**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% | 252  36.1  9.2 | 446  63.9  16.3 | 698 100 |
| No  Row%  Cell% | 45 2.2% 1.6% | 1,998  97.8% 43.7% | 2,043  100 |
| Total  Row%  Cell% | 297 10.1 | 2,444  89.2 | 2,741 100 100 |

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% | 187  53.9  6.8 | 160  46.1  5.8 | 347 100 |
| No  Row%  Cell% | 110 4.6 4.0 | 2,284  95.4 83.4 | 2,394  100 |
| Total  Row%  Cell% | 297 10.8 | 2,444  89.2 | 2,741 100 100 |

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% | 69  61.1  2.5 | 44  38.9  1.6 | 113 100 |
| No  Row%  Cell% | 228 8.7 8.3 | 2,400  91.3  87.6 | 2,628  100 |
| Total  Row%  Cell% | 297 10.8 | 2,444  89.2 | 2,741 100 100 |

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)*  Intermediate  Entrance qualification for university  University/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)*  Intermediate  Entrance qualification for university  University/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)*  Intermediate  Entrance qualification for university  University/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)*  Intermediate  Entrance qualification for university  University/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)*  Intermediate  Entrance qualification for university  University/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) | - |