**Appendix**

**Table A1: Frequencies of racist experience for the indirect instruments (dimension ‘verbal hostilities’)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | N (%)  |
| Yes | 698 (25.5) |
| No  | 2,043 (74.5) |
| N  | 2,741 (100) |

Source: Dollmann et al. (2023), own calculation, not weighted.

**Table A2: Frequencies of racist experience for the indirect instruments (dimension ‘exclusion’)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | N (%)  |
| Yes | 347 (12.7) |
| No  | 2,394 (87.3) |
| N  | 2,741 (100) |

Source: Dollmann et al. (2023), own calculation, not weighted.

**Table A3: Frequencies of racist experience for the indirect instruments (dimension ‘physical violence’)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | N (%)  |
| Yes | 113 (4.1) |
| No  | 2,628 (95.9) |
| N  | 2,741 (100) |

Source: Dollmann et al. (2023), own calculation, not weighted.

**Table A4: Cross-tabulation of the direct and indirect instrument for measuring racist experiences (dimension ‘verbal hostilities’)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Direct instrument: |
| Indirect instrument | Yes | No | Total |
| Yes Row% Cell% | 25236.19.2 | 44663.916.3 | 698100 |
| No Row%  Cell% | 452.2%1.6% | 1,99897.8%43.7% | 2,043100 |
| Total Row% Cell% | 29710.1 | 2,44489.2 | 2,741100100 |

Source: Dollmann et al. (2023), own calculation, not weighted.

**Table A5: Cross-tabulation of the direct and indirect instrument for measuring racist experiences (dimension ‘exclusion’)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Direct instrument: |
| Indirect instrument | Yes | No | Total |
| Yes Row% Cell% | 18753.96.8 | 16046.15.8 | 347100 |
| No Row%  Cell% | 1104.64.0 | 2,28495.483.4 | 2,394100 |
| Total Row% Cell% | 29710.8 | 2,44489.2 | 2,741100100 |

Source: Dollmann et al. (2023), own calculation, not weighted.

**Table A6: Cross-tabulation of the direct and indirect instrument for measuring racist experiences (dimension ‘physical violence’)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | Direct instrument: |
| Indirect instrument | Yes | No | Total |
| Yes Row% Cell% | 6961.12.5 | 4438.91.6 | 113100 |
| No Row%  Cell% | 2288.78.3 | 2,40091.387.6 | 2,628100 |
| Total Row% Cell% | 29710.8 | 2,44489.2 | 2,741100100 |

Source: Dollmann et al. (2023), own calculation, not weighted.

**Table A7: Logistic regression analysis on mismatch between the direct and indirect instruments (dimension ‘verbal hostilities’)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Logit Coefficient (se) | AME (se) |
| Male (*Reference: female)* | 0.436\*\*\*(0.113) | 0.052\*\*\*(0.014) |
| Age | -0.021\*\*\*(0.005) | -0.003\*\*\*(0.001) |
| Anger (*Ref: no anger*) | 0.142(0.141) | 0.017(0.017) |
| Education (*Reference: Basic)*IntermediateEntrance qualification for universityUniversity/college degree |  0.305(0.281)0.699\*\*(0.268)0.534\*(0.260) |  0.030(0.026)0.077\*\*(0.026)0.056\*(0.024) |
| Non-native | 1.681\*\*\*(0.129) | 0.248\*\*\*(0.021) |
| Interview in German | -0.044(0.190) | -0.005(0.023) |
| Interview duration | 0.001(0.005) | 0.000(0.001) |
| Constant | -2.176\*\*\*(0.399) |   |
| N | 2,706 |   |
| Pseudo R2  | 0.1375 |   |
| LR chi2(9)  | 333.12\*\*\* |   |

\*p < 0.05 \*\* p < 0.01 \*\*\* p < 0.001

Dollmann et al. (2023), own calculation, not weighted.

**Table A8: Logistic regression analysis on mismatch between the direct and indirect instruments (dimension ‘exclusion’)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Logit Coefficient (se) | AME (se) |
| Male (*Reference: female)* | 0.717\*\*\*(0.178) | 0.036\*\*\*(0.009) |
| Age | -0.014(0.008) | -0.001(0.000) |
| Anger (*Ref: no anger*) | 0.805\*\*\*(0.162) | 0.040\*\*\*(0.008) |
| Education (*Reference: Basic)*IntermediateEntrance qualification for universityUniversity/college degree |  0.732(0.398)0.309(0.392)0.407(0.375) |  0.035(0.017)0.013(0.015)0.017(0.014) |
| Non-native | 1.879\*\*\*(0.214) | 0.106\*\*\*(0.014) |
| Interview in German | -0.116(0.249) | -0.006(0.013) |
| Interview duration | -0.006(0.008) | 0.000(0.000) |
| Constant | -3.934\*\*\*(0.607) |   |
| N | 2,706 |   |
| Pseudo R2  | 0.1780 |   |
| LR chi2(9)  | 216.36\*\*\* |   |

\*p < 0.05 \*\* p < 0.01 \*\*\* p < 0.001

Dollmann et al. (2023), own calculation, not weighted.

**Table A9: Logistic regression analysis on mismatch between the direct and indirect instruments (dimension ‘physical violence’)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Logit Coefficient (se) | AME (se) |
| Male (*Reference: female)* | 0.838\*(0.341) | 0.012\*(0.005) |
| Age | -0.036\*(0.014) | -0.005\*(0.002) |
| Anger (*Ref: no anger*) | 1.699\*\*\*(0.242) | 0.024\*\*\*(0.004) |
| Education (*Reference: Basic)*IntermediateEntrance qualification for universityUniversity/college degree |  0.150(0.641)0.250(0.627)-0.718(0.644) |  0.003(0.011)0.004(0.010)-0.009(0.009) |
| Non-native | -0.397(0.424) | -0.006(0.006) |
| Interview in German | -0.170(0.604) | -0.003(0.010) |
| Interview duration | -0.005(0.016) | -0.000(0.000) |
| Constant | -3.205\*\*(1.154) |   |
| N | 2,706 |   |
| Pseudo R2  | 0.1863 |   |
| LR chi2(9)  | 88.77\*\*\* |   |

\*p < 0.05 \*\* p < 0.01 \*\*\* p < 0.001

Dollmann et al. (2023), own calculation, not weighted.

**Table A10: Logistic regression analysis on mismatch between the direct and indirect instruments (dimensions ‘verbal hostilities’ and ‘exclusion’)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Logit Coefficient (se) | AME (se) |
| Male (*Reference: female)* | 0.483\*\*\*(0.110) | 0.061\*\*\*(0.014) |
| Age | -0.022\*\*\*(0.005) | -0.003\*\*\*(0.001) |
| Anger (*Ref: no anger*) | 0.113(0.139) | 0.014(0.017) |
| Education (*Reference: Basic)*IntermediateEntrance qualification for universityUniversity/college degree |  0.378(0.269)0.593\*(0.258)0.489\*(0.249) |  0.041(0.028)0.068\*(0.026)0.055\*(0.025) |
| Non-native | 1.760\*\*\*(0.126) | 0.277\*\*\*(0.022) |
| Interview in German | 0.023(0.188) | 0.003(0.023) |
| Interview duration | 0.001(0.005) | 0.000(0.001) |
| Constant | -2.117\*\*\*(0.388) |   |
| N | 2,706 |   |
| Pseudo R2  | 0.1436 |   |
| LR chi2(9)  | 364.89\*\*\* |   |

\*p < 0.05 \*\* p < 0.01 \*\*\* p < 0.001

Dollmann et al. (2023), own calculation, not weighted.

**Table A11: Logistic regression analysis on mismatch between the direct and indirect instruments including both types of mismatches (Sensitivity analysis)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | Logit Coefficient (se) | AME (se) |
| Male (*Reference: female)* | 0.470\*\*\*(0.106) | 0.063\*\*\*(0.014) |
| Age | -0.020\*\*\*(0.004) | -0.003\*\*\*(0.001) |
| Anger (*Ref: no anger*) | 0.067(0.138) | 0.009(0.018) |
| Education (*Reference: Basic)*IntermediateEntrance qualification for universityUniversity/college degree |  0.220(0.250)0.466(0.241)0.300(0.232) |  0.026(0.029)0.060\*(0.029)0.037(0.027) |
| Non-native | 1.635\*\*\*(0.122) | 0.271\*\*\*(0.022) |
| Interview in German | 0.003(0.186) | 0.000(0.025) |
| Interview duration | 0.003(0.005) | 0.000(0.001) |
| Constant | -1.871\*\*\*(0.370) |   |
| N | 2,741 |   |
| Pseudo R2  | 0.1262 |   |
| LR chi2(9)  | 337.59\*\*\* |   |

\*p < 0.05 \*\* p < 0.01 \*\*\* p < 0.001

Dollmann et al. (2023), own calculation, not weighted.

**Table A12: Descriptive statistics of determinants in main model**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Variable** | **Mean (sd)** | **Proportion in %** |
| Age | 42.7 (13.6) | - |
| Male | - | 46.4 |
| Ethnic minority | - | 27.7 |
| Interview language German | - | 94.4 |
| Interview duration (in min) | 19.8 (10.7) | - |