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National identity and attitudes towards immigrants in Finland, Great Britain and the USA

Anna Castrén

Abstract

This paper investigates the relationship between national identity and attitudes towards immigrants. It examines three countries with different history of nation building and immigration: Finland, Great Britain and the USA. It is assumed that the differences in nation building and immigration across the countries have led to a different understanding of national identity and attitudes towards immigrants. The hypothesis is that the relationship between national identity and attitudes towards immigrants is not consistent but is dependent on how belonging to the nation is defined. This paper uses eight different aspects to measure the understanding of national identity. Attitudes towards immigrants are explored on six dimensions: criminality, economy, labor market, society, culture and the number of immigrants. The paper uses the theory of ethnic and civic types of national identity as a basis for the analysis. The ethnic definition of national identity is assumed to be related to anti-immigrant attitudes while a more civic definition may even lead to more open attitudes towards immigrants. Ordinal logistic regression has been used to estimate these relationships. The data used comes from the International Social Survey Programme’s ‘National Identity’ module from 2013. The results show clear differences between the countries both in the general attitudes towards immigrants and the prominence of anti-immigrant attitudes. In all countries ethnic definition of national identity is connected to more negative attitudes towards immigrants. However, there are differences in how individual aspects of identity correlate with different dimensions of attitudes towards immigrants. The number of people viewing the ethnic aspects of national identity as important is larger in Great Britain and anti-immigrant attitudes generally more widespread than in Finland and the USA. Additionally, the results from ordinal logistic regressions show that while the majority of aspects of national identity correlated with anti-immigrant attitudes, some of the civic aspects were connected to more positive attitudes. The results differed between the countries suggesting that the relationship between national identity and attitudes towards immigrants is not consistent and that it does depend on the definition of national identity.
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1 Introduction

During the past years there has been a new rise of anti-immigrant attitudes and xenophobia in the both Europe and the United States of America (USA). In Europe the increased immigration has forced both the European Union and individual countries to negotiate for a new kind of refugee policy and immigration has become one of the main political issues across Europe. This has been exacerbated since the aftermath of the “Arab Spring” and the increasing unrest and humanitarian crises in the Middle East and Northern Africa. This has had a big impact on the political discourse and we have witnessed a rise of right wing populist parties with anti-immigration as their main issue throughout Europe. At the same in the USA the public discourse around immigration has been getting harsher, and the country aggressively attempts to decrease the amount of immigrants entering and even flashes the possibility of a new wave of protectionist politics. The expressed reasoning behind demands for closed borders and anti-immigrant speech varies from economy to safety and even cultural retention but always contains a note of nationalism. It is common to hear arguments including: that scare resources should be used to improve the life of citizens before foreigners; that people from certain cultural backgrounds poses a danger for the natives; and that the national culture is in danger to perish into the mass of newcomers.

The conflict between national interest and outsiders becomes more visible at the times of crises. It is especially pronounced during war and other conflicts but can be directly seen in the communication during any crisis situation. The global refugee crises took place just a few years after the global financial crisis, and the increased immigrant volumes hit countries already experiencing a decline in citizen’s trust to the nations future development. Previous studies have suggested that poor economic health triggers the rise of nationalist parties and general anti-immigrant attitudes (Fetzer 2000, Jackman & Volpert 1996). In the current state it is increasingly important to look into the formation of xenophobia and the anti-immigrant attitudes. National identity is one of the basic building blocks of modern states and has been used to unite citizens for a vast variety of different causes from war to social security. Castles et al. (2014, 64) note that when culturally diverse people enter the nation state it is faced by a dilemma: incorporating them as citizens challenges the myth of cultural homogeneity but failing to do that creates a divided society with inequality and conflict.
Strong national identification and national pride are increasingly being associated with populist anti-immigration actors and parties. Often in the public discussion national pride and anti-immigrant attitudes go hand in hand. In reality this relationship is likely to be more complicated, and to associate national pride exclusively with actors with very specific understanding of national belonging may have dire consequences. It is a common argument that the positive connection between national identity and anti-immigrant attitudes is expected because people strongly identifying with their country are more concerned for the national interest. The assumption is problematic since, as Pehrson et al. (2009) point out, it assumes that immigration is bad for the national interest. All national narratives require a confrontation between ‘us’ and ‘them’ to be able to define the cultural meaning of the borders drawn but the narratives differ between countries. The assumption made in this paper is that the type of the national narrative is likely to have an impact on whether the newcomers are seen as a threat to “the national interest” or not.

There is a vast array of research focused on both national identity and anti-immigrant attitudes. This includes comparative studies but since they have almost exclusively concentrated on traditional high immigration countries, countries with low immigration have received very little attention. The recent increase of migration has led to growing number of immigrants arriving even to traditionally low immigration countries which calls for further interest. Immigration and diversity challenge the shared identity and the imagined homogeneity of the nation which in turn has an impact on the creation and recreation of the national narrative. Comparing countries with very different history of migration allows us to explore the impact of migration on society.

Attitudes towards immigrants are likely to consist of several dimensions. How the attitudes are formed reflects the society in question, and is thereby likely to differ between countries. In research, attitude towards immigrants is often regarded as a single variable which can be problematic especially when aiming for cross-nation comparison. Focusing on one variable, such as whether the number of immigrants should be reduced, reflects only a narrow part of the general attitudes. When aiming to compare low and high immigration countries, a question regarding the number of immigrants does not necessarily reflect the actual attitudes towards immigrants. It is generally expected that people in low immigration countries have more hostile attitudes towards immigrants due to the lack of exposure to immigrants whilst at the same time, since the number of immigrants is smaller they might be less likely to say it
should be decreased. Further, focusing on one statement like this does not tell us why the respondents’ would want to see the number of immigrants decreased. Another common practice has been computing the anti-immigrant prejudice as a combination of several variables. This is similarly problematic because it does not allow us to see what creates the potential differences in cross-country comparison.

The aim of this study is to look into the relationship between national identity and attitudes towards immigrant in three countries with different history of nation building and immigration: Finland, Great Britain and the USA. Finland has traditionally been a country with a low rate of immigration and a relatively homogeneous population while Great Britain and the USA have significantly higher immigration rates. However, the framing of the immigration differs in the two countries. Immigrants in Great Britain have historically been citizens of the former colonies, while the USA has the narrative of a ‘nation of immigrants’.

The research questions are:

1) What are the differences in national identity and attitudes towards immigrants between Finland, Great Britain and the USA?

2) What is the relationship between national identity and attitudes towards immigrants? How does this differ across the countries?
2 Theory and previous research

2.1 Anti-immigrant attitudes

There is a vast field of research focused on the societal and individuals’ attitudes towards immigrants. It has been argued that the structure and history of the society affects the general attitudes towards immigrants. At the same time there is also a variety of studies arguing that the country context is not relevant but the attitudes are instead explained by individual attributes and do not depend on societal setting. On an individual level it has been widely shown that migration background, high-skilled job, higher education and living in city areas are attributes related to more positive attitudes towards immigrants. Results regarding attributes like gender and age are unclear and seem to differ between countries (e.g. Mayda 2006, Malchow-Møller et al. 2009, Pettigrew et al. 2007, Ueffing et al. 2015, Jaakkola 2009).

Ethnic competition theory is one of the commonly cited theories to explain anti-immigrant attitudes. It connects anti-immigrant attitudes to the size of “out-group” and threat it creates to the national “in-group”. It can be roughly divided in two parts: economic competition hypothesis and cultural threat hypothesis. Economic competition hypothesis suggests that the size of economically threatening out-group is connected to higher ethnic threat while cultural threat hypothesis focuses on a culturally threatening out-group. According to the economic competition hypothesis, people with low education and those living in urban areas are more likely to feel threatened. In the European societies most immigrants have lower education than average population and settle in urban areas, increasing the competition for low status jobs without need for formal education (Schneider 2007). This suggests that there would be more negative attitudes towards newcomers in countries and areas with high amount of immigrants because the local population feels that their livelihood is threatened. Similarly, the high amount of immigrants from different cultural background may trigger negative feelings if people fear that it poses a threat to what is known and familiar for them.

The problem with the cultural threat hypothesis is that it assumes there to be a commonly shared culture that is fixed and unchangeable. The increase of immigrant population leads in many cases to increased contact between the different groups of society. This in turn has potential to decrease the unfamiliarity and experienced threat. This is acknowledged by intergroup contact theory that suggests that when the size of the immigrant group grows, also
the chances of majority population to meet immigrants grow which is an effective way to reduce prejudices. The out-group is assumed to be culturally more threatening for those who do not have personal contact with any member of the group than for those who have (ibid.).

A study by Schneider (2007) that looked into the effect of ethnic competition on perceived threat in Europe showed that the economic status of immigrants, in this case educational background, did not add to the average level of perceived ethnic threat whereas their non-western origins did. Higher levels of non-western immigrants lead to higher level of perceived ethnic threat. In addition the study showed that the relationship between perceived ethnic threat and the size of the culturally distant out-group is not linear. This suggests that after a certain level a larger out-group actually increases the contact with immigrants, which in turn is associated with more positive attitudes. Schneider (2007, 63) argues that when “there was a lot of immigration in a country's past, people are used to having people from different areas of the world around, and can more easily deal with cultural diversity without feeling threatened”. This suggests that the relationship between the number of immigrants in the country and the general attitudes towards immigration is not straightforward. Similarly, Jaakkola (2009) argues that the origin of immigrants matters to the perceived threat. She found that Finnish people were more likely to have hostile attitudes towards immigrants from Russia and Somalia than from than they had towards immigrants from Estonia, Poland and China.

The importance of national context has been a focus of a lot of research and there is a wide variation in attitudes towards immigrants that cannot be explained only by the amount of immigrants. The focus has ranged from migration policies to social security system, and the results have varied. While some have not found any differences between countries, others have argued that the results look significantly different in different countries.

A study by Ueffing et al. (2015) looked into how the context of immigration policy correlates with people’s attitudes towards immigration using Germany and Australia as an example. They showed that in Australia where the immigration policy heavily favors skilled immigration the general attitudes are more positive than in Germany that, at the time of the research, had not establish an explicit immigration policy. Similarly a study by Pehrson et al. (2009) based on ISSP data from 2003 in 31 countries showed that the connection between anti-immigrant attitudes and national identification was not given but depended on the majority definition of national belonging on the country level. The connection was stronger in
countries where the definition of national belonging was based on language and weaker where it was based on citizenship.

On the other hand, Pettigrew et al. (2007) argue that the predictors of anti-immigration attitudes do not depend on an individual country’s policies or history of immigration. To test this they compared the attitudes towards immigrants in Germany with those in Canada and the USA. The study did not find significant differences in the results between the countries. According to the study, those opposing immigration share similar characteristics in all three countries. They are generally older and less-educated, living in areas with anti-immigration norms and have little personal contact with immigrants. In addition they found that anti-immigrant attitudes correlate with economic deprivation, perceived collective threat and political alienation and conservatism. However, in another study focusing on the same countries, Esses et al. (2006) looked into the effect of national context and found a different result. They studied how participants reacted to different stimulus. They found that among higher social dominance oriented Canadians and Germans, promoting a national in-group including immigrants promoted more positive attitude towards immigrants among Canadians but had in general the opposite effect on the attitudes of Germans. Malchow-Møller et al. (2009) found that socioeconomic characteristics explain only a small part of the variation between countries in Europe and even if somewhat bigger part can be explained by differences in how the consequences of immigration are perceived, the main part of differences remain unexplained.

Other studies have shown that anti-immigrant attitudes depend on both country context and national identity. Billiet, Maddens and Beerten (2003) studied the attitudes towards foreigners in Belgium and the impact of identifying as Flander, Wallonia or Belgian. They showed that Flemish respondents strongly identifying as Flanders had more negative attitude towards foreigners while the ones strongly identifying with Belgium had more positive. At the same time in Wallonia the ones identifying as Walloon had more positive attitude towards foreigners while the ones identify with Belgium had more negative.

Overall, even if some indicators of the formation of anti-immigrant attitudes are rather commonly agreed on, the total picture is still not. However, in this study it is assumed that in addition to individual characteristics also societal conditions and culture play a part in forming people’s attitudes. State building with help of shared national identity has been of
great interest for the ruling elites for a long time now and its impact should not be understated. In this paper I am especially interested in the impact of the understanding of national belonging on attitudes towards immigrants.

2.2 National identity

There is no question national identity and immigration affect each other. They are inevitably linked with each other. The core of national identity is to define who “we” are, and to be able to make that statement one must at the same time make clear who we are not. Every time a group of newcomers enter the nation it must be assessed if they belong to “us” or not. The understanding of what makes a nation, who is truly part of it, plays a crucial role in determining if immigrants fit that picture or not. Likewise the inclusion (or exclusion) of immigrants recreates the picture of “us” as a nation.

In the world today, nation state is the global norm and the standard form of political organization. The state itself is an institution that requires obedience from its citizens and “regulates political economic and social relations in a bounded territory” (Castels et al. 2014, 63). Membership in the state is generally provided by citizenship. The nation, on the other hand, is often defined as an identity and a sense of belonging, a group of people who share a common culture and “national consciousness” (Castels et al. 2014, 63). In this study, being part of the nation does not refer to having a passport and citizenship but to be considered, and identify, as part of the nation.

Nation states have been historically constructed by exclusion, assimilation and genocide of minority groups, which, in some cases, have led to an image of one nation over time (Castels et al. 2014, 63). Similarly, all states have their national narratives that define the characteristics of the state, their national identity. Smith (2007, 18) defines national identity as “the continuous reproduction, reinterpretation and transmission of a pattern of symbols, values, memories, myths and traditions that compose the distinctive heritage of a nation, and the identification of individuals with the cultural elements of that heritage”. Even if there is xenophobia and prejudices in all societies the country’s national narrative and history is likely to affect the attitudes towards newcomers. De Master and Le Roy argue that in cultures where the membership in the nation has traditionally been connected to a certain ethnicity, the cultural understanding of national identity may appear rather fixed and the distance to other
cultures larger. The contact with other cultures might seem scary not just because it is strange and unknown but also because it threatens to change their own culture, known and comfortable, and make it strange as well (De Master & Le Roy 2000). In multicultural societies where people are used to variation and do not necessarily link the culture as strongly with ethnicity as with shared values, they may be less likely to feel threatened by newcomers since the understanding of national identity is less fixed and thereby more resilient.

Theories about the relationship between nationalism and nation state started to emerge unsurprisingly around the same time that the concept of nation state itself grew popularity. A widely challenged but still commonly used definition of nationalism is the division to civic and ethnic, first developed by Hans Kohn in 1940s. Kohn defined civic nationalism as something characteristic to the West, especially England, France, and the US, and ethnic nationalism to the Eastern and Central Europe and Asia. According to Kohn, Western nationalism was inspired by enlightenment ideas of liberty and equality and based on membership in the nation where everyone holds equal rights and obligations. He argues that the state area was already populated by culturally relatively homogenous group and the birth of the nation took place at the same time with the state. At the same time the rise of nationalism in the East took mostly place in countries or political entities that did not follow ethnic or cultural divisions and thereby nation was created before state and built around idea of common heritage and shared ethnic identity instead of citizenship (Kohn 1961). The distinction between civic and ethnic identity has been used and developed further by several more contemporary scholars. Smith, like Kohn, associates ethnic national identity with certain ethnicity, shared history and ancestry that cannot be obtained simply just moving into the country, and describes civic nationhood more as a political community with historical roots, built on shared values, and legal-political equality of its members. Even if Smith acknowledges that national identity always contains both civic and ethnic elements he also argues that one is usually dominant. (Smith 1991, 9-13)

The concept of civic and ethnic identity has also been widely criticized and it has been showed that especially the assumption of Western countries having more civic and Eastern countries more ethnic understanding of national belonging is not empirically supported. For example Schulman (2002) shows in his study of 15 countries that in many cases the assumption is false or otherwise very weak. Despite this the concept of civic and ethnic nationalism is still commonly used and not least when studying anti-immigrant attitudes. The
results have varied and the definitions of ethnic and civic types of nationalism are not consequent across the studies. Many of the studies done suggest that ethnic understanding of national identity is connected to anti-immigrant attitudes more strongly than civic understanding. However, it has also been argued that the relationship is at least somewhat more complicated.

While many studies have found strong connection between national pride and strong national identity, and anti-immigrant attitudes (e.g. Pettigrew et al. 2007, Byrne and Dixon 2013) it has also been frequently argued that strong national identification does not necessarily come with hostility towards immigrants but is likely to depend on the definition of the national belonging (e.g. Heath and Tilley 2005, McAllister 2016, Jackson et al. 2001).

Heath and Tilley (2005) looked into individuals’ definition of nation in Britain and its implications for xenophobia. They separated three groups based on the respondents understanding of what is important to be British. The division was based on ethnic and civic definitions of nationality. The study showed that those who believed that both ethnic and civic aspects were important wanted to reduce the number of immigrants and had in general more racial prejudices than those who reported only the civic aspect to be important. Those who reported that neither civic nor ethnic aspects are important were in between. McAllister (2016) in his turn looked into how Australians see their identity and how it reflects to their views of immigrants. He found that the predominance of an ethno-national identity leads to negative views and civic identity leads to more positive views towards immigrants. On the other hand Byrne and Dixon (2013) studied the effect of national identity on anti-immigrant attitudes in the USA. They also used the division of ‘civic’ and ‘ethnic’ types of nationalism but their results showed that both types contributed to anti-immigrant attitudes. Even if those with more ethnic identity were more likely to have anti-immigrant attitudes, the civic identity as well increased the negative attitudes when being strong.

It is important to note that there is no clear understanding of the definition of “ethnic” and “civic” aspects of nationalism or national identity, and one should be very careful when comparing results from different studies. For example, when looking into the understanding British identity, Heath and Tilley (2005) define the statement that one needs to have British citizenship in order to be truly British as civic while Byrne and Dixon (2013) mark the same variable as a part of the ethnic understanding when studying American identity. Both papers
base their definition of ethnic and civic aspects on factor analysis which suggests that the format of national identity varies between countries. Additionally, McAllister (2016), who looks into the national identity of Australians, defines all aspects used both in this paper and by Heath and Tilley (both ethnic and civic) as ethnic/national while the civic category consist of statements about how proud one is of different aspects of the country’s achievements.

The main interest of this paper is to be able to compare countries and therefore the different aspects of national identity are treated as separate variables. The division to ethnic and civic aspects will be used to structure and support the analysis. The hypothesis is that being proud of one’s nation and having pronounced national identity does not itself lead to anti-immigrant attitudes but the relationship depends on the understanding of how the belonging to the nation is defined. Agreeing with the importance of ethnic elements of national identity is assumed to be related to anti-immigrant attitudes while more civic elements might even lead to more open attitudes towards immigrants since it is possible for them to become part of the nation.
3 Differences in national identity and migration history

The countries in the study are selected based on the differences in state creation and migration history. This is loosely based on the models created by Castles et al. (2014). They divide countries into four groups based on a foreigner’s access to citizenship. The underlying assumption is that the access varies significantly between different countries and is based on the prevailing concept of the nation. The ideal types are 1) the imperial model, 2) the ethnic model, 3) the republican model and 4) the multicultural model. Currently Finland, Great Britain and the USA have similar requirements for citizenship but the focus here is on their past. Additionally the countries have experienced very different patterns of migration during the past century. The figure below illustrates this by showing the proportion of foreign born population per country. As one can see, the proportion of foreign born population is significantly smaller in Finland compared to Great Britain and the USA.

**Figure 1**: Proportion of foreign born population (%)

Source: Official Statistics of Finland, Migration Institute of Finland 2012, Rendal & Salt 2015, Office for National Statistics, MPI

*Years 1950-1980 for Finland show the amount of foreign citizens and are based on assumption by the Statistics Finland since data collection of foreign born population did not start before 1990.*
3.1 Finland
Finland represents what Castles et al. (2014) define as the ethnic model, a country that gained independency from a larger empire based on the narrative of ethnically and culturally united nation. In Western Europe nationalism was used to bind the population to the state, while in Eastern Europe ethnical similarities lead to the rise of national consistency before the creation of the state. Finland was part of the Russian empire until early 20\textsuperscript{th} century and the creation of nation was linked with the rise of the nationalist movement in the 19\textsuperscript{th} century. However, due to the long time under Swedish rule, the class system was closer to the one in Western Europe, and unlike in other parts of Eastern Europe, the local elites were mostly Finnish. Thereby it was in their interest to stimulate the creation of Finnish nation and national identity, and the creation of nation in Finland was largely done by middle and upper classes. (Anttila 2007) There was a need to present Finland as a nation and unified ethnic group with shared history and the focus of the interest was on Finnish speaking peasant population that was made to the ideological image of the “common folk”. After the civil war the picture of Finnishness became narrower reflecting the winning side. This meant rejecting anything that seemed Eastern and influenced by Russia, and even further strengthened the position and role of the Finnish language. This lead to intensified process of Finnishization that mostly targeted to eastern and northern parts of the country that did not anymore fit the ideal, and was strongly lead by national school system and army. Since the 1970s however the picture of “Finnishness” has grown and widened. Even though it is still connected to the past narratives, marginal cultural identities, urban working class culture and different sub-cultures have been growing and taking more space (Ollila 1998).

Finland was a country of emigration until the late 20\textsuperscript{th} century. It has been estimated that during the 20th century more than million people (which makes 25 % of the 1950 population) moved away from Finland. The largest waves of migration were emigration to Northern America at the beginning of the century and to Sweden during the 1960s and the 1970s. At the beginning of 1990s the amount of foreign citizens was just 1 % of the total population. The character of immigration changed during the 1990s and at the beginning of the decade there was a relatively big amount of both asylum seekers, mostly from Somalia and Balkans, and Ingrians from the former Soviet Union. This raised the amount of foreigners to 2.3 % by 2006. The increase of the foreign born population steepened during the 21\textsuperscript{st} century and by 2016 6.5 % of the total population was foreign born. (Official Statistics of Finland)
3.2 Great Britain

Great Britain represents the imperial model where the formation of the modern nation state took place at the core of an established empire and the citizens of other commonwealth countries long had a right for immigration. According to Castles et al. (2014, 67), in the imperial model a person belongs to the nation by being a subject of the same ruler. This was the prevailing model at the time of the empires and allowed multiethnic states. It almost always included an ideological component that was used to motivate the dominance of one nationality/ethnic group over the others.

Great Britain is a multinational state which in some cases makes the concept of national identity more complicated. Britain has historically been politically and culturally dominated by England and while English may frequently regard terms English and British as interchangeable, it is less likely to happen in Wales or Scotland. However, even if Great Britain is not necessarily one nation, it does not mean that there would not be a British identity. Britain has hundreds of year’s long tradition of common political and military institutions, economy and shared language. In the twentieth century labor movement had a pivotal role in sustaining a British identity when the creation of welfare state overshadowed local national movements. Additionally, British identity used to be strongly connected to the project of the Empire which legacy in modern days has turned from pride to something that is better forgotten. (Kumar 2003) Asari et al. (2008) go as far as to argue that Britain’s problem today is the lack of unifying cultural identity. According to them the “civic” markers of nation such as norms, values and myths, which could be used to build towards inclusive nationalism, were already used as ideological enablers to justify the imperial domination. This results in people relying on more restricted identities in the absence of strong inclusive British identity.

The amount of immigrants in Great Britain has been significantly higher than in Finland. After the WWII workers from the New Commonwealth started to immigrate to Britain and by 1961 there were 541,000 people of New Commonwealth origin. After that the immigration from the New Commonwealth declined due to both new restrictions and economic stagnation but family reunion continued and by 1981 the population of the New Commonwealth origin had already reached 1.5 million (Castels et al. 2014). After the EU enlargement 2004 immigration from Eastern Europe increased and by 2016 Poland was the most common country of birth foreign born population. Between 1993 and 2015 the foreign born population in the UK increased from 3.8 million to 8.7 million. (Rienzo & Vargas-Silva 2017)
3.3 USA

The United States of America (USA) is a state created by immigrants with roots in various countries and represents the republican model or multicultural model depending on what part of its history one is looking at. The republican model defines the nation as a political community where people share the values and respect for laws and political rules. It is open for newcomers who are willing to adopt the national culture. The multicultural model differs from the republican model in its attitude towards shared national culture. Unlike the republican model, the multicultural model does not require the newcomers to assimilate into the main culture but as long as they follow the national laws they may keep their distinctive cultures. (Castles et al. 2014) As Bill Ong Hing (2004) argues, there has always been two Americas, one that is the land of immigrants and open for newcomers, and the other America that has remained Eurocentric and has “idealized the true American as white, Anglo-Saxon, English-speaking, and Christian” (Hing 2004, 4). Immigrating to the USA has not always been easy and immigration policy until 1960s was founded on ethnic prejudice. Despite this fact immigration is a fundamental part of the founding myth of America and is still constantly repeated by citizens and politicians alike. The founders of America were seen as hard working and entrepreneurs, and this legacy still lives on in Americans’ appreciation of personal responsibility and individualism (Citrin & Sides 2008).

Even today immigrants and their children (second generation) comprise 23 % of the total population which means that close to a quarter of the total population has immigrant background. Throughout the whole 19th century the proportion of immigrants fluctuated between 13 % and 15 % until the 1920s when restrictive immigration legislation together with Great Depression and WWII radically decreased the number of immigrants. 1970 was the all-time low of the foreign born population with approximately 5 %. After that it has been steadily growing mostly because the abolishment of national-origin admission quotas in the 1960s and increased immigration from Latin America and Asia reaching 14 % in 2016. While still in 1960 the most common countries of origin were European, nowadays most of the immigrants come from Asia and Latin America. Mexico is by far the most common country of origin with 26 % share of the migration population in 2016. (Zong et al. 2017)
4 Data and method

The data used in this study comes from the International Social Survey Programme’s (ISSP) ‘National Identity’ module that is one of the eleven ISSP topic modules. The ISSP is a cross-national collaboration programme founded 1984 that conducts annual surveys on topics relevant to social sciences. All data is available free of charge. The national identity module concentrates on respondents’ global, national and ethnic identification, attitudes towards both their own nation and international issues and aspects of their national pride. It also includes questions about attitudes towards other cultures and immigrants. There have been three survey rounds: 1995, 2003 and 2013. The data used here is from 2013 (ISSP).

ISSP survey design is cross-sectional and uses sampling procedures that aim to ensure that the data is nationally representative in each country. Furthermore, the data uses weights to expand the results to the population level. The raw data contains 1243 respondents from Finland, 1274 from the United States and 904 from Great Britain.

The dependent variables are attitudes towards immigrants. They are measured with help of six statements that are intended to measure different dimensions of anti-immigrant attitudes.

1. Immigrants increase crime rates
2. Immigrants take jobs away from people who were born in Finland/Great Britain/USA
3. Immigrants improve Finnish/British/American society by bringing new ideas and cultures
4. Finland’s/Britain’s/USA’s culture is generally undermined by immigrants
5. Immigrants are generally good for Finland’s/Britain’s/USA’s economy
6. Do you think the number of immigrants to Finland/Great Britain/USA nowadays should be...

Respondents answered using a five-point ‘Likert’ scale (strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree or strongly disagree). The options for the sixth statement regarding number of immigrants followed a five-point scale going from increase a lot to decrease a lot. In the study the answers are recoded to be on a scale from one to three, where one indicates the more positive attitude towards immigrants, two neutral (neither disagree nor agree) and three the more negative. In order to have the direction consistent from positive (1) to negative (3) the answers for statements with negative wording, immigrants increase crime rates, immigrants take jobs away from people who were born in the country and culture is generally undermined by immigrants, were reversed. Each statement is treated individually and they are not combined at any point.
The main independent variable is the understanding of national identity. There are eight questions in the data set focused on respondents’ understanding of national identity and what makes a person “truly” a part of the nation, e.g. truly Finnish. Questions can be seen in Appendix 1. Respondents were asked to rank each statement on national identity on a 4 point ‘Likert’ scale from not at all important to very important. When analyzing the data, I chose to simplify this data as a binary variable of not important or important. This allowed me to focus on the directionality of the relationship with each variable, allowing for easier comparison across countries. While I may have lost some of the variation in the results, I found this to be outside of the scope of my current study and would consider this analysis to be a supplement project to this research paper. Questions 1-4 represent aspects of nationality that in this study are defined as more “ethnic”, while question 5-8 represent more “civic” aspects. Each of these questions is treated as separate variable.

In addition there are six control variables selected based on previous research on the creation of anti-immigrant attitudes. Immigrant background, university education, gender (male) and living in a big city are binary variables while age is continuous. Having immigrant background indicates that at least one of the parents is born abroad. Living in a big city includes options living in “a big city” and “the suburbs or outskirts of a big city”. Living in “a town or a small city”, “a country village” and “a farm or home in the country” are thus marked as 0. There is also a variable measuring the respondents’ sense of pride of their nationality. In the survey it is on scale 1-4 but here it is coded as a binary variable where 1 indicates that the respondent is proud to be Finnish/British/American.

All analysis was carried out using complete case analysis. In other words, respondents who had not given an answer to all the questions that are used in this analysis (i.e. all dependent variables, independent variables and covariates) were removed from the data prior to the analysis. Complete-case analysis is a commonly used way to handle missing data. One of its key benefits is that it ensures the comparability of different analyses, for example it means that the same sample is being analyzed in every regression model, regardless of specification. One potential problem with complete case analysis is the loss of information, with may introduce bias if the complete cases are not a random sample of all the cases. However, if the missing cases are similar to the complete cases then any bias is likely to be minimal and the use of complete case analysis will be reasonable. (Roderick & Rubin 2014). Prior to the
analysis, I checked the characteristics of missing cases, as compared to complete cases, with respect to the independent and control variables. Their characteristics were very similar, which suggests that the removal of the incomplete cases will not affect the results and that the use of complete-case analysis is justified.

Table 1 below shows the number of complete cases and distribution of control variables. The total amounts of complete cases per country is followed by the proportion of those expressing that they are proud of their nationality, have immigrant background (at least one of the parents is born abroad), have university education, are male and live in big city. Lastly, there is the mean age of the respondents. The raw data contained 1243 respondents from Finland, 1274 from the United States and 904 from Great Britain. Complete cases cover 71 % of the total amount of cases in the raw data for Finland, 78 % for Great Britain, and 73 % for the USA. Removing the cases with missing data did not significantly alter the distribution of any of the variables. The data includes not only citizens of the country but people that currently reside there. This reflects the view of the whole society, not merely just the citizens. This means that it captures the attitudes of both people with an immigrant background and those without which gives a more complete picture of the whole society’s view. The proportion of respondents who are not citizens of the country or did not comment on citizenship is 1.4 % in Finland, 5.3 % in Great Britain and 5.5 % in the USA.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control variables</th>
<th>Finland</th>
<th>Great Britain</th>
<th>USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total amount (complete cases)</td>
<td>881</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud to be Finnish/British/American</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant background</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Education</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in a big city</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ISSP data set, weighted data
The analysis is divided in two parts. The first part estimates the general attitudes towards immigrants and understanding of national identity in each country. For attitudes towards immigrants, this is done by showing the proportion of respondents expressing negative attitude toward immigrants separately for each statement. The understanding of national identity is presented in a similar way showing the proportion of those who agree with the statements. Both tables use weighed data in order to produce nationally representative estimates.

In the second part I use ordinal logistic regression to estimate the relationship between national identity and attitude towards immigrants. Attitude towards immigrants is the independent variable and consists of six different indicators which are analyzed separately. All of the indicators are ordinal which makes ordinal logistic regression natural choice. Another alternative would be to use multinomial logistic regression but this would ignore the order of the response categories, thereby reducing the explanatory power of the analysis (Agresti 2007). Additionally the use of multinomial regression would make the interpretation and comparison of results more complicated because there are 18 models, six for each country, and there would be multiple comparisons to make within each model across response categories.

One of the main assumptions underlying ordinal logistic regression is the proportional odds assumption. Defining feature of the ordinal logistic model is that the regression coefficients are the same for the comparison for all response categories, comparing all of the high categories to all of the low categories. The proportional odds assumption states that odds ratio for the cumulative probabilities are the same irrespective of the point at which the response categories are divided. If this assumption does not hold, there would be need for a model that describes the relationship separately between outcome groups, i.e. a multinomial model (Agresti 2007).

To evaluate if the assumption holds I have compared ordinal logistic regression models to multinomial regression models for the same specifications. This comparison was made substantively, and with reference to significance of coefficients, and in the case of the multinomial the order of magnitude of coefficients. Additionally, I ran Brant's test for parallel lines (Brant 1990). In general the proportion odds assumption appeared to hold, although there was less evidence in support of this assumption when using five response categories.
(strongly agree, agree, neither agree nor disagree, disagree, strongly disagree). As a result I chose to use three response categories (agree, neutral, disagree) throughout, and with this specification the assumption holds in most categories. An example of the comparison of ordinal and multinominal model is presented in Appendix 2. This comparison and comparisons made for all the models shown in the results suggest that using logistic with three category dependent variable is the best choice for modeling the data, including preventing the loss of explanatory power.
5 Results

The aim of this study was to look into the relationship between national identity and attitudes towards immigrant in three countries with different history of nation building and immigration. The first part of the chapter presents attitudes towards immigrants and the understanding of national identity for each country. The second part shows results of ordinal logistic regression focusing on relationship between statements regarding aspects of national identity and different dimensions of attitudes towards immigrants in each country.

5.1 Attitudes towards immigrants and national identity

5.1.1 Attitudes towards immigrants

Attitudes towards immigrants are measured using six questions focused on the impact immigrants have on the society. Table 2 shows the questions and the proportion of people in each country with a response that reflects a negative view towards immigrants. Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the 5 statements to reflect their personal views. Statements 1, 2, and 4 associate negative attitudes of immigrants (increase crime rates, take away jobs and undermine culture) as such agreeing with these statements are associated with a negative view. Conversely statements 3 and 5 associate positive view of immigrants (immigrants improve society and are good for the economy) thus disagreeing with these statements is associated with a negative attitude. For question 6 the table shows the proportion of respondents stating that the amount of immigrants should be decreased and is associated with a negative perception of immigrants. The following table summarizes the negative attitudes towards immigrants across countries.

| Table 2: Attitudes toward immigrants – Proportion of people with more negative view |
|---------------------------------|--------|--------|--------|
| Proportion of people with more negative view | Finland | Great Britain | USA |
| 1. Immigrants increase crime rates | 54 | 44 | 21 |
| 2. Immigrants take jobs away from people who were born in the country | 29 | 48 | 37 |
| 3. Immigrants improve society by bringing new ideas and cultures. | 25 | 26 | 13 |
| 4. Finnish/British/American culture is generally undermined by immigrants | 22 | 43 | 19 |
| 5. Immigrants are generally good for Finland’s/Britain’s/USA’s economy | 46 | 31 | 20 |
| 6. Number of immigrants should be decreased | 40 | 77 | 42 |

Source: ISSP data set, weighted data
There are clear differences between countries both in the dimensions of immigration that respondents are mostly worried about, and the overall perception and negative attitudes towards immigrants. In Great Britain a higher proportion of respondents’ expressed negative views, while in the USA they were the least likely to do so. In Finland the major worry was that immigrants would increase crime rates and be a burden to the economy. The biggest concern for the USA was that immigrants take away jobs from people born there. The biggest worry in Great Britain was the impact on labor market, closely followed by immigrants increasing crime rates and undermining the country’s culture. Overall, Great Britain had the greatest proportion of negative attitudes towards immigrants and the USA the most positive. Close to 80% of the respondents in Great Britain felt that the number of immigrants should be decreased while the proportion in Finland and the USA around 40%.

It is interesting that in Great Britain and Finland the worry for national culture was much higher than in the USA. It is not possible to say if this depends on if the respondents see the national culture as more vulnerable or if immigrants are viewed as culturally more distant in Great Britain than in the USA based on this data. Similarly it is hard to say if the worry for national culture in Finland was smaller due to the amount of immigrants being so much smaller or because they are not seen as a “cultural threat”. In the USA only 13% of the respondents disagreed with the statement that immigrants improve the society by bringing in new ideas while both in Great Britain and Finland 20%. This suggests the “foreign” influences in general are seen as negative more often in Great Britain and Finland than in the USA.

5.1.2 National identity

The importance and definition of national identity differs across the three countries. Table 3 shows the proportion of the respondents considering different aspects of identity as important to be “truly” Finnish/British/American in each country. The four first aspects of national identity are here classified as “ethnic” in the sense that an individual cannot affect them while the aspects from five to eight are something that can be achieved even later in life and thereby classified as “civic”. Civic aspects were perceived as more important than ethnic in Finland and the USA. While this was true for Great Britain, the differences in importance between civic and ethnic aspects were far smaller.
### Table 3: Proportion of respondents considering that following aspects are important to be truly Finnish/British/American

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Explanatory variables</th>
<th>Finland %</th>
<th>Great Britain %</th>
<th>USA %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnic aspects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. to have been born in Finland/Great Britain/USA?</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. to have Finnish/British/American ancestry</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. to be Christian</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. to have lived in Finland/Great Britain/USA for most of one’s life</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Civic aspects</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. to have Finnish/British/American citizenship</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. to be able to speak the national language</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. to respect Finnish/British/American political institutions and laws</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. to feel Finnish/British/American</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ISSP data set, weighted data

Both in Finland and in the USA the civic aspects of national identity were seen as important significantly more frequently than the ethnic aspects. Out of the ethnic aspects having been living in the country for most of one’s life and have been born there were the top two most important aspects in all countries. Interestingly the importance of these two aspects had a higher proportion in the USA than Finland. This partly contradicts the assumption that as an “ethnic” nation, one has to be born into the culture for being truly Finnish while in the USA the belonging is more diverse and fluid.

Similar to the USA and Finland, Great Britain respondents placed a higher value on civic aspects, however the gap was smaller. Having been born in Great Britain (75 %) and having lived there for most of one’s life (77 %) are the valued ethnic aspects. When compared to the 79 % who expressed that feeling British is important to be truly British the difference is marginal.

With the exception of being Christian, the ethnic aspects of national identity were seen as important in Great Britain more often than in Finland and the USA. Conversely, in the USA the civic aspects of national identity had a higher importance from respondents than in Finland and Great Britain. Civic aspects were seen as part of the American identity with the lowest aspect still receiving 86 % support. The difference between the perceived importance of ethnic and civic elements was highest in the Finland. This is mostly due to the larger amount of respondents seeing “being Christian” as important to be truly American in the USA.
Nearly all respondents rated at least one of the civic aspects as important. In the USA everyone rated at least one civic aspect as important while in Finland and Great Britain the number that rated none was less than ten. There was far greater variation in the ethnic aspects.

The figure 2 below shows the proportion of the respondents’ rating either all the ethnic aspects as important or none of the ethnic aspects as important by country. The area in between includes all rating of between 1 and 3 ethnic aspects as important. In the USA more than a quarter of the respondents see all ethnic aspects as important in defining national identity. Conversely, close to a quarter of Finns did not rate any of the ethnic aspects as important. In Great Britain 11 % of the respondents did not mark any of the ethnic aspects as important, but likewise only 10 % saw all of them as important. This suggests that in Finland and the USA the understanding of what it means to truly be a member of the nation is more divided in groups having vastly different definition of it. At the same time in Great Britain the understanding of national identity appears to be more scattered in relation to ethnic aspects.

![Importance of ethnic aspects for being truly Finnish/British/America](image.png)

**Figure 2:** The proportion of the respondent rating all of the ethnic aspects of identity and none of the ethnic aspects of identity as important for being truly Finnish/British/American

Source: ISSP data set, weighed data

There is a clear connection between emphasizing the importance of ethnic identity and anti-immigrant attitudes in all countries. Figure 3 below shows the proportion of both groups having more negative answer for each question per country.
The respondents rating all of the ethnic aspects of identity as important were much more likely to have negative attitudes towards immigrants in relation to all six questions. Similarly, the ones who did not experience any of the ethnic aspects as important were more likely to have more positive attitudes towards immigrants. For example in Great Britain those who saw all ethnic aspects as important were ten times as likely to disagree with that immigrants improve British society by bringing new ideas and cultures than those who did not rate any of
the ethnic variables as important. The relationship between the two was not constant but dependent on the question. The respondents rating all of the ethnic aspects as important were only twice as likely to want to decrease the number of immigrants.

In all countries the difference was largest for question regarding society and culture. In Great Britain and the USA the difference was smallest for question regarding the number of immigrants and labor market, while in Finland it was smallest for questions regarding economy and criminality. These were also the questions with highest levels of negative answers in each country respectively. It seems to indicate that for ideas generally accepted in the country, the understanding of national identity is less important than for ideas less commonly supported. Additionally, the importance of the definition of national identity was especially important for questions regarding culture.

5.2 The relationship between national identity and attitudes towards immigrants

The relationship between individuals’ understanding of national identity and attitude towards immigrants is not constant but differs between countries and for different dimensions of attitudes. For example in the Finnish data, for those who expressed that “to be able to speak Finnish is important for being truly Finnish” the odds of wanting the amount of immigrants decreased (amount) was 1.93 times greater keeping everything else constant. For other dimensions the relationship was close to 1 and not significant.

The tables below show results from ordinal logistic regression. It is done separately for all dimensions of attitudes towards immigrants in each country. The number of observations is the same for each dimension: 883 in Finland, 698 in Great Britain and 905 in the USA. The coefficients that are statistically significant at 0.05 level are bolded and marked with asterisk. The odds ratio shows the likelihood of agreeing with the higher category of dependent variable keeping everything else constant. For example for those who expressed that been born in Finland is important to be truly Finnish, the odds of agreeing with that immigrants increase crime rates (crime) are 2.15 times greater versus the combined lower categories, keeping all of the other variables in the model constant.
### Finland

**Table 4: Ordinal logistic regression Finland**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Attitude towards immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of observations</td>
<td>883</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethnic**

- 1. to have been born in Finland: 2.15*, 2.21*, 1.76*, 2.76*, 2.06*, 2.40*
- 2. to have Finnish ancestry: 1.42*, 1.71*, 2.25*, 1.96*, 1.95*, 1.56*
- 3. to be Christian: 1.68*, 1.98*, 1.11, 1.83*, 1.17, 1.72*
- 4. to have lived in Finland for most of one’s life: 1.39, 1.23, 1.36, 1.09, 1.51*, 1.16

**Civic**

- 5. to have Finnish citizenship: 1.33 | 0.70 | 1.14 | 1.08 | 0.90 | 1.03
- 6. to be able to speak Finnish/Swedish: 1.90 | 0.92 | 0.98 | 1.24 | 1.11 | 1.93*
- 7. to respect Finnish political institutions and laws: 0.94*, 0.82, 1.07, 1.00, 1.10, 1.24
- 8. to feel Finnish: 0.80 | 0.88 | 0.71 | 0.62*, 0.76 | 0.75

**Proud**

- 1.29 | 0.79 | 0.82 | 0.60 | 0.87 | 0.82

**Immigrant background**

- 0.49 | 0.62 | 0.25* | 0.96 | 0.21* | 1.05

**University education**

- 0.73*, 0.45*, 0.44*, 0.47*, 0.46*, 0.37*

**Male**

- 2.14*, 1.25, 1.38*, 1.85*, 0.86, 1.09

**Age**

- 0.99 | 1.00 | 0.99* | 0.99* | 0.98* | 0.98*

**Urban**

- 1.11 | 0.81 | 0.98 | 0.97 | 0.83 | 0.76*

* significant at 0.05 level

### Great Britain

**Table 5: Ordinal logistic regression Great Britain**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Attitude towards immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of observations</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ethnic**

- 1. to have been born in Great Britain: 2.01*, 2.09*, 2.56*, 1.75*, 1.98*, 1.89*
- 2. to have British ancestry: 1.49*, 2.32*, 1.55*, 2.05*, 1.41, 1.82*
- 3. to be Christian: 1.25 | 1.01 | 1.35 | 1.33 | 1.45*, 1.00
- 4. to have lived in Great Britain for most of one’s life: 1.16 | 1.33 | 1.12 | 1.18 | 1.18 | 1.06

**Civic**

- 1.42 | 1.36 | 0.93 | 1.12 | 0.59* | 1.14
- 6. to be able to speak English: 1.37 | 1.28* | 2.06 | 0.76 | 3.18* | 1.13*
- 7. to respect British political institutions and laws: 0.47*, 0.44, 0.52*, 0.53*, 0.50*, 0.99
- 8. to feel British: 1.00 | 1.16 | 1.09 | 1.16 | 0.95 | 0.61

**Proud**

- 0.85 | 0.95 | 0.58* | 1.01 | 0.83 | 1.73*

**Immigrant background**

- 0.89 | 0.80 | 0.38* | 1.02 | 0.48* | 0.44*

**University education**

- 0.39*, 0.47*, 0.28*, 0.26*, 0.33*, 0.35*

**Male**

- 1.28 | 0.97 | 1.06 | 1.32 | 0.95 | 1.12

**Age**

- 1.00 | 1.00 | 1.00 | 0.99* | 1.00 | 1.00

**Urban**

- 1.08 | 1.13 | 1.38* | 1.19 | 1.18 | 0.70

* significant at 0.05 level
Table 6: Ordinal logistic regression USA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent variables</th>
<th>Attitude towards immigrants</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of observations 905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnic</td>
<td>crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. to have been born in the USA</td>
<td>1.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. to have America ancestry</td>
<td><strong>1.75</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. to be Christian</td>
<td>1.42*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. to have lived in the USA for most of one’s life</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. to have American citizenship</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. to be able to speak English</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. to respect American political institutions and laws</td>
<td><strong>0.40</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. to feel American</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proud</td>
<td><strong>2.19</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immigrant background</td>
<td><strong>0.50</strong>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University education</td>
<td>0.69*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban</td>
<td>0.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* significant at 0.05 level

Being born in Finland and having Finnish ancestry are consistently significant and have strong positive correlation with all the dimensions of attitudes towards immigrants. Being Christian has significant correlation with most of the dimensions of attitudes towards immigrants, and having been living in Finland for most of one’s life only in relation to economy. Civic aspects show weak correlation and are mostly not statistically significant. There are few exceptions but generally the civic aspects of national identity do not increase the explanatory power of the model. Stating that speaking Finnish is important to be “truly Finnish” is only significant in relation to the amount of immigrants making it more likely to have negative attitude. The results also suggest that those who stated that feeling Finnish is important for being truly Finnish would generally be less likely to have negative attitudes but the relationship is only significant in relation to culture.

In Great Britain the relationships between ethnic aspects of national identity and attitudes towards immigrants are rather similar to those Finland. However, unlike in Finland, being Christian is mostly not significant. Out of the civic aspects respecting political institutions and laws is related to more positive attitudes towards immigrants. Since 88% of the respondents agreed on that it is important to respect political institutions and laws to be truly British, it
may be more informative to phrase it other way around. Those who did not consider this to be important were more likely to have negative attitudes towards immigrants. Another exception is the attitude concerning economy. Three out of four civic aspects of identity were significant in relation to it. In addition to the need to respect political institutions and laws, also the importance of British citizenship was connected to more positive attitude. Those emphasizing the need to speak English were three times as likely to disagree with that immigrants improve economy compared to the ones who did not see it as important. Additionally, also the importance of being Christian increased the odds for negative attitude.

In the USA ancestry and birthplace did not consistently increase the odds of having more negative attitudes towards immigrants like they did in Finland and Great Britain. The relationship is not statistically significant for all dimensions of attitudes. Overall, the relationship between different aspects of national identity and attitudes towards immigrants vary more than for the other countries. For example, none of the ethnic aspects of national identity is significant in relation to the statement regarding immigrants’ impact on economy. At the same time agreeing with the importance of ancestry, Christianity and living most of your life in the country to be truly American all increase the likelihood to disagree with the statement that immigrants improve the culture.

In the USA, most of the civic aspects of identity are not statistically significant but like for Great Britain, there are few exceptions. Emphasizing the importance to speak English increases the odds of having more negative attitude towards immigrants in relation to labor market, society and the number of immigrants. Since 94 % of the respondents agreed on this aspect one can conclude that those who did not think speaking English is important were significantly less likely to have anti-immigrant attitudes. Further, the results show that highlighting the importance of respecting American political institutions and laws is related to more positive attitudes towards immigrants, but it is significant only in relation to criminality and labor market.

In general, the majority of the different aspects of national identity are not significant in relation to attitudes towards immigrants in all three countries. In Finland and Great Britain statements that one has to be born and have ancestry in the country are consistently related to more negative attitudes toward immigrants with relatively little variation in strength within the country sample. In the USA however, there is not clear relationship between these aspects. In Finland the civic aspects are largely not significant, both in the USA and in Great Britain.
the relationship with attitudes vary a bit more. Both in Great Britain and in the USA the need to respect local laws and institutions is connected to more positive attitudes and the need to speak English to more negative attitudes towards immigrants even though the relationship is not consistently significant across all dimensions.

Overall, the relationship between aspects of national identity and different dimensions of anti-immigrant attitudes is more even in Finland. In Great Britain and especially in the USA the connection varies for different dimensions attitudes towards immigrants. In the USA the statement that immigrants undermine culture had strong connection with ethnic aspects but not with any of the civic aspects. The statement was supported by relatively small proportion of the respondents and it seems possible that it is connected to a special understanding of the culture. At the same time there were no significant connection between the ethnic aspects of identity and the statement that immigrants are generally good for country’s economy. Interestingly, stating that having citizenship is important correlated with more positive attitudes towards immigrants in relation to the economy in Great Britain and more negative in the USA. This can be connected both to differences in citizenship laws and the emotional value of the citizenship.

In terms of the demographic characteristics, those with university education are less likely to have negative attitudes towards immigrants in all three countries. This does support the idea that higher education correlates with more positive attitudes towards immigrants. Being proud of one’s nationality was mostly not significant and the direction of the relationship varied between dimension of attitudes. Overall, the data used here did not show clear connection between national pride and attitudes towards immigrants. In Finland the results suggest that being proud of one’s nationality would generally decrease the odds of having negative attitudes towards immigrants but the results were not significant. Both in Great Britain and the USA those who were proud of their nationality were more likely to believe that immigrants improve the society by bringing in new ideas new ideas and cultures. However, in the USA the odds of agreeing that immigrants increase crime rates were more than twice as high for those who were proud to be American. In Great Britain these respondents were more likely to want to decrease the amount of immigrants in the country.

Having an immigrant background generally decreased the odds to have anti-immigrant attitudes. The relationship was significant in all dimensions in the USA while in Finland and Great Britain the relationship was only significant in some dimensions. This may partly be
due to the small amount of respondents with immigrant background. Gender and age were mostly not significant in Great Britain and the USA while in Finland higher age and being male increased the odds of having more negative attitudes towards immigrants in relation to some of the dimensions. Contrary to some of the previous research, living region was largely not significant. The only exceptions were the impact on society in Great Britain and the amount of immigrants in Finland. The respondents living in large cities were more likely to disagree with that immigrants improve society in Great Britain and less likely to want to decrease the amount of immigrants in Finland. In general, the relationship between social background characteristics and attitudes towards immigrants were in line with the previous research.
6 Conclusion

This paper aimed to examine the relationship between national identity and attitudes towards immigrants in Finland, Great Britain and the United States of America (USA). Since these countries have very different history of nation building and immigration, it was assumed that the understanding of national identity and attitudes towards immigrants would differ. Additionally I was interested in the relationship between national identity and anti-immigrant attitudes. Both national identity and anti-immigrant attitudes were measured using multiple separate variables to see potential differences in the relationship between different dimensions of anti-immigrant attitudes and national identity.

The study showed that there were clear differences between the countries, both in the general attitudes towards immigrants and the prominence of anti-immigrant attitudes. The attitudes were generally most positive in the USA and most negative in Great Britain with Finland falling between the two. The largest categories in Finland were related to criminality and economy, around half of the respondent believing that immigrants impact these negatively. Both in Great Britain and the USA the biggest concern was that immigrants take away jobs from people born in the country. In Great Britain this was closely followed by the perception that immigrants increase crime rates and undermine British culture. The understanding of national identity was estimated based on eight aspects inquiring what the respondents saw as crucial to be truly Finnish/British/American. Consistent with previous studies, the results did not support the idea that Finland as an “Eastern state” would have more ethnic understanding of what being truly Finnish is than Great Britain which is generally regarded as a civic state.

On the contrary, considerably more respondents in Great Britain emphasized the importance of having been born in the country and having British ancestry. Even in the USA the ethnic aspects were reported as being important more often than in Finland.

The understanding of national naturally differs within countries as well but especially in Great Britain the ethnic aspects of identity were supported by a large majority. Only 11 % did not see any of the ethnic aspects of identity as important to be truly British. At the same time 24 % in Finland and 18 % in the USA did not report any of the ethnic aspects as important. This suggests that the definition and understanding of national identity and what is required to be truly a member of the nation is more divided in Finland and the USA than in Great Britain.
National identity is naturally not the only factor determining one’s attitudes towards immigrants but as the previous research has demonstrated, there is a connection between the two. In all three countries, respondents with more ethnic understanding of national identity were more likely to have anti-immigrant attitudes. However, when looking at the relationship between individual aspects of identity and attitudes towards immigrants there were clear differences between the countries.

The results from ordinal logistic regressions showed that the relationship between aspects of national identity and anti-immigrant attitudes varied both within and between countries. There were similarities, for example stating that it is important to be born in the country and to have ancestry to be truly a part of the nation, consistently correlated with anti-immigrant attitudes in Finland and Great Britain even if the strength between different dimensions varied somewhat within the countries. For the USA, the relationship was not consistently statistically significant and the variation in strength larger. This suggests that the relationship between national identity and attitudes towards immigrants is not consistent and does depend on the definition of national identity.

While the hypothesis that the ethnic understanding of national identity is connected to a more negative view towards immigrants was mostly supported, the results regarding the civic aspects were less clear. There are a few exceptions but generally the civic aspects of national identity did not increase the explanatory power of the model. In Finland the civic aspects were largely not significant. In the USA and Great Britain the civic aspects appeared to have more importance in relation to the attitudes towards immigrants. The results show that while some aspects were clearly related to anti-immigrant attitudes, others were connected to more positive attitudes. Agreeing on that being able to speak English is important in order to be truly British/American in many cases increased the odds of having anti-immigrant attitudes. At the same time emphasizing the importance to respecting political institutions and laws made it less likely to have more negative attitudes towards immigrants. It is also worth of noting that the results varied between countries. In the USA emphasizing the importance of citizenship was connected to more negative attitudes in relation to the economy while in Great Britain it correlated with more positive attitude. This further highlights the importance of clearly defining both the national identity and anti-immigrant attitudes, and how the division of ethnic and civic aspects is somewhat arbitrary.
Previous studies have found that agreeing with the civic definition of national identity correlated with positive attitudes towards immigrants. However, in many of the studies the focus has been on respondents defining the national identity in either civic or ethnic terms, or as a combination of both, instead of individual variables. One might consider that while the civic aspects of national identity are supported by a large majority in each country, the difference does not necessarily depend on agreeing with the civic definition but rather on the absence of the ethnic elements.

One of the assumptions made was that national pride itself is not connected to anti-immigrant attitudes but the relationship depends on the definition of the national identity. The analysis shows that expressing pride in one’s nationality was mostly not significant in relation to anti-immigrant attitudes. It is particularly interesting than both in Great Britain and the USA those expressing that they were proud to be British/American were more likely to agree on that immigrants improve society by bringing in new ideas and cultures. This suggests that their picture of the national culture was not of one that has to be protected and preserved but as something that is changing and evolving and can indeed be improved by new influences. This supports the assumption that national pride itself is not connected to anti-immigrant attitudes but it is dependent on the definition of national identity. However, this was a very limited way to measure national pride. Further investigation of what elements of the country or nationality one is proud of or/and an interaction between aspects of national identity and the strength of the national pride would be needed to draw any further conclusions.

It is important to consider the exposure to immigrants across the countries when undertaking the analysis. In 2013, when this survey was conducted, Finland had significantly less immigrants than the USA and Great Britain. This may factor into the explanation between the differences in anti-immigrant attitudes that were most prominent in each country. Finland has had limited exposure to immigrants, meaning Finns are not used to seeing people from immigrant background playing active roles in the labor market. This adds doubt to whether people from immigrant backgrounds can successfully integrate into the labor market, and instead become an economic burden to the society, and to be more likely to engage in criminal activities.

Conversely, in the USA and Great Britain, people are more used to seeing people from immigrant backgrounds in the labor market and they are worried for their jobs. The overall
level of anti-immigrant attitudes in Great Britain compared to the USA suggests that these
differences cannot be explained purely by the amount of immigrants. It is however also worth
of noting that the proportion of immigrants increased steeply in Great Britain between 2001
and 2011 while in the USA the growth has been more even. The steepest growth took place
directly after the EU enlargement in 2004 when East European migrants moved to Britain to
look for work (Rienzo & Carlos 2017). This kind of sudden change can potentially increase
people’s insecurity and trigger a more hostile reaction than slower progress. The increased
immigration also took place at the same time with the global finance crises and following
economic deprivation. This created a vulnerable situation both in the USA and in Europe. To
measure and evaluate economic deprivation and its consequences is complex but based on the
annual GDP growth the consequences were hardest in Finland, the annual GDP growth being
negative as late as 2012 (The World Bank, World Development Indicators 2018). At the
same time the unemployment in the USA almost doubled after 2009 while the change in
Finland and especially in the UK was significantly more modest (OECD 2018). To further
estimate the impact of economy on either attitudes towards immigrants or understanding of
national identity is beyond the scope of this paper.

A general challenge in studying attitudes towards immigrants is the ambiguity of the term
immigrant. It includes very different groups of people, and respondents in surveys like the one
used in this study may have very different association with it. This is especially a problem in a
cross country studies where, in addition to individual differences, there may also be national
differences in what the word immigrant is associated with. For example, in Europe the non-
western origin of immigrants has been argued to lead to higher level of perceived ethnic threat
(Schneider 2007). One of the major problems in this study is that it did not control for racism
or the differences in the composition of the immigration population between countries.
Including a question regarding ethnicity would have controlled for some of the differences in
associations made with the term immigrant.

The amount of immigrants and especially asylum seekers in Finland has increased
significantly since 2013 (Official Statistics of Finland). This has not only increased the
number of immigrants in the country but has also changed the actual composition of the
immigrant population and the media coverage regarding immigrants. It will be of great
interest for the future research to examine the development of the attitudes towards
immigrants in Finland. Additionally, the increased immigration is likely to challenge the
definition of national identity and what it means to be “truly Finnish”. Since the amount of immigrants in Finland has constantly been relatively small, the idea of ethnic unity has not been seriously challenged. Increased immigration will make the immigrant population more visible in the society, which might force Finns to re-examine their definition of what it means to be Finnish.

In Finland the large-scale immigration is a new phenomenon but Great Britain and the USA on the other hand have both experienced large immigration throughout the whole 20th century. Despite this, the attitudes towards immigrants today are widely different. The understanding of national identity is relatively similar in Finland and the USA but the relationship between national identity and attitudes towards immigrants is different. At the same time, while the relationship between national identity and anti-immigrant attitudes are rather similar in Finland and Great Britain, the understanding of national identity differs. The number of people viewing the ethnic aspects of national identity as important is larger in Great Britain and anti-immigrant attitudes generally more widespread.

An important notion to take away is that the relationship between national identity and anti-immigrant attitudes is complex, and most importantly it varies across the countries. Many of the differences between the countries would have been missed by combining the different dimensions of attitudes towards immigrants as one variable or alternatively by focusing on just one of them. This has two important implications. Firstly, it highlights the importance of the definition of “anti-immigrant attitudes” when comparing different countries. As this study has shown, anti-immigrant attitudes vary across topic areas and the results of country comparison will likewise differ depending on what of the dimensions one is looking at. Secondly, it is similarly important to define and investigate the nature of anti-immigrant attitudes within the country. In order to effectively work towards more open society, it is important to recognize the main areas of concern in the country. Even if anti-immigrant attitudes always contain certain amount of xenophobia, they are not constant. The nature of and reasons behind them vary which leads to the need of different kind of actions.
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Appendix

A.1 National identity - ISSP data questions

National identity - ISSP data questions
Some people say that the following things are important for being truly [NATIONALITY]. Others say they are not important. How important do you think each of the following is...

Scale 1-4 (from not important at all to very important)  Binary variables
1. to have been born in [COUNTRY]?  1. Important (3 and 4)
2. to have [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] ancestry  0. Not important (1 and 2)
3. to be a [religion]  
4. to have lived in [COUNTRY] for most of one’s life  
5. to have [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] citizenship  
6. to be able to speak [COUNTRY LANGUAGE]  
7. to respect [COUNTRY NATIONALITY] political institutions and laws  
8. to feel [COUNTRY NATIONALITY]  

A.2 Ordinal and multinomial regression model

Finland – Dependent variable 1: Immigrants increase crime rates.

Iteration 0:  log likelihood = -887.43672
Iteration 1:  log likelihood = -791.32181
Iteration 2:  log likelihood = -789.47291
Iteration 3:  log likelihood = -789.46752
Iteration 4:  log likelihood = -789.46752

Ordered logistic regression

Number of obs = 883
LR chi2(14) = 195.94
Prob > chi2 = 0.0000

Log likelihood = -789.46752  Pseudo R2 = 0.1104

| att | Odds Ratio | Std. Err. | z   | P>|z| | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|-----|------------|-----------|-----|-----|-----------------------|
| ethnic1 | 2.146293 | .3884956 | 4.22 | 0.000 | 1.505272 | 3.060293 |
| ethnic2 | 1.416568 | .2470553 | 1.99 | 0.047 | 1.005179 | 1.996325 |
| ethnic3 | 1.680519 | .3441316 | 2.53 | 0.011 | 1.124959 | 2.51044 |
| ethnic4 | 1.386114 | .2421843 | 1.87 | 0.062 | .9841818 | 1.952191 |
| civic1 | 1.33137 | .2668172 | 1.43 | 0.153 | .8988998 | 1.971907 |
| civic2 | 1.902059 | .3817626 | 3.20 | 0.001 | 1.283451 | 2.818829 |
| civic3 | .9364959 | .2674876 | -0.23 | 0.818 | .5350006 | 1.639169 |
| civic4 | .7993412 | .1563387 | -1.15 | 0.252 | .5448168 | 1.172773 |
| proud | 1.289081 | .2706904 | 1.21 | 0.227 | .8541592 | 1.945457 |
| immigrantb | .493925 | .2065927 | -1.69 | 0.092 | .2175861 | 1.12122 |
| uni | .7338793 | .1103734 | -2.06 | 0.040 | .5465203 | .9854689 |
| man | 2.144581 | .3007347 | 5.44 | 0.000 | 1.629215 | 2.822972 |
| age | .9928766 | .004477 | -1.59 | 0.113 | .9841405 | 1.00169 |
| urban | 1.109379 | .1562942 | 0.74 | 0.461 | .8417031 | 1.462181 |

/cut1 | -.1251751 | .4181717 | -.9447765 | .6944263 |
/cut2 | 1.516558 | .4225215 | .6884308 | 2.344685 |
### Multinomial logistic regression

| atttl | RRR  | Std. Err. | z     | P>|z| | [95% Conf. Interval] |
|-------|------|-----------|-------|-----|----------------------|
| 1     | (base outcome) | | | | |
| 2     | ethnic1 | 1.747596 | 0.476218 | 2.04 | 0.042 | 1.021689 | 2.989258 |
|       | ethnic2 | 1.22922 | 0.368906 | 0.69 | 0.492 | 0.6826091 | 2.21354 |
|       | ethnic3 | 2.855671 | 1.29269 | 2.32 | 0.020 | 1.175955 | 6.394664 |
|       | ethnic4 | 0.8779288 | 0.2331709 | -0.49 | 0.624 | 0.5216593 | 1.477514 |
|       | civici | 1.75208 | 0.4890908 | 2.01 | 0.045 | 1.013776 | 3.028068 |
|       | civic2 | 1.288971 | 0.3548678 | 0.92 | 0.357 | 0.7514469 | 2.210998 |
|       | civic3 | 0.8917345 | 0.3621979 | -0.28 | 0.778 | 0.4022553 | 1.976834 |
|       | civic4 | 1.070289 | 0.2990465 | 0.24 | 0.808 | 0.6189691 | 1.850687 |
|       | proud | 0.989916 | 0.299952 | -0.03 | 0.973 | 0.5466064 | 1.792743 |
|       | immigrantb | 0.7362505 | 0.4080823 | -0.55 | 0.581 | 0.2484444 | 2.381835 |
|       | un | 0.6824202 | 0.1515608 | -1.72 | 0.085 | 0.4415764 | 1.054625 |
|       | man | 1.214246 | 0.2659271 | 0.89 | 0.375 | 0.790476 | 1.865198 |
|       | age | 1.005998 | 0.0069949 | 0.86 | 0.390 | 0.9923817 | 1.019802 |
|       | urban | 0.8934655 | 0.1921874 | -0.52 | 0.600 | 0.5861313 | 1.361991 |
|       | _cons | 0.567883 | 0.339314 | -0.95 | 0.344 | 0.1760597 | 1.831714 |
| 3     | ethnic1 | 2.936008 | 0.7699322 | 4.11 | 0.000 | 1.756063 | 4.90879 |
|       | ethnic2 | 1.66398 | 0.4672973 | 1.81 | 0.070 | 0.9596308 | 2.885306 |
|       | ethnic3 | 3.700595 | 1.620229 | 2.99 | 0.003 | 1.568883 | 8.728758 |
|       | ethnic4 | 1.4398339 | 0.3700308 | 1.42 | 0.156 | 0.8700812 | 2.382693 |
|       | civici | 1.561639 | 0.4345808 | 1.60 | 0.109 | 0.9051156 | 2.69437 |
|       | civic2 | 3.2132709 | 0.6674491 | 2.91 | 0.004 | 1.313602 | 4.071723 |
|       | civic3 | 0.9754865 | 0.39793 | -0.06 | 0.951 | 0.4385214 | 2.16996 |
|       | civic4 | 0.7516665 | 0.2131488 | -0.93 | 0.354 | 0.4522085 | 1.328775 |
|       | proud | 1.320669 | 0.402666 | 0.91 | 0.362 | 0.7265514 | 2.400609 |
|       | immigrantb | 3.561363 | 2.004769 | -1.83 | 0.067 | 0.118198 | 1.073417 |
|       | un | 0.615476 | 0.1339588 | -2.23 | 0.026 | 0.4017413 | 0.924218 |
|       | man | 2.562345 | 0.5432933 | 4.44 | 0.000 | 1.691054 | 3.882555 |
|       | age | 0.99286 | 0.0067261 | -1.06 | 0.291 | 0.979771 | 1.006138 |
|       | urban | 1.092496 | 0.2292059 | 0.42 | 0.673 | 0.724165 | 1.64817 |
|       | _cons | 0.3486603 | 0.2104222 | -1.75 | 0.081 | 0.106888 | 1.137933 |