# Divided by Europe: Affective polarization in the context of European elections 

Hyeonho Hahm ${ }^{\text {a }}$, David Hilpert ${ }^{\text {b }}$, and Thomas König ${ }^{\text {b }}$
${ }^{a}$ Department of Policy Studies, Hanyang University, Seoul, Republic of Korea; ${ }^{b}$ Department of Political Science, University of Mannheim, Mannheim, Germany

## Online Appendix

1 Summary Statistics ..... 2
2 Experimental Design ..... 9
3 Construction of Key Variables and Descriptive Statistics ..... 11
4 Analysis of Country-Level Findings ..... 14
5 Robustness ..... 1818
5.1 Alternative Coding of EU Attachment ..... 18
5.2 Single-Level Model for Individual and Country-Level Moderators. ..... 211
5.3 Entropy Balancing ..... 222
6 Survey Questions ..... 233
7 References ..... 25

## 1 Summary Statistics

The sampling was conducted to broadly represent the adult population with respect to key demographic variables such as age and gender in each of the 25 EU member states. In the following, we compare the distribution of gender and age in our sample against official population statistics, using Eurostat statistics for 2019.

TABLE A1: Sample Breakdown by Gender

|  |  | Male | \% | Female | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Austria | Sample | 630 | 49.33 | 645 | 50.51 |
|  | Population Target | 3746519 | 48.85 | 3922459 | 51.15 |
| Belgium | Sample | 574 | 43.98 | 729 | 55.86 |
|  | Population Target | 4698392 | 49.09 | 4872516 | 50.91 |
| Bulgaria | Sample | 518 | 52.75 | 463 | 47.15 |
|  | Population Target | 2871744 | 48.09 | 3100385 | 51.91 |
| Croatia | Sample | 694 | 55.97 | 545 | 43.95 |
|  | Population Target | 1680528 | 47.62 | 1848311 | 52.38 |
| Czech Republic | Sample | 618 | 54.45 | 515 | 45.37 |
|  | Population Target | 4397590 | 48.82 | 4610966 | 51.18 |
| Denmark | Sample | 508 | 42.33 | 690 | 57.5 |
|  | Population Target | 2383644 | 49.4 | 2441588 | 50.6 |
| Estonia | Sample | 611 | 64.72 | 331 | 35.06 |
|  | Population Target | 514247 | 46.44 | 593157 | 53.56 |
| Finland | Sample | 567 | 48.88 | 586 | 50.52 |
|  | Population Target | 2273941 | 48.94 | 2372168 | 51.06 |
| France | Sample | 594 | 51.38 | 562 | 48.62 |
|  | Population Target | 25596890 | 47.81 | 27938455 | 52.19 |
| Germany | Sample | 597 | 50.25 | 587 | 49.41 |
|  | Population Target | 35303386 | 49.04 | 36688675 | 50.96 |

TABLE A1: Sample Breakdown by Gender (Continued)

| Greece | Sample | 572 | 49.27 | 588 | 50.65 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Population Target | 4390217 | 48.68 | 4627792 | 51.32 |
| Hungary | Sample | 492 | 49.9 | 493 | 50 |
|  | Population Target | 3891151 | 46.96 | 4395722 | 53.04 |
| Ireland | Sample | 577 | 54.38 | 481 | 45.33 |
|  | Population Target | 1893324 | 49.18 | 1956508 | 50.82 |
| Italy | Sample | 569 | 48.55 | 603 | 51.45 |
|  | Population Target | 25356940 | 48.23 | 27220763 | 51.77 |
| Latvia | Sample | 733 | 63.85 | 415 | 36.15 |
|  | Population Target | 717145 | 44.94 | 878650 | 55.06 |
| Lithuania | Sample | 803 | 63.48 | 462 | 36.52 |
|  | Population Target | 1062019 | 45.35 | 1279907 | 54.65 |
| Netherlands | Sample | 577 | 47.26 | 642 | 52.58 |
|  | Population Target | 7120715 | 49.51 | 7260792 | 50.49 |
| Poland | Sample | 658 | 54.92 | 540 | 45.08 |
|  | Population Target | 15411147 | 47.96 | 16723208 | 52.04 |
| Portugal | Sample | 593 | 49.96 | 593 | 49.96 |
|  | Population Target | 4141733 | 46.69 | 4729318 | 53.31 |
| Romania | Sample | 641 | 43.31 | 837 | 56.55 |
|  | Population Target | 7868662 | 48.13 | 8480066 | 51.87 |
| Slovakia | Sample | 746 | 57.52 | 550 | 42.41 |
|  | Population Target | 2222888 | 48.22 | 2386767 | 51.78 |
| Slovenia | Sample | 566 | 49.87 | 569 | 50.13 |
|  | Population Target | 873107 | 49.48 | 891554 | 50.52 |
| Spain | Sample | 718 | 51.43 | 677 | 48.5 |
|  | Population Target | 19447032 | 48.71 | 20477085 | 51.29 |

TABLE A1: Sample Breakdown by Gender (Continued)

| Sweden | Sample | 602 | 48.01 | 648 | 51.67 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Population Target | 4116951 | 49.8 | 4150480 | 50.2 |
| UK | Sample | 641 | 50.12 | 635 | 49.65 |
|  | Population Target | 27237846 | 49.01 | 28342406 | 50.99 |

Sources: (Hahm et al. 2022, Eurostat)

| TABLE A2 Sample Breakdown by Age |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Austria | Sample | $\begin{array}{\|l} \mathbf{1 8 - 2 9} \\ \hline 207 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \% \\ & 16.42 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline 30-39 \\ 201 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \% \\ \hline 15.94 \end{array}$ | $\frac{40-49}{258}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \% \\ \hline 20.46 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbf{5 0 - 5 9} \\ & \hline 292 \end{aligned}$ | $\frac{\%}{23.16}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 60 \text { plus } \\ \hline 303 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l} \% \\ \hline 24.03 \end{array}$ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Population Target | 1625568 | 21.69 | 1239024 | 16.54 | 1195970 | 15.96 | 1404492 | 18.74 | 2027984 | 27.06 |
| Belgium | Sample | 243 | 18.71 | 140 | 10.78 | 201 | 15.47 | 265 | 20.4 | 450 | 34.64 |
|  | Population Target | 2078098 | 22.11 | 1499556 | 15.96 | 1555356 | 16.55 | 1624178 | 17.28 | 2639596 | 28.09 |
| Bulgaria | Sample | 120 | 12.27 | 218 | 22.29 | 246 | 25.15 | 266 | 27.2 | 128 | 13.09 |
|  | Population Target | 1064914 | 18.54 | 1007040 | 17.53 | 1090600 | 18.99 | 941288 | 16.39 | 1639646 | 28.55 |
| Croatia | Sample | 211 | 17.24 | 277 | 22.63 | 299 | 24.43 | 294 | 24.02 | 143 | 11.68 |
|  | Population Target | 698708 | 20.79 | 559050 | 16.63 | 559662 | 16.65 | 574948 | 17.11 | 968688 | 28.82 |
| Czech Republic | Sample | 177 | 15.69 | 195 | 17.29 | 200 | 17.73 | 252 | 22.34 | 304 | 26.95 |
|  | Population Target | 1655640 | 18.82 | 1554406 | 17.67 | 1818450 | 20.68 | 1343664 | 15.28 | 2423020 | 27.55 |
| Denmark | Sample | 196 | 16.51 | 117 | 9.86 | 170 | 14.32 | 236 | 19.88 | 468 | 39.43 |
|  | Population Target | 1141616 | 23.95 | 669530 | 14.04 | 751640 | 15.77 | 808148 | 16.95 | 1396354 | 29.29 |
| Estonia | Sample | 126 | 13.38 | 153 | 16.24 | 218 | 23.14 | 288 | 30.57 | 157 | 16.67 |
|  | Population Target | 220416 | 21.43 | 199400 | 19.39 | 187276 | 18.21 | 161490 | 15.7 | 259912 | 25.27 |


| TABLE A2 Sample Breakdown by Age (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Finland | Sample | $18-29$ <br> 193 | $\begin{array}{\|l} \hline \% \\ \hline 16.75 \end{array}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 - 3 9}$ <br> 186 | $\%$ <br> 16.15 | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline 40-49 \\ \hline 222 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \% \\ \hline 19.27 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \mathbf{5 0 - 5 9} \\ \hline 245 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | \%21.27 | 60 plus <br> 306 | \% <br> 26.56 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Population Target | 997718 | 21.94 | 725876 | 15.96 | 669166 | 14.71 | 728280 | 16.01 | 1426842 | 31.37 |
| France | Sample | 197 | 17.33 | 196 | 17.24 | 254 | 22.34 | 236 | 20.76 | 254 | 22.34 |
|  | Population Target | 11371970 | 22.21 | 7861838 | 15.36 | 8314716 | 16.24 | 8410080 | 16.43 | 15235176 | 29.76 |
| Germany | Sample | 220 | 18.66 | 165 | 13.99 | 235 | 19.93 | 236 | 20.02 | 323 | 27.4 |
|  | Population Target | 14155688 | 20.05 | 11048716 | 15.65 | 10474490 | 14.83 | 13592088 | 19.25 | 21335790 | 30.22 |
| Greece | Sample | 128 | 11.2 | 301 | 26.33 | 379 | 33.16 | 234 | 20.47 | 101 | 8.84 |
|  | Population Target | 1646666 | 18.75 | 1420388 | 16.18 | 1594512 | 18.16 | 1451876 | 16.54 | 2666992 | 30.37 |
| Hungary | Sample | 112 | 11.44 | 176 | 17.98 | 190 | 19.41 | 187 | 19.1 | 314 | 32.07 |
|  | Population Target | 1704522 | 21.9 | 1300818 | 16.72 | 1586832 | 20.39 | 1146370 | 14.73 | 2043760 | 26.26 |
| Ireland | Sample | 214 | 20.52 | 215 | 20.61 | 204 | 19.56 | 184 | 17.64 | 226 | 21.67 |
|  | Population Target | 877430 | 23.17 | 694870 | 18.35 | 735210 | 19.42 | 583776 | 15.42 | 895362 | 23.65 |
| Italy | Sample | 183 | 15.87 | 208 | 18.04 | 252 | 21.86 | 205 | 17.78 | 305 | 26.45 |
|  | Population Target | 9296910 | 18.33 | 7145854 | 14.09 | 9179482 | 18.1 | 9264526 | 18.27 | 15827108 | 31.21 |


|  |  | 18-29 | \% | 30-39 | \% | 40-49 | \% | 50-59 | \% | 60 plus | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Latvia | Sample | 166 | 14.52 | 251 | 21.96 | 288 | 25.2 | 298 | 26.07 | 140 | 12.25 |
|  | Population Target | 297228 | 20.72 | 267532 | 18.65 | 250978 | 17.5 | 250506 | 17.47 | 368046 | 25.66 |
| Lithuania | Sample | 364 | 29 | 264 | 21.04 | 263 | 20.96 | 260 | 20.72 | 104 | 8.29 |
|  | Population Target | 484942 | 22.83 | 347158 | 16.34 | 357430 | 16.83 | 398080 | 18.74 | 536428 | 25.26 |
| Netherlands | Sample | 199 | 16.49 | 136 | 11.27 | 205 | 16.98 | 237 | 19.64 | 430 | 35.63 |
|  | Population Target | 3196778 | 22.45 | 2097662 | 14.73 | 2202670 | 15.47 | 2539218 | 17.83 | 4205102 | 29.53 |
| Poland | Sample | 351 | 29.52 | 279 | 23.47 | 198 | 16.65 | 186 | 15.64 | 175 | 14.72 |
|  | Population Target | 6491052 | 21.06 | 6320360 | 20.51 | 5438144 | 17.64 | 4555630 | 14.78 | 8017108 | 26.01 |
| Portugal | Sample | 217 | 18.42 | 272 | 23.09 | 269 | 22.84 | 223 | 18.93 | 197 | 16.72 |
|  | Population Target | 1605984 | 19.39 | 1218500 | 14.71 | 1528870 | 18.46 | 1392984 | 16.82 | 2537128 | 30.63 |
| Romania | Sample | 239 | 16.44 | 369 | 25.38 | 387 | 26.62 | 284 | 19.53 | 175 | 12.04 |
|  | Population Target | 3285576 | 20.88 | 2714204 | 17.25 | 3122112 | 19.84 | 2466352 | 15.67 | 4149080 | 26.36 |
| Slovakia | Sample | 225 | 17.4 | 240 | 18.56 | 286 | 22.12 | 290 | 22.43 | 252 | 19.49 |
|  | Population Target | 967320 | 21.76 | 881646 | 19.83 | 860510 | 19.36 | 698104 | 15.7 | 1038196 | 23.35 |


| TABLE A2 Sample Breakdown by Age (continued) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Slovenia |  | $\mathbf{1 8 - 2 9}$ | $\boldsymbol{\%}$ | $\mathbf{3 0 - 3 9}$ | $\boldsymbol{\%}$ | $\mathbf{4 0 - 4 9}$ | $\boldsymbol{\%}$ | $\mathbf{5 0 - 5 9}$ | $\boldsymbol{\%}$ | $\mathbf{6 0}$ plus | $\boldsymbol{\%}$ |
|  | Sample | 169 | 15.08 | 236 | 21.05 | 244 | 21.77 | 258 | 23.02 | 214 |  |
| Spain | Population Target | 311420 | 17.83 | 303190 | 17.36 | 319524 | 18.3 | 305208 | 17.48 | 506872 | 29.03 |
|  | Sample | 232 | 16.9 | 319 | 23.23 | 341 | 24.84 | 287 | 20.9 | 194 | 14.13 |
| Sweden | Population Target | 7016668 | 18.04 | 6159250 | 15.84 | 8082144 | 20.78 | 6903880 | 17.75 | 10732122 | 27.59 |
|  | Sample | 194 | 15.65 | 152 | 12.26 | 183 | 14.76 | 275 | 22.18 | 436 |  |
| UK | Population Target | 1879030 | 22.82 | 1316794 | 15.99 | 1296938 | 15.75 | 1298132 | 15.77 | 2443008 | 29.67 |
|  | Sample | 205 | 16.35 | 174 | 13.88 | 228 | 18.18 | 220 | 17.54 | 427 |  |

[^0]
## 2 Experimental Design

Before the dictator game, we presented the respondents with the following background information and instruction.

This game is played by pairs of individuals. Each pair is made up of a Player 1 and a Player 2. Each player will have some information about the other player, but you will not be told who the other players are during or after the experiment.

The game is conducted as follows: A sum of 10 tokens will be provisionally allocated to Player 1 at the start of each round. Player 1 will then decide how much of the 10 tokens to offer to player 2. Player 1 could give some, all, or none of the 10 tokens. Player 1 keeps all tokens not given to player 2. Player 2 gets to keep all the tokens Player 1 offers.

You will play this game three times with three different people.
Respondents then received a tabular overview over Player 2:

## FIGURE A1 Player 2 Profile Example

Player 1: You are Player 1. You have 10 tokens for this game. You can split the tokens between yourself and Player 2 in any way you want.

Information about this round's Player 2
\#1

|  | Player 2 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Gender | Female |
| Nationality | Ireland |
| Age | Muslim |
| Religion | Fine Gael (FG) |
| Party Affiliation | Upper Class |
| Social Class | Player 2 feels that he/she is a citizen of the EU |
| EU |  |

So put the number of tokens you wish to keep in the box labeled "Player 1." Put the tokens you wish to go to Player 2 in the box labeled "Player 2."

| Player 1 (You) | 0 Token(s) |
| :--- | :--- |
| Player 2 | 0 |
| Token $(s)$ |  |
| Total | 0 Token(s) |

## 3 Construction of Key Variables and Descriptive Statistics

Randomized profiles are coded according to whether they represent the respondent's in- or out-group, using information that respondent provided before:

Gender: male (female) respondents are coded to perceive a female (male) Player 2 as out-group. Respondents who indicate gender "Other" cannot be coded easily and are "dummied out" with a separate indicator.

Age: we code respondents according to their belonging to five age groups: 18-29, 30-39, 40-49, 5059,60 plus. The age of Player 2 was randomly selected to be $18,30,42,53$, or 65 years old. We code in-group when respondents are matched with a Player 2 from the same age bracket, and otherwise out-group.

Class: Respondents indicate their subjective belonging to a social class on a hierarchical scale, covering "The working class of society," "The lower middle class of society," "The middle class of society," "The upper middle class of society" and "The higher class of society." We collapse the three middle categories into "Middle Class," creating a three-fold distinction that parallels the set from which we select Player 2's class, "Lower Class," "Middle Class" or "Upper Class." A Player 2 from the same social class is coded as in-group, from a different social class as out-group.

Religion: Respondents could select from a detailed battery of religious beliefs. The religion of Player 2 was randomly selected from a set including "Catholic," "Protestant," "Muslim," and "No Religion." A Player 2 with the same belief as a Catholic, Protestant or Muslim respondent are coded as in-group. A Player 2 with beliefs different from the respondent are coded as out-group, for example Catholic respondents matched with a Protestant or Muslim Player 2, or one with "No religion." Respondents that are neither Catholic, Protestant nor Muslim are indicated with a separate dummy ("Other religion"). Similarly, atheist or agnostic respondents, or respondents who "don't know" are indicated with a separate indicator ("Non-believer").

Nationality: For each of the 25 countries in which we fielded the survey, we only allow nationals of that country to participate. Nationality of Player 2 is randomly selected to be co-national (e.g., "Ireland" for respondents in Ireland), EU-national or non-EU national.

Partisanship: Respondents indicate their partisanship by answering a question which party they feel close to. Depending on the answer, we randomly generate the partisanship of Player 2. Randomization was adjusted such that in expectation, there is a $50 \%$ chance for Player 2 to have the same partisanship (co-partisan), and $50 \%$ chance to be identify with another party from the top 8 parties in the country at that time (out-partisan), based on recent electoral results, polling numbers, and relevance to the research question (Eurosceptic parties).

EU attachment: We used a five-point scale to elicit the respondent's level of attachment to the European Union, from Very attached (1) to Not at all attached (5). The experimental manipulation randomly provides information about whether "Player 2 feels that he/she is not a citizen of the EU," or "Player 2 feels that he/she is a citizen of the EU." For those respondents feeling "Not at all attached" to the EU, we code profiles as in-group where "Player 2 feels that he/she is not a citizen of the EU," and "Player 2 feels that he/she is a citizen of the EU" as the out-group. Conversely, for those respondents who feel at least some level of attachment to the EU ("Not very attached" (4) to "Very attached" (1)), we code profiles as in-group where "Player 2 feels that he/she is a citizen of the EU," and code profiles as out-group where "Player 2 feels that he/she is not a citizen of the EU."

Table A3 summarizes descriptive information on key variables in the survey experiment. Table A4 adds information on individual-level and country-level variables relevant to the multi-level analysis.

TABLE A3 Descriptive Overview over Dependent and Independent Variables

| Variable |  | N | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Tokens for Player 2 (DV) | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Mean }=3.59, \\ & \text { SD }=2.33 \end{aligned}$ | 89,481 | 100 |
| Gender | In Group | 44,660 | 49.9 |
|  | Out Group | 44,695 | 49.9 |
|  | Other | 126 | 0.1 |
|  | Sum | 89,481 | 100 |
| Age | In-Group | 17,631 | 19.7 |
|  | Out-Group | 71,850 | 80.3 |
|  | Sum | 89,481 | 100 |
| Class | In-Group | 28,821 | 32.2 |
|  | Out-Group | 56,940 | 63.6 |
|  | Don't know | 3,720 | 4.2 |
|  | Sum | 89,481 | 100 |
| Religion | In-Group | 9,882 | 11.0 |
|  | Out-Group | 29,823 | 33.3 |
|  | Other religion | 17,712 | 19.8 |
|  | Non-believer | 32,064 | 35.8 |
|  | Sum | 89,481 | 100 |
| Partisanship | In-Group | 15,406 | 17.2 |
|  | Out-Group | 33,416 | 13.5 |
|  | Control-Group (No information provided) | 12,098 | 37.3 |
|  | Not defined | 28,561 | 31.9 |
|  | Sum | 89,481 | 100 |
| Nationality | In-Group | 60,920 | 68.1 |
|  | Out-Group (EU-national) | 22,312 | 25.0 |
|  | Out-Group (non-EU-national) | 6,249 | 7.0 |
|  | Sum | 89,481 | 100 |
| EU Attachment | In-Group | 24,518 | 27.4 |
|  | Out-Group | 24,237 | 27.1 |
|  | Control-Group (No information provided) | 34,477 | 38.5 |
|  | Not defined | 6,249 | 7.0 |
|  | Sum | 89,481 | 100 |

TABLE A4: Descriptive information on individual-level and country-level variables

|  | Min | Mean | Max | N |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Individual level |  |  |  |  |
| Election salience | 0 | 0.60 | 1 | 29,594 |
| Election attention | 0 | 0.94 | 1 | 29,594 |
| Election engagement | 0 | 0.38 | 1 | 29,594 |
| Election participation | 0 | 0.78 | 1 | 29,594 |
| Controls |  |  |  |  |
| Female | 0 | 0.49 | 1 | 29,594 |
| Age | 18 | 46.7 | 98 | 29,286 |
| Education | 0 | 21.2 | 30 | 28,609 |
| Country level |  |  |  |  |
| Dalton polarization index (EU) | 0.24 | 0.80 | 1.55 | 29,594 |
| Vote share Eurosceptic parties | 0 | 16.6 | 49.2 | 29,594 |
| Length of EU membership (in years) | 6 | 32.07 | 67 | 29,594 |
| Gini coefficient | 24.2 | 31.1 | 40.4 | 29,594 |
| Controls |  |  |  |  |
| Population size (in million) | 1.3 | 38.0 | 83.1 | 29,594 |
| GDP per capita | 8,780 | 30,708 | 72,260 | 29,594 |
| Unemployment rate | 2 | 6.3 | 17.3 | 29,594 |

## 4 Analysis of Country-Level Findings

First, we compare the effect of bias based on nationality and EU attachment across the 25 countries in our sample. For nationality, while smaller sample sizes extend the range of $95 \%$ Confidence Intervals, the size of the estimates suggest a general pattern: in most countries, bias against non-EU nationals surpasses the bias against EU-nationals. Exceptions to this pattern include Greece, Ireland, and the UK, where it is more difficult to distinguish the effects. For EU attachment, we see that it leads to significant levels of bias against the out-group in all countries except the Netherlands. Furthermore, the estimates indicate an effect that is substantively comparable or even larger that based on non-EU nationality in all but five countries: Belgium, Croatia, Czech Republic, Netherlands, and Slovenia.

FIGURE A2: Divisions Across Different Identity Attributes, by Country




Notes: The figure illustrates estimates of the effects of the randomly assigned identity attributes on the tokens allocated to Player 2. The bars capture the estimated extent of political divides, measured in the number of tokens that are withheld from the out-group relative to the in-group on each identity attribute. Longer bars indicate larger gaps between in-group and out-group. Lines indicate 95 percent confidence intervals.

Next, we look at the bias against out-partisans relative to co-partisans, conditional on the EUattachment shown. While we see that the partisan divide is prevalent in all 25 countries, we see that EU attachment often makes a substantively important difference, even if relatively sample sizes leave uncertainty around these estimates. In 22 out of 25 countries, the estimates suggest that considerations of EU attachment increase the partisan divide, while the size of this effect varies considerably across countries.

## FIGURE A3: Partisan Divide Conditional on EU Attachment, by Country



Notes: The figure illustrates estimates of the effects of partisanship on the tokens allocated to Player 2. The bars capture the estimated extent of the partisan divide, measured in the number of tokens that are withheld from the out-partisans relative to co-partisans. Longer bars indicate larger gaps between in-group and out-group. Lines indicate 95 percent confidence intervals.

Finally, we compare the level of in-group favoritism and out-group derogation over EU attachment relative to a neutral control group in which we withhold information about Player 2's feeling that he or she is (not) a citizen of the EU. While the pooled pattern clearly indicates that the effect of outgroup derogation is larger than the effect of in-group favoritism, we confirm consistent patterns in 22 out of 25 countries. Again, uncertainty around these estimates is higher in individual-country samples than in the pooled sample that combines information from all 25 countries. Interpreting the findings with caution, we still see that a broad set of countries are consistent with the aggregate pattern of the pooled analysis, rather than a small set of influential countries.

FIGURE A4: In-group Favoritism and Out-Group Animosity, by Country


Notes: The figure illustrates the decomposition of the political divide based on European identity into separate estimates for in-group favoritism and out-group derogation. The bars capture the estimated extent of political divide, measured by the difference in tokens allocated in-group and out-group relative to a control group where we do not display whether Player 2 feels that he or she is a citizen of the EU. Lines indicate 95 percent confidence intervals.

## 5 Robustness

### 5.1 Alternative Coding of EU Attachment

Matching respondents to Player 2 based on their attachment is to some extent arbitrary: for respondents, we evaluate their attachment to the EU on a five-point scale ("Not at all attached", "Not very attached", "Moderately attached", "Fairly attached" or "Very attached"), while Player 2 is characterized by randomly drawing a relevant piece of information: that "Player 2 feels that he/she is a citizen of the EU" or that "Player 2 feels that he/she is not a citizen of the EU." The question is at what level of EU attachment perceive Player 2 of either "type" as in- and out-group. Our measure used in the main analysis distinguishes between respondents who feel "Not at all attached" from respondents who feel at least some attachment, starting from those who feel "Not very attached" (still indicating a minimum of attachment).

Here we propose and test two alternatives. The first alternative groups together respondents who feel "Not at all attached" with those "Not very attached" and contrasts them to respondents who feel "Moderately", "Fairly" or "Very attached." The resulting findings are very similar to those presented in the main manuscript:

FIGURE A5: Divisions Across Different Identity Attributes (First Alternative Coding of EU Attachment)


Notes: Pooled analysis. $\mathrm{J}=29,827 ; \mathrm{N}=89,481$. The figure illustrates estimates of the effects of the randomly assigned identity attributes on the tokens allocated to Player 2. The bars capture the estimated extent of political divides, measured in the number of tokens that are withheld from the out-group relative to the in-group on each identity attribute. Longer bars indicate larger gaps between in-group and out-group. Lines indicate 95 percent confidence intervals.

The second alternative follows the division of the main manuscript but ignores respondents who are "Not very attached" to the EU on the grounds that it is difficult for this group in particular whether respondents feel as a citizen of the EU or feel that they are not citizens of the EU. Again, the resulting findings are very similar to those presented in the main manuscript.

FIGURE A6: Divisions Across Different Identity Attributes (Second Alternative Coding of EU Attachment)


Notes: Pooled analysis. $\mathrm{J}=29,561 ; \mathrm{N}=86,678$. The figure illustrates estimates of the effects of the randomly assigned identity attributes on the tokens allocated to Player 2. The bars capture the estimated extent of political divides, measured in the number of tokens that are withheld from the out-group relative to the in-group on each identity attribute. Longer bars indicate larger gaps between in-group and out-group. Lines indicate 95 percent confidence intervals.

### 5.2 Single-Level Model for Individual and Country-Level Moderators

Since our main analysis rests on a computationally intensive hierarchical linear model, here we test a simple single-level equivalent, clustering standard errors by survey respondents. The main findings remain the same.

TABLE A5: Single-level OLS Model on the European Divide (with Clustered Standard Errors)

|  | Dependent variable: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tokens for Player 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| EU attachment: Out-group | -0.189 (0.136) | ${ }^{-0.433^{* * *}(0.029)}$ | $-0.437^{* * *}(0.028)$ | -0.432*** (0.029) | -0.445*** (0.028) | -0.167 (0.136) | -0.165 (0.136) |
| Election salience | $0.437^{* * *}(0.083)$ |  |  |  |  | $0.446^{* * *}(0.083)$ | $0.447^{* * *}(0.083)$ |
| Election attention | $0.255^{* *}(0.103)$ |  |  |  |  | $0.263^{* *}(0.103)$ | $0.262^{* *}(0.103)$ |
| Election engagement | -0.031 (0.045) |  |  |  |  | -0.029 (0.046) | -0.029 (0.045) |
| Election participation | 0.014 (0.060) |  |  |  |  | 0.004 (0.060) | 0.002 (0.060) |
| EU attachment: Out-group * Election salience | $-0.306^{* * *}(0.107)$ |  |  |  |  | -0.305*** (0.108) | $-0.311^{* * *}(0.108)$ |
| EU attachment: Out-group * Election attention | -0.057 (0.132) |  |  |  |  | -0.084 (0.132) | -0.084 (0.132) |
| EU attachment: Out-group * Election engagement | -0.087 (0.059) |  |  |  |  | -0.083 (0.059) | -0.077 (0.059) |
| EU attachment: Out-group * Election participation | $-0.171^{* *}(0.078)$ |  |  |  |  | $-0.154^{* *}(0.078)$ | $-0.160^{* *}(0.078)$ |
| Dalton Polarization Index (EU) |  | 0.074 (0.107) |  |  |  | -0.023 (0.114) |  |
| EU attachment: Out-group * Dalton Polarization Index (EU) |  | $-0.318^{* *}(0.125)$ |  |  |  | $-0.238^{*}(0.136)$ |  |
| Vote share Eurosceptic parties |  |  | -0.040 (0.104) |  |  |  | -0.048 (0.107) |
| EU attachment: Out-group * Vote share Eurosceptic parties |  |  | $-0.302^{* *}(0.126)$ |  |  |  | $-0.234^{*}(0.131)$ |
| Length of EU Membership |  |  |  | $0.228^{* *}(0.090)$ |  | $0.223^{* *}(0.092)$ | $0.206^{* *}(0.090)$ |
| EU attachment: Out-Group * Length of EU Membership |  |  |  | $-0.227^{* * *}(0.082)$ |  | ${ }^{-0.161 *}$ (0.089) | $-0.195^{* *}(0.084)$ |
| Gini coefficient |  |  |  |  | 0.023 (0.104) | -0.030 (0.108) | -0.020 (0.107) |
| EU attachment: Out-Group * Gini coefficient |  |  |  |  | $-0.216^{*}(0.122)$ | -0.147 (0.126) | -0.063 (0.127) |
| Partisanship information shown | -0.031 (0.030) | -0.032 (0.030) | -0.031 (0.030) | -0.031 (0.030) | -0.031 (0.030) | -0.031 (0.030) | -0.030 (0.030) |
| Female | -0.013 (0.034) | -0.020 (0.034) | -0.019 (0.034) | -0.018 (0.034) | -0.021 (0.034) | -0.011 (0.034) | -0.010 (0.034) |
| Age | $-0.012^{* * *}(0.001)$ | - $0.011^{* * *}(0.001)$ | -0.011*** (0.001) | $-0.011^{* * *}(0.001)$ | $-0.011^{* * *}(0.001)$ | -0.012*** (0.001) | $-0.011^{* * *}(0.001)$ |
| Education | -0.001 (0.004) | -0.001 (0.004) | -0.001 (0.004) | -0.0003 (0.004) | -0.0005 (0.004) | -0.001 (0.004) | -0.001 (0.004) |
| Population size | 0.005 (0.056) | 0.049 (0.063) | 0.079 (0.061) | -0.047 (0.072) | 0.040 (0.060) | 0.004 (0.082) | 0.012 (0.081) |
| GDP per capita | $0.267^{* * *}(0.073)$ | $0.218^{* * *}(0.073)$ | $0.208^{* * *}(0.073)$ | 0.113 (0.099) | $0.186^{* *}(0.075)$ | 0.145 (0.099) | $0.168^{*}(0.099)$ |
| Unemployment rate | $0.209^{* * *}$ (0.073) | $0.168^{* *}(0.077)$ | $0.179^{* *}(0.073)$ | $0.158^{* *}(0.077)$ | $0.218^{* * *}(0.077)$ | $0.150^{*}(0.085)$ | $0.177^{* *}(0.082)$ |
| Constant | $3.815^{* * *}(0.141)$ | $4.092^{* * *}(0.102)$ | $4.090^{* * *}(0.102)$ | 4.080*** (0.102) | 4.091**** 0.102 ) | $3.800^{* * *}(0.141)$ | $3.80{ }^{* * *}(0.142)$ |
| Observations | 28,355 | 28,355 | 28,355 | 28,355 | 28,355 | 28,355 | 28,355 |
| Note: |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<0.1$; ${ }^{*} \mathrm{p}$ | p<0.05; ${ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.01$ |

### 5.3 Entropy Balancing

While aiming at representativeness of the target population, no survey perfectly achieves this standard. Hainmueller (2012) proposes entropy balancing as a method to reweight survey samples according to distribution of demographic characteristics in the target population. By reweighting, we can increase the external validity of our inferences. We reweight our country-specific samples by targeting the distribution of gender age groups according to census data (see Table A1 and A2). Table A6 presents the findings of the multi-level analysis using the reweighted data. Findings are consistent with the main analysis.

TABLE A6 Hierarchical Linear Model on the European Divide (Reweighted)

|  | Dependent variable: |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Tokens for Player 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | (1) | (2) | (3) | (4) | (5) | (6) | (7) |
| EU attachment: Out-group | -0.208* (0.117) | $-0.429^{* * *}(0.026)$ | -0.431*** $(0.026)$ | - $0.430^{* * *}(0.026)$ | $-0.439^{* * *}(0.026)$ | -0.190 (0.118) | -0.185 (0.118) |
| Election salience | $0.464^{* * *}$ (0.076) |  |  |  |  | $0.463^{* * *}$ (0.076) | $0.466^{* * *}(0.076)$ |
| Election attention | $0.257^{* * *}(0.093)$ |  |  |  |  | $0.266^{* * *}$ (0.093) | $0.267^{* * *}(0.093)$ |
| Election engagement | -0.036 (0.044) |  |  |  |  | -0.036 (0.045) | -0.040 (0.045) |
| Election participation | -0.034 (0.056) |  |  |  |  | -0.040 (0.056) | -0.038 (0.056) |
| EU attachment: Out-group * Election salience | $-0.304^{* * *}(0.092)$ |  |  |  |  | -0.296*** (0.092) | -0.302*** (0.092) |
| EU attachment: Out-group * Election attention | -0.065 (0.114) |  |  |  |  | -0.088 (0.114) | -0.090 (0.114) |
| EU attachment: Out-group * Election engagement | -0.070 (0.053) |  |  |  |  | -0.067 (0.054) | -0.060 (0.054) |
| EU attachment: Out-group * Election participation | $-0.134^{* *}(0.068)$ |  |  |  |  | -0.124* (0.069) | -0.130* (0.069) |
| Dalton Polarization Index (EU) |  | 0.019 (0.200) |  |  |  | -0.073 (0.219) |  |
| EU attachment: Out-group * Dalton Polarization Index (EU) |  | $-0.247^{* *}(0.108)$ |  |  |  | -0.223* (0.118) |  |
| Vote share Eurosceptic parties |  |  | -0.041 (0.180) |  |  |  | -0.051 (0.193) |
| EU attachment: Out-group * Vote share Eurosceptic parties |  |  | $-0.312^{* * *}(0.110)$ |  |  |  | $-0.265^{* *}(0.115)$ |
| Length of EU Membership |  |  |  | 0.177 (0.200) |  | 0.191 (0.211) | 0.163 (0.209) |
| EU attachment: Out-Group * Length of EU Membership |  |  |  | -0.134* (0.074) |  | -0.079 (0.080) | -0.107 (0.075) |
| Gini coefficient |  |  |  |  | 0.003 (0.180) | -0.062 (0.194) | -0.044 (0.188) |
| EU attachment: Out-Group * Gini coefficient |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{-0.212 * * *}(0.107)$ | -0.153 (0.110) | -0.067 (0.111) |
| Partisanship information shown | -0.036 (0.027) | -0.037 (0.027) | -0.036 (0.027) | -0.036 (0.027) | -0.036 (0.027) | -0.036 (0.027) | -0.036 (0.027) |
| Female | -0.016 (0.034) | -0.023 (0.034) | -0.023 (0.034) | -0.023 (0.034) | -0.024 (0.034) | -0.015 (0.034) | -0.015 (0.034) |
| Age | $-0.011^{* * *}(0.001)$ | - $0.011^{* * *}(0.001)$ | $-0.011^{* * *}(0.001)$ | ) $-0.011^{* * *}(0.001)$ | $-0.011^{* * *}(0.001)$ | $-0.011^{* * *}(0.001)$ | -0.011*** (0.001) |
| Education | 0.002 (0.004) | 0.001 (0.004) | 0.001 (0.004) | 0.002 (0.004) | 0.002 (0.004) | 0.002 (0.004) | 0.002 (0.004) |
| Population size | -0.003 (0.129) | 0.054 (0.148) | 0.076 (0.136) | -0.050 (0.172) | 0.037 (0.134) | 0.012 (0.202) | 0.009 (0.197) |
| GDP per capita | $0.269^{*}(0.156)$ | 0.222 (0.156) | 0.211 (0.151) | 0.125 (0.218) | 0.183 (0.162) | 0.133 (0.232) | 0.163 (0.231) |
| Unemployment rate | 0.178 (0.171) | 0.131 (0.179) | 0.142 (0.166) | 0.128 (0.180) | 0.189 (0.176) | 0.113 (0.203) | 0.146 (0.194) |
| Constant | $3.790^{* * *}$ (0.137) | $4.037^{* * *}$ (0.107) | $4.037^{* * *}(0.106)$ | $4.033^{* * *}(0.107)$ | $4.036^{* * *}(0.107)$ | $3.781^{* * *}(0.138)$ | $3.778^{* * *}(0.138)$ |
| Observations | 28,355 | 28,355 | 28,355 | 28,355 | 28,355 | 28,355 | 28,355 |
| Note: |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{*} \mathrm{p}<0.1{ }^{* *}{ }^{\text {p }}$ | p<0.05; ${ }^{* * *} \mathrm{p}<0.01$ |

## 6 Survey Questions

Party Identification: Do you consider yourself to be close to any particular political party? If so, which party do you feel close to?

- [Party names]
- Other (fill the blank)
- No, I do not feel close to any political party

EU attachment: Please tell me how attached you feel to... the European Union (EU)

- Very attached (1)
- Fairly attached (2)
- Moderately attached (3)
- Not very attached (4)
- Not at all attached (5)

Election salience: How important is the outcome of the upcoming election to you personally?

- Very important (1)
- (2)
- (3)
- (4)
- Not important at all (5)

Election attention and engagement: From which of the following sources have you heard anything about the upcoming European election campaign? Please indicate all that apply.

- Television
- Newspaper
- Radio
- Social media (such as Facebook, Twitter)
- Other Internet sources (such as e-mail provider, Blog)
- Personal conversations
- Other: specify
- Have not heard anything about the election campaign from any of these sources.

Election participation: On Friday, 24 May 2019, the European election takes place. All citizens of the European Union elect the members of the European Parliament. While a lot of people vote, others do not manage to vote or do not participate in elections for other reasons. How likely is it that you will
vote in the upcoming election?

- I am not eligible to vote
- Certain not to vote
- Not likely to vote
- Might vote
- Likely to vote
- Certain to vote
- Have already voted
- Don't know

Gender: Please indicate your gender.

- Male
- Female
- Other

Age: How old are you?
(respondents choose age from list)
Education: How old were you when you stopped full-time education?
(respondents choose age from list, with option to indicate No education (0 years))
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[^0]:    Sources: (Hahm et al. 2022, Eurostat)

