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Widening Intercultural Representations: 
The Citizens Aspect of Development of European Public Sphere

Yolanda Zografova

Globalization and integration in contemporary European society predetermine changes in the identification of the personality with new social groups, communities and nations. They also premise the acceptance of trans-European values and behavior models. The research question and the goal we are setting in this paper is to scrutinize how EU citizens accept others, foreigners, migrants, as well as to which extent new realities presuppose the formation of a wider perspective in intercultural attitudes. We will also explore the extent to which broadening social representations of a contemporary person exerts an influence on more active involvement and political activeness and how; moreover, are certain distinctions between different countries available when speaking of attitudes toward immigrants and toward processes of EU unification.

Complex analysis of the presence, participation, attitudes, role of the citizens in the European integration processes, as well as in respect to their attitudes towards the European public sphere is one of the priorities of Eurosphere project. The analysis of European Social Surveys* is implemented for achievement of this aim. The ESS rounds from 2006 and 2008 are covered here by conducting a new processing of and analysis of the data. Phenomena of inter-groups relations, perceptions and stereotypes are dependent both on the history of these relations and on the specific features of the corresponding communities, nations, ethnic groups. Person does not only affiliate with and commits to particular social groups, but personal behaviour and specific perceptions of the external groups are influenced to a great extent by the imaginable or real membership in the groups (Tajfel, 1981; Turner, 1984).

Based on the social-cognitive approach, it can be stated that the more the categories into which we represent other persons or groups broaden, the more we liberalize our attitudes towards other people, the easier we perceive other persons’ attitudes towards us, as well as other persons, groups, communities, and nations as co-others. Particular expression of such enlargement is the reception of immigrants from various states, having different
characteristics as equal representatives and participants in the same public spheres. Regardless of the opening of international boundaries and the increased mobility, however, national identity remains a persistent connecting commune phenomenon. “Modern history is construed first and foremost as an aggregate of national histories” (Calhoun, 2003, p.231) However, again Calhoun suggests that “even if the positive, monolithic identity is a form of violation against the otherness, the absolute diversity is also a form of violation against intersubjectiveness and especially against human will a bridge to be construed above the abyss among people, traditions, cultures” (ibid, p.137).

Actually, to absolutize otherness vs. identity or meta-nationality vs. nation could result in amorphousness of the “image” of the contemporary civil societies in the same way as reverse absolutism could lead to development but somewhere even to a boom of meta-nationalism and ethnocentrism. It turns out that the process of collective identity formation shall be completed successfully in view to enable European public sphere; "But there is a long way from the kind of debate and information dissemination taking place nowadays in Europe, to the kind of committed public deliberation needed for collective opinion and will formation, i.e. the requirement of a single, sub-European public sphere revolving on identical topics and policy proposals under similar aspects of relevance throughout Europe, rendering collective decision making possible on the background of a broad mobilization of public support effectively sluiced into the governmental complex by associations, interest organizations and political parties. The mass basis is weak as is the collective identity” (Eriksen, 2005, p.350). Every person shall have the right to express her thoughts in the "pan-European discourse" – in one single European sphere – but it seems that the important point here is that everyone to have the freedom and the willingness to involve in the important issues of the Euro-integration processes. As Kantner states “…a strong European identity is not a functional precondition for legitimate democratic governance in the EU as everyday politics is concerned.” (Kantner,2006, p.502)

According to the approach suggested by Roccas and Brewer, the concept social identity complexity allows us to pose the issue of identity of the European citizens of today from the viewpoint of affluence of identifications they commit to and internalize. Partial inter-section/overlapping of different identities and the extent to which individuals succeed to perceive their affiliations is not limited to one category or in-group. "When an individual acknowledges, and accepts, the non-overlapping memberships of her multiple in-groups, her subjective identity structure is both more inclusive and more complex.”(Brewer&Pierce, 2005, p.429) Intercultural representations, openness toward others would develop and widen
on such a basis. But due to the fact that stereotypes, value orientations and other psychic features are the slowest changed phenomena, significant dynamics could not be expected, especially within a period of two or three years – probably dynamics will increase not earlier than in 10-years period. Subsequent project analyses /which will be finished in 2011/, of Eurobarometer Survey data also will allow us to analyze in a long time interval the way of development and change of the value orientations.

1 Cross-national comparison of the attitudes and political involvement of the citizens in 8 EU countries

The exploratory analysis here serves rather to formulate questions and hypotheses which will be verified in the final year of Eurosphere, developing larger samples from all 16 participant countries in Eurosphere and covering data from a wide range of European studies such as Eurobarometer, EVS, ESS and more.

By a metaanalysis of data extracted from two ESS rounds, conducted in 2006 and 2008, an attempt will be made to expose some of the characteristic specifications of contemporary social psychic of the representative sample in the 8 countries, participated in both ESS rounds. I will now explore the main variables by countries, simultaneously presenting the data in a horizontal aspect – a comparison between the Member-states within the two ESS rounds; as well as in a vertical section – a comparison by years for the given Member-states. The horizontal aspect will provide information about the differences between the countries in every period of research, while the vertical one will demonstrate the development of the attitudes towards different kinds of immigrants, towards people with different sexual orientation, the citizens' participation in the public sphere and more, explored in the dynamics of phenomena, measured during the selected two ESS rounds. Even though the period is too short to expect significant alterations in such durable social-psychic phenomena like values orientation, it can be stated that even if there are no fundamental modifications, the tendencies are quite important because of the shorter terms of crucial changes, happening in EU. We can follow the tendency for each of the selected countries by comparing the rounds of 2006 and 2008.

Regarding the acceptance of immigrants of the same group as the majority in the state, the data show certain dynamics, given the countries in which the most positive attitudes have been shown in 2006, are the same as in 2008; these are Spain, Great Britain, Estonia, while countries with lower levels of positive attitude are Denmark, Bulgaria, Norway. In Germany, a certain decrease is visible in 2008 (see Table 1).
Table 1: ANOVA of accepting immigrants of the same group as majority  
Dependent Variable: Allow many/few immigrants of same race/ethnic group as majority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1059.774(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>151.396</td>
<td>96.961</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>98960.365</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>98960.365</td>
<td>63378.723</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td>1059.774</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>151.396</td>
<td>96.961</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>22941.842</td>
<td>14693</td>
<td>1.561</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>185299.718</td>
<td>14701</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>24001.616</td>
<td>14700</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  R Squared = .044 (Adjusted R Squared = .044) ESS 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>2664.949(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>380.707</td>
<td>265.964</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>104474.162</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>104474.162</td>
<td>72986.311</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>2664.949</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>380.707</td>
<td>265.964</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>22865.524</td>
<td>15974</td>
<td>1.431</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>184580.710</td>
<td>15982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>25530.473</td>
<td>15981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  R Squared = .104 (Adjusted R Squared = .104) ESS 2008
b  Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

The data about attitudes towards acceptance of immigrants of different races/ethnic groups into the country show that the most positive attitudes have been demonstrated in Estonia during both rounds. There is a decrease in 2008 in the acceptance of immigrants of this type in Germany and the UK. The lowest results for the acceptance of these immigrants are those received from Bulgarian and Norwegian respondents. For Spanish citizens, like for the Estonians, the acceptance of immigrants of a different race/ethnic group, is also highly admissible (2006: F=25.01; p<0.000/ ; 2008: F=75.31; p<0.000 – see Table 2). These particular results received in countries differentiated on multiple levels is apparently the consequence of a complex of factors – cultural, social-political and economic, as well as the history of development of stereotypes, prejudices and interethnic/international relations.
Table 2: ANOVA of accepting immigrants of different group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>293,654(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41,951</td>
<td>25,012</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>133933,182</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>133933,182</td>
<td>79855,485</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>293,654</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41,951</td>
<td>25,012</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>24572,577</td>
<td>14651</td>
<td>1,677</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>232585,340</td>
<td>14659</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>24866,231</td>
<td>14658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Type III Sum of Squares, df, Mean Square, F, Sig. 

Corrected Model: R Squared = .012, Adjusted R Squared = .011 ESS 2006

Regarding immigrants coming from poorer countries out of Europe, it is again Estonia to have the most positive attitude, while in Norway the unwillingness to receive this type of migrants is visible in both rounds. The data for Belgium also demonstrate a low level of acceptance. A dynamic development is observed in some of the countries – in Denmark there is a tendency to a more positive attitude in 2008, while in Belgium the opposite is observed. In Germany the data show that the country is less accepting immigrants, while in Spain the acceptance increases in 2008. Bulgarian respondents slightly decrease their positive attitude in 2008 but there are no significant differences in values compared to Germany, Belgium in 2008/2006. Obviously most of the countries refrain from “opening” to immigrant coming from poorer countries, but homogeneous causes could not be ascribed – in the realm of hypotheses certain cases could be described in a situation of known, “local” social-economic realities and problems, while others – according to the context of a high living standard and unwillingness to take the risks on a social, economic and political level. However, at this stage, it could not be assumed that this result is definitive, as the sample of Member-states selected here is much narrower than the whole sample of countries taking part in ESS; a wider analysis would probably shuffle the “ranking” of all given countries.
We have explored the significant differences among attitudes towards immigrants of different groups, because it was to be expected that regarding some groups, citizens would demonstrate more sympathy as for "closer" groups, when they affiliated to the same nationality. Also, if there are stronger nationalist attitudes, the same citizens would be less favourably disposed to representatives of other groups. These expectations were not covered, as the data showed a relative monotony, i.e. same countries manifest similar in their positivity or negativity, positions regarding immigrants. Obviously factors of recent social-economical macro-context predominate, even though specific alterations of stereotypes towards immigrants are also possible.

Tolerance to immigrants is connected to certain attitudes towards their influence on economic and cultural life; also whether they contribute to achieve a better or worse place for living. The cross-national comparison shows that the biggest benefit from immigrants' presence for the economics, in 2006 has been viewed in Bulgaria, Spain and Norway, in 2008 – Norway and Denmark. Essentially, this can be envisaged as a logical consequence of the rich experience of Norway and Denmark with immigrants' presence. The vertical
analysis demonstrates a tendency towards an increase of the positive attitudes in 2008, as in
general, immigration is considered a good thing for the economics in almost all the
countries. Countries like Estonia and the UK tend to treat the issue more skeptically (2006:
F=72,62;p<0,000; 2008: F=41,97; p<0,000 – see Table 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>6660,181(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>951,454</td>
<td>72,625</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>535031,874</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>535031,874</td>
<td>40839,401</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td>6660,181</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>951,454</td>
<td>72,625</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>187866,543</td>
<td>14340</td>
<td>13,101</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>981032,179</td>
<td>14348</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>194526,723</td>
<td>14347</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .034 (Adjusted R Squared = .034) ESS 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>3515,785(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>502,255</td>
<td>41,974</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>583249,416</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>583249,416</td>
<td>48743,343</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td>3515,785</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>502,255</td>
<td>41,974</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>188125,121</td>
<td>15722</td>
<td>11,966</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1044905,81</td>
<td>15730</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>191640,906</td>
<td>15729</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .018 (Adjusted R Squared = .018) ESS 2008
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

The expectations of immigrants exerting their influence on the enrichment of the cultural life
are quite similar in the different countries, but however Denmark, Norway and Germany are
relatively more positive in their attitudes, England and Estonia being again the most
skeptical in 2006 and in 2008 ESS rounds (2006:F=75,16;p<0,000; 2008: F=81,23; p<0,000
– see tab.5).
Table 5: ANOVA of the attitude toward the influence of immigrants on culture
Dependent Variable: Country's cultural life undermined or enriched by immigrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>6970.206(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>995.744</td>
<td>75.166</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>637289.856</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>637289.856</td>
<td>48107.097</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td>6970.206</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>995.744</td>
<td>75.166</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>190443.395</td>
<td>14376</td>
<td>13.247</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1159795.99</td>
<td>14384</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>197413.601</td>
<td>14383</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  R Squared = .035 (Adjusted R Squared = .035) ESS 2006

Table 6: ANOVA of the attitude toward the influence of immigrants on the life in the state
Dependent Variable: Immigrants make country worse or better place to live

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>7316.455(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1045.208</td>
<td>81.239</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>725979.932</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>725979.932</td>
<td>56426.865</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td>7316.455</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1045.208</td>
<td>81.239</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>201505.042</td>
<td>15662</td>
<td>12.866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1277486.57</td>
<td>15670</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>208821.497</td>
<td>15669</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  R Squared = .035 (Adjusted R Squared = .034) ESS 2006

Regarding the indicator of the expectations whether immigrants would turn the country in a better place for living or not, Denmark, Bulgaria and Norway outline the positive “pole” of the views about the immigrants presence's consequences in 2006 as well as in 2008. Estonia and England are more reserved in this aspect as well (2006: F=73.74; p<0.000; 2008: F=57.28; p<0.000 – see Table 6).
When one type of a conclusion or a summarizing perspective in direction of widening of the cultural representations, are the results answering how EU citizens imagine the unification of the Union – whether it should go further or enough has been already achieved. Exploring the ANOVA results for the countries in 2006, leading with much greater expectations for a continuous EU integration, is Bulgaria, followed close by Denmark, as well as Spain, while unification is most unwanted in England. Estonia rates somewhere in between, while Norway, Germany and Belgium seem to merely accept the continuity of unification. In 2008 the two “poles” are still the same – Bulgaria is the most accepting unification, while England – least accepting, Denmark is again nearly the most accepting the unification, while the other countries' results mark a certain tendency to resemble: Estonia is still a little bit more positive, followed by Belgium, Spain, Germany (2006:F=171,72; p<0,000;2008: F=181,75;p<0,000 – Table 7).

However, in order to be able to interpret this data, the profound specifications of identity and its status in each national culture must be accessed and explored, which could not be inserted in the present analysis, as it requires many more additional and detailed analyses. Also, the conduct of a study would be necessary on what precisely have citizens in different countries understood by “unification” - for some individualistic cultures the formulation of the question may sound as directed towards a depersonalization and standardization, while in other national cultures, it would seem as an integration, union.
Table 7: ANOVA of the attitude toward the EU integration
Dependent Variable: European Union: European unification go further or gone too far

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>18277.586(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2611.084</td>
<td>171.721</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>565255.092</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>565255.092</td>
<td>37174.681</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td>18277.586</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2611.084</td>
<td>171.721</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>212464.753</td>
<td>13973</td>
<td>15.205</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1001159.69</td>
<td>13981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>230742.340</td>
<td>13980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  R Squared = .079 (Adjusted R Squared = .079) ESS 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>18055.502(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2579.357</td>
<td>181.754</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>639633.833</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>639633.833</td>
<td>45071.759</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td>18055.502</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2579.357</td>
<td>181.754</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>214432.884</td>
<td>15110</td>
<td>14.191</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1095373.08</td>
<td>15118</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>232488.386</td>
<td>15117</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  R Squared = .078 (Adjusted R Squared = .077) 2008
b  Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

The social-psychological dimensions of behavior tend to gradually change through the alteration of values orientation, social and cultural representations, including stereotypes, each of which has their place in the regulative mechanisms. Even the phenomena that change traditionally slow, such as the social psychic could not remain unaffected by global changes both in the macro-context of a supranational aspect; and because of the intersection of contemporary processes and social-cultural heritage, of achieved life standard and expectations of a higher one, of old stereotypes, “soaked” into the depths and the connected to historical events fears and hopes that the new developments, the new links or union between countries will liberate at least part of the world from the threat of war.

Some of the presented above concrete results by countries can be explained with the number of difficulties of a social-economic nature, that certain states have met in the recent past, as well as the huge flow of labour force. The stereotypes of the aliens, of the others as coming essentially to work during a season and survive and so on, cannot contribute to the formation in all countries of new categorizations of these groups from the point of view of an integrated Europe. The new values, born in the foundation of the integration processes in
some cases are still rather at the level of declaration, but are not associated to any concrete attitudes and actions. The data collected from the extensive interviews in Eurosphere will complement the image of the role that representatives of social, political organizations and media have, accept or ascribe to themselves in 16 European countries in the enlargement of cultural representations during integration processes in EU.

**Table 8: ANOVA of civic social-political activeness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1427,133(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>203,876</td>
<td>94,051</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>707218,176</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>707218,176</td>
<td>326250,497</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td>1427,133</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>203,876</td>
<td>94,051</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>32504,890</td>
<td>14995</td>
<td>2,168</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1119657,17</td>
<td>15003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>33932,023</td>
<td>15002</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  R Squared = .042 (Adjusted R Squared = .042) ESS 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1822,605(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>260,372</td>
<td>128,397</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>759479,197</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>759479,197</td>
<td>374521,441</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>country</td>
<td>1822,605</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>260,372</td>
<td>128,397</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>33238,747</td>
<td>16391</td>
<td>2,028</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1173141,391</td>
<td>16399</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>35061,353</td>
<td>16398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  R Squared = .052 (Adjusted R Squared = .052) ESS 2008
b  Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

Among the goals of Eurosphere is to analyze to what extent and how the civic consiousness is open to European integration processes and what is the civic presence in the public sphere and the communication spaces. The widening of cultural representations “passes” through an enlargement of the personal outlook to a wider socio-political one; the manifestations of personality in different activities, demonstrations, protests, petitions and other, constitute an indicator of this specification. It should actually be expected that given a well working democratic system and progressive social achievements, the participation rates won’t be too high; to the contrary, given a developing democracy and problems of countries in transition, the participation would be in a progressive enhancement. It turns out that in 2006 the
citizens of Denmark, Norway, England are among the most active, while in Bulgaria and Estonia the civic participation is the lowest; countries like Belgium, Spain, Germany, are approximately in the middle. In 2008 similar extent of participation is observed – again Bulgaria and Estonia have the lowest rates, while Germany, Norway and Denmark – the highest; an increase is visible in Germany and a decrease – in Spain (2006: F=94,05;p<0,000; 2008: F=128,39;p<0,000 – Table 8).

The rates of activeness in different forms – i.e. passive in regard to the public sphere – following the news, reading newspapers, watching TV and more – are the highest in Denmark, Estonia Norway, Bulgaria in 2006 and 2008 rounds (2006:F=22,34;p<0,000; 2008:F=29,19; p<0,000 – Table 9). Obviously in countries like Norway and Denmark civic activity is a set of political manifestations and attitudes toward awareness about the political sphere. In former socialist countries, the interest in information predominates over the direct involvement in political processes.

### Table 9: ANOVA of passive political interest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>2234,968(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>319,281</td>
<td>22,343</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>308698,742</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>308698,742</td>
<td>21602,600</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cntry</td>
<td>2234,968</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>319,281</td>
<td>22,343</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>126579,832</td>
<td>8858</td>
<td>14,290</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>603778,034</td>
<td>8866</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>128814,800</td>
<td>8865</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .017 (Adjusted R Squared = .017) ESS 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>2833,550(a)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>404,793</td>
<td>29,198</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>336647,840</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>336647,840</td>
<td>24282,729</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cntry</td>
<td>2833,550</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>404,793</td>
<td>29,198</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>122125,106</td>
<td>8809</td>
<td>13,864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>599454,715</td>
<td>8817</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>124958,655</td>
<td>8816</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .023 (Adjusted R Squared = .022) ESS 2008
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
2 Impact of belonging to different social communities, civic belonging and place of birth on civic attitudes and involvement

The analysis of the data extracted from the two rounds demonstrates that those belonging to minorities (ethnic communities) demonstrate a higher support, compared to majorities, the unification of EU to continue (Table 10). Same representatives of ethnic groups demonstrate more positive attitudes to the influence of immigration on the life in their country: they consider significantly higher than the majority representatives that Immigration is good for country's economy (Table 11); country's cultural life is enriched by immigrants (Table 12); immigrants make country better place to live (Table 13).

Belonging to a religious denomination has a positive effect on the support to development of EU unification (Table 14). Besides, a positive attitude toward immigrants is observed with people with a higher level of religiousness. There is no significant difference between affiliation or non-affiliation to a religion in regard to the acceptance of immigrants from a group, same as the principal national group in the country. But if in 2006 the religious people have been more positive in regard to acceptance of immigrants coming from poorer countries outside Europe, in 2008 a difference between them and non-religious people has not been observed - that is, probably the influence of the factor religiosity has decreased (Table 15).

The analyzed data can lead to the statement that European citizens born in the country (where the interview has been conducted) have developed a higher level of tolerance in regard to the otherness presented by immigrants from different countries — regardless of the ethnic group or if they are coming from poorer countries outside Europe. On the other hand, attitudes of people who were not born in the country, turn out to be more positive in regard to the EU unification, as well as the attitudes toward the influence of immigrants on different life spheres (Table 16).

The category of observed persons that do not have a citizenship in the country are also more positive toward the EU unification (Table 17) and accept immigration influencing in a good way different spheres — economic, cultural and more (Tables 18,19,20). People who are citizens of the country accept immigrants from diverse groups in their country (Tables 21, 22). In both cases it can be stated that there are clear indicators of widening of intercultural relations and attitudes. Of course, it is possible similar ideas and attitudes to be backed with different motivations — for instance, non-citizens might wish to receive a citizenship which would contribute to their support to the EU unification. Also, they might be identifying to an extent with the immigrant groups they support.
3 Influence of the values orientations on the civic activeness and involvement in European integration processes

As factors-predictors regarding the attitudes toward others and the involvement of citizens in political processes, here we shall work with the outlined values orientations in three factors based on the test of values orientations, included in ESS. These factors have been outlined in previous analyses (Sicakkan and Zografova, 2009). In the current inquiry again a similar combination of three factors is outlined on the 2006 and 2008 rounds (see factor matrix in Table 29). Here they will be used partly with other working names that remain quite close to the sense of the included items – Co-otherness (Sicakkan, 2003, 2005) and Traditionalism and Orientation toward success. But before proceeding to the predictor effect of these values orientations through a regressive analysis, the effects of different types of belonging of citizens such as religious, civic, birthplace on co-otherness, because it is a principle variable related to the political activeness and civic engagement in our analyses in Eurosphere. This corresponds to the scientific plan including models of belonging, mobility and participation.

Concerning co-otherness, it is found that people born out of the country are with a higher level of co-otherness than those who have indicated the same country as a birth place (Table 25). At the same time, there is no difference between citizens and those who do not have a citizenship in the country, which is an indicator for that value orientations among inhabitants of Europe are getting closer, more specifically in reducing distances and increasing the willingness to cooperation (Table 24). The fact that affiliation to a religion has a more positive influence than non-affiliation on co-otherness, is rather an expected result – religion is usually connected in representations to formation of readiness to mutual aid, compassion and similar pro-social and human aspects. However, we could not stick to explicit conclusions because the sample comprises representatives of different religions or denominations which have not been distinguished here.

When the regression analysis was conducted, we were interested in the influence of co-otherness, traditionalism, orientation towards the success, religious affiliation, level of religious attitude on attitudes towards the EU integration, the trust in institutions in a national and supranational aspect (including the European Parliament), the attitudes towards immigrants, towards people with different sexual orientation, and activeness and participation in different political activities.
### Table 26: Regression analysis of Traditionalism, Orientation towards the success and Co-otherness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.088</td>
<td>.203</td>
<td>15,247</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism</td>
<td>-.054</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-10,477</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>8.831</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>.096</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>11,791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.542</td>
<td>.191</td>
<td>18,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-9,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>6,241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>11,727</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: European Union: European unification go further or gone too far
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.839</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>38,204</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism</td>
<td>-.060</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-31,956</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>8,415</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>31,310</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.932</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>41,568</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism</td>
<td>-.059</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-33,161</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>12,322</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>30,726</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Gays and lesbians free to live life as they whish
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.511</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>40,340</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism</td>
<td>-.035</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-22,226</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success;</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>2,712</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>17,653</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.807</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>47,756</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-29,523</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>4,819</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>17,776</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Allow many/few immigrants of same race/ethnic group as majority
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
## ESS round 1 Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.067</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>33.056</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism;</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>.056</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.299</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>38.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism;</td>
<td>-.048</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.278</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Allow many/few immigrants of different race/ethnic group from majority
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

## ESS round 1 Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.887</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>29.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism;</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.939</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>31.995</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism;</td>
<td>-.047</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.232</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Allow many/few immigrants from poorer countries outside Europe
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

## ESS round 1 Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.926</td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>27.070</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism</td>
<td>-.029</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>-.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.954</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>22.889</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism</td>
<td>-.046</td>
<td>.004</td>
<td>-.094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.105</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Trust in country's parliament
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
### Dependent Variable: Trust in the European Parliament

**Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3,344, 186</td>
<td>17,983</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism</td>
<td>-0.007, 0.005</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td>-1.430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success</td>
<td>0.027, 0.003</td>
<td>0.074</td>
<td>8.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>0.016, 0.007</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td>2.176</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dependent Variable: Trust in political parties

**Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4,207, 166</td>
<td>25,319</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism</td>
<td>-0.025, 0.004</td>
<td>-0.055</td>
<td>-8.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success</td>
<td>0.008, 0.003</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>2.577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>-0.009, 0.007</td>
<td>-0.012</td>
<td>-1.309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3,579, 156</td>
<td>22,911</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism</td>
<td>-0.033, 0.004</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>-8.284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success</td>
<td>0.008, 0.003</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>2.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>0.024, 0.006</td>
<td>0.035</td>
<td>3.870</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Dependent Variable: actual social-political activeness

**Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5,184, 072</td>
<td>72,263</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism</td>
<td>-0.051, 0.002</td>
<td>-0.251</td>
<td>-27,914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success</td>
<td>0.001, 0.001</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>0.076, 0.003</td>
<td>0.240</td>
<td>26,245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5,317, 066</td>
<td>80,017</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism</td>
<td>-0.062, 0.002</td>
<td>-0.309</td>
<td>-36,658</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success</td>
<td>0.001, 0.001</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>0.081, 0.003</td>
<td>0.259</td>
<td>30,322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Regression Analysis Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4,592, .246</td>
<td>18,687, .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism</td>
<td>.020, .006</td>
<td>.038, 3,181, .001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success</td>
<td>-.045, .004</td>
<td>-.114, -10,221, .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>.047, .010</td>
<td>.058, 4,805, .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4,056, .243</td>
<td>16,695, .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Traditionalism</td>
<td>.033, .006</td>
<td>.062, 5,222, .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Orientation towards the success</td>
<td>-.031, .004</td>
<td>-.079, -7,179, .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Co-otherness</td>
<td>.042, .010</td>
<td>.051, 4,290, .000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| a | Dependent Variable: passive political interest |
| b | Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight |

In both rounds the orientation to success is also a predictor in a positive direction for the same dependent variables, with the exception of its insignificant influence on the actual social-political activeness. In 2008 there is no effect on the trust in politicians; in both rounds it has a negative influence on the passive political interest. In 2006 the orientation toward success does not influence the trust in the national parliament, while in 2008 it has a negative influence. The third values profile or factor – of the “traditionalism” is found to be negatively influencing all dependent variables, included in the regressive analysis for both rounds, except its positive influence on the passive interest in politics and its insignificant effect on the trust in the European Parliament. [see tab.26](#)

In the regressive analysis the variable “how religious” is the subject is found to be with a significantly positive predictor effect on some attitudes, including the attitudes toward the development of Eurounification [only in 2008], acceptance of immigrants of the same ethnic group [in 2008], and in 2008 it's influence the acceptance of immigrants from poorer countries outside Europe is positive; but with a significantly negative effect on the attitude towards the freedom of people with different sexual orientation in the both ESS rounds, [see tab.27](#). This characteristic is a predictor to the attitudes towards the positive influence of immigrants on the economics [2008] and it has a positive influence during both rounds on cultures and in general contributing with their presence to the “place of living”, to the passive political activeness but the influence on the active social-political initiatives is insignificant. In both rounds religiously has a positive predictor influence on trust in EP and in political parties.
The conclusion is being outlined that following the rules and avoiding active involvement in political processes exerts their influence in direction increase of social distances, as well as distance to EU processes. It may seem a paradox at first sight that a factor like following accepted norms and rules could influence in a negative manner the behaviour and involvement of citizens and their attitudes toward immigrants. In fact, we can suppose that a certain type of norms and rules that conservatively preserve the status quo and not norms and rules of behaviour in general. (There could be a relation to the political orientation of citizens as well but it has not been examined in the recent work). This demonstrates the closeness of conformity to established solid regulation and the unwillingness to accept social changes or an ethnic/racial or other diversity in the EU.

Table 27: Regression analysis of citizen's religiousness degree in ESS rounds 2006 and 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.980</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>123.698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How religious are you</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.963</td>
<td>.038</td>
<td>130.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How religious are you</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>6.152</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: European Union: European unification go further or gone too far
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.115</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>270.197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How religious are you</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.220</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>289.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How religious are you</td>
<td>-.061</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>-.168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Gays and lesbians free to live life as they wish
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.785</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>225.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How religious are you</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>-.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.815</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>234.876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How religious are you</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>2.362</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Allow many/few immigrants of same race/ethnic group as majority
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
### Table 1: Unstandardized and Standardized Coefficients for Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.455</td>
<td>.034</td>
<td>72.382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How religious are you</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Allow many/few immigrants of different race/ethnic group from majority
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
c ESS round = 4

### Table 2: Unstandardized and Standardized Coefficients for Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.383</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>68.494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How religious are you</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How religious are you</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Allow many/few immigrants from poorer countries outside Europe
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
c ESS round = 4

### Table 3: Unstandardized and Standardized Coefficients for Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.902</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How religious are you</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>4.865</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How religious are you</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Dependent Variable: Immigration bad or good for country's economy
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
a  Dependent Variable: Country’s cultural life undermined or enriched by immigrants  
b  Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.758</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How religious are you</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5.743</td>
<td>.014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>How religious are you</td>
<td>-.006</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a  Dependent Variable: social-political activeness  
b  Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

The predictor effect is similar when it comes to a religious affiliation; however, there is a negative effect on the attitude toward the EU unification, but a positive effect on political activeness, as well as on acceptance of immigrants coming from poorer countries outside EU (2006 and 2008); negative in regard to the influence of immigration on economics in both rounds (excluding the acceptance of immigrants of a different ethnic group – regarding this dependent variable, the predictor effect is positive) (see Table 28). But regarding this factor, there could not be outlined any firm and one-way conclusions, given that it comprises affiliation to different religions, so different religious affiliations might influence the attitudes and personal behavior in different ways, which can be studied in further more detailed research. However, the fact that the representatives of a certain religious system are less participating in active political actions compared to those, who state no such affiliation, is indicative of the significance of this factor.
### Table 28: Regression analysis of citizen’s religious belonging in ESS rounds 2006 and 2008

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belonging to particular religion or denomination</td>
<td>-1,112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>5,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belonging to particular religion or denomination</td>
<td>-0,204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Dependent Variable: European Union: European unification go further or gone too far
- Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belonging to particular religion or denomination</td>
<td>.266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3,516</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belonging to particular religion or denomination</td>
<td>.311</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Dependent Variable: Gays and lesbians free to live life as they wish
- Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2,431</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belonging to particular religion or denomination</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Belonging to particular religion or denomination</td>
<td>.033</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Dependent Variable: Allow many/few immigrants of different race/ethnic group from majority
- Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

### 4 Summary and conclusions

There are no doubt that enlargement of the opportunities for mobility, contacts with representatives of various cultures and communities changes the stereotypes, enriches representations of individuals of others, as well as of themselves as persons and members of various social groups, communities, ethnic groups, nations. However, this is a slow process and the dependence of the cognitive constructs and mechanisms is in no way simple linear
dependency of the change of the daily life of the individuals or social groups. Cognitive schemes development is not a per se process, it leads to a new social regulation of the behaviour on interpersonal and inter-group level (Zografova, 2008). Maintaining multiple identifications with various social categories and/or groups makes individual excel the geographic, physical and psychic dimensions—attain psychic flexibility to accept the otherness, because he/she starts to represent symbiosis of various “others” by the means of involvement in the various categories. Domination of the tolerance in perceiving the others within the EU framework induces enlargement of the scope of tolerance and social representations also towards communities out of the EU. This takes place on the basis of the psychic mechanisms of development of cognitive images, models, accepting in general the others, and otherness—afterwards representations transfer to neighboring objects. To know and to accept the multiple identifications, including unrelated identities is a way social identity complexity to be attained. Brewer & Pierce suggest that complexity correlates significantly positively with the tolerance to the external, foreign group—“both cognitive and motivational factors lead us to predict that complex social identities will be associated with reduced in-group favoritism and increased tolerance and positivity toward outgroups in general (Brewer & Pierce, 2005, p. 431).

One decade ago, the research in the social-psychological field still used to reveal results in the direction of support of Multiculturalism (Hornsey & Hogue, 2000) but the ESS results demonstrate that throughout the years, positive attitudes towards diversity and expression of co-otherness phenomena, have been more positively developed. As Gergen states, developing his ideas of relational existence: “All that we take to be real, true, valuable or good finds its origin in coordinated action” (Gergen, 2009, p.31).

We can conclude that the answers of the investigated scientific question are not final, but the discussion on the ESS data definitely outlines a consistent widening of intercultural, international and inter-communities attitudes both at a EU and national level. Important relations among different aspects of identity, as well as different types of belonging of the citizens and the developing intercultural social representations, are visible. A relevant development consists of the establishment of stable relationships between the multiple identities, characteristic for the European countries, or multiple interlinked identities, expressing a belonging to EU, as well as the idea of a European identity.

One of the variables that approximate by its meaning the study of attitudes towards diversity is the tolerance to immigrants—which here consists of three types, but they have been scrutinized separately because of their different meaning and sense. It is important to
understand to what extent the developed ability to think and act as a co-other, as a co-European, regulates the manifestation of tolerance to “external” subjects, others, foreigners, when it is subdivided into three options — tolerance to people of the same ethnic group as the majority, to people of a different ethnic or racial group, and to those who come from poorer countries outside Europe. The attitude and value orientation to accept others, placing oneself in their position (co-otherness), as well as the affiliation to different communities, are determining the widening of the image of foreigners’ impact on several aspects of the social reality in the country.

Concerning the posed scientific question about how Europeans accept or do not accept the others, the foreigners-immigrants and whether representations do widen on an intercultural level or not, the data convincingly demonstrate the enlargement of social representations. Regardless some distinctions among different countries, a general tendency is observed to accept otherness, seeing as a factor of enrichment of the cultural life as well as the social-economic conditions in the EU countries. In our further studies within the Eurosphere project the analyses will tend to direct toward a more general, global level – toward the outline of models of influence and interdependence between citizens' attitudes and the real practices and policies on a European level rather than to international differences.

Other important conclusions have also emerged in relation to the fact that the development of the contemporary social psychic's specificities, in the form of co-otherness phenomena, together with the fact of belonging to certain communities, tend to increase the interest in politics and higher rates of participation both in the passive public sphere (keeping up with different media news and events), and in the active public sphere (work in political parties, participation in political initiatives, demonstrations, petitions and more).

Based on the results, we can outline the milestone summary, in regard to the ongoing analyses, that in a social-psychological aspect, Europeans are currently in the process of harmonization of their attitudes according to the common shared spaces, both in the existential, everyday aspect, and in the context of the forming common European public sphere. Dynamics and differentiations among the investigated Member-states are observable, but there are quite identical and optimistic tendencies. Therefore, to whichever extent the state of chaos is characteristic for the communication in the European post modern society, common and unifying tendencies are advancing; they do not lead to some impersonal community, but rather uniting in the debate, the willingness to discuss and acceptance of supranational decisions.
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## Appendix

Table 10: ANOVA of the attitude toward the EU integration depending on minority/majority belonging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Belong to minority ethnic group in country-</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.050</td>
<td>12930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>4.175</td>
<td>923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.98</td>
<td>4.062</td>
<td>13853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>3.913</td>
<td>13961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>4.063</td>
<td>1020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>3.927</td>
<td>14981</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

Dependent Variable: European Union: European unification go further or gone too far

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>472,920(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>472,920</td>
<td>28.719</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>180222,026</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>180222,026</td>
<td>10944,355</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minority belonging</td>
<td>472,920</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>472,920</td>
<td>28.719</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>228086,107</td>
<td>13851</td>
<td>16,467</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>990711,565</td>
<td>13853</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>228559,027</td>
<td>13852</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>430,850(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>430,850</td>
<td>27.985</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>210572,699</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>210572,699</td>
<td>13677,447</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minority belonging</td>
<td>430,850</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>430,850</td>
<td>27.985</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>230610,913</td>
<td>14979</td>
<td>15,396</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1089326,708</td>
<td>14981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>231041,763</td>
<td>14980</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .002 (Adjusted R Squared = .002)

b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
### Table II: ANOVA of attitude toward the influence of immigrants depending on minority/majority belonging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Belong to minority ethnic group in country</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006</strong></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>13252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>3.680</td>
<td>14211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2008</strong></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.485</td>
<td>14475</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>3.565</td>
<td>1100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>3.496</td>
<td>15575</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Immigration bad or good for country's economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2006</strong></td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>773,293(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>773,293</td>
<td>57,343</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>190863,133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>190863,133</td>
<td>14153,419</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minority belonging</td>
<td>773,293</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>773,293</td>
<td>57,343</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>191612,665</td>
<td>14209</td>
<td>13,485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>971336,118</td>
<td>14211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>192385,958</td>
<td>14210</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2008</strong></td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>543,054(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>543,054</td>
<td>44,563</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>216314,091</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>216314,091</td>
<td>17750,553</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minority belonging</td>
<td>543,054</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>543,054</td>
<td>44,563</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>189777,714</td>
<td>15573</td>
<td>12,186</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1037540,454</td>
<td>15575</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>190320,768</td>
<td>15574</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .004 (Adjusted R Squared = .004)

b R Squared = .003 (Adjusted R Squared = .003)

c Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
Table 12: ANOVA of the attitudes toward the influence of immigrants on the culture depending on minority/majority belonging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Belong to minority ethnic group in country</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>3.701</td>
<td>13291</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>3.689</td>
<td>962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>3.703</td>
<td>14253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>3.664</td>
<td>14447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>6.17</td>
<td>3.481</td>
<td>1068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>3.656</td>
<td>15515</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Country's cultural life undermined or enriched by immigrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>306,171(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>306,171</td>
<td>22.361</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>222511,343</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>222511,343</td>
<td>16250.883</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minority belonging</td>
<td>306,171</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>306,171</td>
<td>22.361</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>195128,420</td>
<td>14251</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1148784,016</td>
<td>14253</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>195434,591</td>
<td>14252</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>600,750(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>600,750</td>
<td>45.061</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>264836,656</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>264836,656</td>
<td>19864,809</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>minority belonging</td>
<td>600,750</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>600,750</td>
<td>45.061</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>206818,555</td>
<td>15513</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1269048,973</td>
<td>15515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>207419,305</td>
<td>15514</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .002 (Adjusted R Squared = .001)
b R Squared = .003 (Adjusted R Squared = .003)
c Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
Table 13: ANOVA of the attitude toward the influence of immigrants on the life in the country depending on minority/majority belonging

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Belong to minority ethnic group in country</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>3.411</td>
<td>13319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>3.520</td>
<td>942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>3.425</td>
<td>14261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>3.327</td>
<td>14476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>3.390</td>
<td>1073</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>3.342</td>
<td>15549</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Immigrants make country worse or better place to live

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>626,579(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>626,579</td>
<td>53.616</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>170641,639</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>170641,639</td>
<td>14601,780</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>minority belonging</td>
<td>626,579</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>626,579</td>
<td>53.616</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>166635,783</td>
<td>14259</td>
<td>11,686</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>877476,779</td>
<td>14261</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>167262,363</td>
<td>14260</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1122,137(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1122,137</td>
<td>101,139</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>215789,155</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>215789,155</td>
<td>19449,311</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>minority belonging</td>
<td>1122,137</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1122,137</td>
<td>101,139</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>172493,204</td>
<td>15547</td>
<td>11,095</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>998218,378</td>
<td>15549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>173615,340</td>
<td>15548</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .004 (Adjusted R Squared = .004)

b R Squared = .006 (Adjusted R Squared = .006)

c Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
### Table 14: ANOVA of the attitude toward the EU integration depending on religion

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Belonging to particular religion or denomination</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>4.92</td>
<td>3.966</td>
<td>6383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>4.142</td>
<td>7543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>4.063</td>
<td>13926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>3.890</td>
<td>6756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>3.940</td>
<td>8325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>3.920</td>
<td>15081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>3.890</td>
<td>6756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>3.940</td>
<td>8325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.15</td>
<td>3.920</td>
<td>15081</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: European Union: European unification go further or gone too far

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>96,103(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96,103</td>
<td>5.823</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>754174,176</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>754174,176</td>
<td>45699,640</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>96,103</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96,103</td>
<td>5.823</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>229785,644</td>
<td>13924</td>
<td>16,503</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>997576,652</td>
<td>13926</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>229881,746</td>
<td>13925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>333,739(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>333,739</td>
<td>21,744</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>843912,849</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>843912,849</td>
<td>54982,355</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>333,739</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>333,739</td>
<td>21,744</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>231444,469</td>
<td>15079</td>
<td>15,349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1091676,236</td>
<td>15081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>231778,208</td>
<td>15080</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

* a R Squared = .000 (Adjusted R Squared = .000)

* b R Squared = .001 (Adjusted R Squared = .001)

* c Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
# Table 15. ANOVA of the acceptance of immigrants coming from poorer countries depending on religion

## Descriptive Statistics (a)

Dependent Variable: Allow many/few immigrants from poorer countries outside Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Belonging to particular religion or denomination</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2.5693</td>
<td>1.32543</td>
<td>6610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2.6028</td>
<td>1.34236</td>
<td>7961</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.5882</td>
<td>1.33489</td>
<td>14571</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2.5083</td>
<td>1.33756</td>
<td>6994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2.5014</td>
<td>1.29141</td>
<td>8843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.5044</td>
<td>1.31196</td>
<td>15837</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

## Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (b)

Dependent Variable: Allow many/few immigrants from poorer countries outside Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>8.936(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.936</td>
<td>5.016</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>212278.277</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>212278.277</td>
<td>119160.844</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>8.936</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.936</td>
<td>5.016</td>
<td>.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>25953.846</td>
<td>14569</td>
<td>1.781</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>242261.268</td>
<td>14571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>25962.783</td>
<td>14570</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>.403(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>208638.128</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>208638.128</td>
<td>121207.815</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.403</td>
<td>.234</td>
<td>.629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>27257.193</td>
<td>15835</td>
<td>1.721</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239435.685</td>
<td>15837</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>27257.595</td>
<td>15836</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) R Squared = .000 (Adjusted R Squared = .000)

(b) Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
### Table 16: ANOVA of attitudes toward the EU integration depending on birthplace

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Born in country-</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>4.319</td>
<td>1198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>4.034</td>
<td>12779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>4.062</td>
<td>13977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>3.992</td>
<td>1312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>3.911</td>
<td>13770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>3.924</td>
<td>15082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: European Union: European unification go further or gone too far

| ESS round | Source                | Type III Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F     | Sig.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2006</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>411,510(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>411,510</td>
<td>24.978</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>257019,287</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>257019,287</td>
<td>15600,422</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>birthplace</td>
<td>411,510</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>411,510</td>
<td>24.978</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>230240,210</td>
<td>13975</td>
<td>16,475</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1001039,644</td>
<td>13977</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>230651,720</td>
<td>13976</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>736,127(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>736,127</td>
<td>47,958</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>301919,037</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>301919,037</td>
<td>19669,768</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>birthplace</td>
<td>736,127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>736,127</td>
<td>47,958</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>231468,874</td>
<td>15080</td>
<td>15,349</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1093774,871</td>
<td>15082</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>232205,002</td>
<td>15081</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .002 (Adjusted R Squared = .002)

b R Squared = .003 (Adjusted R Squared = .003)

c Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
Table 17: ANOVA of the attitudes toward the EU integration depending on citizenship

Dependent Variable: European Union: European unification go further or gone too far

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Citizen of country</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>4.045</td>
<td>743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>4.058</td>
<td>13231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>4.063</td>
<td>13974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>3.688</td>
<td>804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5.12</td>
<td>3.927</td>
<td>14307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>3.922</td>
<td>15111</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: European Union: European unification go further or gone too far

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>620,035(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>620,035</td>
<td>37,658</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>155146,273</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>155146,273</td>
<td>9422,843</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>citizenship</td>
<td>620,035</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>620,035</td>
<td>37,658</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>230047,745</td>
<td>13972</td>
<td>16,465</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1000736,593</td>
<td>13974</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>230667,780</td>
<td>13973</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>842,780(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>842,780</td>
<td>54,984</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>184830,026</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>184830,026</td>
<td>12058,469</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>citizenship</td>
<td>842,780</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>842,780</td>
<td>54,984</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>231588,010</td>
<td>15109</td>
<td>15,328</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1094806,240</td>
<td>15111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>232430,790</td>
<td>15110</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .003 (Adjusted R Squared = .003)

b R Squared = .004 (Adjusted R Squared = .004)

c Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
Table 18: ANOVA of attitude toward the influence of immigrants on the economics depending on citizenship

Dependent Variable: Immigration bad or good for country’s economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Citizen of country-</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>3.550</td>
<td>759</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>3.669</td>
<td>13581</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>3.682</td>
<td>14340</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO</td>
<td>5.95</td>
<td>3.311</td>
<td>837</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>3.486</td>
<td>14886</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.03</td>
<td>3.491</td>
<td>15723</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Immigration bad or good for country’s economy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>2107.118(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2107.118</td>
<td>157.092</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>173748.887</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>173748.887</td>
<td>12953.542</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>citizenship</td>
<td>2107.118</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2107.118</td>
<td>157.092</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>192318.940</td>
<td>14338</td>
<td>13,413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>980368.405</td>
<td>14340</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>194426.058</td>
<td>14339</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4         | Corrected Model   | 1500.239(b)             | 1  | 1500.239    | 124,099 | .000 |
|           | Intercept         | 191677.618              | 1  | 191677.618  | 15855.479 | .000 |
|           | citizenship       | 1500.239                | 1  | 1500.239    | 124,099 | .000 |
|           | Error             | 190051.899              | 15721| 12,089     |       |      |
|           | Total             | 1044221.109             | 15723|           |       |      |
|           | Corrected Total   | 191552.138              | 15722|           |       |      |

a R Squared = .011 (Adjusted R Squared = .011)

b R Squared = .008 (Adjusted R Squared = .008)

c Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
**Table 19: ANOVA of the attitude toward the influence of immigrants on the culture depending on citizenship**

Dependent Variable: Country's cultural life undermined or enriched by immigrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Citizen of country-</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>3.445</td>
<td>764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>3.706</td>
<td>13612</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>3.705</td>
<td>14376</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>6.49</td>
<td>3.238</td>
<td>833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>5.60</td>
<td>3.661</td>
<td>14830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>3.651</td>
<td>15663</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Country's cultural life undermined or enriched by immigrants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1333.335(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1333.335</td>
<td>97.771</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>199590.249</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>199590.249</td>
<td>14635.589</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>citizenship</td>
<td>1333.335</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1333.335</td>
<td>97.771</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>196022.871</td>
<td>14374</td>
<td>13.637</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1159186.402</td>
<td>14376</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>197356.205</td>
<td>14375</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1280.051(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1280.051</td>
<td>96.624</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>233601.074</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>233601.074</td>
<td>17633.197</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>citizenship</td>
<td>1280.051</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1280.051</td>
<td>96.624</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>207473.797</td>
<td>15661</td>
<td>13.248</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1276875.731</td>
<td>15663</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>208753.848</td>
<td>15662</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .007 (Adjusted R Squared = .007)

b R Squared = .006 (Adjusted R Squared = .006)

c Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
Table 20: ANOVA of the attitude toward the influence of immigrants on the life in the country depending on citizenship

Descriptive Statistics(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Citizen of country-</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 NO</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>3.381</td>
<td>746</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>3.411</td>
<td>13643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>3.431</td>
<td>14389</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 NO</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>3.172</td>
<td>825</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>3.324</td>
<td>14868</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>3.338</td>
<td>15693</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Immigrants make country worse or better place to live

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Corrected Model</td>
<td>2104.304(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2104.304</td>
<td>181.029</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>156656,454</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>156656,454</td>
<td>13476,869</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizenship</td>
<td>2104,304</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2104.304</td>
<td>181,029</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>167235,901</td>
<td>14387</td>
<td>11,624</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>886694,170</td>
<td>14389</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>169340,205</td>
<td>14388</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 4 Corrected Model | 2262,504(b)        | 1 | 2262,504 | 205,723 | .000 |
| Intercept        | 191643,540          | 1 | 191643,540 | 17425,565 | .000 |
| citizenship      | 2262,504            | 1 | 2262,504 | 205,723 | .000 |
| Error            | 172567,074          | 15691 | 10,998    |       |       |
| Total            | 1005149,597         | 15693 |           |       |       |
| Corrected Total  | 174829,578          | 15692 |           |       |       |

a R Squared = .012 (Adjusted R Squared = .012)
b R Squared = .013 (Adjusted R Squared = .013)
c Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
Table 21: ANOVA of the acceptance of immigrants from a different group depending on citizenship

Dependent Variable: Allow many/few immigrants of different race/ethnic group from majority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Citizen of country-</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2.2487</td>
<td>1.21601</td>
<td>790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2.5449</td>
<td>1.30363</td>
<td>13860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.5309</td>
<td>1.30239</td>
<td>14650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>2.1819</td>
<td>1.19538</td>
<td>852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2.4404</td>
<td>1.28118</td>
<td>15084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.4274</td>
<td>1.27935</td>
<td>15936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects (c)

Dependent Variable: Allow many/few immigrants of different race/ethnic group from majority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>128,417(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>128,417</td>
<td>76,096</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>33625,002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33625,002</td>
<td>19925,108</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>citizenship</td>
<td>128,417</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>128,417</td>
<td>76,096</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>24719,516</td>
<td>14648</td>
<td>1,688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>232509,882</td>
<td>14650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>24847,933</td>
<td>14649</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>107,880(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>107,880</td>
<td>66,182</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>34492,352</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>34492,352</td>
<td>21160,104</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>citizenship</td>
<td>107,880</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>107,880</td>
<td>66,182</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>25973,461</td>
<td>15934</td>
<td>1,630</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>226334,486</td>
<td>15936</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>26081,341</td>
<td>15935</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .005 (Adjusted R Squared = .005)

b R Squared = .004 (Adjusted R Squared = .004)

c Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
Table 22: ANOVA of the acceptance of immigrants coming from poorer countries depending on citizenship

Descriptive Statistics(a)

Dependent Variable: Allow many/few immigrants from poorer countries outside Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Citizen of country-</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 NO</td>
<td>2.3278</td>
<td>1.28706</td>
<td>788</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2.6018</td>
<td>1.33410</td>
<td>13830</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.5888</td>
<td>1.33438</td>
<td>14618</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 NO</td>
<td>2.2696</td>
<td>1.22656</td>
<td>855</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YES</td>
<td>2.5155</td>
<td>1.31450</td>
<td>15017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.5031</td>
<td>1.31223</td>
<td>15872</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Allow many/few immigrants from poorer countries outside Europe

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 Corrected Model</td>
<td>109,793(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109,793</td>
<td>61,919</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>35535,019</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>35535,019</td>
<td>20040,280</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizenship</td>
<td>109,793</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>109,793</td>
<td>61,919</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>25916,795</td>
<td>14616</td>
<td>1,773</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>243098,301</td>
<td>14618</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>26026,589</td>
<td>14617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Corrected Model</td>
<td>97,939(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97,939</td>
<td>57,077</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>37089,706</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37089,706</td>
<td>21615,347</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>citizenship</td>
<td>97,939</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>97,939</td>
<td>57,077</td>
<td>,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>27231,284</td>
<td>15870</td>
<td>1,716</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>239762,638</td>
<td>15872</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>27329,223</td>
<td>15871</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .004 (Adjusted R Squared = .004)

b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
### Table 23. ANOVA of co-otherness depending on religion belonging

**Dependent Variable: Co-otherness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Belonging to particular religion or denomination-</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>24.1946</td>
<td>4.90684</td>
<td>6514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>24.6379</td>
<td>4.68130</td>
<td>7848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.4448</td>
<td>4.79599</td>
<td>14362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>24.3401</td>
<td>4.84140</td>
<td>6959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>24.7804</td>
<td>4.56095</td>
<td>8887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.5895</td>
<td>4.69690</td>
<td>15846</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dependent Variable: Co-otherness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1547.904(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1547.904</td>
<td>67.608</td>
<td>,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>18780817.360</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18780817.360</td>
<td>820288.917</td>
<td>,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>1547.904</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1547.904</td>
<td>67.608</td>
<td>,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>328777.497</td>
<td>14360</td>
<td>22.895</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19472690.494</td>
<td>14362</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>330325.402</td>
<td>14361</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>1615.749(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1615.749</td>
<td>73.576</td>
<td>,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>20108575.317</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20108575.317</td>
<td>915680.122</td>
<td>,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>religion</td>
<td>1615.749</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1615.749</td>
<td>73.576</td>
<td>,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>347938.390</td>
<td>15844</td>
<td>21.960</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20869642.860</td>
<td>15846</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>349554.139</td>
<td>15845</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = ,005 (Adjusted R Squared = ,005)
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Citizen of country-</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>24,6325</td>
<td>4,33648</td>
<td>780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>24,4329</td>
<td>4,81881</td>
<td>13634</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24,4423</td>
<td>4,79423</td>
<td>14414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>24,7591</td>
<td>4,46965</td>
<td>851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>24,5823</td>
<td>4,71222</td>
<td>15032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24,5911</td>
<td>4,69974</td>
<td>15883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Dependent Variable: Co-otherness**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>57,544(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57,544</td>
<td>2,504</td>
<td>,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3475793,987</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3475793,987</td>
<td>151238,506</td>
<td>,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>citizenship</td>
<td>57,544</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>57,544</td>
<td>2,504</td>
<td>,114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>331219,504</td>
<td>14412</td>
<td>22,982</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19530055,235</td>
<td>14414</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>331277,049</td>
<td>14413</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>50,333(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50,333</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>3916986,311</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3916986,311</td>
<td>177353,187</td>
<td>,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>citizenship</td>
<td>50,333</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>50,333</td>
<td>2,279</td>
<td>,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>350744,526</td>
<td>15881</td>
<td>22,086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20921883,154</td>
<td>15883</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>350794,859</td>
<td>15882</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .000 (Adjusted R Squared = .000)
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight
Table 25: ANOVA of co-otherness depending on birthplace
Dependent Variable: Co-otherness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Born in country-</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>24.7594</td>
<td>4.54615</td>
<td>1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>24.4123</td>
<td>4.81447</td>
<td>13178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.4418</td>
<td>4.79402</td>
<td>14417</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>24.7871</td>
<td>4.60182</td>
<td>1378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>24.5735</td>
<td>4.70963</td>
<td>14473</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.5924</td>
<td>4.70105</td>
<td>15851</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: Co-otherness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ESS round</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>301,000(a)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>301,000</td>
<td>13,108</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>6041659,680</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6041659,680</td>
<td>263099,699</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>birthplace</td>
<td>301,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>301,000</td>
<td>13,108</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>331017,195</td>
<td>14415</td>
<td>22,963</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19533000,436</td>
<td>14417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>331318,195</td>
<td>14416</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Corrected Model</td>
<td>125,146(b)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125,146</td>
<td>5,664</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>6683345,567</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6683345,567</td>
<td>302504,229</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>birthplace</td>
<td>125,146</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>125,146</td>
<td>5,664</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Error</td>
<td>350158,225</td>
<td>15849</td>
<td>22,093</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20901753,218</td>
<td>15851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Corrected Total</td>
<td>350283,371</td>
<td>15850</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a R Squared = .001 (Adjusted R Squared = .001)
b R Squared = .000 (Adjusted R Squared = .000)
Table 29: Rotated Component Matrix(a) of the three factors on the ESS data rounds 2006 and 2008 by values orientations in 8 countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Important to think new ideas and being creative</td>
<td>.455</td>
<td>-.175</td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to be rich, have money and expensive things</td>
<td>.632</td>
<td>.147</td>
<td>-.280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to show abilities and be admired</td>
<td>.636</td>
<td>.240</td>
<td>-.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to try new and different things in life</td>
<td>.608</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to have a good time</td>
<td>.654</td>
<td>-.119</td>
<td>.208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to be successful and that people recognise achievements</td>
<td>.693</td>
<td>.215</td>
<td>-.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to seek adventures and have an exiting life</td>
<td>.682</td>
<td>-.242</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to get respect from others</td>
<td>.444</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>-.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to seek fun and things that give pleasure</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>-.109</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to make own decisions and be free</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>-.082</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to live in secure and safe surroundings</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to do what is told and follow rules</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.643</td>
<td>.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to be humble and modest, not draw attention</td>
<td>-.215</td>
<td>.474</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important that government is strong and ensures safety</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.624</td>
<td>.183</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to behave properly</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.701</td>
<td>.170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to follow traditions and customs</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.523</td>
<td>.198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important that people are treated equally and have equal opportunities</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>.539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to understand different people</td>
<td>.035</td>
<td>.146</td>
<td>.666</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to help people and care for others well-being</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to be loyal to friends and devote to people close</td>
<td>.136</td>
<td>.213</td>
<td>.609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Important to care for nature and environment</td>
<td>-.016</td>
<td>.235</td>
<td>.556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
a Rotation converged in 11 iterations.

Total Variance Explained

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Initial Eigenvalues</th>
<th>Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
<th>Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>% of Variance</td>
<td>Cumulative %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.777</td>
<td>8.463</td>
<td>44.653</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.986</td>
<td>4.695</td>
<td>49.348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>1.974</td>
<td>98.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>1.841</td>
<td>100.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.