SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Table S1 Descriptive statistical characteristics of BFI and BSDS scores of the whole sample (N = 214) and by participant's gender and education level

	M (SD)	Mdn	Range	Skewness	Kurtosis	Difference test
Big Five Inventory						
Openness to experience	2.7 (0.64)	2.70	1.1-3.8	-0.30	-0.56	
G: Women	2.71 (0.65)	2.70	1.1-3.8	-0.45	-0.41	
G: Men	2.66 (0.62)	2.65	1.5-3.8	0.05	-0.81	
E: Secondary	2.57 (0.61)	2.60	1.2-3.8	-0.05	-0.51	U = 4447, p = .011,
E: Tertiary	2.78 (0.64)	2.80	1.1-3.8	-0.52	-0.35	$r_{\rm rb} = .20$
Conscientiousness	2.43 (0.67)	2.44	0.7-4.0	-0.27	-0.17	
G: Women	2.5 (0.65)	2.56	0.8-3.9	-0.39	-0.09	t(212) = -2.04,
G: Men	2.3 (0.69)	2.33	0.7-4.0	-0.02	-0.06	p = .043, d =30
E: Secondary	2.43 (0.68)	2.56	0.7-4.0	-0.38	0.19	
E: Tertiary	2.44 (0.66)	2.44	0.9-3.9	-0.19	-0.43	
Extraversion	2.12 (0.88)	2.13	0.3-3.9	-0.10	-0.82	
G: Women	2.13 (0.88)	2.13	0.3-3.8	-0.13	-0.91	
G: Men	2.1 (0.88)	2.13	0.4-3.9	-0.04	-0.55	
E: Secondary	2.16 (0.93)	2.13	0.3-3.9	-0.25	-0.86	
E: Tertiary	2.09 (0.84)	2.13	0.4-3.8	0.02	-0.75	
Agreeableness	2.6 (0.61)	2.67	0.7-4.0	-0.51	0.05	
G: Women	2.68 (0.59)	2.78	1.0-3.8	-0.75	0.35	U = 3613, p < .001,
G: Men	2.42 (0.63)	2.44	0.7-4.0	-0.05	0.28	$r_{\rm rb} = .27$
E: Secondary	2.6 (0.65)	2.67	0.7-4.0	-0.47	-0.02	
E: Tertiary	2.6 (0.59)	2.67	1.0-3.9	-0.54	0.13	
Neuroticism	1.76 (0.90)	1.75	0.0-3.8	0.02	-0.71	
G: Women	1.86 (0.84)	1.88	0.0-3.8	0.01	-0.65	U = 3988, p = .021,
G: Men	1.54 (0.98)	1.69	0.0-3.8	-0.23	-0.80	$r_{\rm rb} = .20$
E: Secondary	1.71 (0.92)	1.80	0.0-3.8	-0.03	-0.80	
E: Tertiary	1.79 (0.88)	1.75	0.0-3.8	0.07	-0.64	
BSDS						
Romani	5.31 (5.37)	4.00	0.0-21.0	1.08	0.42	
G: Women	5.31 (5.06)	4.00	0.0-21.0	1.09	0.67	
G: Men	5.32 (6.02)	3.00	0.0-21.0	1.06	0.02	
E: Secondary	6.02 (5.58)	4.00	0.0-21.0	0.97	0.22	
E: Tertiary	4.8 (5.18)	3.00	0.0-21.0	1.18	0.65	

(Table S1 continues)

Table S1 Table S1 continued

	M (SD)	Mdn	Range	Skewness	Kurtosis	Difference test
Vietnamese	2.52 (3.25)	2.00	0.0-21.0	1.98	5.60	
G: Women	2.64 (3.41)	2.00	0.0-21.0	2.11	6.29	
G: Men	2.28 (2.86)	1.00	0.0-11.0	1.39	1.33	
E: Secondary	3.43 (3.94)	2.00	0.0-21.0	1.71	3.95	U = 4280, p = .003,
E: Tertiary	1.86 (2.44)	1.00	0.0-11.0	1.59	2.26	$r_{\rm rb} = .23$
Foreigners	2.55 (3.24)	1.00	0.0-18.0	1.57	2.58	
G: Women	2.41 (2.99)	1.00	0.0-13.0	1.3	0.79	
G: Men	2.85 (3.73)	1.00	0.0-18.0	1.78	3.66	
E: Secondary	3.24 (3.61)	2.00	0.0-18.0	1.38	2.25	U = 4447, p = .009,
E: Tertiary	2.05 (2.85)	1.00	0.0-13.0	1.67	2.29	$r_{\rm rb} = .20$
Homeless people	7.93 (4.91)	8.00	0.0-21.0	0.45	-0.23	
G: Women	7.82 (4.79)	7.00	0.0-21.0	0.53	-0.06	
G: Men	8.18 (5.18)	8.00	0.0-21.0	0.30	-0.45	
E: Secondary	7.96 (5.24)	8.00	0.0-21.0	0.61	-0.15	
E: Tertiary	7.91 (4.68)	8.00	0.0-21.0	0.29	-0.35	
Migrants	6.78 (6.68)	5.00	0.0-21.0	0.83	-0.52	
G: Women	7.08 (6.88)	5.00	0.0-21.0	0.77	-0.64	
G: Men	6.13 (6.22)	3.50	0.0-21.0	0.96	-0.20	
E: Secondary	8.03 (6.97)	6.50	0.0-21.0	0.54	-1.03	U = 4524, p = .018,
E: Tertiary	5.87 (6.34)	4.00	0.0-21.0	1.09	0.16	$r_{\rm rb} = .19$
People with mental disorders	4.86 (4.66)	3.00	0.0-21.0	1.03	0.56	
G: Women	4.49 (4.31)	3.00	0.0-21.0	1.16	1.43	
G: Men	5.63 (5.30)	4.00	0.0-19.0	0.73	-0.55	
E: Secondary	5.64 (5.00)	5.00	0.0-21.0	0.90	0.34	
E: Tertiary	4.28 (4.34)	3.00	0.0-18.0	1.10	0.67	
People with a physical disability	1.72 (2.77)	1.00	0.0-18.0	2.54	8.10	
G: Women	1.51 (2.34)	0.00	0.0-12.0	1.99	3.99	
G: Men	2.16 (3.50)	1.00	0.0-18.0	2.56	7.25	
E: Secondary	2.29 (3.22)	1.00	0.0-13.0	1.57	1.81	
E: Tertiary	1.3 (2.31)	0.00	0.0-18.0	4.03	23.30	
Overall score	31.67 (24.92)	24.00	0.0-116.0	0.90	0.32	
G: Women	31.30 (23.80)	24.50	0.0-116.0	0.75	0.04	
G: Men	32.60 (27.20)	23.00	0.0-108.0	1.10	0.60	
E: Secondary	36.60 (27.10)	32.00	0.0-116.0	0.75	-0.02	$t^{\text{sqrt}}(212) = 2.42,$
E: Tertiary	28.10 (22.60)	22.50	0.0-107.0	0.94	0.46	p = .016, d = .34

Note. G – gender; E – education level; BSDS – Bogardus Scale of Social Distance; U – Mann-Whitney U test; r_{rb} – rank biserial correlation; t – Student's t-test; d – Cohen's d; sqrt – square root transformation applied.

Table S2 Results of multiple linear regression analysis

	Model 1				Model 2			
	В	β	95% CI	р	В	β	95% CI	р
BSDS overall score ^{sqrt}								
			$(0.8, adj. R^2 = .06, p) = 5.64, p < .00^2$	1			24, adj. $R^2 = .22$,) = 11.05, $p < .00$	1
Age	0.05	.22	[0.09, 0.35]	.001	0.05	.26	[0.14, 0.38]	< .001
$Gender^{\mathtt{b}}$	0.13	.06	[-0.23, 0.34]	.702	0.49	.21	[-0.06, 0.47]	.12
Education ^a	-0.92	39	[-0.65, -0.12]	.005	-0.80	34	[-0.58, -0.09]	.009
BFI: Openness					-0.89	24	[-0.37, -0.11]	< .00
BFI: Agreeableness					-1.20	31	[-0.44, -0.18]	< .00
BFI: Extraversion					-0.02	01	[-0.14, 0.12]	.89
Model comparison						F(3, 207	= 15.30, p < .00	1
BSDS – Romani								
			$(3, adj. R^2 = .02, p) = 2.40, p = .069$)	$R^2 = .18$, adj. $R^2 = .16$, F(6, 207) = 7.74, $p < .001$			
Age	0.07	.14	[0.01, 0.28]	.037	0.09	.19	[0.06, 0.48]	.00
Gender ^b	0.30	.06	[-0.24, 0.35]	.709	1.12	.21	[-0.07, 0.48]	.13
Educationa	-1.43	27	[-0.54, 0.01]	.058	-1.23	23	[-0.49, 0.03]	.08
BFI: Openness					-1.67	20	[-0.49, 0.03]	.00
BFI: Agreeableness					-2.82	32	[-0.45, -0.19]	< .00
BFI: Extraversion					0.04	.01	[-0.13, 0.14]	.93
Model comparison						F(3, 207	= 12.70, p < .00	1
BSDS – Vietnamese								
	$R^2 = .10$, adj. $R^2 = .09$, F(3, 210) = 7.86, $p < .001$			1	$R^2 = .14$, adj. $R^2 = .11$, F(6, 207) = 5.57, $p < .001$			
Age	0.06	.19	[0.06, 0.32]	.004	0.06	.21	[0.08, 0.34]	.00
Gender ^b	0.70	.22	[-0.07, 0.5]	.132	0.93	.29	[0.00, 0.57]	.04
Educationa	-1.79	55	[-0.82, -0.29]	< .001	-1.71	53	[-0.79, -0.26]	<.00
BFI: Openness					-0.60	12	[-0.26, 0.02]	.09
BFI: Agreeableness					-0.78	15	[-0.28, -0.01]	.03
BFI: Extraversion					0.01	.00	[-0.13, 0.14]	.95
Model comparison					F(3, 207) = 3.05,	p = .030	

(Table S2 continues)

Table S2 *Table S2 continued*

	Model 1				Model 2				
	В	β	95% CI	р	В	β	95% CI	р	
BSDS – Foreigners									
			$(0.7, adj. R^2 = .06, 0.0) = 5.13, p = .002$	2			14, adj. $R^2 = .11$, R' = .11, $R' = .11$, $R' =$		
Age	0.05	.18	[0.05, 0.32]	.007	0.06	.21	[0.08, 0.34]	.002	
$Gender^{\mathtt{b}}$	-0.17	05	[-0.34, 0.23]	.710	0.15	.05	[-0.24, 0.33]	.742	
Educationa	-1.30	40	[-0.67, -0.13]	.004	-1.26	39	[-0.66, -0.12]	.004	
BFI: Openness					-0.54	11	[-0.24, 0.03]	.131	
BFI: Agreeableness					-1.11	21	[-0.34, -0.08]	.002	
BFI: Extraversion					-0.17	05	[-0.18, 0.09]	.507	
Model comparison						F(3, 207	p(r) = 5.35, p = .001		
BSDS – Homeless peop	le								
	$R^2 = .02$, adj. $R^2 = .001$, F(3, 210) = 1.05, $p = .373$				R^2 = .18, adj. R^2 = .15, F(6, 207) = 7.48, p < .001				
Age	0.05	.12	[-0.02, 0.25]	.091	0.07	.16	[0.04, 0.28]	.013	
$Gender^b$	-0.26	05	[-0.35, 0.24]	.724	0.54	.11	[-0.17, 0.39]	.431	
Educationa	-0.14	03	[-0.31, 0.25]	.842	0.05	.01	[-0.25, 0.27]	.938	
BFI: Openness					-1.56	20	[-0.34, -0.07]	.003	
BFI: Agreeableness					-2.75	34	[-0.47, -0.21]	< .001	
BFI: Extraversion					0.11	.02	[-0.11, 0.15]	.765	
Model comparison						F(3, 207)	$= 13.70, p < .00^{\circ}$	1	
BSDS - Migrants									
	$R^2 = .10$, adj. $R^2 = .08$, F(3, 210) = 7.44, $p < .001$				R^2 = .21, adj. R^2 = .18, F(6, 207) = 8.96, $p < .001$				
Age	0.15	.25	[0.12, 0.38]	< .001	0.17	.28	[0.15, 0.41]	<.001	
Gender ^b	1.57	.24	[-0.05, 0.52]	.099	2.32	.35	[0.08, 0.62]	.012	
Educationa	-2.72	41	[-0.67, -0.14]	.003	-2.39	36	[-0.61, -0.10]	.006	
BFI: Openness					-2.24	21	[-0.35, -0.08]	.002	
BFI: Agreeableness					-2.48	23	[-0.36, -0.10]	<.001	
BFI: Extraversion					-0.15	02	[-0.15, 0.11]	.768	
Model comparison						F(3, 207	(r) = 9.58, p < .001		

(Table S2 continues)

Table S2 Table S2 continued

	Model 1					Model 2				
	В	β	95% CI	р	В	β	95% CI	р		
BSDS – People with me	ental diso	rders								
		99, adj. $R^2 = .07$, 9) = 6.50, $p < .00$	$R^2 = .17$, adj. $R^2 = .15$, F(6, 207) = 7.13, $p < .001$							
Age	0.10	.24	[0.11, 0.37]	< .001	0.11	.27	[0.14, 0.4]	< .001		
Gender ^b	-0.77	17	[-0.45, 0.12]	.251	-0.21	05	[-0.32, 0.23]	.746		
Educationa	-1.51	32	[-0.59, -0.06]	.018	-1.51	32	[-0.58, -0.06]	.016		
BFI: Openness					-0.61	08	[-0.22, 0.05]	.225		
BFI: Agreeableness					-1.90	25	[-0.38, -0.12]	< .001		
BFI: Extraversion					-0.38	07	[-0.21, 0.06]	.295		
Model comparison						F(3, 207	(r) = 7.20, p < .001			
BSDS – People with a p	hysical d	lisabilit	у							
		$R^2 = .05$, adj. $R^2 = .03$, F(3, 210) = 3.29, $p = .022$				$R^2 = 0.1$, adj. $R^2 = .07$, F(6, 207) = 3.74, $p = .001$				
Age	0.02	.08	[-0.06, 0.21]	.263	0.02	.10	[-0.04, 0.23]	.157		
Gender ^b	-0.49	18	[-0.47, 0.11]	.228	-0.27	10	[-0.39, 0.19]	.507		
Educationa	-0.98	35	[-0.63, -0.08]	.012	-0.92	33	[-0.60, -0.06]	.017		
BFI: Openness					-0.52	12	[-0.26, -0.02]	.097		
BFI: Agreeableness					-0.72	16	[-0.30, -0.03]	.023		
BFI: Extraversion					-0.17	05	[-0.19, 0.09]	.454		
Model comparison						F(3, 207	p(r) = 4.06, p = .008			

Note. N = 214. In Model 1, we entered the control demographic characteristics, i.e., age, gender, and education level to predict social distance scores. In Model 2, we also entered personality traits, i.e., openness to experience, agreeableness, and extraversion, as pre $dictors.\ BSDS-Bogardus\ Scale\ of\ Social\ Distance;\ sqrt-square\ root\ transformation\ applied;\ BFI-Big\ Five\ Inventory.\ ^aEducation$ level: tertiary – secondary; ^bgender: women – men.