Economics Bulletin

Volume 38, Issue 1

What meets the eye: the effect of the presence of immigrants on personal attitudes to migrations in Europe

Eugenio Levi
Sapienza University of Rome

Rama Dasi Mariani
Sapienza University of Rome

Fabrizio Patriarca
Roma Tre University

Abstract

Using ESS and Eurostat data, we investigate attitudes to immigrants in the perspective of a dynamic process of belief formation. We want to verify the existence of a learning effect on personal attitudes to immigration by observing the different effects of past and recent inflows of immigrants. Furthermore, we investigate whether these can be explained as effects of stereotyping and/or by contact theory. We find evidence of a learning effect, since past flows prove not to be significant while recent flows are significant and negative. Stereotyping and contact theory partly explain personal attitudes to immigration, but they do not seem to explain the negative effect correlated to the presence of immigrants and the subsequent learning effect. Finally, we look at the interaction between migration flows and demographic and socio-economic characteristics of the population. Income is the only factor that explains the learning effect, as wealthier social groups are more averse to the presence of immigrants in their neighbourhood but also display a tendency to learn faster.

We wish to thank Fondazione Di Vagno for funding.
Citation: Eugenio Levi and Rama Dasi Mariani and Fabrizio Patriarca, (2018) "What meets the eye: the effect of the presence of immigrants on personal attitudes to migrations in Europe", *Economics Bulletin*, Volume 38, Issue 1, pages 419-430
Contact: Eugenio Levi - eugenio.levi@uniroma1.it, Rama Dasi Mariani - ramadasi.mariani@uniroma1.it, Fabrizio Patriarca - fapatri@hotmail.com.
Submitted: October 02, 2017. **Published:** February 27, 2018.

Economics Bulletin

Submission Number: EB-17-00785

What meets the eye: the effect of the presence of immigrants on personal attitudes on migrations in Europe

Eugenio Levi
Sapienza University of Rome

Rama Dasi Mariani
Sapienza University of Rome

Fabrizio Patriarca
Roma Tre University

Abstract

Using ESS and Eurostat data, we investigate attitudes towards immigrants in the perspective of a dynamic process of beliefs formation. We want to test if there is a learning effect on personal attitudes over immigration by distinguishing the effect of past and recent inflows of migrants. Furthermore, we investigate whether these two different effects are explained by stereotypes or by contact theory. We find evidence of a learning effect since past flows are not significant while recent flows are significant and negative. Stereotypes and contact theory explain both personal attitudes toward immigration, but they do not seem to explain the negative effect related to the presence of immigrants and the subsequent learning. Finally, we look at the interaction of flows with demographic and socio-economic characteristics. Only income explains the learning effect, as the rich are more averse to the presence of immigrants in their neighbourhood but they learn faster.

Submitted: October 02, 2017.

1. Introduction

A political narrative on immigration is now mainstream worldwide. After running electoral campaigns highly charged with anti-immigration rhetoric, Donald Trump won the US presidential elections, the Brexit camp won the referendum on EU membership in the UK, Marine Le Pen won a place in the second round of the last French presidential elections and Alternative for Germany (AfD) entered the German Parliament at the 2017 general elections. However, scientific evidence does not find any correlation between the presence of immigrants and people's personal attitudes to immigration, neither in the case of the USA nor in Europe (Scheve and Slaughter, 2001, Card et al., 2005). Moreover, anecdotal evidence, specific case studies and local commentators all seem to support this result[1].

One possibility is that people's attitudes to immigration are completely disconnected from the *actual* presence of immigrants. However, a different hypothesis may explain these results, i.e. the idea that learning processes are at play, as people's attitudes to immigration may change over time. As a matter of fact, theories originating from social psychology suggest that natives initially react to migration inflows with hostility. This initial negative effect may be motivated by different factors, such as ingroup bias (Tajfel and Turner, 1979) or stereotyping (Oakes et al., 1994). Eventually, hostility may fade away because a learning process may take over. Two strands of theories predict this result: contact theory and theories on stereotypes. The former suggests that contact with immigrants facilitates the elimination of barriers between groups (Allport, 1954); the latter that stereotypes vanish as soon as the natives acquire information over the actual beliefs and behaviours of the immigrants (Arrow, 1971).

This paper tests the existence of a learning process by looking at the effect of recent and past inflows of immigrants. If a learning process is at work, the effect of recent inflows should be negative and that of past ones should be null or not significant. Moreover, we will test whether contact theory and pure discrimination help to explain this learning process and whether individual-level demographic and socio-economic characteristics also affect it.

In order to evaluate the presence of these determinants, we will use individual level data from the European Social Survey and Eurostat for the whole Europe. Our main finding is that migration inflows to a region produce a negative effect on the region's individual attitudes to immigration. However, consistent with our hypothesis, this effect is transitory. Furthermore, although stereotypes and contact influence personal attitudes to immigration, they do not seem to explain the negative effects correlated to the new migration inflows and the subsequent learning process.

Finally, we look at demographics (age) and socio-economic characteristics (education and income). What we find is that income – or at least some variables connected to it – explains this effect, as wealthier groups are more averse to the presence of immigrants in their neighbourhood, but they also display a propensity to learn faster.

2. Aim and methods

In order to investigate in depth people's beliefs on immigration, our analysis proceeds by steps. We will attempt to test the following hypotheses:

[1] http://www.motherjones.com/kevin-drum/2016/11/support-trump-strongest-where- illegal-immigration-lowest, http://www.nytimes.com/2016/11/11/opinion/identity-over- ideology.html

1. There is a learning process at work, whereby recent and past flows of immigrants affect personal attitudes to immigration in different ways;
2. This learning process can be explained with stereotypes, with contact theory, or else with individual socio-economic conditions.

When dealing with immigration to a country, it is essential that we consider the dynamic aspect of the process and its history. Our first step derives from the assumption that recent and past variations in the number of foreign-born people in a neighbourhood may have different effects. It is not hard to imagine that living in an area populated by long term and well integrated immigrants may produce beliefs towards immigration rather different from those that may arise in an area where immigration is a recent phenomenon. The first step of our analysis is to verify whether recent variations have stronger negative effects on people's attitudes to immigration than past variations, since the initial negative effect may be mitigated over time. In other words, we want to assess the existence of a learning process.

Initially, integration can represent a very pressing problem for the community as immigration affects the welfare system and the labour market. Moreover, beliefs that have originated closer in time may include stereotyping (Arrow, 1971), perceived threats (Campbell, 1965) – such as the idea that immigrants take jobs away or exacerbate crime – or racism and other parochial motives (Tajfel and Turner, 1979).

Both pure discrimination and statistical recourse to stereotypes potentially determine initial negative effects. Discrimination, whether in a pure form or as a statistical recourse to stereotypes, is a well-established result of social interactions in experiments on group identity. An ingroup bias emerges with minimal group identity in one-shot interactions (Chen and Li, 2009, Hargreaves Heap and Zizzo, 2009), as subjects show higher prosocial behaviour with members of the same group than with members of other groups. Statistical discrimination may also be the factor behind the initial negative effect. Lacking any information on the immigrants' cultural traits and customs on their first encounter, natives may rationally recur to stereotypes (Arrow, 1971). In fact, it has been observed that when ethnic differences are exposed in cooperation games played in the lab, subjects tend to recur to ethnic stereotypes if they lack information on other participants' customs and beliefs (Castillo and Petrie, 2010).

On the contrary, beliefs that have been shaped over time reflect the result of migration inflows that arrived in the past. These beliefs have undergone a process of learning, as they have formed during the years in relation to the direct knowledge of the immigrants' cultural traits and to a direct understanding of the actual economic impact of the phenomenon.

Statistical discrimination may explain why beliefs change over time. In Castillo and Petrie (2010), subjects in the lab who gain an awareness of other participants' actual customs and cultural traits cease to rely on stereotypes. Another explanation of the learning process derives from contact theory (Allport, 1954). According to this theory, the more individuals are in contact with members of other groups, the more their prejudices are offset and the intensity of conflict is reduced. Over time, individuals may even come to define intergroup goals and perceive the net benefits of cooperation.

Among the specific beliefs that may affect personal attitudes, we observe that concerns over the welfare system, local facilities and competition in the labour market are the primary sources of material worries over immigration (Mayda, 2006; Facchini and Mayda, 2009; Card et al., 2012). People may have different perceptions of their competition with immigrants depending on their own socio-economic position. Different personal characteristics such as age, gender, income and education may imply different levels of competition with immigrants over welfare, amenities and labour. This may affect beliefs in the short run. When a migration inflow hits a local market some adjustment costs necessarily arise. As local authorities and natives learn to cope with immigration, the potential initial distress may be mitigated. Following the positive reactions of the market and the success of integration policies,

personal attitudes may also evolve, depending on the specific socio-economic conditions of natives.

In the second step of our analysis, we try to assess the role of stereotypes, contact and individual conditions, both directly on personal attitudes and in their interaction with the learning process.

2.2 Data

In order to analyse the effect of immigration flows and the existence of a learning process (step 1), we merge the 2014 European Social Survey data at individual level (13,898 observations) with the 2011 Eurostat statistics on the number of immigrants by date of arrival at NUTS2 regional level (138 regions). We take our dependent variable from the former dataset. We consider answers to the questions "To what extent do you think [country] should allow people from the poorer countries [in Europe or, alternatively, outside Europe] to come and live here?". They both range on a scale from 1 to 4 where 1 is the higher level of acceptance ("allow many") and 4 the lowest ("allow none"). (We drop "refuse to reply", "don't know" and "no answer" cases). Our dependent variable consists of the average of these two answers with an inverted sign. As a result, the dependent variable ranges from -4 to -1, and a positive value of an estimated coefficient can be read as a positive effect on the degree of acceptance. This variable can take 7 values. As controls, we consider socio-economic and demographic variables such as education, income, age and gender at the individual level. For education we build two dummy variables: "high education" takes the value 1 if the number of years of education is higher than or equal to 13; "low education" indicates a number of years of education lower than or equal to 9; as for income levels. We directly draw the variable reporting the decile of the income distribution at national level; for age we build a dummy "over 65" years, while the gender dummy is 1 for female.

From the Eurostat dataset, we draw the share of foreign-born people on the whole population at regional level and define as recent inflow the percentage variation in the period from 2005 to 2011, and as past inflow the percentage variation from 2000 to 2005. We consider two dummies at country level to capture variability that derives from different historical paths, aggregating by religious heritage (Catholic or not) and colonial past (according to the country's situation at the outbreak of World War I). In the first dummy, we consider Spain, Portugal and Poland as Catholic countries (Italy is not included in latest ESS releases). In the second dummy, we consider the UK, France, Portugal, Denmark, Germany and the Netherlands as post-colonial countries. Observations that are from immigrant statistical units are excluded from the analysis. For the various specifications of the empirical strategy, we use an ordered probit model[2].

In the further specifications for step 2, we consider two additional variables. As a proxy for stereotyping, we use answers to a question on racism, i.e. "Do you think some races or ethnic groups are born less intelligent than others?", where available answers were only "Yes" or "No". As a proxy for contact, we consider a dummy variable that assumes value 1 for those subjects who experience a daily interaction with immigrants in public areas or at work. Analysing the direct effects of these variables and their interactions with recent and past flows we will test for different ways through which a learning process may work. To test for the influence of age, education and income, we will consider their interactions with recent and past flows of immigrants. Table I reports the descriptive statistics.

[2] We also run robustness checks using OLS. All the results are confirmed and the corresponding estimates can be found in the supplementary data file.

3. Results

Recent and past flows of immigrants. We first look at the learning effect on personal attitudes towards immigrants. We report results of the ordered probit regressions presented in Table II.

Table I: Descriptive Statistics

	Mean	Variance	Min	Max
Allow immigrants from poorer countries	-2.464	0.7863	-4	-1
Flows 2005/2011	0.3343	0.0697	0.0175	1.719
Flows 2000/2005	0.353	0.1981	0.007015	2.411
Years of Education	12.702	16.32	0	50
Income	5.341	7.856	1	10
Female	0.501	0.25		
Over 65	0.1635	0.1368		
Racism	0.1586	0.1334		
Contact	0.3022	0.2109		

Notes: Authors' elaboration using data from ESS (2011, 2014)

Result 1 - The relative variation in the number of immigrants from 2005 to 2011 has a negative effect on attitudes to immigrants.

Controlling for socio-economic and demographic characteristics, the coefficient associated to the relative variation in the share of immigrants from 2005 and 2011 is negative and significant at a 1% level.

Result 2 - When we control for recent flows, the relative variation of immigration from 2000 to 2005 does not have significant effects on attitudes to immigrants.

While recent flows determine negative attitudes to immigrants, this effect tends to disappear over time. Therefore, following a dynamic interpretation of the process of belief formation, although there is an initial negative effect, this is then mitigated and ultimately overcome by learning.

Stereotypes and Contact. In Table III we present the data on the influence of stereotypes and contact on the learning process.

Table II: Past and recent flows – Ordered probit

	(1) Allow few/many immigrants from poorer countries	(2) Allow few/many immigrants from poorer countries	(3) Allow few/many immigrants from poorer countries
Flows	-0.455***		-0.520***

2005/2011	(0.137)		(0.192)
Flows 2000/2005		-0.141** (0.0610)	0.0705 (0.0774)
High education	0.349*** (0.0335)	0.342*** (0.0336)	0.347*** (0.0338)
Low education	-0.193*** (0.0434)	-0.183*** (0.0465)	-0.199*** (0.0446)
Income	0.0368*** (0.00510)	0.0375*** (0.00508)	0.0370*** (0.00512)
Female	0.00660 (0.0317)	0.00704 (0.0315)	0.00714 (0.0316)
Over 65	-0.158*** (0.0445)	-0.160*** (0.0445)	-0.159*** (0.0446)
Catholic	-0.0615 (0.0840)	0.0355 (0.0588)	-0.0885 (0.0980)
Post-colonialistic	-0.331*** (0.0881)	-0.219*** (0.0601)	-0.335*** (0.0946)
N	13897	13897	13897

Notes: Errors clustered at regional level in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

Result 3 - Stereotypes and contact affect personal attitudes to immigrants, but they do not explain the learning process.

Table III: Social identity theory and contact theory – Ordered probit

	(1) Allow few/many immigrants from poorer countries	(2) Allow few/many immigrants from poorer countries	(3) Allow few/many immigrants from poorer countries	(4) Allow few/many immigrants from poorer countries	(5) Allow few/many immigrants from poorer countries
Flows 2005/2011	-0.520***	-0.497***	-0.458**	-0.510***	-0.418**
	(0.192)	(0.183)	(0.183)	(0.193)	(0.182)
Flows 2000/2005	0.0705	0.0605	0.0377	0.0338	0.0145
	(0.0774)	(0.0763)	(0.0809)	(0.0791)	(0.0753)
High education	0.347***	0.328***	0.327***	0.343***	0.343***
	(0.0338)	(0.0329)	(0.0329)	(0.0332)	(0.0333)
Low education	-0.199***	-0.144***	-0.152***	-0.196***	-0.194***
	(0.0446)	(0.0490)	(0.0485)	(0.0444)	(0.0450)
Income	0.0370***	0.0331***	0.0331***	0.0359***	0.0363***
	(0.00512)	(0.00540)	(0.00538)	(0.00503)	(0.00502)
Female	0.00714	-0.00531	-0.00593	0.00770	0.00831
	(0.0316)	(0.0326)	(0.0325)	(0.0314)	(0.0312)
Over 65	-0.159***	-0.127***	-0.125***	-0.126***	-0.125***
	(0.0446)	(0.0473)	(0.0471)	(0.0443)	(0.0442)
Catholic	-0.0885	-0.0270	-0.0217	-0.0618	-0.0594
	(0.0980)	(0.0989)	(0.0975)	(0.0957)	(0.0958)
Post-colonialistic	-0.335***	-0.287***	-0.280***	-0.344***	-0.345***
	(0.0946)	(0.0931)	(0.0918)	(0.0922)	(0.0917)
Racism		-0.503***	-0.453***		
		(0.0485)	(0.0690)		
Racism * Flows 2005/2011			-0.358**		
			(0.167)		
Racism * Flows 2000/2005			0.203		
			(0.153)		

Contact				0.165***	0.253***
				(0.0348)	(0.0589)
Contact * Flows 2005/2011					-0.341**
					(0.143)
Contact * Flows 2000/2005					0.0714
					(0.0598)
N	13897	13533	13533	13897	13897

Notes: Errors clustered at regional level in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

The variables on stereotypes and contact are both significant at 1% level. Consistently with the standard theoretical hypotheses, stereotypes negatively affect personal attitudes while contact with migrants positively affects them. However, coefficients related to migration inflows are unaffected when controlling for these two variables. On the contrary, it appears that the *initial* negative effect emerges with more strength in areas where the natives are racist and the immigrants are not segregated, i.e. where the natives have closer contact with them.

Demographics and socio-economic characteristics Finally, we assess the role of demographic and individual socio-economic conditions on the learning process. In Table IV we report results from models with interaction terms between flows and demographics (age) and socio-economic characteristics (education, income).

Result 4. Levels of income help explain the learning process. In particular, wealthier social groups are initially more averse to immigrants but are more positively affected by the learning process.

Only the interactions with levels of income – or some variables related to it – explain the effect of flows, as they are both significant at 1% level and change the significance of flows. In particular, the effect of recent flows becomes not significant. The interaction term with recent flows becomes significant and negative and the one with past flows significant and positive. This seems to suggest that only wealthier citizens are averse to the presence of new immigrants in their neighbourhood but learn to cope with the phenomenon over time better than the poor.

Result 5. Education and age do not explain the learning process.

The negative effect of recent flows is significant and negative in all models that consider the interactions of recent and past flows with age and education. We notice two things. First, the interaction between high education and past flows is significant and positive. Education seems to influence the learning process by helping to counterbalance the initial negative effect. Second, consistently with the previous result, low educated people seem to be initially less averse to new immigration flows but they learn less.

Table IV: Demographics and socio-economic determinants – Ordered probit

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)

	Allow few/many immigrants from poorer countries	Allow few/many immigrants from poorer countries	Allow few/many immigrants from poorer countries	Allow few/many immigrants from poorer countries	Allow few/many immigrants from poorer countries
Flows 2005/2011	-0.520***	-0.539***	-0.290	-0.473**	-0.568***
	(0.192)	(0.187)	(0.178)	(0.188)	(0.204)
Flows 2000/2005	0.0705	0.0956	-0.0260	0.00825	0.115
	(0.0774)	(0.0781)	(0.0794)	(0.0795)	(0.0888)
High education	0.347***	0.347***	0.348***	0.336***	0.346***
	(0.0338)	(0.0337)	(0.0340)	(0.0521)	(0.0340)
Low education	-0.199***	-0.194***	-0.192***	-0.187***	-0.250***
	(0.0446)	(0.0450)	(0.0446)	(0.0451)	(0.0707)
Income	0.0370***	0.0371***	0.0484***	0.0370***	0.0369***
	(0.00512)	(0.00512)	(0.00596)	(0.00513)	(0.00513)
Female	0.00714	0.00668	0.00758	0.00735	0.00748
	(0.0316)	(0.0317)	(0.0315)	(0.0316)	(0.0316)
Over 65	-0.159***	-0.144**	-0.162***	-0.160***	-0.159***
	(0.0446)	(0.0691)	(0.0447)	(0.0446)	(0.0446)
Catholic	-0.0885	-0.0884	-0.0776	-0.0899	-0.0970
	(0.0980)	(0.0977)	(0.0955)	(0.0972)	(0.0972)
Post-colonialistic	-0.335***	-0.336***	-0.319***	-0.334***	-0.337***
	(0.0946)	(0.0944)	(0.0922)	(0.0936)	(0.0939)
Flows 2005/2011*Over 65		0.102			
		(0.138)			
Flows 2000/2005*Over 65		-0.144*			
		(0.0791)			
Flows 2005/2011*Income			-0.437***		
			(0.110)		
Flows 2000/2005*Income			0.207***		

			(0.0756)		
Flows 2005/2011*HighEd				-0.0937 (0.121)	
Flows 2000/2005*HighEd				0.131** (0.0601)	
Flows 2005/2011*Low Ed					0.549** (0.229)
Flows 2000/2005*Low Ed					-0.284*** (0.0916)
N	13897	13897	13897	13897	13897

Notes: Errors clustered at regional level in parentheses. * $p < 0.1$, ** $p < 0.05$, *** $p < 0.01$

4. Discussions and conclusions

In this paper we draw a distinction between the effect of recent and past migration inflows and propose a behavioural analysis of personal attitudes to immigration that directly takes into account learning processes. The distinction between sudden and lagged effect of migration inflows is crucial in many ways. We exploit the dynamic nature of the immigration process to draw a clear distinction between an initial negative effect that derives from recent variation in the level of immigrants and a learning effect more closely connected to past inflows of immigrants. We further explore the nature of this learning process. Before taking into account material conditions, we tested behavioural explanations, observing how factors such as stereotypes and contact may help explain attitudes to immigration.

Our results confirm the literature on intergroup comparisons in experimental economics which highlights the existence of negative prejudicial attitudes. We present original results with respect to the literature on personal attitudes to immigration (Mayda, 2006; Facchini and Mayda, 2009; Card et al., 2012), which only analyses the static conditions affecting such attitudes. In regions characterised by higher inflow of immigrants between 2005 and 2011, negative attitudes to immigration are stronger.

While, in accordance with the literature on discrimination in social psychology and in behavioural economics, we did expect to encounter negative initial effects, we were more uncertain on the effects of the past flows. Part of the literature on the effects of immigration on political preferences suggests that local amenities are a major concern to native citizens (Halla et al., 2012). However, there is also literature highlighting the positive influence of learning effects, which shows how learning reveals that popular beliefs on immigrants are often false and that immigration actually has a positive impact on the average wage of native citizens (Dustmann et al., 2013). Our results say that the initial negative effect on people's attitudes to immigration affected by new flows on average fades in time.

Personal attitudes to immigration are affected by both racism and daily contact. We observe a general negative effect of stereotyping and a general positive effect of daily contact, which suggests that an initial scarcity of information negatively affects people's attitudes to immigrants. However, these elements do not affect the initial temporary negative effect of migration inflows. General behavioural explanations do not seem to explain the learning process either. The only factor that seems to explain the learning process is income, as we observe that wealthier natives tend to be more strongly affected by the initial negative effect but are also more strongly influenced by learning processes. On the other hand,

the negative effect seems to be more persistent for both low-income and low-educated social groups. This is not consistent with hypotheses that posit a "resentment" by low-skilled workers due to higher levels of competition on the labour market, but it is consistent with compositional concerns. This may indicate some more severe adjustment costs or political failure in favour of the more vulnerable population. This result indicates that it is important to analyse personal attitudes to immigration at a disaggregated level.

Our results are preliminary. We controlled for potential identification problems by considering also a different specification of the model with the 2011 share of immigrants and its variations. Results are confirmed. However, at this stage of our analysis, we cannot exclude endogeneity problems.

We feel that there are still some deficiencies in our analysis. For example, we have not explored other channels that may influence beliefs on immigration, such as the media, current political narrative and the intergenerational transmission of beliefs. Taking these factors into account may allow us to distinguish between beliefs that are deeply ingrained in people's mental frameworks – such as, for example, pure discrimination – and beliefs driven by more contingent concerns. Furthermore, given the cultural nature of prejudice, the immigrants' ethnic origins may influence which beliefs are suggested to the natives by the migrants' presence. Finally, in such a dynamics of belief formation, historical patterns of migrations could also play an important role since new migration inflows could have a different impact in regions where immigration is a recent phenomenon compared to regions populated by long term and well-integrated immigrants (Levi et al 2017).

References

Allport, G. W. (1954). The Nature of Prejudice. *New York: Addison*.

Arrow, K. J. (1971). The theory of discrimination. In O. Ashenfelter and A. Rees (eds.), *Discrimination in Labor Markets*, Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Campbell, D. T. (1965). Ethnocentric and other altruistic motives. In *Nebraska symposium on motivation*, Volume 13, pp. 283–311.

Card, D., Dustmann, C., & Preston, I. (2005). Understanding attitudes to immigration: The migration and minority module of the first European Social Survey.

Card, D., C. Dustmann, and I. Preston (2012). Immigration, wages, and compositional amenities. *Journal of the European Economic Association* 10(1), 78–119.

Castillo, M. and R. Petrie (2010). Discrimination in the lab: Does information trump appearance? *Games and Economic Behavior* 68(1), 50–59.

Chen, Y. and S. X. Li (2009). Group identity and social preferences. *The American Economic Review* 99(1), 431–457.

Dustmann, C., T. Frattini, and I. P. Preston (2013). The Effect of Immigration along the Distribution of Wages. *Review of Economic Studies* (80), 145–173.

Facchini, G. and A. M. Mayda (2009). Does the welfare state affect individual attitudes toward immigrants? evidence across countries. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 91(2), 295–314.

Halla, M., A. F. Wagner, and J. Zweimüller (2012). Does immigration into their neighborhoods incline voters toward the extreme right? The case of the freedom party of Austria. *IZA Discussion Paper* No. 6575.

Hargreaves Heap, S. P. and D. J. Zizzo (2009). The value of groups. *The American Economic Review* 99(1), 295–323.

Levi, E. Mariani, R. D., and Patriarca, F. (2017). Hate at First Sight? Dynamic Aspects of the Electoral Impact of Migrations: The Case of the UK and Brexit. *SPRU Working Paper Series 2017-21.*

Mayda, A. M. (2006). Who is against immigration? a cross-country investigation of individual attitudes toward immigrants. *The Review of Economics and Statistics* 88(3), 510–530.

Oakes, P. J., Haslam, S. A., & Turner, J. C. (1994). *Stereotyping and social reality*. Blackwell Publishing.

Scheve, K. F., & Slaughter, M. J. (2001). Labor market competition and individual preferences over immigration policy. *The review of economics and statistics*, *83*(1), 133-145.

Tajfel, H. and J. C. Turner (1979). An integrative theory of intergroup conflict. *The social psychology of intergroup relations* 33(47), 74.