

## Supplementary Materials

# Us and Ours: Anti-immigrant Sentiment as a Function of Common Resource Management

This document will provide greater details about the design choices, measures, and findings reported in “Us and Ours: Anti-immigrant Sentiment as a Function of Common Resource Management”. The document is organized into five sections. Section 1 deals with the measures used in Studies 1 and 2 in greater detail. Since Study 1 was combined with an experiment, Section 2 will reflect in particular on any potential impact of the experimental protocol on our findings in that study. Section 3 deals with the factor solution of two of the key predictors in our model, Universal and Security resources, presenting it for both studies at once, and explaining our choices of items for each construct. Section 4 deals with an alternative hierarchical regression model where our central predictors were included in the model before other indicators of prejudice, rather than in the last step. This acts as a robustness check and informs the extent to which support for common resources, and predictions about minority groups’ contributions to or benefits from the resources, contribute to explaining prejudice. Finally, also acting as a robustness check, is Section 5, in which the same hierarchical regression model appearing in the paper is presented. However, the indicator for UCRs includes all of the items from our list of common resources which reliably loaded onto this factor. This includes the two items directly relating to support for resources targeting immigrants, which were left out of the analyses presented in the manuscript.

## Section 1: Measures used in Studies 1 and 2

### ***Support for Public Goods***

Support for contributions to common resources was our core independent variable and was measured first in both studies. Participants were presented with a definition of common resources as “social benefits and services (e.g. schools, roads, the police, public libraries, public parks...) which are paid for by taxes”. They were then asked to indicate whether they would overall prefer to increase tax and spend more on social benefits and services or decrease tax and spend less. This initial, dichotomous choice served to introduce the second part of the measure, where we presented the participants with a list of typical common resources which are maintained on the national level through tax-based funding (e.g., kindergartens, military personnel, etc. - see the full list in Table 2). For each of the items, the participants indicated a response on a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 indicated preference for “A lot less” spending, 5 for “A lot more”, and 3 a preference for no change to government spending.

The list could was made up of the two predicted factors, resulting in universal common resources (UCR; 17 items), and security common resources (SCR; 7 items). See Section 3 of this document for factor loadings. Both UCR and SCR achieved satisfactory levels of reliability (Study 1:  $\alpha_{UCR} = .85$ ,  $\alpha_{SCR} = .73$ ; Study 2:  $\alpha_{UCR} = .91$ ,  $\alpha_{SCR} = .79$ ).

### ***Minority Contribution and Benefits***

To test whether the link between the concern for various public goods and prejudice against immigrants truly has to do with the assumption that minority groups will freeride on common resource management we included two new, original items. Minority contributions was a measure of the amount of money members of ethnic minorities hypothetically contribute to common resource management through taxation in comparison to the average citizen. Translated from Croatian, the item stated,

“If an average Croatian citizen pays 100 HRK [approx. \$US 13.8] per month through taxes and other contributions in order to finance public services like education, health insurance, road building and maintenance, sanitary services, the military and police, how much would you say does a member of an ethnic minority group pay for the same purposes?”

Similarly, Minority benefits was a measure of how much, in comparison to an average citizen, a member of an ethnic minority gains from public services. The participant was told to imagine that the average Croatian citizen benefits 100 HRK per month worth of services from various public services. They were then asked to estimate how much a member of an ethnic minority gains in the same period.

We chose to word these items in terms of ethnic minority members and not. Recent immigrants will, realistically, benefit more from public services and benefits than they contribute to them, simply because they have not been in the country long enough. Thus, any observant participant would have to predict lower contributions by immigrants, and higher benefits. Wording the item in terms of ethnic minorities allowed us to avoid an over-inflated difference in anticipated contributions and benefits.

This variable was not included in Study 1.

### ***Social Dominance Orientation***

We included a measure of Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) into our Study 2 as an important predictor of anti-immigrant prejudice. One of the dominant constructs in research on intergroup relations, SDO measures the individual tendency to uphold social hierarchies which favour one group over another (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). It has regularly been associated to more neoliberal attitudes towards welfare policies (e.g. Azevedo, Jost & Rothmund, 2019), and prejudice towards ethnic, religious, gender and sexual minorities and migrants (e.g. Asbrock, Sibley & Duckitt, 2010), particularly among members of the advantaged group (e.g. ethnic majority). As such, SDO could on its own explain prejudice against immigrants, as well as account for any potential influence of support for common resource management.

As noted previously, we have used the Maričić, Franc i Šakić (2008) translation of the 16-item version of the Social Dominance Orientation scale, which is standard in Croatian social psychology. SDO commonly takes only one dimension in Croatia (Grgurev, 2018; Jakšić, 2014; Jelavić, 2017). Indeed, all of the items loaded onto the same single factor. Cronbach's alpha for the resulting variable was .89.

This variable was not included in Study 1.

### ***National Pride***

National pride was measured using items from the ISSP-2013 survey on national identity (National Identity III; ISSP Research group, 2013). Three items were used in Study 1, and six items in Study 2. All three items in Study 1 recorded preference for one's national belonging (e.g., "I would rather be a citizen of my country than any other country on the planet"). These were augmented in Study 2 with items related to the positivity about life in the nation-state ("Overall, my country is a better place to live than most other countries on the planet"), sense of shame for some aspects of national character ("There are things about my country for which I am ashamed"), and one item measuring the importance of national heritage ("I am not particularly concerned about my national heritage"). They loaded onto a single factor with a satisfactory level of scale reliability (Study 1:  $\alpha = .78$ ; Study 2:  $\alpha = .82$ ).

### ***National Identity***

Only an indicator in Study 2, national identity was measured in two parts. Firstly, as national identity (degree of emotional connection experienced with Croatia), and civic identity (degree of emotional connection experienced with fellow citizens). The two items correlated at  $r = .63$ ,  $p < .001$ .

### ***Institutional trust***

In Study 2, we added a measure of trust in institutions, listing 12 institutions relevant to Croatian society following the list from the World Values Survey (e.g. mass media, police, universities, banks...). The participants indicated to what degree they found each of them trustworthy on a 7-point Likert scale. The logic behind including this measure is that, if concerns about government-managed public goods are related to more negative attitudes towards immigrants, then the participants who find governmental, and other social, institutions more trustworthy should have lower concerns, and therefore less prejudice. Our participants expressed highest levels of trust towards scientists ( $M = 4.1$ ,  $SD = 0.72$ ) and universities ( $M = 3.54$ ,  $SD = 0.85$ ), followed by the military ( $M = 3.27$ ,  $SD = 0.94$ ), and lowest levels of trust towards the judiciary branch ( $M = 2.28$ ,  $SD = 0.95$ ) and politicians ( $M = 1.64$ ,  $SD = 0.71$ ). Trust in institutions achieved satisfactory factor loadings as a single factor, and a Cronbach's

<https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000541>

alpha of .79. We will move forward treating it as a single average score of trust in social institutions.

### ***Attitudes towards immigrants and immigration***

Attitudes towards immigrants and immigration represent our main dependent variable. Seven items were selected from the ISSP-2013 questionnaire (see Table 1). Items which indicate more positive attitudes were reverse scored, giving us a measure of prejudice against immigrants. All the items loaded onto a single factor and achieved a high level of scale reliability (Study 1:  $\alpha = .91$ ; Study 2:  $\alpha = .85$ ).

Table E1. Items measuring attitudes towards immigrants. Items which reflect a more positive attitudes were reverse-scored, thereby giving us a measure of prejudice against immigrants.

---

1	Immigrants are dangerous because their presence encourages crime
2	Immigrants are mostly beneficial to the country's economy (reversed)
3	Accepting too many migrants means that other citizens will have fewer jobs available
4	Immigrants from different ethnic and religious groups contribute to society because they introduce fresh ideas
5	Immigrants undermine the unique culture of the host country
6	Legal immigrants should have the same rights as the host population: to vote, to hold political office, to own land, etc.
7	The state has the right to use force when preventing migrants from passing national borders illegally*

---

NOTE. Due to a mistake during data collection, the final item was only collected for a portion of the sample in Study 2 (N = 167), and was therefore dropped from the analysis.

### ***Demographics, socio-economic status, and political orientation***

We recorded our participants' gender, age, and a self-selected ethnic label. In Study 2, this latter information was used to select only those participants who identified as ethnic Croats for the subsequent analysis. Religiosity was measured using a single item, where participants identified themselves as religious, "somewhat" religious, or not religious.

We measured political orientation on a 9-point scale where 1 designated "far left", 5 designated "centre", and 9 designated "far right". We acknowledge that this measure is imperfect, particularly when it comes to our highly international sample in Study 1. The policies and attitudes associated with the political left, right and centre positions are culturally specific. Nevertheless, whereas there are differences (Benoit & Laver, 2006), there is enough overlap to allow for meaningful comparison of

<https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000541>

international left and right orientations (Dalton, Farrell & McAllister, 2011; Piurko et al., 2011), even with this simplistic measure.

We expect that political orientation and religiosity would have an effect on prejudice against migrants in Croatia. As is common, Croatian right-wing politics has a close connection to religious conviction. Moreover, a small but significant correlation has been found between religiosity and support for more neoliberal policies which devalue common resources (Sekulić, 2016), thus making these two measures particularly interesting. However, it is worth noting that the relationship between political orientation and overall support for public spending on social services and benefits probably differs between the international sample of Study 1 and the Croatian one in Study 2. While right-wing political orientation commonly correlates with more neoliberal political attitudes, this is not necessarily the case in Croatia. Historically, left- rather than right-wing parties in post-communist societies supported neoliberal reform (Appel & Orenstein, 2018). In contemporary Croatian politics, mainstream parties on both the left and right uphold spending on public resources. Parties which uphold neoliberal views, seeking to reduce public spending, do not exist on the Croatian political scene (although some individual political actors do). In fact, mainstream Croatian politicians frequently mistake neoliberalism for social progressivism (e.g., Veselinović, 2018).

In both studies, we used two measures to estimate the participants' socio-economic status: their placement into one of five social classes (lower, lower middle, middle, upper middle and upper) and the financial difficulty they experience at "making ends meet". Finally, we asked the participants' perceived degree of social separation between the classes on a 7-point Likert scale where 1 indicated "no differences", and 7 indicated "extreme differences".

## Section 2: Influence of Experimental Conditions

Study 1 was combined with an experiment. Before we turned our attention to testing our hypotheses, we first tested whether the conditions from the experimental study exerted any impact on the support for Universal Goods, Security Goods, or prejudice against migrants. We report the results of this analysis here.

The experiment followed a mixed 2 (group membership in minority or majority group) x 2 (task, where the participants either experienced a PGG or an independent Math task) x 2 (target of allocation being a minority or majority group member) design. The final independent variable, “target”, was distributed within participants, leaving us to account only for the potential impact of group membership and task-type. We performed a multivariate general linear model analysis where differences in attitudes towards migrants, support for Universal, and support for Security Goods are tested across 4 between-subjects experimental conditions.

We found no significant differences in the levels of prejudice against immigrants based on assigned group membership ( $F(1,176) = 0.92, p = .43, \eta^2 = .004, 95\%CI[-0.50, 0.21]$ ), task type ( $F(1, 176) = 1.50, p = .31, \eta^2 = .006, 95\%CI[-0.54, 0.17]$ ), or an interaction of the two ( $F(1,176) = 0.08, p = .80, \eta^2 <.001$ ). The same was the case for support for Universal Goods (group membership:  $F(1,176) = 0.002, p = .92, \eta^2 <.001, 95\%CI[-0.14, 0.12]$ ; task type:  $F(1,179) = 0.01, p = .80, \eta^2 <.001, 95\%CI [-0.11, 0.15]$ ; interaction effect:  $F(1,179) = 0.08, p = .80, \eta^2 <.001$ ), as well as support for Security Goods (group membership:  $F(1,179) = 0.28, p = .39, \eta^2 = .004, 95\%CI[-0.10, 0.26]$ ; task type:  $F(1, 179) = 0.10, p = .61, \eta^2 = .001, 95\%CI[-0.23, 0.13]$ ; interaction effect:  $F(1,179) = 0.32, p = .35, \eta^2 = .005$ ). In short, we found no evidence that experimental conditions intervened with the participants' evaluation of common resources or their prejudice against migrants.

Naturally, the fact our Study 1 followed an experiment which manipulated variables very similar to the ones we were seeking to relate in our survey study was not ideal. Despite the fact we have found no significant influences of any of the between-subject, experimental variables on participants' responses in the survey, we cannot exclude the possibility that merely experiencing an experiment could have influenced all the participants regardless of condition (e.g. making the connection between common resource management and anti-minority sentiment, including anti-immigrant sentiment, salient). This, in addition to other limitations discussed in the article, motivated our Study 2.

### Section 3: Factor Solution for Universal and Security Resources

We had set out to clarify the relationship between attitudes towards various types of CRs and attitudes towards immigrants. We theorized that people would broadly recognize two type of CRs: those which benefit all members of society (e.g., roads, public spaces) or particularly vulnerable groups (e.g., kindergartens, integration programs for the disabled), which we called Universal resources (UCR), and those which protect the community and sanction violations against it (e.g., military, police), which we called Security resources (SCR). Indeed, across our studies, participants' responses indicate they clearly and intuitively distinguish these two factors. Notwithstanding some minor disagreements, which we will discuss below, both our international and Croatian samples understood UCRs and SCRs in the same way.

Across the studies, our data was well suited for the exploratory factor analyses (Study 1:  $KMO = .77$  and Bartlett's test of sphericity ( $\chi = 1808.22$ ,  $df = 496$ ,  $p < .001$ ; Study 2:  $KMO = .90$  and Bartlett's test of sphericity ( $\chi = 4218.17$ ,  $df = 496$ ,  $p < .001$ ). The two-factor solution explained 29.25% of variance in Study 1, and 39.71% of the variance in Study 2. The two factors correlated at .21 in Study 1, and at .26 in Study 2. In both studies, the size and composition of our sample exceeded the minimum recommended by Mundfrom, Shaw and Ke (2005), who suggest a sample size of 75 participants for a 2-factor solution with at least 7 items per factor (in the case of Security goods), and for items whose intercorrelations fit a "wide" model of commonality (most items correlate with each other between .20 and .80). We used maximum likelihood as an extraction method and direct oblimin rotation with a default delta of 0.

Table 2 presents the pattern matrix with factor loadings after oblique rotation. Factor loadings below .30 were suppressed. Three items ("Public spaces", "Old age pensions", and "Roads, bridges and tracks") loaded onto the universal goods factor in Study 2, but not in Study 1. To keep the studies more compatible, we excluded these items from the calculation of the composite score, UCR. Three additional items loaded equally well on both factors in this study ("Aid to the agricultural sector", "Aid to the industrial sector" and "Incentives for small business"). Again, we excluded them from analysis in both studies to keep them more compatible. Finally, two items we had conceptually included into UCR ("Immigration offices", and "Education for Immigrants") and which loaded onto it were subsequently excluded from analysis for being too close to our dependent variable. In this way, the items going towards calculating the composite scores, universal and security goods, were the same across our studies.

**Table E2.** Factor Loadings for Universal and Security Resources in Studies 1 and 2.

	Study 1		Study 2	
	Universal Resources	Security Resources	Universal Resources	Security Resources
Programs to reduce economic inequality	.63		.75	
Social security	.50		.75	
Housing for the homeless	.71		.71	
Minimal wage	.52		.67	
Environmental protection	.53		.67	
Access ramps, Braille signs, traffic lights for the blind, and other infrastructure for the disabled	.61		.65	
Housing for the elderly	.50		.65	
Unemployment benefits	.58		.64	
Education and integration programs for the disabled	.56		.64	
Free university education	.53		.60	
Free access to information	.45		.62	
Regulating big business	.35		.59	
Kindergartens and child-care facilities	.43		.63	
Hospital personnel	.39		.61	
Primary education for children	.35		.60	
Healthcare	.38		.60	
Parks, monuments, concert halls and art museums	.44		.58	
<i>Education and integration programs for immigrants</i>	.54		.52	
<i>Immigration offices</i>	.35		.32	
<i>Aid to the agricultural sector</i>	.33		.38	.41
<i>Incentives for small business</i>	.32		.34	.33
<i>Old age pensions</i>	.38	.31	.64	
<i>Public spaces (stations, squares, etc.)</i>			.52	
<i>Roads, bridges and tracks</i>			.39	
<i>Aid to the industrial sector</i>		.44	.34	.31
Churches, temples and other places of religious worship		.39		.79
Military personnel		.65		.79
War veterans		.54		.72
Border security		.60		.70
Police and law enforcement		.49		.47
Video surveillance of public spaces		.56		.54
Surveillance of the Internet		.51		.47

*Note.* Italicized items were dropped from analysis, as they either did not load consistently onto the same factor across our two studies (e.g., aid to the industrial sector), or they acted as proxies for the



<https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000541>

---

dependent variable, prejudice against immigrants (e.g., immigration offices). Leaving these latter two items in the UCR construct does not significantly change the findings (see Section 5 of the Supplementary Materials for the analysis).

## **Section 4: Robustness Check of the Hierarchical Linear Regression – Contributions of Support for, and Predictions About, Common Resources**

To investigate further the relationship between support for various types of common resources, predictions about minority contributions to, and benefits from, common resources, and prejudice against immigrants, we reversed the order in which we introduced the key predictor variables. This did not significantly change the results (see tables 2A and 2B below).

After demographics are accounted for, support for Universal and Security goods accounted for an additional 16.4% of the variance in Study 1. In Study 2, with a more homogeneous sample, support for various common resources and predictions about minority contributions to, and benefits from them accounted for 33.3% of the variance.

<https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000541>

**Table E3A.** Regression models predicting prejudice against immigrants in Study 1, where key predictors (support for Universal and Security Goods) are introduced in model 2.

	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3				Model 4			
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>
Intercept	5.654	.735		<.001	6.589	.927		<.001	4.538	.996		<.001	3.921	1.096		<.001
Universal Goods	-.952	.175	-.373	<.001	-.935	.168	-.367	<.001	-.522	.175	-.205	.003	-.493	.176	-.193	.006
Security Goods	.457	.135	.233	<.001	.443	.132	.226	<.001	.186	.128	.095	.147	.153	.130	.078	.240
Age					-.002	.008	-.015	.820	-.005	.007	-.040	.522	-.006	.007	-.049	.432
Gender (Male)					.630	.159	.265	<.001	.475	.146	.200	.001	.486	.146	.204	.001
Religiosity					-.205	.107	-.127	.056	-.149	.097	-.092	.126	-.135	.097	-.083	.167
Education Level					-.129	.053	-.159	.016	-.091	.050	-.112	.074	-.081	.051	-.100	.114
Political Orientation (l/r)									.281	.051	.371	<.001	.275	.051	.364	<.001
Social Separation									-.087	.076	-.074	.251	-.077	.076	-.066	.310
Financial difficulty									.223	.069	.223	.001	.243	.070	.243	<.001
Class									-.144	.112	-.093	.200	-.138	.112	-.090	.218
National Pride													.099	.075	.087	.185
Variance explained	$R^2 = .164, p < .001$				$R^2 = .272, p < .001$				$R^2 = .407, p < .001$				$R^2 = .410, p < .001$			
Change in $R^2$	$\Delta R^2 = .174, p < .001$				$\Delta R^2 = .122, p < .001$				$\Delta R^2 = .144, p < .001$				$\Delta R^2 = .006, p = .185$			

<https://doi.org/10.1027/1864-9335/a000541>

**Table E3B.** Regression models predicting prejudice against immigrants in Study 2, where key predictors (support for Universal and Security Goods, predictions about minority contributions/benefits) are introduced in model 2.

	Model 1				Model 2				Model 3				Model 4			
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>
Intercept	4.641	.380		<.001	5.040	.500		<.001	4.916	.631		<.001	3.141	.746		<.001
Minority contribute	-.007	.001	-.271	<.001	-.006	.001	-.246	<.001	-.006	.001	-.231	<.001	-.005	.001	-.202	<.001
Minority benefit	.001	.001	.105	.033	.001	.001	.097	.045	.001	.001	.068	.157	.001	.001	.053	.259
Universal Goods	-.629	.091	-.347	<.001	-.604	.099	-.333	<.001	-.513	.106	-.283	<.001	-.318	.114	-.175	.006
Security Goods	.590	.075	.403	<.001	.466	.083	.318	<.001	.439	.092	.300	<.001	.342	.095	.234	<.001
Age					-.033	.004	-.035	.480	-.002	.004	-.031	.522	-.003	.004	-.042	.379
Gender (binary)					-.043	.100	-.022	.669	-.105	.098	-.055	.285	-.085	.096	-.044	.378
Religiosity					.189	.061	.168	.002	.102	.065	.090	.119	.092	.064	.082	.150
Education level					-.070	.028	-.124	.014	-.051	.028	-.090	.069	-.045	.027	-.079	.103
Political Orientation (l/r)									.136	.037	.229	<.001	.129	.038	.218	<.001
Social separation									-.028	.053	-.027	.596	-.001	.053	-.001	.980
Financial difficulty									-.024	.053	-.026	.650	.013	.053	.014	.809
Class									.072	.089	.047	.415	.074	.087	.048	.396
Trust in Institutions									-.243	.105	-.125	.022	-.285	.105	-.147	.007
National identity													-.004	.056	-.004	.944
Civic identity													.023	.051	.032	.648
National pride													.057	.052	.068	.275
SDO													.237	.059	.230	<.001
Variance explained	$R^2 = .333, p < .001$				$R^2 = .360, p < .001$				$R^2 = .399, p < .001$				$R^2 = .430, p < .001$			
Change in $R^2$	$\Delta R^2 = .342, p < .001$				$\Delta R^2 = .036, p = .003$				$\Delta R^2 = .048, p < .001$				$\Delta R^2 = .038, p = .001$			

## **Section 5: Robustness Check of the Hierarchical Linear Regression – Full List of UCRs**

To investigate the stability of our central analysis, we further the relationship between support for various types of common resources, predictions about minority contributions to, and benefits from, common resources, and prejudice against immigrants, we reversed the order in which we introduced the key predictor variables. This did not significantly change the results (see tables 2A and 2B below).

After demographics are accounted for, support for Universal and Security goods accounted for an additional 15% of the variance in Study 1. Similarly in Study 2, support for various common resources and predictions about minority contributions to, and benefits from them accounted for 21% of the

**Table E4A.** Regression models predicting prejudice against immigrants in Study 1.

	<b>Model 1</b>				<b>Model 2</b>				<b>Model 3</b>				<b>Model 4</b>			
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>
Intercept	4.21	.54		<.001	3.25	.78		<.001	2.45	.92		.285	2.93	1.08		.007
Age	.01	.01	.07	.311	-.001	.01	-.01	.914	-.003	.01	-.02	.725	-.01	.01	-.05	.407
Gender (Male)	.66	.17	.28	<.001	.47	.15	.20	.002	.52	.15	.22	.001	.49	.14	.21	<.001
Religiosity	.30	.12	.19	.009	.17	.10	.10	.080	.12	.10	.08	.215	.12	.10	.07	.220
Education Level	-.13	.06	-.16	.027	-.09	.05	-.11	.084	-.07	.05	-.09	.157	-.08	.05	-.09	.126
Political Orientation (l/r)					.35	.05	.46	<.001	.32	.05	.43	<.001	.26	.05	.34	<.001
Social Separation					-.15	.07	-.13	.038	-.13	.07	-.11	.074	-.08	.07	-.06	.315
Financial difficulty					.21	.07	.21	.003	.23	.07	.23	.001	.24	.07	.24	<.001
Class					.16	.11	-.11	.154	.14	.11	.10	.209	.12	.11	.08	.279
National Pride									.14	.06	.16	.017	.12	.06	.13	.049
Universal Goods													-.61	.19	-.23	<.001
Security Goods													.16	.13	.08	.214
Variance explained	$R^2 = .12, p < .001$				$R^2 = .38, p < .001$				$R^2 = .40, p < .001$				$R^2 = .43, p < .001$			
Change in $R^2$	$\Delta R^2 = .14, p < .001$				$\Delta R^2 = .27, p < .001$				$\Delta R^2 = .02, p = .017$				$\Delta R^2 = .03, p = .004$			

**Table E4B.** Regression models predicting prejudice against immigrants in Study 2.

	<b>Model 1</b>				<b>Model 2</b>				<b>Model 3</b>				<b>Model 4</b>			
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$	<i>p</i>
Intercept	3.03	.27		<.001	2.92	.58		<.001	1.24	.60		.041	3.23	.73		<.001
Age	-.004	.004	-.05	.350	-.004	.004	-.06	.284	-.01	.004	-.06	.207	-.003	.003	-.04	.371
Gender (binary)	.08	.11	.04	.428	-.07	.10	-.04	.477	-.09	.10	-.05	.353	-.10	.10	-.05	.292
Religiosity	.44	.06	.39	<.001	.19	.07	.17	.007	.15	.07	.13	.028	.09	.06	.08	.161
Education level	-.07	.03	-.13	.019	-.06	.03	-.10	.057	-.05	.03	-.09	.075	-.05	.03	-.08	.089
Left-Right political orientation					.25	.04	.42	<.001	.18	.04	.31	<.001	.13	.04	.22	<.001
Social separation					-.06	.06	-.06	.275	.01	.06	.01	.885	.003	.05	.003	.952
Financial difficulty					-.03	.06	-.04	.556	.03	.06	.03	.648	.01	.05	.01	.828
Class					.05	.10	.03	.631	.07	.09	.05	.422	.08	.07	.05	.392
Trust in Institutions					-.06	.11	-.03	.584	-.16	.10	-.08	.130	-.28	.11	-.15	.007
National identity									.06	.05	.08	.259	.02	.05	.03	.659
Civic identity									.04	.06	.04	.516	.06	.05	.07	.260
National pride									.03	.06	.03	.642	-.004	.06	-.004	.945
SDO									.35	.06	.33	<.001	.23	.06	.22	<.001
Minority contribute													-.005	.001	-.21	<.001
Minority benefit													.001	.001	.05	.254
Universal Goods													-.38	.12	-.20	.002
Security Goods													.38	.10	.26	<.001
Variance explained	$R^2 = .16, p < .001$				$R^2 = .27, p < .001$				$R^2 = .37, p < .001$				$R^2 = .44, p < .001$			
Change in $R^2$	$\Delta R^2 = .16, p < .001$				$\Delta R^2 = .27, p < .001$				$\Delta R^2 = .10, p < .001$				$\Delta R^2 = .07, p < .001$			

## References

- Appel, H., & Orenstein, M.A. (2018). *From Triumph to Crisis: Neoliberal Economic Reform in Postcommunist Countries*. Cambridge University Press.
- Asbrock, F., Sibley, C. G., & Duckitt, J. (2010). Right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation and the dimensions of generalized prejudice: A longitudinal test. *European Journal of Personality*, 24(4), 324-340. <https://doi.org/10.1002/per.746>
- Azevedo, F., Jost, J. T., Rothmund, T., & Sterling, J. (2019). Neoliberal ideology and the justification of inequality in capitalist societies: Why social and economic dimensions of ideology are intertwined. *Journal of Social Issues*, 75(1), 49-88. <https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12310>
- Benoit, K., & Laver, M. (2006). *Party policy in modern democracies*. New York: Routledge.
- Dalton, R. J., Farrell, D. M., & McAllister, I. (2011). The dynamics of political representation. *How Democracy Works: Political Representation and Policy Congruence in Modern Societies*, 21-38.
- Franc, R., Šakić, V., & Kaliterna-Lipovčan, L. (2010). Perceived Consequences of Immigrations and Attitude towards Immigrants. *Društvena istraživanja: časopis za opća društvena pitanja*, 19(3), 421-440.
- Grgurev, I. (2018). *Egalitarian Syndrome, Right-Wing Authoritarianism, and Social Dominance Orientation*. (Diploma Thesis, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of Psychology, Zagreb, Croatia).
- ISSP Research Group. (2013). *International Social Survey Program (ISSP): National Identity III*. <https://www.gesis.org/en/issp/modules/issp-modules-by-topic/national-identity/2013>
- Jakšić, K. (2014). Povezanost sklonosti gađenju i orijentacije na socijalnu dominaciju sa stavovima prema muškarcima homoseksualne orijentacije. Neobjavljeni završni rad. Zadar: Sveučilište u Zadru.
- Jelavić, I. (2017). Povezanost osobina ličnosti i autoritarnosti sa stavovima prema imigrantima. Neobjavljeni diplomski rad. Zagreb: Hrvatski studiji.
- Maričić, J., Franc, R., & Šakić, V. (2008, July). *Dimensionality and Correlates of the Social Dominance Orientation Scale on Croatian Sample*. Paper presented at the XXIX<sup>th</sup> International Congress of Psychology, Berlin, Germany. [https://bib.irb.hr/datoteka/373334.Maricic\\_Franc\\_Sakic-SDO-Croatian\\_sample.pdf](https://bib.irb.hr/datoteka/373334.Maricic_Franc_Sakic-SDO-Croatian_sample.pdf)
- Mundfrom, D. J., Shaw, D. G., & Ke, T. L. (2005). Minimum sample size recommendations for conducting factor analyses. *International journal of testing*, 5(2), 159-168.
- Piurko, Y., Schwartz, S. H., & Davidov, E. (2011). Basic personal values and the meaning of left-right political orientations in 20 countries. *Political Psychology*, 32(4), 537-561.
- Sekulić, D. (2016) Ljevica i desnica u Hrvatskoj. (p.137-168). In T. Sekulić (ed.), *Vrijednosti u hrvatskom društvu*. Zagreb: Centar za demokraciju i pravo Miko Tripalo.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Veselinović, V. (2018). The ideology of the populist radical right in Croatia: Case study of the Croatian Party of Rights. *Radovi – Zavod za hrvatsku povijest*, 50(2), 243-278.