

Table 1: ERGM Results

	Model 1	Model 2⁺	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5⁺
Edges	-3.24*** (0.04)	(0.23)	-3.31*** (0.05)	-2.95*** (0.15)	-4.14*** (0.26)
Other-Degree			0.17* (0.08)	-0.21 (0.16)	-0.49** (0.18)
None-Degree			0.07 (0.08)	-0.49** (0.16)	-0.65*** (0.17)
Catholic-Homophily				-0.35* (0.16)	-0.58** (0.18)
Other-Homophily				0.96** (0.32)	0.94** (0.33)
None-Homophily				1.55*** (0.27)	1.50*** (0.28)
AIC	5516.47	5252.44	5516.09	5484.71	5230.24
Log-Likelihood	-2757.23	-2612.22	-2755.04	-2736.35	-2596.12

***p < 0.001, **p < 0.01, *p < 0.05

⁺Models 2 and 5 includes terms for gender, race, parental education, and political orientation.

Table 1: ERGM Results

	Model 1	Model 2⁺	Model 3	Model 4⁺	Model 5	Model 6⁺
Edges	-3.24 ^{***}	-4.62 ^{***}	-3.29 ^{***}	-4.56 ^{***}	-2.95 ^{***}	-4.14 ^{***}
	(0.04)	(0.23)	(0.05)	(0.24)	(0.15)	(0.26)
Catholic-Homophily			0.006	-0.01	-0.35 [*]	-0.58 ^{**}
			(0.08)	(0.10)	(0.16)	(0.18)
Other-Homophily			0.88 ^{***}	0.53 [*]	0.96 ^{**}	0.94 ^{**}
			(0.24)	(0.27)	(0.32)	(0.33)
None-Homophily			0.92 ^{***}	0.79 ^{***}	1.55 ^{***}	1.50 ^{***}
			(0.18)	(0.20)	(0.27)	(0.28)
Other-Degree					-0.21	-0.49 ^{**}
					(0.16)	(0.18)
None-Degree					-0.49 ^{**}	-0.65 ^{***}
					(0.16)	(0.17)
AIC	5516.47	5252.44	5491.08	5241.02	5484.71	5230.24
Log-Likelihood	-2757.23	-2612.22	-2741.54	-2603.51	-2736.35	-2596.12

*** p < 0.001, ** p < 0.01, * p < 0.05

⁺ Models 2, 4, and 6 includes terms for gender, race, parental education, and political orientation.

***The second table makes more sense because Models 3 and 4 test for homophily, which we first want to establish before moving to the mechanisms which are the next two models.