Appendix A

In Study 1, we also conducted a 2 (valence of second contact) × 2 (valence of first contact) ANOVA on abstraction of the *first* contact. Results showed a significant main effect of valence of first contact, $F(1, 112) = 323.91$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .750$, indicating that the linguistic index was significantly higher – indicating lower outgroup discrimination – for positive contact experiences ($M = 1.17$, $SD = .08$) than negative contact experiences ($M = -.85$, $SD = .08$). No other effect was significant.

Appendix B

To further rule out that there were any differences of language valence between second same valence contact conditions, we asked two independent coders, blind to experimental conditions and hypotheses, to rate on 7-point scales the extent to which the intergroup encounters described by participants in Study 1 were positive and negative (1= *not at all positive/negative*, 7= *extremely positive/negative*).

We then conducted a series of t-tests to provide further support for previous results.

We found no significant difference in perceived positivity of second positive contact preceded by negative contact (M = 5.12, SD = 1.29) and that preceded by positive contacts (M = 4.82, SD = 0.81), $t(54) = -1.048$, p =.299. There was also no significant difference in perceived negativity of second positive contact preceded by negative contact (M = 2.37, SD = 0.68) and that preceded by positive contact (M = 2.23, SD = 0.65), $t(54) = -0.793$, p =.431.

We found no significant difference in perceived negativity of second negative contact preceded by positive contact (M = 4.61, SD = 0.96) and that preceded by negative contact (M = 4.50, SD = 0.88), $t(54) = 0.434$, p =.666. There was also no significant difference in perceived positivity of second negative contact preceded by positive contact (M = 2.51, SD = 0.75) and that preceded by negative contact (M = 2.32, SD = 0.63), $t(54) = 1.062$, p =.293.

Results of this post-hoc analysis further support our manipulation of positive and negative intergroup contact.

Appendix C

The linguistic score was also submitted to 2 (valence of second contact) × 2 (valence of first contact) ANOVAs on abstraction of the *first* contact separately for distant past and recent past events. Not surprisingly, for *distant past* events, results showed a significant main effect of valence of first contact, $F(1, 120) = 531.04$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .821$, indicating that the linguistic index was significantly higher – indicating lower outgroup discrimination – for positive contact experiences ($M = 1.70$, $SD = .09$) than negative contact experiences ($M = -1.51$, $SD = .10$). No other effect was significant. Similarly, for *recent past* events, results showed a significant main effect of valence of first contact, $F(1, 122) = 106.15$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .474$, indicating that the linguistic index was significantly higher – indicating lower outgroup discrimination – for positive contact experiences ($M = 0.94$, $SD = .12$) than negative contact experiences ($M = -0.80$, $SD = .12$). No other effect was significant.

Appendix D

In Study 1, using positive and negative first contact as control conditions, we further tested our hypotheses by conducting independent samples t-tests to compare linguistic discrimination values of second contact with the average of the corresponding valence first contact. There was no significant difference in linguistic outgroup discrimination when recalling positive contact preceded by negative contact (M = 1.35, SD = 0.48) compared to recalling positive contact first (average of first contact of positive-positive and positive-negative conditions: M = 1.17, SD = .65), $t(82) = -1.27$, $p = .205$. This evidence does not support the *facilitation* effect.

Evidence showed that linguistic outgroup discrimination was significantly lower when recalling negative contact preceded by positive contact (M = -0.23, SD = 0.77) compared to when recalling negative contact first (average of first contact of negative-negative and negative-positive conditions: M = -0.85, SD = 0.53), $t(82) = -4.28$, $p < .001$, supporting the *buffering* effect.

Therefore, results suggest that the facilitation effect is only supported in the comparison between second same-valence contact, whereas the buffering effect is also supported in the comparison between first and second same-valence contact.

In Study 2, we also conducted independent samples t-tests to compare linguistic discrimination values of valence of second contact with the average of the corresponding valence cells of first contact, separately for distant past and recent past events.

For distant *past* events, linguistic outgroup discrimination was significantly higher when recalling positive contact preceded by negative contact (M = 0.70, SD = 0.82) compared to recalling positive contact first (average of first contact of positive-positive and positive-negative conditions; M = 1.71, SD = 0.77), $t(54) = 5.62$, $p < .001$. This evidence supported *the opposite effect of facilitation*.

Moreover, linguistic outgroup discrimination was significantly lower when recalling negative contact preceded by positive contact (M = -0.71, SD = 1.05) compared to when recalling negative contact first (average of first contact of negative-negative and negative-positive conditions: M = -1.51, SD = 0.74), $t(40) = -3.60$, $p = .001$. This evidence supported the *buffering* effect.

For *recent* events, there was no significant difference in linguistic outgroup discrimination when recalling positive contact preceded by negative contact (M = 1.28, SD = 0.91) compared to recalling positive contact first (average of first contact of positive-positive and positive-negative conditions: M = 0.94, SD = 0.93), $t(70) = -1.75$, $p = .084$. Results did not support the *facilitation* effect for recent events.

Linguistic outgroup discrimination was significantly lower when recalling negative contact preceded by positive contact (M = -0.17, SD = 0.75) compared to when recalling negative contact first (average of first contact of negative-negative and negative-positive conditions; M = -0.80, SD = 0.92), $t(71) = -3.52$, $p = .001$. This evidence supported the *buffering* effect.

Appendix E

Study 1 materials:

In the present research we are interested to know your experiences with migrant people in your country.

According to the UNESCO, the label migrant people refer to “any person who lives temporarily or permanently in a country where he or she was not born”.

Based on this definition, please take a moment to recall a **positive (negative) interaction** that **you have had with a migrant person (occasional interaction or someone you did not know before that time)**. Then describe it below providing as much detail as possible about the other person. It is very important for us that you report information about your experience and impressions about the migrant person.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Please take a moment to recall a **positive (negative) interaction that you have had with a migrant person (occasional interaction or someone you did not know before that time)**.

Then describe it below providing as much detail as possible about the other person.

_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____
_____

Now, please fill in the following questions.

How many migrants do you know?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
None						A lot

How often do you have contact with migrants?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Never						Very often

To what extent do you find the contact with migrants to be pleasant?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Very much

To what extent do you find the contact with migrants to be uncooperative?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all						Very much