**Appendix to Chapter 20**

The measures of variables used in Tables 20.1–20.3 and Figures 20.1–20.2 are described in:   
McLaren, L.M. (2012), ‘The cultural divide in Europe: Migration, multiculturalism, and political trust’, *World Politics*, 64 (2), 199-241, doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0043887112000032.

The measures of variables used in Tables 20.4-20.5 and Figures 20.3-20.4 are as follows.

Individual-level data are from Eurobarometer 71.3 (EB71.3), from June–July 2009.

Political Trust  
‘I would like to ask you a question about how much trust you have in certain institutions. For each of the following institutions, please tell me if you tend to trust it or tend not to trust it. Justice / the (NATIONALITY) legal system, Political parties, The (NATIONALITY PARLIAMENT) (USE PROPER NAME FOR LOWER HOUSE), The (NATIONALITY) Government.’   
The response choices are ‘tend to trust’ or ‘tend not to trust’. ‘Don’t know’ responses were also coded and these were placed between ‘tend to trust’ and ‘tend not to trust’, with ‘tend not to trust’ coded as 0, ‘tend to trust’ coded as 1, and ‘don’t know’ coded as 0.5.

Responses to these are strongly correlated with one another (according to both Kendall’s tau-b and Spearman’s rho) and load onto a single factor in a principal components analysis in every country; scalability coefficients from an Item Response Theory (IRT) model, or Mokken scale, also indicate the existence of a very strong scale, and average Cronbach’s alpha is 0.81 (the lowest alpha was 0.67 for France and the highest was 0.85 for Italy). In addition, prior research on attitudes toward the components of political systems indicates a strong connection between these (Muller 1972; Kaase 1999; Klingemann 1999; Hooghe 2011; but see Denters, Gabriel and Torcal 2007; Fisher, van Heerde and Tucker 2010). We therefore combine these items into a single additive index, with high values representing more positive perceptions of political institutions.

The range of the political trust index is 0–4.

National Identity

The components of national identity emphasized by respondents are measured with the following survey items: ‘People differ in what they think it means to be (NATIONALITY). In your view, among the following, what do you think are the most important characteristics to be (NATIONALITY) (MAXIMUM OF 3 ANSWERS)? (1) To be a Christian; (2) To share (NATIONALITY) cultural traditions; (3) To be born in (OUR COUNTRY); (4) To have at least one (NATIONALITY) parents; (5) To feel (NATIONALITY); (6) To master (COUNTRY LANGUAGE) (OR FOR MULTILANGUAGE COUNTRIES) (7) To master one of the official languages of (OUR COUNTRY); (8) To exercise citizens’ rights, for example voting in (OUR COUNTRY); (9) To have been brought up in (OUR COUNTRY); (10) Being active in any association or organization in (OUR COUNTRY).’

Because none of the Eurobarometer items above asks specifically about ethnicity, we revert to the general notion of ascriptive characteristics and following on from the work of other scholars in this field (Kunovich 2009; Wright 2011; Wright, Citrin and Wand 2012), respondents who chose items 3, 4, or 9 were assumed to emphasize ascriptive identity and respondents who chose items 5, 8, or 10 were assumed to emphasize civic identity. The more of these items a respondent chooses, the higher her score on the ascriptive or civic identity scales.

The range of each scale is 0–3.

The mentioning of sharing cultural traditions or mastering the country's language are dummy variables (0=no mention of these components; 1=mentioned these components).

Economic Expectations

What are your expectations for the next twelve months: will the next twelve months be better, worse or the same, when it comes to...? The economic situation in (OUR COUNTRY); The financial situation of your household; The employment situation in (OUR COUNTRY); Your personal job situation. Better, Worse, Same.

Perception of current economy and economic circumstances: How would you judge the current situation in each of the following? The situation of the (NATIONALITY) economy; Your personal job situation; The financial situation of your household; The employment situation in (OUR COUNTRY). Very good, rather good, rather bad, very bad.

Perceptions of other current issues: The following item appears in the same group as the above items: The situation of the environment in (OUR COUNTRY). Very good, rather good, rather bad, very bad.

All measures were coded such that high values represent more positive perceptions of circumstances.

Life Satisfaction

On the whole, are you very satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied or not at all satisfied with the life you lead? Very satisfied, fairly satisfied, not very satisfied, not at all satisfied.

The measure was coded such that high values represent more positive perceptions of circumstances.

Expectations for Life in Future

What are your expectations for the next twelve months: will the next twelve months be better, worse or the same, when it comes to...? Your life in general. Better, Worse, Same.

The measure was coded such that high values represent more positive perceptions of circumstances.

Level in Society

On the following scale, step '1' corresponds to ‘the lowest level in the society’; step '10' corresponds to ‘the highest level in the society’. Could you tell me on which step you would place yourself? 1 The lowest level in the society…10 The highest level in the society.

The measure was coded such that high values represent more positive perceptions of circumstances.

Left–Right Self-Placement

In political matters people talk of ‘the left’ and ‘the right’. How would you place your views on this scale (1 Left; 10 Right).

Education

How old were you when you stopped full-time education? Those who are still studying were recoded such that their education was their current age.

Age

How old are you?

Size of Town

Would you say you live in a...? Rural area or village, Small or middle sized town, Large town. Large town is the omitted category for the analysis here.

Gender

Coded by interviewer.

Official Government Policy

Regarding treatment of newcomers is measured via Banting and Kymlicka’s Multiculturalism Policy Index (MPI).[[1]](#footnote-1) As noted by Banting and Kymlicka, ‘multiculturalism policies’ refer to a wide range of policies, ‘but what they all have in common is that they go beyond the protection of the basic civil and political rights guaranteed to all individuals in a liberal-democratic state, to also extend some level of public recognition and support for ethnocultural minorities to maintain and express their distinct identities and practices’ (2006: 1). Banting and colleagues have devised multiculturalism policy scores for different types of minorities, including indigenous minorities. Here, we use the index devised for immigrant minorities, which examines the adoption of eight policies (see http://www.queensu.ca/mcp/immigrant/decisionrules.html, last accessed November 22, 2012, for coding decision rules; see also Tolley 2011 for information regarding data collection), as follows:[[2]](#footnote-2)

1. constitutional, legislative or parliamentary affirmation of multiculturalism;
2. the adoption of multiculturalism in school curriculum;
3. the inclusion of ethnic representation/sensitivity in the mandate of public media or media licensing;
4. exemptions from dress-codes, Sunday-closing legislation etc;
5. allowing dual citizenship;
6. the funding of ethnic group organizations to support cultural activities;
7. the funding of bilingual education or mother-tongue instruction;
8. affirmative action for disadvantaged immigrant groups.

MPI scores are available for 1980, 2000, and 2010, and we have decided to use the 2000 scores because they precede the date of the Eurobarometer Survey being used here. We have also investigated Proposition 4 using the 2010 MPI scores and found the results to be very similar to those in the main analysis. Note that the correlation between the 2000 and 2010 scores is 0.51 (Pearson correlation coefficient).

Higher scores on the MPI represent more multiculturalism policies for immigrant-origin minorities.
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