	.050	.050	.049	.174	.174	.033	.067	.066	.066	.195	.192			
N	654	627	627	627	627	627	571	534	534	534	534	534			

Notes: *t* statistics are shown in parentheses. +*p* < .10. **p* < .05. ***p* < .01. ****p* < .001, two-tailed test.

Table B2. Multivariate Regression Analyses for the Effects of Quantity and Quality of Contact on Perceived Group Threat, Separately by Research Location

	Yogyakarta		Ambon	
	Model 3a	Model 3b	Model 3a	Model 3b
Quantity of contact	-.012 (-.65)	-.007 (-.26)	-.037+ (-1.69)	-.008 (-.33)
Quality of contact	-.332*** (-6.54)	-.330*** (-6.48)	-.216*** (-4.92)	-.188*** (-4.11)
Muslim	.042 (.74)	.076 (.54)	.018 (.23)	.298+ (1.92)
Male	-.040 (-.77)	-.040 (-.77)	.014 (.20)	.024 (.35)
Parental education	-.006 (-.15)	-.006 (-.15)	-.017 (-.31)	-.014 (-.24)
Quantity of contact × Muslim		-.008 (-.26)		-.092* (-2.09)
Constant	2.314*** (22.12)	2.306*** (21.33)	2.573*** (18.56)	2.548*** (18.38)
Adjusted R ²	.092	.091	.080	.086
N	627	627	534	534

Note: *t* statistics are shown in parentheses.
 +*p* < .10. **p* < .05. ****p* < .001, two-tailed test.

Table B3. Multivariate Regression Analyses for the Effects of Quantity and Quality of Contact and Perceived Discrimination on Negative Attitudes, Separately by Research Location

	Yogyakarta					Ambon					
	Model 4a	Model 4b	Model 5a	Model 5b	Model 4a	Model 4b	Model 5a	Model 5b	Model 4a	Model 5a	Model 5b
Quantity of contact	-.014 (-.64)	-.017 (-.78)	-.029 (-1.14)	-.017 (-.78)	-.009 (-.36)	-.009 (-.37)	-.034 (-1.01)	-.012 (-.51)			
Quality of contact	-.209*** (-3.38)	-.193** (-3.10)	-.191** (-3.03)	-.169* (-2.42)	-.194*** (-4.06)	-.192*** (-3.99)	-.183*** (-3.74)	-.207*** (-3.71)			
Christian	.137* (1.98)	.140* (2.02)	.096 (1.16)	.171* (2.24)	-.165+ (-1.91)	-.160+ (-1.84)	-.156+ (-1.78)	-.182* (-2.08)			
Male	.046 (.74)	.031 (.49)	.026 (.42)	.030 (.48)	.161* (2.15)	.156* (2.08)	.151* (2.00)	.157* (2.09)			
Parental education	-.090+ (-1.93)	-.089+ (-1.91)	-.088+ (-1.89)	-.090+ (-1.93)	.083 (1.34)	.078 (1.27)	.082 (1.33)	.070 (1.13)			
Perceived discrimination	.217*** (4.89)	.321*** (4.98)	.320*** (4.95)	.331*** (5.01)	.304*** (6.01)	.373*** (4.64)	.420*** (4.77)	.387*** (4.20)			
Perceived discrimination × Christian		-.195* (-2.22)	-.182+ (-1.79)	-.235* (-2.47)		-.114 (-1.11)	-.156 (-1.43)	-.045 (-.39)			
Quantity of contact × Christian			.045 (1.03)				.041 (.93)				
Quantity of contact × discrimination			.013 (.36)				.067 (1.39)				
Quantity of contact × Christian × disc			-.015 (-.28)				-.074 (-1.19)				
Quality of contact × Christian				-.134 (- .98)				.093 (.96)			
Quality of contact × discrimination				.023 (.31)				.028 (.37)			
Quality of contact × Christian × disc				.060 (.45)				-.250* (-2.07)			
Constant	2.715*** (22.90)	2.729*** (23.06)	2.731*** (23.04)	2.736*** (23.00)	2.689*** (21.53)	2.695*** (21.56)	2.680*** (21.24)	2.701*** (21.40)			
Adjusted R ²	.084	.090	.087	.087	.125	.126	.125	.131			
N	627	627	627	627	534	534	534	534			

Note: *t* statistics are shown in parentheses.
+*p* < .10. **p* < .05. ***p* < .01. ****p* < .001, two-tailed test.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

An earlier version of this manuscript was presented at the Social Psychology Section Annual Conference in Exeter, United Kingdom, August 28–30, 2013 and the European Consortium for Sociological Research Conference in Tilburg, the Netherlands, October 14–16, 2013. We are grateful for comments from Karen A. Hegtvedt and the anonymous reviewers of *Social Psychology Quarterly*.

FUNDING

The author(s) disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: (a) Funding for work on this article came from the Dutch National Science Foundation under the Conflict and Security program. All data/additional analyses requests should be sent to Agnieszka Kanas, e-mail: a.kanas@maw.ru.nl; (b) the Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research (NWO) is the national research council in the Netherlands promoting quality and innovation in science; (c) Agnieszka Kanas, Carl Sterkens, Peer Scheepers.

REFERENCES

- Allport, Gordon. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Barlow, Fiona K., Stefania Paolini, Anne Pedersen, Matthew J. Hornsey, Helena R. M. Radke, Jake Harwood, Mark Rubin, and Chris G. Sibley. 2012. "The Contact Caveat: Negative Contact Predicts Increased Prejudice More Than Positive Contact Predicts Reduced Prejudice." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 38:1629–43.
- Binder, Jens, Hanna Zagefka, Rupert Brown, Friedrich Funke, Thomas Kessler, Amelie Mummendey, Annemie Maquil, Stephanie Demoulin, and Jacques-Philippe Leyens. 2009. "Does Contact Reduce Prejudice or Does Prejudice Reduce Contact? A Longitudinal Test of the Contact Hypothesis among Majority and Minority Groups in Three European Countries." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 96:843–56.
- Blalock, Hubert M. 1967. *Toward a Theory of Minority-Group Relations*. New York: John Wiley.
- Bobo, Lawrence D. 1999. Prejudice as Group Position: Microfoundations of a Sociological Approach to Racism and Race Relations. *Journal of Social Issues* 55: 445–472.
- Clogg, Clifford C., Eva Petkova, and Adamantios Haritou. 1995. "Statistical Methods for Comparing Regression Coefficients between Models." *American Journal of Sociology* 100:1261–93.
- Coenders, Marcel and Peer Scheepers. 1998. "Support for Ethnic Discrimination in the Netherlands 1979-1993: Effects of Period, Cohort and Individual Characteristics." *European Sociological Review* 14:405–22.
- Cohen, Jacob. 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral Sciences* (2nd ed.). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Coser, Lewis A. 1956. *The Function of Social Conflict*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Desforges, Donna M., Charles G. Lord, Shawna L. Ramsey, Julie A. Mason, Marilyn D. Van Leeuwen, and Sylvia C. West. 1991. "Effects of Structured Cooperative Contact on Changing Negative Attitudes toward Stigmatized Social Groups." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 60:531–44.
- Dixon, Jeffrey C. 2006. "The Ties That Bind and Those That Don't: Toward Reconciling Group Threat and Contact Theories of Prejudice." *Social Forces* 84:2179–204.
- Ellison, Christopher G. and Daniel A. Powers. 1994. "The Contact Hypothesis and Racial Attitudes among Black Americans." *Social Science Quarterly* 75:385–400.
- Finchilescu, Gillian. 1988. "Interracial Contact in South Africa within the Nursing Context." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 18:1207–21.
- Fox, Jonathan. 2000a. "The Effects of Religious Discrimination on Ethno-Religious Protest and Rebellion." *Journal of Conflict Studies* 20:16–43.
- Fox, Jonathan. 2000b. "Religious Causes of Discrimination against Ethno-Religious Minorities." *International Studies Quarterly* 44:423–50.
- Gijsberts, Merove, Louk Hagendoorn, and Peer Scheepers. 2004. *Nationalism and Exclusion of Migrants: Cross National Comparisons*. Burlington, VT: Ashgate Publishing Company.
- Herek, Gregory M. and John P. Capitano. 1996. "Some of My Best Friends': Intergroup Contact, Concealable Stigma, and Heterosexuals Attitudes toward Gay Men and Lesbians." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 22:412–24.
- Hewstone, Miles, Ed Cairns, Alberto Voci, Juergen Hamberger, and Ulrike Niens. 2006. "Intergroup Contact, Forgiveness,

- and Experience of 'the Troubles' in Northern Ireland." *Journal of Social Issues* 62:99–120.
- Human Rights Watch. 2013. *In Religion's Name. Abuses against Religious Minorities in Indonesia*. New York: Human Rights Watch.
- International Crisis Group. 2000. *Indonesia: Overcoming Murder and Chaos in Maluku*. Jakarta/Brussels: International Crisis Group.
- International Crisis Group. 2002. *Indonesia: The Search for Peace in Maluku. Executive Summary and Recommendations*. Jakarta/Brussels: International Crisis Group.
- International Crisis Group. 2011. *Indonesia: Trouble Again in Ambon*. Jakarta/Brussels: International Crisis Group.
- Islam, Mir Rabiul and Miles Hewstone. 1993. "Dimensions of Contact as Predictors of Intergroup Anxiety, Perceived Out-Group Variability, and Out-Group Attitude: An Integrative Model." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 19:700–10.
- Johnson, Bryan R. and Cardell K. Jacobson. 2005. "Contact in Context: An Examination of Social Settings on Whites' Attitudes toward Interracial Marriage." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 68:387–99.
- Lee, Barrett A., Chad R. Farrell, and Bruce G. Link. 2004. "Revisiting the Contact Hypothesis: The Case of Public Exposure to Homelessness." *American Sociological Review* 69:40–63.
- McLaren, Lauren M. 2003. "Anti-Immigrant Prejudice in Europe: Contact, Threat Perception, and Preferences for the Exclusion of Migrants." *Social Forces* 81:909–36.
- McPherson, Miller, Lynn Smith-Lovin, and James M Cook. 2001. "Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks." *Annual Review of Sociology* 27:415–44.
- Monteith, Margo and C. Vincent Spicer. 2000. "Contents and Correlates of Whites' and Blacks' Racial Attitudes." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 36:125–54.
- Mujani, Saiful. 2003. *Religious Democrats: Democratic Culture and Muslim Political Participation in Post-Suharto Indonesia*. PhD Dissertation. Ohio State University.
- Muller, Dominique, Charles M. Judd, and Vincent, Y. Yzerbyt. 2005. "When Moderation Is Mediated and Mediation Is Moderated." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 89:852–63.
- Noorhaidi, Hasan. 2005. *Laskar Jihad, Islam, Militancy and the Quest for Identity in Post-New Order Indonesia*. Amsterdam: South-east Asia Program.
- Paolini, Stefania, Jake Harwood, and Mark Rubin. 2010. "Negative Intergroup Contact Makes Group Memberships Salient: Explaining Why Intergroup Conflict Endures." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 36:1723–38.
- Paolini, Stefania, Miles Hewstone, Ed Cairns, and Alberto Voci. 2004. "Effects of Direct and Indirect Cross-Group Friendships on Judgments of Catholics and Protestants in Northern Ireland: The Mediating Role of an Anxiety-Reduction Mechanism." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 30:770–86.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. 2010. "Commentary: South African Contributions to the Study of Intergroup Relations." *Journal of Social Issues* 66:417–30.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. and Linda R. Tropp. 2006. "A Meta-Analytic Test of Intergroup Contact Theory." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 90:751–83.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F. and Linda R. Tropp. 2008. "How Does Intergroup Contact Reduce Prejudice? Meta-Analytic Tests of Three Mediators." *European Journal of Social Psychology* 38:922–34.
- Pettigrew, Thomas F., Linda R. Tropp, Ulrich Wagner, and Oliver Christ. 2011. "Recent Advances in Intergroup Contact Theory." *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 35:271–80.
- Powers, Daniel A. and Christopher G. Ellison. 1995. "Interracial Contact and Black Racial Attitudes: The Contact Hypothesis and Selectivity Bias." *Social Forces* 74:205–26.
- Salim, Arskal. 2008. *Challenging the Secular State: The Islamization of Law in Modern Indonesia*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press.
- Savelkoul, Michael, Peer Scheepers, Jochem Tolsma, and Louk Hagendoorn. 2011. "Anti-Muslim Attitudes in the Netherlands: Tests of Contradictory Hypotheses Derived from Ethnic Competition Theory and Intergroup Contact Theory." *European Sociological Review* 27:741–58.
- Scheepers, Peer, Mérove Gijsberts, and Marcel Coenders. 2002. "Ethnic Exclusionism in European Countries. Public Opposition to Civil Rights for Legal Migrants as a Response to Perceived Ethnic Threat." *European Sociological Review* 18:17–34.
- Schlueter, Elmar and Peer Scheepers. 2010. "The Relationship between Outgroup Size and Anti-Outgroup Attitudes: A Theoretical Synthesis and Empirical Test of Group

- Threat and Intergroup Contact Theory." *Social Science Research* 39:285–95.
- Schmid, Katharina, Miles Hewstone, Beate Küpper, Andreas Zick, and Ulrich Wagner. 2012. "Secondary Transfer Effects of Intergroup Contact: A Cross-National Comparison in Europe." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 75:28–51.
- Schneider, Silke L. 2008. "Anti-Immigrant Attitudes in Europe: Out-Group Size and Perceived Ethnic Threat." *European Sociological Review* 24:53–67.
- Shelton, J. Nicole. 2000. "A Reconceptualization of How We Study Issues of Racial Prejudice." *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 4:374–90.
- Sidel, John T. 2006. *Riots, Pogroms, Jihad. Religious Violence in Indonesia*. New York: Cornell University Press.
- Sidel, John T. 2008. "The Manifold Meanings of Displacement: Exploring Inter-Religious Violence 1998-2001." Pp. 29–59 in *Conflict, Violence, and Displacement in Indonesia*, edited by E. E. Hedman. Publication Studies in Southeast Asia, No. 45. Ithaca, NY: Cornell Southeast Asia Program.
- Sigelman, Lee, Timothy Bledsoe, Susan Welch, and Michael W. Combs. 1996. "Making Contact? Black-White Social Interaction in an Urban Setting." *American Journal of Sociology* 101:1306–32.
- Sigelman, Lee and Susan Welch. 1993. "The Contact Hypothesis Revisited: Black-White Interaction and Positive Racial Attitudes." *Social Forces* 71:781–95.
- Statistics Indonesia. 2010. Retrieved December 2011 (<http://bps.go.id>).
- Statistics Indonesia. 2011. Retrieved June 2013 (<http://bps.go.id>).
- Stephan, Walter G., Kurt A. Boniecki, Oscar Ybarra, Ann Bettencourt, Kelly S. Ervin, Linda A. Jackson, Penny S. McNatt, and C. Lausanne Renfro. 2002. "The Role of Threats in the Racial Attitudes of Blacks and Whites." *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* 28:1242–54.
- Stephan, Walter G., Oscar Ybarra, and Kimberly Rios Morrison. 2008. "Intergroup Threat Theory." Pp. 44–55 in *Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping, and Discrimination*, edited by T. D. Nelson. London: Taylor & Francis.
- Sterkens, Carl and Francis-Vincent Anthony. 2008. "A Comparative Study of Religiocentrism among Christian, Muslim and Hindu Students in Tamil Nadu, India." *Journal of Empirical Theology* 21:32–67.
- Sterkens, Carl and Handi Hadiwitanto. 2009. "From Social to Religious Conflict in Ambon. An Analysis of the Origin of Religious Inspired Violence." Pp. 59–86 in *Religion, Civil Society and Conflict in Indonesia*, edited by C. Sterkens, M. Machasin, and F. Wijsen. Münster: Lit Verlag.
- Sterkens, Carl, Agnieszka Kanas, Tri Subagya, Cahyo Pamungkas, Paula Thijs, and Peer Scheepers. 2014. *Ethno-Religious Conflicts in Indonesia 2012. Documentation of Surveys on Ethno-Religious Identity and Latent Intergroup Conflict* (DANS Data Guide 12). Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Swart, Hermann, Miles Hewstone, Oliver Christ, and Alberto Voci. 2010. "The Impact of Crossgroup Friendships in South Africa: Affective Mediators and Multigroup Comparisons." *Journal of Social Issues* 66:309–33.
- Swart, Hermann, Miles Hewstone, Oliver Christ, and Alberto Voci. 2011. "Affective Mediators of Intergroup Contact: A Three-Wave Longitudinal Study in South Africa." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 101:1221–38.
- Tausman, Nicole, Miles Hewstone, and Ravneeta Roy. 2009. "The Relationships between Contact, Status and Prejudice: An Integrated Threat Theory Analysis of Hindu-Muslim Relations in India." *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology* 19:83–94.
- Tredoux, Colin and Gillian Finchilescu. 2007. "The Contact Hypothesis and Intergroup Relations 50 Years on: Introduction to the Special Issue." *South African Journal of Psychology* 37:667–78.
- Tropp, Linda R. 2007. "Perceived Discrimination and Interracial Contact: Predicting Interracial Closeness among Black and White Americans." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 70:70–81.
- Tropp, Linda R., DIALA R. Hawi, Colette Van Laar, and Shana Levin. 2012. "Cross-Ethnic Friendships, Perceived Discrimination, and Their Effects on Ethnic Activism over Time: A Longitudinal Investigation of Three Ethnic Minority Groups." *British Journal of Social Psychology* 51:257–72.
- Tropp, Linda R. and Thomas F. Pettigrew. 2005. "Relationships Between Intergroup Contact and Prejudice Among Minority and Majority Status Groups." *Psychological Science* 16:951–57.
- Verkuyten, Maykel, Jochem Thijs, and Hidde Bekhuis. 2010. "Intergroup Contact and

Ingroup Reappraisal Examining the Deprovincialization Thesis." *Social Psychology Quarterly* 73:398–416.

Williams, Robin Murphy Jr. 1947. *The Reduction of Intergroup Tensions*. New York: Social Science Research Council.

BIOS

Agnieszka Kanas is a postdoctoral researcher in sociology at Radboud University, Nijmegen. Her research focuses on intergroup attitudes and intergroup relations and economic disadvantage and integration of immigrants.

Peer Scheepers is a professor of comparative research methodology at Radboud

University, Nijmegen. He is also a vice-dean of education in the Faculty of Social Sciences at Radboud University. His main interests involve longitudinal and comparative studies of ethnic exclusionism, social capital, and survey methodology.

Carl Sterkens is an associate professor of empirical religious studies at Radboud University, Nijmegen. His research focuses on cross-religious comparison of the relation between religiosity, conflict, and social cohesion in Indonesia and the Southern Philippines and on the aims of academic education in theology and religious studies in the European Union.