Xenophobia in Europe

Testing economic interests and national identity

Sofia Karlsson

Abstract

In this study I have explored xenophobia in Europe, using cross-national attitudinal survey and regression analysis. Two main theories constitute the theoretical framework, one based on economic conditions and one on group belonging and identity. They are tested, using the ISSP study from 2003 with the yearly topic 'National Identity', and their relation to the dependent variable, xenophobia, is examined. The regression analysis show the results for a pooled sample of about 20 000 cases from 20 European countries. Economic conditions such as income and unemployment show no statistical significance with xenophobia. Identity issues are connected to *national identity* and, more exactly, to Anthony D. Smith's division of national identity to an ethnic and a civic dimension. The ethnic dimension shows a rather strong positive correlation with xenophobia and the civic dimension shows no significance at all. Overall the study has both reliability and validity issues, which reduces the possibility to make certain generalizing statements. The main finding is that ethnic national identity is predominant in determining an individual's xenophobic attitudes. The study shows rather low total explanation which suggests that xenophobia is a phenomenon either difficult to detect and measure, or that its causes varies from context to context.

Keywords: Xenophobia, Europe, National Identity, Competition Theory, ISSP.
Words: 6821

Table of Contents

1   Introduction

Immigrants and immigration has been the focus for heated national debates in Europe the past few years and one of the current main issue in European politics is how to better regulate and manage immigration into the union. The radical right has emerged as an electoral force in Europe (as in other stable democracies such as Canada, Australia and New Zealand) and they get much of their support out of resentment against immigrants (Rydgren, 2008:737). Racist violence, stereotypes such as "the criminal immigrant" and discrimination of immigrants on the housing and labour markets are common incidents in today's Europe. This could be connected to an underlying fear and hatred of foreigners – "xenophobia" – that is causing these negative attitudes. This study sets out to detect xenophobia as a phenomenon and tests what relates to it in a European context.

1.1   Aim and purpose

The nature of xenophobia is a debated topic and explanations vary within and between disciplines of social science. This study has a quantitative approach to the phenomenon and will be based on comparative national data with individuals as cases. In a regression analysis, the dependent variable, xenophobia, will be tested together with a few independent variables that are expected to affect and relate to it. The study is limited to European Union member countries, including Norway and Switzerland. These countries are *fairly* similar, culturally and politically and immigration into the region is a recent phenomenon compared to other Western countries such as the United States, Canada and Australia, which were built on immigration. Although there are clear differences in migration patterns between Eastern and Western Europe (Kahanec, Zaiceva, 2009:98) but generally speaking, immigrants arrive from the third world, sometimes as refugees but often as labour migrants in search for better economic opportunities (Harris, 2004, EU research on migration and policy needs 2009).

The data availability from Europe is comprehensive and suitable for comparative research. Together with its current high political importance, xenophobia constitutes a good object for a study. Despite differences between countries and in migration patterns, the aspiration is to test xenophobia and what relates to the phenomenon in Europe.

The choice to use a quantitative method originates in a desire to make generalizing statements on this subject (in regards to Europe). Statistical inference involves making generalizations about a population on a basis of a sample, given that our sample is representative for the whole population (Blalock, 1979:105).

Using this method, we will get the bigger picture and can detect what a case oriented approach cannot (Svensson, Teorell, 2007:68). In addition, a quantitative study can be used as a reference and guideline for future qualitative research within racial and prejudice studies (Hjerm, 2000:10). Statistical methods are in no sense opposed to qualitative analyses. The two approaches complement each other (Blalock, 1979:4). Statistical inference presupposes that the subject *can* be measured. As will be pointed out later, there are several difficulties defining, as well as measuring xenophobia. It's uncertain whether a quantitative study can produce any satisfying results on this subject. Naturally, a comprehensive discussion on the results and their limitation is of great importance.

Some may have ethical objections to a study on attitudes towards immigrants and argue that we help to create and sustain an "us versus them" mentality, when asking people questions about immigrants (Hjerm, 2000:6). But European societies are changing and become more heterogeneous. At the same time it seems to be an intense reaction against this change (Calhoun, 2002:104). The resurgence of nationalism and the popular right, discrimination and segregation are evidence on a societal partition between indigenous/natives and immigrants. If we ignore the problems this may add fuel to myths, stereotyping and racism because there are no facts to disprove them (Svensson, Teorell, 2007:20). A better understanding of the roots to xenophobia can pave the way for a change in policy that can set to work at the problems. To prevent academic research from being disconnected from reality and everyday life, a criterion of "societal relevance" ought to be fulfilled (Svensson, Teorell, 2007:18). Because of the social realities and current political debate in Europe this criterion is easily realized.

To summarize, this study is based on statistical method and will use regression analysis to examine xenophobia in Europe. The regression model will be built around two theoretical traditions. One is based on economic conditions and see xenophobia as a result of competition of scarce resources, such as jobs, welfare etc. The other has a social psychological approach and brings in the question of group belonging and identity.

1.2   The dependent variable: Xenophobia

There are several problems measuring a phenomenon such as xenophobia, but first and foremost a theoretical definition of the actual concept is needed (Svensson, Teorell, 2007:38). The word derives from the Greek "*xenos*", which means "stranger", and "*phobia*" which means, "fear". It's characterized as negative attitudes or fear of individuals that are perceived to be different from the group oneself belongs to. But the hostility is not activated until there are "strangers" that come too close and pose a "threat" to the identity. Someone who consents to this view would argue that it's more "natural" for people to live with others "of their own kind" (Hjerm, 2000:9, Rydgren 2008:740). There is a difference between racism and xenophobia, although they often overlap.

Xenophobia implies behaviour based on the idea that the other is a "stranger" to the group, and racism entails distinction based on physical characteristic differences, such as skin colour, hair type and facial features (www.portal.unesco.org). Traditionally, racism is a belief in superior and inferior races. 'Structural' or 'institutional' racism is when the 'dominant race' is sustained by the developed structures, such as laws, politics, and administration (Castles, 2003:35). The slavery and Jim Crow Laws in the United States, the apartheid regime in South Africa are a few historic examples of structural racism. Modern racial studies are focused on so called "cultural racism" which is more oriented towards the idea of the *ethnie.* According to this new racism, mixing ethnic groups will eradicate the uniqueness and qualities that constitute the *ethnie* (Rydgren, 2008:743-4). This modern understanding of racism causes problems to fully distinguish 'racism' and 'xenophobia'. Despite differences and overlapping features between the phenomena it should be safe to say that a racist is also a xenophobe, but a xenophobe is not necessarily a racist.

What is less clear is where to draw the line between xenophobia and "immigrant scepticism". According to an article on voting on the radical right and xenophobia it was stated that it's possible to be sceptical to immigration without being neither a xenophobe nor a racist (Rydgren, 2008:740). An operational definition that fully distinguishes between an "immigration sceptic" and a xenophobe is difficult to fully achieve in reality. In the same article on the radical right it was concluded that "it's a reasonable assumption that many immigration sceptics are also xenophobes" (Rydgren, 2008:744), which makes it even more difficult to draw a line between the two concepts. Still, it's important that the operational definition is convincing and targets *xenophobes*. The problems with this are discussed in the next section that confers to operationalization of the concept.

2 Methodology

2.1 Operationalization

The lack of a clear definition of Xenophobia affects the means in how it can be measured. Xenophobic and hostile attitudes are somewhat structurally embedded and hidden, which in turn generates the question: How can it be operationalized? As of today, there is no index or uniform methodology in measuring xenophobia, which poses problems for a study that aims to be comparative in nature. But comprehensive attitudinal surveys have been conducted for most European countries in programs that aim to produce data relevant for social science research. Xenophobia will be measured using attitudinal surveys, thus its operational definition (Svensson, Teorell 2007:39) is the respondents' answers on questions regarding immigrants and immigration.

Although the difference between racism and xenophobia has been pointed out earlier, racist violence and everyday discrimination could theoretically be a component in measuring xenophobia, since they are consequences of precisely that. The EU agency FRA (The European Agency for Fundamental Rights) carries out surveys on racist violence and discrimination in all of the European Union member countries, but unfortunately this data is not comparative. Legal definitions and institutional response to racist violence and ethnic/religious discrimination differs between countries and in some countries data collection is either absent or inadequate. There are no common definitions on either racist violence or discrimination. In some countries racism and discrimination are interpreted from the offenders point of view, some countries from the victims point of view and in some from the police point of view (Goodey 2007: 570-571). Moreover, there is no perfect correlation between what people think and say and what they actually do. Resentment against outsiders doesn't necessarily evolve into racist or discriminating action so measuring xenophobia this way could lead to a grave understatement of the phenomenon. Likewise, voters on xenophobic parties could also be used as an indicator. But a high voting turnout on xenophobic parties, such as the radical right, can be a result of xenophobia but the existence of xenophobic parties can also be the reason for the emerging of xenophobic attitudes. Ultimately, it's important to make a distinction between *things* and *the effects of things*. Therefore a comparative attitudinal study provides the best way to get to xenophobia - understood as a concept that is measurable. The obvious fact that this operational definition may exclude important

components from the concept leaves us with validity problems. The chance of making systematic errors throughout the study should be considered high (Esaiasson 2007:64).

Attitudinal surveys always risk having reliability problems (Svensson, Teorell, 2007:56). "Strongly agree" and "Strongly disagree" can be interpreted differently depending on the individual. In this type of survey an evident risk is also that respondents give answers that are expected. If the respondent feels it's socially unaccepted to be xenophobic he/she might adapt his/hers answers to better comply with the norm. In those cases mode of data collection are face-to-face interviews there is a risk of altered answers is high (Esaiasson, 2007:266). In this case, where we are dealing with an issue potentially connected to certain social stigmatization, we cannot rule out that non-respondents that are treated as "missing" may have chosen to not answer questions on immigrants due to their very xenophobic sentiments (Hjerm 2000:8).

Additionally, a study that includes this many countries risk jeopardizing the criteria of *equality of meaning* – the items means the same in different contexts. Cross-cultural differences in social acceptability bias or in the use of more extreme response categories (for example rather use "Strongly agree" or "Strongly disagree" than less extreme "Agree" or "Disagree") are factors that are problematic for this criteria and the reliability of the study (Heath et al, 2009:304). It's important that they are taken into consideration in the final discussion.

It's clear that operationalizing xenophobia entails both validity and reliability problems. Because of the imminent risk to underestimate the *absolute* prevalence, the focus will be on how different factors *relate to* the phenomenon.

2.2   Data and measures

Since the study is limited to European countries the ideal material to use is the European Social Survey, ESS, dataset. The ESS is the most accurate cross-national social survey because of its uniform methodological standards and strict rules regarding sampling. The ESS sampling strategy is equivalent in all participating countries and the requirement for random sampling is met (Fisher et al, 2005:310). But the ESS doesn't provide a good way to operationalize 'national identity' which becomes a problem since this study have the intention to test the impact of national identity as well as economic conditions on xenophobia. Therefore the data derives from the International Social Survey Program, ISSP, which is, although less accurate than the ESS, a widely used dataset by scientists. The ISSP is worldwide, with 45 member countries, out of which 20 countries are European. The program carries out surveys every year, each year including core questions and a yearly topic. In 2003 the yearly topic was "National Identity" and contained questions on immigrants,

The European countries covered in the ISSP are Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, United Kingdom, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Norway, Poland,

Slovakia, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Spain, Portugal, France, Germany, Austria and Netherlands.

To achieve the aims for cross-national comparison *optimal comparability* is requires in the operationalization of the study within all participating countries. Sample selection, translation of the questionnaire, methods and processes must be equal in every country (Heath et al, 2009:312). The ISSP is administered by different organizations in different countries with different sampling and field work methodologies (Fisher et al, 2005:310). The mode of data collection differs between countries (telephone, face-to-face, mail-back), which further threats the validity of the study.

It's also essential to achieve high response rates in the participating countries, so that the people interviewed in each country represent its population. When the response rates vary between countries, the validity of cross-national comparisons is threatened (Heath et al, 2009:312). The ISSP show large variations in response rates between countries. For example on one extreme in the 2003 study, we have France with mail-back data collection mode a response rate on 17%, while in Spain we see a response rate on 99% (Heath et al, 2009:299). The ISSP sample is a national representative random sample of the adult population, designed to achieve a norm of 1,400 cases, and, in any event, a minimum of 1,000. When there is a shortfall in the achieved sample size, a central methodology committee decides if the study will not be counted as successful and will be excluded from the merged data set (www.issp.org). Still, the impact of non-response bias should be considered significant, with potentially significant variation between countries (Heath et al 2009:294). This study does not examine the absolute prevalence of xenophobia in one country compared to the other, but the issues brought up are jeopardizing the validity of the study as a whole.

The multiple regression analysis will test the dependent variable, (xenophobia), against different independent variables, based on the ISSP study from 2003 and using SPSS computer program. The dependent variable will be put in relation to several independent variables that can explain the variation in the dependent variable (Esaiasson et al, 2007:54). In addition to that, variables that are thought to affect the dependent and independent variables need to be controlled for (Svensson, Teorell, 2007:204). Even though one would like to test all variables that logically could have an impact, the key is to build a model with few, but most relevant, variables (Körner, Wahlgren, 2007:398). The choice of independent variables and control variables depends on which mechanisms behind the theories that the model is built on. No statistical methods can *prove* causality if we haven't conducted an experiment. What appears to be a causal relation can only be discussed when connected to a theory. Therefore, the fundamental question in data analysis is theoretical and not statistical (Eggeby, Söderberg, 1999:135). In this study, theories from two different traditions constitute the theoretical foundation. One is rooted in material conditions and economic competition of resources. The other has a social psychological approach and is based on identity issues – here connected to national identity. They are both equally relevant in a European context.

6

3   Theoretical Framework

3.1   Competition theory

Competition Theory, also called *Conflict Theory,* states that xenophobic attitudes is based on economic competition for scarce resources. The most marginalized members of the society feel threatened by competition for resources such as welfare and jobs from outsiders (Bobo, Hutchins, 1996:953). If the resources shrink in the state, region or group, the competition and hostility directed against ethnic minorities intensifies. Sudden changes in economic circumstances increase ethnic group mobilization (Olzak, 2006:60). The actual competitive circumstances can be real (shares assumptions with Marxist materialism) or just perceived as such, but in short the theory implies that socially vulnerable individuals are more likely to perceive a higher threat and be more adverse towards immigrants (Hjerm, 2009:51, Goodey, 2007:572).

Competition Theory is applicable on both individual and group levels. On an individual level, *Self-interest Theory,* it's the *individual's* competition for scarce resources that produce a negative attitude towards those he/she is in conflict with (Quillian, 1995:587). The group threat model builds on the insights of the self-interest model, but extends the claim to the collective level. Xenophobia and racism develops out of the dominant *group's* feel of being collectively threatened. One group develops a social position in relation to another group and the unequal power relations between the groups cause prejudice to emerge. There's a dominant and a subordinate group and the sub-dominant poses a (real or imagined) threat (Quillian, 1995:588).

It has been shown on data from Western Europe that the *relative size on the subordinate group and the economic situation of the particular country* can strongly influence the degree of prejudice expressed by dominant group members (Quillian, 1995:606). Mikael Hjerm (2009) has shown the same argument to hold on a municipal level in Sweden where anti-immigration attitudes appeared the strongest in poor municipalities with a large share of immigrants (Hjerm, 2009:57-8). According to Herbert Blumer's (1958) group position theory it's a *perceived* threat to the dominant group's *sense of* social status that causes xenophobia (Bobo, Hutchings, 1996:955). This theory involves materialistic conditions but it also shares assumptions with social psychologically based theories on group belonging and identification. It's a synthesis of both and is also brought up under section 3.2.

Competition and conflict theories originate from the United States, where scientists have studied the field longer due to the history of slavery and later segregation and discrimination of black people. Applying the theories on a

European context will test their validity over space and time with hopes to find interesting results

3.1.1 Theoretical relevance of Competition theory in Europe

Western Europe has seen an inflow of immigrants since the 1960's, fuelled by the need for labour to sustain the economic growth. Those countries with a history of colonialism became to host a large amount of people from their former colonies in Africa, Latin America and Asia. But new patterns were also created such as the West German guest worker program that imported labourers from Southern Europe, North Africa, Yugoslavia and Turkey to work in the industry. Eastern European countries started receiving some economic immigration during the 1990's and after the accession of the EU8[1] countries to the EU those countries became increasingly attractive for migrants (Kahanez, Zaiceva, 2009:98). Immigrants arrive from former Warsaw pact countries such as Ukraine and Russia, but also faraway from Asia and Africa (Castles, 2003:97).

Despite differences within the EU it's widely recognized that immigration is fuelled by a demand for cheap labour. Because of low fertility rates and ageing population there's a lack of workers within low-skilled jobs. This coexists with domestic unemployment because of levels of wages and unemployment benefits. Immigrants fill in where native labour is missing (Employment in Europe Report, 2008:47, Harris, 2004). Recent migration helps to address, in particularly the labour market shortages at the low end of the jobs spectrum. Immigrants were found to be relatively more concentrated in hotels and restaurant, private household and construction sectors. The breakdown of 3rd (i.e. non-EU) country immigrants' employment varies between the EU countries but overall, non-EU born immigrants are strongly underrepresented in non-manual occupations (Employment in Europe Report, 2008:71-73).

The EU's latest report on employment in the union concluded that there's little evidence that immigration leads to higher unemployment (Employment in Europe Report, 2008:54). This suggests a low *real* competition between immigrants and natives, but can still be perceived as such, as argued by Blumer.

This section has shown that competition theories are appropriate and relevant to a European context.

3.2 Social identity theory and group positioning

Competition Theory cannot explain xenophobia among individuals whose interests are not threatened by the ethnic minority. Members of the dominant

---

[1] Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lituania, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia

group sometimes express xenophobic attitudes although the may economically profit from immigrants, as low paid labourers for instance (Quillian, 1995:587). How can we explain this? Theodor Adorno's famous F-scale from the 1950's was one of the first psychological efforts to explain prejudice. It set out to discover *The Authoritative Personality* and find explanations based on individuals' personality traits (Akrami, Ekhammar, 2007:900). Psychological explanations are too personality based for this study, but social psychology, which originates in analyzing the individual's relation to the group, society or system can be a approach useful within political science and sociology.

Within social psychological explanations to prejudice emphasise social group membership, social identity, social self-categorization or social position (Akrami, Ekhammar 2007:899-900). Henry Tajfel's *Social Identity Theory* explains xenophobia as a reaction to an individual's categorization of the world in which he/she belongs. Social identity is understood as a *part* of individuals' self-concept, which derives from their membership in a social group. Xenophobia is favouritism shown towards the group the individual belongs to and develops because of the believed relation between our own identity, the 'self' and the group, our *social identity* (Tajfel, 1982:2). We want to think higher of the in-group because of our self-esteem and this produces adverse feelings towards the 'out-group' (Hinton, 2003:111-2). Social identity theory states that memberships may vary in salience in time and as a function of a variety of social institutions (Tajfel, 1982:3). Hjerm (1998) argue that it's our *national identity* that define who is in the in-group and who is not, to demarcate the boundaries of the nation and so links Social identity theory to National identity. Blumer's *group position theory* (1958) shares some assumption with the social psychological explanations to prejudice. According to Blumer it develops from historical and collective developed judgements about the positions in the social order that in-group members should rightfully occupy relative to members of an out-group. The core is the subjective image of where the out-group members should stand *vis-à-vis* in-group members (Bobo, Hutchins, 1996:955). Next section reviews national identity and its history as a community formed for political purposes.

3.2.1 Theoretical relevance: National identity

Despite globalization with the growing interdependence between nations, nationalism is on the rise and national sentiments remain surprisingly strong (Held, 2002:49). But scientists widely disagree what a 'nation' and 'national identity' actually is (Held, 2002:50).

According to Anthony D. Smith (1991) and national identity are interrelated ethnic, cultural, territorial, economic and legal political components (Smith, 1991:15). To John Keane, "'*National identity' is a collective identity in which people, despite no physical contact, consider themselves bound together because they speak a common language, inhabit a particular territory, share a variety of customs, including memories from the past*" (Keane, 1994:171). Either explanation or definition of national identity virtually always includes some

human *political* communities (Smith, 2003:12). The rise of nations altered the landscape of political activity - the main purpose of the nation was political (Held, 2002:49).

According to the modernist view of the nation, 'national identity' is a product of *nationalism* (Smith, 1991:71). In line with this view, nationalism as an ideology and movement belongs to the modern history, created in the 19th century, central in the era of mass-politics and democratization. As the Italian politician Massimo d'Azeglio famously expressed: "We have made Italy, now we have to make Italians" (Hobsbawm, 1990:44). This makes 'national identity' into a European invention that has a political importance in its way to infuse citizens with a sense of purpose, confidence and dignity. It makes its citizens, the people, feel at home (Keane, 1994:171). The nation's political meaning may explain why nationality, despite its youth still remains so strong. (Held, 2002:51). Blumer sees prejudice as a collectively and historically developed sense of group position and this can also be linked to 'national identity' if we understand 'national identity' as attached to and a product of nationalism. Because nationalism is, as Keane writes '*not only fearful of the other. It is also arrogant, confidently portraying the Other as inferior rubbish*' (Keane, 1994:176).

Anthony Smith (1991) argues that 'national identity' as a collective identity contains distinct elements of *civic* on one hand and *ethnic* on the other (Smith, 1991:8). The civic conception of the nation stresses the historic territory, legal-political equality of members and common civic culture and ideology. The ethnic conception of the nation emphasizes a community of birth and native culture. It stresses a common (presumed) descent, a common ancestry, rather than the territory (Smith, 1991:11-12). In Britain, it has been shown that people who believed that both civic and ethnic aspects are important to be truly British was the group who also wanted to reduce immigration, remove illegal immigrants, more racially prejudice and less approving of anti-discrimination laws (Heath, Tilly, 2005:131).

Smith concluded that every nation contained civic, territorial, and ethnic, genealogical, elements in varying degrees and different forms (Smith, 1991:13). Hjerm's (1998) analysis of National identity in four Western European countries tests Smith's 'ethnic' and 'civic' elements of national identity. Representing a stronger and more exclusive perception of national identity, ethnic national identity showed positive correlation with xenophobia, compared to the civic dimension that showed no correlation (Hjerm, 1998). It was also found that on an individual level it's possible to see expressions of both civic and ethnic factors at the same time. The do not only coexist on a country level, which is central to Smith's arguments (Hjerm, 1998:340).

This study aims to test Smith's distinction of an ethnic and a civic dimension on a sample covering all of Europe. The central assumption is that 'national identity' can be connected to social identity theory and group identification, which is taken from Hjerm's research design.

4 The Model

4.1 Hypotheses

• **H1:** Individuals who are economically vulnerable (face unemployment, employed in low status professions) will be more xenophobic and show adverse attitudes towards immigrants because of competition over scarce resources.

• **H2:** Individuals who express a strong sense of national identity are more xenophobic than others. Those who express a high degree of the ethnic dimension are expected to be more adverse towards immigrants than those who express a high degree of the civic.

4.2 The dependent variable

Michael Hjerm, sociologist at Umeå University, has already used data from the 1995 ISSP survey in an effort to show the connection between xenophobia, national identity and national pride (Hjerm 1998). Hjerm operationalized xenophobia by combining answers on attitudes towards immigrants into an index.
Hjerm's operational definition of xenophobia:
• Immigrants generally good for economy
• Immigrants take jobs away from people
• Immigrants make society open to new ideas, cultures.
• Immigrants increase crime rates

The answers in the ISSP range in 5 steps from Agree strongly, Agree, Neither agree nor disagree, disagree and disagree strongly". The items were combined into an index where the higher the number the more xenophobic. Two of the variables had to be recoded so that all variables ranged in the same direction. A modified version of Hjerm's index is used. Hjerm's first indicator, *Immigrants increase crime rates,* is replaced with *It is impossible for people who do not share (Country's) customs and traditions to become fully (Country nationality).* Although "the criminal immigrant" is a common stereotype the item would need to be expressed a bit differently to target a xenophobe for certain. There has to be a clear explanation why the respondent thinks that immigrants increase crime rates.
The final index and operational definition of xenophobia:
• Immigrants generally good for economy

- Immigrants take jobs away from people
- Immigrants make society open to new ideas, cultures
- It is impossible for people who do not share (Country's) customs and traditions to become fully (Country's nationality)

Cronbach's alpha: 0.664

The variables were computed and finally divided with 4, to form 5-point scale *(see Appendix)*

To use multi-item scaling is generally recommended because the inclusion of more items give us higher reliability. However, this is accompanied with a reduction in validity of the cross-national comparison (Heath et al, 2009:308). Variations within the variables in the index are problematic. Someone who believe that immigration is good for the economy could also consider immigration to take jobs away or to undermine the cultural life of his/hers country. This is causing a reduction of validity and we may not be targeting a xenophobe or be measuring xenophobia.

To test how well a set of items inter-correlate Cronbach's alpha is used. If the inter-item correlations are high, then there is evidence that the items are measuring the same underlying construct. It should be higher than 0.6 for the items to have good reliability when computed to an index (Sorjonen, 5). Cronbach's alpha for this index is 0.664, which is considered good.

4.3   The independent variables

Family Income: *Self-interest theory* predicts that individuals with a low income are the most likely to be in competition with immigrants for jobs and therefore would express more prejudice (Quillian, 1995:595). The income variable is country specific. Some countries have coded the income as midpoints intervals that were asked to respondents. Values are monthly incomes in each country's currency. An approximate exchange rate to the Euro at the field time is given in the codebook for conversion purposes. The currencies were converted into euro and added as a new variable in the material. Since price levels differ between countries the variable was computed again into another variable based on EU's Purchasing Power Standard *(see Appendix)*. This allows us to use the variable cross-nationally. Finally, the variable was made into a dummy indicating whether the respondent's earnings were 1000 euro or less (1) or more than 1000 euro (0) per month. The choice of 1000 euro as the limit was made after a *subjective* appreciation of low income in average EU standards.

Denmark, the United Kingdom, Austria, France, Portugal and Spain had the income variable as midpoints of intervals. This caused some uncontrolled arbitrariness when converted and compared to incomes in other countries.

Employment status – This dummy-variable indicates whether the respondent is unemployed (1) or not (0). According to *self-interest theory* unemployed individuals are expected to show higher prejudice since they are in competition (real or perceived) for jobs.

Occupation – Immigrants are overrepresented in manual jobs. This dummy variable indicates whether the respondent work within manual labour (1) or not (0). It was difficult to draw a perfect line between manual and non-manual work (see Appendix) so some arbitrariness can be found in the recoding of this variable.

National Identity – This independent variable is operationalized through an index, which separates the items into ethnic and civic dimensions, based on Smith's (1991) partition. As part of the ISSP, respondents were asked following questions on national identity:

1. Important: To have been born in (Country)
2. Important: To have (Country nationality) citizenship
3. Important: To have lived in (Country) for most of one's life
4. Important: To be able to speak (Country language)
5. Important: To be a (religion)
6. Important: To respect (Country nationality) political institutions and laws
7. Important: To feel (Country nationality)
8. Important: To have (country nationality) ancestry

Statements 1, 3 and 8 should be characterized as ethnic, since they claim common descent as important (Heath, Tilly, 2005:122, Hjerm, 1998:339). Statements 2 and 6 are easily characterized as belonging to the civic dimension because they emphasize the legal-political aspect of national identity (Heath, Tilly, 2005:122, Hjerm, 1998:340). Statement 7, To feel (Country nationality), also belongs to the civic model according to Smith (ref!!). Statement 4 is more difficult since it can belong to either of the models depending on how it is interpreted (Hjerm, 1998:340), and was consequently excluded. Statement 5 belongs to the ethnic model (Heath, Tilly, 2005:123), but was also excluded in order to make the two indexes even.

Operationalization of the ethnic dimension:
- Important: To have been born in (Country)
- Important: To have lived in (Country) for most of one's life
- Important: To have (country nationality) ancestry

Cronbach's alpha: 0.764

Operationalization of the civic dimension:
- Important: To have (Country nationality) citizenship
- Important: To respect (Country nationality) political institutions and laws
- Important: To feel (Country nationality)

Cronbach's alpha: 0.676

The answers range in four steps from Very important, Fairly Important, Not very important and Not important. The civic and ethnic models were respectively summed into and index and divided by 3 in order to create a 4-point scale.

Education – Expected to show that the more educated the less xenophobic. Better information on out-group members, acquired through either education or true acquaintance with such individuals are expected, on the other hand, to reduce out-group hostility (Levanon, Lewin-Epstein, 2005:92). This dummy variable controls whether the respondent has a university degree completed (1) or not (0).

Age – Age is a factor that can affect xenophobia. Previous research has shown that people who regard ethnic aspects of national identity as important tend to be older, and that people that express a 'neither civic', 'neither ethnic' attitude towards national identity tend to be the youngest. Older people are expected to show more prejudice than younger. If it reflects life cycles or generational factors is difficult to say (Heath, Tilly, 2005:119), but is added as a control variable in the regression model. No attempt is made to here to separate life cycles from cohort effects.

Non-citizens were filtered out in the final regression analysis in order to avoid contaminating the analysis with non-citizen's attitudes to a nation to which they don't belong.

4.4   Results

Model 1 shows the results of a multiple regression of economic indicators on xenophobia for the pooled sample of 19110 individuals from 20 European countries. In model 2 the respondent's age and whether he/she has a university degree is controlled for. Table 1 shows that all variables, except the dummy variable on Family income, in Model 1 are statistically significant, however Employment status looses its significance in Model 2, when education and age are added to the regression analysis. The regression coefficient (beta) tells us the average change in the dependent variable that 1 unit of increase in the independent causes – when all the other independent variables are controlled for (Svensson, Teorell, 2007:192-193).

Model 2 shows that if the respondent works in manual jobs versus non-manual, the average increases in his/hers xenophobic attitudes are 0,126 units on

the 5-point scale measuring xenophobia. That is a slight reduction from Model 1 where the regression coefficient is 0,182.

Table 1:

Models:	1	2	3	4	5
INDEPENDENT VARIABLES					
Competition Theory:					
Family Income	0	0			0
	(0)	(0)			(0)
Employment status	-0.067***	-0.020			-0.030**
	(0.014)	(0.015)			(0.014)
Work in manual sector	0.182***	0.126***			0.078***
		(0.016)			(0.016)
Social Identity Theory:					
National id. -Ethnic dimension			0.359***	0.339***	0.349***
			(0.008)	(0.008)	(0.009)
National id. - Civic dimension			0.005	0.015	-0.001
			(0.011)	(0.011)	(0.012)
University degree		-0.355***		-0.269***	-0.26***
		(0.019)		(0.017)	(0.018)
Age		0.002***		0	-0.001
		(0)		(0)	(0)
N	19110	19031	21312	21214	17116
Adjusted R²	0.007	0.026	0.115	0.126	0.137

***p≤0.01, **p<0.05, *p<0.1.

Two tailed tests. Entries are unstandardized regression coefficients, with standard errors within parenthesis

Models 3 and 4 show that the ethnic dimension of national identity is determining an individual's degree of xenophobia, also when age and education are brought into the model (age is non-significant). For every units increase in the 4-point national identity-scale, there's an increase of 0,339 units on the scale measuring xenophobia. The civic dimension shows no significance to determine the dependent variable in either model.

Model 5 contains all variables. Civic dimension of national identity and age continue to be statistically non-significant. Employment status retains significance on a 0.05 significance level

5   Discussion

The dependent variable, xenophobia, seems to have been operationalized in a quite convincing way. It was difficult to draw a perfect line between 'immigration sceptics' and 'xenophobes' but the ISSP dataset had items that said more of the former than the latter. For example *"Government spends too much money assisting immigrants'* would probably have been one of the variables used if I wanted to find immigration sceptics instead of xenophobes. The final index to operationalize xenophobia inter-correlated with 0.664, according to Cronbach's alpha, which backed up the reliability.

The respondent's family income or employment status showed no significance at all in the regression analysis. If the respondent was employed in manual labour showed significance, however very low. It's possible that I failed to detect those individuals who are, or feel like they are, in competition in reality. Maybe the operational definition was incomplete. But the results terminates that the individually based competition theory – *Self interest theory* – has nothing, (or *very* little), to say about xenophobia in Europe. It's worth noticing that the group aspect of competition theory – *Group threat theory* – was never examined in this study. *If* Competition theory has anything to say about xenophobia in Europe, it would have to be examined on a collective level, as previously done by Quillian (1995) and Hjerm (2009). Maybe this would present competition theory as significant, but of this, I can't say anything from the results in this study.

When we have a very large sample, more than 10 000 cases, it's not surprising if we are able to reject the null hypothesis on a 0,001 level. When samples are large we are in fact saying very little when we have established a 'significant relation' (Blalock, 1979:162). The fact that 'Work in manual sector' was statistically significant in Model 5 could be due to the very large sample in this study - more than 17 000 cases.

Education has a reducing impact in both models, which confirms the expected result that educated people are less xenophobic. However, as was discussed in section 2.2 Data and measures the risk of altered answers is high in this type of study. If educated individuals show less xenophobic attitudes this can be a result of *knowing* that it's 'wrong' to be xenophobic and therefore adapted answers after this. They could in fact be just as prejudice and xenophobic as somebody that is uneducated. This is impossible to know, however, unless we turn to psychological tests such as the IAT test[2] where it would be possible to detect such 'hidden' forms of prejudice.

---

[2] Implicit Association Test measures the reaction time and the design makes sure that the person can't manipulate his/hers answers

Age looses its significance when national identity is controlled for. To understand why we have to go beyond the statistical information available and make an assumption of the direction of cause and effect (Blalock, 1979:474). The assumption made here is that age affects degree of ethnic national identity (the other way around is not realistic). This, in turn, has a positive effect on xenophobia. In a sense, age *does* have an effect on the dependent variable, but only indirectly, through the degree of national identity.

Hjerm's findings on ethnic national identity proved to hold even in a more extensive study. Ethnic national identity was clearly positively correlated to xenophobia. Cronbach's alpha was more than 0.6 for both indexes, which was important for the reliability to be good. Heath et al (2009) argue that separating 'national identity' into 'ethnic' and 'civic' elements using the ISSP 2003 survey entails clear issues with the *equivalence of meaning* (the items have equal meaning in different contexts). Together with issues of mode of data collection and response bias, dividing the questions into an ethnic and civic dimension of national identity has potential to lead to gravely misleading results (Heath et al, 2009:312). Their objections are important because they undermine the validity of the findings here. I cannot conclude that I fully measured the ethnic and civic aspects of national identity in the same way for all the European countries that were part of the study.

Overall, the regression model gave a quite low account to xenophobia. Either the phenomenon was not targeted properly because of reliability and validity problems in a cross-national, cross-cultural study. It's also likely that the sources to xenophobia differs from context to context, maybe even on a local level. The statistically strongest effects are a decrease in xenophobia if the individual have a university degree and an increase when the individual express higher degree of *ethnic* national identity. It's difficult to say exactly *how much* ethnic national identity affects xenophobia since both variables are in ordinal scales, which means that I can rank the values but the real distance between them is unknown.

If the European Union develop more comprehensive surveys with a uniform methodology (like the ESS) it will become easier to operationalize xenophobia for quantitative research. At present there is no material over time, which is needed to fully examine how xenophobia develops and is sustained. A better material is necessary for the research to keep a high degree of reliability and validity. Globalization, with increased movements of people, is changing our societies and they become more heterogeneous. It's important that scientists conduct future research and develop methods and theories that can help understand why xenophobia and prejudice prevail.

6   References

Akrami, Nazar, Ekehammar, Bo, 2007. "Personality and Prejudice: From Big Five Personality Factors to Facets", *Journal of Personality,* Vol. 75, no 5, 899-926.

Andersson, Rickard, Wahman Michael, 2009. *En Introducerande Guide till SPSS.* Statsvetenskapliga institutionen, Lund.

Calhoun, Craig, 2002. "Class Consciousness of Frequent Travelers: Towards a Critique of Actually Existing Cosmopolitanism" in Cohen, Robin, Vertovec, Steven (eds.), *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism. Theory, Context, Practice.* Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp 86-109.

Blalock Hubert M. 1979. *Social Statistics.* 2nd edition. McGraw Hill

Castles, Stephen, Miller, Mark J, 2003. *The Age of Migration.* 3rd ed. Basingstoke: Palgrave.

Bobo, Lawrence, Hutchings Vincent L., 1996. "Perceptions of Racial Group Competition: Extending Blumer's Theory of Group Position to a Multiracial Social Context", *American Sociological Review,* Vol.61, no.6, pp. 951-972

Eggeby, Eva, Söderberg, Johan, 1999. *Kvantitativa metoder – för samhällsvetare och humanister.* Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Esaiasson et al, 2007. *Metodpraktikan.* Vallingby: Norstedts Juridik AB

Fisher, Stephen, Heath, Anthony, Smith, Swawna, 2005. "The Globalization of Public Opinion Research", *Annual Review of Political Science,* Vol. 8, pp. 297-333.

Goodey Jo, 2007. "Racist violence in Europe: Challenges for official data collection", *Ethnic and Racial Studies,* Vol. 30, no 4, 570-589.

Heath Anthony, Martin, Jean, Spreckelsen, Thees, 2009. "Cross-national comparability of survey attitude measures", *International Journal of Public Opinion Research,* Vol. 21, no. 3, pp 293-314.

Heath, Anthony, Tilley, James R., 2005. "British National Identity and Attitudes Towards Immigration", *International Journal of Multicultural Societies,* Vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 119-132.

Held, David, 2002. "Culture and Political Community: National, Global and Cosmopolitan " in Cohen, Robin, Vertovec, Steven (eds.), *Conceiving Cosmopolitanism. Theory, Context, Practice*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp 48-60.

Hinton Perry R, 2000. *Stereotyper, Kognition och Kultur.* Lund: Studentlitteratur.

Hjerm Mikael, 1998. "National Identities, National Pride and Xenophobia: A Comparison of Four Western Countries", *Acta Sociologica,* Vol. 42, no 24, 335-347.

Hjerm Mikael, 2000. *My People Right or Wrong? A Comparative Analysis of National Sentiments and their Meaning.* Umeå: Umeå Universitets Tryckeri.

Hjerm Mikael, 2009. "Anti Immigrant Attitudes and Cross-Municipal Variation in the Proportion of Immigrants", *Acta Sociologica,* Vol. 52, no 1, 47-62.

Hobsbawm, Eric, 1990. *Nations and nationalism since 1780 Programme, Myth, Reality.* 2nd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge university press.

Kahanec, Martin, Zaiceva, Anzelika, 2009. "Labour market outcomes of immigrants and non-citizens in the EU, An East-West comparison", *International Journal of Manpower,* Vol. 30, no. 1, pp. 97-115.

Keane John, 1994. "Nationalism and Citizens in Europe", *International Social Science Journal,* Vol. 140, pp. 169-184.

Körner, Svante, Wahlgren, Lars, 2007. *Statistisk Dataanalys.* Upplaga 4:3, Poland: Pozkal.

Levanon, Asaf, Lewin-Epstein, Noah, 2005. "National Identity and Xenophobia in an Ethnically Divided Society", *International Journal of Multicultural Societies,* Vol. 7, no. 2, pp. 90-118.

Quillian, Lincoln, 1995. "Prejudice as a Response to Perceived Group Threat: Population Composition and Anti-immigrant and Racial Prejudice in Europe", *American Sociological Review,* Vol. 60, no 4, 586-611.

Rydgren, Jens, 2008. "Immigration sceptics, xenophobes or racists? Radical right wing voting in six West-European countries", *European Journal of Political Research,* Vol. 47, 737-765.

Olzak Susan, 2006. *The Global Dynamics of Racial and Ethnic Mobilization.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Smith Anthony D, 1991. *National Identity.* Nevada: University of Nevada Press.

Smith, Rogers M, 2003. *Stories of peoplehood: the politics and morals of political membership*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Svensson, Torsten, Teorell, Jan, 2007. *Att fråga och att svara*, Malmö: Liber AB.

Tajfel et al, 1982. *Social Identity and Intergroup Relations.* Cambridge : Cambridge University Press.

Internet:

Employment in Europe Report, 2008:
http://ec.europa.eu/social/main.jsp?catId=561&langId=en 2010-01-06

EU research on migration and policy needs, Moving Europe
http://ec.europa.eu/research/social-sciences/policy-briefs-reviews_en.html 2010-01-06.

European Social Survey http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/ 2010-01-06.

Eurostat:
http://epp.eurostat.ec.europa.eu/tgm/table.do?tab=table&init=1&plugin=1&language=en&pcode=tsier010 2010-01-06.

Harris, Nigel, 2004, UNESCO http://portal.unesco.org/shs/en/ev.php-URL_ID=3026&URL_DO=DO_TOPIC&URL_SECTION=201.html 2010-01-06.

International Social Survey Program http://www.issp.org/

ISSP Dataset 2003:
http://www.gesis.org/en/services/data/survey-data/issp/modules-study-overview/national-identity/2003/ 2010-01-06.

Sorjonen, Kimmo, Faktoranalys, Cronbach's Alpha, Risk Ratio, & Odds Ratio

med SPSS
http://docs.google.com/viewer?a=v&q=cache:4acynCUw8YIJ:courses.ki.se/datasal__faktoranalys.pdf%3Fnode%3D203720+cronbach%27s+alpha&hl=sv&gl=se&pid=bl&srcid=ADGEESiRwscSqwetLvucbxk4kqojAVfVuWGajtv2NywtNG3FlvdHb_k9rV4nTIgjH83RgpEhUd38y8pE36XeVoaixwqIU57VXJl51nahpSX6_M9nBP9qiqJ-XJRjmAa7kKYAeUG7Mvpx&sig=AHIEtbTg_q-nT7ZH6Ln1kEVFF9yz2TE9Gw

2010-01-06.

7 Appendix: SPSS functions

All European countries were filtered out and copied to a new dataset using *Data – Select cases – Only if condition European country code Satisfied - Copy to new dataset*

Only citizens were included: *Data – Select cases – Only if V56 = 1*

V56: Are you a citizen of (Country) Yes = 1

Operational definition of xenophobia:

Following variables were used for the operational definition of xenophobia, from the ISSP 2003 Variable list:

V47 It is impossible for people who do not share (Country's) customs and traditions to become fully (Country's nationality)

V51 Immigrants generally good for economy

V52 Immigrants take jobs away from people

V53 Immigrants improve (Country nationality) society by bringing in new ideas and cultures

Categories:

1 Agree Strongly, 2 Agree, 3 Neither agree nor disagree, 4 Disagree, 5 Disagree strongly

V47 and V52 were changed so that they range in the same direction as V51 and V53 – from a positive feeling towards immigrants to a negative feeling

Recoding: Transform – Recode into different variables

1 to 5, 2 to 4, 3 copied, 4 to 2, 5 to 1, all other values = 0

The index finally constructed using *Transform – Compute variable*

(V47 + V51 + V52 + V53) / 4

This is a 5-point scale measuring an individual's degree of xenophobic attitudes. The higher the score, the higher the xenophobia.

Operational definition of National Identity:

An index created based on Hjerm and Smith's division of national identity into a civic and an ethnic dimension:

Operationalization of the ethnic dimension:

V11 Important: To have been born in (Country)

V13 Important: To have lived in (Country) for most of one's life

V18 Important: To have (country nationality) ancestry

(V11+V13+V18)/3

Operationalization of the civic dimension:

V12 Important: To have (Country nationality) citizenship

V16 Important: To respect (Country nationality) political institutions and laws
V17 Important: To feel (Country nationality)

(V12+V16+V17)/3

The index is a 4 point scale because the answers range in 4 steps: 1 Very important, 2 Fairly Important, 3 Not very important, 4 Not important

They have all been recoded so that the more national identity the higher score.

To compute Cronbach's alpha: Analyze → Scale → Reliability Analysis.

Education variable (DEGREE):
The categories were: 0 = no formal qualification, 1 = Lowest formal qualification, 2 = above lowest qualification, 3 = Higher level completed, 4 = Above higher level completed 5 = University degree completed, 7 = Other education
It was made into a dummy variable: *Transform – Compute into different variables*
5 = 1, all other variables = 0
Current Employment status (WRKST):
Dummy variable: recoded into a dummy with unemployed = 1, all other = 0 (Employed-full time, employed-part time, employed less than part-time, Helping family member, student, retired, housewife, permanently disabled, other (not in labour force)

Family Income (INCOME):
Variable of Family income – This variable was country specific where each country provided income in national currency. I converted all variables into monthly income in Euro. An approximate exchange rate to Euro was given by the ISSP 2003 codebook. For every country a new variable was created with the respondents' income in Euro. The new variables were put together in a new variable, covering all countries.
But to make the incomes comparative over all countries had to convert again, using PPP:
Comparative price levels are the ratio between Purchasing power parities (PPPs) and market exchange rate for each country. PPPs are currency conversion rates that convert economic indicators expressed in national currencies to a common currency, called Purchasing Power Standard (PPS), which equalises the purchasing power of different national currencies and thus allows meaningful comparison. The ratio is shown in relation to the EU average (EU27 = 100). If the index of the comparative price levels shown for a country is higher/ lower than 100, the country concerned is relatively expensive/cheap as compared with the EU average.

Country	Euro exchange rate	EU-27=100 PPP 2003
Bulgaria	0.50826	40.7
Czeck	0.03319	54.5
Denmark	0.13412[3]	141.1
Finland	0.16819	126.6
UK	1.45298	107.8
Hungary	0.004051	58.3
Latvia	1.43748	54.4
Norway	0.12702[4]	142.1
Poland	0.24569	54.4
Slovakia	0.02581	50.7
Slovenia	0.004179	76.2
Sweden	0.10597	123.5
Switzerland	0.64305	143.9
France	Euro	110
Portugal	Euro	86
Spain	Euro	88.4
Germany	Euro	106.1
Austria	Euro	103.3
Ireland	Euro[5]	126.4
Netherlands	Euro	107.8

Denmark, the United Kingdom, Austria, France, Portugal and Spain had midpoints of intervals.

The formula: (income * exchange rate)/PPP index
Example Sweden: Transform – Compute variable – Select cases only if: v3= 13 (country code Sweden)
 (income * 0.10597)/ 1.235
Occupation (ISCO88):
This variable had 9 categories of work sectors:
1. Legislators, senior professionals and managers
2. Professionals
3. Technicians and associate professionals
4. Clerks
5. Service workers and shop and market sales workers
6. Skilled agricultural and fishery workers
7. Craft and related trade workers
8. Plant and machine operators and assemblers

---

[3] Had to be computed from Annual to Monthly through dividing the variable with 12
[4] Amounts in 1000 norweigan crowns. There was an error in the ISSP dataset. The values of family income are based on yearly income and not on monthly income.
[5] Had to be computed from yearly income to monthly income through dividing the variable with 12

9. Elementary occupations

Catergory 1 – 5 contained non-manual professions and were therefore coded 0. Category 6-9 were coded 1 to detect those who work within manual professions. I had to make a decision whether to use only "Elementary occupations" which included low skilled and low paid jobs but since the breakdown of 3rd country immigrants' employment varies between the EU countries I decided to take all categories containing manual labour in different forms.