Appendix: Supplementary Material

Table A. *Fit Indices of Confirmatory Factor Analyses*

Models	χ^2 (df)	TRd (Δ df)	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
A: 1 Factor	1977.951 (183)***		.719	.678	.092
B: 2 Factors: negative feelings toward immigrants/negative attitudes toward refugee policies, conformity/inequality	1831.107 (182)***	44.622 (1)***	.742	.702	.088
C: 3 Factors: negative feelings toward immigrants/negative attitudes toward refugee policies, conformity, inequality	1672.995 (180)***	129.987 (2)***	.766	.728	.085
D: 4 Factors: negative feelings toward immigrants, negative attitudes toward refugee policies, conformity, inequality	1115.940 (177)***	586.354 (3)***	.853	.826	.068
E: 4 Factors (modified): negative feelings toward immigrants, negative attitudes toward refugee policies, conformity, inequality	636.561 (155)***	433.878 (22)***	.924	.907	.052

***$p < .001$.

Table B. *Fit Indices of Measurement Invariance* ($N_{\text{low education level}} = 381$, $N_{\text{medium education level}} = 483$, $N_{\text{high education level}} = 292$)

Models	χ^2 (df)	TRd (Δ df)	CFI	TLI	RMSEA
A: Configural invariance	1066.042 (465)		.913	.893	.058
B1: Metric invariance	1137.793 (497)	72.096 (32)***	.907	.893	.058
B2: Partial metric invariance	1087.35 (481)	25.348 (16)	.912	.896	.057

***$p < .001$. Model B1 and B2 are compared to model A by using the Satorra-Bentler Scaled Chi-square test.

We examined whether the measurement loadings, intercepts and residual variances could be constrained to be equal across the levels and thus whether the same relations between the items and the latent construct can be assumed. The forward approach was adopted and the configural invariance model that allows relations between the items and the constructs to be different across the education levels provided an acceptable model fit (see Model A). The metric model did not provide a better fit than the configural model. However, the partial metric model had a better fit than the configural model. The measurements of social conformity and group-based inequality were metric, whereas the measurement of negative feelings toward immigrants and negative attitudes toward refugee policies were configural. For testing our central hypothesis we compared support for social conformity and acceptance of group-based inequality across the education levels, and the metric invariance allowed us to compare the coefficients. The aim was not to compare the coefficients of negative feelings toward immigrants and negative attitudes toward refugee policies across education levels, thus configural invariance for these variables did not cause problems for our analysis.

Table C. *The Wald Tests Findings for the Difference Test of the Means for Social Conformity, Group-Based Inequality, and Political Orientation Across the Education Levels* ($N_{\text{low education level}} = 381$, $N_{\text{medium education level}} = 483$, $N_{\text{high education level}} = 292$)

	Wald test value
Political orientation	
low education versus medium qualification	0.133
low education versus high education	3.47*
medium qualification versus high education	4.653*
Social conformity	
low education versus medium qualification	24.482***
low education versus high education	113.392***
medium qualification versus high education	43.285***
Group-based inequality	
low education versus medium qualification	9.357**
low education versus high education	13.14***
medium qualification versus high education	3.682*

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. ***$p < .001$. Df = 1 for all difference tests.

Tables presenting the results for the main model without (D1) and with (D2) education levels.

Table D1. *Standardized Regression Coefficients for Predicting Negative Outcomes, Excluding Educational Level*

Variables	Negative feelings toward immigrants		Negative attitudes toward refugee policies		Social conformity		Group-based inequality	
	β	***SE***	**β**	***SE***	**β**	***SE***	***B***	***SE***
Direct effects								
Political orientation	.083*	.042	.010*	.042	.275***	.040	.312***	0.051
Social conformity	.317***	.054	.352***	,054				
Group-based inequality	.489***	.059	.495***	.058				
Indirect effects								
Political orientation via social conformity	.087***	.018	.097***	.019				
Political orientation via group-based inequality	.153***	.032	.155***	.033				
Control effects								
Age	-.205***	.038	-.114**	.037	.292***	.037	.138*	.065
Female	-.045	.035	-.022	.033	.016	.038	-.167**	.049
Experimental condition (ref = condition 1)[A]								
Condition 2	.018	.040	.043	.037	-.048	.044	-.041	.052
Condition 3	.036	.040	.048	.039	-.085	.047	-.074	.056
Condition 4	-.055	.042	-.014	.038	-.070	.048	.014	.057
Condition 5	-.015	.042	.013	.041	-.087	.048	.035	.057
Condition 6	.014	.040	.068	.038	-.131**	.048	.027	.059
Explained variance - R^2	.476***	.046	.514***	.045	.157***	.029	.156***	.043
Fit statistics								
χ^2 (df)	988.470 (283)***							
CFI	.906							
TLI	.883							
RMSEA	.046							

Table D2. *Standardized Regression Coefficients for Predicting Negative Outcomes, Including Educational Levels*

Variables	Negative feelings toward immigrants		Negative attitudes toward refugee policies		Social conformity		Group-based inequality	
	β	***SE***	**β**	***SE***	**β**	***SE***	***B***	***SE***
Direct effects								
Political orientation	.084*	.041	.120**	.041				
Low education level					.152*	.065	.282**	.093
Medium education level					.240***	.072	.182*	.081
High education level					.412***	.068	.420***	.074
Indirect effects								
Political orientation via social conformity								
Low education level	.045*	.021	.050*	.023				
Medium education level	.066**	.023	.074**	.026				
High education level	.123***	.027	.136***	.029				
Political orientation via group-based inequality								
Low education level	.114**	.041	.112**	.039				
Medium education level	.091*	.044	.090*	.044				
High education level	.205***	.043	.202***	.044				

Note. Control variables (age, gender, experimental condition) not shown, see Table D1.

Wald test findings for difference testing of the path from political orientation to social conformity and group-based inequality

Table E. *Wald Test Values for Difference Testing of the Path from Political Orientation to Conformity and Group-Based Inequality*

Variables	Main model
Political orientation – social conformity	
low education versus medium education	.567
low education versus high education	6.676**
medium education versus high education	3.415*
Political orientation – group-based inequality	
low education versus medium education	.200
low education versus high education	2.097
medium education versus high education	3.671*

*$p < .05$. **$p < .01$. Df = 1 for all difference tests.

Education level was hypothesized to affect the ideological meaning of political orientation, but not the associations between social conformity and group-based inequality, on the one hand, and negative feelings toward immigrants and refugee policies, on the other. However, we explored whether these associations depended on educational level. We conducted a multiple regression analysis for the two dependent variables separately. Education, social conformity, group-based inequality (all centered scores) and the two interactions between education and the two measures were used as predictors, together with gender and age. There were no significant interaction effects in the prediction of feelings toward immigrants ($p >$ .15) and also not for the interaction between education and social conformity in predicting the attitude toward refugee policies ($p = .07$). However, for this attitude the interaction between education and group-based inequality was significant ($\beta = 0.096$, $t = 3.23$, $p = .001$). For the lower educated, the association was weaker than for the higher educated. The overall pattern

of findings indicate that it is unlikely that the stronger relationship between political orientation and anti-immigrant attitudes among the higher educated is due to the higher educated have a general tendency to respond more consistently in survey research.