Widening Intercultural Representations

The Citizens Aspect of Development of European Public Sphere

Yolanda Zografova

EUROSPHERE ONLINE WORKING PAPER SERIES
Title: WP4.2 – Widening Intercultural Representations: The Citizens Aspect of Development of European Public Sphere
Author: Y. Zografova
This version: October 2011
Webpage: http://eurospheres.org/publications/workpackage-reports/

Author Contact Information:

Yolanda Zografova

Institute of Population and Human Studies,

Bulgarian Academy of Sciences

zografova@abv.bg

Table of Contents

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 inter-subjectiveness 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 verifiedin 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

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	1059,774(a)	7	151,396	96,961	,000
Intercept	98960,365	1	98960,365	63378,723	,000
country	1059,774	7	151,396	96,961	,000
Error	22941,842	14693	1,561		
Total	185299,718	14701			
Corrected Total	24001,616	14700			

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

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	2664,949(a)	7	380,707	265,964	,000
Intercept	104474,162	1	104474,162	72986,311	,000
Country	2664,949	7	380,707	265,964	,000
Error	22865,524	15974	1,431		
Total	184580,710	15982			
Corrected Total	25530,473	15981			

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

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

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

a R Squared = ,012 (Adjusted R Squared = ,011) ESS 2006

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	835,514(a)	7	119,359	75,314	,000
Intercept	135512,502	1	135512,502	85506,069	,000
Country	835,514	7	119,359	75,314	,000
Error	25254,251	15935	1,585		
Total	226439,502	15943			
Corrected Total	26089,765	15942			

a R Squared = ,032 (Adjusted R Squared = ,032) ESS 2008
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

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, Belguim 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.

Table 3. ANOVA of accepting immigrants from poorer countries

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

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	511,379(a)	7	73,054	41,825	,000
Intercept	140725,665	1	140725,665	80567,791	,000
country	511,379	7	73,054	41,825	,000
Error	25534,627	14619	1,747		
Total	243173,759	14627			
Corrected Total	26046,006	14626			

a R Squared = ,020 (Adjusted R Squared = ,019) ESS 2006

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	958,838(a)	7	136,977	82,391	,000
Intercept	146475,535	1	146475,535	88104,241	,000
country	958,838	7	136,977	82,391	,000
Error	26385,940	15871	1,663		
Total	239886,444	15879			
Corrected Total	27344,778	15878			

a R Squared = ,035 (Adjusted R Squared = ,035) ESS 2008
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

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 4: ANOVA of attitude toward the influence of immigrants on economics
Dependent Variable: Immigration bad or good for country's economy

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

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

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

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

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	6970,206(a)	7	995,744	75,166	,000
Intercept	637289,856	1	637289,856	48107,097	,000
country	6970,206	7	995,744	75,166	,000
Error	190443,395	14376	13,247		
Total	1159795,99	14384			
Corrected Total	197413,601	14383			

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

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	7316,455(a)	7	1045,208	81,239	,000
Intercept	725979,932	1	725979,932	56426,865	,000
country	7316,455	7	1045,208	81,239	,000
Error	201505,042	15662	12,866		
Total	1277486,57	15670			
Corrected Total	208821,497	15669			

a R Squared = ,035 (Adjusted R Squared = ,035) ESS 2008
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

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).

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

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	5867,116(a)	7	838,159	73,740	,000
Intercept	491395,170	1	491395,170	43232,223	,000
country	5867,116	7	838,159	73,740	,000
Error	163551,274	14389	11,366		
Total	887250,051	14397			
Corrected Total	169418,390	14396			

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

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	4357,280(a)	7	622,469	57,287	,000
Intercept	577945,808	1	577945,808	53189,265	,000
Country	4357,280	7	622,469	57,287	,000
Error	170484,960	15690	10,866		
Total	1005471,93	15698			
Corrected Total	174842,240	15697			

a R Squared = ,025 (Adjusted R Squared = ,024) ESS 2008
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

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

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	18277,586(a)	7	2611,084	171,721	,000
Intercept	565255,092	1	565255,092	37174,681	,000
country	18277,586	7	2611,084	171,721	,000
Error	212464,753	13973	15,205		
Total	1001159,69	13981			
Corrected Total	230742,340	13980			

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

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Corrected Model	18055,502(a)	7	2579,357	181,754	,000
Intercept	639633,833	1	639633,833	45071,759	,000
country	18055,502	7	2579,357	181,754	,000
Error	214432,884	15110	14,191		
Total	1095373,08	15118			
Corrected Total	232488,386	15117			

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 counrtries 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
Dependent Variable: social-political activeness

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

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

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

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).

Table 9: ANOVA of passive political interest
Dependent Variable: passive political interest

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

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

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

a R Squared = ,023 (Adjusted R Squared = ,022) ESS 2008
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

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). Obviusly 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

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

ESS round	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
3	1	(Constant)	3,088	,203		15,247	,000
		Traditionalism	-,054	,005	-,099	-10,477	,000
		Orientation towards the success	,032	,004	,078	8,831	,000
		Co-otherness	,096	,008	,113	11,791	,000
4	1	(Constant)	3,542	,191		18,508	,000
		Traditionalism	-,047	,005	-,088	-9,724	,000
		Orientation towards the success	,021	,003	,053	6,241	,000
		Co-otherness	,091	,008	,108	11,727	,000

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

ESS round	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
3	1	(Constant)	2,839	,074		38,204	,000
		Tradiitionalism	-,060	,002	-,283	-31,956	,000
		Orientation towards the success	,011	,001	,070	8,415	,000
		Co-otherness	,093	,003	,282	31,310	,000
4	1	(Constant)	2,932	,071		41,568	,000
		Traditionalism	-,059	,002	-,282	-33,161	,000
		Orientation towards the success	,015	,001	,097	12,322	,000
		Co-otherness	,087	,003	,265	30,726	,000

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

ESS round	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
3	1	(Constant)	2,511	,062		40,340	,000
		Traditionalism	-,035	,002	-,204	-22,226	,000
		Orientation towards the success;	,003	,001	,023	2,712	,007
		Co-otherness	,044	,003	,165	17,653	,000
4	1	(Constant)	2,807	,059		47,756	,000
		Traditionalism	-,044	,002	-,257	-29,523	,000
		Orientation towards the success	,005	,001	,039	4,819	,000
		Co-otherness	,042	,002	,157	17,776	,000

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	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
3	1	(Constant)	2,067	,063		33,056	,000
		Traditionalism;	-,043	,002	-,246	-27,125	,000
		Orientation towards the success	,005	,001	,036	4,249	,000
		Co-otherness	,056	,003	,207	22,427	,000
4	1	(Constant)	2,299	,059		38,940	,000
		Traditionalism	-,048	,002	-,278	-32,184	,000
		Orientation towards the success	,006	,001	,048	6,054	,000
		Co-otherness	,055	,002	,202	23,046	,000

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	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
3	1	(Constant)	1,887	,064		29,441	,000
		Traditionalism;	-,044	,002	-,243	-26,804	,000
		Orientation towards the success;	,006	,001	,044	5,181	,000
		Co-otherness	,060	,003	,217	23,496	,000
4	1	(Constant)	1,939	,061		31,995	,000
		Traditionalism;	-,047	,002	-,262	-30,281	,000
		Orientation towards the success	,006	,001	,046	5,731	,000
		Co-otherness	,065	,002	,232	26,543	,000

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

ESS round	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
3	1	(Constant)	4,926	,182		27,070	,000
		Traditionalism	-,029	,005	-,058	-6,244	,000
		Orientation towards the success	-,003	,003	-,009	-1,047	,295
		Co-otherness	,018	,007	,023	2,398	,016
4	1	(Constant)	3,954	,173		22,889	,000
		Traditionalism	-,046	,004	-,094	-10,482	,000
		Orientation towards the success	,008	,003	-,021	-2,577	,010
		Co-otherness	,082	,007	,105	11,671	,000

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

ESS round	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
3	1	(Constant)	3,344	,186		17,983	,000
		Traditionalism;	-,007	,005	-,014	-1,430	,153
		Orientation towards the success	,027	,003	,074	8,084	,000
		Co-otherness	,016	,007	,022	2,176	,030
4	1	(Constant)	2,721	,173		15,735	,000
		Traditionalism	-,004	,004	-,009	-1,019	,308
		Orientation towards the success	,024	,003	,069	8,038	,000
		Co-otherness	,046	,007	,062	6,580	,000

a Dependent Variable: Trust in the European Parliament
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

ESS round	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
3	1	(Constant)	4,207	,166		25,319	,000
		Traditionalism	-,025	,004	-,055	-5,839	,000
		Orientation towards the success;	,008	,003	,023	2,577	,010
		Co-otherness	-,009	,007	-,012	-1,309	,190
4	1	(Constant)	3,579	,156		22,911	,000
		Traditionalism	-,033	,004	-,074	-8,284	,000
		Orientation towards the success;	,008	,003	,023	2,832	,005
		Co-otherness	,024	,006	,035	3,870	,000

a Dependent Variable: Trust in political parties
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

ESS round	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
3	1	(Constant)	5,184	,072		72,263	,000
		Traditionalism	-,051	,002	-,251	-27,914	,000
		Orientation towards the success;	,001	,001	,004	,448	,654
		Co-otherness	,076	,003	,240	26,245	,000
4	1	(Constant)	5,317	,066		80,017	,000
		Traditionalism;	-,062	,002	-,309	-36,658	,000
		Orientation towards the success	,001	,001	,004	,571	,568
		Co-otherness	,081	,003	,259	30,322	,000

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

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

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 imigrants 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 religiousity 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

ESS round	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
3	1	(Constant)	4,980	,040		123,698	,000
		How religious are you	,001	,008	,002	,179	,858
4	1	(Constant)	4,963	,038		130,942	,000
		How religious are you	,046	,007	,050	6,152	,000

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

ESS round	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
3	1	(Constant)	4,115	,015		270,197	,000
		How religious are you	-,056	,003	-,152	-18,608	,000
4	1	(Constant)	4,220	,015		289,870	,000
		How religious are you	-,061	,003	-,168	-21,422	,000

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

ESS round	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
			B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
3	1	(Constant)	2,785	,012		225,319	,000
		How religious are you	-,003	,002	-,010	-1,221	,222
4	1	(Constant)	2,815	,012		234,876	,000
		How religious are you	,006	,002	,019	2,362	,018

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

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
1	(Constant)	2.455	.034		72.382	.000
	How religious are you	.008	.003	.026	2.626	.009

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

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
1	(Constant)	2.383	.035		68.494	.000
	How ...	.009	.003	.031	3.040	.002
	How religious are you	.013	.003	.044	4.504	.000

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

ESS round	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			
			B	Std. Error	Beta		B	Std. Error
3	1	(Constant)	4,902	,036			136,304	,000
		How religious are you	,016	,007	,019		2,289	,022
4	1	(Constant)	4,865	,033			146,953	,000
		How religious are you	,040	,006	,049		6,202	,000

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

b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

ESS round	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients			
			B	Std. Error	Beta		B	Std. Error
3	1	(Constant)	5,446	,036			150,760	,000
		How religious are you	,010	,007	,012		1,390	,165
4	1	(Constant)	5,500	,035			158,400	,000
		How religious are you	,033	,007	,039		4,856	,000

a Dependent Variable: Country's cultural life undermined or enriched by immigrants
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

ESS round	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
			B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
3	1	(Constant)	5,758	,014		398,409	,000
		How religious are you	-,007	,003	-,020	-2,449	,014
4	1	(Constant)	5,743	,014		418,438	,000
		How religious are you	-,006	,003	-,017	-2,124	,034

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

ESS round	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
			B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
3	1	(Constant)	5,149	,071		72,600	,000
		Belonging to particular religion or denomination	-,112	,047	-,020	-2,413	,016
4	1	(Constant)	5,448	,067		81,517	,000
		Belonging to particular religion or denomination	-,204	,044	-,038	-4,663	,000

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

ESS round	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
			B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
3	1	(Constant)	3,500	,027		130,093	,000
		Belonging to particular religion or denomination	,266	,018	,124	15,048	,000
4	1	(Constant)	3,516	,026		136,594	,000
		Belonging to particular religion or denomination	,311	,017	,145	18,382	,000

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

ESS round	Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients		
			B	Std. Error	Beta	B	Std. Error
3	1	(Constant)	2,431	,022		109,549	,000
		Belonging to particular religion or denomination	,027	,015	,015	1,823	,068
4	1	(Constant)	2,524	,021		118,665	,000
		Belonging to particular religion or denomination	,033	,014	,019	2,354	,019

a Dependent Variable: Allow many/few immigrants of different race/ethnic group from majority
b 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, incl. the 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.

References:

ESS Round 4: European Social Survey Round 4 Data (2008). Data file edition 1.0. Norwegian Social Science Data Services, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data.

ESS Round 3: European Social Survey Round 3 Data (2006). Data file edition 3.2. Norwegian Social Science Data Services, Norway – Data Archive and distributor of ESS data.

Brewer, M., Pierce, K. 2005. Social Identity Complexity and Outgroup Tolerance. Pers Soc Psychol Bull 2005; 31;428

Calhoun, C. 2003. Critical social theory. Kritika i humanizum, Sofia.

Eriksen, E 2005. An Emerging European Public Sphere. European Journal of Social Theory 8(3): 341–363. Sage Publications

Gergen, K. 2009. Relational Being. Beyond Self and Community. Oxford University Press

Hornsey, M. & Hogg, M. 2000. Assimilation and Diversity: An Integrative Model of Subgroup Relations. In: Personality and Social Psychology Review, 2000, Vol. 4, No. 2, 143-156

Sicakkan, H. (2003). *Politics, Wisdom and Diversity. Or Why I don't want to be tolerated?* Norwegian Journal of Migration Research 4:32-44.

Sicakkan, H. (2005). *How is a Diverse European Society Possible? An Exploration into New Public Spaces in Six European Countries*. AMID Working Paper Series. Aalborg: University of Aalborg. Norwegian Journal of Migration Research 4:32-44.

Sicakkan, H., Y. Zografova, (2009). Explaining Citizens' Attitudes to European Integration , Paper, presented at the International Conference of Eurosphere in Osnabrueck,2009, /manuscript/

Tajfel, H. 1981. Human groups and social categories: studies in Social Psychology. Cambridge

Turner, J. 1984. Social identification and psychological group formation. In: Tajfel, H. (Ed.). The social dimension: European developments in Social Psychology. Cambridge

Zografova, Y. 2008. Social psychological knowledge and development of new conceptions and behaviour models. In: /Ed./ Chobanova, R. Demnad for Knowledge in the Process of European Economic Integration, Institute of Economics, BAS, 255-264.

Appendix

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

ESS round	Belong to minority ethnic group in country-	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
3	NO	4,95	4,050	12930
	YES	5,48	4,175	923
	Total	4,98	4,062	13853
4	NO	5,13	3,913	13961
	YES	5,61	4,063	1020
	Total	5,16	3,927	14981

a Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

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.
2006	Corrected Model	472,920(a)	1	472,920	28,719	,000
	Intercept	180222,026	1	180222,026	10944,355	,000
	minority belonging	472,920	1	472,920	28,719	,000
	Error	228086,107	13851	16,467		
	Total	990711,565	13853			
	Corrected Total	228559,027	13852			
2008	Corrected Model	430,850(a)	1	430,850	27,985	,000
	Intercept	210572,699	1	210572,699	13677,447	,000
	minority belonging	430,850	1	430,850	27,985	,000
	Error	230610,913	14979	15,396		
	Total	1089326,708	14981			
	Corrected Total	231041,763	14980			

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

b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight

Table 11: ANOVA of attitude toward the influence of immigrants depending on minority/majority belonging

ESS round	Belong to minority ethnic group in country	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
2006	NO	4,93	3,667	13252
	YES	5,60	3,750	959
	Total	4,97	3,680	14211
2008	NO	5,00	3,485	14475
	YES	5,53	3,565	1100
	Total	5,03	3,496	15575

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

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

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

ESS round	Belong to minority ethnic group in country	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
3	NO	5,46	3,701	13291
	YES	5,88	3,689	962
	Total	5,48	3,703	14253
4	NO	5,61	3,664	14447
	YES	6,17	3,481	1068
	Total	5,64	3,656	15515

	Dependent Variable: Country's cultural life undermined or enriched by immigrants					
ESS round	Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
3	Corrected Model	306,171(a)	1	306,171	22,361	,000
	Intercept	222511,343	1	222511,343	16250,883	,000
	minority belonging	306,171	1	306,171	22,361	,000
	Error	195128,420	14251	13,692		
	Total	1148784,016	14253			
	Corrected Total	195434,591	14252			
4	Corrected Model	600,750(b)	1	600,750	45,061	,000
	Intercept	264836,656	1	264836,656	19864,809	,000
	minority belonging	600,750	1	600,750	45,061	,000
	Error	206818,555	15513	13,332		
	Total	1269048,973	15515			
	Corrected Total	207419,305	15514			

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

ESS round	Belong to minority ethnic group in country	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
2006	NO	4,69	3,411	13319
	YES	5,30	3,520	942
	Total	4,73	3,425	14261
2008	NO	4,92	3,327	14476
	YES	5,68	3,390	1073
	Total	4,96	3,342	15549

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

ESS round	Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
2006	Corrected Model	626,579(a)	1	626,579	53,616	,000
	Intercept	170641,639	1	170641,639	14601,780	,000
	minority belonging	626,579	1	626,579	53,616	,000
	Error	166635,783	14259	11,686		
	Total	877476,779	14261			
	Corrected Total	167262,363	14260			
2008	Corrected Model	1122,137(b)	1	1122,137	101,139	,000
	Intercept	215789,155	1	215789,155	19449,311	,000
	minority belonging	1122,137	1	1122,137	101,139	,000
	Error	172493,204	15547	11,095		
	Total	998218,378	15549			
	Corrected Total	173615,340	15548			

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

ESS round	Belonging to particular religion or denomination-	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
2006	NO	4,92	3,966	6383
	YES	5,04	4,142	7543
	Total	4,99	4,063	13926
2008	NO	5,04	3,890	6756
	YES	5,24	3,940	8325
	Total	5,15	3,920	15081

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.
2006	Corrected Model	96,103(a)	1	96,103	5,823	,016
	Intercept	754174,176	1	754174,176	45699,640	,000
	religion	96,103	1	96,103	5,823	,016
	Error	229785,644	13924	16,503		
	Total	997576,652	13926			
	Corrected Total	229881,746	13925			
2008	Corrected Model	333,739(b)	1	333,739	21,744	,000
	Intercept	843912,849	1	843912,849	54982,355	,000
	religion	333,739	1	333,739	21,744	,000
	Error	231444,469	15079	15,349		
	Total	1091676,236	15081			
	Corrected Total	231778,208	15080			

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			
ESS round	Belonging to particular religion or denomination	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
3	NO	2,5693	1,32543	6610
	YES	2,6028	1,34236	7961
	Total	2,5882	1,33489	14571
4	NO	2,5083	1,33756	6994
	YES	2,5014	1,29141	8843
	Total	2,5044	1,31196	15837
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					
ESS round	Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
3	Corrected Model	8,936(a)	1	8,936	5,016	,025
	Intercept	212278,277	1	212278,277	119160,844	,000
	religion	8,936	1	8,936	5,016	,025
	Error	25953,846	14569	1,781		
	Total	242261,268	14571			
	Corrected Total	25962,783	14570			
4	Corrected Model	,403(a)	1	,403	,234	,629
	Intercept	208638,128	1	208638,128	121207,815	,000
	religion	,403	1	,403	,234	,629
	Error	27257,193	15835	1,721		
	Total	239435,685	15837			
	Corrected Total	27257,595	15836			
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

ESS round	Born in country-	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
2006	NO	5,37	4,319	1198
	YES	4,95	4,034	12779
	Total	4,99	4,062	13977
2008	NO	5,64	3,992	1312
	YES	5,11	3,911	13770
	Total	5,16	3,924	15082

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.
2006	Corrected Model	411,510(a)	1	411,510	24,978	,000
	Intercept	257019,287	1	257019,287	15600,422	,000
	birthplace	411,510	1	411,510	24,978	,000
	Error	230240,210	13975	16,475		
	Total	1001039,644	13977			
	Corrected Total	230651,720	13976			
2008	Corrected Model	736,127(b)	1	736,127	47,958	,000
	Intercept	301919,037	1	301919,037	19669,768	,000
	birthplace	736,127	1	736,127	47,958	,000
	Error	231468,874	15080	15,349		
	Total	1093774,871	15082			
	Corrected Total	232205,002	15081			

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

Descriptive Statistics(a)

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

ESS round	Citizen of country	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
3	NO	5,62	4,045	743
	YES	4,96	4,058	13231
	Total	4,99	4,063	13974
4	NO	5,86	3,688	804
	YES	5,12	3,927	14307
	Total	5,16	3,922	15111

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.
3	Corrected Model	620,035(a)	1	620,035	37,658	,000
	Intercept	155146,273	1	155146,273	9422,843	,000
	citizenship	620,035	1	620,035	37,658	,000
	Error	230047,745	13972	16,465		
	Total	1000736,593	13974			
	Corrected Total	230667,780	13973			
4	Corrected Model	842,780(b)	1	842,780	54,984	,000
	Intercept	184830,026	1	184830,026	12058,469	,000
	citizenship	842,780	1	842,780	54,984	,000
	Error	231588,010	15109	15,328		
	Total	1094806,240	15111			
	Corrected Total	232430,790	15110			

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

ESS round	Citizen of country-	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
3	NO	6,13	3,550	759
	YES	4,91	3,669	13581
	Total	4,97	3,682	14340
4	NO	5,95	3,311	837
	YES	4,99	3,486	14886
	Total	5,03	3,491	15723

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

ESS round	Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
3	Corrected Model	2107,118(a)	1	2107,118	157,092	,000
	Intercept	173748,887	1	173748,887	12953,542	,000
	citizenship	2107,118	1	2107,118	157,092	,000
	Error	192318,940	14338	13,413		
	Total	980368,405	14340			
	Corrected Total	194426,058	14339			
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

ESS round	Citizen of country-	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
3	NO	6,41	3,445	764
	YES	5,44	3,706	13612
	Total	5,49	3,705	14376
4	NO	6,49	3,238	833
	YES	5,60	3,661	14830
	Total	5,64	3,651	15663

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

ESS round	Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
3	Corrected Model	1333,335(a)	1	1333,335	97,771	,000
	Intercept	199590,249	1	199590,249	14635,589	,000
	citizenship	1333,335	1	1333,335	97,771	,000
	Error	196022,871	14374	13,637		
	Total	1159186,402	14376			
	Corrected Total	197356,205	14375			
4	Corrected Model	1280,051(b)	1	1280,051	96,624	,000
	Intercept	233601,074	1	233601,074	17633,197	,000
	citizenship	1280,051	1	1280,051	96,624	,000
	Error	207473,797	15661	13,248		
	Total	1276875,731	15663			
	Corrected Total	208753,848	15662			

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)

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

ESS round	Citizen of country-	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
3	NO	5,90	3,381	746
	YES	4,68	3,411	13643
	Total	4,73	3,431	14389
4	NO	6,10	3,172	825
	YES	4,91	3,324	14868
	Total	4,96	3,338	15693

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

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

ESS round	Citizen of country-	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
3	NO	2,2487	1,21601	790
	YES	2,5449	1,30363	13860
	Total	2,5309	1,30239	14650
4	NO	2,1819	1,19538	852
	YES	2,4404	1,28118	15084
	Total	2,4274	1,27935	15936

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects(c)

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

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

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

ESS round	Citizen of country-	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
3	NO	2,3278	1,28706	788
	YES	2,6018	1,33410	13830
	Total	2,5888	1,33438	14618
4	NO	2,2696	1,22656	855
	YES	2,5155	1,31450	15017
	Total	2,5031	1,31223	15872

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

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

ESS round	Belonging to particular religion or denomination-	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
3	NO	24,1946	4,90684	6514
	YES	24,6379	4,68130	7848
	Total	24,4448	4,79599	14362
4	NO	24,3401	4,84140	6959
	YES	24,7804	4,56095	8887
	Total	24,5895	4,69690	15846

Dependent Variable: Co-otherness

ESS round	Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
3	Corrected Model	1547,904(a)	1	1547,904	67,608	,000
	Intercept	18780817,360	1	18780817,360	820288,917	,000
	religion	1547,904	1	1547,904	67,608	,000
	Error	328777,497	14360	22,895		
	Total	19472690,494	14362			
	Corrected Total	330325,402	14361			
4	Corrected Model	1615,749(a)	1	1615,749	73,576	,000
	Intercept	20108575,317	1	20108575,317	915680,122	,000
	religion	1615,749	1	1615,749	73,576	,000
	Error	347938,390	15844	21,960		
	Total	20869642,860	15846			
	Corrected Total	349554,139	15845			
a R Squared = ,005 (Adjusted R Squared = ,005)						
b Weighted Least Squares Regression - Weighted by dweight*pweight						

Table 24: ANOVA of co-otherness depending on citizenship
Dependent Variable: Co-otherness

ESS round	Citizen of country-	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
3	NO	24,6325	4,33648	780
	YES	24,4329	4,81881	13634
	Total	24,4423	4,79423	14414
4	NO	24,7591	4,46965	851
	YES	24,5823	4,71222	15032
	Total	24,5911	4,69974	15883
Dependent Variable: Co-otherness				

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

ESS round	Born in country-	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
3	NO	24,7594	4,54615	1239
	YES	24,4123	4,81447	13178
	Total	24,4418	4,79402	14417
4	NO	24,7871	4,60182	1378
	YES	24,5735	4,70963	14473
	Total	24,5924	4,70105	15851

Dependent Variable: Co-otherness

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

	Component		
	1	2	3
Important to think new ideas and being creative	,455	-,175	,379
Important to be rich, have money and expensive things	,632	,147	-,280
Important to show abilities and be admired	,636	,240	-,067
Important to try new and different things in life	,608	-,119	,346
Important to have a good time	,654	-,119	,208
Important to be successful and that people recognise achievements	,693	,215	-,054
Important to seek adventures and have an exiting life	,682	-,242	,086
Important to get respect from others	,444	,250	-,033
Important to seek fun and things that give pleasure	,643	-,109	,215
Important to make own decisions and be free	,396	-,082	,407
Important to live in secure and safe surroundings	,062	,677	,106
Important to do what is told and follow rules	,017	,643	,048
Important to be humble and modest, not draw attention	-,215	,474	,305
Important that government is strong and ensures safety	,113	,624	,183
Important to behave properly	-,017	,701	,170
Important to follow traditions and customs	-,016	,523	,198
Important that people are treated equally and have equal opportunities	,001	,168	,539
Important to understand different people	,035	,146	,666
Important to help people and care for others well-being	,106	,229	,639
Important to be loyal to friends and devote to people close	,136	,213	,609
Important to care for nature and environment	-,016	,235	,556
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.			
a Rotation converged in 11 iterations.			

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4,529	21,569	21,569	4,529	21,569	21,569	3,713	17,679	17,679
2	3,070	14,621	36,189	3,070	14,621	36,189	2,876	13,697	31,376
3	1,777	8,463	44,653	1,777	8,463	44,653	2,788	13,276	44,653
4	,986	4,695	49,348						
20	,414	1,974	98,159						
21	,387	1,841	100,000						
Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.									