

Study Preregistration

Reference groups and social solidarity: Comparative factorial survey experiment of social cohesion between Chile and Germany.

Abstract

In recent years, global economic inequality, public health crises, and increasing migration have intensified social science interest in social cohesion. This concept includes interpersonal trust, collaboration, openness, and relationships with civil society and the political system. Studies in sociology and social psychology emphasize how social interactions shape attitudes, particularly through social comparison. People evaluate their attributes against those of others, influenced by reference groups. These groups provide a basis for comparison that can shape attitudes toward inequality, welfare policies, and social trust. Demographic and socioeconomic factors in reference groups can impact support for social policies like pensions and taxes. Social cohesion is closely tied to societal values, which form the foundation for popular support and the legitimacy of welfare regimes. Contact with working-class individuals, for example, may increase support for redistributive policies, while professionals in interpersonal occupations may foster more inclusive attitudes. However, rapid demographic changes, such as those brought about by migration, can lead to perceived threats and reduced solidarity among certain groups, especially the working class. This study aims to examine how reference group characteristics relate to attitudes toward social cohesion through a vignette-based survey experiment conducted in Chile and Germany. Chile, with its high inequality and market-based welfare system, contrasts with Germany's more state-involved, corporatist welfare model. The research seeks to understand how demographic and socioeconomic factors influence trust and willingness to support others, even when reciprocity is uncertain. It focuses on the role of reference groups in shaping attitudes toward social solidarity, with specific attention to friendship, collaboration, and territorial conflict. Survey respondents will evaluate vignettes of individuals varying in characteristics such as gender, education, income, employment status, and migration background to assess the potential for friendship, collaboration, and closeness.

Study Information

Background

In recent years, the increase in global economic inequality (Piketty & Goldhammer, 2014), the recent health crisis, and growing migratory flows in various parts of the world (OECD, 2023), have heightened the focus of social sciences on social cohesion. This concept encompasses individuals' experiences that contribute to building trust, collaboration, and openness at the interpersonal level and their relationships with civil society organizations and the political system (Chan, To, & Chan, 2006).

Within this framework, a tradition of studies in sociology and social psychology has emphasized the role of social interactions in shaping and changing individuals' attitudes (Merton & Rossi, 1968; Pettigrew, 1998) (Merton & Rossi, 1968; Pettigrew, 1998), highlighting how these interactions can trigger social comparison processes linked to the salience of group attributes being compared to those of the observer (Jasso, 1990, p. 199). In this context, it has been established that reference groups provide information through which individuals compare and evaluate their own attributes with similar groups (e.g., status), as well as in processes shaping attitudes toward different groups (Festinger, 1954). This research tradition allows for a better understanding of key issues related to attitude formation that either facilitate or hinder social cohesion.

The field of research on the consequences of reference group composition has suggested that attitudes in various domains related to social cohesion, such as beliefs about inequality, support for welfare policies, and social trust, are influenced by the composition of the surrounding social environment (Baldassarri & Abascal, 2020; Evans, Kelley, & Kolosi, 1992; Mijs, 2018). Along these lines, studies on the role of reference groups have suggested that demographic and socioeconomic characteristics can influence support for social policies, such as pension systems and taxes (Castillo, Olivos, & Azar, 2019; Sachweh & Eicher, 2023). In addition to the tendency to prefer similar individuals in friendship and kinship ties (McPherson, Smith-Lovin, & Cook, 2001), the social forces driving encounters with dissimilar individuals go beyond individual choices and are closely linked to structural opportunities for contact (Blau, 1977).

The normative structure of a society, represented by the shared values among its citizens, lays the foundation for popular support and legitimacy of welfare regimes as an expression of social solidarity (Mau, 2003). Solidarity is understood as the degree to which people are connected and share a common purpose, including their willingness to cooperate and fight for shared goals and the extent of trust and support they offer each other within their community (Green & Janmaat, 2011). For instance, being connected to working-class individuals may increase support for redistributive policies and strengthen backing for welfare policies exclusive to nationals, contrasting with the more egalitarian and diversity-oriented attitudes of professionals in interpersonal occupations (Lindh, Andersson, & Völker, 2021). Similarly, rapid migratory flows can increase demographic diversity, which in turn may heighten perceived threats and reduce sympathy toward immigrants among working-class groups, potentially undermining social solidarity (Castillo, Bonhomme, Miranda, & Iturra, 2023)

In this discussion, a knowledge gap remains regarding how the composition of reference groups influences attitudes toward social solidarity at the individual level when studying social cohesion.

Hypotheses

Hypothesis in the Socioeconomic Domain

Expectations regarding the behavior of others play a crucial role in fostering social connections beyond close family and friends (Diprete, Gelman, McCormick, Teitler, & Zheng, 2011). In this regard, optimistic expectations promote cooperation with strangers and create additional opportunities for collective efforts. However, the ability to maintain an optimistic outlook often varies based on socioeconomic status. Individuals with higher socio-economic status, who are generally more affluent, can afford to maintain a positive view of others, as the potential consequences of disappointment are less severe for them (Uslaner & Brown, 2005). In contrast, individuals with lower socio-economic status face greater risks in social exchanges; unfavorable interactions or betrayals can have more damaging consequences, making them more cautious in their dealings with strangers (Uslaner & Brown, 2005). In this line, how individuals are perceived plays a role in shaping expectations of their behavior, where interactions with higher status groups are preferred as they might be perceived as more reliable and competent associated with their economic and social resources (Salgado, Núñez, & Mackenna, 2021). In contrast, lower-status individuals might be perceived as less skillful and deprived, which can be relatively less preferred than those more affluent and educated individuals (Fiske & Markus, 2012). In this regard, status-based expectations underscore how socioeconomic status influences attitudes in terms of trust, cooperation, and conflict. Therefore, the hypotheses regarding how socioeconomic status affects attitudes read as follows:

H1a: Individuals with higher socio-economic status (income and education) are perceived as more trustworthy.

H1b: Individuals with higher socio-economic status (income and education) are considered more suitable for cooperation.

H1c: Individuals with higher socio-economic status (income and education) are perceived as less prone to conflict.

Hypotheses in the Sociocultural Domain

The sociocultural domain represents a relevant aspect of how people perceive others. In this regard, among the domains of migration and religion, societies strive to provide a common ground when diversity challenges social cohesion (Baldassarri & Abascal, 2020; Castillo et al., 2023). In some contexts, migrants may be perceived as an economic, social, or cultural threat, which can negatively affect attitudes toward migrants. Factors like competition for jobs, pressure on social services, or concerns about crime or national identity can shape these attitudes (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005). Thus, the hypotheses related to migration read as follows:

H2a: Individuals with a migration background are considered less trustworthy.

H2b: Individuals with a migration background are considered less suitable for cooperation.

H2c: Individuals with a migration background are considered more prone to conflict.

In the case of religion, being a member of a religious group can operate as a social marker that is associated with values and behavior that might affect how individuals are perceived. Therefore, expectations on how this individual might behave are also related to what extent people would like to engage in social interactions with persons from this group (Rowatt & Al-Kire, 2021). In this regard, religious people can be perceived as slow planners, non-impulsive, and more trustworthy than non-religious people (Moon, Krems, & Cohen, 2018). Thus, for those religious groups that are perceived as less conflictive and committed to the collective good, social interactions with them might be also preferred. Against this background, the expected hypotheses related to religion read as follows:

H3a: Individuals with a religious background are considered more trustworthy.

H3b: Individuals with a religious background are considered more suitable for cooperation.

H3c: Individuals with a religious background are considered less prone to conflict.

Hypothesis in the political domain

Political position can be an object of evaluation when it comes to establishing social relations. In this line, there are different possibilities in which individuals are evaluated according to their political views. In this regard, political identity plays an important role in motivating trustworthiness and openness to reciprocate. In general, these dimensions have been observed along the line of in/out group membership in the study of political polarization. However, it might be the case that people evaluate political positions (e.g. left-right) according to how distant they are from the poles as they represent more conflicting sides of the political spectrum. In this sense, centrists are often viewed as more moderate and open to compromise (Hernández-Lagos & Minor, 2020). Also, their positions can be seen as less extreme, potentially making them more approachable to individuals from diverse political backgrounds, which might enhance positive perceptions toward them. For instance, survey evidence shows that moderate political parties are more trusted than right and left-wing parties in Chile (ELSOC, 2022). By contrast, in Germany, right-wing people are less liked than left-wing people, who are liked and disliked equally (Groh-Samberg et al., 2023). Against this background, an expectation is that moderate (e.g. center) political views might "fall in the middle" and will be more preferred than those in the poles of the political spectrum. Therefore, the hypothesis for political position reads as follows:

H4a: Individuals with a moderate political orientation are considered more trustworthy.

H4b: Individuals with a moderate political orientation are considered more suitable for cooperation.

H4c: Individuals with a moderate political orientation are considered less prone to conflict.

Hypothesis in the value domain

Values also play an important role in social interactions. Based on the human values approach (Schwartz, 1992), in societies with higher value similarity, the levels of social trust tend to be higher. In other words, as societies share common values the willingness of people to see common goals among other fellow citizens is higher (Uslaner & Brown, 2005). According to Schwartz's human values theory, there are two main dimensions in which values can be organized. One dimension goes from self-transcendence to self-enhancement, which contrasts the welfare of others (benevolence, universalism) with self-interest (achievement, power). Another dimension is Openness to change vs. Conservation, which contrasts independence and novelty (self-direction, stimulation) with stability and tradition (security, conformity, tradition).

Values can importantly be associated with social interactions. Sociability preferences are also motivated by value similarity as inbred homophily nurtures trustworthy social interactions (Visser & Mirabile, 2004). However, it is also possible to expect that certain value profiles generate more sympathy than others. In this regard, given a certain dominant value profile in a given society, one expectation might be that individuals who are perceived as more similar to that profile are considered more open to contributing to the common good.

According to the human values approach, societies with greater value similarity exhibit higher levels of social trust (Beilmann & Lilleoja, 2015). Shared values foster a collective sense of purpose, increasing individuals' willingness to perceive common goals among fellow citizens. Additionally, sociability preferences are often driven by value similarity, as homophily based on shared values promotes trustworthy social interactions (McPherson et al., 2001). However, certain value profiles may elicit more positive responses than others. In societies with a dominant value profile, individuals whose values align closely with that profile are more likely to be perceived as open to contributing to the common good.

At the same time, according to the theory, specific social norms are closely related to certain value profiles. For instance, self-transcendence is closer to prosociality and open to helping others which can be closer to the aims of cooperative or trustworthy behavior. In contrast, self-enhancement represents the opposite of prosocial orientation as it focuses on self-interested motives. Thus, as values work as criteria for evaluation accordingly, it might be expected that those with human values closer to the aim of the common good and the welfare of others might be perceived as more trustworthy, more cooperative, and less conflictive. This alignment enhances their social desirability and perceived trustworthiness within the community. In this regard, the following hypotheses emerge:

H5a: Individuals with self-transcendence values are considered more trustworthy.

H5b: Individuals with self-transcendence values are considered more suitable for cooperation.

H5c: Individuals with self-transcendence values are considered less prone to conflict.

Hypothesis related to cross-group interactions

Social interactions are influential in shaping attitudes related to trust, willingness to cooperate, and perceived conflict. Homophily in social relations, defined as the tendency for networks to consist of members from the same group, is driven by preferences for same-group interactions and limited opportunities to connect with outgroup members (McPherson et al., 2001). This dynamic fosters stronger sympathy towards in-group members, conceptualized as relational trust, where individuals prefer social interactions with those who share similar group memberships, and the attraction intensifies with increasing group similarity (Fiske & Markus, 2012). Consequently, social cohesion-related attitudes are likely to strengthen in same-group interactions and weaken in cross-group interactions (Grigoryan, Cohrs, Boehnke, van de Vijver, & Easterbrook, 2022). Evidence shows that working-class individuals in more homogeneous working-class environments are more supportive of redistribution but less inclined to extend welfare services to migrants (Lindh et al., 2021). Similarly, class homogeneity reinforces stratified attitudes toward social cohesion, deepening class-based disparities in social trust, participation, sense of belonging, and orientation toward collective goals (Otero, Völker, Rözer, & Mollenhorst, 2022). Additionally, individuals from lower socioeconomic status exhibit greater trust in similar others while demonstrating reduced trust in individuals of higher socioeconomic status (Salgado et al., 2021). These findings highlight how homophily and socioeconomic factors interplay to shape trust and social cohesion within and across groups. In the context of a vignette study, we expect that cross-group interactions between the observer (respondent) and observed individual (vignette) characteristics also affect attitudes. Therefore, the cross-group hypothesis reads as follows:

H6a: Homophilic social interactions are associated with individuals being considered more trustworthy.

H6b: Homophilic social interactions are associated with individuals being considered suitable for cooperation.

H6c: Homophilic social interactions are associated with individuals being less prone to conflict.

Design Plan

Study type

Experiment - A researcher randomly assigns treatments to study subjects, this includes field or lab experiments. This is also known as an intervention experiment and includes randomized controlled trials.

Blinding

For studies involving human subjects, the subjects will not know the treatment group to which they have been assigned.

Is there any additional blinding in this study?

Concerning the factorial survey, the respondents will not know that a different set of vignettes is presented to different respondents.

Study design

A factorial vignette study will be conducted to address the question presented earlier. This method allows the researcher to understand the role of the observed characteristic of a fictitious subject or vignette in the evaluation by an external observer. Thus, the evaluations are adjusted based on the attributes of the vignettes. Each vignette is described in terms of specific demographic or socioeconomic characteristics (e.g., gender, income), which survey participants then evaluate. For efficiency reasons, each respondent evaluates only a limited number of vignettes to ensure variation between and within subjects in the expected responses (e.g., ten vignettes). The dimensions included in the design are shown in Table 1

Table 1: Attributes of fictitious persons

Dimension	Values	Label	Text (Chile)	Text (Germany)
ID	1-10	A B C D E F G H I J	"A" "B" "C" "D" "E" "F" "G" "H" "I" "J"	<i>Same</i>
Gender	1 2	Man Woman	"Male" "Female"	<i>Same</i>
Age	1 2 3	25 years 45 years 65 years	"25" "45" "65"	<i>Same</i>
Migratory background	1 2 3	No immigration history 2nd generation 1st generation	"Born in Chile, of Chilean parents." "Born in Chile, of Peruvian parents" "Born in Venezuela, he came to Chile"	"Born in Germany, of German parents." "Born in Germany, of Turkish parents" "Born in Syria, he came to Germany"
Religion	1 2 3 4	1st Religious group 2nd Religious group 3rd Religious group Non-religious	"Catholic" "Evangelical" "Jewish" "Non-religious"	"Christian" "Muslim" "Jewish" "Non-religious"
Education	1 2 3	Low Medium High	"Finished Primary Education". "Finished Highschool" "Went to college and earned a bachelor's degree."	"After leaving secondary school, an apprenticeship"/1st generation: "simple vocational training" "After leaving secondary school, vocational training"/1st generation: "qualified vocational training" "After leaving school, university studies"/1st generation: "university studies"
Labor status	1 2 3	Employed Unemployed Domestic labor	"employed" "unemployed" "homemaker"	"employed" "unemployed" "homemaker"
Income	1 2 3	Low Medium High	"\$500.000 (CLP)" "\$910.000 (CLP)" "\$4.100.000 (CLP)"	"€850" "€2.500" "€6.000"
Political orientation	1 2 3 4	Left Center Right Politically disinterested	"left-wing" "center" "right-wing" "disinterested"	"left-wing" "center" "right-wing" "disinterested"

Value orientation	1	Self-transcendence Conservation Self-improvement Openness to change	"Being tolerant and helping the people around you"	"Being tolerant and helping the people around you"
	2		"Feeling safe, adapting to others, and respecting traditions"	"Feeling safe, adapting to others, and respecting traditions"
	3		"achieving personal success and being in charge"	"achieving personal success and being in charge"
	4		"Making your own decisions and leading a fun and adventurous life."	"Making your own decisions and leading a fun and adventurous life."

The present design has a combination of $2 \times 3 \times 3 \times 4 \times 3 \times 3 \times 3 \times 4 \times 4$ according to the level of each dimension, which represents a factorial universe of 31,104 possible combinations. To reduce the number of combinations, the D-Efficient algorithm designed in SAS software was implemented. This method optimizes the number of vignettes in a two-step process. First, the optimal number of vignettes within the factorial universe is estimated, which increases as more descriptors are incorporated into the vignettes. Therefore, the algorithm first selects the optimal number of vignettes and then organizes them into blocks, ensuring the orthogonality of the characteristics in each vignette. The optimal solution obtained is a total of 144 vignettes distributed in 15 decks, where 9 decks contain 10 vignettes and 6 decks contain 9 vignettes.

In this way, a smaller number of vignettes nested in blocks is available, with these blocks randomly assigned to each respondent. The complete representation of the dimensions and levels of each characteristic can be seen as follows:

Person [ID] is [Gender] and [Age] years old. [She/he] was born in [Migration Background] and is [Religion]. Person [ID] has completed [Education], is [Employment Status], and has a monthly income of [Income] at [her/his] disposal. [She/he] defines [herself/himself] politically [Political Orientation]. To person [ID], it is important to [Value Orientation].

For the survey, the plan is to design an instrument with a flow that includes two main sections: (1) introduction and (2) vignette evaluation.

After the vignette is presented to the person, they respond to a series of questions. For example, "Imagine you meet person [ID] through your circle of acquaintances. How likely is it that they would get along with person [ID]?" The respondent then proceeds to answer on a scale where 0 is "not likely at all" and 10 is "extremely likely."

Randomization

The questions related to the factorial survey have four randomizations:

1. Only one of the 15 decks is randomly presented to each respondent.
2. The order of the 9 to 10 vignettes within the deck is also randomized.

In the case of the Chilean study, the main questionnaire will be programmed using formr (<https://formr.org/>). Whereas in the German study, the questionnaire will be programmed by the company in charge of the fieldwork and recruitment of the participants. Thus, the randomizer provided by this platform will be used. In all randomizations, the elements will be evenly presented.

Sampling Plan

Existing Data

Registration before analysis of the data

Explanation of existing data

Data collection procedures

An external company will be in charge of collecting the data. Respondents will be invited to participate in the survey with an incentive provided by said company. To achieve greater representativeness of the sample, the quota method will be used, that is, the program will only allow responses to respondents with the required demographic characteristics. The quotas used were age, sex, and education.

No files selected

Sample size

Regarding data collection, the Chilean sample will be conducted by an independent online study with the support of a specialized company, aiming to reach a sample of 3500 cases. For Germany, the sample comes from a subsample of the Research Institute Social Cohesion Household Panel Survey (N = 4000).

Sample size rationale

No response

Stopping rule

The rule of detention is to reach the number of respondents indicated in the quotas. However, there may be modifications depending on the contingencies of the fieldwork and the response rates.

Variables

Manipulated variables

No response

No files selected

Measured variables

a) Factorial survey section

Nine to ten different descriptions are presented, each on a separate question sheet. After each description, the respondent is asked three questions. Here is an example:

“Person [ID] is female and is 25 years old. She was born in Chile, has Peruvian parents and is Catholic. Person [ID] went to college and earned a university degree, is a homeowner and has a monthly income of \$250,000 at her disposal. She considers herself politically centrist. For Person [ID] it is important to achieve personal success and be in charge.”

- 1) Imagine you know person [ID] through your circle of acquaintances. How likely is it that you would get along with person [ID]?
- 2) Imagine you are faced with a task that you cannot perform on your own. How likely would you be to ask the person [ID] for help?
- 3) Imagine that person [ID] moves into your neighborhood. How likely is it that you would come into conflict with that person?

The response categories are 0 is "Not likely at all" to 10 is "absolutely likely".

b) Sociodemographic

Gender: What is your gender? The alternatives are: Male, Female, Other, or Prefer not to answer.

Age: Could you indicate your age? Respondents can provide their age within the range of 18 to 110 years.

c) Socioeconomic

Education (Chile): What is your educational level? The alternatives are: Incomplete Primary Education, Complete Primary Education, Incomplete Secondary Education, Complete Secondary Education, Incomplete Technical/Vocational Education, Complete Technical/Vocational Education, Incomplete University Education, Complete University Education, or Postgraduate Studies (Master's or Doctorate).

Highest School-Leaving Certificate (Germany): What is the highest school-leaving certificate that you've earned? Response categories: Lower secondary school, secondary school, O-level or equivalent qualification, polytechnic secondary school, advanced technical certificate, higher secondary vocational school, high school, A-level, general or subject-linked higher education entrance qualification, other school leaving certificate, currently a full-time student attending general school, and left school without graduating.

Highest Educational Qualification (Germany): What is the highest educational qualification you've earned? Response categories: Vocational in-company training (apprenticeship), professional qualification from a vocational school and training program, preparatory service for the intermediate civil service in public administration, completion of one-year training at a healthcare school, completion of two-to-three years training at a healthcare school, completion of training as a care worker, graduation from a technical school in GDR, graduation from a technical school, master craftsperson school, administration and business academy, or technical academy, Bachelor, Diploma/Master/Magister/State examination, PhD, other degree, still in vocational training (e.g., preparatory vocational year, apprenticeship, internship, or studies), currently a student in career-oriented schooling or at a technical school, and no vocational qualification or not in vocational training.

Household Income Bracket: (Chile) Into which of the following income brackets does your household fall? *For this question, consider net monthly income from salaries and wages for all working members of your household (including pensions, contributions from relatives or friends, rental income, and others).* Response categories: Less than \$280,000 CLP net monthly, between \$280,001 and \$380,000 CLP net monthly, between \$380,001 and \$470,000 CLP net monthly, between \$470,001 and \$610,000 CLP net monthly, between \$610,001 and \$730,000 CLP net monthly, between \$730,001 and \$890,000 CLP net monthly, between \$890,001 and \$1,100,000 CLP net monthly, between \$1,100,001 and \$2,700,000 CLP net monthly, between \$2,700,001 and \$4,100,000 CLP net monthly, more than \$4,100,001 CLP net monthly.

Household Income Numeric: (Germany) What did you earn from your work last month? Please state both: – gross income, which means income before deduction of taxes and social security – and net income, which means income after deduction of taxes, social security, and unemployment and health insurance. Responses are in Euros.

Household Size: What is the number of people living in your household? Response category: Open-ended response.

Number of Books at Home: Approximately how many books are there in your household? Response categories: Between 0 and 10 books, between 11 and 25 books, between 26 and 100 books, between 101 and 200 books, between 201 and 500 books, more than 500 books, I don't know, I prefer not to answer.

d) Sociocultural

Religious Affiliation (Chile): How would you describe yourself in religious terms? Please select one of the following options. Response categories: Catholic, Evangelical, Protestant (Lutheran, Anglican, Presbyterian churches), Jewish, believer but not affiliated, atheist, agnostic, none, I don't know, I prefer not to answer.

Religion or Confession (Germany): Whether you are a member of a church or religious community or not: do you feel that you belong to a particular religion or confession? Response categories: Rome Catholic, Evangelical/Protestant (Evangelical Church in Germany, without free churches), Evangelical free church, Eastern Orthodox, Jewish, Muslim/Islam, Far Eastern religious communities like Buddhism, Hinduism, Sikh, Shinto, Tao, any other religion or confession, and no, I don't have any religion or confession.

Mother's Country of Residence at Birth (Chile): In which country was your mother living when you were born? Response categories: Chile, Venezuela, Bolivia, Peru, Colombia, Haiti, Ecuador, Argentina, Dominican Republic, Spain, Brazil, Cuba, Paraguay, and others.

Parents from Germany (Germany): Next, we would like to know more about the origins of your parents and grandparents. Were both your parents born in Germany? Alternatives are: Yes, No.

e) Political

Political Affiliation (Chile): Traditionally, political positions are generally defined as leaning toward the left, center, or right. Please indicate which of the following positions you identify with or sympathize with the most. Response categories: Right, center-right, center, center-left, left, independent, none, I don't know, I prefer not to answer.

Political Affiliation (Germany): In politics, people often talk about 'left' and 'right' to mark different political attitudes. If you think about your own political attitude: Where would you place yourself? The alternatives are 0 Entirely left 1 to 10 [10] 10 Entirely right

d) Value and attitudes

Human Values: The scale consists of 21 short verbal portraits of different people describing the importance of different values to them. For each item, respondents indicate how similar the person described in the item is to themselves. Thus, respondents' personal values are inferred from the implicit values of the people they view as similar to themselves.

There is a 6-point rating scale with the following categories: 1 = "Very much like me", 2 = "Like me", 3 = "Somewhat like me", 4 = "A little like me", 5 = "Not like me", 6 = "Not like me at all". Alternatively, the response category "Don't know" is offered.

- 1. Considers having original and creative ideas important. Likes to do things their own way.
- 2. Being wealthy is important. Wants to have a lot of money and expensive things.
- 3. Thinks it's important that everyone is treated equally. Believes everyone should have the same opportunities in life.
- 4. It's important to show abilities. Wants everyone to admire them for what they do.
- 5. Living in a safe environment is important. Avoids anything that might jeopardize safety.
- 6. Enjoys surprises and is always looking to try new things. Thinks it's important to do a variety of things in life.
- 7. Believes people should do as they are told. Thinks rules should always be followed, even when no one is watching.
- 8. It's important to listen to people who are different. Even when disagreeing, seeks to understand them.
- 9. Acting humbly and modestly is important. Tries not to attract attention.
- 10. Having fun is important. Likes to indulge in pleasures.
- 11. Making independent decisions is important. Prefers to be free and not rely on others.
- 12. Helping those around is very important. Cares about others' well-being.
- 13. Being successful is important. Desires recognition for achievements.
- 14. It's important that the government guarantees safety against all threats. Desires a strong state capable of defending its citizens.
- 15. Seeks adventure and enjoys taking risks. Wants an exciting life.
- 16. Always behaving correctly is important. Strives to avoid doing anything that might be considered wrong.
- 17. Gaining respect from others is important. Wants others to follow directions.
- 18. Being loyal to friends is important. Values dedication to those who are close.
- 19. Firmly believes people should care about nature. Thinks protecting the environment is important.
- 20. Traditions are important. Strives to follow the customs of religion or family.
- 21. Seeks opportunities to have fun. Doing things that bring pleasure is important.

Living well together: The scale consists of 12 statements describing different perspectives on what it means to live well together in a society. For each item, respondents indicate the extent to which the statement corresponds to their personal beliefs. Thus, respondents' attitudes about social cohesion and societal values are inferred from the degree to which they agree with the statements provided.

There is a 5-point rating scale with the following categories: 1 = “Not at all,” 2 = “Rather not,” 3 = “In part,” 4 = “Rather so,” and 5 = “Totally.”

“One can have different views on how people should live together in a society. To what extent do the following statements correspond to your beliefs? For me, living well together in a society means that ...”:

- ... everyone has a place in society
- ... everyone can develop freely according to their abilities and inclinations
- ... all share the same values, customs, and traditions
- ... people from different cultural backgrounds living together
- ... everyone obeys law and order
- ... everyone can live the way they want to
- ... differences of opinion are discussed and compromises are worked out
- ... someone is there to show you the way
- ... the families and neighborhood are tightly knit
- ... you can live life freely and independent from others
- ... everyone has an equal chance to influence political decisions
- ... everyone is prepared to self-restrict for the good of society

Indices

No response

No files selected

Analysis Plan

Statistical models

To evaluate the hypotheses, multilevel linear models will be estimated. Given that vignettes will be nested within respondents, multilevel regression the outcomes can be affected by the vignettes’ characteristics (level-1) and the respondents’ characteristics (level-2). At the same time, according to the second hypothesis, it is also possible to estimate cross-level interaction between the respondents’ characteristics and the vignettes’ characteristics (e.g. respondents’ socioeconomic status x vignette SES)

No files selected

Transformations

The response variables will be transformed into numeric variables for estimation purposes.

Inference criteria

A p-value less than or equal to 0.05 will be used as the inference criterion.

Data exclusion

We will exclude respondents who do not answer at least 60% of the vignettes.

Missing data

No response

Exploratory analysis

As exploratory analyses, we will include interactions between the socioeconomic, sociocultural, and value dimensions. For instance, to test whether migration background mitigates the positive association between socioeconomic status an interaction between SES and migration can be estimated.

Other

Other

No response

References

- Baldassarri, D., & Abascal, M. (2020). Diversity and prosocial behavior. *Science (New York, N.Y.)*, 369, 1183–1187.
- Beilmann, M., & Lilleoja, L. (2015). Social trust and value similarity: The relationship between social trust and human values in Europe. *Studies of Transition States and Societies*, 7, 19–30.
- Blau, P. (1977). A Macrosociological Theory of Social Structure. *American Journal of Sociology*, 83, 26–54.
- Castillo, J. C., Bonhomme, M., Miranda, D., & Iturra, J. (2023). Social cohesion and attitudinal changes toward migration: A longitudinal perspective amid the COVID-19 pandemic. *Frontiers in Sociology*, 7. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fsoc.2022.1009567>
- Castillo, J. C., Olivos, F., & Azar, A. (2019). Deserving a Just Pension: A Factorial Survey Approach. *Social Science Quarterly*, 100, 359–378.
- Chan, J., To, H.-P., & Chan, E. (2006). Reconsidering Social Cohesion: Developing a Definition and Analytical Framework for Empirical Research. *Social Indicators Research*, 75, 273–302.
- Diprete, T. A., Gelman, A., McCormick, T., Teitler, J., & Zheng, T. (2011). Segregation in Social Networks Based on Acquaintanceship and Trust. *Source: American Journal of Sociology AJS*, 116, 1234–1283.
- ELSOC, S. T. (2022). *Estudio Longitudinal Social de Chile* [Data set]. Harvard Dataverse.
- Evans, M. D. R., Kelley, J., & Kolosi, T. (1992). Images of Class: Public Perceptions in Hungary and Australia. *American Sociological Review*, 57, 461.
- Festinger, L. (1954). A Theory of Social Comparison Processes. *Human Relations*, 7, 117–140.
- Fiske, S. T., & Markus, H. R. (2012). *Facing social class: How societal rank influences interaction*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Green, A., & Janmaat, J. G. (2011). *Regimes of Social Cohesion*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK.
- Grigoryan, L., Cohrs, J. C., Boehnke, K., van de Vijver, F. A. J. R., & Easterbrook, M. J. (2022). Multiple categorization and intergroup bias: Examining the generalizability of three theories of intergroup relations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 122, 34–52.
- Groh-Samberg, O., Cornesse, C., Gerlitz, J.-Y., Kroh, M., Lengfeld, H., Liebig, S., ... Zinn, S. (2023). *German Social Cohesion Panel 2021 - Anchor Persons: Dataset and Documentation* (Version 1.0.0) [Data set]. RDC-RISC, RDC-SOEP.
- Hernández-Lagos, P., & Minor, D. (2020). Political identity and trust. *Quarterly Journal of Political Science*, 15, 337–367.
- Jasso, G. (1990). Methods for the Theoretical and Empirical Analysis of Comparison Processes. *Sociological Methodology*, 20, 369.
- Lindh, A., Andersson, A. B., & Völker, B. (2021). The Missing Link: Network Influences on Class Divides in Political Attitudes. *European Sociological Review*, 37, 695–712.
- Mau, S. (2003). *The moral economy of welfare states: Britain and Germany compared*. London ; New York: Routledge.
- McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J. M. (2001). Birds of a Feather: Homophily in Social Networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 415–444.
- Merton, R. K., & Rossi, A. (1968). Contributions to the Theory of Reference Group Behavior. *Social Theory and Social Structure*, 279–334.
- Mijs, J. (2018). Inequality Is a Problem of Inference: How People Solve the Social Puzzle of Unequal Outcomes. *Societies*, 8, 64.
- Moon, J. W., Krems, J. A., & Cohen, A. B. (2018). Religious People Are Trusted Because They Are

- Viewed as Slow Life-History Strategists. *Psychological Science*, 29, 947–960.
- OECD. (2023). *International Migration Outlook 2023*. OECD.
- Otero, G., Völker, B., Rözer, J., & Mollenhorst, G. (2022). The lives of others: Class divisions, network segregation, and attachment to society in Chile. *The British Journal of Sociology*, 73, 754–785.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup Contact Theory. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 49, 65–85.
- Piketty, T., & Goldhammer, A. (2014). *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*. Harvard University Press. JSTOR.
- Rowatt, W. C., & Al-Kire, R. L. (2021). Dimensions of religiousness and their connection to racial, ethnic, and atheist prejudices. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 40, 86–91.
- Sachweh, P., & Eicher, D. (2023). Deserving more? A vignette study on the role of self-interest and deservingness opinions for popular support for wealth taxation in Germany. *Journal of Social Policy*, 1–19.
- Salgado, M., Núñez, J., & Mackenna, B. (2021). Expectations of trustworthiness in cross-status interactions. *Social Science Research*, 99, 102596.
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Countries. In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1–65). Elsevier.
- Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005). Relationships Between Intergroup Contact and Prejudice Among Minority and Majority Status Groups. *Psychological Science*, 16, 951–957.
- Uslaner, E. M., & Brown, M. (2005). Inequality, Trust, and Civic Engagement. *American Politics Research*, 33, 868–894.
- Visser, P. S., & Mirabile, R. R. (2004). Attitudes in the Social Context: The Impact of Social Network Composition on Individual-Level Attitude Strength. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 87, 779–795.