Supplemental Materials:

Group-Based Relative Deprivation Explains Endorsement of Extremism among Western-Born Muslims

For data, see: https://osf.io/zny2m/?view_only=a2f2ff4c96b94abd9ef1dc7c0ccf27ef

Table S1

*Overview of the samples, N, **Birthplace** and **Gender** in Study 1-7*

Study	N	% Foreign born	% Native/West born	% Female	% Male
1	59	44	56	39	61
2	230	67	33	60	40
3	259	55	45	69	31
4	243	52	48	47	53
5	104	51	49	55	45
6	366	51	49	49	51
7	60	47	53	45	55

Table S2

*Self-Reported **Socioeconomic Status** in Study 1-7*

Study	% upper	% upper middle	% middle	% lower middle	% working class
1	-	19.3	61.4	14.0	5.3
2	2.2	13.8	71.4	11.6	0.9
3	1.2	12.5	68.0	13.3	5.1
4	6.4	19.7	48.3	18.4	7.3
5	4.2	12.5	42.7	29.2	11.5
6	-	18.0	67.5	12.6	1.9
7	6.7	23.3	33.3	28.3	8.3

Socioeconomic status was measured by asking participants to indicate which socioeconomic class they belong to: Upper class, Upper middle class, middle class, lower middle class, or working class.

Table S3

Birthplace and Country of Residence Among Participants in Study 6

Country of residence	Born in Pakistan	Born in the West	Total
UK	19	64	83
USA	13	59	72
Canada	13	26	39
Germany	17	11	28
Norway	13	2	15
France	5	9	14
Australia	4	9	13
Sweden	13	0	13
Switzerland	12	0	12
Denmark	11	0	11
Austria	7	3	10
Spain	8	2	10
Belgium	8	0	8
Netherlands	7	1	8
Italy	7	0	7
Portugal	7	0	7
Greece	6	0	6
Poland	5	0	5
Ireland	4	0	4
Scotland	1	0	1
Total	180	186	366

Detailed description of recruitment procedures

Study 1
Data for Study 1 was collected from Muslim community centers and Mosques in three major cities in Denmark. Initially, we established contact with imams and community leaders to obtain permission to visit targeted localities. After gaining permission, a member of our research team was permitted to attend formal and informal meetings held in the community centers and Mosques. Those attending the events were directly approached and invited to participant in the study. Participants were given three options: they could (1) fill out the survey on the spot, (2) take it with them and bring it back the following week, or (3) take it with them and return it by mail (envelop and stamp were provided). The participation rate was low since people only attended events for brief and specific social and religious reasons, which meant they often had no time to take part in the study. The percentage of returned questionnaires by mail was approximately 25%. Moreover, most of the surveys were incomplete (in many cases left entirely blank), and people often forgot to return the survey when they returned to the center/Mosque the following week.

Studies 2-5
Our previous experience was that standard sampling methods among studied populations produce extremely low response rate. In order to overcome this obstacle, we established contact with well-known and well-respected members of Muslim networks in Denmark and Belgium. For example, we reached out to spokespeople for Muslims in Denmark, namely the head imam for the main mosque in Copenhagen and the president of largest Muslim association in Denmark. Eliciting help from these individuals proved to be crucial in creating a culture of trust, and we were able to connect with larger Muslim communities *via* email correspondence.

We also relied on Facebook. In order to maximize the diversity of our participants, we identified a large number of ideologically diverse Islam- and Muslim-related Facebook groups in Denmark and Belgium; we included groups that primarily targeted practicing Muslims with strong religious beliefs and adherence to traditional Islamic values; we also included groups that primarily targeted moderate, well-educated, secular Muslims. We selected at random 32 groups from Denmark and 15 from Belgium from which to recruit our participants. We obtained permission from administrators of Facebook groups with the help of our established network of contacts, and then individually invited each person to participate in the study. In addition, we posted the survey on the walls of each selected Facebook group.

Study 6
Participants for Study 6 were approached by four university students (two from the public-sector and two from the private-sector) and three research assistants, who come from various socio-economic backgrounds. This approach was used to ensure diversity in the pool of participants by reaching out to various social and religious communities. A combination of convenience and snowball sampling was used both for participants born inside Pakistan and for ones born in the West. Many of these participants were approached both directly and *via* various Facebook pages and other portals for Pakistani immigrants living abroad.

Study 7
For Study 7, snowball sampling technique was used. Study participants were recruited at their community meetings in three largest cities in Denmark. We reached out to personal contacts to distribute our survey to a small sample from the targeted subpopulation, both during social gatherings and online. Individuals who agreed to participate were also asked to refer/recommend others for the study.

Table S4

Measures and Items Included in Study 1-6

Muslim identification

1. Being a Muslim is important to me. [a]
2. I feel strongly connected to other Muslims.
3. I strongly identify with other Muslims.
4. I feel very connected to my religious community.

Perceived injustice

1. Muslims in Muslim countries suffer because of the foreign policy of Western countries.
2. The foreign policy of Western countries towards Muslim nations cannot be justified.
3. The foreign policy of Western countries harms Muslims worldwide.
4. The foreign policy of Western countries is anti-Islamic worldwide.
5. Western military interventions in Muslim countries are immoral.

Group-based anger

1. I feel angry when I think of Western countries' foreign policies towards Muslim countries.
2. I feel outrage when I think of Western countries' foreign policy towards Muslim countries.
3. I feel furious when I think of Western countries' foreign policy towards Muslim countries.

Violent behavioural Intentions

1. I am ready to use violence against other people in order to achieve something I consider very important.
2. I am ready to do everything in my power to change Western countries' foreign policy towards Muslim countries.

Group-based relative deprivation

1. Muslims should have the same opportunities to improve their lives as non-Muslim westerners have.
2. Muslims will always be at the bottom and non-Muslim westerners at the top of the social ladder.
3. I feel furious about Muslim' limited opportunities to get ahead in their lives.
4. I think Muslims are disadvantaged because the West oppresses them.
5. Muslims are disadvantaged because the West keeps them down.
6. I feel angry because Non-Muslim westerners discriminate against Muslim.

[a]This item was not included in the pilot study

Table S5

Reliability indices for the included measures in Study 1-6

Variable	*Study* 1	*Study* 2	*Study* 3	*Study* 4	*Study* 5	*Study* 6
Group-based relative deprivation	.85	.80	.79	.89	.92	.79
Muslim identification	.91[a]	.92	.90	.94	.72	.90
Perceived injustice	.86	.87	.88	.89	.89	.60
Group-based anger	.59	.91	.91	.84	.94	.94
Violent behavioral intentions	.89	.79	.61	.87	.88	.64

[a]This scale consisted of 3 items while the remaining samples responded to 4 items..

Multigroup confirmatory factor analyses

To examine the interrelations between all the study variables we ran multigroup confirmatory factor analyses. More specifically, we examined if Muslim identification, perceived injustice, group-based anger, group-based relative deprivation, and violent behavioral intentions would comprise five factors in each Muslim sample (exempting sample 7 with the Sri Lankan Tamils). Intercepts, factor variances, and error variances were free to vary across samples, reflecting the possibility of different item mean scores and overall variability, while we assumed that the loadings would be equivalent across samples (i.e. testing metric invariance). We ran the model without the first item of the Muslim identification scale as it was not included in sample 1. Such a model had borderline acceptable fit, $\chi2(922) = 2324.85$, $p < .001$, CFI = .911, RMSEA = .085, 90% CI [.081, .090], SRMR = .100. Adding a few residual correlations (between item 4 and 5 of the deprivation scale, in sample 3 and 6 and items 2 and 3 of the same scale in sample 4) improved the model to acceptable levels, $\chi2(919) = 2112.00$, $p < .001$, CFI = .925, RMSEA = .079, 90% CI [.074, .083], SRMR = .098. In other words, a few items were interpreted as closer together in some samples, but the overall structure seemed to be fairly invariant across all studies.

Table S6
Confirmatory factor analyses

	Chi-Square	df	p	RMSEA	CFI	TLI	SRMR
Sample 1	197.64	141	.001	.083	.917	.900	.075
Sample 2	336.74	159	.000	.070	.936	.924	.061
Sample 3	341.15	158	.000	.067	.943	.932	.053
Sample 4	269.75	158	.000	.054	.968	.962	.052
Sample 5	255.87	160	.000	.076	.948	.938	.050
Sample 6	388.91	158	.000	.063	.952	.943	.049
Total Sample	693.79	160	.000	.051	.965	.958	.035

Table S7

Mean (Standard Deviations) for the Variables in Study 1-6

Sample/birth place	Group-based relative deprivation	Muslim identification	Perceived injustice	Group-based anger	Violent behave. intentions
Study 1					
Foreign born	4.13 (0.58)	4.80 (0.56)	3.65 (1.03)	3.83 (0.80)	3.81 (1.04)
Native born	**5.59** (0.46)	**5.33** (0.91)	**5.12** (0.79)	**4.64** (0.83)	**4.42** (1.01)
Study 2					
Foreign born	4.54 (1.25)	4.67 (1.76)	4.89 (1.49)	4.21 (1.70)	1.62 (1.22)
Native born	**4.69** (1.33)	**5.79** (1.34)	**5.24** (1.32)	**4.90** (1.71)	**1.92** (1.41)
Study 3					
Foreign born	4.50 (1.31)	4.95 (1.69)	4.96 (1.54)	4.32 (1.82)	1.47 (0.96)
Native born	**4.84** (1.40)	**5.87** (1.26)	**5.12** (1.45)	**4.68** (1.81)	**1.59** (1.23)
Study 4					
Foreign born	3.88 (1.32)	3.50 (1.30)	4.64 (1.24)	4.56 (1.15)	3.74 (1.27)
Native born	**4.81** (0.94)	**4.28** (1.29)	**5.20** (1.06)	**5.03** (1.22)	**4.53** (1.14)
Study 5					
Foreign born	3.59 (0.94)	4.68 (1.29)	4.55 (0,92)	4.13 (1.21)	2.20 (0.93)
Native born	**5.24** (0.77)	**6.02** (1.10)	**5.51** (0,96)	**5.25** (0.91)	**3.75** (0.85)
Study 6					
Foreign born	3.87 (0.78)	4.49 (1.14)	4.16 (0.85)	3.78 (1.24)	2.64 (1.13)
Native born	**5.09** (1.08)	**5.58** (1.40)	**5.36** (1.60)	**5.03** (1.53)	**3.67** (1.68)

Means in **boldface** are higher than respective means scores for the other group (foreign born versus native/West born) within the sample – for significance testing of these correlations see the last line in Table S6.

Table S8

Bivariate Correlations between Variables in Study 1/Study 2/Study 3/Study 4/Study 5/Study 6

Variable	1	2	3	4	5
1. Group-based relative deprivation	-				
2. Muslim identification	**.38/.32/.35/.50/.62/.42**	-			
3. Perceived injustice	**.72/.46/.47/.49/.68/.56**	**.35/.38/.41/.33**/**.60/.44**	-		
4. Group-based anger	**.55**/**.58**/**.60**/.51/.67/**.65**	**.30/.44/.43/.31**/**.54/.51**	**.66**/**.73**/**.69**/**.52**/**.77/.61**	-	
5. Violent behavioral intentions	**.44**/**.25**/**.34**/**.37**/**.76/.54**	**.27/.16/.19/.59**/**.61/.39**	**.51**/.09/**.22**/**.35**/**.63/.43**	**.53**/**.21**/**.35**/**.56**/**.54/.54**	-
6. Birthplace[a]	**.82**/.06/**.13**/**.38**/**.70/.54**	**.33/.30/.29/.29**/**.49/.39**	**.64**/.11/.05/**.24**/**.46/.42**	**.45**/**.18**/.10/**.20**/**.46/.41**	**.29**/.11/.05/**.31**/**.66/.34**

[a]Birthplace coded as foreign born = 0, native/West born = 1.

Boldfaced coefficients are significant $p < .05$ (two-tailed).

Table S9

*Spearman's Rank-Order Correlations (p-value) between **Socioeconomic Status** and Key Variables*

Variable	*Study 1*	*Study 2*	*Study 3*	*Study 4*	*Study 5*	*Study 6*
Group-based relative deprivation	-.02 (.90)	-.07 (.31)	-.11 (.07)	-.01 (.92)	.16 (.13)	.08 (.13)
Muslim identification	.04 (.75)	-.07 (.28)	**.16** (.01)	-.04 (.56)	.15 (.15)	**.10** (.05)
Perceived injustice	.14 (.31)	.00 (.97)	-.02 (.81)	.03 (.71)	.15 (.15)	.04 (.45)
Group-based anger	.12 (.36)	-.01 (.91)	-.01 (.83)	-.10 (.14)	.09 (.37)	**.11** (.04)
Violent behavioral intentions	-.02 (.87)	-.06 (.36)	.03 (.60)	-.06 (.40)	.12 (.26)	.06 (.28)
Birthplace[a]	.05 (.74)	.00 (.98)	-.10 (.13)	-.11 (.11)	.16 (.12)	**.18** (.00)
N (vary as a function om missing)	57	220-223	254-256	231-234	96	366

[a]Birthplace coded as foreign born = 0, native/West born = 1.

Boldfaced coefficients are significant (two-tailed)

Table S10

Weighted Mean Indirect Effect of Birthplace on Violent Behavioral Intentions for Various Mediators (Studies 1-6)

Mediator	Weighted mean effect size	Standard error	95% CI	*z*	*p*
Muslim identification	0.24	0.06	[0.12, 0.35]	3.99	.001
Perceived injustice	0.27	0.08	[0.10, 0.43]	3.22	.001
Group-based anger	0.28	0.08	[0.12, 0.44]	3.39	.001
Group-based relative deprivation	0.43	0.13	[0.18, 0.69]	3.29	.001
Group-based relative deprivation (4 items)	0.39	0.13	[0.13, 0.64]	2.98	.003

Table S11

*Bootstrapped Unstandardized Indirect Effect (standard error)[95% CI] of Birthplace on Respective Dependent Variables with **Socioeconomic Status** as a Mediator*

Study	Muslim identification	Perceived injustice	Group-based anger	Violent behavioral intentions
1	0.001 (0.03) [-0.06, 0.06]	0.004 (0.06) [-0.17, 0.07]	0.003 (0.05) [-0.15, 0.05]	0.000 (0.05) [-0.15, 0.04]
2	0.002 (0.02) [-0.04, 0.05]	0.001 (0.01) [-0.14, 0.04]	0.001 (0.02) [-0.03, 0.06]	0.002 (0.02) [-0.03, 0.07]
3	-0.062 (0.04) [-0.16, 0.01]	0.006 (0.03) [-0.05, 0.06]	-0.001 (0.03) [-0.07, 0.06]	-0.002 (0.02) [-0.03, 0.03]
4	0.000 (0.02) [-0.04, 0.04]	-0.015 (0.02) [-0.07, 0.01]	0.012 (0.02) [-0.02, 0.05]	0.005 (0.019) [-0.03, 0.05]
5	0.003 (0.06) [-0.13, 0.12]	0.015 (0.04) [-0.06, 0.11]	-0.003 (0.04) [-0.09, 0.09]	0.005 (0.03) [-0.06, 0.08]
6	0.012 (0.03) [-0.04, 0.07]	-0.022 (0.02) [-0.07, 0.02]	0.020 (0.03) [-0.03, 0.08]	-0.00 (0.03) [-0.06, 0.05]

Independent variable: Birthplace (foreign born = 0, native/West born = 1). Mediator: **Socioeconomic status**. All analyses were conducted using SPSS-add on PROCESS with 5000 bias-corrected bootstrap. For more details see, see Supplemental Online Materials.

Table S12

Correlations, Reliabilities, and Means (Standard Deviations) for the Variables in Study 7

	Correlations					*M* (*SD*)		*α*
Variable	1	2	3	4	5	foreign born	native born	
1. Group-based relative deprivation	-					3.22 (1.07)	3.39 (0.95)	.86
2. Group identification	.21	-				6.05 (0.97)	6.06 (0.81)	.89
3. Perceived injustice	**.67**	.07	-			3.33 (0.99)	3.31 (0.99)	.89
4. Group-based anger	**.63**	.13	**.74**	-		3.29 (1.13)	3.13 (1.18)	.96
5. Violent behavioral intentions	**.65**	.19	**.74**	**.74**	-	2.89 (1.23)	2.78 (1.21)	.68
6. Birthplace[a]	.09	.01	-.01	-.07	-.05	-	-	-

[a]Coded as foreign born = 0, native/West born = 1. **Boldfaced** coefficients are significant $p < .05$ (two-tailed).

Table S13

Results of Tukey's HSD Test of the Means **Group-Based Relative Deprivation** *Across All Studies*

Study	Study	Mean Difference	SE	*p*	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower	Upper
1	2	0.39	0.18	0.03	0.04	0.74
	3	0.29	0.18	0.10	-0.05	0.64
	4	0.62	0.18	0.00	0.28	0.97
	5	0.55	0.20	0.01	0.16	0.94
	6	0.45	0.17	0.01	0.12	0.79
	7	1.63	0.22	0.00	1.19	2.07
2	1	-0.39	0.18	0.03	-0.74	-0.04
	3	-0.10	0.11	0.39	-0.31	0.12
	4	0.24	0.11	0.04	0.02	0.46
	5	0.16	0.14	0.27	-0.12	0.44
	6	0.06	0.10	0.54	-0.14	0.26
	7	1.24	0.18	0.00	0.90	1.59
3	1	-0.29	0.18	0.10	-0.64	0.05
	2	0.10	0.11	0.39	-0.12	0.31
	4	0.33	0.11	0.00	0.12	0.54
	5	0.25	0.14	0.07	-0.02	0.53
	6	0.16	0.10	0.11	-0.04	0.35
	7	1.34	0.17	0.00	1.00	1.68
4	1	-0.62	0.18	0.00	-0.97	-0.28
	2	-0.24	0.11	0.04	-0.46	-0.02
	3	-0.33	0.11	0.00	-0.54	-0.12
	5	-0.08	0.14	0.59	-0.36	0.20
	6	-0.17	0.10	0.09	-0.37	0.03
	7	1.01	0.18	0.00	0.66	1.35
5	1	-0.55	0.20	0.01	-0.94	-0.16
	2	-0.16	0.14	0.27	-0.44	0.12
	3	-0.25	0.14	0.07	-0.53	0.02
	4	0.08	0.14	0.59	-0.20	0.36
	6	-0.10	0.14	0.48	-0.36	0.17
	7	1.08	0.20	0.00	0.70	1.47
6	1	-0.45	0.17	0.01	-0.79	-0.12
	2	-0.06	0.10	0.54	-0.26	0.14
	3	-0.16	0.10	0.11	-0.35	0.04
	4	0.17	0.10	0.09	-0.03	0.37
	5	0.10	0.14	0.48	-0.17	0.36
	7	1.18	0.17	0.00	0.85	1.51
7	**1**	**-1.63**	**0.22**	**0.00**	**-2.07**	**-1.19**
	2	**-1.24**	**0.18**	**0.00**	**-1.59**	**-0.90**
	3	**-1.34**	**0.17**	**0.00**	**-1.68**	**-1.00**
	4	**-1.01**	**0.18**	**0.00**	**-1.35**	**-0.66**
	5	**-1.08**	**0.20**	**0.00**	**-1.47**	**-0.70**
	6	**-1.18**	**0.17**	**0.00**	**-1.51**	**-0.85**

Table S14

*Results of Tukey's HSD Test of the Means **Self-Reported Socioeconomic Status** Across All Studies Except Study 6 As It Did Not Include the Same 5-step Measure of Socioeconomic Status*

Study	Study	Mean Difference	SE	*p*	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower	Upper
1	2	0,102	0,121	0,960	-0,245	0,449
	3	-0,033	0,120	1,000	-0,376	0,309
	4	0,048	0,121	0,999	-0,297	0,394
	5	-0,260	0,137	0,404	-0,651	0,131
	7	-0,031	0,151	1,000	-0,463	0,402
2	1	-0,102	0,121	0,960	-0,449	0,245
	3	-0,135	0,075	0,465	-0,349	0,079
	4	-0,053	0,077	0,982	-0,272	0,165
	5	-0,362	0,100	0,004	-0,647	-0,076
	7	-0,132	0,119	0,876	-0,472	0,208
3	1	0,033	0,120	1,000	-0,309	0,376
	2	0,135	0,075	0,465	-0,079	0,349
	4	0,082	0,074	0,880	-0,130	0,293
	5	-0,227	0,098	0,190	-0,506	0,053
	7	0,003	0,117	1,000	-0,333	0,338
4	1	-0,048	0,121	0,999	-0,394	0,297
	2	0,053	0,077	0,982	-0,165	0,272
	3	-0,082	0,074	0,880	-0,293	0,130
	5	-0,308	0,099	0,024	-0,592	-0,025
	7	-0,079	0,119	0,985	-0,418	0,259
5	1	0,260	0,137	0,404	-0,131	0,651
	2	0,362	0,100	0,004	0,076	0,647
	3	0,227	0,098	0,190	-0,053	0,506
	4	0,308	0,099	0,024	0,025	0,592
	7	0,229	0,135	0,532	-0,156	0,614
7	**1**	**0,031**	**0,151**	**1,000**	**-0,402**	**0,463**
	2	**0,132**	**0,119**	**0,876**	**-0,208**	**0,472**
	3	**-0,003**	**0,117**	**1,000**	**-0,338**	**0,333**
	4	**0,079**	**0,119**	**0,985**	**-0,259**	**0,418**
	5	**-0,229**	**0,135**	**0,532**	**-0,614**	**0,156**

Table S15

Bootstrapped Unstandardized Indirect Effect (standard error)[95% CI] of Birthplace on Respective Dependent Variables in Study 7

Group identification	Perceived injustice	Group-based anger	Violent behavioral intentions
0.03 (0.06)	0.11 (0.18)	0.13 (0.20)	0.14 (0.21)
[-0.07, 0.17]	[-0.22, 0.50]	[-0.25, 0.55]	[-0.27, 0.59]

Independent variable: Birthplace (foreign born = 0, native/West born = 1). Mediator: Group-based relative deprivation. All analyses were conducted using SPSS-add on PROCESS with 5000 bias-corrected bootstrap. For more details see, see Supplemental Online Materials.

Table 16

*Bootstrapped Unstandardized Indirect Effect (SE)[95% CI] of Birthplace on Respective Dependent Variables with Group-Based Relative Deprivation As a Mediator and **Gender as Covariate** (Studies 1-6)*

Study	Muslim identification	Perceived injustice	Group-based anger	Violent behavioral intentions
1	0.43 (0.26)	1.17 (0.33)	0.83 (0.31)	1.04 (0.46)
	[-0.06, 0.98]	[0.55, 1.86]	[0.25, 1.46]	[0.21, 2.00]
2	0.07 (0.08)	0.08 (0.09)	0.13 (0.14)	0.04 (0.05)
	[-0.08, 0.23]	[-0.11, 0.26]	[-0.14, 0.43]	[-0.04, 0.15]
3	0.11 (0.07)	0.16 (0.10)	0.26 (0.15)	0.09 (0.05)
	[-0.01, 0.24]	[-0.01, 0.37]	[-0.02, 0.56]	[-0.01, 0.20]
4	0.46 (0.10)	0.40 (0.08)	0.44 (0.09)	0.28 (0.08)
	[0.29, 0.66]	[0.25, 0.57]	[0.27, 0.63]	[0.13, 0.45]
5	1.07 (0.21)	1.08 (0.20)	1.13 (0.24)	1.03 (0.26)
	[0.66, 1.49]	[0.69, 1.49]	[0.72, 1.66]	[0.55, 1.55]
6	0.41 (0.11)	0.72 (0.10)	1.00 (0.12)	0.84 (0.11)
	[0.21, 0.63]	[0.52, 0.91]	[0.78, 1.24]	[0.63, 1.07]

Independent variable: Birthplace (foreign-born Muslims = 0. native-born Muslim/Muslims born in western countries = 1). Mediator: Group-based relative deprivation. All analyses were conducted using SPSS-add on PROCESS with 5000 bias-corrected bootstrap.

Table 17

*Weighted Mean Indirect Effect of Birthplace on Respective Dependent/Outcome Variable with Group-Based Relative Deprivation As a Mediator and **Gender as Covariate** (Studies 1-6)*

Dependent Variables	Weighted mean effect size	Standard error	95% CI	*z*	*p*
Muslim identification	0.38	0.12	[0.15, 0.60]	3.28	.001
Perceived injustice	0.53	0.15	[0.25, 0.81]	3.67	.001
Group-based anger	0.60	0.16	[0.28, 0.92]	3.71	.001
Violent behavioral Intentions	0.43	0.13	[0.17, 0.69]	3.25	.001

Table 18

*Bootstrapped Unstandardized Indirect Effect (SE)[95% CI] of Birthplace on Respective Dependent Variables with Group-Based Relative Deprivation As a Mediator and **Age as Covariate** (Studies 4-6).* Data included specific values for age only in studies 4-6 (in the earlier studies age was reported in 5-year spans, which allowed too little nuance for the current purpose).

Study	Muslim identification	Perceived injustice	Group-based anger	Violent behavioral intentions
4	0.48 (0.10) [0.29, 0.69]	0.42 (0.09) [0.25, 0.61]	0.47 (0.10) [0.28, 0.68]	0.28 (0.09) [0.13, 0.47]
5	1.07 (0.22) [0.65, 1.53]	1.04 (0.20) [0.67, 1.47]	1.10 (0.24) [0.68, 1.63]	1.01 (0.25) [0.52, 1.49]
6	0.43 (0.11) [0.22, 0.64]	0.71 (0.10) [0.52, 0.90]	1.00 (0.11) [0.77, 1.21]	0.83 (0.11) [0.63, 1.07]

Independent variable: Birthplace (foreign-born Muslims = 0. native-born Muslim/Muslims born in western countries = 1). Mediator: Group-based relative deprivation. All analyses were conducted using SPSS-add on PROCESS with 5000 bias-corrected bootstrap.

Table 19

*Weighted Mean Indirect Effect of Birthplace on Respective Dependent/Outcome Variable with Group-Based Relative Deprivation As a Mediator and **Age as Covariate** (Studies 4-6)*

Dependent Variables	Weighted mean effect size	Standard error	95% CI	*z*	*p*
Muslim identification	0.60	0.14	[0.31, 0.89]	4.13	.001
Perceived injustice	0.68	0.16	[0.38, 0.99]	4.39	.001
Group-based anger	0.83	0.22	[0.41, 1.25]	3.87	.001
Violent behavioral Intentions	0.68	0.23	[0.22, 1.13]	2.90	.001

Additional references – references excluded from the manuscript due to space limitation.

Amnesty International (2012). Choice and prejudice: Discrimination aginst Muslims in Europe. *Amnesty International Report.* Retrived from http://www.amnesty.eu/content/ assets/REPORT.pdf

Bansak, K., Hainmueller, J., & Hanggartner, D. (2016). How economic, humanitarian, and religious concerns shape European attitudes toward asylum seekers. *Science, 354*, 217-222. doi:10.7910/dvn/yunkul

Chang, L., & Krosnick J., A. (2009). National surveys via RDD telephone interviewing versus the Internet: comparing sample representativeness and response quality. Public Opinion Quarterly. 73, 641–78.

Coolsaet, R. (2015). *"What drives Europeans to Syria, and to IS? Insights from the Belgia case"*. (Egmont paper 75). Egmont – Royal Institute for International Relations. Retrived from: http://www.egmontinstitute.be/content/uploads/2015/03/75.pdf? type =pdf

Heckathorn, D., D. (1997). Respondent-driven sampling: A new approach to the study of hidden populations. *Social problems, 44*, 174-199.

Guimond, S., & Dube-Simard, L. (1983). Relative deprivation theory and the Quebec nationalist movement: The cognitive emotional distinction and the personal-group deprivation issue. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 44, 526-535. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.44.3.526

Kahn, J., & Weiner, T. (2002, March 18) . "World Leaders Rethinking Strategy on Aid to Poor," The New York Times. New York, Retrieved from: http://www.nytimes.com/ 2002 /03/18/world/world-leaders-rethinking-strategy-on-aid-to-poor.html? pagewanted=all

Kaur, R. (2017, October 17). Who says you're a Dane? *New York Times, Opinion.*

Lipsey, M., & Wilson, D. (2001). Practical meta-analysis. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lyons-Padilla, S., Gelfand, M, J., Mirahmadi, H., Farooq, M., & van Egmond, M. (2015). Belonging nowhere: Marginalization & radicalization risk among Muslim immigrants. *Behavioral Science & Policy, 1*, 1–12.

Peçanha, S. & Lai, R. (2015, December 8). The origins of Jihadist-inspired attackers in the U.S. *The New York Times*, Retrieved from https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/ 2015/11/25/ us/us-muslim-extremists-terrorist-attacks.html

Piazza, J., A. (2006). Rooted in Poverty?: Terrorism, Poor Economic Development, and Social Cleavages. *Terrorism and Political Violence, 18*, 159-177. doi: 10.1080/095465590944578

Sageman, M. (2004). Understanding Terror Networks, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Skjoldager, M., & Sheikh, J. (2014, August 8) "Syrienskrigere er opvokset her". *Politiken*, Retrieved from http://politiken.dk/indland/art5578203/ Syrienskrigere-er-opvokset-her

Smith, E. R., Spears, R., & Oyen, M. (1994). "People like us:" The influence of personal deprivation and group membership salience on justice evaluations. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 30*, 277-199. doi: 10.1006/jesp.1994.1013

Sokolsky, R., & McMillan, J. (2002, February 12). "Foreign Aid in our Own Defense." New York Times, Op-ed page. Retrieved from: https://www.nytimes.com/2002/02/12/opinion/foreign-aid-in-our-own-defense.html

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (2nd ed., pp. 7-24). Chicago: Nelson-Hall.

Tougas, F., & Veilleux, F. (1988). The influence of identification, collective relative deprivation, and procedure of implementation on women's response to affirmative action: A causal modeling approach. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 20*, 15-28. doi: 10.1037/h0079920

Victoroff, J., Adelman, A. J., & Matthews, M. (2012). Psychological Factors Associated with Support for Suicide Bombing in the Muslim Diasporapops. *Political Psychology, 33*, 791-809.

Vidino, L., Marone, F., & Entenmann, E. (2017). Fear thy neighbor: Radicalization and jihadist attacks in the West. Report, ISPI, Retrieved from: https://icct.nl/wp-content/uploads/2017/06/FearThyNeighbor-RadicalizationandJihadistAttacksinthe