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Abstract
Attitudes towards immigrants are determined by both interests (immigrants are taking my job) and values (immigrants are taking my country). While these individual attributes (e.g., education, occupation, and national attachment) are a useful first step in predicting citizens’ anti-immigrant attitudes, it is also important to control for the national context. Domestic factors will alter how individual characteristics are translated into attitudes, and in the current analysis, we focus on two groups of contextual factors. The first is the immigrant population while the second focuses on the policy position of the political parties within a country. Using data from the Eurobarometer (fall 2003) to measure individual attributes and attitudes, Eurostat for immigrant populations and Benoit and Laver’s (2006) data set on party positions, we find, holding all individual-level variables constant, citizens residing in countries with larger immigrant populations and a national political discourse that is more negative with respect to immigration will express stronger anti-immigrant attitudes.

Prepared for presentation at the Annual Meetings of the American Political Science Association, Boston, Massachusetts, August 28, 2008.
Over the last decade immigration has become an increasingly salient and contentious issue across Europe. Citizens now list immigration as one of the most important issues facing their country and there is some evidence that attitudes toward immigrants have become more negative. At the same time right-wing political parties with strong anti-immigrant positions have broken through in every European country (Ignazi 2003; Golder 2003). As European governments move to harmonize immigration and asylum policies at the EU level, public opinion can act to either facilitate or hinder those efforts (Lahav 2004). For this reason it is important to understand the determinants of European public opinion regarding immigration.

What explains attitudes toward immigrants? Why do some individuals welcome immigrants into their society and recognize the economic and social contributions they offer, while others view immigrants as a threat to their jobs or culture and want to send them all back to their country of origin? Those who evaluate immigration in more objective terms are likely to focus on whether immigrants are going to take their jobs or whether immigrants will do the jobs that no one else wants. Alternatively, a more symbolic evaluation of immigration will perceive immigrants as either a cultural threat or a source of cultural enrichment. Whether one views immigration objectively or symbolically, those who judge it negatively see it as a threat of some kind, while those with a more positive assessment view it as a benefit.

Previous research has developed this distinction by categorizing the sources of anti-immigrant attitudes as either material/economic interest or national/cultural identity (e.g., Citrin et al., 1997, Side and Citrin 2007, O’Rourke and Sinnott 2006). The objective claims noted above would fall under interest-based explanations while the symbolic claims would be categorized as identity-based explanations. While this research is no doubt on the right track – interest and identity are important clusters in explaining anti-immigrant attitudes – there is more to it. While citizens’ attitudes could be quite well predicted from a model that only contained individual-level indicators – interests and values – a more complete understanding will emerge if we control for the environment in which that individual is located (McLaren 2002). In the current paper, we argue that we need to control for two key domestic factors that mediate how individual interests and values are transformed into anti-immigrant attitudes. The size of the existing immigrant population and the positions the national political parties take with respect to immigration policy are important national factors that influence anti-immigrant attitudes.

In the next section, a brief review of the extant literature about anti-immigrant attitudes is presented. This section is followed by a theoretical account of national contextual factors on attitudes toward immigrants. The discussion of the data and the model is followed by the results and conclusion. The results of the ordered logit show that holding interest and identity-based factors constant, citizens residing in countries with larger immigrant populations and a national political discourse that is more negative with respect to immigration will express stronger anti-immigrant attitudes.

Interests, Identity and the National Context

---

1 Since 2003 the Eurobarometer has asked respondents to rank the two most important issues facing their country at that moment. From 2003 to 2007, the proportion of respondents listing immigration has risen by one-third. In a report to the European Monitoring Center on Racism and Xenophobia, Coender, et al. (2003) compare immigration-related responses from three Eurobarometer surveys (1997, 2000, 2003). While there is clear evidence that anti-immigrant attitudes rose between 1997 and 2000, the evidence that it continued to rise from 2000 to 2003 is mixed.
Scholars of public opinion have developed two explanations to account for the individual level anti-immigrant sentiments: economic interest and identity/values (see Sides and Citrin, 2007, Hainmueller and Hiscox, 2007; Lahav, 2004 for good reviews). Both are based on the perceived threat that immigrants present, but the first is a material threat – *immigrants are taking my job* – while the second is a symbolic threat – *immigrants are taking my country*.

**Material Interest-based Explanations: *immigrants are taking my job!***

If an individual’s anti-immigrant attitudes are based on a material interest argument then the threat that immigrants pose must be based on a perceived injury to either one’s own well-being (Kinder, Adams and Gronke, 1989) or the country’s welfare (Sears and Citrin, 1982). A recent stream of the research literature concludes that much of the anti-immigrant sentiment is related to the fear of negative effects of labor market competition, particularly, among the low-skilled and manual workers (Scheve and Slaughter, 2001; Borjas, 1999). The main argument of these studies is that native low-skilled workers will loose out in the labor market in competition with the low-skilled immigrants (Borjas, 1999). It is also argued that the distributional effect of the flow of the low-skill immigrant workers may have a dampening effect on the wage levels. Whether this is the actual case in real economic terms is subject of controversy among scholars (Friedberg and Hunt, 1995; Bhagvati, 2002), the literature has established that unskilled, or manual workers may feel threatened by the immigrants and that they have the perceptions of immigrants taking the jobs that would otherwise be going to natives (Gang et al. 2002: Citrin et al, 1997, Sides and Citrin, 2007). These studies focus on the perception of threat rather than the actual economic conditions as an important determinant of anti-immigrant sentiment (see Sides and Citrin, 2007). The main evidence concerning the relationship of skill status and attitudes about immigrants is built on an educational impact with the implicit assumption that less education overlaps with low-skill (Borjas, 1999). This economic line of reasoning has recently been challenged by some scholars who argue that education may help generate greater tolerance and more cosmopolitan outlook leading to positive attitudes toward immigrants (McLaren, 2001; Citrin et al, 1997; Hainmueller and Hiscox 2007). Alternatively, pro-immigrant attitudes can also be driven by material interest. Those who are well educated or have white-collar or “high skill” jobs will be supportive of immigration for the economic benefits that these new, relatively unskilled workers will bring to their country.

**Identity-based Explanations: *immigrants are taking my country!***

Identity-based explanations emphasize the role of values and long-standing national attachments in construction of attitudes. Especially prominent, in this vein, is the symbolic politics theory which gives more weight to abstract values such as ideology, beliefs, national sentiments, and racial bias over material concerns (Sears, 1996). Among these symbolic tendencies, feelings of national identity may be more easily connected to anti-immigrant attitudes, because these feelings may be cognitively mapped to such constructs as “in-group favoritism” and “out-group bias” (Tajfel, 1982) to feed anti-racial or anti-immigrant sentiments. On this account, anti-immigrant sentiments are largely derived from the idea of a symbolic threat. Hence, anti-immigrant attitudes should be greatest among those individuals who have a strong attachment to and take pride in their nationality (Sides and Citrin, 2007). These are individuals who fear losing the cultural identity into which they were born. One’s political orientation may also be relevant here where it is usually assumed that those who identify with left parties or place themselves on the left side of the political spectrum will be more supportive of pro-immigration policies than those on the right. (Brug, Fennema and Tillie 2000, Hainmueller and Hiscox, 2007)

**The National Context:**
Individual attributes are central to explaining individual attitudes. However, the domestic context can also influence these attitudes. Both Lahav (2004) in her nation-level analysis of public opinion toward immigration and Sides and Citrin’s (2007) and McLaren’s (2002) individual-level studies argue that the size of the immigrant population should be positively related to anti-immigrant attitudes. Lahav finds empirical support for her hypothesis, but Sides and Citrin find no evidence that the size of the immigrant population leads to more negative attitudes toward immigrants. Crepaz and Damron (2009), on the other hand, do not find a statistically significant and robust relationship between percentage of foreign-born population and anti-immigrant attitudes. McLaren, however, finds that the number of immigrants has a strong impact on threat perception.

In the broader field of European public opinion, it has recently been argued that individuals’ opinions of EU policies and institutions are not only determined by one’s own material interest or cultural/political identity, but they are also cued by the political party to which the individual belongs (Hooghe and Marks 2005; Rohrschneider 2002; Steenberg et al. 2007). If the individual belongs to a political party with strong anti-immigrant positions, s/he will be more likely, holding all else equal, to express anti-immigrant attitudes. Ideally, in the Eurobarometer data we are using we would have information on the party preferences of each respondent. Unfortunately, we do not have that, but even without this direct link we argue that the general tenor of political discourse within a country will impact individual attitudes. If the political parties within a country take, on average, a more anti-immigration position, then the individuals within that country are more likely, all else equal, to express more anti-immigrant attitudes. In other words, we propose a contextual effect associated with the mood of the parties’ ideological competition on individual attitudes toward immigrants.

There is good reason to believe that the general discourse of party ideologies may be relevant in the larger party system. Questioning the idea of a disconnect between liberal immigration policies and public opinion, Lahav (2004: 1154) argues that public may exert an influence by leading to more restrictive policies throughout the Europe. (Lahav, 2004:1176). Second, there should be a connection between the public and the policy makers either from bottom to top (Carruba, 2001), or from top to down (Hooghe and Marks, 2005) or in both directions (Steenbergen et al., 2007). Regardless of in what direction the connection goes, the general tenor of party discourse may work as a constraint on the formation of public opinion. As sides and Citrin succinctly put (2007: 477):

“The recent successes of extreme right-wing parties make it clear that the mobilization of public opinion can batter an elite consensus characterized by greater tolerance of immigrants. Moreover, the mere presence of anti-immigrant parties can push mainstream parties towards a tougher line on immigration for fear of being outflanked.”

In well-established Western European party systems, one can argue that parties will change their positions to capture the votes of the largest possible electorate (Downs, 1957) and this will take place in a dynamic electoral market where parties are likely to shift their ideological positions to adjust to the changing preferences of the electorate (Mair, Muller, Plasser, 2004; Mair, 1998). Since the extreme right parties made significant gains within the last two decades, one can argue that this may lead some other parties shift their positions about immigration to capture the votes of anti-immigrant portion of the electorate. The success of extreme right parties in countries like Austria, France, the Netherlands, and Belgium may produce a side-effect on the overall tenor of the immigration discourse in the electoral market. The overall tone of the anti-immigrant ideology in a nation, on the other hand, may serve as a contextual factor shaping attitudes toward immigrants. We expect that individuals living in countries with stronger
anti-immigrant party discourse will, on average, have stronger anti-immigrant sentiments holding other factors constant.

**Data and Model**
All of the individual level data used in our empirical tests are from the Eurobarometer 60.1 conducted in Fall 2003. This survey includes questions about immigration in addition to the standard trends. There are two items in the survey which most directly access an individual’s attitudes toward immigrants and are used in this study as our dependent variables. Respondents are asked how they feel about the following statement:

*Immigrants contribute a lot to (OUR COUNTRY)*

The possible responses are:
- totally disagree (1)
- tend to disagree (2)
- tend to agree (3)
- totally agree (4)
- don’t know (DK)

In this item interviewees are prompted with a positive statement about immigrants and so must “disagree” to express anti-immigrant attitudes. Alternatively, the second item is a negative statement about immigrants. Specifically, respondents are asked to respond to the following:

*Immigrants are a threat to our way of life*

The possible responses are the same as above, but this time the respondent must agree with the statement to express anti-immigrant attitudes.

To illustrate cross-national differences, the data are collapsed to agree versus disagree, aggregated to the national level and presented in Figures 1 and 2. While one could not expect that the ordering of countries from pro to anti-immigrant would be identical across the two items, there is a rough correspondence. Sweden, Finland, Spain, Portugal and Luxembourg are in or near the bottom third (the more pro-immigrant group) for both indicators. In or near the top third (the more anti-immigrant group) for both indicators we find Austria, Greece, Belgium, the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

To show that there is a strong relationship between responses to these two questions, the national averages are plotted against each other in Figure 3. Since stating that immigrants are a threat is a much more negative expression than that they simply do not contribute, it is not surprising to find 13 of the 15 countries above the 45-degree line. For example in Germany, 59% say that immigrants do not contribute, but only 39% feel that immigrants are a threat. The only surprise is that in Greece and Portugal, more respondents are willing to say that immigrants are a threat than to say that they do not contribute.

Our independent variables can be divided between those measuring interest and identity. For measuring attachment to national identity we use an item asking respondents how proud they feel about being a part of their nation. The survey responses for the EU15 reveals the following pattern:

- not at all proud: 2%
- not very proud: 8%
- fairly proud: 42%
- very proud: 48%

To measure symbolic threat we created a dummy variable asking the respondents to state whether the EU means a loss of cultural identity. Overall, 14% of the respondents stated that the EU represents a loss of cultural identity whereas 86% did not agree with this statement.
We also use an item to measure political ideology. The Eurobarometer uses a 10-point left(1)-right(10) self-placement scale to measure ideology. For our purposes, we create four dichotomous variables extreme left (values 1, 2), left (3, 4), right (7,8) and extreme right (9,10) and kept center (5,6) as the reference category. Using these breakpoints, 6% of the EU15 respondents are extreme left, 19% are left, 54% are center, 16% are right and 5% are extreme right.

The “national pride,” “loss of cultural identity”, “right” and “extreme right” variables should be positively related to anti-immigrant attitudes, while the “left” and “extreme left” variables should be negatively related.

Our material interest variables are education and occupation. The education variable asks the respondent’s age at which schooling was stopped. Those with higher levels of education will on average be earning more and will be less worried about immigrants taking their job provided that most immigrants are unskilled workers. In addition, the well-educated should be more likely to accept the economic argument that immigrants can have a positive impact on societies suffering from low birth rates. Therefore, education should be negatively related to anti-immigrant attitudes.

The Eurobarometer asks respondents to categorize their occupation from a list of 18 choices. In terms of a second measure of material interests we create dummy variables equal to one if the respondent is (a) unemployed, (b) a manual worker or (c) a student. In this case, all other occupations serve as the reference category.

Sides and Citrin (2007) also use income and occupation to proxy for material interests. Their three employment categories are: unemployed, student and retired. They have a direct measure of income from the 2002-03 European Social Survey. Since the income question included in Eurobarometer contains a large proportion of missing values we use “manual worker” as an indicator of those at the lower end of the income scale. Education can also proxy for income. We expect that unemployed and manual workers will have stronger anti-immigrant attitudes, because they are more likely to see the immigrants as competitors in the job market.

Finally, we employ four individual-level control variables that have been commonly used in previous studies of European public opinion. A dummy variable for gender (female=1) and a continuous measure of age are included. We also include a measure of political awareness asking the respondents how frequently they discuss politics when they meet with their friends and relatives. Of more than 15,000 respondents in the sample, 29% indicate they never discuss politics, 57% state they occasionally do so, and another 14% state that they are frequently involved in political discussions. Finally, respondents are asked to evaluate the level of satisfaction with their lives. Along a four-point scale, about 4% of the respondents reported that they were not at all satisfied, 15% said they were not very satisfied while 57% stated that they were fairly satisfied and another 24% were very satisfied with their lives.

At the nation level, the size of the non-EU immigrant population and the mean party position on immigration policy are used to capture the national context. The size of the immigrant population from non-EU15 countries is obtained from Eurostat for the year 2002. Data for three countries
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2 Sides and Citrin (2007:490) have income as an indicator of “economic interests,” but education under “other controls” in their study.
were not available from Eurostat. The sizes of the non-EU15 immigrant population for France (1999), Greece (2001), and Ireland (2002) were calculated from data provided by the Migration Policy Institute. Figure 4 shows the percentage of non-EU15 immigrants in each of the EU15 members. Austria has the largest percentage of non-EU15 immigrant population (7.9%) followed by Germany and Greece where more than 6% of the immigrants arrive from non-EU 15 countries. In Finland and Portugal the percentage of non-EU immigrants is below 2%.

We also calculate the average policy positions of parties in a nation to capture the tenor of the party competition as it relates to immigration policy. To measure the position of each political party on the issue of immigration, we used Benoit and Laver’s (2006) expert survey on party positions conducted in 2003-04. This survey includes expert judgments of each party’s ideological position on various issues for 47 countries. Experts are asked to rank the parties in their country on a 20-point scale. The following item is used to measure the party positions for immigration policy:

- favors policies designed to help asylum-seekers and immigrants integrate into society (1)
- favors policies designed to help asylum-seekers and immigrants return to their country of origin (20)

Since each party’s issue positions are judged by more than one expert, we first calculated the mean party positions from the experts’ individual scores. Parties placed at higher levels on this scale are considered to be anti-immigrant and those at lower levels are pro-immigrant. In Appendix B, the immigration policy scores for each party are presented.

To obtain a national measure of the immigration position within a party system, we weighted the mean party immigration scores by the vote share of each party in the closest election which is reported in Laver and Benoit (2004). In the final step, we calculated the country mean for immigration policy by summing across the vote-weighted immigration positions of all parties.

This score is a measure of the mean ideological position of all parties in a given party system with respect to immigration policy. Figure 5 reports the average position of the political parties on immigration for the fifteen countries in the analysis. When the mean party ideological score for immigration policy in EU15 is considered (10.05), party competition appears to have a more pro-immigration tone in Sweden, France, UK, Finland, Italy, Portugal, Belgium, and Germany. Conversely, party ideological competition is characterized by higher anti-immigration positions in Spain, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Greece, Ireland, Austria and Denmark.

Results
Since our dependent variables are composed of ordinal scales, we rely on ordered logit for our estimation. The Eurobarometer samples approximately 1,000 respondents from each country (but only ~500 from Luxembourg). Survey weights are used in all models. “Don’t Know” responses account for approximately 9% of the total and these are treated in two ways. For the main analyses they are dropped from the sample. However, as a robustness check we re-do the analyses inserting the don’t know responses as the middle category in our ordinal scales of “immigrants contribute” and “immigrants threaten.” These results are presented in Appendix A and are fully consistent with the results which drop the don’t know responses.

In discussing the estimation results, reported in Table 1, the first point to note is that the two dependent variables, “immigrants contribute” and “immigrants threaten” measure attitudes toward immigrants in the opposite directions. For “immigrants contribute” higher values mean
more “pro” immigrant attitudes, but the opposite is true for the “immigrants threaten” variable. This means that when reading the results the signs are expected to change across these two equations. Our result show that every parameter that is significant in one equation is significant, but with the opposite sign, in the other equation – just as expected. To simplify the presentation, we will only focus on “immigrants threaten” equation since the ordering of this variable has higher values indicating more anti-immigrant attitudes.

Turning first to the individual level variables, we find support for both the “interest” and “identity” explanations. Having more years of education or being a student is negatively related to anti-immigrant attitudes. Also, as predicted, being a manual laborer increases the likelihood of holding anti-immigrant values. However, being unemployed is insignificant. Sides and Citrin (2007) do not include a “manual worker” variable, but do include education, student, and unemployed. Even though we are using different data sets (Eurobarometer for us; the European Social Survey for them) and different dependent variables, our results for these three “interest” variables are consistent with their findings.

All of our “identity” variables are significant and in the expected direction. Fear of losing one’s cultural identity and pride in one’s nationality are both positively and significantly related to holding anti-immigrant attitudes. In terms of our measures of ideology, individuals classified as “left” or “extreme left” will express more positive opinions about immigrants than those in the “center” (the reference category). Alternatively, among those on the “right” or “extreme right” there will be higher levels of anti-immigrant attitudes. Interestingly, the values of the parameters are quite symmetrical. The parameter value for left is -0.36 while the parameter value for right is +0.39. The extreme left and extreme right comparison is -0.53 and +0.74. This indicates that the extreme right’s attitudes toward immigrants is farther from the center than the views of the extreme left, and that seems to be consistent with popular perception.

Finally, examining the national context, both variables are statistically significant and in the expected direction. Holding all else equal, individuals in countries whose political parties hold on average more anti-immigrant positions are more likely to agree with the statement that immigrants are a threat. This is consistent with the view that the political discourse in a country cues the attitudes of its citizens. Given our data we can not associate specific citizens with their respective parties. That is the type of cueing that is generally discussed in the literature. However, even without information about that direct link between citizens and their political parties, our results indicate that the overall tenor of the political debate on the issue of immigration can influence the opinions of population. Second, individuals in countries that have a higher proportion of non-EU15 immigrants will be more likely to express anti-immigrant attitudes. This is consistent with the nation-level results from Lahav (2004). However, Sides and Citrin (2007), whose analysis is most comparable to our own, find that the level of immigration has no significant impact on anti-immigrant attitudes.

We also calculated the predicted probabilities to demonstrate the substantive effects of national context and national identity on anti-immigrant attitudes. In Figure 6, we plot the predicted probabilities for two outcomes, “Totally Disagree” and “Totally Agree”, to show the effects of the size of immigrant population and average party positions on pro-immigrant attitudes (immigrants contribute). In this chart, national pride is fixed at its highest value (4) to capture the strong feelings of national identity and all other variables are kept at their means. In Figure 6, the x-axis include countries ordered from the lowest to highest scores for the size of immigrant population and from pro-immigrant to anti-immigrant party positions. Panel a shows that as the percentage of immigrant population increases, an individual with strong national feelings becomes less likely to have pro and more likely to have anti-immigrant attitudes. The difference between
Finland (with only 1.6% immigrants) and Austria is very visible for “totally disagree” (an increase of .3). While the impact of the size of immigrant population is less pronounced for those who agree that immigrants contribute to their country, it is still a negative trend indicating that an individual with nationalistic feelings becomes less likely to believe that immigrants contribute to his/her country. Panel b provides a similar picture for the effect of the party competition on immigration policy. When national average of party ideological positions move from pro-immigration to anti-immigration, an individual with strong national attachments becomes more anti-immigrant (is more likely to disagree that immigrants contribute to his/her country). At the same time, the predicted probabilities move downward for anti-immigrant attitudes.

A slightly different picture emerges for our second dependent variable asking the respondents to evaluate whether the immigrants are a threat or not. In Figure 7a-b, the lines for totally disagree (pro-immigrant attitude) and totally agree (anti-immigrant attitude) intersect at a higher percentage of immigrant population and closer to the national anti-immigrant ideological positions. It looks like a threshold for the size of immigrant population (in this case 3.9% for Denmark) and the party positions (in this case 10.19 for Spain) is required before these contextual variables make a difference in attitudes toward immigrants for a person with strong national feelings. This may be due to the negative wording in this particular question. However, regardless of the question, the size of immigrant population and the tenor of party competition for immigration policy significantly affect attitudes for immigrants. In Figure 6 and 7, we presented the probabilities of having pro and anti-immigrant attitudes at varying levels of immigrant population and average party positions for an individual with strong national attachments. For both dependent variables, an individual with strong national attachments become more anti-immigrant as the size of immigrant population or anti-immigrant party discourse increases. To conclude, indicators of an individual’s material interest and national/political identity have the predicted effect on anti-immigrant attitudes. However, even controlling for these individual-level determinants, the national context has an important impact on individual attitudes toward immigrants.

It is not just about who you are; it is also about where you live.

Conclusion
Immigration is now one of the most salient issues in the EU and in member states. The terrorist acts and the rise of anti-immigrant extreme-right parties are more visible aspects of the “immigration problem”. Another noticeable trend related to this issue is the rise of anti-immigrant attitudes throughout Europe. In this paper, we attempted to explain the individual and national determinants of attitudes toward immigrants. Our analysis showed that in addition to the material interests and identity at the individual level, national context has a significant impact on attitudes toward immigrants. The size of immigrant population, in this case from non-EU 15, is positively related to anti-immigrant attitudes as is the tenor of ideological competition on immigration policy. For the latter, if the party competition on immigration policy is formed at a point closer to anti-immigrant preferences, this provides a national cue informing attitudes toward a more anti-immigrant position. The overall party competition on policy issues and the resulting discourse has an impact on individual attitudes. Our analysis also show that individuals with strong national attachments are more likely to have anti-immigrant attitudes and they are more likely to see immigrants as a threat if they live in a country with a large immigrant population and an anti-immigrant policy discourse among political parties.
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Figure 1

"Immigrants are a threat to our way of life"

Percentage which agrees with this statement

Figure 2

"Immigrants contribute a lot to our country"

Percentage which disagrees with this statement
Figure 3: Two Indicators of Anti-Immigrant Values
Source: Eurobarometer 60.1 (2003)
Figure 4

**How large is the immigrant population?**

Percent of the Total Population from non-EU15 countries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>FIN</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>IRL</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>EU15</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5

**Average Position of the Political Parties on the Issue of Immigration**

Party scores range from 0 (pro-immigration) to 20 (anti-immigration)
Each party's score is weighted by the vote share of each party to calculate a national average

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>UK</th>
<th>FI</th>
<th>I</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>L</th>
<th>NL</th>
<th>GR</th>
<th>IRL</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>DK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Score</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 6: Predicted Probabilities: Effect of national Context on pro-immigrant attitudes for an individual with strong national identity (Immigrants Contribute)

Panel a: Size of Immigrant Population

Panel b: Party Ideological Positions
Figure 7: Predicted Probabilities: Effect of national Context on pro-immigrant attitudes for an individual with strong national identity (Immigrants Threat)

Panel a: Size of Immigrant Population

Panel b: Party Ideological Positions
Table 1: The Determinants of Anti-Immigrant Attitudes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>“Immigrants contribute a lot to our country” (1,4)</th>
<th>“Immigrants threaten our way of life” (1,4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>National Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parties’ anti-immigration score</td>
<td>-0.184*** (0.016)</td>
<td>0.109*** (0.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% nonEU15 immigrants</td>
<td>-0.245*** (0.024)</td>
<td>0.131*** (0.024)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Material Interests</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of education</td>
<td>0.048*** (0.006)</td>
<td>-0.053*** (0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed (0,1)</td>
<td>-0.066 (0.098)</td>
<td>0.111 (0.096)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Worker (0,1)</td>
<td>-0.301*** (0.110)</td>
<td>0.227** (0.117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (0,1)</td>
<td>1.250*** (0.139)</td>
<td>-1.415*** (0.138)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Identity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of cultural identity (0,1)</td>
<td>-0.585*** (0.066)</td>
<td>0.493*** (0.068)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud of Nationality (1,4)</td>
<td>-0.107*** (0.034)</td>
<td>0.128*** (0.033)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left (0,1)</td>
<td>0.343*** (0.058)</td>
<td>-0.361*** (0.059)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right (0,1)</td>
<td>-0.330*** (0.061)</td>
<td>0.385*** (0.063)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtremeLeft (0,1)</td>
<td>0.468*** (0.092)</td>
<td>-0.534*** (0.096)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtremeRight (0,1)</td>
<td>-0.610*** (0.123)</td>
<td>0.741*** (0.117)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Controls</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (female=1)</td>
<td>-0.081 (0.045)</td>
<td>-0.043 (0.044)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.001 (0.001)</td>
<td>0.003 (0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss politics (1,3)</td>
<td>0.338*** (0.039)</td>
<td>-0.247*** (0.039)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction (1,4)</td>
<td>0.180*** (0.035)</td>
<td>-0.214*** (0.035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observations</td>
<td>13638</td>
<td>13764</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Robust standard errors in parentheses
Country-level fixed effects included in the estimation.

* significant at 10%;
** significant at 5%;
*** significant at 1%
Appendix A: The Determinants of Anti-Immigrant Attitudes: A Robustness Check

“Don’t Knows” have been coded as the middle category

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“National Context”</th>
<th>“Immigrants contribute a lot to our country”, with don’t knows (1,5)</th>
<th>“Immigrants threaten our way of life”, with don’t knows (1,5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parties’ anti-immigration score</td>
<td>-0.185*** (0.016)</td>
<td>0.113*** (0.017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% nonEU15 immigrants</td>
<td>-0.232*** (0.023)</td>
<td>0.127*** (0.023)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Material Interests”</th>
<th>“Immigrants contribute a lot to our country”, with don’t knows (1,5)</th>
<th>“Immigrants threaten our way of life”, with don’t knows (1,5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of education</td>
<td>0.046*** (0.005)</td>
<td>-0.053*** (0.005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed (0,1)</td>
<td>-0.061 (0.091)</td>
<td>0.122 (0.089)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manual Worker (0,1)</td>
<td>-0.318*** (0.102)</td>
<td>0.216** (0.109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student (0,1)</td>
<td>1.208*** (0.132)</td>
<td>-1.385*** (0.132)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>“Identity”</th>
<th>“Immigrants contribute a lot to our country”, with don’t knows (1,5)</th>
<th>“Immigrants threaten our way of life”, with don’t knows (1,5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss of cultural identity (0,1)</td>
<td>-0.617*** (0.064)</td>
<td>0.510*** (0.066)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud of Nationality (1,4)</td>
<td>-0.104*** (0.031)</td>
<td>0.118*** (0.031)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Left (0,1)</td>
<td>0.314*** (0.054)</td>
<td>-0.344*** (0.055)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right (0,1)</td>
<td>-0.358*** (0.059)</td>
<td>0.383*** (0.061)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtremeLeft (0,1)</td>
<td>0.449*** (0.090)</td>
<td>-0.547*** (0.093)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ExtremeRight (0,1)</td>
<td>-0.608*** (0.117)</td>
<td>0.731*** (0.114)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controls</th>
<th>“Immigrants contribute a lot to our country”, with don’t knows (1,5)</th>
<th>“Immigrants threaten our way of life”, with don’t knows (1,5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender (female=1)</td>
<td>-0.064 (0.042)</td>
<td>-0.031 (0.042)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.001 (0.001)</td>
<td>0.002 (0.001)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss politics (1,3)</td>
<td>0.312*** (0.036)</td>
<td>-0.239*** (0.036)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Life satisfaction (1,4)</td>
<td>0.162*** (0.033)</td>
<td>-0.198*** (0.032)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Observations 15021 15021

Robust standard errors in parentheses
Country-level fixed effects included in the estimation.

* significant at 10%;
** significant at 5%;
*** significant at 1%
Appendix B: Party Positions on Immigration Policy within the EU15
Range: 1(pro) to 20(anti)
Source: Benoit and Laver 2006

Austria

FPO Freedom Party of Austria
Gru The Greens
OVP Austrian People's Party
SPO Austrian Social Democratic Party

Belgium

CD&V Christian Democratic & Flemish
CDH Humanist Democratic Centre
Eco Ecolo
FN National Front
Gro! Groen!
MR Reformist Movement
N-VA New Flemish Alliance
PS Socialist Party
SPSp SP.A-Spirit
VB Flemish Block
VLD Flemish Liberals and Democrats
CD  Centrumdemokraterne
DF  Dansk Folkeparti
Enh  Enhedslisten
FrP  Fremskridtspartiet
KF  Konservative Folkeparti
KrF  Kristelig Folkeparti
RV  Radikale Venstre
SD  Socialdemokratiet i Danmark
SF  Socialistisk Folkeparti
V  Venstre, Danmarks liberale parti

PS  Suomen Kristillisdemokraatit
KESK  Suomen Keskusta
KOK  Kansallinen Kokoomus
KD  Perussuomalaiset
SDP  Suomen Sosialidemokraattinen Puolue
SFP  Svenska Folkepartiet i Finland
VAS  Vasemmistoliitto
VIHR  Vihreää Liitto
France

- **FN**: Front National
- **MPF**: Mouvement pour la France
- **PCF**: Parti Communiste Francais
- **PS**: Parti Socialiste
- **RPF**: Rassemblement pour la France
- **RPR**: Rassemblement pour la Republique
- **UDF**: Union pour la Democratie Francaise
- **V**: Les Verts

Germany

- **CDU/CSU**: Christian Democratic Union/Christian Social Union
- **DKP**: German Communist Party
- **DVU**: German People's Union
- **FDP**: Free Democratic Party
- **GRÜ**: Green Party
- **NPD**: National Democratic Party
- **PDS**: Party of Democratic Socialism
- **Rep**: Republicans
- **SPD**: Social Democratic Party of Germany
- **Schil**: Partei Rechtsstaatlicher Offensive
KKE Kommunistiko Koma Ellados
ND Nea Dimokratia
PASOK Panellinio Sosialistiko Kinima
SYN Synaspismos

FF Fianna Fail
FG Fine Gael
GR Greens
LB Labour
PD Progressive Democrats
SF Sinn Fein
AN  Alleanza Nazionale
DS  Democratici di Sinistra
FI  Forza Italia
Green  Federazione dei Verdi
It.Val.  Lista di Pietro Italia dei Valori
LN  Lega Nord
MSFT  Movimento Sociale Fiamma Tricolore
Marg  La Margherita
PDCI  Partito dei Comunisti Italiani
Pann  Lista Pannella Bonino
RC  Rifondazione Comunista
SDI  Socialisti Democratici Italiani
UDC  Unione di Centro

ADR  Action Comity for Democracy and Pensions Justice
CSV  Christian Social People's Party
DL  The Left
DP  Democratic Party
G  The Green
LSAP  Luxembourg Socialist Workers' Party
CDA  Christen Democratisch Appèl
CU  ChristenUnie
D66  Democraten 66
GL  Groen Links
LPF  Lijst Pim Fortuyn
PvdA  Partij van de Arbeid
SGP  Staatskundig Gereformeerde Partij
SP  Socialistische Partij
VVD  Volkspartij voor Vrijheid en Democratie

BE  Left Block
CDS/PP  People’s Party
PCP  Portuguese Communist Party
PEV  Ecology Party- Greens
PS  Socialist Party
PSD  Social Democratic Party
CiU  Convergència i Unió de Catalunya
IU  Izquierda Unida
PNV  Partido Nacionalista Vasco
PP  Partido Popular
PSOE  Partido Socialista Obrero Español

M  Centerpartiet
C  Folkpartiet Liberalerna
KD  Kristdemokraterna
M  Moderata Samlingspartiet
MP  Miljöpartiet de Gröna
SAP  Socialdemokratiska Arbetarepartiet
V  Vänsterpartiet
United Kingdom

Con  Conservative Party
LD   Liberal Democrats
Lab  Labour Party
PCy  Plaid Cymru
SNP  Scottish National Party