# Appendix A

## Survey questionnaire items

### Ethnic identity scale

A five-point Likert-type scale ranging from *highly disagree* (1) to *highly agree* (5).

1. I am glad to be a member of my nation.

2. I feel strong ties with members of my nation

3. Belonging to my nation is very important to me.

4. I feel that I belong to my nation.

5. Belonging to my nation makes me proud.

### Ethnonationalism scale items

A five-point Likert-type scale ranging from *highly disagree* (1) to *highly agree* (5).

1. My nation is better than other nations.

2. I would rather belong to my nation than any other nation.

3. In all historical conflicts with other nations my nation was always right.

### Perceived symbolic threat scale items

A four-point scale ranging from *highly disagree* (1) to *highly agree* (4).

1. My [out-group] peers do not respect the language of my nation.

2. My [out-group] peers should not overemphasize their national symbols and customs.

3. My [out-group] peers are listening the music that bothers us.

4. My [out-group] peers think they are better than we are.

5. My [out-group] peers are name-calling us because we are of different nationality.

### Intergroup anxiety

A five-point scale ranging from *not at all* (1) to *extremely* (5). It consisted of six items that ask participants how they would feel when interacting with members of the other ethnic group (e.g. having a conversation with them, collaborating on a school task, etc.).

1. Comfortable

2. Nervous

3. Friendly

4. Uncertain

5. Worried

6. Equal

### The tendency for out-group discrimination scale

Yes/no responses.

1. If the teacher asked me to help one of two students who were absent from school by taking homework to them, I would choose to take the homework to the [in-group member] even if the [out-group member] lived closer to my home.

2. If I had to choose which students would be picked for a school sports team, I would rather pick the [in-group member] even if the [out-group member] was better at sports.

3. If I liked some girl/boy that I do not know, I would approach her/him only if she/he was of my nationality.

4. In an important mathematics competition I would rather work in pair with the [in-group member], although I know that the [out-group member] is better mathematician.

5. If I had forgotten to bring school supplies to school, I would borrow it only from the [in-group member].

6. If I had forgotten to do my homework, I would rather get a bad mark than to copy homework from the [out-group member].

7. On a school trip, I would rather share a room with the [in-group member], although I know that the [out-group member] is more fun.

8. I would accept friend request on the social media/Facebook only if it was from [in-group member].

### The Active bystander scale

How would you act in these situations?

Indicate your most probable reaction on a four-point scale: *support them or join them* (1), *ignore them* (2), *ask them to stop* (3), and *ask my peers to help me to make it stop* (4).

1. When my peers spread lies or gossip [out-group students]

2. When my peers call [out-group students] names

3. When my peers provoke [out-group students] with overemphasizing national symbols

4. When my peers threaten [out-group students]

5. When my peers get into fight with [out-group students]

# Appendix B

**Table 1**

*Correlations, means and standard deviations for the main variables for the whole sample*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | *M* | *SD* | 1. | 2. | 3. | 4. | 5. | 6. | 7. |
| 1. Group status |  - |  - | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2. Ethnic identity | 4.16 | 0.86 | -.04 | 1 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 3. Ethnonationalism | 2.67 | 1.07 | .01 | .52\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |  |
| 4. Perceived symbolic threat | 1.92 | 0.78 | .15\*\* | .03 | .25\*\* | 1 |  |  |  |
| 5. Intergroup anxiety | 1.80 | 0.71 | .03 | -.02 | .22\*\* | .51\*\* | 1 |  |  |
| 6. Tendency for discrimination | 1.16 | 1.80 | .07\*\* | .16\*\* | .34\*\* | .32\*\* | .38\*\* | 1 |  |
| 7. Tendency for prosocial behavior | 2.96 | 0.66 | .01 | .01 | -.24\*\* | -.38\*\* | -.36\*\* | -.22\*\* | 1 |

*Note.* The range of ratings for each measure is as follows: group status, 1-majority 2-minority; ethnic identity, 1-5; ethnonationalism, 1-5; perceived symbolic threat, 1-4; intergroup anxiety, 1-5; tendency for discrimination, 0-no 1-yes; tendency for prosocial behavior, 1-4

\*\* *p* < .01

**Table 2**

*Direct and indirect effects of ethnic identity and ethnonationalism on the tendency for discrimination and for prosocial behavior for the whole sample*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Tendency for discrimination Model A (*N* = 986) | Tendency for prosocial behaviorModel B (*N* = 985) |
| Ethnic identity |  |  |
|  Direct effect | 0.08 [-0.04, 0.19] | **0.06 [0.01, 0.10]** |
|  Indirect effect via symbolic threat | **-0.02 [-0.05, -0.01]** | **0.02 [0.01, 0.04]** |
|  Indirect effect via intergroup anxiety | **-0.09 [-0.16, -0.05]** | **0.03 [0.01, 0.04]** |
|  |  |  |
| Ethnonationalism |  |  |
|  Direct effect | **0.38 [0.27, 0.49]** | **-0.12 [-0.16, -0.08]** |
|  Indirect effect via symbolic threat | **0.06 [0.02, 0.10]** | **-0.05 [-0.07, -0.03]** |
|  Indirect effect via intergroup anxiety | **0.14 [0.09, 0.21]** | **-0.04 [-0.06, -0.02]** |
|  Total effect | **0.54 [0.41, 0.67]** | **-0.11 [-0.16, -0.05]** |

*Note.* Coefficients are standardized, bootstrapped 95% BCa CI in parentheses.

Significant coefficients are bolded.

**Table 3**

*Summary of fit statistics for the multiple group path model for group status – ethnic majority and minority*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Model | *df* | *Χ2* | *Δ Χ2* | *Δ df* | *p* |
| Model A. Tendency for discrimination |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Unconstrained model | 0 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  Constrained model | 8 | 10.10 | 10.10 | 8 | .26 |
| Model B. Tendency for the prosocial behavior |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Unconstrained model | 0 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  Constrained model | 8 | 14.73 | 14.73 | 8 | .07 |

*Note.* Unconstrained model – all path coefficients in the model are free, constrained model – all path coefficients are equal for majority and minority

\*\* *p* < .01; \* *p* < .05

**Table 4**

*Summary of fit statistics for the multiple group path model for group status – ethnic majority and minority in different social contexts*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Social context | Model | *df* | *Χ2* | *Δ Χ2* | *Δ df* | *p* |
| Serb-Croat context | Model A. Tendency for discrimination |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Unconstrained model | 0 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  Constrained model | 8 | 8.78 | 8.78 | 8 | .36 |
| Model B. Tendency for the prosocial behavior |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Unconstrained model | 0 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  Constrained model | 8 | 10.49 | 10.49 | 8 | .23 |
|  Hungarian-Croat context | Model A. Tendency for discrimination |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Unconstrained model | 0 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  Constrained model | 8 | 14.08 | 14.08 | 8 | .08 |
| Model B. Tendency for the prosocial behavior |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Unconstrained model | 0 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  Constrained model | 8 | 12.54 | 12.54 | 8 | .13 |
| Czech-Croat context | Model A. Tendency for discrimination |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Unconstrained model | 0 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  Constrained model | 8 | 21.41 | 21.41 | 8 | .01\*\* |
| Model B. Tendency for the prosocial behavior |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Unconstrained model | 0 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  Constrained model | 8 | 17.98 | 17.98 | 8 | .02\* |
| Italian-Croat context | Model A. Tendency for discrimination |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Unconstrained model | 0 | 0.00 | 3.51 | 8 |  |
|  Constrained model |  | 8 | 3.51 | .90 |
| Model B. Tendency for the prosocial behavior |  |  |  |  |  |
|  Unconstrained model | 0 | 0.00 |  |  |  |
|  Constrained model | 8 | 9.44 | 9.44 | 8 | .31 |

*Note.* Unconstrained model – all path coefficients in the model are free, constrained model – all path coefficients are equal for majority and minority

\*\* *p* < .01; \* *p* < .05

# Appendix C

**Figure 4**

*Path diagram of mediation model for the for the subsample in the Serb-Croat context, Model A*



*Note.* Path coefficients are standardized regression weights. Path coefficients displayed with solid lines are significant, 95% confidence intervals did not include zero. Path coefficients displayed with dotted lines are nonsignificant. Model explained 32.7% of the variance.

**Figure 5**

*Path diagram of mediation model for the for the subsample in the Serb-Croat context, Model B*

**

*Note.* Path coefficients are standardized regression weights. Path coefficients displayed with solid lines are significant, 95% confidence intervals did not include zero. Path coefficients displayed with dotted lines are nonsignificant. Model explained 25.7% of the variance.

**Figure 6**

*Path diagram of mediation model for the for the subsample in the Hungarian-Croat context, Model A*

**

*Note.* Path coefficients are standardized regression weights. Path coefficients displayed with solid lines are significant, 95% confidence intervals did not include zero. Path coefficients displayed with dotted lines are nonsignificant. Model explained 22.6% of the variance.

**Figure 7**

*Path diagram of mediation model for the for the subsample in the Hungarian-Croat context, Model B*

**

*Note.* Path coefficients are standardized regression weights. Path coefficients displayed with solid lines are significant, 95% confidence intervals did not include zero. Path coefficients displayed with dotted lines are nonsignificant. Model explained 19.1% of the variance.

**Figure 8**

*Path diagram of mediation model for the for the subsample in the Italian-Croat context, Model A*

**

*Note.* Path coefficients are standardized regression weights. Path coefficients displayed with solid lines are significant, 95% confidence intervals did not include zero. Path coefficients displayed with dotted lines are nonsignificant. Model explained 14.8% of the variance.

**Figure 9**

*Path diagram of mediation model for the for the subsample in the Italian-Croat context, Model B*

**

*Note.* Path coefficients are standardized regression weights. Path coefficients displayed with solid lines are significant, 95% confidence intervals did not include zero. Path coefficients displayed with dotted lines are nonsignificant. Model explained 14.3% of the variance.