

Stöhr, Tobias; Wichardt, Philipp C.

Conference Paper

Openness to Concerns of Host Country Population Improves Attitudes Towards Immigrants

Beiträge zur Jahrestagung des Vereins für Socialpolitik 2016: Demographischer Wandel - Session: Migration and Political Economy, No. E22-V2

Provided in Cooperation with:

Verein für Socialpolitik / German Economic Association

Suggested Citation: Stöhr, Tobias; Wichardt, Philipp C. (2016) : Openness to Concerns of Host Country Population Improves Attitudes Towards Immigrants, Beiträge zur Jahrestagung des Vereins für Socialpolitik 2016: Demographischer Wandel - Session: Migration and Political Economy, No. E22-V2, ZBW - Deutsche Zentralbibliothek für Wirtschaftswissenschaften, Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft, Kiel und Hamburg

This Version is available at:

<https://hdl.handle.net/10419/145574>

Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Die Dokumente auf EconStor dürfen zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden.

Sie dürfen die Dokumente nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, öffentlich zugänglich machen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen.

Sofern die Verfasser die Dokumente unter Open-Content-Lizenzen (insbesondere CC-Lizenzen) zur Verfügung gestellt haben sollten, gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der dort genannten Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

Terms of use:

Documents in EconStor may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes.

You are not to copy documents for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the documents publicly, to make them publicly available on the internet, or to distribute or otherwise use the documents in public.

If the documents have been made available under an Open Content Licence (especially Creative Commons Licences), you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the indicated licence.

Openness to Concerns of Host Country Population Improves Attitudes Towards Immigrants*

Preliminary draft - comments welcome.

Abstract This paper reports results from a randomized questionnaire study among German citizens regarding their attitudes towards Syrian refugees. Being shown a picture of an alleged Syrian refugee the description of whom was varied, respondents were asked to indicate their attitude towards that person in various domains on a 6-point Lickert-scale. Among other things, the data show that people who are more risk averse are also less sympathetic, empathic, trusting. However, once the refugee is described as being open towards concerns in the German population – regarding cultural change, arising costs and increasing violence – reported levels of liking and trust increase substantially, especially for risk averse people. Moreover, we find that having close non-German friends or relatives increases the willingness to interact with immigrants. Thus, the data emphasise two aspects: (1) the importance of being open for the concerns of the local population for them to be open minded, i.e. sympathetic and trusting, and (2) the relevance of personal experience for the willingness to interact. Finally, we find that overall women are more empathic but less trusting and more hesitant regarding actual interaction.

Keywords: Migration, Immigration, Integration

JEL codes: F22, Z10, Z12

1 Introduction

Currently, the social and economic integration of the many refugees from Syria is one of the great challenges for the European Union. However, while debates on a political level are heated,¹ integration is not a “top-down” decision. Eventually, to achieve integration a lot depends on the willingness of the local population of the host country to interact with and trust the new citizens. Otherwise, minorities may have incentives to remain within relatively homogenous cultural groups, hindering the full integration not only in the short run but even of later generations (e.g. Bisin and Verdier, 2001; Bisin et al., 2011). Such challenges are not only constrained to culturally heterogeneous immigrants. Evidence from the World War II shows that integration is not always easy (e.g. Bauer et al., 2013; Braun and Weber, 2015), even if the new neighbours are of the same nationality.

But what is it that determines whether people interact with and trust immigrants? Previous research on school teacher emphasises the importance of empathy – the ability to feel with others in a non-judgemental way (e.g. Noddings, 1984) – in dealing with culturally diverse student groups (e.g. Goodman, 2000; McAllister and Irvine, 2002). Moreover, research from social psychology has shown that attitudes towards immigrants are related to standard categories as the Big Five personality traits (e.g. Gallego and Pardos-Prado, 2014; Freitag and Rapp, 2015; Dinesen et al., 2016), or personal values (e.g. Sapienca et al., 2010; Vecchione et al., 2012).

Inspired by these finding, we set out to investigate how attitudes towards immigrants – especially general liking, empathy and trust – as well as and the willingness to actually interact vary with the presentation of the situation. In particular, we were interested in how individual reactions towards an allegedly Syrian refugee depend on the person being himself described as showing empathy with the host population,² the hypothesis being that an empathic statement increases openness. Moreover, as previous research from France (Adida et al., 2010 and 2016) showed that a muslim background is associated with lower integration, we also varied religion (and name) of the refugee between Muslim and Christian. Finally, as a weak proxy for personality traits, we controlled for risk aversion – using a question from the German Socio-Economic Panel (GSOEP) which was shown to correlate

¹For example, end of January 2016 the Guardian writes “EU border controls: Schengen scheme on the brink after Amsterdam talks” quoting senior diplomat about the influx of refugees as saying: ‘This cannot continue.’

²Here operationalised by describing the refugee as showing awareness and openness with respect to concerns in German population regarding foreign infiltration, increasing violence and arising costs. The German term sometimes translated as “foreign infiltration” in the questionnaire, “Überfremdung”, is literally translated as “overforeignization”. It particularly captures fears about the cultural heterogeneity introduced by immigrants.

as predicted by Lauriola and Levine (2001) with Big Five Personality traits (cf. Lönngqvist et al., 2015) – and self-perception as sociable.

The data show that, once the refugee is described as being empathetic towards concerns in the German population – regarding foreign infiltration, increasing violence and arising costs – reported levels of liking and trust increase substantially; interestingly, the effect is particularly strong for more risk averse people.³ However, willingness to interact (talk to, meet for a coffee, invite home) is not affected by adding an empathic statement to the description of the reference person. Here we find that in particular people with non-German close friends or relatives react more forthcoming and that a self-perception as more sociable and low levels risk-aversion are relevant. In particular, more sociable respondents reported to be far more willing to talk to the reference person. The effect of this variable is decreasing, though, for more intensive contact such as inviting home. By contrast, low risk aversion was particularly important for more intensive contact. Finally, we find that overall women are more empathic but less trusting and less willing to interact.

To wit, an empathic statement showing openness to concerns in the population has a positive impact on more general attitudes. Actual willingness to engage in real interaction, however, is more driven by prior experience, self-perception as sociable and risk attitudes. Nevertheless, with respect to real life integration, more positive attitudes towards others, of course, help to create positive experience once occasion, i.e. the interaction, arises. And positive experience apparently is what matters strongly. Accordingly, what the data seem to suggest is that first creating an atmosphere of mutual understanding – including openness for the concerns of the host population – can help to provide a better starting point for later interactions. More generally speaking, the data suggest that taking serious the concerns of the host populations, even from the side of politicians, is likely to help create a more positive atmosphere. This, we are eager to emphasize, does not mean that one has to give in to the concerns being expressed. What is important, according to our study, is creating a climate where concerns can be expressed and meet a general willingness to listen.

³This is indeed consistent with the aforementioned findings by Gallego and Pardos-Prado (2014), Freitag and Rapp (2015) or Dinesen et al. (2016) on the connection between Big Five personality traits and attitudes towards immigrants.

2 Design and Procedures

Design

For our study, we devised a standard vignette questionnaire showing a picture of one person with five different sets of information claimed to refer to the person. In all sets, the person was described as being 34 years old, currently living in Hannover⁴, being married with two children, job seeking and having worked as a taxi driver. However, we varied religion and name between Muslim (Dawud) and Christian (Raphael) while always describing the person as religious. Moreover, we varied whether the person had made a statement in which he showed his openness towards concerns in the German host population regarding foreign infiltration⁵, increasing violence and arising costs. Finally, as a reference, we added one questionnaire describing the person as a faithful German Muslim/Christian. A summary of the treatments is provided in Figure 1.

<i>Nationality</i>		Syrian		German
<i>Openness to concerns</i>		No detail	Is Open	No detail
<i>Religion</i>	Muslim	x	x	x
	Christian	x	x	x

Note: Titles in italics indicate the three dimensions that have been varied.

Figure 1: Overview of treatments.

Following this information, subjects had to indicate on a 6-point Lickert-scale their personal assessment regarding the following questions:

1. How much do you like Dawud/Raphael?
2. How well can you put yourself into Dawud/Raphael's shoes?
3. How fast is Dawud/Raphael going to integrate into the German society? (Only for Dawud/Raphael described as Syrian.)
4. Generally, would you trust Dawud/Raphael?
5. Can you imagine to talking to a person like Dawud/Raphael about his experiences?
6. Can you imagine meeting a person like Dawud/Raphael for coffee or tea?
7. Can you imagine inviting a person like Dawud/Raphael home?

⁴The study was conducted in Kiel and Rostock and we wanted a neutral reference.

⁵See Footnote 2.

Note that we only asked about interaction with someone similar to the reference person. This was done in order to avoid a situation where people might expect us to actually present the person to them on the spot – a belief we would have been unable to control for. The questionnaire concluded with some general questions about age, gender, nationality, close non-German friends or relatives, income, socialising attitudes (6-points) and risk aversion (10 point scale following the GSOEP).

Procedures

The data for our study were collected in December 2015 and early January 2016 in Kiel and Rostock.⁶ In both cities, we approached people in the streets asking whether they would be willing to support our research by answering a short questionnaire. In order to be able to later test for city-specific effects, we decided to go to similar location (city center and a more quiet location close to the water); these data were gathered in December 2015. In addition, we invited students from different lectures at the University of Rostock to participate in the study; some of these data were gathered early January 2016. In all cases questionnaires were distributed randomly. In total, 662 people responded to our questionnaire.

3 Results

Summary Statistics and General Treatment Differences

Summary statistics are provided in Table 1. About half the sample was collected in the street in the cities of Rostock and Kiel and the other half in lectures at the University of Rostock. Moreover, Table 2 shows that the covariates are balanced across treatments.

For our main analysis, we use an ordered logit model for estimation. Thus, estimates from the model can be interpreted as the log odds change in belonging to a higher category of the outcome variable. The baseline for all estimations is the Syrian, who is a religious muslim and gives not further indication of openness to concerns of the host population.

A first analysis without controlling for personal characteristics shows results in show that the “openness” treatment, i.e. appreciating fears in the host population and calling for respect, made the refugee significantly more likeable; cf. Table 3. Furthermore, the participants in the experiment reported they were significantly better able to put themselves into the reference person’s position and also expected the refugee to integrate significantly faster. However, there is no effect on generalized trust or the reported willingness to interact

⁶Both Kiel and Rostock are old Hanse cities in the north of Germany located at the Baltic coast – Kiel in West Germany and Rostock in East Germany.

Variable	Mean	Std. Dev.	Min.	Max.	N
<i>Settings</i>					
Data collected in Kiel	0.2	0.4	0	1	662
Data collected at university	0.52	0.5	0	1	662
<i>Treatments</i>					
Treatment(is open)	0.34	0.48	0	1	662
Treatment(is Christian)	0.53	0.5	0	1	662
Treatment(is German)	0.31	0.46	0	1	662
<i>Outcome variables</i>					
Liking	4.25	0.99	1	6	654
Empathy	3.85	1.45	1	6	661
Would trust	3.99	1.12	1	6	657
Would talk to	5.12	1.17	1	6	661
Would meet for coffee/tea	4.47	1.44	1	6	661
Would invite home	3.77	1.59	1	6	620
Expect fast integration	3.65	1.16	1	6	447
<i>Individual characteristics of respondents</i>					
Female	0.5	0.5	0	1	642
Age	32.62	17.56	10	87	639
Close relationship to foreigner	0.6	0.49	0	1	642
Sociable	4.57	1.06	1	7	640
General risk attitude	5.79	1.98	1	10	640

Notes: Summary statistics reported in this table refer to all observations. The question about fast integration was not included for in the “is German” treatment.

Table 1: Summary statistics

	Treatment		
	T(is Christian)	T(is open)	T(is German)
<i>Covariate</i>			
Female	0.47	0.22	0.69
Age	0.49	0.88	0.51
Close relationship to foreigner	0.60	0.98	0.82
Sociable	0.73	0.45	0.75
General risk attitude	0.26	0.86	0.31

Notes: Sample comparisons are conducted using a two-sided t-test with H0 of no difference in means. The reported numbers are p-values. There are thus no statistically significant differences in covariates across treatments.

Table 2: Balance of covariates across treatments (p-values).

with the refugee by talking, meeting or inviting him due to signalling “openness.” Thus, while making the reference person more likeable and subjectively more easy to understand, the openness treatment does not affect the reported willingness to interact.

Moreover, random assignment of the religion has no statistically significant effect on most outcome variables. Only regarding trust, being Christian increases the score received from the respondent by 25 log odds points. This seems plausible given the importance of a shared frame of reference for mutual understanding and the fact that the number of Muslims in both Kiel and Rostock is comparably small.⁷

Finally, describing the reference person as German – Muslim or Christian – has no statistically significant effect on attitude scores. Yet, reported willingness to talk to or meet him is lower. This may, for example, be due to a generally higher interest in the refugees, for whom there may be some awareness that they are difficult to assess from the photo and story while there may be a clearer “out-group” feeling for the respective German.

	(1) likeable	(2) empathy	(3) would trust	(4) would talk to	(5) would meet for coffee	(6) would in- vite home	(7) expect fast integra- tion
<i>Treatments</i>							
Is Open	0.363** (0.172)	0.355** (0.169)	-0.017 (0.173)	0.011 (0.181)	0.025 (0.173)	-0.205 (0.176)	0.326* (0.172)
Is Christian	0.082 (0.144)	0.019 (0.138)	0.254* (0.141)	0.019 (0.148)	-0.174 (0.141)	-0.008 (0.142)	0.216 (0.171)
Is German	0.148 (0.177)	0.004 (0.172)	-0.248 (0.174)	-0.358** (0.177)	-0.355** (0.167)	-0.202 (0.177)	
Observations	654	661	657	661	661	620	447

Notes: Estimates from an ordered logit model with the reported regressors. Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. The question about fast integration was not included for in the “is German” treatment. The sample size in column 6 is smaller because there had been a printing issue on the first day of field work. This is not driving any results.

Table 3: Treatment effects for Syrian refugee including the “German” treatment.

⁷Today, official data do not cover the religion of citizens due for historical reasons. Estimates can be provided using the distribution of religion in countries of origin, but these are inherently biased in several ways. Generally, the share of Muslims and the foreign population in general are lower in the East than the West of the country. Official estimates based on the 2011 census state that Kiel had a share of foreign population of 7.8 percent, Rostock of 3.7 percent (destatis, 2014). Further tests show that the effect of religion is strongest among university students which would be compatible with the idea that experience, i.e. a broader frame of reference, is important.

Result 1 (General Treatment Effects) *Results from an ordered logit model show that, without adding controls, treatments have the following average effects on reported answers relative to the reference person being described as faithful Syrian Muslim:*

- *Describing the reference person as open to concerns has a significant positive effect on reported levels of liking, empathy (both $p < .05$) and expectation of fast integration ($p < .1$).*
- *Describing the reference person as Christian has a significant positive effect on the reported level of trust ($p < .1$).*
- *Describing the reference person as German, has a significant negative effect on reported willingness to talk to or meet him (both $p < .05$).*

Influence of Respondent's Characteristics

Once individual characteristics, context dummies and an interaction term between openness and risk aversion are added, we are also able to say more about the different treatment effect; see Table 4.⁸

Regarding attitudes (likable, empathy, trust), we find that the treatment effect of describing the refugee as open for the concerns in the German population interacts strongly with individual risk aversion. More specifically, adding controls, both reported liking and willingness to trust show a strong positive correlation with describing the reference person as open. As can be seen from the interaction term between risk and openness, the effect is particularly strong for risk averse individuals (recall that risk aversion is measured on a 1 to 10 scale with high numbers indicating a high willingness to take risks).⁹ Moreover, risk aversion has a highly significant positive effect on all attitude variables in its own right. Otherwise, all other treatment effects, except for the positive influence of being Christian on trust, vanish and can be explained through the control variables.

In particular, we find that self-perception as sociable is strongly positively associated with likeability and empathy in columns 1 and 2, that women are more empathic but less trusting, and that close relations to a foreigner have (weakly significant) positive effect on trust. Note that the latter observation is consistent with our interpretation of the positive effect of the Christian-Treatment on trust as it again indicates the positive impact of a shared frame of reference on trust. Moreover, older people report higher levels of empathy. Re-

⁸Adding an interaction term of sociable and open does not have any effect, which is why we do not report results in the following.

⁹The interaction effects can be shown to be robust using tests for non-linear interaction terms in ordered outcome models.

	(1) likeable	(2) empathy	(3) would trust	(4) would talk to	(5) would meet for coffee	(6) would in- vite home	(7) expect fast integra- tion
<i>Treatments</i>							
Is Open	1.748*** (0.585)	0.776 (0.614)	1.377** (0.541)	-0.141 (0.548)	0.384 (0.523)	0.294 (0.520)	0.340 (0.568)
Is Open \times risk	-0.249*** (0.096)	-0.074 (0.096)	-0.239*** (0.086)	0.018 (0.089)	-0.063 (0.086)	-0.091 (0.083)	-0.004 (0.097)
Is Christian	0.088 (0.148)	0.046 (0.142)	0.263* (0.147)	0.097 (0.157)	-0.146 (0.146)	-0.038 (0.153)	0.198 (0.177)
Is German	0.196 (0.182)	0.036 (0.177)	-0.154 (0.183)	-0.359* (0.188)	-0.253 (0.174)	-0.112 (0.183)	
<i>Individual Char.</i>							
Female	0.010 (0.156)	0.297** (0.146)	-0.335** (0.151)	-0.054 (0.160)	-0.265* (0.153)	-0.340** (0.151)	-0.215 (0.184)
Age	-0.043 (0.031)	0.048* (0.027)	-0.013 (0.030)	0.057** (0.027)	0.116*** (0.029)	0.090*** (0.031)	0.031 (0.037)
Age squared	0.000 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	-0.001** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)
Close to foreigner	0.254 (0.156)	0.147 (0.148)	0.289* (0.154)	0.519*** (0.163)	0.425*** (0.153)	0.552*** (0.158)	-0.000 (0.182)
Sociable	0.197** (0.078)	0.255*** (0.082)	0.101 (0.083)	0.398*** (0.087)	0.222*** (0.080)	0.097 (0.076)	0.145 (0.092)
Risk attitude	0.186*** (0.052)	0.110** (0.055)	0.223*** (0.050)	0.056 (0.048)	0.126*** (0.045)	0.178*** (0.050)	0.038 (0.061)
<i>Context</i>							
Data from Kiel	0.163 (0.243)	-0.192 (0.218)	0.717*** (0.223)	0.290 (0.229)	0.207 (0.217)	0.362 (0.253)	0.309 (0.262)
Data from Uni	-0.542** (0.256)	-0.308 (0.237)	-0.136 (0.260)	0.007 (0.266)	-0.048 (0.241)	-0.134 (0.257)	-0.105 (0.319)
Observations	628	633	630	633	633	593	429

Notes: Estimates from an ordered logit model with the reported regressors. Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors in parentheses. *** $p < 0.01$, ** $p < 0.05$, * $p < 0.1$. Please note that the question about fast integration was not included for in the "is German" treatment. The base outcome for context is data gathered on the street in Rostock.

Table 4: Interaction of risk attitude and the openness treatment.

spondents in Kiel reported to be more trusting both than people in the street in Rostock as well as compared to the university students in Rostock.

Result 2 (Effects on Attitudes) *An ordered logit regression including controls shows the following main patterns in the data (cf. Table 4):*

- *Describing the reference person as open has a positive effect on reported levels of liking ($p < .01$) and willingness to trust ($p < .05$). Both effects is stronger for more risk averse people, though ($p < .01$).*
- *Women are more empathic and less trusting (both $p < .05$).*

- *Self-perception as sociable has a positive impact on reported levels of liking ($p < .05$) and empathy ($p < .01$).*
- *All attitudes show a positive correlation with stated willingness to take risks.*

Furthermore, regarding the different variables measuring a willingness to interact, we find that self-reporting as more sociable is strongly positively correlated with the willingness to interact with the reference person. The effect however is far less pronounced when it comes to the question of inviting him home. By contrast, the coefficients of risk attitude in columns 4 to 6 increase towards the right of the table and become statistically more significant the closer the contact referred to in the question becomes. Thus, the data suggest that more sociable people are more willing to have some contact with the a person such as a refugee. However, if a sociable person is at the same time risk averse, he or she would not be more likely to invite the person. The reported willingness to establish such close contact is systematically more strongly linked to risk aversion than to sociability.

Moreover, respondents with close relationships with foreigners through friends or family are far more willing to get into contact with someone similar to the reference person. In fact, the respective outcome variables, which seek to measure the willingness to actually becoming actively integrating, have particularly large point estimates.

Result 3 (Determinants of Willingness to Interact) *An ordered logit regression including controls shows the following main patterns regarding the reported willingness to talk to, meet or invite someone similar to the reference person (cf. Table 4):*

- *Having close relations to a foreigner has a strong positive impact on all three categories of interaction (all $p < .01$).*
- *Being more sociable has a positive effect on willingness to talk to or meet ($p < .01$). There is no effect for invite home, though.*
- *Being more willing to take risks has a positive effect on willingness to meet and invite home (both $p < .01$).*

A further point that deserves a brief mention is that none of the variables shows a statistically significant correlation with the expected speed of integration. The reason for this might simply be lack of experience.

Finally, there are some more general results regarding personal characteristics. In spite of reporting higher empathy women are significantly less willing to meet or invite the reference person, a fact that could be linked to lower trust. While reported empathy increases

with age, our evidence suggests that the willingness to involve closely with the refugee has an inverse u-shape in age, i.e. the highest values for working age adults and lower values for the young and very old.

Result 4 (Gender and Age Effects) *An ordered logit regression including controls shows the following patterns regarding personal characteristics (cf. Table 4):*

- *Women are more empathic ($p < .05$), but less trusting ($p < .05$), and less willing to meet ($p < .1$) or invite ($p < .05$) someone similar to the reference person.*
- *Older people are more trusting ($p < .1$) and more willing to interact with someone similar to the reference person ($p < .01$ for meet and invite; ($p < .05$ for talk to)).*

4 Concluding Remarks

The civil war in Syria and the unstable political situation in the region at large have driven a large number of refugees to Western and Central Europe. While many countries debate reinstating controls or completely closing their borders, arrivals have so far only decreased by a small margin. Regardless of whether the number of refugees arriving will be decreased by policy or not, one of the most pressing questions for the political stability and the economic development of Europe in the near future is integrating the many newcomers who are going to stay.

In this paper, we have presented data from a survey of German citizens asking about their attitudes towards a reference migrant as well as their willingness to interact with him. In order to identify the effects of different kinds of information provided about the reference person, we have randomized part of his description. As we have argued, attitudes are more positive if the description of the reference person states his openness and understanding of concerns in the German population regarding foreign infiltration, increasing violence and arising costs. These effect is particularly strong for more risk averse people.

Of course, integration requires not only positive attitudes but real interaction. Here the data reveal that willingness to interact (talk to, meet for a coffee, invite home) is not affected by adding an empathic statement to the description of the reference person. Instead, we find that positive prior experience, i.e. a non-German close friend or relative, greatly enhances the willingness to integrate the reference person actively. A self-perception as more sociable matters less for the willingness to integrate the migrant by, for example, inviting him home than low levels risk-aversion. Taken together, the results of the present study, therefore, suggest that the willingness of the host population to integrate the many refugees could

benefit greatly from creating an atmosphere of mutual understanding and openness for each other's concerns.

From a practical or policy point of view, we therefore believe that what is important in the current situation is to remain open for everyone's concerns and to educate both groups – foreigners and host country populations – in this respect. Note that this does not mean that one has to give in to all concerns raised, especially not if they are based only on unfounded prejudice. Yet, what the data seem to suggest is that being open and signalling that openness improves attitudes towards each other. Once people meet, be it on the street or in some formal institutional context, more positive attitudes are likely to trigger more positive experience with each other. And that, it seems, is what fosters a general willingness to interact, which is so important for successful social and economic integration.

References

- Adida, C., Laitin, D., Valfort, M.-A., 2010. Identifying Barriers to Muslim Integration in France. *PNAS* 107, 22384-22390.
- Adida, C., Laitin, D., Valfort, M.-A., 2016. Why Muslim Integratoin Fails in Christian-Heritage Societies. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Massachusetts.
- Bauer, T., Braun, S., Kvasnicka, M., 2013. The Economic Integration of Forced Migrants: Evidence for Post-war Germany. *Economic Journal* 123, 998-1024.
- Bisin, A., Verdier, T., 2001. The Economics of Cultural Tranmission and the Dynamics of Preferences. *Journal of Economic Theory*, 97, 298-319.
- Bisin, A., E. Patacchini, T. Verdier, Y. Zenou, 2011. Formation and persistence of oppositional identities. *European Economic Review*, 55, 1046-1071.
- Braun, S., Weber, H., 2015. How do regional labor markets adjust to immigration? A dynamic analysis for post-war Germany. Mimeo.
- Destatis (German Federal Statistical Office), 2014. Bevölkerung und Erwerbstätigkeit 2013: Ausländische Bevölkerung Ergebnisse des Ausländerzentralregisters, Wiesbaden.
- Dinesen, P., Klemmensen, R., Norgaard, A., 2016. Attitudes Toward Immigration: The Role of Personal Predispositions. *Political Psychology* 37, 55-72.
- Freitag, M., Rapp, C., 2015. The Personal Foundations of Political Tolerance towards Immigrants. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 41, 351-373.
- Gallego, A., Pardos-Prado, S., 2014. The Big Five Personality Traits and Attitudes Towards Immigrants. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 40, 79-99.
- Goodman, D., 2000. Motivation people from privileged groups to support social justice. *Teachers College Record* 102, 1061-1085.
- Lauriola, M., Levin, I.P., 2001. Personality traits and risky decision-making in a controlled experimental task: an exploratory study. Personal. *Individual Differences* 31, 215-236.

- Lönnqvist, J.-E., Verkasalo, M., Walkowitz, G., Wichardt, P., 2015. Measuring Individual Risk Attitudes in the Lab: Task or Ask – An Empirical Comparison. *Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization* 119, 254-266.
- McAllister, G., Irvine, J., 2002. The role of empathy in teaching culturally diverse students. *Journal of Teacher Education* 53, 433-443.
- Noddings, N., 1984. *Caring: A feminine approach to ethics and moral education*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Sapienza, I., Hichy, Z, Guarnera, M., Di Nuovo, S., 2010. Effects of Basic Human Values on Host Community Acculturation Orientations. *International Journal of Psychology* 45, 311-319.
- Vecchione, M., Caprara, G., Schoen, H., Castro, J., Schwartz, S., 2012. The Role of Personal Values and Basic Traits in Perceptions of the Consequences of Immigration: A Three-Nation Study. *British Journal of Psychology* 103, 359-377.
- <http://www.theguardian.com/world/2016/jan/25/refugee-crisis-schengen-area-scheme-brink-amsterdam-talks> (29.1.2016)

5 Appendix

	(1) likeable	(2) empathy	(3) would trust	(4) would talk to	(5) would meet for coffee	(6) would invite home	(7) expect fast integration
Treatment(is open)	0.365** (0.173)	0.351** (0.167)	-0.017 (0.169)	0.012 (0.178)	0.022 (0.168)	-0.202 (0.174)	0.326* (0.172)
Treatment(is Christian)	0.182 (0.173)	0.010 (0.166)	0.263 (0.170)	0.113 (0.179)	-0.089 (0.168)	0.073 (0.173)	0.216 (0.171)
Observations	450	456	454	457	456	417	447

Notes: Estimates from an ordered logit model with the reported regressors. Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Please note that the question about fast integration was not included for in the "is German" treatment.

Table A1: Treatment effects for Syrian refugee excluding the “German” treatment.

	(1) likeable	(2) empathy	(3) would trust	(4) would talk to	(5) would meet for coffee	(6) would invite home	(7) expect fast integration
<i>Treatments</i>							
Is Open	0.302* (0.175)	0.339* (0.173)	-0.019 (0.180)	-0.040 (0.191)	0.022 (0.181)	-0.236 (0.183)	0.314* (0.178)
Is Christian	0.084 (0.147)	0.045 (0.142)	0.260* (0.147)	0.097 (0.157)	-0.145 (0.147)	-0.046 (0.152)	0.198 (0.177)
Is German	0.173 (0.182)	0.027 (0.176)	-0.174 (0.182)	-0.357* (0.189)	-0.257 (0.174)	-0.121 (0.183)	
<i>Individual Char.</i>							
Risk Attitude	0.101** (0.044)	0.085* (0.047)	0.140*** (0.042)	0.062 (0.041)	0.105*** (0.039)	0.146*** (0.041)	0.036 (0.048)
Sociable	0.219*** (0.077)	0.261*** (0.081)	0.124 (0.083)	0.396*** (0.086)	0.226*** (0.080)	0.106 (0.076)	0.146 (0.091)
Close to foreigner	0.263* (0.156)	0.156 (0.148)	0.302* (0.155)	0.518*** (0.163)	0.430*** (0.154)	0.558*** (0.158)	0.145 (0.182)
Female	-0.020 (0.155)	0.292** (0.146)	-0.356** (0.153)	-0.051 (0.160)	-0.275* (0.153)	-0.356** (0.150)	-0.215 (0.184)
Age	-0.040 (0.031)	0.049* (0.027)	-0.012 (0.030)	0.057** (0.027)	0.116*** (0.029)	0.091*** (0.030)	0.031 (0.037)
Age squared	0.000 (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)	0.000 (0.000)	-0.001** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.001*** (0.000)	-0.000 (0.000)
<i>Context</i>							
Data from Kiel	0.146 (0.242)	-0.207 (0.216)	0.684*** (0.223)	0.293 (0.228)	0.204 (0.217)	0.364 (0.254)	0.307 (0.260)
Data at Uni	-0.527** (0.254)	-0.310 (0.236)	-0.140 (0.260)	0.007 (0.266)	-0.048 (0.241)	-0.130 (0.257)	-0.106 (0.318)
Observations	628	633	630	633	633	593	429

Notes: Estimates from an ordered logit model with the reported regressors. Heteroskedasticity-robust standard errors in parentheses. *** p<0.01, ** p<0.05, * p<0.1. Please note that the question about fast integration was not included for in the "is German" treatment. The base outcome for context is data gathered on the street in Rostock.

Table A2: Treatment effects for Syrian refugee including the “German” treatment with covariates.