

Madlen Preuß

## Unequal balances of power. The assertion of an established status as a new explanatory approach for intergroup conflicts

*Kurzfassung:* In Anlehnung an Elias' Arbeit zur Etablierten-Außenseiter-Figuration, dass Macht integraler Bestandteil einer jeden menschlichen Beziehung sei, sollten sich intergrupale Konflikte durch tatsächliche und/oder behauptete Machtbalancen erklären lassen, ungeachtet spezifischer Referenzkategorien. Vor diesem theoretischen Hintergrund wird eine Skala zur empirischen Erfassung der Behauptung eines Etablierten-Status' vorgestellt und als alternativer Prädiktor zu etablierten Erklärungsansätzen vorgeschlagen. Analysen auf Basis repräsentativer Surveys in 2014, 2016 und 2018 zeigen, dass nicht nur ein reliables und valides Messinstrument vorliegt, sondern auch eine Vorhersagekraft für eine ganze Reihe an Ablehnungen schwacher Gruppen. Dies spricht allgemein für eine stärkere Adaption des Elias'schen Theoriemodells in der quantitativ-empirischen Erforschung von Intergruppenkonflikten und im Besonderen für die Idee, Komplexe wie Religion, Kultur oder Geschlecht weniger als Ursache, denn als Legitimierung dieser Konflikte zu verstehen.

*Abstract:* Following Elias' Established-Outsider-Figuration that power is an integral part of every human relationship, intergroup conflicts should be explained by actual and/or claimed power balances, regardless of reference categories. Against this theoretical background, a scale for the empirical measuring of the assertion of an established status is developed and proposed as an alternative predictor to established explanatory approaches. Analyses based on German surveys in 2014, 2016 and 2018 show there is a reliable and valid measuring instrument and a predictive power for a whole series of rejections of weaker groups. This argues for a stronger adaptation of Elias' concept in quantitative empirical research of intergroup conflicts and the idea of considering religion, culture or gender less as a cause but rather as a legitimation of these conflicts.

### 1. Introduction: objectives and frame

*The Established and the Outsiders* (Elias & Scotson, 1994[1965]) by Elias and Scotson is probably one of the widely applied and cited books by Elias. Many research studies use the figurational approach to examine the positioning of one group in relation to others, thus revealing the importance of power relation between them. This positioning is dynamic and can be determined but does not have to be objective/objectified characteristics (e.g. class, religion, gender, ethnicity). The pivotal aspect of the established-outsider figuration is that while these characteristics can become relevant in human relationships, they do not necessarily cause in- and exclusion, social inequality or intergroup conflicts. Which category it is that determines and legitimates those group relations is not a question of the category itself, but rather a so-called oldness of associations and asymmetrical power balances. The strong attention to supposedly distinctive characteristics – treated as resources and/or property – clouds the view of the central and decisive aspect of social inequalities or inequivalencies – the differences in power (Elias, 1994: xxx).

In this light, it is surprising that the approach of the established-outsider relationship is widely used in qualitative-empirical, discourse-analytical or and socio-historical work (e.g. Dunning, 2016; Hogenstijn et al., 2008; Lake, 2011; Petintseva, 2015; Scott et al., 2012) but not in quantitative-empirical studies; with exception of a few works which approach the topic via partial segments or detours (see Heitmeyer, 2002; Hoffmann-Nowotny, 2001; Hoffmann-Nowotny et al., 1997). This may be mainly due to the fact that the strong moment of dependence in figurations cannot be captured by quantitative methods. Additionally, established-outsider relationships are the result of inequality relations that exclusively base on power differentials, whereas aspects such as religion or ethnicity are only downstream efforts to explain or legitimize the unequal relationship. Quantitative methods, however, have in common to assume a formal independence and thus also a balanced distribution of power. But this is the actual strength of the theoretical model: to detach categories from their substantiality and instead of examining their specific variance and embedding in time and context with the help of the established-outsider relationship.

Despite these rather poor preconditions, the present paper argues to take the established-outsider model more into account in the (quantitative) research on intergroup conflicts. The central aim is to show its potential by means of a developed measurement that captures one of the key moments in the theoretical model, the assertion of an established status. In the sense of Elias, we can find such an assertion wherever and whenever people and/or groups relate to each other. The assertion of an established status always precedes intergroup conflicts. However, it does not mean that some people and/or groups have this attitude or belief or do not have; quite the contrary, the assertion of an established status only evolves in the encounter with relevant others and is thus subject to a clear situational and contextual dependence. And this is the decisive difference to prominent explanatory approaches within research of intergroup conflicts: social dominance orientation (SDO, Pratto et al.,

1994; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), (right-wing) authoritarianism (Adorno et al., 1950; Altemeyer, 1981; Oesterreich, 1993) or anomia (Merton, 1938; Srole, 1956).

Against this background, my central hypotheses are: first, the assertion of an established status can be measured empirically as a distinctive and independent concept to the three individual differences approaches. Second, respondents' agreements with the assertion vary much stronger over the years because of its situational and contextual dependence. Third, there will be an independent explanation for the rejection and devaluation of social groups. To test these assumptions, I use three cross-sectional surveys of the German population conducted in 2014, 2016 and 2018. In the following, I will briefly address the original theory by Elias and summarize relevant findings on established-outsider figurations in intergroup relations as well as clarify my own empirical approach. Empirically in a first exploratory step, the developed measurement's wording and reliability will be presented in detail. Following this, I present its validity by using structural equation modeling for testing of distinction to the other approaches and for the relationship with resentments against different social groups. The paper closes with the discussion of the measurement's strength and weakness and remarkable results. The results illuminate the significant role of the assertion of an established status in the context of in- and exclusion, prejudices and therefore intergroup conflicts and show that a greater use of the established-outsider model is worthwhile.

## 2. Elias' established and outsiders

Norbert Elias developed the established-outsider model based on a study in an English suburban settlement Winston Parva (pseudonym), carried out by him and John L. Scotson in the late 1950s. The value of their research study is that neither social class, ethnic, nor racial difference were distinctive for the community. The relationship between the inhabitants was nevertheless very conflictual and characterized by strong narratives of *us versus them*. Elias' basic premise was that conventional references to such differences were not sufficient to explain the sharp boundaries between them, but must be sought in the underlying power differentials. In a later added essay, he elaborates the theoretical frame for applying the model to social group relations characterized by mutual dependency and power differentials.

Winston Parva comprised one area with longer-term residents (zone A1, middle class, and zone A2, working class) and a newer estate which was dominated by new arrivals from other towns and communities (zone B, working class). Actually, Elias and Scotson came to investigate a higher delinquency rate in zone B, but even after its reduction (movement of so-called problem families), the harsh segregation between the areas remained. However, these demarcations did not go hand in hand with differences in nationality or ethnicity (white English people), in religion (Christians) or socio-economic aspects like income or education levels, but between both working classes. The different duration of their stay in the settlement was the only difference. This was the starting point of the investigation and the key question was why, how and under what conditions the longer residence of the one group became equal with prestige and the newness of the others was translated in inferiority.

Elias and Scotson give the following answer: it is not the difference in the mere (physical) length of stay, but the so-called social oldness and thus social cohesion that lead to an imbalance of power and status between the groups. The high rate of social cohesion among the established is due to a common canon of norms and behavioral codes, they are connected by memories and history, and have established a social hierarchy across the generations, recognized by all. The newcomers are rather to be seen as a loose group of people who share neither identification nor norms or practices and "were strangers not only to the old residents but also to each other" (Elias, 1994: xviii, xxxvii-xxxix). This leads to a significant advantage for the established residents, a *social lead* in their relationship to the newcomers which they increase through various mechanisms. The strong cohesion enables the established to pool their immaterial and material resources and use them more effectively. They already fill status positions in relevant local institutions, help each other on a basis of trust and rely on their informal networks (ibid.: xviii). Additionally, the established are subject to a strong social control of compliance with norms and codes of conduct (Elias & Scotson, 1994: 50, 241-243). Both social cohesion and its reproduction through social control can be thus not only be understood as the main cause of the imbalance of power, but also to ensure that belonging to the established group is regarded with "pride and satisfaction" (ibid.: 149). Their shared history and powerful key positions make them believe in a *group charisma*. In contrast, the newcomers are not familiar with codes of conduct, norms nor do they have access to that knowledge, positions or any identification with Winston Parva because of missing common past. In the eyes of the established, those facts show their inadequacy, failure in human equivalence, and prove their *group disgrace* (ibid.: 138; Elias, 1994: xxii-xxiii). The already existed differences in power and status reinforce even more the established's extraordinary quality which they want to maintain. For this purpose, they use well-known strategies of stigmatization: besides their defined inferiority indicators, such as the absence of status positions or commitment, accusations of anomie, delinquency, but also uncleanness are helpful in stigmatization attempts as they do not require references to specific contexts. This is supported by praise gossip about their own group and blame gossip about the newcomers. Blame gossip is particularly effective; it not only ensures that they can assure themselves of their own integrity and decency, but also satisfies the tendency of desire to forbidden and the need to belong to "the

community of the righteous" (Elias & Scotson, 1994: 93). In doing so, the established refer to everything which attest the newcomers' inferior and reinforce their own superiority. Additionally, they use the pars-pro-toto principle by assessing their own group value against the best members and that of newcomers against their worst and most anomic members; a strategy that will always show that the established are rightly the superior group (ibid.: 7, Elias, 1994: xix).

The study of Winston Parva impressively shows, it does not need ethnic, religious, cultural or class differences for one group to discriminate against, stigmatize or exclude another group. It rather shows that power differentials are decisive. This power is neither a characteristic or property that people have or do not have, nor can it be conserved. It is a characteristic of all human relationships and in a fluctuating balance. Even in particularly strong power differentials no one is absolutely powerful or powerless (Elias, 1978: 78, 143-144). Following this, the selection of characteristics with that groups explain and/or legitimize similarities and differences is unlimited and arbitrary as long as they are useful for distinction. Thus, they must be understood as "reinforcing shibboleth which makes [differences] more easily recognizable as such" (Elias, 1994: xxx). In short, they are categories of second order and not the root of intergroup conflicts such as the established-outsider relationship.

### 3. State of research and current study

#### 3.1 Applications of the established-outsider-model in research on intergroup relations

Most literature that use Elias' theoretical framework can be divided into two major research fields: one focuses primarily on the dynamics of figurations, i.e. on changing power differentials between groups, the emergence of new groups and the leaving of old ones or on identity shifts. Other studies rather take a snap shot of existing established-outsider-relationships and examine what mechanisms and instruments of power are used for or what positions to fight for. I want to take attention to a few selected contributions, which are exemplary for both fields of research and also raise relevant conceptual and methodological questions with regard to the present paper.

Within the first field, particularly those dealing with gender relations are strongly represented; according to Elias, the oldest established-outsider-figuration we can observe (Elias, 1987b). Ernst (2003) examines, e.g. the under-representation of women in decision-making and status positions in science and business and attributes this to a permanent interplay of (counter-)stigmatization in the still strongly male-dominated field. Using etiquette literature from the 18th century up to today's career guides, she shows codes of conduct that support this established-outsider relationship to this day. She states, the concept of harmonious difference is central which ascribes special and especially different leadership qualities to women than to men and simultaneously warns against an *unprofessional feminization* of work (see also Wouters, 2004). Gerhard (2003) studies the changes in family images and corresponding gender arrangements since 1900, and Waterstradt (2015) takes a socio-historical look at the development of parenthood (see also Ernst (1996) or Schröter (1987) on marriage). Lacassagne (2016) uses a different example to illustrate grown established-outsider relationships. She examines the French and British colonization of Canada and how a permanent hierarchy has been established in which the aborigines are to this day outsiders in a strong power divide – despite their duration of stay. In contrast, a replication study by Hoffmann-Nowotny and colleagues (1997; 2001) shows the replacements and shifts between former and later outsider-groups. By the example of Italians as the first and biggest group of migrant workers they observe a successful political, economic, spatial positioning and a highly positive image, less rejections and attempts to distance by autochthonous Swiss in the comparison between the 1960s and 1990s - in contrast to younger groups of guest workers like Turks or Tamils, whose rejections increased. An inversion of the established-outsider-relationship is shown by some urban studies, which examine the coexistence of longer and newer residents in microcosms such as neighborhoods or districts. In her study on playground participation in Amsterdam, Karsten (1998) states that Dutch children have lost their established status to former outsiders, children of migrants, which she attributes mainly to their numerical dominance. Hüttermann (2000) and Zifonun (2010) come to similar results in their district studies on German towns Duisburg and Mannheim respectively, in which they show how power relations between former established and outsiders, autochthonous long-residents and (Turkish) migrants, tips over (see also Ceylan, 2017; May, 2004).

Rosenthal (2016) stresses the possible simultaneity of established and outsider status. She examines how Palestinians on the West Bank and Israel are trying to build a sense of unity with Israelis that includes both, Christian and Muslim Palestinians. The focus is on Arab and Christian Palestinians and Israeli Jews, who are bound together in a strong and usually asymmetrical dependence and whose relationships are constantly changing depending on local structures, success or failure of collective narratives and private or public references (see also Petintseva, 2015; Loyal, 2011). In an older study, Eckert and Kißler (1992) address also this very circumstance and work out the complexity and variability of established-outsider figurations using the example of a Cologne district. They identify different degrees and contexts that determine the conflictive relations between old-established residents, younger-alternative newcomers and Turkish residents by a pure duration of stay independent of migration and by a specific migration-related demarcation. In none of these conflicts are the Italian residents involved but have close relationships to each of the groups. At this, Italians can be understood

as (potential) *relevant third* in the sense of Simmel (2009 [1908]). Using the example of a Dutch municipality, Hogenstijn et al. (2008) also identify such a third group that they describe as locally indifferent. This group moves between the old-established and the newcomers, but has highly networks to individual persons of both and is not very place- or municipality-bound. It does, however, mean a significant source of power, provided that attempts to mobilize them for the established or outsider group are successful. A similar question is discussed by Neckel (1997) in his process analysis of the German reunification. However, the relevant third – West German politics – here directly participates in the established-outsider relationship between former political leaders and civil rights activists in the GDR and inverts it by supporting the latter; but this was limited to the transformation phase. Furthermore, some studies find a completely new arrangement: East Germans often see themselves as losers of German reunification and generally feel generally powerless in the face of perceived established West Germans (e.g. Treibel, 1993b; Stenger, 1998; Mansel & Kaletta, 2009). Koppetsch (2017) adds to this aspect the potential radicalization of those who assert an established status. She works out that it is particularly the fear of status loss that has strengthened right-wing populism in Germany. Right-wing populists accuse German politics, the relevant third, of betrayal. In their opinion, politics must protect their status and the familiar order instead of betraying it by *reaching out their hands* to the actual outsiders (e.g. Muslims, refugees).

Thus, the mobilization of relevant and powerful third can be one possible strategy that established use to ensure or strengthen the established status. In one of the first applications of Elias' theoretical model to Germany, Korte (1987) identifies further ones. He already observes in the early 1980s after the failure of the so-called Gastarbeiter-policy, that Germans not only try to exclude immigrants from social advancement and political participation. They also assure themselves of their own superiority by declaring it impossible for foreigners to fulfil their standards and norms, while at the same time implying that they do not even want to. Loyal (2011) applies the established-outsider model to the situation of immigrants in Ireland and shows the dominance of the Irish in the labor market by migrants' significant overqualification for their jobs. They are subject to massive discrimination in application procedures and in many cases are excluded from potential employment from the outset (see also O'Connell & McGinnity, 2008; Lever & Milbourne, 2014). In Hüttermann's study (2000) of a German district, the former old-established residents rather concentrate on old sources of power by using their (still superior) power of complaint to local institutions against migrants. In his examination of an anti-discrimination initiative at a British tennis club, Lake (2011) shows that only the old members hold the key positions. They decide on training times, arbitrarily interpret the general club rules or break them to new members by refusing their meetings or disrupting their games. Bucholc (2013) examines the migration of Polish refugees who fled to Norway in the 1980s and asks for the role of social or collective ideas in established-outsider figurations. She finds so-called moral circles, close personal networks, on which the Polish refugees fail. Scott et al. (2012) show similar results in their study of an Australian mining community. Workers who come for several months are excluded from residents - even though they receive a higher income or do not aspire to political positions. Here, the residents rely on gossip and accuse them of immoral and undisciplined behavior such as excessive alcohol consumption to achieve their higher moral position. In her analysis of the so-called Sarrazin debate in 2010, Rommel (2016) also identifies a civilizational and moral superiority that Sarrazin attempts to impose in his distinction between a democratic, Christian and modern Germany and fundamentalist, uncivilized and criminal Muslims. In particular, Sarrazin's thesis that peaceful coexistence between (Christian) Germans and (German) Muslims is impossible reinforces the established-outsider figuration by means stigmatization based on attributed and objectified characteristics and a homogenization of the *hostile group* through the pars-per-toto principle.

Elias and Scotson have already postulated that such an adaption to national, transnational or international level is possible (Elias & Scotson, 1994: 156-157). However, some authors criticize the missing integration of (geographical and social) space as a potential dimension of categorization processes in the theoretical framework (e.g. Bauböck 1993; May, 2004; Hogenstijn et al., 2008). Among others, Bauböck (1993) argues that the political constitution and national identity can replace the decisive factors of social oldness, cohesion and territoriality, provided that this is based on ideas of origin and culture. Here, we could speak of *imagined communities* (Anderson, 1983) that refer to a grown national identity at the (nation-state) macro-level and therefore assert a social oldness. Following this, the assurance and reinforcement of social cohesion is realized by a normative charge of imagined shared norms and values to which newcomers have to declare their commitment and willingness for assimilation (e.g. German Leitkultur-debate, Manz, 2004). In this sense, people refer to a territorially defined right to citizenship based on descent (*jus sanguinis*) and thus legitimizing their own belonging and the non-belonging of others. The (national) claim to space and territory would then be reserved for those who are part of the *original community*. Consequently, people do not need face-to-face relations but can imagine their picture as a community of fate, territory, and culture and thus create their group charisma (Bauböck, 1993: 151). A similar interpretation framework is used by the long-term study *Group-Focused Enmity* (GFE, 2002-2012). It is the only one that has a quantitative measurement developed with reference to Elias' established-outsider model. Within the GFE-syndrome, the so-called rights of established are defined as one facet among others such as racism, anti-Semitism or sexism, which have their core in an ideology of inequivalence (Zick et al., 2008). The theoretical conception underwent slight changes in project's course, but is generally described as "devaluation of

newcomers (e.g., new neighbors, colleagues, and classmates), seeking to uphold the precedent rights of the established" (ibid.: 366). Since 2002, it has been operationalized by the same two indicators: "Those who are new somewhere should first be satisfied with less" and "Those who have always been living here should have more rights than those who came later". In an analysis of all GFE-facets, Zick et al. (2012) can show that the rights of established, racism, xenophobia and Islamophobia share a common category of order in the topology of devaluations: the forcing away of newcomers. Recent data show that since 2014 38% of the German population agrees with statements on rights of established (Zick et al., 2019).

One last study must be mentioned because it clearly emphasizes the dependency in established-outsider relationships; if groups are not dependent on each other, they consequently do not have to fight for power and corresponding resources. In comparison of the positions of women and homosexuals, van Stolk and Wouters (1987) argue that the growing emancipation efforts of women shakes the *harmonious inequality* between them and men. At the same time, the enforcement of gender equality is dependent on the other party of figuration, the men. For homosexuals, it is still more difficult to free themselves from the outsider status: they "have no particular social task, and therefore have no social power source at their disposal. They can and do organize themselves but (. . .) have no obvious means of exerting pressure" (ibid.: 483). This means, as long as the established and the outsiders in their common configuration do not really need each other and are not useful to each other, they remain free of any double bind. Although the power differentials and thus an unequal relationship remains, it holds only little potential for conflict. Conversely, the more groups see their sources of power in distress, the louder an established status is asserted.

The studies mentioned have shown how fruitful Elias' established-outsider model can be in explaining intergroup conflicts and at the same time urge caution in understanding them as manifest and unchangeable. They are dynamic and moveable, and while for one conflict constellation culture or religion are used for legitimation, in the next it is gender or lifestyle in another. They all have in common that one group believes to be more powerful and superior than another and uses various sources of power to ensure and reinforce the unequal power balances. However, it is important to emphasize that the examination of established-outsider relationships is only given a part of it. The quiet intergroup conflict of today can become the loud one of tomorrow and they can take on a completely different form depending on the context, relevance and levels. The attempt to develop a quantitative-empirical measurement is an offer to add a decisive perspective to the (quantitative) investigation of intergroup conflicts. It should support the idea of studying intergroup conflicts as such in their very specific characteristics, observing changes in the individual established-outsider relationships, but also recognizing shifts in the status ascriptions and replacements of groups. In its freedom of reference from social categories, it offers the possibility of identifying the actual relevance of supposed causes such as religion, gender, culture etc. Finally, a quantitative-empirical measurement extends the current state of research on established-outsider relationships itself, in which the adaptation in larger contexts allows to examine comparatively its scope and extent.

### 3.2 The assertion of an established status: theoretical conception and hypotheses

In applying Elias' framework for quantitative methods, some aspects must be considered: first, there is a lack of methodological insight into the study of Winston Parva. Neither it is known under which conditions an interview was conducted with whom and when, nor are there guidelines or protocols for the (non)participatory observations. Consequently, I mainly orientate myself on the theoretical framework and the state of research. Second, a quantitative modeling of an established-outsider figuration is impossible per definition. While self-definitions and ascriptions can be quantitatively measured, the mutual and dependent negotiation of statuses cannot. Third, three German cross-sectional surveys are available to test the validity and explanatory power of the developed measurement. This means, the present study is based only on theoretical assumptions about causality, but it is not capable of making any statement on the empirical direction of causality.

Despite these limitations, a quantitative measurement can be achieved provided that its conditions and limits are clearly defined: This is based on the decision for one of the two perspectives, the perspective of the established. Even if only one elementary part is considered, it makes it possible to capture at least the self-image of some as established and the simultaneous attribution of outsider status to others. Second, the so-called assertion of an established status (AoE) shall be free from any reference to specific group relationships. This allows to fulfill the theoretical assumption of perceived superiority and to identify the actual explanatory power of an asserted established role on the attribution of outsider status. Third, it is important to consider that an established status, and thus the power that people or groups assert in the respective constellation, is not a manifest characteristic, quite the contrary: only in the encounter with relevant others, the potential outsiders, an established status can be asserted. This relevance and functionality, which the groups must have for each other to form an established-outsider relationship, depends on contextual aspects: who meets whom, when and where with which history as a social group and/or the monopolization of certain power resources. These aspects determine the extent to which an established status is asserted for one's own group and the outsider status is ascribed to another. In principle, any social group can be an addressee of an established status that another group asserts against them. The actual attribution of the outsider's status depends on their relevance and the necessity to keep them down (quiet

versus loud conflicts). Finally, it should be noted that - in contrast to the GFE project - I assume that AoE is to be understood as a positioning in certain group constellations and thus as an explanatory concept. It is not equal to prejudices against certain groups, but always precedes them. To sum up, the new concept is defined as follows:

The assertion of an established status shall be understood as a positioning which develops in the encounter of humans and/or groups and is based on a perceived power superiority. It is situation- as well as context-related and not limited to any social constellations. Those humans and/or groups, who assert an established status in a social relationship, expect privileges and supremacy over the others, the power inferiors. People and/or groups who assert this status do not accord power inferiors the right of participation and equality and relegate them to the lower bounds of social hierarchy.

To introduce the assertion of an established status as another important explanatory concept in research on intergroup conflicts, I will test its validity in a first step against three prominent concepts of SDO (Pratto, et al., 1994; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), anomia (Merton, 1938; Srole, 1956) and authoritarian aggression, a sub-dimension of authoritarianism (Adorno et al., 1950; Altemeyer, 1981; Oesterreich, 1993). According to Altemeyer (1996), an authoritarian aggression is directed against persons or groups when established authorities sanction that aggression. In general, it is understood as an individual and stable difference variable, which has proven to be a strong predictor of intergroup conflicts (e.g. Cohrs & Stelzl, 2010; Duckitt & Sibley, 2010). This also applies to SDO. People with such an attitude share an understanding of society, based on inequality and in equivalence, support social hierarchies and competition between groups (e.g. Cohrs et al., 2005; Sibley et al., 2007). Anomia is understood as a reaction of disorientation and powerlessness to perceived anomic developments in political and social areas of society, but without direct connection to hostility towards social groups (Srole, 1956). It is assumed that people tend to prefer strict, simple and radical orders in order to regain control and orientation and for this reason devalue other (disturbing) groups (e.g. Hüpping, 2006; Legge & Heitmeyer, 2012). To sum up, in contrast to SDO and authoritarian aggression, AoE is not a stable and individual difference variable. It only arises when people and/or groups believe they have to position themselves as established against others to protect their resources and privileges that are perceived as threatened. In comparison, although the status' assertion and anomia have in common to be a reaction to a certain circumstance, the assertion is directed against very specific groups whose existence - determined by contextual aspects - represents a threat to the established status, while anomia has no clear group reference.

This constitutes the first main hypothesis that the assertion of an established status is distinctive and empirically valid compared to social dominance orientation, authoritarian aggression and anomia (H1). The second hypothesis is that AoE, similar to anomia, varies stronger in its agreements and disagreements over the years than SDO and authoritarian aggression because it is not a stable attitude (H2). Furthermore, I hypothesize an interdependent explanatory power for the rejection and/or devaluation of certain social groups compared to SDO, authoritarian aggression and anomia (H3). Depending on surveys' content, I can prove the explanatory power for sexism, heterosexism, devaluation of homeless people and asylum seekers as well as the rejection of migrants in general, Muslims, Sinti and Roma, Africans and Asians.

In a first step, I analyze the relationships between the four explanatory concepts and sexism, heterosexism and the devaluation of homeless people; due to the survey conditions only in 2014. The sub-hypothesis is that AoE independently, but moderately predicts negative attitudes towards women, homosexuals and homeless people in comparison to SDO, authoritarian aggression and anomia (H3.1). The state of research has shown that the relationship between women and men can still read as an established-outsider relationship. Additionally, the sexism debate has received a lot of media and societal attention at the beginning of the year 2013 (keyword *Aufschrei*). By comparison, homosexuals have no actual relevance to becoming loud in asserting an established status against them. However, in the year before the survey, there was an intensive and controversial discussion about the introduction of same-sex marriage not only in Germany which can be interpreted as a threat to previous privileges and alleged superiority of a heteronormative establishment. With regard to homeless people, it can be assumed that it is the way of living in general that is met with rejection. Furthermore, they live on the margins of German society as actual outsiders and are often confronted with accusations of delinquency or anomie. However, remembering the different levels as a contextual aspect, in this case an overall societal level, then women, homosexuals or homeless people are not necessarily the social groups against which an established status has to be asserted or power and resources defended - which leads to the assumption of only a moderate effect.

In a second step, I analyze the relationships between the four explanatory concepts and the devaluation and rejection of certain migrant groups: migrants in general, Muslims, Sinti and Roma, Africans, Asians, asylum seekers. For the first five groups I can compare the explanatory power by AoE, SDO, anomia and authoritarian aggression in all three survey points, the explanation of rejection of asylum seekers is possible for the comparison between 2014 and 2016. The basic assumption is that AoE independently predicts negative attitudes towards the migrant groups in comparison to SDO, authoritarian aggression and anomia. In line with Elias' emphasis on relevance and functionality that groups must have for each other to develop an established-outsider relationship, I hypothesize that the explanatory power of AoE strongly differs for the rejection of the different groups as well

as in the comparison between years (H3.2). It depends on the respective (socio-)political and international developments and can therefore increase, shift, possibly even overlap or lose its strength again; similar to H2.

It would be reasonable to assume that the rejection of migrants in general and Muslims in particular is most strongly predicted over the years by AoE. Many studies have impressively shown that they have a high potential for being outsider in reference to established Germans. The explanatory power for rejections of Africans and asylum seekers would only have to increase over the years due to the large refugee movement to Germany in 2015 and 2016. Although both groups have close overlaps, in 2014 asylum seekers came mainly from Syria, Russia or countries of former Yugoslavia, while the number of refugees from African countries has only been increasing since 2015. The perception of Germans during this period was strongly influenced by the sociopolitical discussion about receiving refugees but also by media reporting, which particularly showed people from Africa to be fleeing (e.g. Fengler et al., 2017). Another influential aspect could be the event of the 2015 New Year's Eve on Cologne, when many sexual assaults on women were carried out by migrants from Morocco and Algeria, among others. The narrative of the black man attacking native white women was one consequence and the event were by the majority as evidence that the intake of refugees was a mistake (see Behrendes, 2016; Drüeke, 2016). Consequently, both groups became more relevant and it could be the decisive factor for Germans to assert an established status against them. Conversely, it can be expected that the rejection of Asians is very weakly predicted. Although, some Germans will reject this group because they are perceived as migrants and, depending on the societal concept of an *original community*, do not belong to it. However, their attributed relevance can be classified as very low, because Asians play practically no role in German discourses on migration and integration and must be described as invisible and unheard. A last assumption is that the effect on the rejection of Sinti and Roma decreases over the three survey points. With the free movement of workers for Bulgaria and Romania in 2013, they came into focus as a relevant immigration group. But they are perceived as a very weak and marginalized group in the German population and are particularly discussed with regard to participation in the German social system, so that the general *German superiority* is not really threatened (End et al., 2009; Bartels et al., 2013). Additionally, with regard to findings of some studies on shifts and replacement of outsider groups, it is to be expected that Sinti and Roma rather being overshadowed due to the appearance of more relevant groups against whom an established status must be asserted, and that the attribution of outsider status to Sinti and Roma is less urgent.

#### 4. Sample and measures

The empirical analyses are based on data from three representative cross-sectional surveys of persons living in Germany in winter 2013/14, winter 2015/16 and spring 2018.<sup>1</sup> They were collected by means of computer-assisted telephone interviews, including mobile samples. All interviews were pretested and conducted by a professional survey center. The sample in 2014 consisted of 2,006 participants, with 53.3% female and the age range is from 18 to 94 years with a mean age of 49 years (SD=17.2). In 2016, 1,300 persons were interviewed, with 53.2% female and an age range from 18 to 93 years with a mean age of 53 (SD=17.4). The sample in 2018 consisted of 2,009 participants, 58.4% are female and the age range is from 18 to 93 years with a mean age of 55 (SD=16.4).

The dependent variables which reflect negative attitudes toward certain social groups, more specifically their rejection or devaluation, were measured by at least two indicators; for all descriptives see Table 1 (appendix). For sexism, heterosexism, devaluation of homeless people and asylum seekers, measures are given which had been used successfully in previous surveys. Each of these constructs was developed within the framework of the GFE project, an overview of their scales, definitions and quality criteria is given by Krause and Zick (2013). Sexism, heterosexism and the devaluation of homeless people are only included in 2014's survey, the devaluation of asylum seekers can be compared between 2014 and 2016. The measures of rejection of migrants, Muslims, Sinti and Roma, Asians and Africans are clearly aimed at the non-acceptance of groups' presence in German society. They are comparable to each other and have the same metrics, in which only the named migrant group varies, and each of them is included in all surveys. The rejection was measured by two indicators; the limitation-item was developed by Preuß (2020), the second item was taken from GFE project (Heitmeyer, 2002). To measure social dominance orientation (SDO), authoritarian aggression (AUT) and anomia (ANO) I also used known and established measures. The three items for operationalizing SDO are based on a modified and short version used by the GFE project following Sidanius & Pratto (1999). This also applies to the measurement of AUT with two indicators which was taken from the GFE project and is a modified and shorter version of the scale developed by Altemeyer (1981). The ANO scale with three items based on the German version by Fischer and Kohr (1980) of the original measurement by McClosky and Schaar (1965). For each of the constructs mentioned so far, the participants responded using a five-point Likert scale ranging from (1) disagree completely to (5) agree completely.

---

<sup>1</sup> The survey *Belonging and Equivalency* is financed by the Mercator Stiftung and headed by Andreas Zick (Institute for Interdisciplinary Research on Conflict and Violence, Bielefeld University) and the author.

The new explanatory concept of the assertion of an established status aims to capture the perspective of individuals and/or groups who see themselves as established in certain established-outsider relationships. This perspective is the decisive point of reference, in that agreements with the various measurement statements reflect the positioning as established in relation to others. Second, it should not be limited to any social categories to meet the fact that, depending on contextual aspects, different groups can find themselves in an established-outsider relationship. Many studies have shown that a wide variety of intergroup conflicts can be explained with the help of the theory model; regardless of whether they relate to urban districts and neighborhoods, migration, religion, gender or ethnicity and nationality. In other words, although the established perspective is adopted in this paper, this does not mean that it is reserved for a particular group. The measurement should be able to respond to every conceivable established-outsider relationship, e.g. by allowing women and men, Muslims and Christians, people with and without a migration background to assert an established status against *their* specific outsider groups. For this, I refrained from directly measuring an alleged superiority or a perceived group charisma because it is hardly feasible without a reference to specific and thus distinguish characteristics of the respective group. Instead, AoE should be reflected indirectly via expectations on potential outsiders. In this sense, the self-appointed established ones demand the assurance of their asserted or real privileges and expect that *their* declared outsiders are neither equal to them nor make claims on their resources. They should be inferior in their rights to those of the established ones and recognize their lower social status.

The measurement of AoE was developed in an exploratory way by using multiple pre-tests which were conducted by the author and an independent and professional survey institute. The final measure is based on five items which all start with the same introduction "If someone is new somewhere or joins later, he or she...": "should first be satisfied with less"; "should be entitled to as much as everyone else"; "should have the same rights as everyone else"; "should in no case make demands or claims"; "should join the end of the queue, if it is not enough for everyone". The first item was taken from the GFE project and published for the first time in 2002 (see Heitmeyer, 2002), all other indicators were newly developed by the author. Respondents were asked to indicate their agreement on five-point response scale ranging from (1) disagree completely to (5) agree completely. Finally, one further methodological aspect should be mentioned: the frequent impairment of attitude measurements by an acquiescence bias should avoid by using the semantic oppositely poled items (Danner et al., 2015; Weijters & Baumgartner, 2012). However, this may create the risk of common method bias, e.g. that the equally poled items, regardless of their content, provoke their own factor or that the scale reliability is over- or underestimated (Schermelleh-Engel & Werner, 2012). This fact will be considered in the evaluation of the developed measurement.

For now, we can state a satisfactory reliability: according to Cronbach, the alpha values for AoE are  $\alpha(2014)=.68$ ,  $\alpha(2016)=.73$  and  $\alpha(2018)=.73$ ; see descriptives in Table 1. Essentially, mean values and standard deviations of the manifest indicators show a sufficient variance in responses. However, the item "... should have the same rights as everyone else" shows kurtosis (6.53) and skewness (-1.95) with a strong tendency to agree in all years and a low standard deviation in 2014. Overall, it can be observed that the average agreement with the negatively formulated statements, e.g. "... should first be satisfied with less", is lowest in 2014, increases in 2016 and decreases again slightly in 2018. Conversely, the positively poled items reach the highest averages in 2014 and the lowest in 2016.

## 5. Results

To test the research hypotheses, structural equation modeling (SEM, conducted with Mplus Version 7) was applied. It allows to model different latent constructs and their relationships with multiple indicators. As I already stated, some item distributions are non-normal, so I used the robust estimation method (MLR, see Yuan & Bentler, 1998). Missing values were treated with the full information maximum likelihood procedure (FIML, see Enders, 2010).

By incorporating confirmatory factor analyses (CFA), I test the underlying structure of my proposed model and thus answer Hypothesis 1 that the assertion of an established status is distinctive and empirically valid compared to social dominance orientation, authoritarian aggression and anomia. I ran CFA for each survey and additionally exploratory factor analyses (EFA) and correlation analyses.

EFA was applied for identifying the underlying factor structure. Here, the first indication of common method bias must be noted. Although the respective items load in the theoretical assumed factors, the AoE factor loadings are relatively low in 2014 and 2016 and also for SDO in general. Furthermore, three AoE items show cross loadings in AUT in 2016. This was to be expected, since AUT is directed towards undesirable troublemakers and outsiders who break the rules and standards. It could almost be read as a reaction to the violation of the established's status, which could explain their empirical relationship. However, I would rather argue that this is the result of the positively poled items and thus the common method bias. This is confirmed by results of CFA. The problem here continues to be that large modification indices (2014=190.48, 2016=167.34, 2018=234.23) suggest the covariance between both positively poled items of AoE, which improves the model fit dramatically. This impairs

the factor loadings; e.g. factor loadings of one AoE item are  $\lambda < .5$  in all years. These problems are mainly due to the item which addressed equal rights for newcomers. Perhaps the normative promise of equality plays a role here, which *must* not be questioned; at least not without a clear reference group (e.g. social desirability, Barger, 2002; Paulhus, 2002). Another point is that only the aggression subdimension of authoritarianism can be used, whose stimulus in question wording might be the reason for a closer relationship with AoE. I would recommend changing the measurement of the construct of an asserted established status slightly in future research in order to check whether it is a theoretical problem or a problem in measurement. In doing so, the moment of the same rights should not be waived, but possibly measured more sensitively. Furthermore, future research analyses should consider to integrate the whole construct of authoritarianism to test the robustness of a larger and more differentiated measure of AoE.

In the present paper I decided to give up a balanced measurement with negatively and positively poled items and to exclude the latter ones from the measure. With reference to methodological discussions on sufficiently robust measurements with three indicators, this seems to be an acceptable solution for this first attempt at development (e.g. Drolet & Morrison, 2001). Thus, the problem of missing distinction between the four constructs no longer exists. The results of EFA show the theoretical assumed factor loadings in each survey, the AoE item loadings reach values of  $\lambda > .5$  without any cross loadings in other factors (see Table 2, appendix). Additionally, the correlation analyses underpin the impression of validity by showing that AoE items correlate higher with each other and correlate lower with criterion measures of SDO, AUT and ANO; results are presented in Table 3 (appendix). They. However, there are also some closer relations of the item "... should first be satisfied with less" with AUT and ANO items in 2016 and ANO items in 2018. The results of CFA and the goodness-of-fit model comparison demonstrate that the theoretical model provides a satisfactory fit to the data in each year (see Table 4, appendix). Under the condition of a freed parameter between two SDO items in 2014, goodness-of-fit statistics indicate a model fit of:  $\chi^2(37)=89.41$ ,  $p=.000$ , CFI=.99, TLI=.98, RMSEA=.03. In 2016, a parameter between two ANO items was freed and the model fits the data with:  $\chi^2(37)=102.9$ ,  $p=.000$ , CFI=.98, TLI=.97, RMSEA = .04. In 2018, the proposed model does not need any modifications for fitting the empirical data:  $\chi^2(38)=143.01$ ,  $p=.000$ , CFI=.98, TLI=.97, RMSEA=.04. Additionally, all factor loadings were highly significant ( $p=.000$ ) and exceed the usual benchmark of  $\lambda \geq .5$  (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). A look at the factor correlations shows that the constructs are closely related. For AoE these are particularly correlations with SDO and AUT in 2014 ( $r=.53/.52$ ) and with AUT and ANO in 2016 ( $r=.63/.52$ ) and 2018 ( $r=.5/.56$ ). However, they are far below the threshold of  $r \geq .8$  which would diagnose the problem of multicollinearity and the factor loadings are sufficiently high and significantly different from 0. Furthermore, the factor correlations between the others reach values between  $r=.36$  (SDO/AUT) and  $r=.70$  (ANO/AUT). In cases like these, second-order CFA are recommended to check whether there is an higher order construct behind the single, but related first-order factors. Additional analyses confirm this point; the four constructs can be attributed to a second-order factor with high factor loadings ( $.5 \leq \lambda \leq .85$ ) and fits the data well in each survey. This could be explained by the fact that all constructs have in common to prefer simplified social orders with clear social hierarchies and imply radical solutions against groups who threaten the security of this preferred social order. All in all, and under the condition of a shorter version of the actually intended measurement, H1 can be confirmed. The concept of the assertion of an established status is distinctive and empirically valid compared to social dominance orientation, authoritarian aggression and anomia.

According to Hypothesis 2, I assumed the agreements and disagreements with the statements of AoE will vary more than with SDO and AUT statements between the years. The corresponding frequencies are presented in Table 5 (appendix). First, it can be observed that there is a variance in (dis)agreements with ANO statements, differences range from .05% to 11% between years, but the AoE spectrum is broader: here, focusing on the reduced version of measurement, the (dis)agreements differ by up to 14%, the smallest difference is 5%. Second, the theoretical assumption of SDO and AUT as relatively stable individual attitudes is confirmed by frequencies. They show a strong consistency across the years for both agreements and disagreements. Thus, H2 can be confirmed.

Hypothesis 3 implied the general assumption that AoE has an interdependent explanatory power for the rejection and/or devaluation of certain social groups compared to SDO, AUT and ANO. To meet the broad research on established-outsider figurations, I prove H3 for a whole series of rejections of social groups that were available to me. Looking at the results of SEM shown in Table 6, the superordinate hypothesis can be confirmed: AoE not only predicts the devaluation and/or rejection of certain social groups in general, but in some cases also shows the strongest explanatory power compared to SDO, AUT and ANO.

| Prediction of                         | $\beta$ | 2014 S.E. | p-value | $\beta$ | 2016 S.E. | p-value | $\beta$ | 2018 S.E. | p-value |
|---------------------------------------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|-----------|---------|---------|-----------|---------|
| <b>Sexism</b>                         |         |           |         |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| AoE                                   | .202    | .047      | .000    |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| SDO                                   | .288    | .051      | .000    |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| AUT                                   | -.038   | .041      | .352    |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| ANO                                   | .169    | .042      | .000    |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| <b>Heterosexism</b>                   |         |           |         |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| AoE                                   | .10     | .051      | .052    |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| SDO                                   | .23     | .053      | .000    |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| AUT                                   | .068    | .042      | .105    |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| ANO                                   | .184    | .045      | .000    |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| <b>Devaluation of homeless people</b> |         |           |         |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| AoE                                   | .211    | .046      | .000    |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| SDO                                   | .331    | .046      | .000    |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| AUT                                   | .185    | .040      | .000    |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| ANO                                   | .053    | .041      | .188    |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| <b>Devaluation of asylum seekers</b>  |         |           |         |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| AoE                                   | .135    | .043      | .000    | .259    | .058      | .000    |         |           |         |
| SDO                                   | .108    | .043      | .012    | .102    | .043      | .017    |         |           |         |
| AUT                                   | .495    | .041      | .000    | .545    | .062      | .000    |         |           |         |
| ANO                                   | .137    | .040      | .001    | .092    | .056      | .099    |         |           |         |
| <b>Rejection of migrants</b>          |         |           |         |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| AoE                                   | .162    | .045      | .000    | .232    | .061      | .000    | .308    | .044      | .000    |
| SDO                                   | .303    | .043      | .000    | .225    | .048      | .000    | .18     | .046      | .000    |
| AUT                                   | .23     | .039      | .000    | .311    | .060      | .000    | .25     | .032      | .000    |
| ANO                                   | .226    | .038      | .000    | .205    | .057      | .000    | .221    | .038      | .000    |
| <b>Rejection of Muslims</b>           |         |           |         |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| AoE                                   | -.004   | .042      | .922    | .229    | .057      | .000    | .259    | .040      | .000    |
| SDO                                   | .363    | .042      | .000    | .301    | .048      | .000    | .182    | .045      | .000    |
| AUT                                   | .232    | .035      | .000    | .076    | .052      | .147    | .21     | .029      | .000    |
| ANO                                   | .208    | .036      | .000    | .347    | .051      | .000    | .265    | .037      | .000    |
| <b>Rejection of Sinti and Roma</b>    |         |           |         |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| AoE                                   | .199    | .045      | .000    | .185    | .061      | .002    | .119    | .045      | .009    |
| SDO                                   | .218    | .042      | .000    | .301    | .048      | .000    | .167    | .048      | .001    |
| AUT                                   | .294    | .040      | .000    | .267    | .057      | .000    | .231    | .030      | .000    |
| ANO                                   | .153    | .039      | .000    | .158    | .053      | .003    | .21     | .039      | .000    |
| <b>Rejection of Africans</b>          |         |           |         |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| AoE                                   | .066    | .043      | .129    | 1.90    | .059      | .000    | .197    | .041      | .000    |
| SDO                                   | .328    | .046      | .000    | .313    | .050      | .000    | .21     | .044      | .000    |
| AUT                                   | .183    | .036      | .000    | .063    | .054      | .241    | .174    | .030      | .000    |
| ANO                                   | .175    | .036      | .000    | .283    | .052      | .000    | .209    | .036      | .000    |
| <b>Rejection of Asians</b>            |         |           |         |         |           |         |         |           |         |
| AoE                                   | .086    | .043      | .047    | .13     | .060      | .030    | .069    | .048      | .153    |
| SDO                                   | .292    | .044      | .000    | .317    | .048      | .000    | .203    | .059      | .001    |
| AUT                                   | .179    | .034      | .000    | .094    | .057      | .096    | .111    | .031      | .000    |
| ANO                                   | .206    | .037      | .000    | .225    | .051      | .000    | .277    | .039      | .000    |

Table 6: Structural equation model results (standardized estimates with standard errors)

In specifying this core hypothesis, I have firstly assumed a moderate prediction of sexism, heterosexism and the devaluation of homeless people (H3.1). These relationships could be examined in 2014 and the results show that both sexism and the devaluation of homeless people are predicted by AoE ( $\beta=.20$ ,  $\beta=.21$ ;  $p=.000$ ), while there is a weak, non-significant effect for heterosexism ( $\beta=.10$ ,  $p=.05$ ); H3.1 is supported. In the second sub-hypothesis, I assumed an independent explanatory power for certain migrant groups by AoE compared with SDO, AUT and ANO, and hypothesized that its prediction differs greatly both for group rejection and in comparison between years (H3.2). The analysis includes the groups of migrants in general, Muslims, Sinti and Roma, Africans, Asians and asylum seekers. Concerning the first point of H3.2, the identical measurement of rejection of the first five group allows me to compare them in their explanation by AoE. I argued that results will reflect the diverse presence of these groups in public discourses which are discussed under very different signs and involved in very quiet but also very loud established-outsider relationships. This assumption of strong differences can be confirmed. For example, there is hardly any effect for the rejection of Asians throughout the years ( $\emptyset\beta=.10$ , non-significant), while migrants' rejection has the highest average prediction, compared to all groups ( $\emptyset\beta=.24$ ,  $p=.000$ ). Concerning the second point of H3.2, I made a lot of considerations about this assumption, why these differences will vary across the years. Most of them can be observed in the results. For instance, the explanation of the devaluation of asylum seekers by AoE increases from  $\beta=.135$  in 2014 to  $\beta=.259$  in 2016 (both  $p=.000$ ),

the rejection of migrants or Africans also increases by more than a unit from 2014 to 2018 (migrants:  $\beta=.16$ ,  $\beta=.31$ ; Africans:  $\beta=.07$ ,  $\beta=.20$ ;  $p=.000$ ), while the rejection of Sinti and Roma decreases from 2014 to 2018 ( $\beta=.20$ ,  $p=.000$ ;  $\beta=.12$ ,  $p=.009$ ). The most interesting point is that the explanatory power of AoE for the rejection of Muslims starts with no effect in 2014 and ends with  $\beta=.259$  ( $p=.000$ ) in 2018 which is also the second strongest prediction besides ANO ( $\beta=.265$ ,  $p=.000$ ). All in all, Hypothesis 3.2 can be confirmed.

## 6. Summary and conclusion

The present paper had several objectives. With reference to Elias' established-outsider-relationship, it aimed at developing a quantitative measurement to capture the assertion of an established status (AoE) as one of its key moments; to test the measure against established and prominent explanatory concepts of intergroup conflicts – social dominance orientation (SDO), authoritarian aggression as sub-dimension of authoritarianism (AUT) and anomia (ANO); and to investigate whether and how AoE is related to the rejection and/or devaluation of certain social groups compared to the other explanatory concepts.

Using structural equation modeling, I have shown that AoE measurement is distinctive and empirically valid against SDO, AUT and ANO and has an independent explanatory power for negative attitudes towards social groups. Unlike SDO or AUT, AoE is not a relatively stable individual difference variable, and unlike ANO, it can still be directed against certain groups directly. It is conceptualized as a dynamic positioning that take contextual parameters into account and bases on a perceived superiority of ones over others. Thus, asserting an established status depends on the functionality and relevance of other groups; both determine the *loudness* of an established-outsider relationship. Based on frequencies across 2014, 2016 and 2018, it was shown, how strongly AoE varies in its (dis)agreements, similar to ANO, while SDO and AUT show the expected consistency. The variance in its explanatory power for rejections of certain groups also underlines the intended dynamic character and shifting between groups. With regard to Bauböck's (1993) understanding of a nationalized social oldness, e.g. Sinti and Roma, against whom an established status is still most strongly asserted in 2014, are increasingly pushed into the background, while groups such as Africans or Muslims gain relevance in 2016 and 2018. At the same time, Asians seem to have no relevance and functionality at all for those who see themselves as established. Notable is the interplay of contextuality and differentiation between the respective groups for all explanatory concepts. There are strong effects for sexism, heterosexism and the devaluation of homeless people by SDO, but weak or non-significant ones by AUT or ANO while AoE predicts sexism and the devaluation of homeless most strongly, but not heterosexism. The devaluation of asylum seekers shows a strong prediction by AUT and (very) weak effects by SDO and ANO while the explanatory power of AoE only increases between the years. Across the years, SDO loses its strong influence for the rejection of the different migrant groups to the other explanatory concepts, except for Asians, where it shows a relatively constant prediction of their rejection. In comparison, AUT is rather relatively constant in its explanation for the rejection of migrants or Sinti and Roma but plays no role in explaining rejection of Muslims and Africans in 2016, while ANO consistently influences the rejection of all groups. These results indicate two things: First, to take a closer look at the interdependence of specific motives to devalue or reject social groups, the social groups themselves as well as the embedding in time and their main discourses. Second, that AoE measurement is able to identify which groups are to be less affected by outsider status and which are more likely to be, which is going hand in hand with public discourses, the louder questioning of the *ushers' function* (Hüttermann, 2000) and perceived increasing instability of power differentials (Elias, 1984).

The study has some limitations: First, the data originate from cross-sectional surveys and the analyses are therefore based on correlations and covariations; it is not capable of making a statement on the direction of causality. Although observations over time could also provide initial answers, a rigorous testing of causality can only be answered in experimental or longitudinal designs. Additionally, analyses based on the panel and measurements of the study *Group-Focused Enmity* have already shown that the cause-effect relationship can be confirmed; here, the so-called rights of established explain negative attitudes towards social groups. Furthermore, future research with the latter could observe more closely how strong contextuality affects AoE and how dynamic the various (conflict) group constellations are accordingly. Second, the survey study aims to generate comparable data on rejections of many social groups and other constructs, so that it relies mainly on short scales due to time and space limitations in telephone interviews. Therefore, I would recommend replicating analyses with more differentiated measures to test for robustness – both for the explanatory concepts and dependent concepts of rejection and/or devaluation. Third, the original measurement of AoE is subject to a common method bias. Here, it would be worth considering either developing further indicators or varying the response direction anew. However, the moment of denial of equal rights should not be waived because of its implied social control that is crucial for AoE. Possibly, an even more sensitive operationalization could respond to the presumed contradiction of a universal promise of equality, which probably evokes social desirability. At this point a side result should be mentioned in more detail: the weak performance of SDO. In addition to the low reliability over the years, there are low factor loadings in both EFA and CFA and a highly problematic result of its convergent validity. Additional analyses have shown that this weak measurement quality of SDO is also present in other representative surveys.

It seems necessary to put the existing and established measure to the test. Finally, it would be very promising to integrate the so-called *shibboleths*, which strengthen an established-outsider-relationship, but are by no means decisive. In the present paper, their reference was avoided for the time being in order not to cloud the basic idea of an asserted superiority. By adding such "peripheral" (Elias, 1994: xxx) aspects that legitimize the rejection of potential outsider groups, one could examine Elias' basic premise, but also the importance that social characteristics such as religion or culture in conflicts are actually attributed in intergroup conflicts. According to Elias, the explanatory power should consequently increase for those potential outsiders who are addressed by the respective characteristics.

To sum up, the results of the study provide a first relevant indication that changes in established-outsider relationships can be (quantitatively) captured, apart from a necessary contextualization and comparable measurements. Elias' theoretical framework can be usefully applied to recognize which intergroup conflict is based on unequal power relations – and in a second step, to explain why with respect to contextual embedding. The act of joining is a sociologically relevant reality. It can, but does not have to be understood exclusively as a physical change of location and is therefore not limited to any group constellation. It can also refer to the entry into already existing and/or already closed constellations. The present study supports Elias' core idea of considering the exclusion of groups, the respective extent and specific degrees of exclusion against the background of historical change; whereby the various developments can also overlap or be directed backward. We can find the assertion of an established status everywhere, and sometimes it does not need an individual worldview based on inequality, competition or conformity to norms to believe that one's rights must be defended. The concept of established-outsider relationship can help to better understand social group processes and thus conflicts that are not based on factors above.

### References

- Adorno, T.W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D.J. & Sansford, R.N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Altemeyer, B. (1996). *The authoritarian specter*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Altemeyer, B. (1981). *Right-wing authoritarianism*. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Anderson, B. (1983). *Imagined communities. Reflections on the origin and spread of nationalism*. London: Verso.
- Barger, S.D. (2002). The Marlowe-Crowne affair. Short forms, psychometric structure, and social desirability. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 79(2), 286-305.
- Bartels, A., von Borcke, T., End, M. & Friedrich, A. (2013). *Antiziganistische Zustände. Kritische Positionen gegen gewaltvolle Verhältnisse*. Münster: Unrast.
- Bauböck, R. (1993). Etablierte und Außenseiter, Einheimische und Fremde. Anmerkungen zu Norbert Elias' Soziologie der Ausgrenzung. In: Nowotny, H. & Taschwer, K. (eds.), *Macht und Ohnmacht im neuen Europa. Zur Aktualität der Soziologie von Norbert Elias*. Wien: WU, 147-166.
- Behrendes, U. (2016). Die Kölner Silvesternacht 2015/2016 und ihre Folgen Wahrnehmungsperspektiven, Erkenntnisse und Instrumentalisierungen. *Neue Kriminalpolitik*, 28(3), 322-343.
- Bucholc, M. (2013). Outside the moral circle. Polish political refugees in Norway. Between the established and the outsiders. *Human Figurations, Everyday practices and long term-process: Overcoming dichotomies with the work of Norbert Elias* 2(3). URL (Letzter Aufruf April 2020): <https://quod.lib.umich.edu/h/humfig/11217607.0002.303?view=text;rgn=main>
- Ceylan, R. (2017). Neue Migrantengruppen und alte Ausgrenzungsmechanismen im Kontext der Etablierten-Außenseiter-Figuration. In: Ceylan, R., Ottersbach, M. & Wiedemann, P. (Hrsg.), *Neue Mobilitäts- und Migrationsprozesse Und Sozialräumliche Segregation*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 87-98.
- Cohrs, J.C., Moschner, B., Maes, J. & Kielmann, S. (2005). The motivational bases of right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation. Relations to values and attitudes in the aftermath of September 11, 2001. *Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin* 31(10), 1425-1434.
- Cohrs, J.C. & Stelzl, M. (2010). How ideological attitudes predict host society members' attitudes toward immigrants. Exploring cross-national differences. *Journal of Social Issues* 66(4), 673-694.
- Danner, D., Aichholzer, J. & Rammstedt, B. (2015). Acquiescence in personality questionnaires. Relevance, domain specificity, and stability. *Journal of Research in Personality* 57, 119-130.
- Drolet, A.L. & Morrison, D.G. (2001). Do we really need multiple-item measures in service research? *Journal of Service Research* 3(3), 196-204.
- Drüeke, R. (2016). *Die TV-Berichterstattung in ARD und ZDF über die Silvesternacht 2015/16 in Köln (Studie im Auftrag des Gunda-Werner-Instituts für Feminismus und Geschlechterdemokratie der Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung)*. Berlin: Heinrich-Böll-Stiftung.
- Duckitt, J. & Sibley, C.G. (2010). Right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation differentially moderate intergroup effects on prejudice. *European Journal of Personality* 24(7), 583-601.
- Dunning, M. (2016). "Established and outsiders". Brutalisation processes and the development of "jihadist terrorists. *Historical Social Research, Special Issue: Established-Outsider Relations & Figurational Analysis* 41(3), 31-53.
- Eckert, J. & Kibler, M. (1992). Multikultur und ethnische Vielfalt. Überlegungen angesichts gewandelter städtischer Lebensweisen. *Soziale Welt* 43(4), 462-475.
- Elias, N. (1994). A theoretical essay on established and outsider relations. In: Elias, N. & Scotson, J.L. (eds.), *The Established and the outsiders. A sociological enquiry into community problems*. London: Sage.
- Elias, N. (1987). Vorwort. In: van Stolk, B. & Wouters, C. (eds.), *Frauen im Zwiespalt. Beziehungsprobleme im Wohlfahrtsstaat*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 9-16.

- Elias, N. (1984). Notizen zum Lebenslauf. In: Gleichmann, P., Goudsblom, J. & Korte, H. (eds.), Macht und Zivilisation. Materialien zu Norbert Elias' Zivilisationstheorie. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 9-82.
- Elias, N. (1978). What is sociology? London: Hutchinson.
- Elias, N. & Scotson, J.L. (1994). The established and the outsiders. A sociological enquiry into community problems, 2nd ed. London: Sage.
- End, M., Herold, K. & Robel, Y. (2009). Antiziganistische Zustände. Zur Kritik eines allgegenwärtigen Ressentiments. Münster: Unrast.
- Enders, C.K. (2010). Applied missing data analysis. New York: Guilford Press.
- Ernst, S. (2003). From blame gossip to praise gossip? Gender, leadership and organizational change. *The European Journal of Woman's Studies* 10(3), 277-299.
- Ernst, S. (1996). Machtbeziehungen zwischen den Geschlechtern. Wandlungen der Ehe im "Prozeß der Zivilisation." Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.
- Fengler, S., Zappe, A.C., Bastian, M. & Brinkmann, J. (2017). Medien unterschätzen Flüchtlingsstrom aus Afrika. *Europäisches Journalismus-Observatorium (EJO)*. URL (03.04.2020): <https://de.ejo-online.eu/qualitaet-ethik/medien-unterschaetzen-fluechtlingsstrom-aus-afrika>.
- Fischer, A. & Kohr, H.-U. (1980). Politisches Verhalten und empirische Sozialforschung. Leistung und Grenzen von Befragungsinstrumenten. Weinheim; München: Juventa.
- Gerhard, U. (2003). Mütter zwischen Individualisierung und Institution. Kulturelle Leitbilder in der Wohlfahrtspolitik. In: Gerhard, U., Knijn, T. & Weckwert, A. (eds.), *Erwerbstätige Mütter. Ein europäischer Vergleich*. München: C. H. Beck, 53-84.
- Heitmeyer, W. (2002). Deutsche Zustände, Folge 1. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 15-36.
- Hoffmann-Nowotny, H.-J. (2001). Das Fremde in der Schweiz. *Ergebnisse soziologischer Forschung*. Zürich: Seismo.
- Hoffmann-Nowotny, H.-J., Bösch, A., Romano, G. & Stolz, J. (1997). Das "Fremde" in der Schweiz - 1969 und 1995. Eine Replikationsstudie. Zürich: Soziologisches Institut, Universität Zürich.
- Hogenstijn, M., van Middelkoop, D. & Terlouw, K. (2008). The Established, the outsiders and scale strategies. *Studying local power conflicts. The Sociological Review* 56(1), 144-161.
- Hüpping, S. (2006). Anomia. Unsicher in der Orientierung, sicher in der Abwertung. In: Heitmeyer, W. (ed.), *Deutsche Zustände, Folge 4*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 86-100.
- Hüttermann, J. (2000). Der avancierende Fremde. Zur Genese von Unsicherheitserfahrungen und Konflikten in einem ethnisch polarisierten und sozialräumlich benachteiligten Stadtteil. *Zeitschrift für Soziologie* 29(4), 275-293.
- Karsten, L. (1998). Growing up in Amsterdam. Differentiation and segregation in children's daily lives. *Urban Studies* 35(5), 565-581.
- Koppetsch, C. (2017). Aufstand der Etablierten? Soziopolis, URL (02.04.2020): <https://soziopolis.de/beobachten/kultur/artikel/aufstand-der-etablierten/>
- Korte, H. (1987). The established Germans and their foreign migrant outsiders. *Migration Word Magazine* 15, 12-16.
- Krause, D. & Zick, A. (2013). Gruppenbezogene Menschenfeindlichkeit. Kurzskaalen. In: Kemper, C.J., Brähler, E. & Zenger, M. (Hrsg.), *Psychologische und sozialwissenschaftliche Kurzskaalen. Standardisierte Erhebungsinstrumente für Wissenschaft und Praxis*. Berlin: Medizinisch Wissenschaftliche Verlagsgesellschaft, 100-136.
- Lacassagne, A. (2016). The complexities of the established-outsider-relations in Canada. Re-integrating socio-historical analysis and engaging with some post-colonial thoughts. *Historical Social Research* 41(3), 81-100.
- Lake, R.J. (2011). "They treat me like I'm scum". Social exclusion and established-outsider relations in a British tennis club. *International Review for the Sociology of Sport* 48(1), 112-128.
- Legge, S. & Heitmeyer, W. (2012). Anomia and discrimination. In: Salzborn, S., Davidov, E. & Reinecke, J. (Eds.), *Methods, theories, and empirical applications in the social sciences*. Wiesbaden: VS Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, 117-125.
- Lever, J. & Milbourne, P. (2014). Migrant workers and migrant entrepreneurs. Changing established-outsider relations across society and space? *Space and Polity* 18(3), 255-268.
- Loyal, S. (2011). A land of a hundred thousand welcomes? Understanding established and outsiders relations in Ireland. *The Sociological Review* 59(1), 181-201.
- Mansel, J. & Kaletta, B. (2009). Desintegrationsprozesse, Anerkennungsprobleme und Gruppenbezogene Menschenfeindlichkeit. Ein Ost-West-Vergleich. In: Heitmeyer, W. (Hrsg.), *Deutsche Zustände, Folge 7*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 73-92.
- Manz, S. (2004). Constructing a normative national identity. The Leitkultur debate in Germany, 2000/2001. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 25(5-6), 481-496.
- May, D.M. (2004). The interplay of three established-outsider figurations in a deprived inner-city neighbourhood. *Urban Studies* 41(11), 2159-2179.
- McClosky, H. & Schaar, J.H. (1965). Psychological dimensions of anomy. *American Sociological Review* 30(1), 14-40.
- Merton, R.K. (1938). Social structure and anomie. *American Sociological Review* 3(5), 672-682.
- Neckel, S. (1997). Etablierte und Außenseiter und das vereinigte Deutschland. Eine rekonstruktive Prozessanalyse mit Elias und Simmel. *Berliner Journal für Soziologie* 7(2), 205-215.
- O'Connell, P. & McGinnity, F. (2008). Immigrants at work. Ethnicity and nationality in the Irish labour market. Dublin: The Equality Authority and Economic and Social Research Institute.
- Oesterreich, D. (1993). Autoritäre Persönlichkeit und Gesellschaftsordnung. Der Stellenwert psychischer Faktoren für politische Einstellungen - eine empirische Untersuchung von Jugendlichen in Ost und West. Weinheim; München: Juventa.
- Paulhus, D.L. (2002). Socially desirable responding. The evolution of a construct. In: Braun, H., Jackson, D.N. & Wiley, D.E. (eds.), *The role of constructs in psychological and educational measurement*. New York: L. Erlbaum, 49-69.
- Petintseva, O. (2015). Approaching new migration through Elias' established and outsider lens. *Human Figurations* 4(3).
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L.M. & Malle, B.F. (1994). Social dominance orientation. A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 67(4), 741-763.
- Preuß, M. (2020). Elias' Etablierte und Außenseiter. Eine quantitativ-empirische Modellierung am Beispiel der deutschen Migrationsgesellschaft. Bielefeld: transcript.
- Rommel, I. (2016). Culturalism of exclusion in an established-outsider-figuration. *Historical Social Research* 41(3), 175-193.

- Rosenthal, G. (2016). *Established and outsiders at the same time. Self-images and we-images of Palestinians in the West Bank and in Israel*. Göttingen: Göttingen University Press.
- Schermelleh-Engel, K. & Werner, C. (2012). *Methoden der Reliabilitätsbestimmung*. In: Moosbrugger, H. & Kelava, A. (eds.), *Testtheorie und Fragebogenkonstruktion*. Berlin; Heidelberg: Springer, 119-142.
- Schröter, M. (1987). *Marriage*. *Theory, Culture & Society* 4(2-3), 317-322.
- Scott, J., Carrington, K. & McIntosh, A. (2012). *Established-outsider relations and fear of crime in mining towns*. *Sociologia Ruralis* 52(2), 147-169.
- Sibley, C.G., Wilson, M.S. & Duckitt, J. (2007). *Effects of dangerous and competitive worldviews on right-wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation over a five-month period*. *Political Psychology* 28(3), 357-371.
- Sidanius, J. & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance. An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Simmel, G. (2009). *Sociology. Inquiries into the construction of social forms*. Leiden: Brill.
- Srole, L. (1956). *Social integration and certain corollaries. An explanatory study*. *American Sociological Review* 21(6), 709-716.
- Stenger, H. (1998). "Deshalb müssen wir uns noch fremd bleiben ...". *Fremdheitserfahrungen ostdeutscher Wissenschaftler*. In: Münkler, H., Meßlinger, K. & Ladwig, B. (Hrsg.), *Die Herausforderung durch das Fremde*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag, 305-400.
- Tabachnick, B.G. & Fidell, L.S. (2007). *Using multivariate statistics*, 5th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Treibel, A. (1993). *Transformationen des Wir-Gefühls. Nationale und ethnische Zugehörigkeiten in Deutschland*. In: Blomert, R., Kuzmics, H. & Treibel, A. (Hrsg.), *Transformationen des Wir-Gefühls. Nationale und ethnische Zugehörigkeiten in Deutschland*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 313-345.
- van Stolk, B. & Wouters, C. (1987). *Power changes and self-respect. A comparison of two cases of established-outsider relations*. *Theory, Culture & Society* 4(2), 477-488.
- Waterstradt, D. (2015). *Prozess-Soziologie der Elternschaft. Nationsbildung, Figurationsideale und generative Machtarchitektur in Deutschland*. Münster: MV-Wissenschaft.
- Weijters, B. & Baumgartner, H. (2012). *Misresponse to reversed and negated items in surveys. A review*. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 49(5), 737-747.
- Wouters, C. (2004). *Sex and Manners. Female emancipation in the West 1890-2000*. London: Sage.
- Wouters, C. (1987). *Developments in the behavioural codes between the sexes. The formalization of informalization in the Netherlands, 1930-85*. *Theory, Culture & Society* 4(2-3), 405-427.
- Yuan, K.-H. & Bentler, P.M. (1998). *Normal theory based test statistics in structural equation modelling*. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology* 51(2), 289-309.
- Zick, A., Berghan, W. & Mokros, N. (2019). *Gruppenbezogene Menschenfeindlichkeit in Deutschland 2002-2018/19*. In: Zick, A., Küpper, B. & Berghan, W. (Hrsg.), *Verlorene Mitte - Feindselige Zustände. Rechtsextreme Einstellungen in Deutschland 2018*. Bonn: Dietz, 53-116.
- Zick, A., Hövermann, A. & Krause, D. (2012). *Die Abwertung von Ungleichwertigen. Erklärung und Prüfung eines erweiterten Syndroms der Gruppenbezogenen Menschenfeindlichkeit*. In: Heitmeyer, W. (Hrsg.), *Deutsche Zustände, Folge 10*. Frankfurt a.M.: Suhrkamp, 64-86.
- Zick, A., Wolf, C., Küpper, B., Davidov, E., Schmidt, P. & Heitmeyer, W. (2008). *Syndroms of Group-Focused Enmity. The interrelation of prejudices tested with multiple cross-sectional and panel data*. *Journal of Social Issues* 64(2), 363-383.
- Zifonun, D. (2010). *Ein ‚gallisches Dorf‘? Integration, Stadtteilbindung und Prestigeordnung in einem ‚Armenviertel‘*. In: Müller, M. & Zifonun, D. (eds.), *Ethnowissen. Soziologische Beiträge zu ethnischer Differenzierung und Migration*. Wiesbaden: Springer VS, 311-327.

The author:

Madlen Preuß is lecturer and researcher focusing on social inequality and empirical social research at the Faculty of Social Science at the University of Applied Science Bielefeld, Germany, and associated researcher at the Institute for Interdisciplinary Research on Conflict and Violence at Bielefeld University, Germany. Her areas of interest include conflicts associated with migration, social inequalities and inequivalencies, discrimination, empirical social research, and social area analyses.

eMail: madlen.preuss@fh-bielefeld.de

**Appendix**

|  |  |
|--|--|
| <b>Assertion of an established status</b> $\alpha(2014)=.67, \alpha(2016)=.73, \alpha(2018)=.73$ |  |
| If someone is new somewhere or joins later, he or she ...  |  |
| aoe01  | Should first be satisfied with less.   |
| aoe02  | Should be entitled to as much as everyone else.  |
| aoe03  | Should have the same rights as everyone else.  |
| aoe04  | Should in no case make demands or claims.  |
| aoe05  | Should join the end of the queue, if it is not enough for everyone.                            |
| <b>Social dominance orientation</b> $\alpha(2014)=.55, \alpha(2016)=.57, \alpha(2018)=.52$       |  |
| sdo01  | The groups at the bottom of society should stay at the bottom.                                 |
| sdo02  | Some groups of people are worth less than others.  |
| sdo03  | Some groups of people are more useful than others.   |
| <b>Authoritarian aggression</b> $\alpha(2014)=.76, \alpha(2016)=.71, \alpha(2018)=.75$           |  |
| aut01  | Crime should be punished more harshly.   |
| aut02  | To maintain law and order stronger action should be taken against outsiders and troublemakers. |
| <b>Anomia</b> $\alpha(2014)=.82, \alpha(2016)=.79, \alpha(2018)=.81$                             |  |
| ano01  | Nowadays things are so confusing that you sometimes do not know where you stand.               |
| ano02  | Nowadays things are so complex that you sometimes do not know what is going on.                |
| ano03  | In the past people were better off because everyone knew what to do.                           |
| <b>Sexism</b> $\alpha(2014)=.81$   |  |
| sx01   | Women should think stronger on the role as wives and mothers.                                  |
| sx02   | It is more important for a wife to help her husband's career than to have one herself.         |
| <b>Heterosexism</b> $\alpha(2014)=.79$   |  |
| hsx01  | Homosexuality is immoral.  |
| hsx03  | In a same-sex couple, the welfare of the child is at risk.                                     |
| <b>Devaluation of homeless people</b> $\alpha(2014)=.73$   |  |
| hl01   | Most homeless people are unwilling to work.  |
| hl02   | The homeless in the towns are unpleasant.  |
| hl03   | Begging homeless should be chased away from the pedestrian zone.                               |
| <b>Devaluation of asylum seekers</b> $\alpha(2014)=.72, \alpha(2016)=.75$                        |  |
| asyl01   | The most asylum seekers were not persecuted in their home countries.                           |
| asyl03   | In my opinion a tightening of asylum law seems to be useful.                                   |
| <b>Rejection of migrants</b> $\alpha(2014)=.88, \alpha(2016)=.85, \alpha(2018)=.84$              |  |
| ff01   | The number of migrants in Germany should be limited.   |
| ff02   | There are too many migrants living in Germany.   |
| <b>Rejection of Muslims</b> $\alpha(2014)=.88, \alpha(2016)=.84, \alpha(2018)=.84$               |  |
| mf01   | The number of Muslims in Germany should be limited.  |
| mf02   | There are too many Muslims living in Germany.  |
| <b>Rejection of Sinti and Roma</b> $\alpha(2014)=.73, \alpha(2016)=.82, \alpha(2018)=.89$        |  |
| sr01   | The number of Sinti and Roma in Germany should be limited.                                     |
| sr02   | There are too many Sinti and Roma living in Germany.   |
| <b>Rejection of Asians</b> $\alpha(2014)=.92, \alpha(2016)=.88, \alpha(2018)=.85$                |  |
| asif01   | The number of Asians in Germany should be limited.   |
| asif02   | There are too many Asians living in Germany.   |
| <b>Rejection of Africans</b> $\alpha(2014)=.86, \alpha(2016)=.90, \alpha(2018)=.91$              |  |
| afir01   | The number of Africans in Germany should be limited.   |
| afir02   | There are too many Africans living in Germany.   |

Table 1: Wording and reliability of main variables

|       | 2014       |            |            |            |     | 2016       |            |            |            |     | 2018       |            |            |            |     |
|-------|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----|------------|------------|------------|------------|-----|
|       | F1         | F2         | F3         | F4         | U   | F1         | F2         | F3         | F4         | U   | F1         | F2         | F3         | F4         | U   |
| aoe01 | .02        | .03        | <b>.53</b> | .00        | .70 | -.01       | <b>.62</b> | .05        | -.01       | .57 | .08        | <b>.66</b> | .01        | -.04       | .52 |
| aoe04 | .00        | .05        | <b>.57</b> | -.04       | .66 | .03        | <b>.51</b> | .07        | .01        | .68 | .03        | <b>.58</b> | .04        | -.01       | .62 |
| aoe05 | .01        | -.01       | <b>.61</b> | .03        | .61 | .05        | <b>.55</b> | -.03       | .03        | .64 | -.01       | <b>.60</b> | -.01       | .09        | .58 |
| sdo01 | .05        | .04        | .11        | <b>.40</b> | .74 | -.01       | .12        | .01        | <b>.54</b> | .65 | -.04       | .09        | .02        | <b>.48</b> | .73 |
| sdo02 | -.01       | .01        | .00        | <b>.57</b> | .68 | .02        | -.10       | .01        | <b>.49</b> | .79 | -.01       | .02        | -.05       | <b>.45</b> | .81 |
| sdo03 | .00        | -.02       | -.03       | <b>.63</b> | .63 | -.02       | .00        | -.01       | <b>.63</b> | .62 | .08        | -.04       | .04        | <b>.49</b> | .72 |
| aut01 | .05        | <b>.69</b> | -.01       | -.04       | .51 | .14        | -.01       | <b>.60</b> | -.01       | .54 | .08        | -.02       | <b>.68</b> | -.02       | .50 |
| aut02 | .04        | <b>.67</b> | .05        | .04        | .45 | .04        | .09        | <b>.60</b> | .00        | .51 | -.02       | .05        | <b>.68</b> | .03        | .49 |
| ano01 | <b>.69</b> | .11        | -.05       | .01        | .45 | <b>.76</b> | -.01       | .02        | -.02       | .42 | <b>.74</b> | .01        | .02        | .03        | .40 |
| ano02 | <b>.71</b> | -.01       | .07        | .03        | .44 | <b>.50</b> | .07        | .07        | .15        | .52 | <b>.62</b> | .01        | .03        | .11        | .49 |
| ano03 | <b>.80</b> | -.03       | .00        | -.03       | .41 | <b>.78</b> | .00        | -.01       | -.06       | .44 | <b>.80</b> | .04        | -.01       | -.08       | .40 |

Table 2: Exploratory factor analysis results (promax-rotation)

| <b>2014</b> | aoe01      | aoe04      | aoe05 | sdo01      | sdo02      | sdo03 | aut01      | aut02 | ano01      | ano02      | ano03 |
|-------------|------------|------------|-------|------------|------------|-------|------------|-------|------------|------------|-------|
| aoe01       | 1.000      |            |       |            |            |       |            |       |            |            |       |
| aoe04       | <b>.34</b> | 1.000      |       |            |            |       |            |       |            |            |       |
| aoe05       | <b>.39</b> | <b>.41</b> | 1.000 |            |            |       |            |       |            |            |       |
| sdo01       | .21        | .19        | .24   | 1.000      |            |       |            |       |            |            |       |
| sdo02       | .15        | .13        | .19   | <b>.26</b> | 1.000      |       |            |       |            |            |       |
| sdo03       | .15        | .13        | .17   | <b>.34</b> | <b>.43</b> | 1.000 |            |       |            |            |       |
| aut01       | .23        | .24        | .23   | .17        | .15        | .11   | 1.000      |       |            |            |       |
| aut02       | .27        | .27        | .28   | .27        | .20        | .19   | <b>.61</b> | 1.000 |            |            |       |
| ano01       | .18        | .20        | .23   | .23        | .17        | .19   | .36        | .40   | 1.000      |            |       |
| ano02       | .24        | .23        | .28   | .25        | .20        | .21   | .31        | .39   | <b>.57</b> | 1.000      |       |
| ano03       | .23        | .17        | .23   | .23        | .17        | .17   | .31        | .34   | <b>.62</b> | <b>.63</b> | 1.000 |
| <b>2016</b> |            |            |       |            |            |       |            |       |            |            |       |
| aoe01       | 1.000      |            |       |            |            |       |            |       |            |            |       |
| aoe04       | <b>.43</b> | 1.000      |       |            |            |       |            |       |            |            |       |
| aoe05       | <b>.44</b> | <b>.36</b> | 1.000 |            |            |       |            |       |            |            |       |
| sdo01       | .25        | .19        | .25   | 1.000      |            |       |            |       |            |            |       |
| sdo02       | .08        | .13        | .12   | <b>.22</b> | 1.000      |       |            |       |            |            |       |
| sdo03       | .15        | .16        | .19   | <b>.43</b> | <b>.34</b> | 1.000 |            |       |            |            |       |
| aut01       | .29        | .29        | .28   | .19        | .12        | .16   | 1.000      |       |            |            |       |
| aut02       | .33        | .31        | .29   | .20        | .12        | .15   | <b>.56</b> | 1.000 |            |            |       |
| ano01       | .26        | .29        | .28   | .19        | .18        | .16   | .40        | .37   | 1.000      |            |       |
| ano02       | .32        | .26        | .33   | .28        | .19        | .26   | .38        | .38   | <b>.52</b> | 1.000      |       |
| ano03       | .28        | .23        | .27   | .16        | .11        | .15   | .37        | .35   | <b>.63</b> | <b>.52</b> | 1.000 |
| <b>2018</b> |            |            |       |            |            |       |            |       |            |            |       |
| aoe01       | 1.000      |            |       |            |            |       |            |       |            |            |       |
| aoe04       | <b>.46</b> | 1.000      |       |            |            |       |            |       |            |            |       |
| aoe05       | <b>.49</b> | <b>.41</b> | 1.000 |            |            |       |            |       |            |            |       |
| sdo01       | .25        | .21        | .27   | 1.000      |            |       |            |       |            |            |       |
| sdo02       | .15        | .16        | .21   | <b>.24</b> | 1.000      |       |            |       |            |            |       |
| sdo03       | .18        | .20        | .23   | <b>.32</b> | <b>.26</b> | 1.000 |            |       |            |            |       |
| aut01       | .25        | .24        | .23   | .16        | .10        | .19   | 1.000      |       |            |            |       |
| aut02       | .29        | .29        | .27   | .21        | .12        | .21   | <b>.60</b> | 1.000 |            |            |       |
| ano01       | .32        | .29        | .29   | .21        | .17        | .26   | .35        | .31   | 1.000      |            |       |
| ano02       | .33        | .26        | .28   | .25        | .18        | .28   | .32        | .32   | <b>.56</b> | 1.000      |       |
| ano03       | .31        | .30        | .27   | .16        | .12        | .23   | .32        | .28   | <b>.65</b> | <b>.57</b> | 1.000 |

Table 3: Correlation analysis results.<sup>2</sup>

| Item                | 2014      |      | 2016      |      | 2018      |      |
|---------------------|-----------|------|-----------|------|-----------|------|
|                     | $\lambda$ | S.E. | $\lambda$ | S.E. | $\lambda$ | S.E. |
| aoe01               | .58       | .022 | .68       | .025 | .72       | .019 |
| aoe04               | .59       | .025 | .60       | .027 | .64       | .022 |
| aoe05               | .68       | .023 | .63       | .026 | .67       | .020 |
| sdo01               | .65       | .031 | .63       | .044 | .56       | .030 |
| sdo02               | .44       | .034 | .45       | .05  | .43       | .034 |
| sdo03               | .51       | .032 | .69       | .044 | .58       | .031 |
| aut01               | .72       | .019 | .74       | .023 | .77       | .021 |
| aut02               | .85       | .019 | .75       | .025 | .78       | .022 |
| ano01               | .76       | .016 | .69       | .025 | .81       | .015 |
| ano02               | .78       | .015 | .76       | .021 | .71       | .018 |
| ano03               | .80       | .014 | .66       | .025 | .79       | .014 |
| $\eta$ -correlation | r         | S.E. | r         | S.E. | r         | S.E. |
| AoE ↔ SDO           | .53       | .037 | .45       | .045 | .47       | .034 |
| AoE ↔ AUT           | .52       | .029 | .63       | .033 | .50       | .027 |
| AoE ↔ ANO           | .46       | .030 | .62       | .033 | .56       | .025 |
| SDO ↔ AUT           | .46       | .032 | .36       | .039 | .42       | .029 |
| SDO ↔ ANO           | .48       | .033 | .47       | .045 | .51       | .033 |
| AUT ↔ ANO           | .56       | .024 | .70       | .029 | .52       | .024 |

Table 4: Confirmatory factory analysis results (standardized factor loadings).<sup>3</sup>

<sup>2</sup> Note: All correlations are  $p < .001$

<sup>3</sup> 2014:  $\chi^2(37)=89.41$ , CFI=.99, TLI=.98, RMSEA=.03;  
 2016:  $\chi^2(37) = 94.0$ , CFI = .98, TLI = .97, RMSEA = .03;  
 2018:  $\chi^2(38) = 121.36$ , CFI = .98, TLI = .97, RMSEA = .03  
 All factor loadings and correlations are  $p < .001$

|   | Survey 2014 |       |       | Survey 2016 |       |       | Survey 2018 |       |       |
|---|-------------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|-------------|-------|-------|
|   | disagree    | agree | N     | disagree    | agree | N     | disagree    | agree | N     |
| <b>Assertion of an established status</b> |             |       |       |             |       |       |             |       |       |
| aoe01                                     | 36.0        | 32.4  | 1,982 | 27.4        | 43.1  | 1,281 | 36.7        | 36.6  | 1,987 |
| aoe02                                     | 15.0        | 61.3  | 1,984 | 20.2        | 52.4  | 1,278 | 19.7        | 54.3  | 1,977 |
| aoe03                                     | 5.2         | 85.6  | 1,999 | 11.1        | 72.4  | 1,283 | 9.3         | 76.2  | 1,994 |
| aoe04                                     | 48.5        | 19.8  | 1,981 | 34.4        | 32.0  | 1,280 | 41.2        | 26.8  | 1,975 |
| aoe05                                     | 57.8        | 16.8  | 1,973 | 47.3        | 25.9  | 1,269 | 56.4        | 19.5  | 1,950 |
| <b>Authoritarian aggression</b>           |             |       |       |             |       |       |             |       |       |
| aut01                                     | 15.6        | 64.7  | 1,949 | 16.7        | 65.7  | 1,270 | 18.0        | 63.5  | 1,979 |
| aut02                                     | 27.5        | 48.0  | 1,945 | 24.9        | 54.0  | 1,260 | 21.1        | 56.5  | 1,939 |
| <b>Social dominance orientation</b>       |             |       |       |             |       |       |             |       |       |
| sdo01                                     | 71.5        | 13.5  | 1,955 | 73.2        | 13.1  | 1,265 | 70.8        | 13.9  | 1,971 |
| sdo02                                     | 87.6        | 4.9   | 1,993 | 88.9        | 5.1   | 1,282 | 89.7        | 4.2   | 2,001 |
| sdo03                                     | 88.9        | 5.5   | 1,984 | 88.4        | 5.8   | 1,284 | 83.9        | 9.0   | 1,990 |
| <b>Anomia</b>                             |             |       |       |             |       |       |             |       |       |
| ano01                                     | 43.8        | 28.5  | 1,983 | 38.2        | 37.8  | 1,277 | 45.5        | 29.3  | 1,980 |
| ano02                                     | 48.2        | 26.7  | 1,971 | 47.7        | 29.8  | 1,247 | 50.8        | 26.6  | 1,965 |
| ano03                                     | 42.5        | 29.1  | 1,988 | 34.2        | 40.1  | 1,281 | 41.0        | 34.0  | 1,985 |

Table 5: Frequencies of variables in 2014, 2016 and 2018.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>4</sup> Respondents who answered with the middle category were not shown.