

Social Trust, Authoritarianism and Immigration Attitudes

Reha Atakan ÇETİN*

Sefa ÇETİN**

Erol TURAN***

ABSTRACT

In recent decades, the issue of immigration has started to attract scholarly attention while being considered as problematic by the host communities of many developed nations. Accordingly, researchers in the related fields have attempted to discover the main dynamics of the growing anti-immigrant attitudes in those countries receiving the majority of the immigrant population. In the existing literature, there have been similar theoretical and empirical studies that focus on these relations between authoritarianism and social trust and developing varying attitudes and perceptions for immigrants.

While, with high social trust, people are to have more positive attitudes towards immigrants, people with low social trust are to have more negative attitudes towards immigrants, which was a part of this paper's hypothesis. If the social trust provides more social cohesion and integration, it can be argued that social trust has an important role in the attitudes towards immigrants in Western societies that are rich in social capital and trust. Accordingly, in such societies, it is reasonable to hypothesize that high social trust would have an impact on developing a positive attitude towards immigrants.

This paper aims to explore the effect of social trust and authoritarianism on developing anti-immigrant attitudes within the context of contemporary American society. Based on the data from the 2016 ANES Time Series Study and with the methodology of OLS regression analysis, the study tests the following hypotheses: (1) low social trust and high levels of authoritarianism have strong influence on people's attitudes towards immigrants and (2) the effect of social trust on developing negative attitudes towards immigrants varies by education level. Using the OLS analysis, we find that low levels of social trust and high levels of authoritarianism are strongly associated with having anti-immigrant attitudes. We also find that the relationship between social trust and negative attitudes towards immigrants is greater for people who have a bachelor's degree than for people who do not.

Keywords: Social Trust, Authoritarianism, Immigration

Sosyal Güven, Otoriterlik ve Göçmenlere Yönelik Tutum

ÖZ

Son yıllarda, göç konusu, pek çok araştırmacı tarafından önemli bir sorun olarak kabul edilmiş; konu akademik olarak da gittikçe daha fazla dikkat çekmeye başlamıştır. Buna göre, ilgili alanda çalışan araştırmacılar, göçmen nüfusun çoğunluğunu alan ülkelerdeki artan göçmen karşıtı tutumların ana dinamiklerini belirlemeye çalışmışlardır. Mevcut literatürde, otoriterizm ile sosyal güven arasındaki ilişkilere odaklanan ve göçmenler için çeşitli tutumlar ve algılar geliştiren benzer teorik ve ampirik çalışmalar yapılmıştır.

Yüksek sosyal güven ile insanlar göçmenlere karşı daha olumlu tutumlara sahip olurken, sosyal güveni düşük insanlar bu yazının hipotezinin bir parçası olan göçmenlere karşı daha olumsuz tutumlara sahip olmaktadır. Sosyal güven daha fazla sosyal bütünlük ve entegrasyon sağladığı için, sosyal güven ve sosyal sermaye bakımından zengin olan Batı toplumlarında göçmenlere yönelik tutumlarda sosyal güvenin önemli bir rolü olduğu söylenebilir. Buna bağlı olarak, bu tür toplumlarda, yüksek sosyal güven, göçmenlere karşı olumlu tutum geliştirmede etkili olmaktadır.

Bu makale, çağdaş Amerikan toplumu bağlamında sosyal güven ve otoriterizmin göçmen karşıtı tutumlar geliştirmedeki etkisini incelemeyi amaçlamıştır. 2016 ANES Zaman Serisi Çalışması verilerine ve OLS regresyon analizi metodolojisine dayanarak, çalışma şu hipotezleri test etmiştir: (1) düşük sosyal güven ve yüksek otoriterizm düzeyleri, insanların göçmenlere yönelik tutumları üzerinde güçlü etkiye sahiptir ve (2) sosyal güvenin göçmenlere yönelik olumsuz tutum geliştirmedeki etkisi eğitim seviyesine göre değişmektedir. OLS analizini kullanarak, düşük sosyal güven ve yüksek otoriterizm düzeylerinin, göçmen karşıtı tutumlara sahip olmakla güçlü bir şekilde ilişkili olduğu; ayrıca, sosyal güven ve göçmenlere yönelik olumsuz tutumlar arasındaki ilişkinin lisans derecesine sahip kişiler için, sahip olmayanlardan daha büyük olduğu sonuçları bulunmuştur.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Sosyal Güven, Otoriterlik, Göçmenlik

1. Introduction

In recent decades, the issue of immigration has started to attract scholarly attention while being considered as problematic by the host communities of many developed nations. Accordingly, researchers in the related fields have attempted to discover the main dynamics of the growing anti-immigrant attitudes

*Ph.D. Student/Graduate Teaching and Research Assistant, University of Illinois, orcid no: 0000-0002-8253-844X, rcetin2@uic.edu

**Prof. Dr., İstanbul Gedik University, orcid no: 0000-0003-0935-5097, sefa.cetin@gedik.edu.tr

***Assoc. Prof. Dr., Kastamonu University, orcid no: 0000-0003-0343-7622, eturan@kastamonu.edu.tr

Makalenin Gönderim Tarihi: 15.03.2019; Makalenin Kabul Tarihi: 24.04.2019

in those countries receiving the majority of the immigrant population. With this consideration, we try to explore how authoritarian personalities and social trust can have an influence on developing negative attitudes towards immigrants. In the existing literature, there have been similar theoretical and empirical studies that focus on these relations between authoritarianism and social trust and developing varying attitudes and perceptions for immigrants. Our objective is to further examine and empirically test the relevant hypotheses by operationalizing the recent public opinion survey of American National Election Studies Survey (ANES) of 2016 with the methodology of the ordinary least squares analysis (OLS) analysis. In this case, our first hypothesis will be that low trust in other people and high levels of authoritarian notions in people's personalities result in having more negative attitudes towards immigrants. Our second hypothesis is that the effect of social trust on negative attitudes towards immigrants is different for people with a bachelor's degree and for people without a bachelor's degree.

The study aims to test the above-mentioned hypothesis by measuring the independent variables of social trust and authoritarianism with respect to the dependent variable of attitudes towards immigrants. In so doing, we aim to use the following variables and corresponding questions in the 2016 American National Election Studies (NES) data. In the study, firstly, we will discuss the major implementations of studying public attitudes towards immigration. Secondly, we will provide a normative discussion on authoritarianism, social trust and their relation to the immigrant attitudes. In the last part, we empirically test the influence of the levels of authoritarianism and social trust on people's negative attitudes towards immigrants.

2. Public Attitudes Towards Immigration

Why public attitudes towards immigration matter? Esses et. al (2002) discuss the importance and relevance of studying public attitudes towards immigration in several ways. First, public attitudes have the potential to influence public policy since governments value public attitudes and take them into account while formulating and implementing different policies such as immigration legislation. For instance, both in Canada and the United States, emerging public opposition to racial and ethnic discrimination resulted in removing of openly discriminatory regulations related to immigration issues during the 1960s (Espenshade and Hampstead, 1996; Troper, 1993). Second, based on public attitudes' potential effect on citizens' daily behavior, one can observe that public opinion is to be a crucial determinant on the likelihood of success and satisfaction of immigrants as well as on the overall social environment in the host society. For example, a sheer number of studies found that favorable attitudes of the host society members towards incomers are likely to produce positive expectations whereas more negative and unfavorable attitudes are likely to promote anxiety, fear, and tension (Crocker et al., 1998; Devine, et al., 1996). Likewise, immigrants' perceptions for host society can also influence their expectation in the sense that how they are likely to be treated and if they feel welcome in their new country. Third, they might give shape to the collective view of national identity as well as to the perception of in-group and out-group attitudes. In other words, as Esses and his colleagues (2002) underline, immigration attitudes may shape who would be considered worthy of sharing national resources while the priority of well-being of different group members is determined in different economic and social policies.

3. Authoritarianism

The study of authoritarianism has been a major focus of many scholars in various fields including political science, psychology, and sociology. One of the first important study considering authoritarianism was that of Adorno et al., (1950). In his study, *The Authoritarian Personality*, Adorno et al., (1950) introduced a set of criteria, in regards to authoritarianism. With these criteria, they define personality traits, ranked these traits and their intensity in any individual on what it called the 'F scale' (F for fascist). Adorno et al., (1950) discussed the authoritarian personality as potentially fascist: "...conventional, submissive, unimaginative, superstitious, mystical, rigid and stereotyped in thinking, preoccupied with power and toughness, cynical and destructive, misanthropic, and projective, especially in projecting repressed sexuality and hostility" (Eckhardt, 1991; 97-124). Cognitively, the authors found that authoritarians are less educated and less intelligent on average, yet more concrete in their reasoning even when they were

more intelligent than average (Adorno et al., 1950; 287-288). They are also more intolerant of ambiguity, are more superstitious, suggestible, and autistic, whereas participants with less authoritarian personalities showed greater imagination.

More recent studies show that those score higher in authoritarianism tend to have a different way of cognitive processes than those who scores low where the former is more likely to view the world in concrete terms, such as black and white (Altemeyer, 1996; Stenner, 2005). Conversely, more comfort with shades of gray has been associated with persons who score low in authoritarianism. As Hetherington and Weiler (2009) argue, a need for order is the main motivation for authoritarian attitudes. Authoritarians rely on established authorities with the aim of providing order and reducing anxiety. By doing them, they are searching the ways to reduce ambiguity. Having the potential and power to impose order and authority and promote social conformity, established authorities may include religious/political leaders, dominant cultural and social norms, as well as foundational texts in a given society (Hetherington and Weiler, 2009: 75).

From the perspective of the theory of social identity, studies suggest that authoritarianism involves increased attachment to group values as well as willingness to exclude out-group members (Altemeyer, 1988; 196). Under this framework, scholars address the condition that “Increased authoritarianism tends to increase reliance on stereotypes and motivations to see one’s group as superior to the outgroup (Esses et. al. 2002; 69-85). Additionally, authoritarian personalities tend to protect existing social norms (Feldman, 2003; 22). In that sense, scholars also found a strong relationship between authoritarianism and negative effect toward minority groups, including Jews, African Americans, gays, and Arabs (Hetherington and Weiler, 2009: 43). In other words, authoritarians are intolerant of outgroup members as they perceive those members as deviating from the norm (Adorno et al., 1950; Altemeyer, 1996). Intolerance of authoritarians is associated with their perceived social norms and values which are seen as legitimate and traditional by those individuals (Altemeyer, 1988; 103). Parallel with these findings, Duckitt and Sibley (2009) claims that authoritarians are especially likely to perceive immigrants as an outsider as they are more likely to be willing to defend the status quo, existing order, and norms.

In regards to the concept’s relationship with the topic of immigration, some scholars prefer to use the term “Right Wing Authoritarianism” (RWA) while arguing that it powerfully and independently predicts the prejudices towards immigrants as well as support for strict policies related to immigration issues (Esses et. al., 2002; Danso et. al., 2007; Oyamot et. al., 2006). Being characterized by a concern with compliance to the in-group norms, social order, and security (Adorno et al., 1950; Altemeyer, 1996), RWA is connected to having prejudices with the motivation of achieving and sustaining security (Duckitt and Sibley, 2009; 45).

In the vast majority of the previous studies, perceived threat has been discussed as an important determinant along with developing authoritarian personalities. In that sense, threat variable also plays a critical and supporting role while analyzing authoritarianism. By using mainly experimental methods, scholars have demonstrated that threat triggers authoritarianism (Altemeyer, 1988; Sales, 1973). The result is that those scoring high in authoritarianism is likely to become less tolerant, yet more aggressive (Esses et. al., 2002; 69-85). Contrarily, as a result of the introduction of threat, the participants who are less authoritarian are supposed to become more principled and tolerant. Yet, this conventional wisdom can be challenged. As Oxley et. al. (2008) argue, these findings in previous studies might result from the condition that researchers generally provided participants stimuli which has more threatening features to those already scoring high in authoritarianism, than who score low. In that sense, as Hetherington and Weiler (2009) mention, although these studies show a lot about who is more open and sensitive to a threat, they lack in providing comprehensive analysis on what really happens at the times of perceived threat for those participants who score differently in the parts of the authoritarianism distribution. In accordance with this critique, one may further state that when the perceived threat is distributed symmetrically across the distribution of authoritarianism, opinions are likely to converge on different issues, making the preferences on certain issues indistinguishable between who score low and who score high in authoritarianism. In addition to that, we here aim to keep our empirical analysis simple.

Considering these reasons, in this paper, we neither included any variables related to the threat nor interacted them with the key independent variable of authoritarianism.

4. Social Trust

According to the Pew Research Center (2018), social trust refers to a belief in the honesty, integrity, and reliability of others, a belief in faith. It can also be defined as trust in strangers. In other words, it involves the meaning of trust in people with whom we are not acquainted (Herrerros and Criado, 2009; 337-355). This concept implies an expectation and belief that strangers are trustworthy. As Putnam (2000) points out, people with high levels of social trust are more likely to respect the rights of other people. On the other hand, as some authors underline, it might not be the case, as Putnam's 'civic America' was coexistent with substantial levels of racism against Blacks (Hero, 2003; 113-122). Thus, it can be argued that it is not clear whether such arguments of social trust are extended only to people of a certain similar background or to a wider community of people overall (Herrerros and Criado, 2009; 337-355).

In regards to this normative debate, some authors argue that the expectation of social trust extended to people from different cultural and ethnic backgrounds can be moralistic (Uslaner, 2002; 133). Under this understanding, it has been underlined that this kind of outlook can be based on an imperative to treat all other people as if they are all trustworthy (Herrerros and Criado, 2009; 337-355). However, for some scholars, such an approach has been found as too demanding and non-consequentialist (Herrerros and Criado, 2009; 337-355). Scholars also attempt to explain having social trust from the rationalistic point of view, claiming that in case of a confrontation with people from other cultural and ethnic backgrounds, people tend to form their individual expectations based on different informational shortcuts with the use of some certain cultural stereotypes. For example, as Gambetta and Hamill (2005) mention, New York City taxi drivers use skin color to screen the customers which leads to the discrimination towards Hispanics and African Americans. From the social trust perspective, however, it is in his or her interest to offer cooperation and reconsider his or her behavior if the stranger decides to cheat. At the end, although he or she might be more open to the cheating, social truster is likely to acquire higher payoffs in case his or her offer of cooperation is reciprocated by that stranger (Herrerros and Criado, 2009; 337-355). Additionally, by cooperation, some scholars underline the concept of 'social intelligence' which is defined as a consequence of such cooperative behavior (Yamagishi, 2001; 121-147). Along with interpersonal trust and cooperation, social trusters gain this skill of social intelligence as having trust helps them to be more cooperative and provides some cues to distinguish who is trustworthy and who is not. In that sense, 'trust-warranting properties' emerge, thanks to a high level of information gained through the high levels of social trust and cooperation with strangers (Bacharach and Gambetta, 2001). Considering all these, it can be concluded that a social truster is someone with such a 'social intelligence' who learned to differentiate people in terms of their trustworthiness. 'At the end of this process of social behavior, 'social intelligence' teaches the individual that cues and heuristics can be biased. Thus, people with high levels of social trust acknowledges the necessity to exclude such cues and heuristics based on overall racial, ethnic, and cultural stereotypes (Herrerros and Criado, 2009; 337-355). From this point of view, one may reach the conclusion that people with high social trust are likely to have more positive attitudes towards immigrants. Conversely, people with low social trust are likely to have more negative attitudes towards immigrants, which was a part of this paper's hypothesis.

In order to provide a more relevant normative framework on the relationship between social trust and immigration, one may further explore the existing research. On one hand, the growing literature on the role of ethnic diversity in the development of social capital and trust predicts that high levels of diversity are associated with lower social trust, implying that immigration and ethnic diversity may challenge community cohesion (Knack and Keefer, 1997; 1251-1288). Some conclude that social trust is lower in heterogeneous communities (Costa and Kahn, 2003; 103-111). As Delhey and Newton (2005) point out, 'the greater the dissimilarity of other people, the more suspicion and distrust'. In the case of the US, Hooghe et. al. (2006) find that interpersonal trust tends to be lower in more ethnically diverse communities. On the other hand, regarding the immigrant attitudes, some studies suggest social trust is correlated with openness to immigration (Sides and Citrin, 2007; Rustenbach, 2010) and tolerance for

minorities (Uslaner, 2003; 81-94). This argument creates the possibility of more integrated societies. Based on this view, if social trust generates more social cohesion and integration, then it could be suggested that social trust should be a relevant determinant for attitudes towards immigrants in Western societies who are rich in social capital and trust. Accordingly, in such societies, it is reasonable to hypothesize that high social trust would have an impact on developing positive attitudes towards immigrants. Likely, from the same point of view, we may expect that low levels of social trust would have a negative impact on attitudes towards immigrants in the community.

5. Data and Model

Based on the above-mentioned normative framework, our aim is to test the following hypotheses: (1) having low levels of social trust and high levels of authoritarianism in people's personalities result in having more negative attitudes towards immigrants and (2) the effect of social trust on developing negative attitudes towards immigrants varies by education level (with bachelor's and without bachelor's degree). As for the data, we analyzed the 2016 ANES Times Series Study which was funded by the National Science Foundation by grants to the University of Michigan and Stanford University. Data collection was performed by Westat, Inc who developed the sampling plan and collaborated with ANES. The sampling frame of the study was provided by Marketing Systems Group. The ANES 2016 Time Series is part of the series of election studies conducted by the ANES since 1948 with the objective of supporting analysis of public opinion and voting behavior in U.S. presidential elections.

The recent study that was released in December 2017 provides a dual-mode design consisted of both traditional face-to-face interviewing (n=1,181) and surveys conducted on the Internet (n=3,090) with a total sample size of 4,271. The target population of the face-to-face mode was 222.6 million U.S. citizens who are 18 years old or older living in the 48 states of the U.S. or the District of Columbia. The target population for the internet was 224.1 million U.S. citizens who are 18 years old or older living in the 50 U.S. states or the District of Columbia. As for both modes mentioned above, the sampling frame was residential addresses' lists that mail is delivered. In order to be eligible to participate, residing at the sampled address and being a U.S. citizen age 18 or older at the time of the recruitment were the requirements.

5.1. Variables

We aim to test the above-mentioned hypotheses by measuring the independent variables of social trust and authoritarianism with respect to the dependent variable of attitudes towards immigrants. In so doing, we use the variables on authoritarianism and social trust while also operationalizing control variables such as feelings towards illegal immigrants, along with other control variables such as education, race, gender, age, income, party identification and ideology in our model.

We use the few independent variables as a proxy for authoritarianism. These following four variables aiming to explore authoritarianism at the individual level constitute our first variable, authoritarianism. First continuous variable constituting authoritarianism is "Please tell me which one you think is more important for a child to have: Independence or respect for elders." Response categories include independence, respect for elders, both, no post-election interview, no post data/incomplete IW, don't know and refused. The second one is the question of "Which one is more important for a child to have: Curiosity or good manners." Categories for the responses include curiosity, Good manners, Both, No post-election interview, no post data/incomplete IW. The third one is "Which one is more important for a child to have: Obedience or Self-reliance." (obedience, self-reliance, both, no post-election interview, no post data/incomplete IW, don't know, refused). The last question regarding the authoritarianism is that "Which one is more important for a child to have: Being considerate or well behaved." (being considered, well behaved, both, no post-election interview, no post data/incomplete IW, don't know, refused). We coded these variables to range from 0 to 1 where higher value indicate higher levels of authoritarianism in people's personalities.

We use the following independent variable as a proxy for social trust since this variable includes the most relevant question aiming to discover respondent's trust to other people: "Generally speaking, how

often can you trust other people?” Response categories include always, most of the time, about half the time, some of the time, never, don’t know and refused. Potential responses are coded to range from 0 to 1, for the ease of data analysis. Higher values indicate higher levels of social trust among respondents.

A policy preference of an individual might be a relevant indicator for his/her position in the given subject. Accordingly, an answer given to the question focusing on immigration policy can be a predictor for respondents’ attitudes towards immigrants. Thus, we use the following dependent variable as a proxy for negative attitudes towards immigration: “Do you favor, oppose, or neither favor nor oppose building a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico?” Response categories are the following: favor a great deal, favor a moderate amount, favor a little, neither favor nor oppose, oppose a little, oppose a moderate amount, oppose a great deal, don’t know, refused. Being scaled from 0 to 6, higher values indicate higher support for building a wall on the US border to Mexico (i.e more negative attitudes towards immigrants).

In addition to these, we find it necessary to include another variable related to the immigrant attitudes as a control in our empirical model with the objective of the less biased analysis. With this consideration, we incorporate the control variable of feeling thermometer for attitudes towards illegal immigrants with 103 unique outcomes in the NES 2016 data. Again, we coded along with the more common control variables of race, gender, education, income, party identity, and ideology. For these variables such as feelings towards illegal immigrants, ideology (liberal to conservative), party identification (Democrat to Republican), and income, we followed the similar re-scaling process (ranging from 0 to 1) for ease of analysis. For demographic control variables, including gender, race, age, and education, we created dummy variables because these had non-linear relationships to the dependent variable. In the OLS analysis, the control variables of female (gender), black (race), Hispanic (race), other (race), age (30 to 44), age (45 to 64), and bachelor’s degree (education) have been operationalized.

With the aim of providing a more accurate response base analysis, we re-coded responses such as “No post-election interview”, “No post data”, “Incomplete IW”, “Don’t know” and “Refused” and deleted missing cases among the response options. Descriptive summary statistics of the model with three variables can be seen in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Summary Statistics

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min	Max	Obs.
Support for Building a Wall	2.565	2.388	0.000	6.000	3323
Authoritarianism	0.541	0.324	0.000	1.000	3323
Social Trust	0.539	0.228	0.000	1.000	3323
Education (Bachelor’s Degree)	0.401	0.490	0.000	1.000	3323
Feelings Towards Illegal Immigrants	0.417	0.273	0.000	1.000	3323
Black	0.094	0.291	0.000	1.000	3323
Hispanic	0.099	0.298	0.000	1.000	3323
Other	0.074	0.261	0.000	1.000	3323
Female	0.531	0.499	0.000	1.000	3323
Age (30-44)	0.258	0.437	0.000	1.000	3323
Age (45-64)	0.361	0.480	0.000	1.000	3323
Age (65 and older)	0.219	0.413	0.000	1.000	3323
Income	0.540	0.296	0.000	1.000	3323

Party Identification	0.474	0.361	0.000	1.000	3323
Ideology	0.530	0.278	0.000	1.000	3323

5.2. Regression Model

We are using ordinary least squares (OLS) methodology to test the models indicated as linear equations below:

Model 1:

Negative Attitudes Towards Immigrants

$$=b_0 + b_1(\text{authoritarianism}) + b_2(\text{social trust}) + b_3(\text{education}) + b_4(\text{attitudes towards illegal immigrants}) + b_5(\text{race:black}) + b_6(\text{race:hispanic}) + b_7(\text{race:other}) + b_8(\text{gender:female}) + b_9(\text{age:30-44}) + b_{10}(\text{age: 45-64}) + b_{11}(\text{age:65 and older}) + b_{12}(\text{income}) + b_{13}(\text{partisanship}) + b_{14}(\text{ideology}) + \epsilon$$

Model 2:

Negative Attitudes Towards Immigrants

$$=b_0 + b_1(\text{authoritarianism}) + b_2(\text{social trust}) + b_3(\text{education}) + b_4(\text{social trust*education}) + b_5(\text{attitudes towards illegal immigrants}) + b_6(\text{race:black}) + b_7(\text{race:hispanic}) + b_8(\text{race:other}) + b_9(\text{gender:female}) + b_{10}(\text{age:30-44}) + b_{11}(\text{age: 45-64}) + b_{12}(\text{age:65 and older}) + b_{13}(\text{income}) + b_{14}(\text{party identification}) + b_{15}(\text{ideology}) + \epsilon$$

These two regression models will be used to test our hypothesis. In the first model (table 2), we are operationalizing our dependent variable (support for building the wall on the US border with Mexico which is the proxy for negative immigrant attitudes), key independent variables (authoritarianism and social trust), and our control variables with the aim of testing the impact of authoritarianism and social trust on developing negative attitudes towards immigrants (i.e. support for building the wall on the US border with Mexico). At this point, our objective is to test our first hypothesis that low levels of social trust and high levels of authoritarianism result in having more negative attitudes towards immigrants.

In the second model (Table 2), we will be focusing on similar variables with slightly different model. In this case, by integrating the interaction term of social trust and education into our model, we aim to see if the effect of social trust on developing negative attitudes towards immigrants varies by education. In so doing, as explained above, our education variable is a dummy variable, indicating people with a bachelor’s degree. Our objective for the second model with the interaction term is to test our second hypothesis that the effect of social trust on developing negative attitudes towards immigrants is different for people with bachelor’s and without bachelor’s degree.

6. Results

Table 2. OLS Analysis of Negative Attitudes Towards Immigrants

Independent Variables	Model 1	Model 2
Authoritarianism	0.826** (0.114)	0.824** (0.114)
Social Trust	-0.480** (0.148)	-0.257 (0.176)
Education (Bachelor’s Degree)	-0.325** (0.073)	0.081 (0.189)
Trust x Bachelor’s Degree		-0.714**

		(0.306)
Feelings Towards Illegal Immigrants	-2.145**	-2.134**
	(0.134)	(0.134)
Black	-0.104	-0.111
	(0.121)	(0.121)
Hispanic	-0.548**	-0.543**
	(0.114)	(0.114)
Other	-0.015	-0.017
	(0.123)	(0.122)
Female	-0.064	-0.062
	(0.064)	(0.064)
Age (30-44)	0.228**	0.226**
	(0.101)	(0.101)
Age (45-64)	0.421**	0.423**
	(0.096)	(0.096)
Age (65 and older)	0.311**	0.306**
	(0.106)	0.106
Income	-0.506**	-0.509**
	(0.120)	(0.120)
Party Identification	1.967**	1.962**
	(0.120)	(0.120)
Ideology	1.364**	1.360**
	(0.154)	(0.154)
Constant	1.842**	1.735**
	(0.172)	(0.178)
Observations	3323	3323
F- Stat	176.16**	165.00**
R-squared	0.424	0.425
** is significant at p<0.05		
Numbers in parentheses are standard errors		

Based on the findings that have been listed in Model 1 of Table 2, we find statistically significant relationship between each of our key independent variables and dependent variable. Firstly, there is a positively statistically significant relationship between authoritarianism and negative attitudes towards immigrants at the $p<0.05$ level. In this case, a one unit increase in authoritarianism is associated with a

0.826 unit increase in support for building a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico, on average, controlling for all other variables in our model. Secondly, there is a negatively statistically significant relationship between social trust and support for building a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico at the $p < 0.05$ level. On average, a one unit increase in social trust is associated with a 0.480 unit decrease in support for building a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico, controlling for all other models in the model. These findings support the anticipated direction of the relationship as specified by the above-mentioned theoretical framework. The findings also support our first hypothesis that low social trust and high levels of authoritarianism have an impact on developing negative immigrant attitudes. Similarly, high levels of social trust and low levels of authoritarianism in an individual's personality result in having fewer negative attitudes towards immigrants. As indicated, the relationship of each key independent variable with the dependent variable is statistically significant, supporting the first hypothesis.

In regards to the control variables, based on our first model in table 2, it can be seen that education, feelings towards illegal immigrants, being Hispanic, age (for respondents who are 30 years old and over), income, party identification, and ideology are all statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level. More specifically, on average, people with a degree are 0.325 unit less supportive of building a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico, controlling for other variables in the model. Regarding the effect of the feelings towards illegal immigrants, it can be interpreted that, on average, a one unit increase in people's feelings towards illegal immigrants is associated with 2.145 units decrease in support for building a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico, controlling for all other variables in the model. Here, it is also important to mention that the feeling thermometer for illegal immigrants has initially been coded in an increasing scale where the upper scales refer to a warmer or favorable feeling towards immigrants. Considering the racial aspects, we find that being Hispanic has also a negative effect on developing negative attitudes towards immigrants. Particularly, based on the model 1 in table 2, our finding is that, on average, being Hispanic is associated with a 0.548 unit decrease in support for building a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico while controlling all other variables in the model. It has also been found that age has an impact on our dependent variable. On average, controlling all other variables in the model, people who are between 30 and 44 years old are 0.228 units more supportive of building the wall on the border of US and Mexico. With a similar positive direction, on average, people who are between 45 and 64 years old are 0.421 units more supportive of building a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico, controlling all other variables in the model. On average, people who are 65 years old or older are 0.311 unit more supportive of building a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico, controlling all other variables in the model. Each of these age categories, as the control variables which are dummied out, are statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level. Regarding the age category, the F-value of 6.69 indicates that the age variables (for people who are 30 years old or older) are also jointly statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level.

Unlike the age variable, we reached the empirical finding that income has a negative effect on having negative attitudes towards immigrants. Based on the results in Table 2, Model 1, it can be inferred that, on average, a one unit increase in income is associated with a 0.506 unit decrease in support of building a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico, controlling for all other variables in the model. Lastly, party identification and ideology have both positively statistically significant effects on the support of building a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico, at the $p < 0.05$ level. In regards to party identification, on average, a one unit increase in republicanism is associated with a 1.967 unit increase in support for building the wall on the U.S. border with Mexico, controlling for all other variables in the model. As for the ideology, it can be interpreted that, controlling for all other variables in the model, on average, a one unit increase in conservatism is associated with a 1.364 increase in support for building the wall on the U.S. border with Mexico.

In addition to these, interpretation of constant is also crucial for our first model, since it is statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level. It can be inferred that, on average, respondents who never trust others, are not authoritarian, who do not have a bachelor's degree, feeling very cold towards illegal immigrants, are white, male and between 18 and 29 years old, who earn less than 5,000 USD, are extremely liberal, and strong democrat are 1.842 units more supportive of building the wall on the U.S. border with Mexico, controlling for all other variables in the model.

Maximum effects indicate the relative substantive effects of each independent variable on the dependent variable. In our case, maximum effects refer to the relative substantive effects of social trust and authoritarianism on the dependent variable of support for building a wall to the US border with Mexico (i.e. negative attitudes towards immigrants). We can calculate the maximum effects by multiplying each variable's estimated coefficient by its maximum value. Yet, since all the variables in the model have been rescaled from 0 to 1, absolute values of the coefficients are also indicating the maximum effects. As it can be seen from the Table 2, Model 1, feelings towards illegal immigrants (beta coefficient of -2.145), party identification (beta coefficient of 1.967), and ideology (beta coefficient of 1.364) have the largest maximum effect in the model, in an order of magnitude. According to the OLS results, race category of 'other' (beta coefficient of -0.015) and variable of female (beta coefficient of -0.064) have the smallest maximum effects, in an order of magnitude. These numbers are the maximum effects that explain the largest predicted changes in negative attitudes towards immigrants caused by the identified variables.

With the aim of testing the second hypothesis (that was the effect of social trust on negative attitudes towards immigrants is different for people with bachelor's degree and for people without a bachelor's degree), one may also look at the interaction term that has been operationalized in the second model of Table 2. Based on the results shown in Table 2, we see a negatively statistically significant relationship between our interaction term (trust*ba degree) and the dependent variable at the $p < 0.05$ level. We find that, on average, for people with bachelor's degree, a one unit increase in social trust is associated with a 0,971 unit decrease in support for building a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico, controlling for all other variables in the model. For people who do not have a bachelor's degree, on average, a one unit increase in social trust is associated with a 0.257 unit decrease in support for building a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico, controlling for all other variables in our model. These results support our second hypothesis that the effect of social trust on developing negative attitudes towards immigrants varies for people with and without bachelor's degrees. In regards to the effect of social trust on negative attitudes towards immigrants, having a bachelor's degree has a multiplicative effect.

The F-value of 176.16 indicates that the variables in the model are jointly statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level. The adjusted R2 of 0.424 indicates that the model accounts for 42.4 percent of the variance of respondents' response on support for building a wall on the U.S. border with Mexico.

7. Conclusion

Using the OLS analysis, this paper examines the sources of negative attitudes towards immigrants by testing the effect of social trust and authoritarianism at the individual level with the data drawn from the NES 2016 Time Series Study. Overall, we find supporting empirical evidence for both of the hypotheses that have been clarified above. First, based on these individual-level analyses, we find that low levels of social trust and high levels of authoritarianism are associated with more negative attitudes towards immigrants (i.e. more support for building a wall on the U.S. border to Mexico). Likewise, as social trust increases and authoritarianism decreases, people's negative attitudes towards immigrants decrease. These results are also consistent with the theoretical framework suggesting that social trust and authoritarianism have an impact on attitudes towards immigrants. Secondly, as the results suggest in our second model, having a bachelor's degree and social trust has a multiplicative effect on developing negative attitudes towards immigrants. This supports our second hypothesis that the effect of social trust on developing negative attitudes towards immigrants varies by people's education level (i.e. bachelor's degree).

Apart from the normative and empirical relevance of the study, these findings may have several policy implications. Based on our results, first, policies aiming to increase social trust have the potential to diminish the likelihood of developing anti-immigrant perceptions among the public. In accordance with this view, Putnam (2007) points out two important points in regards to the establishment of community and civic organizations that may help to increase the levels of social trust: building a community for immigrants with the objective of creating a place where they can express their own culture within the host community and building a multicultural community where various cultures come together (including natives and immigrants). He further states that these can only be realized if the members of the

immigrants and host society come together over a period of time as they have more opportunity to build trust.

In addition, it has been found that education (i.e. having a bachelor's degree) has a multiplicative effect regarding the impact of social trust on developing negative immigrant attitudes. Based on this finding, it can be stated that there could be implemented more education and training policies aiming to provide true information about different cultures. These policies may also carry the potential to diminish the likelihood of associating some certain problems with immigrants in the country which would contribute to reducing the negative attitudes towards immigrants (article 6). For instance, as Card (2005) argues, there are common misconceptions about immigrants, including the belief that they are negatively impacting the labor market and the economy. With more education and training, these misunderstandings about immigrants can be diminished.

The study has also few limitations. It is an individual-level analysis of the attitudes towards immigrants in the U.S. As for the future studies, more comprehensive and thorough analysis might be conducted at the aggregate level by focusing at regional and national levels. For the purposes of comparison, it might also be critical to include further data from European or Latin American countries to be able to make comparisons at the global level, with regards to the immigrant attitudes. Lastly, both normatively and empirically, this study considers only two key independent variables. However, many studies suggest there are also other factors (such as economic competition, crime rates, human capital etc.) that might influence the attitudes towards immigrants. To fully understand anti-immigrant attitudes, future studies might focus on more multiple explanations at different levels of analysis.

References

- Adorno, Theodor, Else, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, Daniel, Sanford, Nevitt. *The Authoritarian Personality*, New York, Wiley, 1950.
- Altemeyer, Bob. *Enemies of Freedom: Understanding Right-Wing Authoritarianism*, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1988.
- Altemeyer, Bob. *The Authoritarian Specter*, Cambridge, Mass, Harvard University Press, 1996.
- Americans and Social Trust: Who, Where and Why (2007). Pew Research Center. [Online] Available at: <<http://www.pewsocialtrends.org/2007/02/22/americans-and-social-trust-who-where-and-why/>>, [Erişim tarihi: 08.12.2018].
- Bacharach, M. and Gambetta, D. (2001). Trust in Signs, In K. S. Cook (ed.), *Trust in Society* (pp. 148–184). New York: Russell Sage Foundation,
- Costa, D. L. and Kahn, M. E. (2003) "*Civic Engagement and Community Heterogeneity: An Economist's Perspective*", *Perspectives on Politics*, 1 (1): 103–111.
- Crocker, J., Major, B., and Steele, C. M. (1998). Social Stigma. In D. T. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske and G. Lindzey (eds.) *Handbook of Social Psychology* (pp. 504–553). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Danso, H. A., Sedlovskaya, A., and Suanda, S. H. (2007). "*Perceptions of Immigrants: Modifying the Attitudes of Individuals Higher in Social Dominance Orientation*", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 33 (8): 1113–1123.
- Delhey, J. and Newton, K. (2005) "*Predicting Cross-National Levels of Social Trust. Global Pattern or Nordic Exceptionalism?*", *European Sociological Review*, 21 (4): 311–327.
- Devine, P. G., Evett, S. R., and Vasquez-Suson, K. A. (1996). Exploring the Interpersonal Dynamics of Intergroup Contact. In R. Sorrentino and E. T. Higgins (Eds.) *Handbook of Motivation and Cognition: The Interpersonal Context* (Vol. 3, pp. 423-464). New York: Guilford.
- Duckitt, J. and Sibley, C. G. (2009). A Dual-Process Motivational Model of Ideological Attitudes and System Justification. In J. T. Jost, A. C. Kay and H. Thorisdottir (eds.), *Social and Psychological Bases of Ideology and System Justification* (pp. 292-312). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Eckhardt, W. (1991). "*Authoritarianism*", *Political Psychology*, 12 (1): 97-124.
- Espenshade, T. J. and Hempstead, K. (1996). "*Contemporary American Attitudes Toward U.S. Immigration*", *The International Migration Review*, 30(2): 535–570.

- Esses, V. M., Dovidio, J. F., Jackson, L. M., and Armstrong, T. L. (2001). "The Immigration Dilemma: The Role of Perceived Group Competition, Ethnic Prejudice, and National Identity", *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(3): 389–412.
- Esses, V. M., Dovidio, J. F., and Hodson, G. (2002). "Public Attitudes Toward Immigration in the United States and Canada in Response to the September 11, 2001, Attack on America", *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 2 (1): 69–85.
- Feldman, Noah. *After Jihad: America and the Struggle for Islamic Democracy*, New York, Farrar, Straus and Giroux, 2003.
- Gambetta, Diego and Hamill, Heather. *Streetwise: How Taxi Drivers Establish Their Customers' Trustworthiness*, New York, Russell Sage, 2005.
- Hero, R. E. (2003). "Social Capital and Racial Inequality in America", *Perspectives in Politics*, 1 (1): 113–122.
- Herreros, F., and Criado, H. (2009). "Social Trust, Social Capital and Perceptions of Immigration", *Political Studies*, 57(2): 337–355.
- Hetherington, Marc Joseph and Weiler, Jonathan. *Authoritarianism and Polarization in American Politics*, New York, Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- Knack, S. and Keefer, P. (1997). "Does Social Capital Have an Economic Payoff? A Cross-Country Investigation", *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 112 (4): 1251–1288.
- Oyamot, C. M., Borgida, E. and Fisher, E. L. (2006). "Can Values Moderate the Attitudes of Right-Wing Authoritarians?", *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 32 (4): 486–500.
- Putnam, Robert David. *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*, New York, Simon and Schuster, 2000.
- Rustenbach, E. (2010). "Sources of Negative Attitudes Toward Immigrants in Europe", *International Migration Review*, 44 (1): 53-77.
- Sales, S. M. (1973). "Threat as A Factor in Authoritarianism: An Analysis of Archival Data", *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, no: 28, p. 44–57.
- Sides, J. M., and Citrin, J. (2007). "European Opinion about Immigration: The Role of Identities, Interests, and Information", *British Journal of Political Science*, 37 (3): 477-504.
- Stenner, Karen. *The Authoritarian Dynamic*, New York, NY, Cambridge University Press, 2005.
- Troper, H. (1993). "Canada's Immigration Policy Since 1945", *International Journal*; Toronto, 48 (2): 255-281.
- Uslaner, Eric. *The Moral Foundations of Trust*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press, 2002.
- Uslaner, E. (2003) Trust and Civic Engagement in East and West. In G. Badescu and E. M. Uslaner (eds.) *Social Capital and the Transition to Democracy* (pp. 81-94). London, UK: Routledge.
- Yamagishi, T. (2001). Trust as A Form of Social Intelligence, In K. Cook (ed.), *Trust in Society* (pp. 121-47). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.