Additional results for moderation analyses that did not yield significant interactions.

**Anxiety about aging moderation analyses**

**Frequency of contact**. In a multiple regression, gender (β = -.18, $p < .001$), years of education (β = -.16, $p < .001$), intergenerational contact frequency (β = -.16, $p < .001$) and anxiety about aging (β = .46, $p < .001$) significantly predicted ageism, $F(6,403) = 39.63$, $p < .001$. This model accounted for 37% of the variance in ageism. The interaction term of intergenerational contact frequency*anxiety about aging did not significantly predict ageism (β = -.06, $p = .15$).

**Quality of contact**. In a multiple regression, gender (β = -.15, $p < .001$), years of education (β = -.16, $p < .001$), intergenerational contact quality (β = -.31, $p < .001$) and anxiety about aging (β = .39, $p < .001$) significantly predicted ageism, $F(6,403) = 51.98$, $p < .001$. This model accounted for 44% of the variance in ageism. The interaction term of intergenerational contact quality*anxiety about aging was not a significant predictor (β = -.04, $p = .39$) of ageism.

**Attitudes toward own aging**. In a multiple regression analysis, gender (β = -.17, $p < .001$), years of education (β = -.16, $p < .001$), and anxiety about aging (β = .49, $p < .001$) significantly predicted ageism, $F(6,404) = 35.88$, $p < .001$. This model accounted for 35% of the variance in ageism. However, attitudes toward own aging (β = -.05, $p = .32$) and the interaction term of attitudes toward own aging*anxiety about aging did not significantly predict ageism (β = .02, $p = .68$).

**Age moderation analyses**

**Death anxiety.** In a multiple regression analysis, gender ($\beta = -.17$, $p < .001$), years of education ($\beta = -.20$, $p < .001$), and death anxiety ($\beta = .27$, $p < .001$) significantly predicted ageism, $F(5,405) = 17.18$, $p < .001$. This model accounted for 18% of the variance in ageism. The death anxiety*age interaction term did not significantly predict ageism ($\beta = -.01$, $p = .823$).

**Frequency of contact.** In a multiple regression analysis, gender (β = -.17, $p < .001$), years of education (β = -.22, $p < .001$), and intergenerational contact frequency (β = -.26, $p < .001$) significantly

predicted ageism, $F(5,404) = 18.21$, $p < .001$. This model accounted for 18% of the variance in ageism. The interaction term of intergenerational contact frequency*age did not significantly predict ageism ($\beta = .02$, $p = .953$).

**Quality of contact.** In a multiple regression, gender ($\beta = -.13$, $p < .01$), years of education ($\beta = -.21$, $p < .001$), and intergenerational contact quality ($\beta = -.45$, $p < .001$) significantly predicted ageism, $F(5,404) = 38.67$, $p < .001$. This model accounted for 32% of the variance in ageism. The interaction term of intergenerational contact quality*age was not a significant predictor ($\beta = .05$, $p = .275$) of ageism.

**Attitudes toward own aging.** In a multiple regression analysis, gender ($\beta = -.15$, $p < .01$), age ($\beta = -.16$, $p < .01$), years of education ($\beta = -.18$, $p < .001$), and attitudes toward own aging ($\beta = -.26$, $p < .001$) significantly predicted ageism, $F(5,405) = 18.80$, $p < .001$. This model accounted for 19% of the variance in ageism. However, the interaction term of attitudes toward own aging*age did not significantly predict ageism ($\beta = .08$, $p = .10$).