

Participation in civil society organizations and ethnic minorities' interethnic friendships in Britain

Senhu Wang¹  | Liran Morav² 

¹Department of Sociology, National University of Singapore, Singapore

²Department of Sociology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK

Correspondence

Liran Morav, St Edmund's College, Cambridge CB3 0BN, UK.
Email: LM501@cam.ac.uk

Abstract

In Britain, civil society organizations (CSOs) have garnered much praise for promoting interethnic friendships (IEF) and strengthening community cohesion. Yet, there is very little empirical evidence to suggest that participation in CSOs promotes ethnic minorities' IEF. Using nationally representative longitudinal (2011–2019) and cross-sectional (2010) data, this article explores the association between participation in CSOs and IEF formation among five British ethnic minority groups and analyses how this relationship is affected by the ethnic composition of CSOs. Overall, fixed effects models show that participation in CSOs only significantly promotes IEF for Indians. For other minority groups it has either no effect or, in the case of Pakistanis, significantly decreases IEF. Further analyses show that compared with ethnic minorities that do not participate in any CSOs, those who participate in mostly interethnic CSOs tend to have significantly more IEF, whereas those who participate in mostly co-ethnic CSOs tend to have significantly less IEF. Taken together, these findings suggest that the association between civic participation and ethnic minorities' IEF is much more

Both authors contributed equally to the writing of this paper.

We would like to thank Maria Iacovou, Yaojun Li, Darja Irdam, Daniel Tanis and three anonymous reviewers for their highly constructive comments on this paper. Understanding Society is an initiative funded by the Economic and Social Research Council and various Government Departments, with scientific leadership by the Institute for Social and Economic Research, University of Essex, and survey delivery by NatCen Social Research and Kantar Public. The research data are distributed by the UK Data Service.

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivs License, which permits use and distribution in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, the use is non-commercial and no modifications or adaptations are made.

© 2021 The Authors. The *British Journal of Sociology* published by John Wiley & Sons Ltd on behalf of London School of Economics and Political Science.

nanced than previously thought and policy interventions seeking to improve ethnic integration should, therefore, take the ethnic background of participants and the ethnic composition of CSOs into account.

KEYWORDS

civic participation, ethnic minorities, interethnic friendships (IEF), civic organizations, immigrants, social integration

1 | INTRODUCTION

In the postwar period, the arrival and settlement in Britain of several million immigrants from British ex-colonies have triggered heated debates on the state of “race relations” in the country. Opponents of immigration have repeatedly warned that migrants from Britain's ex-colonies in South Asia, Sub-Saharan Africa, and the Caribbean would fail to integrate in British society and threaten the fabric of British communities across the country (Favell, 2001). Concerns about interethnic relations, community cohesion, and ethnic minority integration continue to this day. Since 2000, a series of urban disturbances and terror attacks involving ethnic minority youths have stimulated extensive debates about whether Britain's multiculturalist policy framework has encouraged immigrants and their children to become segregated from the rest of society (Finney & Simpson, 2009; Phillips, 2010; Prime Minister's Office, 2011; The Casey Review, 2016).

In this context, the perceived tendency of some minority groups to develop ethnically homogeneous social networks has become a topic of considerable controversy. According to Muttarak (2014), around 44% of ethnic minorities in Britain have only co-ethnic friends. It is commonly argued that the possession of exclusively co-ethnic friendship networks may impede ethnic minorities' life chances in a wide arrange of socioeconomic domains, and intensify hostility between some minority groups and mainstream society (Heath & Demireva, 2014; Muttarak, 2014). By contrast, out-group or interethnic friendships (IEF), especially with host society members, are thought to facilitate ethnic minority integration by providing access to economic and cultural resources of people located outside their co-ethnic networks (Li, 2004; Windzio, 2012), reducing ethnic prejudice in society, strengthening pro-diversity attitudes (Hargreaves et al., 2020), and improving social cohesion in local communities (Gorny & Torunczyk-Ruiz, 2013; Sturgis et al., 2015). Moreover, IEF with politically active members of the host society have been found to improve the representation of ethnic immigrants' concerns in political institutions (Kokkonen & Karlsson, 2017).

Recognizing the importance of IEF and interethnic contact more generally, a recent report of the British All-Party Parliamentary Group on Social Integration (APPG, 2017) recommended that “[l]ocal authorities should proactively consider how they might support the growth of *civic and community institutions* which promote cross-community contact” (APPG, 2017, p. 52, emphasis added). The report explicitly grounds this recommendation on the findings of the *intergroup contact* literature, which convincingly show that contact between members of different social groups in favorably structured settings tends to weaken intergroup prejudices and improve people's attitudes toward social out-groups (Allport, 1979; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). The problem with the intergroup contact literature is its narrow focus on intergroup attitudes, rather than intergroup relationships (see, Dixon et al., 2005). A favorable change in one's attitudes toward ethnic out-groups does not usually equate with new friendships. Besides, most CSOs with mixed-ethnic memberships cannot guarantee that interactions embedded within them will be mostly interethnic.

In fact, one of the most consistent findings of the social network literature is that individuals in most social settings tend to interact with people who are similar to them in key sociodemographic dimensions—and will generally prefer to establish relationships with them rather than with dissimilar others (McPherson et al., 2001; Skvoretz, 2013). The impact of this “homophily principle” tends to be stronger for more intense relationship categories, such as close friendships and intimate partnerships (Blackwell & Lichter, 2004; Windzio, 2018; Windzio & Bicer, 2013). This suggests that CSO participation may *not* actually facilitate IEF between ethnic minority participants in CSOs. The contrasting theoretical expectations from CSO participation need to be tested using rigorous empirical methods.

So far, only a small number of empirical studies have examined the relationship between participation in CSOs and ethnic minorities' IEF. Although they find that ethnic minorities who participate in CSOs tend to have more IEF than those who do not participate (Laurence, 2011; Martinovic et al., 2011; Muttarak, 2014), these studies have several important limitations. First and foremost, they rely on cross-sectional data, and thus, only examine the snapshot association between IEF and civic participation. Although Martinovic et al. (2011) study of immigrants in Canada explores how CSO participation 6 months after immigration relates to increases in ethnic minority immigrants' IEF ties 2 and 4 years later, the data and analytical method used are not fully longitudinal. The authors only measure CSO participation at one point in time, making it unclear whether subsequent increases in IEF are truly driven by previous civic participation or rather by the confounding effects of time-varying omitted variables.

Another important limitation of previous studies is that they only examine how participation in CSOs affects ethnic minorities *as a whole*. In actuality, well-documented socioeconomic and cultural differences between British ethnic minority groups (Heath et al., 2013; Zuccotti, 2015) may very well mean that the relationships between CSO participation and IEF differ depending on participants' ethnic group memberships and recency of settlement in Britain (see, Wessendorf, 2020).

Furthermore, it is highly likely that IEF formed by ethnic minorities in a given CSO will also depend on the internal ethnic composition of the CSO's membership, as this will ultimately determine opportunities for interethnic contact (see, Smith et al., 2014; Smith-Lovin & McPherson, 1987). After all, IEF cannot form in ethnically homogeneous CSOs. To our knowledge, the only study to test this relationship empirically is the aforementioned study by Martinovic et al. (2011). Its authors find that immigrants who joined CSOs with “mainly co-ethnic” memberships acquired fewer IEF over time compared to immigrants who joined CSOs whose participants mostly belonged to other ethnic groups. Unfortunately, this study's only looks at ethnic minorities born abroad and does not distinguish between different ethnic groups.

Building on this prior literature and its limitations, the present article uses two complementary studies to investigate the relationship between CSO participation and IEF formation in a more fine-grained and robust fashion. Study 1 uses longitudinal data analyzed via fixed effects models to investigate how participation in CSOs affects IEF among five different ethnic minority groups in Britain: ethnic Indians, Pakistanis, Bangladeshis, black Caribbeans, and black Africans. Meanwhile, study 2 is a *complementary study* (Mark, 2015) that specifically examines the relationship between interethnic contact opportunities within CSOs and ethnic minority participants' IEF. It draws on a separate, cross-sectional data set comprising a comparable ethnic minority sample, which is analyzed using linear and logistic regression models.

The reason we conduct a separate study to investigate the effect of interethnic contact opportunities is that the longitudinal data set used in study 1 unfortunately does not contain information about the ethnic composition of participants' CSOs. Given the significant role of interethnic contact opportunities in previous studies of structured tie formation, we reasoned that testing the effects of contact opportunities on IEF using a separate study is preferable to ignoring this variable altogether. We are mindful that doing so using a cross-sectional regression design implies that findings are potentially more vulnerable to endogenous selection bias (Elwert & Winship, 2014). To reduce this risk, we introduce a range of relevant control variables into the regression models of study 2.

Even so, we recognize that the second study's cross-sectional design and dissimilar respondent sample place limits on our ability to draw robust inferences regarding the effect of CSOs' ethnic compositions on ethnic minorities' IEF. This is why we interpret study 2 in close complementarity with the findings of study 1, rather than treating it as a stand-alone investigation. Ultimately, the primary function of study 2 is to facilitate a more nuanced and comprehensive interpretation of the findings of study 1. This complementary, two-study approach helps us make maximal use of currently available UK survey data on civic participation and IEF, allowing us to investigate a wider range of potential determinants of IEF.

Overall, this article contributes to the literature in three important ways. First, by using panel data and fixed effects models, it provides a more rigorous empirical analysis of the relationship between CSO participation and ethnic minorities' IEF. Second, the article sheds lights on the impact of participant ethnicity on IEF formation within CSOs. Third and finally, it facilitates a more nuanced understanding of how a CSO's ethnic composition affects its participants' IEF ties.

2 | THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES

In the rest of this section, we draw on intergroup contact theory and the social network literature to develop a series of hypotheses on the relationship between participation in CSOs and ethnic minorities' IEF. We theorize friendship tie formation as a dyadic two-step process, consisting of two people (i) coming into contact and (ii) choosing to establish a friendship relationship. Following Verbrugge (1977), we call the processes underpinning each step "meeting" and "mating," respectively. The meeting process incorporates the events and mechanisms responsible for bringing people into interactional contact with each other. Mating, in turn, is the process responsible for transforming interactions within contact episodes into long-lasting relationships.

Our ensuing theoretical discussion of the link between CSO participation and ethnic minorities' IEF considers the joint impacts of ethnicity, ethnic homophily, and intergroup contact on the meeting and mating processes taking place within CSOs. We organize our hypothesis around three distinct social-theoretical principles that we think would influence the relationship between participation in CSOs and IEF formation. These are intergroup contact, ethnic homophily, and contact opportunities.

2.1 | Intergroup contact

As discussed previously, the intergroup contact hypothesis posits that under appropriate conditions, experiences of contact with people from different social groups will reduce individuals' prejudice and hostility, and foster positive attitudes toward out-groups (Pettigrew, 1998; for a critical review of this literature, see Dixon et al., 2005). The optimal intergroup contact situation is one where participants (i) enjoy equality of status, (ii) engage in cooperative communication, (iii) collaborate toward shared goals, and (iv) have their interactions sanctioned by higher authorities such as law, custom, or other authoritative institutions.

CSOs tend to be organized around informal cooperative activities that provide participants with opportunities to engage in open and friendly interactions that often involve working together on a shared task (Small, 2009). This accords with the conditions set out in intergroup contact literature. We therefore expect participants in cross-ethnic CSOs¹—that is, CSOs offering opportunities for interethnic interactions—to develop more positive attitudes toward ethnic out-groups and, consequently, form new IEF. Basing ourselves on the intergroup contact hypothesis, we formulate the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 1a *Participation in cross-ethnic CSOs significantly increases the share of IEF in ethnic minorities' friendship networks.*

2.2 | Ethnic homophily

One could alternatively argue that IEF formation within CSOs requires more than just positive attitudes toward other participants. After all, friendships involve high levels of mutual trust and relational investment (Allan & Adams, 2006; Fehr, 1996). We draw on the principle of homophily to suggest that, by and large, participants in CSOs would prefer to make these investments in co-ethnic rather than interethnic relationships—even if their attitudes toward other ethnic minorities in a CSO are positive.

The homophily principle posits that social ties are more likely to form between individuals who are similar to each other in key dimensions, such as gender, socioeconomic status, and ethnicity (McPherson et al., 2001). Homophily in social networks can occur because similar people tend to gravitate toward similar social milieus and organizations, where they are more likely to interact and form ties with each other (Feld & Grofman, 2009). This discussion, however, focuses on a second variant of homophily—choice homophily—which is driven by individuals' psychological predisposition to prefer associating with similar others within a social setting (Smith-Lovin & McPherson, 1987).

Ethnicity is an important dimension of choice homophily, structuring people's friendship choices in a variety of social settings, including schools (Goodreau et al., 2009; Leszczensky & Pink, 2015; Schaefer et al., 2011), universities (Kossinets & Watts, 2009), workplaces (Kleinbaum et al., 2013), and social functions (Ingram & Morris, 2007), among others. Shared ethnicity signals to individuals that they are likely to share common experiences, interests, and values, making each other appear more attractive and worthy of the costly relational investments associated with friendship (Gans, 1961; Huston & Levinger, 1978; Lazarsfeld & Merton, 1954).

In CSOs, choice homophily would produce a biased mating process among participants, suggesting a counterhypothesis to the one previously stated:

Hypothesis 1b *Participation in cross-ethnic CSOs is not associated with, or even decreases, the share of IEF in ethnic minorities' friendship networks.*

2.3 | Contact Opportunities

This perspective argues that IEF ties formed by CSO participants are relatively unaffected by their homophilous friendship preferences; instead what matters are the interethnic contact opportunities available to them within their specific CSOs. This line of argument is based on Blau's (1977, p. 52) macrosocial theory of social structure, which posits that the probability of intergroup relations decreases the bigger the relative size of any one social group within a given social "substructure." Thus, for present purposes, the bigger the relative size of one's ethnic group within a CSO, the more opportunities one has to engage in co-ethnic interactions and form co-ethnic friendships. Accordingly, we expect that participants in CSOs in which most co-participants belong to different ethnic groups ("mostly interethnic CSOs") will more likely form new interethnic, rather than co-ethnic, friendships.

This prediction is consistent with multiple studies linking greater institutional diversity to increased likelihoods of IEF in educational institutions (Fischer, 2008; Joyner & Kao, 2000; Smith et al., 2016), workplaces (Kokkonen et al., 2015), and residential neighborhoods (Schlueter, 2012). It also aligns with the study by Martinovic et al. (2011) discussed in the previous section, which found that IEF only increased among immigrants who joined mostly interethnic CSOs. Thus, we advance the following hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2a *Participation in mostly interethnic CSOs increases the share of IEF in ethnic minorities' friendship networks.*

By the same logic, we would also expect contact opportunities to affect friendship formation in the opposite direction: Participants in CSOs with mostly co-ethnic memberships (“mostly co-ethnic CSOs”) would likely engage in more co-ethnic than interethnic interactions and subsequently develop more co-ethnic than interethnic friendship ties:

Hypothesis 2b Participation in mostly co-ethnic CSOs decreases the share of IEF in ethnic minorities' friendship networks.

2.4 | Ethnic differences

The theoretical framework and hypotheses formulated thus far assume that the mechanisms mediating the relationships between CSO participation and IEF formation operate in the same way among all ethnic minority participants. However, there are good reasons to expect choice homophily to exert a greater force on the friendship choices of ethnic Pakistani and Bangladeshi participants than those of other ethnic minority participants, including ethnic Indians, black Caribbeans, and black Africans. If so, we should expect that ethnic Pakistani and Bangladeshi participants will respond differently to interethnic exposure within CSOs, when compared to the other minority groups investigated in this article.

The literature identifies two significant group features that reinforce individuals' ethnically homophilous attraction to members of their ethnic group. The first is the normative sanctioning of co-ethnic relationships by individuals' parents and wider ethnic community networks. Multiple quantitative and qualitative studies focusing on ethnic minority attitudes to interethnic mixing have found that preferences for co-ethnic friendships are stronger among individuals whose parents and ethnic communities emphasize the importance of the intergenerational transmission of traditional ethnocultural values and identity—with particular emphasis on ethnic endogamy and religious identity (Carol, 2014; Kecskes, 2003; Maliepaard & Lubbers, 2013; Munniksmas et al., 2012; Nauck, 2001; Reinders, 2004).

The second group feature reinforcing homophilous friendship choices is racialized group status (see, Gans, 2017). Research on racialized ethnic minority groups has shown that experiences of discrimination and group marginalization often impels racialized group members to develop militant ethnic identities and ethnically homophilous friendship networks as a matter of personal resilience and group solidarity (Portes & Rivas, 2011; Reynolds, 2007; Tatum, 1997). On top of that, racialization also discourages members of other ethnic groups from seeking close relationships with racialized group members (see, e.g., Barwick, 2017; Leszczensky & Pink, 2017; Tyler, 2020). The outcome of both processes is that racialized and harshly stigmatized ethnic groups develop overwhelmingly co-ethnic tie networks—both by choice and through social exclusion.

With these considerations in mind, we expect Pakistani and Bangladeshi minorities to have a stronger preference for co-ethnic friendships in CSOs compared to members of Indian, black Caribbean, and black African ethnic groups—for several reasons. First, Pakistanis and Bangladeshis have stronger religious identification and attachments to traditional ethnocultural values and norms compared to Britain's other major ethnic minority groups (Beishon et al., 1998; Goodwin et al., 2006; Heath et al., 2013; Modood et al., 1997). Second, Pakistani and Bangladeshi minorities in Britain have arguably experienced more discrimination and racialization in recent decades than other British minority groups—mostly due to heightened public prejudice against Muslims in the wake of the 9/11 terrorist attacks and Britain's subsequent involvement in the so-called “war on terror” (Field, 2007; Khan, 2006; Mac an Ghaill & Haywood, 2015).

Of course, the characteristics and processes underpinning Pakistani and Bangladeshi minorities' homophilous friendship preferences are not unique to these groups. Ethnic Indians can also exhibit a strong attachment to ethnocultural norms (Modood et al., 1997). Likewise, black Caribbeans and black Africans are also racialized minorities

in Britain (Heath & Di Stasio, 2019; Reynolds, 2007)—though unlike ethnic Pakistanis and Bangladeshis, they tend to be significantly less committed to traditional ethnic group norms and relationships: black Caribbeans and black Africans express more positive views about interethnic mixing and exogamy, are more likely to intermarry and have interethnic friends, and live in more ethnically mixed neighborhoods (Harris et al., 2017; Heath et al., 2013). At any rate, the reason we focus on ethnic Pakistanis and Bangladeshis is the conjunction and stronger salience of both features—ethnocultural attachment and racialized ethnic (or ethnoreligious) group status—in these groups. Indeed, some authors have suggested that the combination of heightened racialization and more traditional ethnocultural environments of ethnic Pakistanis and Bangladeshis lie at the root of these minorities' more ethnically segregated friendship networks and residential patterns as compared to other British ethnic minorities (Finney & Simpson, 2009; Heath et al., 2013, p. 31; Muttarak, 2014; Wang & Ramsden, 2018).

For present purposes, however, the combined effect of these group features will likely be to (i) reinforce choice homophily and interethnic avoidance behaviors (see, Skvoretz, 2013) among Pakistani and Bangladeshi CSO participants, and (ii) discourage other participants from interacting with ethnic Pakistani and Bangladeshi participants. We would therefore expect Pakistani and Bangladeshi participants to be significantly less reactive than other ethnic minorities to interethnic contact within CSOs. This means we can supplement each of the previous two pairs of hypotheses with a third hypothesis concerning ethnic differences:

Hypothesis 1c Participation in CSOs increases the share of IEF in ethnic minorities' friendship networks for all minority ethnic groups except ethnic Pakistanis and Bangladeshis.

Hypothesis 2c Participation in mostly interethnic CSOs increases the share of IEF in ethnic minorities' friendship networks for all minority ethnic groups except ethnic Pakistanis and Bangladeshis.

3 | STUDY 1

The first study aims to facilitate a deeper understanding of the causal relationship between participation in CSOs and ethnic minorities' IEF by using a British longitudinal data set analyzed using fixed effects models.

3.1 | Method

3.1.1 | Data and sample

The data used in this study come from the third (2011–2013), sixth (2014–2016), and ninth (2017–2019) wave of the United Kingdom Household Longitudinal Study (UKHLS). All three waves contain consistent measures of respondents' civic participation and social network compositions, constituting a panel data set. UKHLS comprises a stratified and clustered General Population Sample (GPS) of around 40,000 households as well as an Ethnic Minority Boost Sample (EMBS), which was designed to yield at least 1,000 respondents from Britain's five major ethnic minority groups: Indians, Pakistanis, Bangladeshis, black Caribbeans, and black Africans (Knies, 2016). The average interview response rates in the three waves are 61% and 47% for the GPS and EMBS, respectively (Knies, 2016). To construct the analytical sample, we first excluded White British respondents, since they are not the focus of this investigation, alongside ethnic minority groups with very small sample sizes. After additionally dropping a small number of cases with missing values (5%), the final sample used in this study contained 16,597 respondent-wave observations, including Indian, Pakistani, Bangladeshi, black African, and black Caribbean respondents living in the United Kingdom from 2011 to 2019.

3.1.2 | Measures

Dependent variable

The dependent variable is interethnic friendships (IEF). The questionnaire asked respondents about the proportion of their friends who are from the same ethnic group, and provided four ordinal options: "all the same" (1), "more than half" (2), "about half" (3), and "less than half" (4). For the purpose of consistency and comparability with previous studies (Muttarak, 2014), we recoded "all the same" response as 0 (i.e., respondent has no IEF) and other categories as 1 (i.e., respondent has IEF).

Ethnicity

Ethnicity is measured by self-identified ethnic classification. Specifically, the questionnaire asked respondents to select from a list of 18 ethnic categories to which they think they belong (for more details, see understandingsociety.ac.uk). Using this approach, five ethnic minority groups (i.e., Indians, Pakistanis, Bangladeshis, black Caribbeans, and black Africans) were identified and selected, reflecting Britain's largest and most established ethnic minority groups (Office for National Statistics 2015).

Civic participation

Civic participation is our principal independent variable. The questionnaire asked respondents whether they joined the activities of any one of 16 types of CSOs on a regular basis. Religious and ethnic community organizations were excluded from the analysis, as this article focuses on the impact of CSOs that would, at least in principle, cater to all ethnic groups equally. We first recoded civic participation simply as a binary variable where 0 indicates no participation in any organization, and 1 means participation in at least one organization.

In robustness checks, we further distinguished between participation in one organization and participation in two or more organizations to measure the effect of higher civic participation intensity. We also conducted a robustness check using *membership* (instead of participation) in a civic organization as the independent variable, so as to distinguish between passive and active civic participation. Finally, because religious organizations in Britain sometimes have ethnically heterogeneous memberships (Sobolewska et al., 2015), we included these organizations in the civic participation variable in a third robustness analysis. Reassuringly, we found that our results are robust to this alternative variable specification.

Other control variables

As a range of demographic and socioeconomic features are also related to ethnic minorities' IEF (Martinovic et al., 2011; Muttarak, 2014), the analysis controlled for these variables. These include respondents' age (grand mean centered), age squared, and partnership coded as a binary variable indicating whether respondents have a partner. Employment and occupational status have four categories: "no work," "lower occupations," "intermediate occupations," and "higher occupations." Logged equalized household income takes into account the number of people in the household. For more details about the distribution of each variable, see Table A1 in Online Supplementary Material. It is important to note that as we use panel data and fixed effects models, we are only able to control for time-varying variables. All time-constant variables such as gender, family backgrounds are automatically controlled for in the models (for more details, see analytical strategy section). Further analysis showed that for all independent variables Variance Inflation Factor is smaller than three, suggesting that there is no multicollinearity among these variables.

3.1.3 | Analytical strategy

As we have a panel data set and our dependent variable is binary, we used fixed effects (FE) logistic regression analysis with cluster robust standard error. FE models use only "within-individual" variation and analyze

how *changes* in civic participation are linked to *changes* in IEF within each individual over time. In this way, the FE regression eliminates all unobserved heterogeneity and confounding effects due to time-constant variables, enabling a more accurate estimate of the causal relationship between CSO participation and ethnic minorities' IEF (Allison, 2009). We fitted a separate model for the pooled ethnic minority sample as well as for each ethnic minority group independently, in order to explore whether CSO participation affects IEF differently for different ethnic minorities—all while controlling for demographic and socioeconomic characteristics. We also conducted a number of robustness checks to confirm the validity of the results.

3.2 | Results

Descriptive statistics (see Table A1 in Online Supplementary Material) shows that on average 87.77% of black Caribbeans and 83.21% of black Africans have IEF as opposed to 77.55% of Indians, and only 71.12% Pakistanis and 67.44% Bangladeshis. In terms of civic participation or membership, we find that around 37%–41% of black Caribbeans and 31%–39% of black Africans are members or participate in CSOs, as opposed to 26%–32% of Indians, 17%–22% of Pakistanis, and 17%–22% of Bangladeshis. Taken together, these results suggest that black Caribbeans and black Africans are the most civically engaged groups with most IEF, followed by Indians, while Pakistanis and Bangladeshis are relatively less civically engaged and least likely to have IEF.

Table 1 reports the odds ratios of six fixed effects logistic regression models examining the effects of civic participation on ethnic minorities' IEF while controlling for a range of demographic and socioeconomic variables. Overall, we find that for ethnic minority participants as a whole, participation in civic organizations is not significantly associated with greater shares of IEF. The results lend support to hypothesis 1b rather than hypothesis 1a, suggesting that civic participation has no effect on ethnic minorities' IEF. However, considering we have no information on the precise ethnic compositions of participants' CSOs, we cannot rule out the possibility that IEF acquired by participants in mostly interethnic CSOs are counterbalanced by reductions in IEF among participants in mostly co-ethnic CSOs. This possibility is explicitly examined in study 2.

In subsample analyses, we find that for Indians civic participation is significantly associated with more IEF, whereas for Pakistanis civic participation is significantly associated with reductions in IEF. For Bangladeshis, black Caribbeans, and black Africans, civic participation does not significantly affect the share of IEF. While this pattern of results supports our suggestion that the impact on IEF of civic participation varies by ethnic minority group, it does not fit into any one of the hypotheses concerning ethnic differences. Contrary to expectations, only Indians seem to obtain IEF following civic participation; all other ethnic minorities do not, with Pakistanis appearing to lose IEF following CSO participation.

Next, we conducted a number of robustness checks (see Online Supplementary Material). First, Table A2 explores the intensity of civic participation and shows that for Indians participation in two or more organizations is significantly associated with having IEF, with a slightly stronger effect than participation in only one organization. For other ethnic minority groups, participation in two or more organizations is not significantly associated with the presence of IEF. This may be due to relatively small sample sizes for ethnic minority groups who participate in more than one organization. Second, Table A3 shows that for ethnic minorities as a whole *membership* in civic organizations is not significantly associated with the presence of IEF and the effect size of the odds ratio is very small. The same pattern of results applies to all specific ethnic groups, suggesting that CSO membership alone does not affect ethnic minorities' IEF. Third, Table A4 includes religious organization in our measures of CSO membership and participation. The results remain very similar, suggesting that our model is robust to this alternative variable specification. Finally, Table A5 includes interaction terms of civic participation with gender and migration generation, and finds that the effects of civic organization membership/participation on IEF do not significantly vary across genders and generations.

TABLE 1 Fixed effects logistic regression models examining the impacts of civic organization participation on ethnic minorities' interethnic friendships

	Pooled	Indian	Paki	Bangla	B. Cari	B. Afri
<i>Participation in civic organizations</i> (Ref. = No participation)						
Any organizations	1.12 (0.09)	1.76** (0.34)	0.66* (0.14)	1.07 (0.26)	0.95 (0.34)	1.08 (0.31)
Age	1.00 (0.01)	1.00 (0.03)	1.00 (0.03)	0.95 (0.04)	0.96 (0.05)	1.08 [†] (0.05)
Age squared	1.08** (0.00)	1.09* (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)	1.00 (0.00)
<i>Partnership (Ref. = No)</i>						
Yes	0.63* (0.11)	0.98 (0.69)	1.35 (0.55)	0.16* (0.13)	0.97 (0.74)	0.39 [†] (0.22)
<i>Employment status (Ref. = No work)</i>						
Lower occupations	1.21 (0.19)	1.32 (0.58)	1.06 (0.50)	1.22 (0.69)	1.68 (1.23)	0.69 (0.41)
Intermediate occupations	1.11 (0.16)	1.19 (0.45)	1.24 (0.44)	2.03 (0.97)	1.42 (0.89)	0.94 (0.45)
Higher occupations	1.30* (0.16)	1.83 [†] (0.64)	1.18 (0.36)	3.40* (1.64)	1.66 (0.98)	1.36 (0.58)
Logged household income	0.92 (0.05)	0.87 (0.13)	0.82 (0.13)	1.00 (0.18)	0.66 (0.17)	0.62 (0.19)
AIC	3,048	496	506	345	196	249
BIC	3,099	532	543	379	225	279
Respondent-wave observations	4,244	691	694	485	258	338
Number of respondents	1,640	261	277	194	99	134

Note: Odds ratios were reported and standard errors were in parentheses.

Data source: UKHLS wave 3, 6, and 9.

Abbreviations: AIC, Akaike's information criterion; BIC, Bayesian information criterion.

[†] $p < .1$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

4 | STUDY 2

The second study complements the first study by exploring the role of ethnic composition within CSOs in shaping ethnic minorities' IEF using a nationally representative cross-sectional data set.

4.1 | Method

4.1.1 | Data and sample

The data used in the second study come from the Ethnic Minority British Election Survey (EMBES) 2010. EMBES provides a nationally representative sample of the major ethnic minority groups in Britain, that is,

Indians, Pakistanis, Bangladeshis, black Caribbeans, and black Africans (Howat et al., 2011). The survey uses a clustered and stratified sampling strategy. Specifically, addresses were first screened for presence and density of ethnic minorities. Next, areas with high densities of ethnic minorities have higher probabilities to be sampled, whereas areas with low ethnic minority density are less likely to be sampled (Howat et al., 2011). The overall response rate is 60%. In order to adjust for the unequal selection probabilities, probability weights are used in all analyses. To construct the analytic sample, we first excluded ethnic minority groups with small sample sizes and only keep the major five ethnic minority groups. After excluding a small number of missing cases (1%), the final analytical sample contained 2,531 respondents. For further details about the data, see Howat et al. (2011).

4.1.2 | Measures

Dependent variable

The dependent variable is interethnic friendships (IEF). The questionnaire asked respondents about the proportion of their friends who are from the same ethnic group, and provided five ordinal options: "all the same" (1), "most of them" (2), "about half of them" (3), "a few of them" (4), and "none of them" (5). As the measure and distribution of this variable are different from those in study 1, we treat it as a continuous variable. Just in case, however, we also conducted robustness checks where we recoded the variable into a binary variable (0 indicates "all the same" or "most of them," 1 indicates "about half of them," "a few of them," or "none of them") and found that the results remain similar (see online supplement, Table A7).

Ethnicity

Ethnicity is measured by self-identified ethnic categories to which they think they belong. Using this approach, five ethnic minority groups (i.e., Indians, Pakistanis, Bangladeshis, black Caribbeans, and black Africans) are identified and selected because they are the largest and most established minority groups in Britain.

Civic participation

The survey first asked respondents whether they participate in the following six types of organizations: sports club, hobby club, charity group, political or citizens group, children's school group, and other associations. As with study 1, participation in places of worship and ethnic organizations is excluded from the analysis of study 2—these categories of participation are queried in a separate part of the questionnaire.

Inter-ethnic contact opportunities within CSOs

Next, the survey asked respondents to indicate what proportion of members within each one of their organizations share their ethnic group membership. Respondents were given five options: "all the same" (1), "most of them" (2), "about half of them" (3), "a few of them" (4), and "none of them" (5). We used a two-step process to construct a CSO ethnic composition variable on the basis of these response categories. In the first step, as only a small number of respondents selected the categories "all the same" and "none of them," we collapsed the five response categories into three categories as follows: (1) "mostly/only co-ethnic" (i.e. all or most of the CSO's co-members are from the same ethnic group as respondent) (2) "intermediate" (about half of the CSO's co-members are from the same ethnic group as respondent), and (3) "mostly/only interethnic" (None or only a few of the CSO's co-members are from the same ethnic group as respondent). Many respondents either did not participate in any CSOs or, conversely, participated in more than one CSO. Therefore, in the second step, we created a new variable measuring each participant's amalgamated inter-ethnic exposure across all CSOs in which he or she participates. The categories of this new variable were constructed as follows:

(1) "No participation"; (2) "Mostly co-ethnic" - includes respondents who only participated in 'mostly/only co-ethnic organizations'; (3) "Intermediate and other mixed" - includes respondents who participated in either: i. both 'intermediate' and 'mostly co-ethnic' organizations; ii. both 'intermediate' and 'mostly interethnic' organizations; or iii. only 'intermediate' organizations; (4) "Mostly interethnic" - includes respondents who only participated in 'mostly/only interethnic' organizations.

To ensure that the results are robust, we also tested an alternative specification of the CSO ethnic composition variable, using a modified schema to assign respondents to different categories. The recoded variable comprises the following categories:

(1) "No participation"; (2) "Mostly co-ethnic or intermediate & mostly co-ethnic" - includes respondents who participated in either: i. both 'intermediate' and 'mostly/only co-ethnic' organizations; or ii. only 'mostly/only co-ethnic' organizations; (3) "Intermediate" - includes respondents who only participated in 'intermediate' organizations; (4) "Mostly interethnic or intermediate & mostly interethnic" - includes respondents who participated in either: i. both 'mostly/only interethnic' organizations and 'intermediate' organizations; ii. only 'mostly/only interethnic' organizations. We excluded from the sample a small number of respondents who participated in both 'mostly/only co-ethnic' and 'mostly/only interethnic' organizations due to difficulties of classification.

Other control variables

As a range of demographic and socioeconomic features are also related to ethnic minorities' IEF (Martinovic et al., 2011; Muttarak, 2014), we controlled for these variables. These include respondents' age (grand mean centered), age squared, gender, migration generation, education levels (including three categories: "tertiary," "secondary," and "no qualification"), and whether they have suffered ethnic discrimination. We also included ethnicity of partner (including three categories: "no partner," "co-ethnic partner," and "interethnic partner"), ethnicity of work colleagues (including three categories: "no work," "co-ethnic work colleagues," and "interethnic work colleagues"), and proportion of co-ethnics in local areas. The three variables can help us reduce self-selection effects of civic participation on IEF (i.e., people with more IEF are more likely to participate in CSOs). For more details on the distribution of each variable, see Table A6 in Online Supplementary Material.

4.1.3 | Analytical strategy

This study first used Ordinary Least Squares (OLS) regression models to analyze the role of ethnic composition in shaping the metrical measure of IEF, and then, used logistic regression models with a binary measure of IEF in robustness checks. We fitted models for both the pooled ethnic minority sample and for each ethnic minority group separately using two types of ethnic composition variables—while simultaneously controlling for a wide range of demographic and socioeconomic characteristics.

4.2 | Results

Table 2 shows a number of OLS regression models investigating the relationship between ethnic composition in CSOs and ethnic minorities' IEF. In Models 1, we find that for ethnic minorities as a whole, those who participated in mostly co-ethnic organizations have a significantly smaller proportion of IEF compared to those who did not participate in CSOs, whereas those who participated in mostly interethnic organizations have a significantly larger proportion of IEF in their friendship networks. Ethnic minorities who participated in organizations with an intermediate share of co-ethnics have a similar proportion of IEF compared with those who did not participate in any

TABLE 2 OLS regression models investigating effects of ethnic composition in organizations on ethnic minorities' interethnic friendships

	Pooled	Indian	Paki	Bangla	Paki/Bangla	B. Cari	B. Afri
Models 1							
<i>Ethnic composition of civic organizations (Ref. = No participation)</i>							
Mostly co-ethnic	-0.29*** (0.06)	-0.10 (0.10)	-0.41*** (0.09)	-0.12 (0.17)	-0.35*** (0.08)	-0.35* (0.17)	-0.29* (0.12)
Intermediate and other mixed	0.02 (0.07)	0.09 (0.13)	-0.14 (0.13)	0.06 (0.22)	-0.11 (0.11)	0.12 (0.13)	0.11 (0.14)
Mostly interethnic	0.44*** (0.07)	0.49*** (0.13)	0.43** (0.14)	0.21 (0.19)	0.35** (0.12)	0.36** (0.13)	0.53*** (0.13)
Constant	2.74*** (0.09)	2.66*** (0.16)	2.72*** (0.17)	2.90*** (0.27)	2.75*** (0.15)	2.57*** (0.20)	2.63*** (0.17)
R-squared	0.19	0.25	0.20	0.21	0.19	0.16	0.22
Observations	2,531	566	633	258	891	570	504
Models 2							
<i>Ethnic composition of civic organizations (Ref. = No participation)</i>							
Mostly or mostly & interm. co-ethnic	-0.28*** (0.06)	-0.10 (0.09)	-0.42*** (0.09)	-0.12 (0.17)	-0.35*** (0.08)	-0.31† (0.16)	-0.30* (0.12)
Intermediate	0.02 (0.07)	0.01 (0.15)	-0.09 (0.13)	-0.17 (0.19)	-0.12 (0.11)	0.16 (0.14)	0.13 (0.17)
Mostly or mostly & interm. interethnic	0.42*** (0.07)	0.48*** (0.13)	0.37** (0.14)	0.29† (0.18)	0.33** (0.11)	0.34** (0.12)	0.51*** (0.12)
Constant	2.73*** (0.09)	2.66*** (0.16)	2.71*** (0.17)	2.91*** (0.27)	2.74*** (0.15)	2.57*** (0.20)	2.61*** (0.17)
R-squared	0.19	0.26	0.20	0.22	0.19	0.16	0.22
Observations	2,531	566	633	258	891	570	504

Note: All models controlled for age, age squared, gender, migration generation, education levels, whether suffer ethnic discrimination, ethnicity of partners, ethnicity of work colleagues, local share of co-ethnics. Coefficients were reported and standard errors were in parentheses.

Data source: EMBES 2010.

† $p < .1$; * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$.

organizations. These results provide strong support for hypotheses 2a and 2b, highlighting the important role of ethnic composition within CSOs in ethnic minority participants' IEF.

These results are also significant at the level of individual ethnic groups—with two exceptions. One is Indians, for whom there is no decrease in the share of IEF among participants in mostly co-ethnic CSOs. The second exception is Bangladeshis. In the latter group, although the directions of the coefficients are similar to the ones in the pooled sample analysis, none of the coefficients reaches statistical significance. This is likely due to the small sample size of Bangladeshis respondents. In anticipation of this, we also included a pooled sample of Pakistani and Bangladeshi respondents in the analysis shown in Table 2, since both ethnic minority groups were associated with the same country before 1971 and share many characteristics, including religion, labor market outcomes, gender role values, and more (Wang, 2019; Wang & Coulter, 2019). For the pooled Pakistani/Bangladeshi group, we find that the ethnic composition of CSOs affects IEF in the same way as for the other ethnic groups. Overall, with the partial exception of Indian participants in majority co-ethnic CSOs, our findings lend further support to hypotheses 2a and 2b, while failing to support hypothesis 2c, which expected participation in mostly interethnic CSOs not to increase IEF among Pakistani and Bangladeshi participants. In Models 2, we repeated the same analyses while using a different variable to measure CSO ethnic composition and find that the results are generally consistent with those of Models 1.

We also test the robustness of our results by conducting two additional analyses. First, we repeat the main analysis while using a logistic regression model that uses a binary IEF variable (see Table A7 in Online Supplementary Material). Reassuringly, we find the results of this robustness test to be consistent with those of the main analysis, suggesting that our findings are robust to alternative model specifications. Second, we control for ethnic minorities' attitudes toward interethnic mixing to account for the possibility of motivational self-selection, whereby ethnic minorities who are willing to make IEF are more likely to participate in cross-ethnic CSOs to achieve that goal (see Table A8 in Online Supplementary Material). This variable is measured by a single question asking respondents to what extent they agree that people of their ethnic origin should mix with White people and other ethnic minority groups. Responses are recorded on a 5-point scale ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree." As this question was only asked in a subsample of ethnic minority respondents, the robustness check was conducted using the pooled sample of ethnic minorities to ensure sufficient sample size. Reassuringly, we find the results remain similar to the ones in the main analysis, suggesting that our findings are unlikely to reflect motivational self-selection.

5 | DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

There is a growing consensus in policy discourse that positive social ties between members of different ethnic groups are an important driver of social cohesion and social capital in ethnically mixed communities in Britain (APPG, 2017; Hargreaves et al., 2020; Social Integration Commission, 2014; The Casey Review, 2016). Toward this end, recently published policy recommendations state that government and local authorities should proactively support the growth of civic and community organizations that promote cross-ethnic contact (APPG, 2017). And yet, there is relatively little evidence that such organizations actually foster lasting interpersonal relationships between members of different ethnic groups. In response, we set out to critically investigate the relationship between CSO participation and ethnic minorities' IEF—focusing on the five largest ethnic minority groups in Britain. Our analyses yielded several important findings.

In a first study using longitudinal data and fixed effects models, we found that participation in CSOs does not significantly affect the IEF of ethnic minorities as a whole. However, in ethnic group-specific analyses, we found that participation in CSOs significantly promotes IEF among ethnic Indian participants. For other minority groups, it seems to have either no effect or, in the case of Pakistanis, a negative effect on participants' IEF ties. This pattern of results strongly suggests that the impact of CSO participation on minorities' IEF varies by ethnic group

membership. At the same time, the findings do not fit squarely within any one of the theoretical perspectives that we thought might explain the relationship between CSO participation and ethnic minorities' IEF.

It bears stressing that in the absence of precise information on the ethnic composition of participants' CSOs, the nonsignificant results of study 1 might actually reflect the effects of divergent interethnic interaction opportunities found within participants' IEF: participants with few interethnic contact opportunities in their CSOs might have experienced a drop in their IEF share, whereas those participating in CSOs with copious interethnic contact opportunities experienced an increase in IEF. This explanation is partially supported by the findings of study 2, as discussed below.

Even so, if the CSO ethnic compositions reported by participants in study 2 resemble those of participants in study 1, then only a very small minority of participants in study 1 participated exclusively in ethnically homogeneous CSOs; the vast majority of them enjoyed at least some interethnic exposure within their respective CSOs. This means that even though almost every CSO participant in study 1 was exposed to at least some ethnic outgroups within his or her CSOs, this exposure did not increase participants' IEF. In other words, mere exposure to members of other ethnic groups within CSOs does not promote IEF formation among Britain's ethnic minorities as a whole.

In sum, the findings of study 1 make it clear that participation in CSOs does not guarantee new IEF, and that friendship formation within CSOs is shaped by multiple, ethnic group-sensitive, mechanisms. This calls into question policy recommendations that use intergroup contact theory to assert that ethnic minority participation in CSOs will promote interethnic ties in Britain. Intergroup contact theory alone does not appear to adequately explain friendship formation patterns in complex settings like CSOs.

That participation in CSOs does not increase the share of IEF for black Caribbeans and black Africans is particularly surprising, considering that these groups have the highest level of civic participation and the largest share of IEF among British ethnic minorities (Heath et al., 2013). One possible explanation is that black Caribbeans and black Africans in Britain may already have extensive interethnic networks before they join civic organizations (Peach, 2005). They also tend to live in more ethnically diverse areas than other minorities (Zuccotti, 2015). Drawing on McPherson et al. (1992), we suspect that CSO participants from both of these groups experience greater competing social pressures to devote their time and efforts to alternative settings and social circles. As a result, they enjoy fewer opportunities for, and invest fewer resources in, intraorganizational interactions and IEF formation (Fehr, 1996).

Another significant finding in our first study is that mere membership—as opposed to active participation—in CSOs seems not to affect any ethnic minority group's IEF. This suggests that it is active participation, rather than passive membership, that contributes to friendships formation within CSOs. If so, our findings support previous research showing that more active forms of voluntary civic engagement increase personal benefits for participants (McGarvey et al., 2019, p. 59).

In a second study using cross-sectional data and a more detailed measure of IEF, we showed that the ethnic compositions of ethnic minorities' CSOs significantly affect the share of IEF in their friendship circles. Compared to not participating in CSOs, we found that participation in mostly interethnic CSOs is associated with a greater share of IEF ties, while participation in mostly co-ethnic CSOs is associated with a lower share IEF. Meanwhile, participation in CSOs with an intermediate share of co-ethnics had no discernible effect on minorities' friendship networks. This pattern of results applied to every ethnic minority group examined—with the exception that ethnic Indian participants in majority co-ethnic CSOs did not seem to have a lower share of IEF. That aside, even Pakistani and Bangladeshi participants—who belong to racialized ethnic groups with more traditional ethnocultural values—seem to have more IEF when participating in majority interethnic CSOs.

The findings of study 2 suggest that the relationship between civic participation and ethnic minorities' IEF depends on the interethnic contact opportunities available to minorities within their CSOs. Arguably, the nonsignificant results of study 1 reinforce this conclusion: the likely reason civic participation did not increase the share of IEF reported by ethnic minorities in study 1 is that a large share ethnic minorities participate in mostly co-ethnic

CSOs, where they are more likely to form co-ethnic, rather than interethnic, friendships. This conclusion supports the view that intraorganizational contact opportunities represent the principal mechanism of intergroup friendship formation (De Bunt et al., 1999; Van Kossinets & Watts, 2009).

Another interesting finding in study 2 is that, unlike the other minority groups, ethnic Indians who participate in mostly co-ethnic CSOs do not have less IEF than nonparticipants. This might explain why ethnic Indians in study 1 were the only respondent group to experience increases in IEF following CSO participation: ethnic Indians are not necessarily better than other groups at forming IEF in majority interethnic settings—rather, they are significantly less likely to experience reductions in IEF when they participate in co-ethnic CSOs.

Unfortunately, we found no previous studies in the ethnicity and social network literatures to explain why ethnic Indian friendship formation patterns behave this way. One possible explanation is that ethnic Indians who join mostly co-ethnic CSOs attend them less frequently (see Low et al., 2007: Table 3.4) and/or for shorter periods of time compared to other participants in mostly co-ethnic CSOs, thereby reducing opportunities for co-ethnic tie formation (Popielarz & McPherson, 1995). Another possibility, drawing on Blau (1977; see also, Smith-Lovin & McPherson, 1987), is that majority-Indian CSOs have more socioeconomically and religiously heterogeneous membership pools compared to other majority single-ethnic CSOs. This would narrow the basis for choice homophily among ethnic Indian participants and, consequently, reduce the appeal of co-ethnic friendships. Either way, without more information on the characteristics of ethnic Indians' CSO participation and the features of majority-Indian CSOs, the source of ethnic Indians' atypical friendship formation patterns in CSOs remains an open question.

We should stress here that the above interpretations of the first study's findings on the basis of the results of study 2 rely on the use of a cross-sectional analysis of one data set (study 2) to explain the findings of a longitudinal study drawing on a different (albeit comparable) data set (study 1). This kind of complementary, two-study design was chosen because it allowed us to take available UK data on ethnic minorities' civic participation as far as it can go—enabling us to examine a wider range of determinants of IEF formation than would have been possible in a single study. That said, the chosen design also means that we cannot fully rule out the possibility that the non-significant findings of study 1 reflected methodological or other issues associated with the study itself. Moreover, there is also a risk that the findings of study 2 are the products of self-selection or other biases commonly associated with cross-sectional designs. We discuss these and other possible limitations later in this section.

Overall, the findings of study 2 support Blau's (1977) theory of structured associations insofar as they highlight the importance of demographically diverse intraorganizational contact opportunities for intergroup tie formation. More importantly, they support multiple previous studies linking individuals' interethnic friendship patterns to contact opportunities embedded within organized social settings (Currarini et al., 2010; Kokkonen & Karlsson, 2017; Schlueter, 2012; Smith et al., 2016). Finally, while the findings of our second study resemble those of previous quantitative investigations of IEF formation within CSOs (Martinovic et al., 2014; Muttarak, 2014), we go beyond the previous literature in two important respects. First, we show that interethnic contact opportunities facilitate IEF for different ethnic minority groups considered independently. Second, using a more nuanced measure of contact opportunities than those employed in previous studies, our study suggests that the influence of CSO participation on minorities' IEF can also be negative: a participant in a CSO that offers mostly co-ethnic contact opportunities is more likely to make new co-ethnic, rather than interethnic, friends.

Considered together, the studies comprising this article make important contributions to the previous literature by advancing a more nuanced understanding of the relationship between ethnicity, CSO participation and IEF using large-scale longitudinal and cross-sectional data. They underscore the importance of contact opportunities to IEF formation within CSOs while showing, using a rigorous longitudinal design, that CSO participation in and of itself does not tend to promote IEF among most British ethnic minorities. The implications for policy are straightforward: policy initiatives hoping to use CSOs to promote positive interethnic ties in mixed communities would do well to ensure that these organizations attract sufficiently diverse memberships.

Future research wishing to build on these findings should bear in mind the limitations associated with each of the studies conducted. First and foremost, given the cross-sectional design of study 2, we cannot rule out the possibility that our findings concerning the effect of interethnic contact opportunities on IEF formation reflect a self-selection bias. For one thing, it is possible that individuals with more pre-participation IEF tended to join mostly interethnic CSOs, while those with few/no pre-participation IEF tended to join mostly co-ethnic CSOs. After all, interethnic friendships improve people's attitudes towards ethnic out-groups and are known to be an important channel of recruitment for CSOs. Both mechanisms could cause ethnic minorities with more IEF to prefer joining mostly interethnic CSOs (Hewstone, 2015; Low et al., 2007, p. 37; Popielarz & McPherson, 1995; but see also Wiertz, 2016). Another possible self-selection effect could be that participants with high motivation to form IEF tended to join mostly interethnic CSOs, while those averse to IEF joined mostly co-ethnic CSOs.² In this case, the propensity to form IEF in mostly interethnic CSOs would reflect between-subject motivational differences, rather than a contact opportunity effect.

We should stress, however, that while both types sources of bias are plausible, the models used in the second study included several control variables chosen to minimize the potential influence of these self-selection processes on the outcome variables. We included several known predictors of prior IEF (namely: partner's ethnicity, ethnicity of work colleagues, and neighborhood co-ethnic share) and interethnic friendship motivation (attitudes toward interethnic mixing) (see Table A6 in Online Supplementary Material) (Fong & Isajiw, 2000; Kokkonen et al., 2015; Schlueter, 2012). Our findings proved robust to the inclusion of these control variables. Nevertheless, we acknowledge that we could not control for all conceivable processes of self-selection. For example, none of the control variables available could adequately control for the possible confounding effects of respondents' school-based pre-participation IEF. Future investigations will hopefully be able to examine the relationships between interethnic contact opportunities and CSO participants' IEF using longitudinal data on the ethnic composition of respondents' CSOs. We believe that the availability of such data in our longitudinal study would have enabled us to replicate the findings of our second, cross-sectional study.

Another important limitation concerned study 1. Although we used a longitudinal data set and fixed effects model to explore the relationship between CSO participation and ethnic minorities' IEF, the said data set only contains three waves and, therefore, relatively small within-subject variation. Thus, the results obtained may have underestimated the effect of civic participation on IEF, seeing as respondents that did not experience any changes in civic participation and IEF during the longitudinal survey were removed from the analyses. When more waves of UKHLS are available, future studies could explore the effects of civic participation on ethnic minorities' IEF using a sample that offers more statistical power.

Finally, due to small sample sizes and data limitations, our analysis could not distinguish between different types of civic organizations. For example, charities and trade unions may exert different effects on the process of friend-making. Thus, future research could make significant contributions to the social integration and cohesion literatures by distinguishing between different types of civic organizations and investigating their differential impact on interethnic tie formation.

DATA AVAILABILITY STATEMENT

"The University of Essex Ethics Committee has approved all data collection on Understanding Society main study and innovation panel waves, including asking consent for all data linkages except to health records. Requesting consent for health record linkage was approved at Wave 1 by the National Research Ethics Service (NRES) Oxfordshire REC A (08/H0604/124), at BHPS Wave 18 by the NRES Royal Free Hospital & Medical School (08/H0720/60) and at Wave 4 by NRES Southampton REC A (11/SC/0274). Approval for the collection of biosocial data by trained nurses in Waves 2 and 3 of the main survey was obtained from the National Research Ethics Service (Understanding Society - UK Household Longitudinal Study: A Biosocial Component, Oxfordshire A REC, Reference: 10/H0604/2)."

ORCID

Senhu Wang  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0065-7059>

Liran Morav  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7415-6591>

ENDNOTES

¹ For simplicity, the term “CSOs” will be used throughout this paper to mean *cross-ethnic* CSOs. As explained in the Methods section, we exclude from the analytical sample ethnic minorities who only participated in religious and/or ethnic community CSOs, as these types of organizations are often (although not always—see, Sobolewska et al., 2015) ethnically homogeneous and/or provide few opportunities for the meaningful interethnic interactions set out in the intergroup contact literature.

² We thank the anonymous reviewer who brought this point to our attention.

REFERENCES

- Allan, B. G., & Adams, R. G. (2006). Sociology of friendship. In C. Bryant, & D. Peck (Eds.), *The handbook of 21st century sociology*. Sage Publications.
- Allison, P. D. (2009). *Fixed effects regression models*. Sage.
- Allport, G. W. (1979). *The nature of prejudice* (25th ed.). New York: Basic Books.
- APPG. (2017). Integration not demonisation: The final report of the All-Party Parliamentary Group on Social Integration's inquiry into the integration of immigrants. <https://socialintegrationappg.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/sites/2/2018/09/Final-Report-into-the-integration-of-migrants.pdf>
- Barwick, C. (2017). Are immigrants really lacking social networking skills? The crucial role of reciprocity in building ethnically diverse networks. *Sociology*, 51(2), 410–428.
- Beishon, S., Modood, T., & Virdee, S. (1998). *Ethnic minority families*. Joseph Rowntree Foundation.
- Blackwell, D. L., & Lichter, D. T. (2004). Homogamy among dating, cohabiting, and married couples. *Sociological Quarterly*, 45(4), 719–737.
- Blau, P. M. (1977). A macrosocial theory of social structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83(1), 26–54.
- Cabinet Office. (2011). *PM's speech at Munich Security Conference*. <https://www.gov.uk/government/speeches/pms-speech-at-munich-security-conference>
- Carol, S. (2014). The intergenerational transmission of intermarriage attitudes and intergroup friendships: The role of Turkish migrant parents. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 40(10), 1550–1571.
- Currarini, S., Jackson, M. O., & Pin, P. (2010). Identifying the roles of race-based choice and chance in high school friendship network formation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, 107(11), 4857–4861.
- Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2005). Beyond the optimal contact strategy: A reality check for the contact hypothesis. *American Psychologist*, 60(7), 697–711.
- Elwert, F., & Winship, C. (2014). Endogenous selection bias: The problem of conditioning on a collider variable. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 40, 31–53.
- Favell, A. (2001). *Philosophies of integration: Immigration and the idea of citizenship in France and Britain* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fehr, B. (1996). *Friendship processes*. Sage Publications.
- Feld, S., & Grofman, B. (2009). Homophily and the focused organization of ties. In P. Hedstrom, & P. Bearman (Eds.), *The Oxford handbook of analytical sociology*. Oxford University Press.
- Field, C. D. (2007). Islamophobia in contemporary Britain: The evidence of the opinion polls, 1988–2006. *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, 18(4), 447–477.
- Finney, N., & Simpson, L. (2009). *“Sleepwalking to segregation”: Challenging myths about race and migration*. The Policy Press.
- Fischer, M. J. (2008). Does campus diversity promote friendship diversity? A look at interracial friendships in college. *Social Science Quarterly*, 89(3), 631–655.
- Fong, E., & Isajiw, W. W. (2000). Determinants of friendship choices in multiethnic society. *Sociological Forum*, 15(2), 249–271.
- Gans, H. J. (1961). Planning and social life: Friendship and neighbor relations in suburban communities. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 27(2), 134–140.
- Gans, H. J. (2017). Racialization and racialization research. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 40(3), 341–352.
- Goodeau, S., Kitts, J., & Morris, M. (2009). Birds of a feather, or friend of a friend? Using exponential random graph models to investigate adolescent social networks. *Demography*, 46(1), 103–125.

- Goodwin, R., Christakopoulou, S., & Panagiotidou, V. (2006). Britain. In J. Georgas, J. W. Berry, F. J. R. van de Vijver, Ç. Kagitçibasi, & Y. H. E. Poortinga (Eds.), *Families across cultures: A 30-nation psychological study*. Cambridge University Press.
- Gorny, A., & Torunczyk-Ruiz, S. (2013). Neighbourhood attachment in ethnically diverse areas: The role of interethnic ties. *Urban Studies*, 51(5), 1000–1018.
- Hargreaves, J., Kessler, E., Izamoje, D., & Symon, A. (2020). *How we get along: The diversity study of England and Wales*.
- Harris, R., Johnston, R., & Manley, D. (2017). The changing interaction of ethnic and socio-economic segregation in England and Wales, 1991–2011. *Ethnicities*, 17(3), 320–349.
- Heath, A., & Demireva, N. (2014). Has multiculturalism failed in Britain? *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37(1), 161–180.
- Heath, A. F., & Di Stasio, V. (2019). Racial discrimination in Britain, 1969–2017: A meta-analysis of field experiments on racial discrimination in the British labour market. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 70(5), 1774–1798. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12676>
- Heath, A., Fisher, S., Rosenblatt, G., Sanders, D., & Sobolewska, M. (2013). *The political integration of ethnic minorities in Britain*. Oxford University Press.
- Hewstone, M. (2015). Consequences of diversity for social cohesion and prejudice: The missing dimension of intergroup contact. *Journal of Social Issues*, 71(2), 417–438.
- Howat, N., Norden, O., Williams, J., & Pickering, E. (2011). *Ethnic minority British election study: Technical report*, London.
- Huston, T. L., & Levinger, G. (1978). Interpersonal attraction and relationships. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 29, 115–156.
- Ingram, P., & Morris, M. W. (2007). Do people mix at mixers? Structure, homophily, and the “life of the party”. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 52(4), 558–585.
- Joyner, K., & Kao, G. (2000). School racial composition and adolescent racial homophily. *Social Science Quarterly*, 81(3), 810–825.
- Kecskes, R. (2003). Ethnische Homogenität in sozialen Netzwerken türkischer Jugendlicher [Ethnic Homogeneity in Social Networks of Turkish Youth]. *Zeitschrift Für Soziologie Der Erziehung Und Sozialisation [Journal for Sociology of Education and Socialization]*, 23(1), 68–84.
- Khan, S. (2006). Muslims!. In N. Ali, V. Karla, & S. Sayyid (Eds.), *A postcolonial people: South Asians in Britain*. Hurst & Company.
- Kleinbaum, A. M., Stuart, T. E., & Tushman, M. L. (2013). Discretion within constraint: Homophily and structure in a formal organization. *Organization Science*, 24(5), 1316–1336.
- Knies, G. (2016). Understanding society: The UK household longitudinal study waves 1–6. User Guide.
- Kokkonen, A., Esaiasson, P., & Gilljam, M. (2015). Diverse workplaces and interethnic friendship formation—A multilevel comparison across 21 OECD countries. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 41(2), 284–305.
- Kokkonen, A., & Karlsson, D. (2017). That’s what friends are for: How intergroup friendships promote historically disadvantaged groups’ substantive political representation. *British Journal of Sociology*, 68(4), 693–717.
- Kossinets, G., & Watts, D. J. (2009). Origins of homophily in an evolving social network. *American Journal of Sociology*, 115(2), 405–450.
- Laurence, J. (2011). The effect of ethnic diversity and community disadvantage on social cohesion: A multi-level analysis of social capital and interethnic relations in UK communities. *European Sociological Review*, 27(1), 70–89.
- Lazarsfeld, P. F., & Merton, R. K. (1954). Friendship as social process: A substantive and methodological analysis. In M. Berger, T. Abel, & C. Page (Eds.), *Freedom and control in modern society*. Van Nostrand.
- Leszczensky, L., & Pink, S. (2015). Ethnic segregation of friendship networks in school: Testing a rational-choice argument of differences in ethnic homophily between classroom- and grade-level networks. *Social Networks*, 42.
- Leszczensky, L., & Pink, S. (2017). Intra- and inter-group friendship choices of Christian, Muslim, and non-religious youth in Germany. *European Sociological Review*, 33(1), 72–83.
- Li, P. S. (2004). Social capital and economic outcomes for immigrants and ethnic minorities. *Journal of International Migration and Integration / Revue de l'integration et de la migration internationale*, 5(2), 171–190. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12134-004-1008-8>
- Low, N., Butt, S., Paine, A. E., & Smith, J. D. (2007). *Helping out: A national survey of volunteering and charitable giving*.
- Mac an Ghaill, M., & Haywood, C. (2015). British-born Pakistani and Bangladeshi young men: Exploring unstable concepts of Muslim, Islamophobia and Racialization. *Critical Sociology*, 41(1), 97–114.
- Maliepaard, M., & Lubbers, M. (2013). Parental religious transmission after migration: The case of Dutch Muslims. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 39(3), 425–442.
- Mark, M. M. (2015). Mixed and multimethods in predominantly quantitative studies, especially experiments and quasi-experiments. In S. Hesse-Biber, & R. B. Johnson (Eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of multimethod and mixed methods research inquiry*. Oxford University Press.
- Martinovic, B., Van Tubergen, F., & Maas, I. (2011). Acquisition of cross-ethnic friends by recent immigrants in Canada: A longitudinal approach. *International Migration Review*, 45(2), 460–488.

- Martinovic, B., van Tubergen, F., & Maas, I. (2014). A longitudinal study of interethnic contacts in Germany: Estimates from a multilevel growth curve model. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 1–18.
- McGarvey, A., Jochum, V., Davies, J., Dobbs, J., & Hornung, L. (2019). *Time well spent: A national survey on the volunteer experience*, London.
- McPherson, M., Popielarz, P., & Drobnic, S. (1992). Social networks and organizational dynamics. *American Sociological Review*, 57(2), 153–170.
- McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. (2001). Birds of feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 415–444.
- Modood, T., Berthoud, R., Lakey, J., Nazroo, J., Smith, P., Virdee, S., & Beishon, S. (1997). *Ethnic minorities in Britain: Diversity and disadvantage*. The Fourth National Survey of Ethnic Minorities. London: Policy Studies Institute.
- Munniksma, A., Flache, A., Verkuyten, M., & Veenstra, R. (2012). Parental acceptance of children's intimate ethnic out-group relations: The role of culture, status, and family reputation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 36(4), 575–585.
- Muttarak, R. (2014). Generation, ethnic and religious diversity in friendship choice: Exploring interethnic close ties in Britain. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 37, 1–28.
- Nauck, B. (2001). Transmission in immigrant families. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32(2), 159–173.
- Office for National Statistics. (2015). *2011 census analysis: Ethnicity and religion of the non-UK born population in England and Wales*.
- Peach, C. (2005). Social integration and social mobility: Spatial segregation and intermarriage of the Caribbean population in Britain. In G. Loury, T. Modood, & S. Teles (Eds.), *Ethnicity, social mobility and public policy: Comparing the US and UK*. Cambridge University Press.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49(1), 65–85.
- Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 90(5), 751–783.
- Phillips, D. (2010). Minority ethnic segregation, integration and citizenship: A European perspective. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 36(2), 209–225.
- Popielarz, P. A., & McPherson, M. (1995). On the edge or in between : Niche position, niche overlap, and the duration of voluntary association memberships. *American Journal of Sociology*, 101(3), 698–720.
- Portes, A., & Rivas, A. (2011). The adaptation of migrant children—ProQuest Central. *The Future of Children*, 21(1), 219–246.
- Reinders, H. Entstehungskontexte interethnischer Freundschaften in der Adoleszenz. *Zeitschrift Für Erziehungswissenschaft*, 7(1), 121–145.
- Reynolds, T. (2007). Friendship networks, social capital and ethnic identity: Researching the perspectives of Caribbean young people in Britain. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 10(4), 383–398.
- Schaefer, D. R., Simpkins, S. D., Vest, A. E., & Price, C. D. (2011). The contribution of extracurricular activities to adolescent friendships: New insights through social network analysis. *Developmental Psychology*, 47(4), 1141–1152.
- Schlueter, E. (2012). The inter-ethnic friendships of immigrants with host-society members: Revisiting the role of ethnic residential segregation. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 38(1), 77–91.
- Skvoretz, J. (2013). Diversity, integration, and social ties: Attraction versus repulsion as drivers of intra- and intergroup relations. *American Journal of Sociology*, 119(2), 486–517.
- Small, M. L. (2009). *Unanticipated gains: Origins of network inequality in everyday life*. Oxford University Press.
- Smith, S., Maas, I., & van Tubergen, F. (2014). Ethnic ingroup friendships in schools: Testing the by-product hypothesis in England, Germany, the Netherlands and Sweden. *Social Networks*, 39(1), 33–45.
- Smith, S., Van Tubergen, F., Maas, I., & McFarland, D. A. (2016). Ethnic composition and friendship segregation: Differential effects for adolescent natives and immigrants. *American Journal of Sociology*, 121(4), 1223–1272.
- Smith-Lovin, L., & McPherson, J. M. (1987). Homophily in voluntary organizations: Status distance and the composition of face-to-face groups review. *American Sociological Review*, 52(3), 370–379.
- Sobolewska, M., Fisher, S., Heath, A., & Sanders, D. (2015). Understanding the effects of religious attendance on political participation among ethnic minorities of different religions. *European Journal of Political Research*, 54, 271–287.
- Social Integration Commission. (2014). *Kingdom United?: Thirteen steps to tackle social segregation*.
- Sturgis, P., Brunton-Smith, I., Kuha, J., & Jackson, J. (2015). Ethnic diversity, segregation and the social cohesion of neighbourhoods in London. *Ethnic and Racial Studies*, 38(1), 1–21.
- Tatum, B. D. (1997). *Why are all the black kids sitting together in the cafeteria?: And other conversations about race*. Basic Books.
- The Casey Review. (2016). *The Casey Review: A review into opportunity and integration*.
- Tyler, K. (2020). Suburban ethnicities: Home as the site of interethnic conviviality and racism. *British Journal of Sociology*, 71(2), 221–235.
- Van De Bunt, G. G., Duijn, M. A. J. V., & Snijders, T. A. B. (1999). Friendship networks through time: An actor-oriented dynamic statistical network model. *Computational & Mathematical Organization Theory*, 5(2), 167–192.

- Verbrugge, L. M. (1977). The structure of adult friendship choices. *Social Forces*, 56(2), 576–597.
- Wang, S. (2019). The role of gender role attitudes and immigrant generation in ethnic minority women's labor force participation in Britain. *Sex Roles*, 80, 234–245.
- Wang, S., & Coulter, R. (2019). Exploring ethnic and generational differences in gender role attitudes among immigrant populations in Britain: The role of neighborhood ethnic composition. *International Migration Review*, 53(4), 1121–1147.
- Wang, S., & Ramsden, M. (2018). Revisiting the “parallel lives” thesis: Neighbourhood attachment and residential integration of ethnic minorities in England. *Population, Space and Place*, 24(8), 1–15.
- Wessendorf, S. (2020). Ethnic minorities' reactions to newcomers in East London: Symbolic boundaries and convivial labor. *British Journal of Sociology*, (1), 1–13.
- Wiertz, D. (2016). Segregation in civic life. *American Sociological Review*, 81(4), 800–827. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122416651312>.
- Windzio, M. (2012). Integration of immigrant children into inter-ethnic friendship networks: The role of 'Intergenerational Openness'. *Sociology*, 46(2), 258–271. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0038038511419182>
- Windzio, M. (2018). Social exchange and integration into visits-at-home networks: Effects of third-party intervention and residential segregation on boundary-crossing. *Rationality and Society*, 30(4), 491–513.
- Windzio, M., & Bicer, E. (2013). Are we just friends? Immigrant integration into high- and low-cost social networks. *Rationality and Society*, 25(2), 123–145.
- Zuccotti, C. V. (2015). *Shaping ethnic inequalities: The production and reproduction of social and spatial inequalities among ethnic minorities in England and Wales*. European University Institute.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional Supporting Information may be found online in the Supporting Information section.

How to cite this article: Wang S, Morav L. Participation in civil society organizations and ethnic minorities' interethnic friendships in Britain. *Br J Sociol*. 2021;72:808–828. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-4446.12819>