APPENDIX A

Table I: Means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and inter-correlations between theoretically relevant study variables in France

	M	*SD*	*Reliability*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
1. Intergroup contact	2.2	.76	*r* = .57***	1	−.19***	−.40***	−.22***	−.22***
2. Social dominance orientation	1.49	.59	*r* = .36***		1	.27***	.21***	.18***
3. Anti-immigrant attitudes	2.10	.79	α = .81			1	.43***	.35***
4. Anti-Semitism	2.02	.76	α = .78				1	.27***
5. Attitudes towards homosexuals	2.32	.98	*r* = .59***					1

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table II: Means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and inter-correlations between theoretically relevant study variables in Germany

	M	*SD*	*Reliability*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
1. Intergroup contact	2.25	.79	$r = .61^{***}$	1	−.17***	−.31***	−.21***	−.21***
2. Social dominance orientation	1.84	.72	$r = .41^{***}$		1	.43***	.32***	.22***
3. Anti-immigrant attitudes	2.14	.73	α = .80			1	.45***	.30***
4. Anti-Semitism	2.16	.76	α = .77				1	.25***
5. Attitudes towards homosexuals	2.03	.93	$r = .53^{***}$					1

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table III: Means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and inter-correlations between theoretically relevant study variables in Hungary

	M	*SD*	*Reliability*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
1. Intergroup contact	1.78	.88	*r* = .68***	1	−.05	−.21***	−.08*	−.18***
2. Social dominance orientation	2.16	.86	*r* = .36***		1	.17***	.12**	.03
3. Anti-immigrant attitudes	2.54	.73	α = .65			1	.32***	.16***
4. Anti-Semitism	2.74	.88	α = .72				1	.16***
5. Attitudes towards homosexuals	3.04	1.01	*r* = .59***					1

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table IV: Means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and inter-correlations between theoretically relevant study variables in Italy

	M	*SD*	*Reliability*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
1. Intergroup contact	1.82	.62	*r* = .59***	1	−.16***	−.24***	−.07*	−.19***
2. Social dominance orientation	1.80	.75	*r* = .38***		1	.42***	.29***	.24***
3. Anti-immigrant attitudes	2.44	.76	α = .74			1	.28***	.28***
4. Anti-Semitism	2.01	.77	α = .72				1	.12***
5. Attitudes towards homosexuals	2.62	1.01	*r* = .52***					1

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table V: Means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and inter-correlations between theoretically relevant study variables in the Netherlands

	M	*SD*	*Reliability*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
1. Intergroup contact	1.83	.59	*r* = .52***	1	−.21***	−.26***	−.12***	−.12***
2. Social dominance orientation	1.82	.68	*r* = .37***		1	.41***	.25***	.22***
3. Anti-immigrant attitudes	2.13	.71	α = .79			1	.29***	.25***
4. Anti-Semitism	1.78	.61	α = .69				1	.14***
5. Attitudes towards homosexuals	1.68	.84	*r* = .71***					1

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table VI: Means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and inter-correlations between theoretically relevant study variables in Poland

	M	*SD*	*Reliability*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
1. Intergroup contact	1.75	.80	*r* = .42***	1	−.08*	−.22***	−.07*	−.17***
2. Social dominance orientation	1.99	.78	*r* = .37***		1	.24***	.14***	.02
3. Anti-immigrant attitudes	2.26	.65	α = .68			1	.32***	.26***
4. Anti-Semitism	2.72	.79	α = .76				1	.27***
5. Attitudes towards homosexuals	3.34	.81	*r* = .57***					1

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table VII: Means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and inter-correlations between theoretically relevant study variables in Portugal

	M	*SD*	*Reliability*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
1. Intergroup contact	2.58	.85	*r* = .58***	1	.03	.06	−.03	−.07
2. Social dominance orientation	1.98	.52	*r* = .40***		1	.34***	.09**	.15***
3. Anti-immigrant attitudes	2.29	.46	α = .79			1	.20***	.24***
4. Anti-Semitism	2.39	.46	α = .51				1	.11**
5. Attitudes towards homosexuals	2.61	.73	*r* = .57***					1

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table VIII: Means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and inter-correlations between theoretically relevant study variables in the UK

	M	*SD*	*Reliability*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
1. Intergroup contact	2.01	.79	*r* = .60***	1	−.28***	−.35***	−.18***	−.26***
2. Social dominance orientation	1.63	.71	*r* = .43***		1	.44***	.29***	.30***
3. Anti-immigrant attitudes	2.48	.79	α = .80			1	.37***	.37***
4. Anti-Semitism	1.89	.67	α = .72				1	.30***
5. Attitudes towards homosexuals	2.42	1.06	*r* = .76***					1

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table IX: Means, standard deviations, reliabilities, and inter-correlations between theoretically relevant study variables – Full sample

	M	*SD*	*Reliability*	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*
1. Intergroup contact	2.02	.82	*r* = .60***	1	−.13***	−.26***	−.11***	−.19***
2. Social dominance orientation	1.85	.74	*r* = .39***		1	.34***	.27***	.21***
3. Anti-immigrant attitudes	2.31	.72	α = .74			1	.33***	.30***
4. Anti-Semitism	2.21	.80	α = .78				1	.33***
5. Attitudes towards homosexuals	2.51	1.05	*r* = .68***					1

*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

APPENDIX B: Additional relationships between demographic control variables and theoretically relevant variables across countries.

Full sample

In addition, our control variables also yielded a range of statistically significant relationships. As such, females reported less intergroup contact ($b = -.06$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$), lower social dominance orientation ($b = -.04$, $SE = .02$, $p = .04$), more negative attitudes towards immigrants ($b = .04$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), less anti–Semitism ($b = -.11$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$), and less negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = -.22$, $SE = .03$, $p < .001$). Older respondents reported less intergroup contact ($b = -.01$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), greater anti–Semitism ($b = .01$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$), and more negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = .01$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$). Higher education was associated with lower social dominance orientation ($b = -.01$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), lower anti–immigrant attitudes ($b = -.01$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), and less negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = -.01$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$). Higher income was associated with greater contact ($b = .03$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), lower social dominance orientation ($b = -.06$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), less negative attitudes towards immigrants ($b = -.03$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), less anti–Semitism ($b = -.02$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$) and less negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = -.02$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$). Finally, greater far right political orientation was associated with less reported contact ($b = -.05$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), greater social dominance orientation ($b = .06$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), more negative attitudes towards immigrants ($b = .03$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), and more negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = .06$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$).

France

Our control variables also yielded a number of significant regression weights. Thus, females reported lower levels of contact with immigrants than males ($b = -.14$, $SE = .05$, $p < .01$). Older respondents reported less contact ($b = -.01$, $SE = .00$, $p < .001$), more anti–Semitism ($b = .01$, $SE = .00$, $p < .001$) and more negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = .02$, $SE = .00$, $p < .001$). Higher levels of education were associated with more intergroup contact ($b = .02$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), lower social dominance orientation ($b = -.01$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), less anti–immigrant attitudes ($b = -.01$, $SE = .00$, $p < .01$), and less negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = .48$, $SE = .11$, $p < .001$). And higher income was associated with less negative attitudes towards immigrants ($b = -.03$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$). More far–right political orientation was associated with less contact ($b = -.06$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), greater social dominance orientation ($b = .04$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), more anti–immigrant attitudes ($b = .04$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$) and more negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = .11$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$).

Germany

Females reported less negative attitudes towards homosexuals than did males ($b = -.33$, $SE = .06$, $p < .001$). Increasing age was associated with less intergroup contact ($b = -.01$, $SE = .00$, $p < .001$), lower anti–immigrant attitudes ($b = -.01$, $SE = .00$, $p < .01$), but with higher levels of anti–Semitism ($b = .01$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), as well as more negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = .02$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$). Respondents with higher levels of education reported lower social dominance orientation ($b = -.02$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), and less negative attitudes towards immigrants ($b = -.01$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$). Higher income was associated with more contact ($b = .05$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), lower social dominance orientation ($b = -.01$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$), less negative attitudes towards immigrants ($b = -.02$, $SE = .01$, $p = .01$) and lower anti–Semitism ($b = -.03$, $SE = .01$, $p = .01$). Finally, greater far–right political orientation was associated with less immigrant contact ($b = -.07$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$), greater social dominance orientation ($b = .12$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$), more anti–Semitism ($b = .03$, $SE = .02$, $p = .04$) and more negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = .10$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$).

Hungary

Females reported less anti–Semitism ($b = -.33$, $SE = .06$, $p < .001$) and less negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = -.23$, $SE = .07$, $p < .001$) than did males. Older respondents reported less intergroup contact ($b = -.01$, $SE = .00$, $p < .01$), and respondents with higher levels of education reported more intergroup contact ($b = .01$, $SE = .00$, $p < .01$), Respondents with higher income reported more intergroup contact ($b = .06$, $SE = .02$, $p < .01$) and less negative attitudes towards immigrants ($b = -.05$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$). And greater far–right political orientation was associated with greater anti–Semitism ($b = .06$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$).

Italy

Females reported less intergroup contact ($b = -.10$, $SE = .04$, $p < .01$) and less anti–Semitism ($b = -.15$, $SE = .05$, $p < .03$) than males. Older respondents also reported less contact ($b = -.01$, $SE = .00$, $p < .001$), as well as lower anti–immigrant attitudes ($b = -.01$, $SE = .00$, $p < .001$), more anti–Semitism ($b = .01$, $SE = .00$, $p = .03$) and more negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = .02$, $SE = .00$, $p < .001$). Respondents with higher levels of education reported more intergroup contact ($b = .01$, $SE = .00$, $p < .001$), lower social dominance orientation ($b = -.01$, $SE = .04$, $p < .01$), and less anti–Semitism ($b = -.01$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$). Respondents with higher income had lower levels of social dominance orientation ($b = -.10$, $SE = .04$, $p < .01$), and reported less negative attitudes towards immigrants ($b = -.05$, $SE = .01$, $p < .01$), but more negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = .09$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$). Finally, respondents with greater far–right political orientation reported less contact ($b = -.02$, $SE = .01$, $p = .01$), higher social dominance orientation ($b = .09$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), more anti–immigrant attitudes ($b = .04$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), greater anti–Semitism ($b = -.03$, $SE = .01$, $p = .05$), and more negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = .08$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$).

The Netherlands

Females reported less negative attitudes towards homosexuals than did males ($b = -.14$, $SE = .06$, $p < .01$). Older respondents reported less contact ($b = -.01$, $SE = .00$, $p < .001$), less negative attitudes towards immigrants ($b = -.01$, $SE = .00$, $p < .001$), and more anti–Semitism ($b = .01$, $SE = .00$, $p < .001$). Respondents with higher levels of education reported lower social dominance orientation ($b = -.01$, $SE = .00$, $p = .01$). Higher income was associated with more contact ($b = .03$, $SE = .01$, $p = .03$), lower social dominance orientation ($b = -.09$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$), and less negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = -.06$, $SE = .02$, $p = .01$). And greater far–right political orientation was associated with less intergroup contact ($b = -.04$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), higher social dominance orientation ($b = .09$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$), more negative attitudes towards immigrants ($b = .06$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), and more negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = .10$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$).

Poland

　　Females reported more negative attitudes towards immigrants ($b = .07$, $SE = .03$, $p = .01$), lower anti–Semitism ($b = -.26$, $SE = .05$, $p < .001$), and less negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = -.21$, $SE = .05$, $p < .001$). Older respondents reported higher levels of anti–Semitism ($b = .01$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), and less favorable attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = .01$, $SE = .01$, $p = .01$). Higher levels of education were associated with less negative attitudes towards immigrants ($b = -.01$, $SE = .01$, $p < .01$), as was higher income ($b = -.03$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$). Respondents with higher income also reported less negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = -.03$, $SE = .01$, $p = .02$). And greater far–right political orientation was associated with more negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = .05$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$).

Portugal

Females reported less negative attitudes towards immigrants ($b = -.09$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$), less anti–Semitism ($b = -.07$, $SE = .03$, $p = .01$), and less negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = -.29$, $SE = .05$, $p < .001$). Older respondents reported more anti–Semitism ($b = .01$, $SE = .00$, $p < .001$), and more negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = .02$, $SE = .00$, $p < .001$). Higher education levels were associated with lower social dominance orientation ($b = -.02$, $SE = .00$, $p < .001$), and less anti–immigrant attitudes ($b = -.01$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), while higher income was associated with less contact ($b = -.06$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$), lower social dominance orientation ($b = -.04$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), and lower anti–immigrant attitudes ($b = -.02$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$). Greater far–right political orientation was associated with higher social dominance orientation ($b = .04$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$), and more negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = .05$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$).

The UK

Females reported less negative attitudes towards homosexuals than did males ($b = -.42$, $SE = .07$, $p < .001$). Older respondents reported less intergroup contact ($b = -.01$, $SE = .00$, $p < .01$), more anti–Semitism ($b = .01$, $SE = .00$, $p = .03$), and more negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = .02$, $SE = .00$, $p < .001$). Respondents with higher levels of education reported more intergroup contact ($b = .01$, $SE = .00$, $p < .01$), lower social dominance orientation ($b = -.02$, $SE = .00$, $p < .001$) and less negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = -.01$, $SE = .01$, $p = .01$). Higher income was associated with more intergroup contact ($b = .03$, $SE = .01$, $p < .01$), lower social dominance orientation ($b = -.03$, $SE = .01$, $p = .02$), and less negative attitudes towards homosexuals ($b = -.03$, $SE = .02$, $p < .02$). Finally, greater far–right political orientation was associated with less intergroup contact ($b = -.07$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$), greater social dominance orientation ($b = .09$, $SE = .02$, $p < .001$), and more negative anti–immigrant attitudes ($b = .04$, $SE = .01$, $p < .01$).