Ideological Configurations and Prediction of Attitudes toward Immigrants in Chile and Germany

Héctor Carvacho, Graduate School "Group-Focused Enmity", University of Bielefeld, Germany

Vol. 4 (2) 2010

Ideological Configurations and Prediction of Attitudes toward Immigrants in Chile and Germany

Héctor Carvacho, Graduate School "Group-Focused Enmity", University of Bielefeld, Germany

The concept of ideological configuration is proposed to refer to a complex of ideological attitudes – Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA) and Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) – based on a shared core of derogation of outgroups. This concept is used in two surveys, in Chile and in Germany, to predict attitudes toward foreigners. Analyses using structural equation modeling (SEM) showed that a second-order factor involving RWA and SDO predicts hostility toward foreigners in Germany and affection toward Peruvian and Argentinean immigrants in Chile. This prediction was stronger in Germany than in Chile. The difference in strength is discussed in terms of the kind of measurements, different contexts of migration, and characteristics of the immigrants. Further research using the concept of ideological configuration is proposed.

Research in social sciences and particularly in social psychology has tried to explain the derogation of others using different notions of ideology (Billig 1982). Since *The Authoritarian Personality* was published (Adorno et al. 1950), most definitions in psychology describe ideology as an organization of attitudes, values, and beliefs giving meaning to political and social behaviors (Jost 2006). The concept of ideological configurations is proposed here to describe the articulation and constellation of certain ideological attitudes. One specific ideological configuration, encompassing the common core between Social Dominance Orientation (SDO) and Right-Wing Authoritarianism (RWA), is used to predict attitudes toward others.

This article compares the prediction of attitudes toward foreigners in Chile and Germany by using the ideological configurations of the general population in both countries,

employing a comparative perspective with cross-cultural data. Research on attitudes toward immigrants and immigration using this approach has increased recently (Ceobanu and Escandell 2010; Citrin and Sides 2008; Meuleman et al. 2009), but it has been mainly used in surveys in North America and Europe. This article takes up the challenge of including countries outside of these regions, where migration has different characteristics. The comparison of attitudes toward immigrants and immigration between European countries and the United States has shown that individual ideological variables (e.g. political orientation, preference for cultural and religious homogeneity, and so on) are stronger predictors than country-level variables such as GDP, unemployment rate, or size of the migrant population (Citrin and Sides 2008; Sides and Citrin 2007). Investigating whether these findings are replicated in a different cultural context, such as Chile, becomes particularly relevant.

In addition, the definition of ideological configurations used here enriches the theoretical discussion of attitudes toward immigrants, because it is based on ideological attitudes (RWA and SDO) that have been widely used in different cultural contexts. The approach laid out in this study could be used in further research in different regions as a way to avoid the problem of contextual dependence of more specific ideological issues, focusing on the cross-cultural comparison of relations between variables.

This article belongs to the research tradition of the study of attitudes and prejudice research, which takes up the challenge of predicting discriminatory behavior. For example, meta-analytic studies have shown an important correlation between attitudes and behavior (Dovidio et al. 1996; Schütz and Six 1996). More recently, using experimental designs (Dovidio et al. 2004) and longitudinal data (Wagner, Christ and Pettigrew 2008), the causal relationship has been tested, concluding that prejudice predicts behavior. Identifying how attitudes lead to discrimination is a central task in conflict research, because a better understanding of this phenomenon has great potential for preventing conflict and discrimination.

1. Ideological Configurations

Even though a psychological component has been part of the discussion of the concept of ideology from the very beginning – for example in the Marxist notion of false consciousness (as outlined in *The German Ideology*) – research on social psychology of intergroup conflict has just started to use this notion systematically, drawing on research into authoritarianism mainly since the publication of *The Authoritarian Personality* (Adorno et al. 1950; see also Fromm 1942). Initially, the impact of Theodor Adorno and his colleagues' writings was not widespread. For example, in Gordon Allport's *The Nature of Prejudice* (Allport 1954) – probably the most influential work in prejudice research – the concept of ideology does not play an important role in the author's arguments, although some of his propositions could be interpreted to include ideological components.

Criticisms of *The Authoritarian Personality,* especially concerning methodological issues (Funke 2005), kept research on authoritarianism in the background for many years. But after Robert Altemeyer published *Right-Wing Authori-*

tarianism (Altemeyer 1981), methodological problems were partially left behind while an increasing number of scholars have considered ideology as a relevant concept to explain the derogation of others. Since then, the measurement of RWA has been widely used in social psychology.

Research on authoritarianism has not been the only field to include ideology as a key concept. Starting in the seventies, Social Identity Theory, or SIT (Tajfel and Turner 1986) proposed the importance of "individuals' belief systems about the nature and the structure of the relations between social groups in their society" (p. 9) to understanding the stability of group hierarchies. More recently, two new theories have been proposed with a focus on ideology, based on some of the basic assumptions of SIT: Social Dominance Theory (Sidanius and Pratto 1999) and System Justification Theory (Jost and Banaji 1994). The former argues that a general orientation toward social dominance (SDO) can enhance or attenuate hierarchies (captured by the two dimensions of SDO: support for group-based dominance and opposition to equality), via legitimizing myths such as prejudices. System Justification Theory has concentrated on psychological mechanisms, such as stereotyping, that have the ideological function of justifying the system and the status quo – even among groups where this justification could work against self or group interests. Measurements of RWA and SDO have been extensively used in social psychology to predict attitudes such as prejudice toward outgroups. This prediction has been tested in different cultural contexts (Duriez, Van Hiel, and Kossowska 2005; Pratto et al. 2000; cf. Lehmiller and Schmitt 2007), and toward multiple groups, for example, in the form of a syndrome of prejudice (Bäckström and Björklund 2007; Zick et al. 2008).

RWA and SDO were developed to capture the ideological background of intergroup attitudes across societies. Authors of these theories were expecting to define a general ideological orientation that applies in many different contexts. The definition and operationalization of these concepts allowed researchers to find similar patterns independent of context. However, some evidence shows that both ideological attitudes are context-dependent and sensitive to group dynamics (Jetten and Iyer 2010). For example, Kreindler (2005) suggested that both variables depend on

group processes; SDO reflects category differentiation, based on group membership, whereas RWA reflects normative differentiation, based on group prototypicality.

In order to avoid this problem, here both concepts are treated as ideological attitudes, that is, as basic evaluations of ideological objects such as social hierarchies, norms, group boundaries, and so on. However, the definition of the concept of attitude itself is not free of problems, specially regarding the stability of attitudes. Attitudes have been defined as constructed on the spot from accessible information, and yet also as stable entities stored in memory (Bohner and Dickel 2011). According to recent findings, the proximity of the attitude's object strongly affects the stability of the attitude, with attitudes regarding proximal objects being more volatile than attitudes regarding distal objects (Ledgerwood, Trope, and Chaiken 2010). If this is so, ideological attitudes such as RWA and SDO, which refer to very abstract objects such as group hierarchies or norms, should be generally stable. Whether these constructs are stable enough to be shared in different contexts, with fixed meanings, as values seem to be (Fischer and Schwartz 2010), is an empirical question that remains open.

The relationship between RWA and SDO has been explored, first by Altemeyer (1998), who described how these measurements work in a complementary way, the dominant and the authoritarian being two complementary groups, although, he also found (Altemeyer 2004) that people with high levels of both variables are extremely prejudiced. Next, John Duckitt and his colleagues proposed a dual process model, distinguishing how each concept predicts prejudice based on different motivations: RWA is a response to perception of the world as dangerous, and SDO is a response to perception of the world as competitive (Duckitt et al. 2002). Taking up the challenge of disentangling the relationship between RWA and SDO, an increasing number of researchers have extended Duckitt's findings. J. Christopher Cohrs and Frank Asbrock (2009) found experimental evidence in support of Duckitt's theory regarding RWA, but not for SDO. Lotte Thomsen et al. (2008) showed that RWA predicts negative attitudes toward immigrant groups who do not assimilate into the dominant culture, because this violates ingroup conformity, and SDO predicts negative attitudes toward immigrant

groups who do assimilate into the dominant culture. Finally, in recent years, a new line of research has focused on identifying moderators of the relationship between the two concepts, finding, for example, that political interest heightens the correlation, whereas religious identity works in the opposite direction (Dallago et al. 2008). Michele Roccato and Luca Ricolfi (2005) found that the correlation between the two concepts was higher in countries with strong ideological contrasts and that, within these countries, the relation was greater in adult samples than in student samples.

However, there is not much research dealing with both concepts' shared derogation of others as a common defining core, although this derogation is differently motivated. Regarding RWA, this element refers mainly to justification of and support for punishing the deviants, which is captured in the notion of authoritarian aggression (see Passini 2008), one of the three components proposed by Altemeyer (1981). In SDO derogation is included in the idea of superiority of some groups over others, mainly present on the dimension of group-based dominance (Sidanius and Pratto 1999).

The concept of ideological configuration is proposed to refer to the organization of ideological attitudes. While ideological configurations can be defined at many levels (individual, group, society), in this article the configuration is assessed at the individual level. Specifically, one possible ideological configuration is used here to predict attitudes toward immigrants and immigration, based on the derogative component of RWA and SDO. Given the definition of RWA and SDO as ideological attitudes, this ideological configuration is expected to show (a) a certain stability across societies, even though under moderating influences; and (b) a strong prediction of attitudes toward outgroups.

2. Migration and Prejudice in Chile and Germany

There is a great disparity in the number of studies conducted in Germany and Chile. Germany has a longstanding research tradition in social psychology involving intergroup and ideological attitudes. For instance, in recent years German researchers have shown that prejudice toward immigrants is related to ideologies of assimilation and segregation in acculturation preferences among majority-group members (Zick et al. 2001); that the differentiated prediction

of prejudice proposed by Duckitt et al. (2002) works better for RWA than for SDO (Cohrs and Asbrock 2009); that RWA and SDO are some of the strongest predictors of prejudice toward immigrants (Pettigrew, Wagner, and Christ 2007); and that both attitudes strongly predict Group-Focused Enmity, a syndrome of generalized prejudice against several groups at the same time (Zick et al. 2008).

Yet research in Chile concerning these topics is relatively scare, with only a few studies published to date. SDO and RWA measurements have been rarely used, with some exceptions: A panel study with students explored the relationship between social attitudes and religion (González et al. 2008). An SDO scale was recently tested and validated in Chile (Cárdenas et al. 2010). Published results on the relationship between RWA and political identity showed that RWA is, as expected, stronger among right-wingers (González et al. 2005); that it is predicted by a nonlinear interaction between socioeconomic level and political identity (Haye et al. 2009); and that it decreases with high income, although not for right-wingers after controlling for education (Carvacho and Haye 2008).

Publications concerning prejudice or intergroup attitudes toward immigrants are not common in Chile. Roberto González (2005) presented some research about prejudice toward different minorities, showing that levels of prejudice toward Peruvian immigrants are among the highest in Chile, just below prejudice toward poor people and Romanies. Manuel Cárdenas and his colleagues (Cárdenas 2006; Cárdenas et al. 2007) published some results showing high levels of subtle and blatant prejudice toward Bolivian immigrants among student samples. The only current article the author is aware of that explores the relationship between RWA and attitudes toward immigrants in Chile (Bolivians in this case) describes the expected pattern: prejudiced people show a high level of RWA (Cárdenas 2007).

The evidence of these Chilean studies leads us to expect the same results observed in most western societies to be replicated in Chile. Consequently, a strong relationship be-

tween SDO, RWA, and attitudes toward immigrant groups is hypothesized. However, a detailed description of this relationship is required to illustrate immigration in Chile from a psychological viewpoint.

There are two important reasons for the disparity in the amount of research on immigration and ideological attitudes between Germany and Chile. First, research on these topics in social psychology in Chile started just in the last decade, with the field still in the process of consolidation. Second, until now the phenomenon of immigration has been more relevant in Germany than in Chile (Martínez Pizarro 2005; Pettigrew et al. 2007; Zick, Pettigrew, and Wagner 2008). According to estimates by the United Nations, in 2005, 12.9% of the German population were foreigners, while in Chile only 1.4% of the population came from other countries. The number of immigrants in Germany has greatly increased since 1960, when they constituted only 2.8% of the population. In Chile, the percentage of immigrants was the same in 2005 as in 1960 (United Nations 2009). However, the Chilean government estimated a 71.9% increase in the number of foreigners living in Chile from 2002 to 2008, most of them being Peruvians (33.9%) and Argentineans (18.7%). Peruvians are the group with the most significant rise in the immigration rate (Martínez Pizarro 2003; Ministry of the Interior, Chile, 2009).

A comparison of Germany and Chile could indicate whether there are similarities in the structure of the relationship between ideological attitudes and attitudes toward foreigners in those different contexts. It is hypothesized that both countries have a similar ideological configuration that predicts attitudes toward immigrants.

3. The Chilean Study
3.1. Sample
The relationship among RWA, SDO, and positive attitudes toward Peruvian and Argentinean immigrants was explored in a survey of the general population in Santiago, Chile, in the context of a large study of the political culture of Chileans.[1] The sample is composed of 663 Chilean adults living

in Santiago. It was selected in a two-stage procedure. The first stage resulted in a random selection of an equal number of city blocks from each of three socioeconomic levels. In the second stage, a maximum of five interviews per block – based on assigned quotas of sex and age – were conducted by trained interviewers at participants' residences.

3.2. Measurements

Right-Wing Authoritarianism was measured using a four-item scale based on Altmeyer's RWA scale (Altemeyer 1981; Altemeyer 1998). As usual, items including the dimensions of authoritarian aggression (3 items) and authoritarian submission (1 item) loaded on one factor in the factor analysis. The conventionalism dimension was not included.

Social Dominance Orientation was measured via a 4-item scale assessing the first dimension of SDO, group-based dominance. The items were translated into Spanish from the SDO_6 scale (Sidanius and Pratto 1999).

Affection toward Immigrants was measured with a three-item scale used with two target groups, Argentineans and Peruvians, as these are the biggest migrant groups. The items contained questions about how much people like the target group; how much people admire the target group; and how much they trust them. All the scales present good enough reliability statistics, as can be seen in Table 1. The full list of the used items in Spanish is in Appendix 1.

Table 1: Cronbach's Alpha of scales used in the Chilean study

Scales	Cronbach's Alpha	No. of items	n	Missing values
RWA	0.78	4	650	13
SDO	0.65	4	650	13
Affection toward Peruvians	0.88	3	636	27
Affection toward Argentineans	0.86	3	639	24

3.3. Results
3.3.1. Measurement Models

Confirmatory factor analysis was used to test the proposed model. All the analyses presented in this and the following sections were carried out using the software Mplus, version

5.21 (Muthén and Muthén 1998–2007). Full information maximum likelihood (FIML) estimation for missing values was used to deal with incomplete data (1.15% of missing values).

A first measurement model (M1), using the maximum likelihood estimator (as in all the following estimations), was computed. In this model all the scales described in the previous section were built as latent variables predicting the observed variables (items). A second-order factor based on the latent variables of RWA and SDO was calculated in order to identify the common core shared by these ideological attitudes. Thus, the ideological configuration in M1 was built as a second-order latent variable predicting the ideological attitudes. A second-order factor of affection toward immigrants was also built, based on the attitudes toward Argentineans and Peruvians (first-order latent variables). One additional path correlating the measurement error of two similar items from the scales of affection toward Peruvians and Argentineans (which differ only in the target) was included in order to improve the model, which presented adequate fit indices ($\chi^2 = 167.106$; df = 71; p < 0.01; CFI = 0.973; RMSEA = 0.045; SRMR = 0.039). In Table 2, the standardized coefficients of the items' loadings are provided.

In addition, a second model (M2) was estimated. Whereas M1 included second-order latent variables, M2 did not, using the first-order ideological factors instead. This model was based on the theoretical definitions of RWA and SDO as two differently motivated predictors of intergroup attitudes (e.g., Duckitt et al. 2002), which led us to expect that both variables predict intergroup attitudes separately. Hence, the only difference between M1 and M2 was that the latter did not include the second-order ideological factor and the first-order ideological factors were correlated. The fit indices of M2 were identical to those in M1 since the models are equivalent, which means that they have the same number of estimated parameters, identical fit indices, covariance, correlation and other moment matrices, and residuals (Hershberger 2006). The standardized coefficients for this model are also in Table 2. The structural equation modeling (SEM) presented in the next section was carried out using both measurement models in order to compare the prediction of prejudice based on

a single ideological factor with the one based on RWA and SDO as different predictors.[2]

Table 2: Standardized coefficients for M1 and M2

Observed and latent variables	M1	M2
RWA		
RWA1	0.47*	0.47*
RWA2	0.83*	0.83*
RWA3	0.83*	0.83*
RWA4	0.63*	0.63*
SDO		
SDO1	0.52*	0.52*
SDO2	0.52*	0.52*
SDO3	0.65*	0.65*
SDO4	0.58*	0.58*
Affection toward Peruvians		
AFEPER1	0.83*	0.83*
AFEPER2	0.82*	0.82*
AFEPER3	0.89*	0.89*
Affection toward Argentineans		
AFEARG1	0.83*	0.83*
AFEARG2	0.80*	0.80*
AFEARG3	0.83*	0.83*
Affection toward Immigrants		
Affection toward Peruvians	0.90*	0.90*
Affection toward Argentineans	0.68*	0.68*
Ideological Configuration		
RWA	0.91*	
SDO	0.58*	
Affection toward Immigrants	−0.37*	
Correlations		
AFEPER2 with AFEARG2	0.33*	0.33*
RWA with SDO		0.53*
Affection toward Immigrants with RWA		−0.34*
Affection toward Immigrants with SDO		−0.22*

* Coefficient is significant at p < 0,001.

3.3.2. Structural Equation Modeling

In M1, the ideological configuration explained 83% of the variance of RWA and 33.3% of the variance of SDO. Therefore, as expected, ideological configuration strongly predicts ideological attitudes because they share a central core. Once regressed, the ideological configuration negatively predicted affection toward immigrants, with the more authoritarian and social dominant reporting less affection toward immigrants. The standardized regression coefficient had a medium strength ($\beta = -0.37$; $p < 0,01$) and explained 14% of the variance of the criterion.

In M2, affection toward immigrants was regressed on RWA and SDO. Due to the correlation of both predictors, they competed in the prediction of attitudes toward immigrants. As a result, SDO did not predict significantly the criterion ($\beta = -0.05$). On the contrary, RWA was negatively and significantly related with affection toward immigrants ($\beta = -0.31$; $p < 0.01$). Both predictors together explained 12% of the variance of the criterion.

According to the dual process model (Duckitt et al. 2002), the stronger prediction of RWA should be explained by the assumption that in Chile immigrants are perceived as dangerous for the ingroup, probably threatening the ingroup's values. Further research should test this assumption.

Even though both models have the same fit indices and explained almost the same variance of affection toward immigrants, M1 is preferable as an explicative model because of its theoretical parsimony.[3] This parsimony is expressed by the explained variance in the criterion, which is based on one single path coming from a unique ideological indicator. Thus, the common core of derogation of others between RWA and SDO proposed here as an ideological configuration was successfully used to predict attitudes toward immigrants in Chile, with at least the same explanatory power as the prediction based on the separate ideological attitudes.

---

2 Additional models including the second dimension of SDO, opposition to equality, were also computed. However, since they didn't show the expected behavior they were excluded from analyses in both surveys. Theoretically opposition

to equality should show identical but mirrored relations as group-based dominance. Whether this is a measurement problem, for instance based on the wording of the items, or a conceptual difference, as Jost and Thompson (2000) suggested,

should be solved with additional evidence.

3 Statistically the models are equivalent, hence they have identical number of parameters estimated. For the concept of parsimony see Preacher 2006.

4. The German Study

4.1. Sample

The second survey included the same ideological attitudes and indicators of hostility toward foreigners in a German national representative sample of people older than sixteen with no migration background (n = 1740). Those variables were employed in a larger study on prejudice, conducted in 2006 using telephone interviews.[4]

4.2. Measurements

Right-Wing Authoritarianism was measured with a three-item scale, based on Altmeyer (1981; 1998). As in the Chilean study, only the dimensions of authoritarian aggression (2 items) and authoritarian submission (1 item) were included, but not conventionalism.

Social Dominance Orientation: In the German survey, SDO was measured with a three-item scale. These items were taken from the SDO_6 scale (Sidanius and Pratto 1999).

Hostility toward Foreigners.[5] A four-item scale was used asking participants about topics such as considering foreigners a burden for the welfare system, that there are too many foreigners living in Germany or in the educational system, and that when jobs are scarce foreigners should be send it back. The content of the items refers to what the literature calls attitudes toward immigration, which has been shown to be very difficult to distinguish from attitudes toward immigrants. In fact, both variables are strongly connected, empirically and theoretically (Ceobanu and Escandell 2010).

A full item list in German is in Appendix 2. The reliability of the scales was satisfactory (see Table 3).

Table 3: Cronbach's Alpha of scales used in the German study

Scales	Cronbach's Alpha	No. of items	n	Missing values
RWA	0.74	3	1681	59
SDO	0.63	3	1677	63
Hostility to foreigners	0.81	4	1593	147

4.3. Results

4.3.1. Measurement Models

As in the Chilean survey, FIML estimation for missing values was used to complete the data (1.59% of missing values), and all the analyses were carried out in Mplus, version 5.21, using the maximum likelihood estimator.

Measurement models with the same structure were computed. First, M3 included a second-order ideological factor built with both ideological measurements, in order to identify the common core of the ideology of derogation. This model also included the indicators of hostility against foreigners, a latent variable predicting four observed variables. The fit indices of M3 were acceptable (χ^2 = 172.206; df = 32; p < 0.01; CFI = 0.973; RMSEA = 0.050; SRMR = 0.034). No additional path was needed to fit the model. The standardized coefficients of this model are shown in Table 4.

Second, M4 was computed without the second-order ideological factor, and it included the correlations between all the latent variables (see Table 4). This model presented the same fit indices as M3 because these are also equivalent models.

In order to confirm whether the strong relationship between the latent variables in both models is due to multicollinearity, additional factor analyses were carried out. Models where the observed variables loaded on one factor, on two independent factors (an ideological and a hostility factor), on two related factors, and on three independent factors were computed. Even though these models were more parsimonious than M3 and M4, none of them explained sufficient variance to fit the data properly.[6] Since the equivalent solutions, one based on

---

4 This study was conducted by the Institute of Interdisciplinary Research in Conflict and Violence (IKG), Universität Bielefeld.

5 "Foreigner" is used to refer to the German word Ausländer (Zick et al. 2001).

6 Fit indices for alternative models: 1 factor χ^2 = 1002,312; df = 35; p < 0,01; CFI = 0,813; RMSEA = 0,126; SRMR = 0,071), 2 independent factors (χ^2 = 1413,688; df = 35; p < 0,01; CFI = 0,734; RMSEA = 0,150; SRMR = 0,198), 2 re-lated factors (χ_2 = 671,105; df = 34; p < 0,01; CFI = 0,877; RMSEA = 0,104; SRMR = 0,065), 3 independent factors (χ^2 = 1131,196; df = 35; p < 0,01; CFI = 0,789; RMSEA = 0,134; SRMR = 0,203).

three related factors and the other including a second-order ideological factor, were the best available solutions, the alternative models were not considered for additional analyses.

In the two selected models, further statistics were taken into account to check multicollinearity. The correlations of the parameter estimates were checked. No values above 0.95 were detected, meaning that the parameters in the model were estimated independent of each other. Since multicollinearity can affect the stability of the parameter estimates, the standard errors tend to be larger than usual. However, this is not the case in any of the models, where standard errors stay below 0.1. Finally, considering this statistical evidence and the fact that the measurements were based on conventional scales widely tested in prejudice research, the problem of multicollinearity could be ruled out.

Table 4: Standardized coefficients for M3 and M4

Observed and latent variables	M3	M4
RWA		
RWA1	0.72*	0.72*
RWA2	0.84*	0.84*
RWA3	0.57*	0.57*
SDO		
SDO1	0.63*	0.63*
SDO2	0.65*	0.65*
SDO3	0.57*	0.57*
Hostility to Foreigners		
HF1	0.74*	0.74*
HF2	0.86*	0.86*
HF3	0.54*	0.54*
HF4	0.71*	0.71*
Ideological Configuration		
RWA	0.71*	
SDO	0.63*	
Hostility to Foreigners	0.93*	
Correlations		
RWA with SDO		0.44*
Hostility to Foreigners with RWA		0.73*
Hostility to Foreigners with SDO		0.59*

* Coefficient is significant at p < 0.001.

4.3.2. Structural Equation Modeling

An SEM was conducted based on M3. RWA and SDO had a strong loading in the second-order ideological factor (see Table 4). Hostility toward foreigners was regressed on ideological configuration. Results showed a very strong relationship between both variables: 87% of the variance of hostility toward foreigners was explained by the ideological configuration.

Using M4, hostility toward foreigners was regressed on RWA and SDO. As a result, both predictors presented significant standardized regression coefficients: RWA = 0.50 and SDO = 0.37 (p < 0.001). Thus, the ideological attitudes together explained 54% of the variance of hostility toward foreigners. In contrast with the results in Chile, in the German survey both predictors play a role in explaining attitudes toward foreigners. It could be interpreted that this group is perceived as both dangerous for the ingroup and competitive with it.

When hostility toward foreigners was predicted by the ideological configuration, the explained variance is over 30% greater than when predicted by the ideological attitudes separately. In addition to the theoretical parsimony of the model involving ideological configuration, the relevant difference in explanatory power supports the use of this model when predicting attitudes toward foreigners. Choosing the model with more explanatory power is considered to be a valid criterion in cases of statistical equivalence (Hershberger 2006).

4.4. Summary of Results

Ideological configurations were suggested as a way to improve the understanding of derogative behaviors. This article presented one possible ideological configuration operationalized as a second-order factor built using ideological attitudes (RWA and SDO). As expected, in both samples the ideological attitudes loaded strongly on the second-order factor involving the proposed ideological configuration.

With regard to the prediction of attitudes toward foreigners, both models showed equivalent good fit. In both cases the ideological configuration predicted attitudes toward

immigrants. However, the regression coefficients showed a stronger prediction for hostility toward foreigners in the German sample than for affection toward immigrants in the Chilean sample (see Table 5).

When the ideological configuration models were compared with alternative models based on approaches emphasizing the differentiated prediction of ideological attitudes on attitudes toward immigrants, results suggested that ideological configuration is an equal (Chilean survey) or even superior predictor (German survey) compared with the separate ideological attitudes.

Table 5: Ideological configuration and ideological attitudes predicting attitudes toward foreigners

Latent variables	β	r^2
M1 (Chile)		
Affection toward Immigrants on Ideological Configuration	−0.37*	0.14
M2 (Chile)		
Affection toward Immigrants on:		0.12
RWA	−0.31*	
SDO	−0.05	
M3 (Germany)		
Hostility toward Foreigners on Ideological Configuration	0.93*	0.87
M4 (Germany)		
Hostility toward Foreigners on:		0.54
RWA	0.50*	
SDO	0.37*	

* Coefficient is significant at p < 0.001.

5. Discussion

Results indicated empirical evidence for an ideological configuration based on the derogation of others with Chilean and German participants. Moreover, this ideological configuration could be considered as a valid way to explore the relationship between ideological attitudes in different cultural contexts. The second-order ideological construct could be understood as an extreme, socially available form of adhesion to norms and hierarchies that led to the derogation of others.

Nevertheless, there is a difference between surveys regarding the loadings of RWA and SDO on the second-order factor. In the Chilean sample the strongest loading was from RWA. In Germany, the two components were more or less equivalent. These results suggest that in Chile the ideological configuration is based mainly on the punishment of deviants, whereas in Germany both mechanisms, punishment of deviants and group hierarchies, are included. This difference between countries suggests that the ideological attitudes can be organized differently across societies, but share a common core regarding the function of the ideology, which is to justify and fuel the derogation of outgroups. However, these results should be examined carefully, because no multigroup comparison was carried out to test the measurement invariance, as the scales were not based on exactly the same items. Further research should help test whether ideological configuration shares the same meaning across different cultures.

Ideological configuration was successfully used in Chile and Germany to predict attitudes toward immigrants. Its explanatory power was even greater than when the variables were used separately. This evidence suggests that the exploration of the common core of RWA and SDO should be included in the agenda of prejudice research. However, since the present studies are cross-sectional, additional research should also address the problem of causality, for example with a longitudinal design.

The difference between the countries in the prediction of attitudes toward foreigners can be accounted for by three factors. First, in the Chilean study the dependent variable is operationalized as affection toward Argentineans and Peruvians; thus, it is a positive attitude specifically directed toward concrete target groups. In Germany, by contrast, the dependent variable is hostility toward foreigners, a negative attitude focused on a general target, with items that can be considered related to the general topic of immigration. This problem has been previously detected in the literature (Ceobanu and Escandell 2010, Meuleman et al. 2009); however, it is not clear if the strong relationship (theoretical and empirical) between both kinds of attitudes can be empirically distinguished. For that reason, the results presented here have to be carefully interpreted. We might

expect a stronger relationship of the ideological attitudes with negative attitudes toward outgroups than with positive attitudes. But the Chilean survey's identification of specific target groups could have moderated the relationship of the ideological attitudes with attitudes toward outgroups, by inhibiting the expression of negative feelings toward these specific outgroups.

Second, it is relatively easy to find a superordinate identity among Chileans, Argentineans, and Peruvians – perhaps a larger Latin American identity – because their countries share the same majority language, Spanish; the same majority religion, Catholic; and the same majority ethnic background, *mestizo* (a mixture between Europeans and Native Americans).[7] In contrast, in Germany the prevalent migrant groups come from countries in which a different language is spoken, such as Poland, the former Soviet Union, or Turkey; some have a different religious background, particularly migrants from Muslims countries; and some have a different ethnic background, mainly the non-European immigrants. In this case the perceived similarity between the migrant group and the host country's inhabitants would differ between Chile and Germany. Previous research within Europe and the United States has shown that the issue of language is one of the most important concerns in public opinions regarding the integration of immigrants (Citrin and Sides 2008).

The third factor is the history of migration. Chile has experienced significant immigration only in recent years, whereas in Germany migration has been a permanent phenomenon for the last five decades. These historical experiences could also produce a differentiation in the structure of prejudice. It would be interesting to observe if in the future the relationship between ideological configuration and attitudes toward foreigners becomes stronger in Chile because of the consolidation of migration groups living in the country.

Finally, further research regarding the concept of ideological configuration could be useful to improve the understanding of discrimination toward foreigners, specially if this approach includes a broader cross-cultural comparison that allows generalizing the findings presented here to other societies where migration is also becoming relevant. In the same way, other ideological attitudes and different targets should be included in the analyses to provide a more comprehensive model of ideological configuration.

---

7 It should be taken into account that Uhlmann and others (2002) found that Chileans show higher preferences for white-skinned people than for mestizos, and thus the argument of homogeneity among Latin Americans should be considered carefully.

References

Adorno, Theodor W., Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniel J. Levinson, and R. Nevitt Sanford. 1950. *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper & Row.

Allport, Gordon W. 1954. *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.

Altemeyer, Robert A. 1981. *Right-Wing Authoritarianism*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.

Altemeyer, Robert A. 1998. The Other "Authoritarian Personality." *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* 30: 47–92. doi:10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60382-2. http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0065260108603822.

Altemeyer, Robert A. 2004. Highly Dominating, Highly Authoritarian Personalities. *The Journal of Social Psychology* 144 (4): 421–47. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15279331.

Bäckström, Martin, and Fredrik Björklund. 2007. Structural Modeling of Generalized Prejudice. *Journal of Individual Differences* 28 (1): 10–17. doi:10.1027/1614-0001.28.1.10. http://psycontent.metapress.com/openurl.asp?genre=article&id=doi:10.1027/1614-0001.28.1.10.

Billig, Michael. 1982. *Ideology and Social Psychology*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Bohner, Gerd, and Nina Dickel. 2011. Attitudes and Attitude Change. *Annual Review of Psychology* 62: 13.1–13.27. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.121208.131609. https://www.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.psych.121208.131609.

Cárdenas, Manuel. 2006. "Y Verás Como Quieren en Chile …": Un Estudio Sobre el Prejuicio Hacia los Inmigrantes Bolivianos por parte de los Jóvenes Chilenos. *Ultima década* 14 (24): 103–29. doi:10.4067/S0718-22362006000100006. http://www.scielo.cl/scielo.php?script=sci_arttext&pid=S0718-22362006000100006&lng=en&nrm=iso&tlng=en.

Cárdenas, Manuel. 2007. Escala de Racismo Moderno: Propiedades Psicométricas y su Relación con Variables Psicosociales. *Universitas Psychologica* 6 (2): 255–62. http://www.scielo.org.co/scielo.php?pid=S1657-92672007000200005&script=sci_arttext&tlng=es.

Cárdenas, Manuel, Andrés Music, Paula Contreras, Hans Yeomans, and Carlos Calderón. 2007. Las Nuevas Formas de Prejuicio y sus Instrumentos de Medida. *Revista de Psicología de la Universidad de Chile* 16 (1): 69–96. http://www.facso.uchile.cl/psicologia/revista/2007/01/03_prejuicio.pdf#navpanes=0&zoom=100.

Cárdenas, Manuel, Patricio Meza, Karen Lagues, and Susan Yañez. 2010. Adaptación y Validación de la Escala de Orientación a la Dominancia Social (SDO) en una Muestra Chilena. *Universitas Psychologica* 9 (1): 161–68. http://revistas.javeriana.edu.co/index.php/revPsycho/article/download/240/431.

Carvacho, Héctor, and Andrés Haye. 2008. Configuración Ideológica y Estructura Social: Resucitando el Tema desde la Psicología Política. *Revista de Psicología de la Universidad de Chile* 17 (2): 81–94. http://www.facso.uchile.cl/publicaciones/psicologia/index.html.

Ceobanu, Alin M., and Xavier Escandell. 2010. Comparative Analyses of Public Attitudes Towards Immigrants and Immigration Using Multinational Survey Data: A Review of Theories and Research. *Annual Review of Sociology* 36 (1): 309–28. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.012809.102651. http://arjournals.annualreviews.org/doi/abs/10.1146/annurev.soc.012809.102651.

Citrin, Jack, and John Sides. 2008. Immigration and the Imagined Community in Europe and the United States. *Political Studies* 56 (1): 33–56. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9248.2007.00716.x. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1467-9248.2007.00716.x.

Cohrs, J. Christopher, and Frank Asbrock. 2009. Right-Wing Authoritarianism, Social Dominance Orientation and Prejudice against Threatening and Competitive Ethnic Groups. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 39 (2): 270–89. doi:10.1002/ejsp.545. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ejsp.545.

Dallago, Francesca, Rossana Cima, Michele Roccato, Luca Ricolfi, and Alberto Mirisola. 2008. The Correlation between Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation: The Moderating Effects of Political and Religious Identity. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 30 (4): 362–68. doi:10.1080/01973530802502333. http://www.informaworld.com/openurl?genre=article&doi=10.1080/0197353080250 2333&magic=crossref||D404A21C5BB053405B1A640AFFD44AE3.

Dovidio, John F., John C. Brigham, Blair T. Johnson, and Samuel L. Gaertner. 1996. Stereotyping, Prejudice, and Discrimination: Another Look. In *Stereotypes and Stereotyping*, C. Neil Macrae, Charles Stangor, and Miles Hewstone, eds., 276–319. New York: Guilford.

Dovidio, John F., Samuel L. Gaertner, Jason A. Nier, Kerry Kawakami, and Gordon Hodson. 2004. Contemporary Racial Bias: When Good People Do Bad Things. In *The Social Psychology of Good and Evil*, Arthur G. Miller, ed., 141–67. New York: Guilford.

Duckitt, John, Claire Wagner, Ilouize du Plessis, and Ingrid Birum. 2002. The Psychological Bases of Ideology and Prejudice: Testing a Dual Process Model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 83 (1): 75–93. doi:10.1037//0022-3514.83.1.75. http://psycnet.apa.org/journals/psp/83/1/75/.

Duriez, Bart, Alain Van Hiel, and Malgorzata Kossowska. 2005. Authoritarianism and Social Dominance in Western and Eastern Europe: The Importance of the Sociopolitical Context and of Political Interest and Involvement. *Political Psychology* 26 (2): 299–320. http://www3.interscience.wiley.com/journal/118651344/abstract.

Fischer, Ronald, and Shalom H. Schwartz. 2010. Whence Differences in Value Priorities? Individual, Cultural, or Artifactual Sources. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Sept.: 1–18. doi:10.1177/0022022110381429. http://jcc.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0022022110381429.

Fromm, Erich. 1942. *The Fear of Freedom*. London: Routledge.

Funke, Friedrich. 2005. The Dimensionality of Right-Wing Authoritarianism: Lessons from the Dilemma between Theory and Measurement. *Political Psychology* 26 (2): 195–218. http://www.jstor.org/stable/3792612.

González, Roberto. 2005. Movilidad Social: El Rol del Prejuicio y la Discriminación. *en foco* 59: 1–23. http://www.expansivaudp.cl/media/en_foco/documentos/12102005134506.pdf.

González, Roberto, Jorge Manzi, Flavio Cortés, David Torres, Pablo De Tezanos-Pinto, Nerea Aldunate, María Teresa Aravena, and José Luis Saíz. 2005. Identidad y Actitudes Políticas en Jóvenes Universitarios: El Desencanto de los que no se Identifican Políticamente. *Revista de Ciencia Política* 25 (2): 65–90. http://redalyc.uaemex.mx/redalyc/pdf/324/32425203.pdf.

González, Roberto, Jorge Manzi, Joaquín Silva, María Paz Cadena, Diego Carrasco, and Rodrigo Pizarro. 2008. *Jóvenes, Cultura y Religión*. Santiago, Chile: Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile. http://www.mideuc.cl/estudiojovenes/docs/Informefinal2007.pdf.

Haye, Andrés, Héctor Carvacho, Roberto González, Jorge Manzi, and Carolina Segovia. 2009. Relationship between Political Orientation and Socioeconomic Status in Chilean Political Culture: A Political Psychology Approach. *Polis, Revista de la Universidad Bolivariana* 8 (23): 351–84. http://www.revistapolis.cl/polis final/english/23e/pdf/haye_et_al_ingl.pdf.

Hershberger, Scott L. 2006. The Problem of Equivalent Structural Models. In *Structural Equations Modeling: A Second Course,* Gregory R. Hancock and Ralph O. Mueller, eds., 13–41. Greenwich, Conn.: Information Age.

Jetten, Jolanda, and Aarti Iyer. 2010. Different Meanings of the Social Dominance Orientation Concept: Predicting Political Attitudes over Time. *The British Journal of Social Psychology* 49: 385–404. doi:10.1348/014466609X435723. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/19397844.

Jost, John T. 2006. The End of the End of Ideology. *The American Psychologist* 61 (7): 651–70. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.61.7.651. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/17032067.

Jost, John T., and Mahzarin R. Banaji. 1994. The Role of Stereotyping in System-Justification and the Production of False Consciousness. *British Journal of Social Psychology* 33: 1–27.

Jost, John T., and Erik P. Thompson. 2000. Group-Based Dominance and Opposition to Equality as Independent Predictors of Self-Esteem, Ethnocentrism, and Social Policy Attitudes among African Americans and European Americans. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 36 (3): 209–32. doi:10.1006/jesp.1999.1403. http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0022103199914038.

Kreindler, Sara A. 2005. A Dual Group Processes Model of Individual Differences in Prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Review* 9 (2): 90–107. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0902_1. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/15869377.

Ledgerwood, Alison, Yaacov Trope, and Shelly Chaiken. 2010. Flexibility Now, Consistency Later: Psychological Distance and Construal Shape Evaluative Responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 99 (1): 32–51. doi:10.1037/a0019843. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/20565184.

Lehmiller, Justin J., and Michael T. Schmitt. 2007. Group Domination and Inequality in Context: Evidence for the Unstable Meanings of Social Dominance and Authoritarianism. *European Journal of Social Psychology* 37 (4): 704–24. doi:10.1002/ejsp.383. http://doi.wiley.com/10.1002/ejsp.383.

Martínez Pizarro, Jorge. 2003. *El Encanto de los Datos: Sociodemografía de la Inmigración en Chile según el Censo de 2002*. Santiago, Chile: CEPAL. http://meme.phpwebhosting.com/~migracion/rimd/documentos_miembros/1727234.pdf.

Martínez Pizarro, Jorge. 2005. Magnitud y Dinámica de la Inmigración en Chile, según el Censo de 2002. *Papeles de Población* (44): 109–47. http://redalyc.uaemex.mx/redalyc/pdf/112/11204405.pdf.

Meuleman, Bart, Eldad Davidov, and Jaak Billiet. 2009. Changing Attitudes toward Immigration in Europe, 2002–2007: A Dynamic Group Conflict Theory Approach. *Social Science Research* 38 (2): 352–65. doi:10.1016/j.ssresearch.2008.09.006. http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S0049089X08001051.

Ministry of the Interior, Chile. 2009. Informe Estadístico: Estimación de Población de Extranjeros en Chile a Diciembre de 2008. Santiago, Chile. http://www.extranjeria.gov.cl/filesapp/Informe%20Estimacion%20Poblacion%20Extranjeros%202008.pdf.

Muthén, Linda K., and Bengt O. Muthén. 1998-2007. *Mplus User's Guide,* 5th ed. Los Angeles, Calif.: Muthén & Muthén.

Passini, Stefano. 2008. Exploring the Multidimensional Facets of Authoritarianism: Authoritarian Aggression and Social Dominance Orientation. *Swiss Journal of Psychology* 67 (1): 51–60. doi:10.1024/1421-0185.67.1.51. http://psycontent.metapress.com/openurl.asp?genre=article&id=doi:10.1024/1421-0185.67.1.51.

Pettigrew, Thomas F., Ulrich Wagner, and Oliver Christ. 2007. Who Opposes Immigration? Comparing German with North American Findings. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race* 4 (1): 19–39. doi:10.1017/S1742058X07070038. http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S1742058X07070038.

Pratto, Felicia, James H. Liu, Shana Levin, Jim Sidanius, Margaret Shih, Hagit Bachrach, and Peter Hegarty. 2000. Social Dominance Orientation and the Legitimization of Inequality across Cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* 31 (3): 369–409. doi:10.1177/0022022100031003005. http://jcc.sagepub.com/cgi/doi/10.1177/0022022100031003005.

Preacher, Kristopher. 2006. Quantifying Parsimony in Structural Equation Modeling. *Multivariate Behavioral Research* 41 (3): 227–59. doi:10.1207/s15327906mbr4103_1. http://www.informaworld.com/openurl?genre=article&doi=10.1207/s15327906mbr4103_1&magic=crossref||D404A21C5BB053405B1A640AFFD44AE3.

Roccato, Michele, and Luca Ricolfi. 2005. On the Correlation between Right-Wing Authoritarianism and Social Dominance Orientation. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology* 27 (3): 187–200. doi:10.1207/s15324834basp2703_1. http://www.informaworld.com/openurl?genre=article&doi=10.1207/s15324834basp2703_1&magic=crossref||D404A21C5BB053405B1A640AFFD44AE3.

Schütz, Heidi, and Bernd Six. 1996. How Strong Is the Relationship between Prejudice and Discrimination? A Meta-Analytic Answer. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations* 20 (3–4): 441–62. doi:10.1016/0147-1767(96)00028-4. http://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/0147176796000284.

Sidanius, Jim, and Felicia Pratto. 1999. *Social Dominance: An Intergroup Theory of Social Hierarchies and Oppression*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sides, John, and Jack Citrin. 2007. European Opinion about Immigration: The Role of Identities, Interests and Information. *British Journal of Political Science* 37 (3): 477. doi:10.1017/S0007123407000257. http://www.journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0007123407000257.

Tajfel, Henri, and John C. Turner. 1986. The Social Identity Theory of Intergroup Behavior. In *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*, Stephen Worchel and William G. Austin, eds., 7–24. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Thomsen, Lotte, Eva G. T. Green, and Jim Sidanius. 2008. We Will Hunt Them Down: How Social Dominance Orientation and Right-Wing Authoritarianism Fuel Ethnic Persecution of Immigrants in Fundamentally Different Ways. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 44: 1455–64.

Uhlmann, Eric, Nilanjana Dasgupta, Angélica Elgueta, Anthony G. Greenwald, and Jane Swanson. 2002. Subgroup Prejudice Based on Skin Color among Hispanics in the United States and Latin America. *Social Cognition* 20 (3): 198–225.

United Nations. 2009. Trends in Total Migrants Stock: The 2008 Revision. New York. *http://esa.un.org/migration/.*

Wagner, Ulrich, Oliver Christ, and Thomas F. Pettigrew. 2008. Prejudice and Group-Related Behavior in Germany. *Journal of Social Issues* 64 (2): 403–16. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.00568.x. *http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.00568.x.*

Zick, Andreas, Ulrich Wagner, Rolf van Dick, and Thomas Petzel. 2001. Acculturation and Prejudice in Germany: Majority and Minority Perspectives. *Journal of Social Issues* 57 (3): 541–57. doi:10.1111/0022-4537.00228. *http://www.blackwell-synergy.com/links/doi/10.1111/0022-4537.00228.*

Zick, Andreas, Thomas F. Pettigrew, and Ulrich Wagner. 2008. Ethnic Prejudice and Discrimination in Europe. *Journal of Social Issues* 64 (2): 233–51. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.00559.x. *http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.00559.x.*

Zick, Andreas, Carina Wolf, Beate Küpper, Eldad Davidov, Peter Schmidt, and Wilhelm Heitmeyer. 2008. The Syndrome of Group-Focused Enmity: The Interrelation of Prejudices Tested with Multiple Cross-Sectional and Panel Data. *Journal of Social Issues* 64 (2): 363–83. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.00566.x. *http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/j.1540-4560.2008.00566.x.*

Appendix 1: Items included in the Chilean survey

Right-Wing Authoritarianism:

Voy a leerle un conjunto de frases que se refieren a distintos aspectos del mundo político, y para cada una de ellas le pido que me diga, de 1 a 5, su grado de acuerdo o desacuerdo (1 = muy en desacuerdo; 5 = muy de acuerdo):

· Más que partidos y programas políticos, lo que nos hace falta es un líder que resuelva los problemas.

· Los gobiernos deben ocupar mano dura cada vez que hay dificultades.

· En vez de tanta preocupación por los derechos de las personas, lo que este país necesita es un gobierno firme.

· Las verdaderas claves para una sociedad exitosa son la obediencia y la disciplina.

Social Dominance Orientation:

Voy a leerle un conjunto de frases que se refieren a distintos aspectos del mundo político, y para cada una de ellas le pido que me diga, de 1 a 5, su grado de acuerdo o desacuerdo (1 = muy en desacuerdo; 5 = muy de acuerdo):

· Algunos grupos dentro de nuestro país son simplemente inferiores a otros.

· En realidad no está mal que existan grupos que estén arriba y otros que estén abajo.

· En realidad no está mal que algunas personas tengan más oportunidades en la vida que otras.

· Los grupos inferiores debieran quedarse donde les corresponde.

Affection toward Immigrants:

Piense ahora en los peruanos/argentinos que han venido a vivir o trabajar a Chile. Usando la siguiente tarjeta (1 = muy poco; 5 = mucho), por favor dígame, de 1 a 5:

· ¿Cuánto le agradan los peruanos/argentinos?

· ¿Cuánto los admira?

· ¿Cuánto confía en ellos?

Appendix 2: Items included in the German survey

Right-Wing Authoritarianism:

Es gibt Meinungen die man immer wieder mal hört. Sagen Sie mir bitte für die folgenden Meinungen jeweils, ob sie

1. voll und ganz zustimmen

2. eher zustimmen

3. eher nicht zustimmen

4. oder überhaupt nicht zustimmen.

· Verbrechen sollten härter bestraft werden.

· Um Recht und Ordnung zu bewahren, sollte man härter gegen Außenseiter und Unruhestifter vorgehen.

· Zu den wichtigsten Eigenschaften, die jemand haben sollte, gehören Gehorsam und Respekt vor dem Vorgesetzten.

Social Dominance Orientation, group-based dominance:

In Deutschland leben verschiedene Bevölkerungsgruppen. Wie beurteilen Sie die folgenden Meinungen

1. voll und ganz zustimmen,

2. eher zustimmen,

3. eher nicht zustimmen, oder

4. überhaupt nicht zustimmen

· Die Gruppen, die in unserer Gesellschaft unten sind, sollen auch unten bleiben.

· Es gibt Gruppen in der Bevölkerung, die weniger wert sind als andere.

· Einige Bevölkerungsgruppen sind nützlicher als andere.

Hostility toward Foreigners:

Wie beurteilen Sie die folgenden Meinungen. Sagen Sie mir bitte jeweils, ob sie

1. voll und ganz zustimmen

2. eher zustimmen

3. eher nicht zustimmen

4. oder überhaupt nicht zustimmen.

· Die in Deutschland lebenden Ausländer sind eine Belastung für das soziale Netz.

· Es leben zu viele Ausländer in Deutschland.

· Die vielen ausländischen Kinder in der Schule verhindern eine gute Ausbildung der deutschen Kinder.

· Wenn Arbeitsplätze knapp werden, sollte man die in Deutschland lebenden Ausländer wieder in ihre Heimat zurückschicken.

Héctor Carvacho

hscarvac@uc.cl