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**Background**: Integration of immigrants is an interactive process of learning a new culture, an obtaining of rights, access to a position and status and building of personal relations between migrants and the receiving society. Their ability to reciprocally adjust to intercultural encounters is one of the most important factors of successful integration.

**Aim**: The purpose of this study is to investigate Swedish young adults perception and attitudes towards immigrants and immigrants’ integration into the Swedish society. Furthermore the aim is to study their perception of social interaction of immigrants and the Swedish host society. How Swedish young adults perceive their country’s immigration policy.

**Method**: A qualitative research, using an online open-ended questionnaire and in-depth telephone interviews were applied to collect the data about Swedish young adults perceptions and attitudes. The transcribed data were subjected to thematic analysis.

**Result**: The results of the qualitative research helped to understand Swedish young adults perceptions and attitudes. The findings showed that two of the biggest reasons that Swedish young adults support immigration are: humanitarism and labor force. Swedish young adults are very aware of immigrants’ integration in Sweden. They socialize with immigrants and have contact with them in daily basis. Swedish young adults, have a negative opinion regarding Sweden’s immigration policy.

**Conclusion**: Swedish young adults define immigrants as a people born in one country but move to another (particularly in Sweden) with an intention to reside there permanently. Regarding their acculturation expectations, they support integration as the best acculturation strategy. They think that immigrants in Sweden are “half way” integrated, geographically segregated, discriminated, prejudiced in different degrees and immigrant woman are the most excluded category.
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INTRODUCTION

“Remember, remember always, that all of us, and you and I especially, are descended from immigrants and revolutionists.” – Franklin D. Roosevelt

This thesis presents the findings of a qualitative research investigating Swedish young adults perception and attitudes towards immigrants and immigrants’ integration into the Swedish society. Furthermore, how aware are Swedish young adults of immigrants’ social integration and how Swedish young adults perceive their country’s immigration policy.

Vast of the research on immigration has been focusing on immigrant’s adaptation (e.g. Richardson, 1974; Taft, 1985, 1986) where immigrants themselves were the protagonists in the concept of integration. Enumerated studies were concentrating on the perspectives of immigrants, with the purpose of adopting or proposing a process for their adjustment. Not much research can be found elaborating the needs or adjustments that need to be done in the hosting society. Integration of immigrants should not be understood directly as something concerning immigrants alone, but residents, governments and institutions of the receiving society as well. Their ability to reciprocally adjust to intercultural encounters is one of the most important factors of successful integration (Ahokas, 2010; Avramov & Cliquet, 2004; Bommes & Morowska 2004; Entzinger & Biezeveld, 2003)

It is important to understand perceptions because they help construct individual’s conscious experience and allow them to interact with the people around. Further, people’s behavior is based on their perception of what reality is, not on reality itself. Hence, the world as it is perceived is the world that is behaviorally important. According to Pickens (2005) perception is closely related to attitudes. Where as Card, Dustmann and Peterson (2005) noted that public attitudes towards immigration and immigrants are found to be more important than integration policies in shaping migration policies.

This research initially presents a literature review regarding immigration, immigrants and their integration. Continuing, it present concepts that are related to immigrants and their integration which will help further analyze, discuss and present the results of the study. It will also present in details how the empirical research was conducted: the choice of methodology, the generated results, and a discussion. Finalizing the research with a conclusion.

Motivation

My interest for this subject is rooted from the beginning of my master studies. I remember, I was so excited to come to Sweden as a freemover student to do my Master studies. I was excited to see a country, which I have never visited before, meet new people, make new finds, learn a new language and culture.

When I came to Sweden, I met not just Swedish friends and culture but many other cultures from around the World as well. Sweden is a country of big diversity, thanks to the big number of immigrants and international students. That is when I begun wondering how native Swedes cope with this diversity, especially Swedish young adults. Do Swedish young adult interact with immigrants? How do they perceive
immigrants and what is their attitude regarding immigration? Do they support immigration, and many other questions. This curiosity made me read more about the subject of immigration and notice the lack of research that elaborates the perceptions and attitudes of hosting societies towards immigrants as well as its importance.
BACKGROUND

The main focus of this chapter is to present information of the field of study. It will provide information on what previous research have shown regarding the studied subject and relevant concepts with the subject. The chapter begins with defining migration, immigration, and a brief history of migration after the Second World War, onwards. Continuing, it will present reviewed literature regarding immigration, integration, multiculturalism, intercultural relations, otherness, ethnocentrism, stereotypes, prejudice, xenophobia, racism, discrimination and immigrant integration in Sweden. In what aspect these subjects have been approached in previous studies, how they relate with each other and how they affect immigrants’ integration.

Migration and immigrants

Migration movements have characterized society since the beginning of human history. Migration is “a process of moving, either across an international border, or within a state. It is a population movement, encompassing any kind of movement of people, whatever its length, composition and causes; it includes migration of refugees, displaced persons, uprooted people, and economic migration” (International Organization of Migration, 2004, p.41). Researchers categorize migration in many different types based on many factors, e.g. mobility, voluntariness, permanency etc. (Berry & Sam, 1997). Koser (2007) states that there are three ways to categorize migrants: 1) Voluntary and forced migration – comparing to voluntary migration which is movement of free will or choice, e.g., labor migration, entrepreneurial migration, professional migration; forced migration is a movement of people who are forced to leave their country because of conflict, persecution, environment reasons etc., known as refugees and asylum seekers. 2) People who move for political reasons (refugees) and those who move for economic reasons (labor migrants); and 3) Legal and irregular migrants - irregular migrants are people who enter a country without documents or stay after in a country after their residence permit has expired. While, Garnier (2012) categorizes migration into: emigration and immigration. Emigration is “the act of departing or exiting from one State with a view to settle in another (IOM, 2004, p. 21).

There are many definitions regarding immigration and immigrants and it is of key importance to define what this study encompasses with these two terms. According to Divell (2008) “Immigration is the arrival of citizens from one nation-state who plan on taking or do take up long terms or permanent residence in another country” (p.478). Merali (2008) defines immigration as “movement of people from one nation-state to another” (p.503). According to the International Organization of Migration (2004), immigration is “a process by which non-nationals move into a country for the purpose of settlement” (p. 31). This thesis supports the definition of immigrants that is given by the International Organization of Migration.

Following many definitions of immigration, there are many definitions about immigrants as well. According to Roysircar & Pimpinella (2008) “immigrants are people who leave their country of birth to live in a different country, most often on a permanent basis” (p.1171). Hall (2005) supports the definition given by the American Heritage Dictionary according to which an immigrant is a person who leaves one country to settle permanently in another. According to Koser (2010) migrants are defined as people living outside their home country for over one year not including people who move for shorter periods of time, as students, people on professional
secondment, or tourists. Regarding the definition of immigrants, this thesis is based on Koser’s (2010) definition of migrants. What Koser (Ibid.) defines as migrants this thesis will define as immigrants. This research in the immigrant group encompasses foreigners that live in Sweden for more than one year (labor immigrants, family reunion immigrants, refugees, asylums), excluding students.

Immigration to Europe has a short history, compared to the United States, Australia and Canada, which are identified as immigration countries (Buonfino, Byrn, Collett, Cruddas, Cuperus, Dijssebloem, Dubet, Einaudi, Hillebrand, Kronig, Pearson, Sik, & Rumi, 2007). After the Second World War most of migrants in Europe came from countries with colonial and specific bilateral arrangements (Messina, 2007). In the following decades (20th and 21st centuries) as a result of a more interconnected world (trade agreements, international financial and trade organizations, labor recruitment cooperation, guest worker programs), and the created economic disparities, millions of people cross borders yearly immigrating to the industrialized parts of the world (Castles & Miller, 1993).

Besides of the above mentioned factors that affect migration, nowadays the biggest factors are Globalization and Europeanization (Ho & Loucky, 2012). Globalization has increased the disparities in development of human welfare (Koser, 2010). These increased disparities have intensified differences between the industrial and developing countries, driving those in poorer countries to look for opportunities abroad (Ibid.). At the same time transforming the structure of many societies: socially, politically and economically (Rodriguez-Garcia, 2010). Another phenomenon that has affected migration in Europe is the freedom given to European Union (EU) citizens to live and work among member countries of the EU (Buonfino, et al., 2007). These movements lead to growth of multicultural diversity as well as demographic, ethnic, and cultural changes into receiving countries (Rodríguez-García, 2010).

Due to this continuous migration there has been a rapid increase in the diversity of immigrants and nationalities, posing a challenge of integration for both sides (immigrants and host society) (Buonfino, et al., 2007). Buonfino, et al., (Ibid.) states that diversity will become even more noticeable in the coming decades and Europe shall no longer post questions if it should embrace migration and diversity, but on how to create a solid framework for dialogue and learn how to live together.

**Multiculturalism**

In order to react to the issues and challenges of a society going through simultaneously fast development along with raising ethno-cultural diversity from immigration, multiculturalism was established (Ng, 1988). Based on Berry’s (2011) acculturation theory, a society is multicultural when cultural diversity is a feature of the society as a whole, including all the ethno-cultural groups. Berry (Ibid.) states that multicultural ideology embraces the fundamental view that cultural diversity is good for a society and such diversity should be shared and adapted. Valtonen (2008) states that “multiculturalism is an official approach to the organizing and managing of ethnocultural diversity” (p. 68). Where as, Van De Vijver, Breugelmans, & Schalk-Soekar (2008) determine three definitions of multiculturalism: a) multiculturalism referring to a demographic feature, specifically the poly-ethnic composition of society. b) The concept of multiculturalism used by policymakers indicating a specific type of policy about cultural diversity. c) Multiculturalism as a psychological concept is an
attitude related to political ideology referring to the acceptance and support of the culturally heterogeneous population of a society. The interest of this thesis is pinned on multiculturalism as a psychological concept.

Many authors (Parekh 2000; Modood 2007; Kymlicka 1995; Raz 1994) agree that multiculturalism has two aims: recognizing groups’ cultural differences and developing a common identity between communities living in the same territory (Scuzzarello, 2010). Verkuyten (2005) states that members of native-born culture tend to be less supportive of multiculturalism comparing to members of immigrant cultures because multiculturalism is identity supporting for minority ethnic groups and identity threatening for the dominant group. In accordance with Van De Vijver, Breugelmans, & Schalk-Soekar (2008) host societies’ “attitude toward multiculturalism have direct consequences for the acculturation strategies that are available to the minorities” (p. 95). The host society’s attitude, interaction with state immigration policies and immigrant acculturation preferences frame acculturation outcomes on a social level (Van De Vijver et al. 2008).

Based on this, only when, both state policies and majority attitudes are favorable toward multiculturalism, immigrants can pursue integration, leading to a multicultural society. Van De Vijver et al. (2008) suggests that in order to achieve a harmonious intragroup relation in a culturally diverse society, the accordance between the host society and immigrants and the relation between state policies and majority attitudes should be taken into consideration.

Multiculturalism is effected through policies, programmes and approaches that are formed for the purpose of handling ethnocultural diversity as component of the state’s acknowledgement and accommodation of distinct groups and communities with the wider policy framework (Valenton, 2008). Multiculturalism policy is created and applied in numerous forms to reflect the settlement priorities and strategies of the society (Ibid). These multicultural approaches and concepts, have developed in many advanced industrial societies, like the United States, Canada, Australia, Sweden, Britain, Germany and France. Anyhow, while some of these countries are multicultural in the descriptive sense, Sweden, Canada and Australia have actually adopted ‘multiculturalism’ as precise government policy (Ibid.).

**Immigrant’s integration**

The concept of integration, is defined differently by many authors e.g. Lucassen, Heckman, Esser, Buonfino, Esser, etc. which will be discussed below.

According to Lucassen (2005) integration is defined as the general sociological mechanisms that describe the way, in which all people, migrants as well as non-migrants, find their place in society. Integration does not produce a uniform, unitary and harmonious society or national culture, it allows a number of important differences, creating a multicultural state or nation (Ibid.). Heckman (2004) defines “integration as a process of inclusion of migrants in the core institutions, relations and statuses of the receiving country” (as cited in Sardinha, 2009, p.33). He further clarifies that the integration of immigrants is an interactive process of learning a new culture, an obtaining of rights, access to a position and status and building of personal relations between migrants and the receiving society. An integrated society does not entail sameness, it implies dynamic processes through which immigrants and hosts learn to live together (Buonfino, et al., 2007).
Esser (2006) defines integration as a dynamic process that can lead to different ways of co-existence of various groups in society. He distinguishes two intertwined aspects. The first is social integration and refers to "the inclusion (or exclusion) of actors in an existing social system" and following on from this the equal or unequal distribution of the characteristics of among aggregates or categories of actors (Esther 2006. p. 7). The second, aspect is system integration, concerning "the cohesion of entire social systems and refers to the cohesion beyond different elements of a society" (Ibid.). According to Callens, Valentova, & Meuleman (2012) social integration corresponds with the individual level, whereas system integration with the societal level and these two aspects are associated between. Aspects that play a role in social integration of individuals, also affects the system integration of the society.

Berry, Kim, Power, Young, & Bujaki (1989) determined four possible integration models: integration, assimilation, marginalization and segregation. These models will be explained further in the Theoretical Frame of References chapter.

What does it mean for a society to be integrated? Integration is a mutual process where everyone is involved and must take contribution (Wiesbrock, 2011). An integrated society is characterized by “openness, tolerance and participation of all groups in as many activities as possible and where phenomena like discrimination, racism and xenophobia are unusual and not accepted” (Allwood, Edeback, & Myhre, 2006. p.55). A very crucial aspect of immigrant integration into a host society is the degree to which the host society will permit immigrants’ insertion into the society through its policies, programs and integration initiatives (Sardinha, 2009). At the same time allowing them to retain their specific identities because every individual being, feels the need to be part of a group or society, to be respected, understood, supported, to be part of the history (Buenfino et al., 2007).

Entzinger & Biezeveld (2003) state that when in a society groups or individuals are closely and intensely related to one another, that society is integrated. “In recent years, the term social cohesion has become widely used as an equivalent for integration as a characteristic of a society” (Entzinger & Biezeveld, 2003, p.6). Chan, Ho-Pong, & Chan (2006) consider social cohesion as “a state of affairs concerning both the vertical interactions (state-citizen cohesion) and horizontal intuitions' (cohesion within a civil society) among members of a society, as characterized by a set of attitudes and norms that include trust, a sense of belonging, and the willingness to participate and help, as well as their behavioral manifestations” (p. 290).

Integration of immigrants into the receiving society comprises at least four basic dimensions: 1) socio-economic, 2) cultural, 4) legal and political; and 4) the attitudes of receiving societies towards immigrants (Entzinger & Biezeveld, 2003).

1) Socio-economic integration
According to Entzinger & Biezeveld (2003) participation of immigrants in the labor market is one of the biggest indicators of successful integration. The level of education and language skills affects successful participation in the labor market as well. In accordance with Entzinger & Biezeveld (Ibid.) knowledge of the language of the host society is seen as conditional for successful integration. As important indicators of socio-economic integration Entzinger & Biezeveld (Ibid.) see the level of use of socialsecurity, use welfare and other social policy instruments, the quality of housing and residence patterns.
2) Cultural integration

Entzinger & Biezeveld (2003) point out that it is presumed that certain common basis is crucial in creating a mutual understanding in a society. By this we mean what are the core values and rules of the host society, whether immigrants are expected to assimilate or whether they supports the multicultural idea. The same applies to immigrants as well. According to Sardinha (2009) cultural integration means embracing different religious beliefs, sexual orientations and cultural affiliations, thus ensuring equal rights for all people living within a society.

3) Legal and political integration

Entzinger & Biezeveld (2003) state that one of the most important values of the European Union (EU) is the “granting of equal rights to all citizens of its Member States” as well as “to third country nationals residing in its territory” (p. 25). Sardinha (2009) states that immigrants must be involved in public consultations have a right to vote and facilitate the procedure of gaining nationality. Greater political participation creates a sense of belonging and the integration in the democratic domain will be greater (Ahokas, 2010).

4) Attitudes of receiving society

Entzinger & Biezeveld (2003) state that attitudes of receiving society affect each of the three above-mentioned domains. Integration is a two-sided process in which immigrants as well as receiving society equally carry responsibilities (Ibid). Granting of legal and political rights, welfare benefits and a welcoming atmosphere of the receiving society play a significant role in the successful integration of immigrants (Ibid). As noted by Card, Dustmann and Peterson (2005) public attitudes towards immigration and immigrants are found to be more important than integration policies in shaping migration policies.

This research has an emphasis on the attitudes and perceptions of receiving towards social integration of immigrants, hence it is important to define social integration. According to Huber (2003) the concept of social integration was introduced into the international policy discourse at the World Summit for Social Development in Copenhagen in 1995. The Report on the World Summit for Social Development (Bernstein, Goree, Wagner, & Wise, 1995) stresses that the aim of social integration is “to enable different groups in society to live together in productive and cooperative diversity” (p.6). Huber (2003) state that “social integration is not the attempt to make people adjust to society, but the attempt to make society accepting of all its people…” (p.433). Sardinha (2009) sees social integration as a “gradual process through which individuals and groups become participants in the civic, economic, political, cultural and social life of the receiving country” (p. 33). This thesis embraces Rubin, Watt, & Ramalli’s (2012) definition, according which, social integration “refers to the quantity and quality of social connections and interactions that people have with others” (p. 498). In case of this research, the quantity and quality of social connections and interaction between Swedish young adults and immigrants.

According to Ahokas (2010)receiving societies should welcome immigrants and provide them with the possibility to become familiar with the host country’s language, fundamental values and customs, consequently, while immigrants should demonstrate
determination to become part of the receiving society. Rubin, Watt, & Ramalli (2012) explain how social integration has three important benefits for immigrants: it facilitates intergroup contact and, strengthens intergroup relations between immigrants and host nationals. Second, it enables immigrants to access the social capital of host nationals and, consequently, access better employment and lifestyle opportunities (Martinovic, van Tubergen, & Maas, 2009; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006). Third, it can help to reduce health risks that may be elevated amongst immigrants, such as psychological distress and the risk of suicide (Dalgard & Thapa, 2007; Kposowa, McElvain, & Breault, 2008)” (p. 499). Further, Rubin, Watt, & Ramalli (Ibid.) emphasizes that it is import to investigate the processes that facilitate immigrant’s social integration. Considering that, lack of social integration in a culturally diverse society brings the social unity at risk (Adachi, 2011). That is why this study emphasizes social integration.

Social exclusion and segregation

The concept of social inclusion/exclusion, is typically used in migration and settlement discussions, at its core has the idea of relationships between individuals and groups with the major establishments of society (Valtonen, 2008). According to Valtonen (Ibid.) “social exclusion refers to breakdown in relations to the mainstream of social life” (p.39). Social exclusion is a condition of deprivation of individuals and social groups from the most important domains of human activity: education, work, family, communication, community and public institutions, political life, leisure and recreation (Bask, 2010). In accordance with The Ministry of Health and Social Affairs of Sweden (2006) “social exclusion means that people or groups are excluded from various parts of society or have their access to them impeded. Social exclusion occurs in part through people not gaining access to key parts of social life, such as the labor market and in part through a process in which people are gradually excluded as a result of a social problem leading to several other subsequent problems.” (p. 15).

Besides by the receiving society, insufficient integration or social exclusion may be caused by the minorities in the case they do not accept the rules of the host society and try to find a solution by segregating or creating a new mixed culture (SOU 2004:73). Michael (2012) sees voluntary separation as a mechanism that enables immigrants to resist the assimilation pressures of the majority, in favor of maintaining the culture and history of a group’s members. A social exclusion study in Sweden conducted by Bask (2010) showed that immigrants suffer from welfare problems to a greater extent than Swedes. When hypothesizing why, one of Bask’s (2010) suggestions is that maybe immigrants face discrimination.

Bask (2010) argues that there “is no evidence that immigrants have been better integrated into Swedish society over time from the perspective of social exclusion risk. Instead, there are weak signs that integration has become worse.” (p. 300). Sernhede (2007) studied a hip-hop collective in a neighborhood of Angered (an area near Gothenburg). He argues that the most common features of the stories of the young people are about experiencing exclusion, non-participation, that official Swedish institutions are not interested in them and the feeling that native Swedes do not want to get to know immigrants. It is important to point that, increased social exclusion pushes certain groups into marginalization and segregation (Hammaren, 2010). Michael (2012) embodies that “segregation refers to a concentration by race, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, political ideology, gender, religion, employment status and language” (p.470). Segregation coincides with harm e.g. inferior educational and employment
opportunities, less access to public goods and services, stigma, and discrimination.

Bunar (2007) argues that in Sweden the guiding principles for urban renewal policy (URP) in 1997, created social, ethnic and discriminatory segregation in the big-cities, building areas where only people with immigrant origin live. Ethnic residential segregation is the degree to which two or more ethnic groups live apart from each other in distinct part of the urban environment (Bolt, Özüekren, & Philips, 2010). It is an issue that has a big impact in isolating social classes and ethnic groups by creating physical distance, hence separating people (immigrant and host-society) from integrating with each other (Schlueter, 2012; Sadikot, 2011).

**Ethnocentrism**

Before continuing, it is important to elaborate ethnocentrism because the following concepts in the next section are all linked to ethnocentrism.

Bizumic, Duckitt, Popadic, Dru, & Krauss (2009), Brewer (1988) see ethnocentrism as a major element of the modern nationalism and development of prejudice. Adorno, Frenkel-Bruswik, Levinson, & Sanford (1950) link ethnocentrism and political attitudes in terms of personality to the authoritarian personality. According to Adorno et al., (Ibid.) the authoritarian personality is submissiveness to authority, rigid conventionalism, cynicism, superstitions and preoccupation with power, which are linked to various measures of ethnocentrism. Authoritarianism has been seen by many authors (e.g. Adorno et al., 1950; Altemeyer, 1996; Duckitt, 2001) as the most important personality variable that causes ethnocentrism. However, Duckitt (2001) argues that authoritarianism is not a personality variable, but a cluster of social and ideological beliefs.

Sumner (1911) defines ethnocentrism as “The sentiment of cohesion, internal comradeship, and devoted to the in-group, which carries with it a sense of superiority to any out-group and readiness to defend the interests of the in-group against the out-group” (p. 11). He also evaluates ethnocentrism as an affiliation of in-group positivity and out-group negativity. However, Brewer & Brown (1998) disagree with Sumner (1911) and state that in-group positivity and out-group negativity are unrelated. Bizumic & Duckitt (2008) argues that ethnocentrism is narcissism at the group level, he explains that there are six expressions of the concept of group self-centeredness. Four of them being intergroup expressions (group preference, superiority, purity, exploitativeness), which embrace the belief that “one’s own ethno-cultural group is more important than out-groups” (Bizumic & Duckitt, 2008, p.438). And two intragroup expressions (group cohesion and devotion) embrace the belief that “one’s ethno-cultural group is more important than in-group members” (Ibid.). Giving a more complete definition of ethnocentrism Bizumic, et al. (2009) identified two kinds of ethnocentrism: intragroup and intergroup ethnocentrism.

“Ethnocentrism is an attitudinal construct that involves a strong sense of ethnic group self-centeredness and self importance. This sense has intergroup and intragroup expressions. Intergroup expressions involve the central belief or sentiment that one’s own ethnic group is more important than other ethnic groups, whereas intragroup expressions involve the central belief or sentiment that one’s own ethnic group is more important than its individual members. Intergroup expressions involve preferring ethnic in-groups over out-groups, a belief in the superiority of one’s ethnic group over out-
groups, the wish for ethnic purity within the ethnic in-group, and acceptance of exploitation of out-groups when this is in in-group’s interests. Intragroup expressions, on the other hand, involve a need for strong group cohesion and a sentiment of strong devotion to one’s own ethnic group. These six different expressions of ethnocentrism should be mutually interacting and reinforcing” (Bizumic, Duckitt, Popadic, Dru, & Krauss, 2009, p. 874).

Intergroup and intragroup ethnocentrisms are connected and reinforce each other, at the level of generalization their common factor is of an intragroup nature. They are both concerned with the same idea of giving greater importance to the in-group, reject and exploit those belonging to other groups and cultures, forming a unitary concept of ethnocentrism (Bizumic, et al. 2009).

**Stereotypes, Prejudice, Xenophobia, Racism and Discrimination**

It is important to define human culture before we continue further, because people can act or better say their actions are shaped within their cultural context, without them being aware of it (Whitley & Kite, 2010). Matsumato & Juang (2008) define human culture as “a unique meaning and information system, shared by a group and transmitted across generations, that allow the group to meet basic needs of survival, pursue happiness and well being, and derive meaning from life” (p. 12). Members of a cultural group hold mutual beliefs about behavior, values, attitudes, and opinion, thus the culture unconsciously affects the creation of stereotyping and prejudice (Whitley & Kite, 2010).

Prejudice, stereotypes and mistrust between different ethnic groups are developed as a result of perceived differences related to race, ethnicity and culture (Otten, Sassenberg, & Kessler, 2009). The similarity – attraction hypothesis highlights that when a person is perceived to have similar characteristics to ourselves we evaluate him/her positively (Byrne, 1971). This similarity reduces insecurity in interpersonal relations and it confirms that our beliefs are correct, that is the reason why people do not evaluate cultural differences (Van Oudenhoven, Ward, & Masgoret, 2006).

Continuing with the explanation of stereotypes. Lippmann (1922) announced the term “stereotype” to indicate the typical picture that comes to mind when hearing or thinking about a particular social group. Dovidio, Hewstone, Glick & Esses (2010) defines stereotypes “as associations and beliefs about the characteristics and attributes of a group and its members that shape how people think about and respond to the group”(p.8). Hamilton (1981) suggests that stereotypes are self-fulfilling forecast that influence the way that members of one group treat another. Stereotypes are addressed through socialization, the media, language and discourse, thus affecting how people perceive and respond to a group member (McGarty, Yzerbyt, & Spears, 2002). Mass communication and mass media have enormous influence on how we perceive the society and the world around thus shaping the public opinion (Wolf, 2009). According to Entzinger & Biezeveld (2003) bad news on media tend to increase stereotypes and prejudice and hinder integration. Frequently public authorities, political parties and media transmit mixed messages regarding immigration, or even incite xenophobic reactions by associating the sense of socioeconomic and individual insecurity with the presence of immigrants (Avramov, 2009). On the other side trying to present a more positive image of immigrants by covering up problems may create a reaction from the host society (Entzinger & Biezeveld, 2003). Hammering (1981) explains how the media
in Sweden in the past have affected the categorization of immigrants as the opposite of Swede, advocating stereotypes of “us” – constructing an idealized Swedish identity and claiming that “they” are abnormal and have to adjust to “Swedishness”. Stereotypes regarding criminality, race, culture and religious antagonisms, additionally worsen conditions for people who are already sidetracked by poverty and alienation (Hammaren, 2010). It is important to mention the phenomenon of stereotype threat that occurs when members of a stereotyped group become aware of that negative stereotype, causing impairment on performance, leading to changes in behavior of the stereotyped group (McGarty, Yzerbyt, & Spears, 2002).

Stereotypes are initiators of prejudice (Bernstein, 2013). However, Whitley & Kite, (2010) argue that stereotypical belief not always leads to prejudice, it is more a matter of acceptance of stereotypes and acting upon them. Whitley & Kite (2010) mentions Devine’s (1989) study, which came to conclude that low-prejudiced people reject stereotypes and high-prejudiced people accept them. Notwithstanding, stereotypes are part of a social belief system and people can be affected and behave unconsciously, including low-prejudicing people (Whitley & Kite, 2010). Allport (1954) sees prejudice as negative attitudes towards groups and individuals based on their group (out-group) membership. Aboud (1988) defines prejudice as a “unified, stable and the consistent tendency to respond in a negative way toward members of a particular ethnic group” (p. 6).

Esses, Dovidio, Jackson, Armstrong (2001) explain that migration in large groups of people results in a feeling of threat by newcomers in the host community. There is a relationship between national identification and negative attitudes towards immigration, because people are always concerned for the national interest and immigration is perceived as bad for the national interest (Whitley & Kite, 2010). Stephan & Stephan (1996; 2000) explains the integrated theory of prejudice and suggests four types of threat that lead to prejudice: 1. Realistic threat concerns the economic and political power of the in-group that is perceived as challenged by the out-group. 2. Symbolic threat derives from differences in values, beliefs, morals, and attitudes between the two group members. 3. Intergroup anxiety and 4. Negative stereotypes, both focus on the avoidance of unpleasant interactions and the meaning of it with others. Intergroup anxiety develops in response to concerns of decreased self-concept and unfavorable assessment by others (Van Oudenhoven, Ward, & Masgoret, 2006). Negative stereotypes contain elements of threat, leading to prediction of negative events and interaction (Ibid.). Many theories and studies (e.g. Bubo, 1983; Esses, Dovidio, Jackson & Armstrong, 2001; Stephan et al., 2002; Esses, Haddock & Zanna, 1993; Kinder & Seasers, 1981) have shown that both realistic threats (economic, political power and the well being of the in-group) and symbolic threat (differences in terms of values, morals and standards) anticipate prejudice (Preira, Vala, & Costa-Lopes, 2010). However, Preira, Vala, & Costa-Lopes (Ibid.) emphasize that negative attitudes toward the out-groups (immigrants) use the threat perceptions as a justifying factor. When an out-group is seen as a threat a discriminatory behavior against members of that out-group is justifiable. Preira, Vala, & Costa-Lopes (2010) in their study have concluded that if the prejudice is greater, the perception of symbolic threat is greater and that implies greater opposition to immigration thus leading to discrimination.

Yakushko (2009) states that (as cited in Esses et al. 2001) host societies perceive immigrants as a threat when they are doing well because they accentuate the fact that immigrants are taking jobs and education opportunities away from native individuals.
On the other hand, immigrants who have a need for social services are criticized for being a burden to native-born society members. Even if tolerance is widely shared in society, negative emotions towards a group are severely rooted in individual's socialization, that often remains present (Zick, Kupper, & Hovermann, 2011). From a psychological perspective, the most important function of prejudice is bonding since it influences the creation of the sense of belonging in a particular in-group, thus creating a social identity (Hjerm, 2005; Zick, Kupper, & Hovermann, 2011).

Preira, Vala, & Costa-Lopes (2010) explain the relationship between prejudice and discrimination through the theory of system justification, concluding that prejudice can draw justification to legitimize discrimination. In accordance with Whitley & Kite (2010) discrimination comprises of refusing equal treatment of individuals and groups of people because of different race, gender, age, or any other factor. Discrimination does not imply just discerning of individuals, but also engages inappropriate behavior and unfair treatment of those individuals due to group membership (Dovidio, Hewstone, Glick, & Esses, 2010).

Discrimination can be experienced verbally and behaviorally (Whitley & Kite, 2010). Benokraitis & Feagin, (1995) have developed a system of classification for discrimination forms: **blatant discrimination** consists of “unequal and harmful treatment // that is typically international, quite visible, and easily documented” (Benokraitis & Feagin, 1995, p. 39). **Subtle discrimination** consists of “unequal and harmful treatment // that is typically less visible and obvious than blatant discrimination. It is often unnoticed because people have internalized subtle (discriminatory) behavior as ‘normal’, ‘natural’, or customary” (Benokraitis & Feagin. 1995, p. 41). And, **covert discrimination** consists of “unequal and harmful treatment // That is hidden, purposeful, and, often, maliciously motivated // behavior that consciously attempts to ensure // failure, as in hiring or other employment situations” (Benokraitis & Feagin. 1995, p. 42). Yakushko(2009) states that many authors (e.g. Jackal, & Reuter, 2006; Liebkind & Jasinskaja-Lahti, 2000; Liebkind, Jasinskaja-Lahti, & Solheim, 2004) have come to the conclusion that immigrant’s similarity with the host society does not protect them from experiencing discrimination because of their immigrant status. Perceived discrimination as a significant source of acculturative stress, serves as an important challenge to psychological sociocultural adjustment and influences negatively the cultural identity and sense of self, of immigrants (Berry, Phinney, Sam, & Vedder, 2006;Sabatier, 2008). Besides the psychological consequences, there are behavioral consequences as well(Brenick, Alain, Titzmann, Michel, & Silbereisen, 2012).

Discrimination is censured in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and in many international conventions, as the crucial instruments determining basic human rights. Sweden has ratified these conventions, particularly the Convention for the Elimination of Racism and Racial Discrimination (CERD), the ILO Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention No.111, 1958, the ILO Migrant Workers (Supplementary Provision) Convetion, No.143 (1975) which is concerned with equality of labor market opportunity and treatment in the workplace. In Sweden there are four laws that ban discrimination on the ethnicity and religion ground. Accordingly, discrimination is not part of the legislation, however, according to Attstrom (2007) and many other studies, in practice this is not totally applicable, within private as well as public enterprises. Korkmaz (2006) states immigrants are having obstacles regarding employment based upon particular degree of covert discrimination behavior of the natives. D’Ancona & Martinez (2010) also came to the conclusion that in Sweden discrimination, racism,
xenophobia and other forms of intolerance are denied by the Swedish society, but still committed and suffered by people and organizations, in many social levels and everyday life contexts.

Another phenomena that are linked to stereotypes and prejudice, which have discriminatory potential, are xenophobia and racism. Reynolds, Falger, & Vine (1987) define xenophobia as a “psychological state of hostility or fear towards outsiders” (p. 28). Yakushko (2009) states that xenophobia is a phenomenon attached to nationalism, nativism and ethnocentrism. According to Yakushko (2009) “Xenophobia is a form of attitudinal, affective, and behavioral prejudice toward immigrants and those perceived as foreign” (p. 43).

Xenophobia and racism are affected by different factors. The factors that contribute to racism are based on subordination, slavery, colonialism and segregation (Helms, 1994). Xenophobia is related to the host community’s reaction of feeling threatened by the immigrants in the economic and political aspect (Yakushko, 2009). Whereas, racism is associated with prejudices against people, established on group’s visible distinctive markers, such as skin color (Castles & Miller, 1993). Comparing to xenophobia, which marks especially people who are foreigners in a particular society, regardless of their similarities or differences with the native people (Yakushko, 2009). Racism occurs when one group seeks to dominate and abuse others over all geographic and ethnocultural boundaries, gaining the privileges from that domination (Yakushko, 2009). In many countries frequently can be noticed the concern of the nation purity, and many other issues that according to the host society come from immigrants, thus conflating it with racism (Smith, 2006). Lau Chin (2004) defines racism “as belief attitudes, institutional arrangements, and behaviors that tend to denigrate individuals or groups because of these persons’ phenotypic characteristics or ethnic group affiliation” (p.224). Balibar (2005) and Staszak (2009) see racism as an extreme form of otherness, exclusion, sexism, nationalism, imperialism, etc. or as a final form of a set of such processes, which is realized depending on the circumstances.

There has been a debate since 1980s regarding the changes of earlier, open racism to a more covert racism. The developed ‘new-racism’ has been given many labels: ‘cultural-racism’, ‘neo-racism’ and ‘racism of cultural difference’. Delanty, Wodak, & Jones (2008) names this new form of racism as ‘xeno-racism’, because it exploits the settled xenophobic frames, ethnocentrism and prejudice in sophisticated ways. Delanty, Wodak, & Jones (2008) express their concern that racism in Europe is on the increase featuring hostility to migrants, refugees and asylum-seekers. Many European countries the extreme right has adopted a coded form of racism (Ibid.). This new form compared to the old one it is not expressed openly or in terms of neo-fascist rhetoric, by some notion of biological or racial superiority but it is rather justified using the social aspect (job protection, welfare benefits) and cultural differences.

**Intercultural contact**

Increased migration has created a cultural diversity within nations resulting in a growing need to increase intercultural relation in order to understand each other (Van Oudenhoven, Ward, & Masgoret, 2006). If immigrants can integrate effectively, and national populations can accept and include immigrant and ethno-cultural group members into their organizations, then social congruence and economic efficiency will be strengthened (Dandy & Pe-Pua, 2010).
According to Allport’s (1954) contact hypothesis, the lack of knowledge about a group causes negative attitudes towards that group. Personal contact between social groups creates mutual understanding thus making them less hostile toward one another (Thomsen, 2012). Allport (1954) points that when individuals of two groups with equal status come into positive, personal, and cooperative contact with each other, supported by the authorities, they will get to know each other thus resulting in the reduction or even elimination of prejudice. When studying social integration of immigrants, Schlueter (2012) emphasizes the importance of friendship between immigrants and host-society members. According to Schlueter (Ibid.) inter-ethnic friendship decreases social segregation between immigrant and host-society members, increases immigrants’ life opportunities and improves the inter-ethnic relations by reducing ethnic prejudice. It is worth pointing out that casual everyday contact and superficial interaction do not promote positive intergroup contacts between members of different ethnic groups (Dovidio, Gaertner, John, Halabi, Saguy, Pearson & Riek, 2008).

On the other hand, Samarov, Porter, & McDaniel (2012) believe that people see the world through criteria that culture places in their perception. People from different cultures, perceive the world differently and this affects intercultural community (Ibid.). Intercultural interaction obstacles emerge from differences in cognition (e.g. fundamental epistemologies, values, norms, etc.), affect (e.g. types and levels of emotional expressivity), and patterns of behavior (e.g. language, customs, communication styles, etc.). Efficient intercultural interaction requires cognitive, affective, and behavioral adjustments that can be difficult and problematic for individuals in an intergroup engagement (Dodd, 1995; Gudykunst, 1986; Lustig & Koester, 1996). Lack of positive intergroup experiences and cultural and ethnic understanding leads to prejudice and stereotypes, which can lead to further negative consequences e.g. intergroup conflicts, inequality, intergroup anxiety and tension (Kim, 2012).

**Immigration and integration in Sweden**

In the period after the Second World War, Europe became a region of immigration. Immigrants, so called guest workers were considered to be of a temporary nature, but many of them stayed and were followed by their spouses and children (Doomenik, 2001). During the 19th century until about 1920s, Sweden was an emigration country (Dingu-Kyrklund, 2007). However, in 1930 there was a shift of pattern in favor of immigration, when Sweden opened its borders to refugees from the Second World War, which led to noticeably increased number of immigrants (Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Department for Migration and Asylum Policy, 2001). In 1939 Sweden received 70 000 war children evacuated from Finland, in the period from 1943 to 1945 about 30 000 Estonians, Latvians, Lithuanians, 60 000 Norwegians and Danes moved to Sweden (Ibid.). Large numbers of these refugees settled permanently in Sweden. In the Post War period from 1950 to 1960 Sweden had a great need for labor force, workers were recruited from Italy, Australia, Belgium and Greece bringing in Sweden 256 000 people. With the establishment of the Nordic labor market, and the excess unemployment in Finland, the greatest number (over half a million) of the labor immigrants coming to Sweden were Finns (Ibid.). Sweden did not apply guest workers politic, rather it encouraged migrants to bring their families (Dingu-Kyrklund, 2007). In 1970s the labor migration declined excessively due to the recession and the restrictiveness of the immigration policy (Wadensjö, 2007; Dingu-Kyrklund, 2007). During this period, immigrants who were already domiciled were encouraged to become
naturalized citizens (Dingu-Kyrklund, 2007). In 1980s immigration in Sweden took 
shifts to refugee immigration. Refugees, people in need and their relatives became the 
most important groups, increasing the number of immigrants from outside Europe to 146 
000, increasing (Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Department for Migration and Asylum 
policy, 2001). During the 1990s immigrants in Sweden came from Africa and Asia, 
following 1993-1995 Sweden received a large number of refugees from the war in 
Bosnia-Herzegovina and Kosovo as well (Ibid.). In 1995 Sweden become a member of 
the European Union (EU), which lead to an intra-European migration, including the 
return of many Swedes who had moved abroad (Dingu-Kyrklund, 2007). In 2000 there 
were attempts to instigate intra-EU and intra-Nordic freedom of movement and block 
unwanted immigration from third countries (Ibid.). However, immigration increased in 
comparison to the average level of immigration in the 1990s (Wadensjö, 2007). 
Immigration to Sweden broke records in 2009, when 102 000 persons immigrated to 
Sweden (OECD, 2012). Swedish population counts about 9.5 million inhabitants, of 
which half a million are foreign citizens (Bernitz, 2012).

Sweden has often been viewed as an international role model of social equality, gender 
equality, integration policy and place of refuge (Eliassi, 2010). Because of the increasing 
number of labor immigrants, there was a need to discuss the immigration issue and 
formulate an official policy (Hammaren, 2010). The first turn from the early free 
immigration to a new policy based on a regulated immigration, in Sweden was marked 
by the first immigrant integration measures in 1965, when the language courses for 
immigrants were launched (Dingu-Kyrklund, 2007). During the period of 1960-1990 
immigration policy in Sweden has been framed on the affinity of equal rights, 
opportunities, obligations and social position for “Swedes” and “immigrants” (Eliassi, 
2010). On 1968 the Riskdag (The Swedish Parliament) initiated an assimilation policy 
for immigrants, however, its Committee Report (SOU 1974: 69) led to a new policy for 
immigrants and a trend to encourage the naturalization of permanent residents (Dingu-
Kyrklund, 2007). In 1975 the Riksdag adopted a minority policy according to which 
Sweden was viewed as developing into an ethnically plural society (Westin, 2006). In 
the elections of 1991 an extreme right wing party called Ny demokrati (The New 
Democracy) was brought to the Rikstag and the first consequence of this was the 
withdrawal of the Amendment in the Immigration Act Prop. 1990/91:195, leading to 
new amendments that drastically reduced the possibility for certain categories of 
refugees to seek shelter in Sweden (Ibid.). Until the completion of the official 
investigation regarding Sweden’s immigration and integration policies in 1996, in 
Sweden in some areas there were more liberal tendencies and in other areas more 
restrictive (Ibid.). In 1996, Sweden announced the transition from immigration to an 
integration policy. “Swedish policy on migration in a global perspective” (SOU 1996:55), 
“Sweden, the future and multiculturalism,” Prop.: 1997/98: 16, (“Sverige, 
framtid och mångfalden”) highlighted the need to acknowledge the ethnic and 
cultural diversity as part of Swedish society and a starting point for an integrated policy 
for the entire society (Ibid.).

In accordance with the Swedish Government (Ministry of Justice, 2011) immigration 
helps vitalize society, the labor market and the economy thanks to the new knowledge 
and experience that new arrivals bring from their home countries. Sweden is considered 
a leading country of immigration policy in Europe, which recognizes the importance of 
immigrants’ integration (Dingu-Kyrklund, 2007). In the mid 1970s the Swedish politics 
and policies introduced the concept of integration, which resulted in a multicultural 
approach (Schönwälder, 2007). The Swedish integration policy aims at system
integration, i.e. that immigrants have the right to live under equal conditions, have access to jobs and exercise political influence to the same extent as the native population (Eliassi, 2010). The possibility of participating in various social relationships (i.e. social integration) was not formally part of the basic goals of the Swedish system integration; it was a freedom of choice until 1997 when the integration policy was reformed (Ibid.). Wiesbrock (2011) argues that the results in respect of the success of Swedish integration measures are ambiguous. Despite the good intentions of integration programs to turn immigrants into good citizens and to become equal members of society, it is particularly apparent that this assistance is complex (Olwig & Paerregaard, 2011). Interventions seem to be designed primarily to fit the welfare system rather than to the needs of refugees (Ibid.). Integration has become the groundwork in determining who belongs and by implication, who does not belong in society (Ibid.). The central and local governments, voluntary associations and non-governmental organizations (NGO), have been trying to solve together the major concerns of integration policy. Despite, “it is very difficult indeed to explain the rather modest outcomes of these efforts (cultural obstacles, the regulated nature of the labor market, problems related to the complex immigration blending labor immigrants with political refugees, xenophobia among groups of the Swedish population, and so on)” (Pierre, Jochem, & Jahn, 2011, p.18)

According to Wiesbrock (2011) compared to countries like France, which lead assimilationist policies Sweden leads more liberal immigration policy with the emphasis on multiculturalism. The objectives of integration policy in Sweden are a) equal rights, responsibilities and opportunities for all, regardless of ethnic or cultural background; b) a community based on diversity; and c) a society characterized by mutual respect and tolerance, in which everyone can take an active and responsible part, irrespective of background (Regeringskansliet, 2002). Preventing and fighting ethnic discrimination, xenophobia and racism are issues with high priority in the integration policy of Sweden (Ibid). Sweden has created several laws banning discrimination on ethnic grounds as well. However, Allwood, Edeback, & Myhre (2006) points out that the implementation of these laws has not been very strict. Many authors (e.g. Kallas & Kaldur; Wiesbrock; Envall) argue that Sweden is one of the countries that have given a big effort in creating good integration policies for immigrants, but racism and xenophobia have been always evident. Some regard it as personal agitation, inherent in adolescent behavior, and not political or structural problem in society (Bunar, 2007). However, the presence of extreme parties such as The Sweden Democrats (a Swedish anti-immigration party) in the Swedish political arena and in the Riksdag (the Swedish Parliament), also the increased hate crime reported by Bra (The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention) testifies the opposite (Loow, 2000). Baski (2008) points that there is existence of inequality creating strata in the society.

On the administrative side, in Sweden each minister, each ministry and each government agency are responsible for integration issues within its respective area, the municipalities as well have great responsibility for many issues that are important for integration (Ministry of Integration and Gender Equality, 2009). As understood from The Ministry of Integration and Gender Equality (2009) Sweden gives a big effort in creating initiatives and different programs for introduction of newly arrived with the Swedish society (Swedish for immigrants SFI, Step-in jobs, Introductory dialogue, Better surveys, Mentoring schemes, Organized resettlement, Dialogue with values-based organizations on integration). It is the ministry that frames the measures, but implementation happens on the local level, thus the local councils are responsible and play a big role in the implementation of integration policy (Kallas & Kaldur, 2007).
According to the Swedish Ministry of Justice (2011) Sweden is engaged in constructive cooperation with the UN Refugee Agency (UNHCR), the possibility of seeking asylum must be safeguarded and that all EU Member States must share the responsibility for offering protection to refugees, opposing the trend in Europe toward more closed borders. Wiesbrock(2011) states that the entrance of Sweden Democrats (SD) into the national parliament in 2010 and following other EU member states strategies, will affect Sweden’s liberal approach concept and lead Sweden to adapt a restrictive integration policy.

The next chapter will explain how immigration and social work are related, and how social works affects immigration. This will help in understanding why immigrants’ integration is chosen as a subject of this social work thesis.
IMMIGRATION AND SOCIAL WORK

It is of key importance to discuss how immigration is related to social work hence this section will do that. According to Geldof (2011) raising ethnic diversity and at-risk population is one of the major challenges for social work. Social work is charged with guarding the rights and promoting the psychological health of at-risk populations (Lum, 1996). In particular, social work has long been concerned with the rights, well-being, and health of immigrant populations (Chang-Muy, 2008).

Social work approaches have a generic focus on the social functioning of individuals and groups (Valtonen, 2008, p. 39). This focus is operationalized in strategy that seeks to strengthen and enhance the individual’s person-in-environment links (Valtonen, 2008). Strong relationship or connections with the social environment progress from the involvement, participation, and engagement of individuals in meaningful and effective activity (Ibid.). Valtonen (2008) states that social work activity is positioned at the interface between the individual and society, and between the citizen and the state, hence in between the processes that promote solidarity in society and those which cause marginalization.

Despite of the type of social services systems and human service adjustment in the receiving countries, social workers have come to be devoted with key roles and significant activities in helping and facilitating the integration of immigrants (Valtonen, 2008). Immigration has constantly been and remains to be essential to social work services due to the fact that immigrants are sensitive to all types of sub-standard living conditions and abuses, including child labor, prostitution and human trafficking (Craig de Silva, 2007). Many countries in Europe have growing immigrant and refugee communities and concern over their integration into the society (Valtonen, 2001). “Taking the holistic perspective on resettlement, social work can be seen as a crucial support and bridging service through transition” (Valtonen, 2001, p. 247). Activities entail active nourishing of linkage to promote immigrant engagement in the society, a mandate that goes beyond that of assuring accessibility to welfare benefits. The thrusts of empowerment for complete engagement and efficient practice of citizenship include capacity building, networking of sources and fighting discriminatory barriers (Valtonen, 2001).

The assumptions of immigrant integration that underlie social policies and social services for immigrants need to be interrogated because these assumptions may be not only ineffective, but also oppressive. Social workers have an ethical obligation to work against oppressive conditions (Sakamoto, 2007).

The next chapter will describe and define the research problem where the aim and research questions of the study are presented as well.
DEFINITION OF RESEARCH PROBLEM

The settlement of immigrants with distinctive backgrounds causes different reactions among countries and host societies (Alexander, 2003). For some countries, immigration is welcomed because it adds a new vitality and provides a cheap labor. According to Buonfino, Byrne, Collett, Cruddas, Cuperus, Dijsselbloem, Dubet, Einaudi, Hillebrand, Kronig, Pearson, Sik, Rumi Ibanez (2007) as stated in the Home Office research immigrants pay more in taxes than they take in benefit. For others, this means a cease of belonging, loss of jobs and housing (Ibid.). The idea that the so far integration policy has failed is becoming prevalent in many European countries (Kallas & Kaldur, 2007). According to Kallas & Kaldur (Ibid.) in some countries the judgment is based upon the idea that continual immigration has positioned pressure on the practicality of the welfare state model. In other countries, the emphasis is on the distinction in values of immigrant and native population coming from their cultural background, which results in the fragmentation of society and the reduction of both external and internal safety. The war against terrorism has given especial priority to the integration problems of Muslim immigrants, together with the problems of the social status of women immigrants (Kallas & Kaldur, 2007). Rodriguez-Garcia (2010) thinks that the message that is sent to immigrants in Europe is that they do not belong entirely until they have assimilated. At the same time, on the other side, immigrants in ofentimes do not truly have the possibility to assimilate because they are considered as not having the same right to completely belong to the nation or to the civil society, and they are not granted complete privileges. Different cultural background values of immigrants and host population result in fragmentation of society (Kallas & Kaldur, 2007).

As noted by Card, Dustmann and Peterson (2005) public attitudes towards immigration and immigrants are found to be more important than integration policies in shaping migration policies. In accordance with Avramov (2009) “on the basis of the general population climate in the host countries we can conclude that one of the pillars for successful integration of immigrants, their massive acceptance by the natives is remarkably fragile” (p. 24). Vast of the research on immigration has been focusing on immigrant’s adaptation (e.g. Richardson, 1974; Taft, 1985, 1986) and on the perspectives of immigrants, with the purpose of adopting or proposing a process for their adjustment. Researchers have done studies regarding Swedish society attitudes towards immigrants. However, these studies are in Swedish language and there is lack of literature in English about this subject. It is worth mentioning the European Social Survey, which is in English despite the quantitative methodology.

The settlement of immigrants with an extremely different background of the local population touches deeper chords within the host society, varying from fear to compassion. The response of host society members to immigrant settlement can differ from acceptance to indifference, to what some citizens perceive as an invasion of strangers (Alexander, 2003). The last response may lead to voting for anti-immigrant parties and/or act of violence, to which immigrants do not stay passive (Ibid.). The significant electoral success of anti-immigration parties in Europe shows that, significant number of residents perceive immigration as having negative outcomes both in economic and non-economic spheres, which leads to prefer a more restrictive immigration policy (Meuleman, Davidov, & Billiet, 2009). Native people more frequently share perspectives regarding risks and disadvantages that immigrants bring, such as crime, violence, and loss of employment for natives.
The question is: What have to do perceptions with attitudes and behavior? Why is it important to research perceptions? According to Pickens (2005) perception is closely related to attitudes. Perception is the process by which organisms interpret and organize sensation to produce a meaningful experience of the world (Lindsay & Norman, 1977). In other words, a person is confronted with a situation or stimuli and he/she interprets that stimuli into something meaningful based on prior experience (Pickens, 2005). However, essentially reality can be different from what an individual interprets or perceives (Ibid.). In accordance with (Pickens, 2005) “social perception is how an individual "sees" others and how others perceive an individual” (p. 60). This is achieved through various means such as categorizing an individual based upon a single characteristic, evaluating a person’s characteristics by comparing him with others, perceiving others in ways that truly reflect a perceiver’s own habits and beliefs, judging someone on the basis of one’s perception of the group to which that person belongs, inducing a person to act inappropriately based on another person’s perception, or controlling another person’s perception of oneself (Pickens, 2005). Researchers in social psychology have demonstrated that complex behavior is automatically shaped and guided by the knowledge that is incidentally activated during perception and, once activated, can guide actual behavior (Bargh, 2005).

Constant, Kahanec & Zimmermann (2009) stress “attitudes and sentiments about ethnic minorities are certainly related to natives’ perceptions about them” (p. 4). Based on the group threat theory, anti-immigrant sentiments and behaviors result from perceived group threat, broadly defined here as concerns that immigrants challenge the well-being of the majority group (Rieck, Mania, & Gaertner, 2006; Meuleman, Davidov, & Billiet, 2009). According to group conflict theorists, negative attitudes toward out-groups essentially stem from the view that certain prerogatives of the own group are threatened by other groups (Blalock, 1967; Coser, 1956). Negative out-group sentiments can thus be seen as a defensive reaction to perceived intergroup competition for scarce goods (Meuleman, Davidov, & Billiet, 2009). In other words, the subjective perception of competition plays a crucial mediating role between actual threats to group interests and negative out-group attitudes (Meuleman, Davidov, & Billiet, 2009).

AIM

The purpose of this study is to investigate Swedish young adults perception and attitudes towards immigrants and immigrants’ integration in Sweden. Furthermore the aim is to study their perception of social integration of immigrants and the Swedish host society. How Swedish young adults perceive their country’s immigration policy.

This research focuses on the following questions:

- How do Swedish young adults with higher education perceive immigrants?
- How Swedish young adults with higher education perceive their country’s immigration policy?
- How aware are Swedish young adults with higher education of immigrant’s integration and what influences the immigrant’s social integration?
- How supportive are Swedish young adults with higher education of immigration and multiculturalism in Sweden?
THEORETICAL FRAME OF REFERENCE

This section will explain the two theories (Acculturation Theory and Social Identity Theory) that will be used to analyze and discuss the findings of this research.

Acculturation theory

Acculturation theory tries to understand and explain intercultural relations and plural societies. Migration results in a meeting of people from different countries and backgrounds leading to cultural diversity within nations (Sam & Berry, 2006). “Acculturation covers all the changes that arise following contact between individuals and groups of different cultural backgrounds” (Sam & Berry, 2006, p. 11). According to Dandy & Pe-Pua (2010) and Samarov, Porter, & McDaniel (2012) acculturation refers to the phenomenon that immigrants steadily take over certain significant components of their surrounding cultural environment, without entirely abandoning their initial cultural identity.

Before we continue with the Berry’s acculturation theory, we will talk about plural societies, which will help in better understanding the acculturation theory. In accordance with Allen & Skelton (1999) a plural society is one in which different cultural and ethnic groups live together in a social and political structure that they have build cooperating together. Sam & Berry (2006) point two key aspects of this concept: the continuity or not of diverse cultural communities, and the participation or not of this community in the daily life of the plural society. The first concept brings the idea of unicultural society (one culture and one people), which used to be the case. However, nowadays it is known that there is no society portrayed by one culture, one language, one religion and one identity for the whole population. Some people still deny this fact and see their societies as uniform, and some others embrace the fact of plural society. Sam & Berry (2006) explain two models of plural society:

1. The melting pot model where there is one dominant society and the minority groups are on the margins. The minority groups are rejected, they are accepted to participate in the society by being absorbed into the dominant culture and essentially disappear as a group.
2. The multicultural model where individuals and groups keep their cultural identity while participating in the social structure larger society. In this kind of societies all the different cultures and groups are welcome, creating shared norms about how to live together.
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Figure 1 Two Implicit Models of Plural Societies
Berry’s (2011) acculturation strategies are established upon distinctions between orientations towards one’s own group and toward other groups. This distinction is presented based on the attitudes towards two basic issues: cultural/identity maintenance and contact, and participation in the society. Depending on the individual and social relations, and interaction of the strategies of the two groups in contact, Berry identifies four intercultural preferences from the perspective of non-dominant groups known as acculturation strategies and four preferences from the perspective of the dominant group known as acculturation expectations.

Beginning from the perspective of non-dominant ethno-cultural group:

1. **Assimilation** is defined when individuals do not maintain their original cultural identity and seek to move fully into the host society.
2. **Separation** is the preferred option for individuals who wish to maintain their original culture and avoid interaction with others.
3. **Integration** is a strategy followed by individuals who wish to maintain their cultural identity and at the same time interact with other groups and be part of the larger social framework.
4. **Marginalization** characterizes those who have no possibility or interest in maintaining their culture and no possibility or interest in having relations with the host society as well.

Figure 2. Acculturation strategies in ethno-cultural groups and the larger society

*Repined from The Cambridge Handbook of Acculturation Psychology (p. 35) by Sam, David L.; Berry, John W. 2006, New York: Cambridge University Press.*
These strategies are based on the assumption that non-dominant groups are free to choose who they want to interact with (Berry J. W., 2011). In case the dominant group dictates a certain form of acculturation, a third element comes to the fore. That element is “the power of dominant groups to influence the acculturation strategies available to, and used by, the non-dominant groups”, (Berry, 2011, p.2.6) then other terms are used. For example, in the case of integration, it can only be “chosen and successfully pursued by the non-dominant groups when the dominant society is open and inclusive” (Ibid.) toward cultural diversity. In order for the integration to be achieved, a mutual accommodation is required, including acceptance of each other by both groups and others as well, to live culturally different people within the same society (Sam & Berry, 2006). Integration requires non-dominant group to adapt the basic values of the dominant group, at the same time larger society must adapt its institutions to fulfill the needs of all groups living within the society (Ibid.).

Berry (2011) highlights the big importance that the dominant society has in the acculturation process and creation of a multicultural society. When talking about the dominant’s group perception of how non-dominant group should acculturate, we talk about acculturation expectations. Berry identifies four possible acculturation expectations:

1. When the dominant society accepts the fact that immigrant groups want to maintain their cultural identity and welcome them in the society by engaging in a relationship with them, integration is defined. In this case it can be seen that agreement from the both sides is achieved thus creating a strategy of mutual accommodation, generally called multiculturalism.

2. Assimilation is the case when the dominant group does not accept the maintenance of heritage culture of the non-dominant group, though is supporting social contact. When assimilation is required by the dominant group, Berry nominates it as melting pot and when it is enforced it becomes a pressure cooker.

3. In case that the dominant group does not want to have any relationship with members of other groups (They separate from other cultural groups) it is segregation.

4. When the dominant group enforces marginalization it is a form of exclusion.

From the many studies that have examined these acculturation strategies (e.g. Berry, Phinney, Sam & Veddra, 2006; Berry, Kalin & Taylor, 1977), integration is the most preferred acculturation strategy by the non-dominant group. While immigrant groups try to hold on their cultural identity and in the same time attempt to connect to the host community to create a home, such demands result in cultural confusion and isolation (Piontkowski, Rohmann, & Florack, 2002). Same as immigrants, receiving societies tend to approach the social-cultural incorporation of immigrants in different ways in order to establish unity (Callens, Valentova, & Meuleman, 2012). The chosen strategies depend on historical, demographical, political and social characteristics and the definition of integration, adapted in the institutional level (Rodríguez-García, 2010). Receiving society members evaluate positively and perceive as less threatening immigrants who agree with their beliefs, values and interests, while differences lead to intercultural threat and conflict (Ibid.).

Low perceived fit of acculturation attitudes between groups involved in the acculturation process has negative impact of intergroup relations,
whereas correspondence between acculturation attitudes leads intergroup interaction to less anticipated conflicts (Rohmann, Florack, & Piontkowski, 2006). Berry mentions that even if the pluralism is accepted, there are fluctuations in accepting of different cultures, creating hierarchies of acceptance (Sam & Berry, 2006).

Social identity theory (SIT)

Before we continue with Social Identity Theory (SIT), it is important to elaborate the concept of ‘otherness’, because identity is a process of classification that creates our relationship to other individuals and groups, which helps in defining the in-groups and out-groups (Udrea, 2011). Hence, there must be ‘them’ against which we can compare ourselves in order to define ‘us’ (Ibid.). In the past, many researchers (Turner et al., 1987, Shore, 1993, Neumann, 1999, Mummendey and Waldzus, 2004, Staszak, 2008, Fligstein, 2009) have discussed ‘identity’ in relation to the ‘other’. As Waldzus & Mummendey (2004) state “people’s perceptions of themselves are constructed in relation to elements of the outside world” (as cited in Udrea, 2011, p. 120). People create their identity or the idea of who they are as a response to some other group (Fligstein, 2009). As Mineva (2007) explains Other-ness and We-ness (a term she uses for the “Us” “the Self “) are two sides of the same coin dividing humanity into: one whose identity is valued and represents the norm and another who is discriminated and devalued. According to Lamont & Fournier (1992) defining the ‘other’ requires drawing boundaries. In accordance with Baudrillard & Guillaume (1994) “Otherness is crossing a boundary, and a boundary can be totally imaginary and invisible” (p. 50). It is worth mentioning that the process of stigmatization and differentiation of out-groups by the dominant in-group creates ‘otherness’ and negation of identity, in the same time motivating them toward discrimination (Staszak, 2009).

Social identity theory (SIT) introduces social identity as a way to explain intergroup relations. Social identity theory and other researches arising from it, emphasize the importance of individuals to identify with a social group, the impact that it has on their self-esteem, intergroup and intragroup cognitions, attitudes and behavior. Social identity theory (SIT) has been defined by its founder Tajfel (1981) as “that part of an individual’s self-concept which derives from his knowledge of his membership of a social group … together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (p. 225). In accordance with Tajfel & Turner (1979) people categorize themselves and others as belonging to different social groups and evaluate each other. Membership in a group and values placed upon that group is defined as social identity (Trepte, 2006).

The goal of SIT in social psychology is to define and explain behavioral outcomes and consequences of the process of social identity (Brewer, 2007). Individuals customize their social behavior depending on if they are interacting with members of the in-group or out-group (Ibid.). Trepte (2006) states that we categorize people in groups in order to understand the world and social integration. Tajfel (1979) suggests four fundamental principles of SIT: social categorization, social comparison, social identity and self-esteem. Tajfel & Turner (1979) outline: “Social categorizations are conceived here as cognitive tools that segment, classify, and order the social environment, and thus enable the individual to undertake many forms of social action...They create and define the individual’s place in society” (p. 40). For example, we use categories to describe people with specific clothing style, people with the same habits, people with same profession, etc. and we have expectations, hopes and fears about every each of these social
groups (Trepte, 2006). According to Trepte (2006) “the first type of behavior that is
triggered by social categorization is social comparison” (p. 258). We compare ourselves
with others in order to define our social identity. We do not only compare social groups,
but we evaluate them as well, to get the idea of superiority or inferiority of our group.
Based on Frestinger’s (1954) idea of social comparison Tajfel (1978) defines social
identity as “that part of an individual's self-concept which derives from his knowledge
of his membership of a social group together with the value and emotional significance
attached to that membership” (p. 63). Social identity is achieved based on comparison
between in-group and a compatible out-group. Underlying inter-group behavior is
motivated by the main drive of reaching self-enhancement. The need of positive self-
esteeem is fulfilled when we get a positive evaluation from one’s own group (Turner,
Brown, & Tajfel, 1979). Abrams & Hogg (1988) elaborate further the concept of self-
esteeem suggesting the self-esteem hypothesis. It brings two conclusions: First, inter-
group discrimination increases self-esteem. Second, low self-esteem causes increased
out-group discrimination.
METHODOLOGY

This section of the thesis, will present in details, the process how this study was conducted. This comprises of accounts of the selected methods of gathering data, including the participants and analyzing the data. Ethical aspects of the study are further elaborated. This chapter is divided into several subheadings in order to display a clearer overview of the whole research process.

It begins by describing how the researcher elected this particular subject. Continuing, it describes what preparations were done with the purpose to begin the study and details of how the literature review was conducted. Continuing, it explains the epistemological and ontological assumptions, the research design, why this particular design is chosen. The first subheading, explains the setting where the empirical part of the study took place. The second subheading, describes the individuals who participated in the study and how they were selected. Followed by the materials and instructional strategies that were used to conduct the study, measurement instruments, how the data was collected and the techniques that were used to analyze the data. Finalizing this chapter with the ethical considerations.

Initial procedure

This study began by reflecting upon the broad topic of immigrant’s integration and narrowing it by identifying this research subject. Continuing, the focus of the research was honed by answering the questions: Who will be studied? From what perspective? What will be the focus of the study? Why and how it will be conducted? A literature review was conducted in order to learn what has been published and to clarify the research question, goals and objectives of the study. Afterward a project plan was written and an application to the Ethics Committee of Southeast Sweden (Etikkommittén Sydost) was submitted for an advisoryethical evaluation.

The research aim is to focus on the perceptions of young Swedish adults regarding the integration of immigrants and Sweden as a receiving country. How do young native Swedes perceive the immigrants and their integration, how well are immigrants accepted by them, their opinion on what affects the integration as a process, what affects their perception about immigrants, their perception on multiculturalism.

As a preparation for the study and development of a project plan, the first thing to do was consulting the literature concerning the subject. The necessary literature for the review was found in the libraries that could be accessed, the Linnaeus University Library, Stockholm University Library and academic databases. The search for articles and dissertations on the subject, was conducted using the keywords: immigration, immigrant’s integration, integration of immigrants in Sweden, immigration in Sweden, social integration in Sweden, attitudes towards immigrants in Sweden, perception of natives towards immigrants’. The searched databases were: OneSearch–Beta, ProQuest, Dissertation.se, DIVA, LIBRIS, SwePub and OneSearch. Searching results were refined by including only peer-reviewed articles, published in the last ten years with the exception of very small number of articles that were one or two years older.

The phase of developing the research design. By exploring the literature while having in mind the research question, objective and goals, the best suited research design of the study was defined. This is a qualitative research following the constructivist paradigm.
The fundamental approach of constructivism is that reality is socially constructed by people active in the research process (Robson, 2011; Schwandt, 2000). Constructivism presumes that the task of the researcher is to understand the multiple social construction of meaning and knowledge from the perspective of those who live it (Robson, 2011; Schwandt, 2000). In accordance with Guba & Lincoln (1994) “realities are apprehendable in the form of multiple, intangible mental constructions, socially and experimentally based, local and specific in nature (although elements, are often shared among many individuals and even across cultures), and dependent for their form and content in the individual persons or groups holding the constructions.” (p. 110). The goal of constructivism is to produce a better knowledge (Mittwede, 2012).

When choosing the best research design and approach for the study, the research aim and research questions were analyzed. Empirical phenomenology was chosen as study approach. “Phenomenology is concerned with the systematic reflection and analysis of phenomena associated with conscious experiences, such as human judgment, perceptions, and actions, with the goal of (1) appreciating and describing social reality from the diverse subjective perspectives of the participants involved, and (2) understanding the symbolic meanings underlying these subjective experiences.” (Bhattacherjee, 2012. p. 109). In accordance with Patton (2002) Husserl sees phenomenology as the study of how people describe things and experience them through their sense from the point of view of the person who is experiencing it. The phenomenological approach supposition is that there is an essence or essences to shared experience. The common experiences of different people when analyzed and compared lead to mutually understood core meaning or essence of a phenomenon. Thus, it is important to know what people experience, how they interpret the world, put together a phenomena and develop a worldview (Ibid.). Aspers (2009) present empirical phenomenology as an additional and fourth route of the three phenomenological routes relevant to social sciences, which is built based on the work of Husserl, Heidegger and Schutz. The three phenomenological routes are: a) the one taken by Schütz, which is essentially non-empirical, b) ethnomethodology, which is only remotely related do phenomenology, c) the integration of phenomenology into mainstream social science and the last which is presented by Asper d) empirical phenomenology, which is a development based on interpretations of the above phenomenology. “Empirical phenomenology proceeds from the assumption that a scientific explanation must be grounded in the meaning” (p. 1) and in the social sciences should be “connected to the meaning structure of real people (p. 5)” (Aspers, 2009). Empirical phenomenology acknowledges that the social world is socially constructed, that the central role of theory is research and the role of unintended consequences (Aspers, 2009). In social science, central to the phenomenological approach is the description of how people feel, perceive and think about things, however social scientists seek understanding and explanation as well (Ibid.). Aspers (2009) highlight the relevance of unintended consequences as the effect of actions that have certain intended results as goals, in empirical research and social sciences in general. Aspers (Ibid.) summarizes the improvement of empirical phenomenology over previous attempts to do phenomenological social sciences in three points: it is empirical, it integrates, makes use of theory in empirical research and it checks for unintended consequences.

Qualitative research design was chosen for the study as best suited. According to Bui (2009) qualitative method investigated the topic in depth describing experiences and perceptions from the point of view of the participants, creating a comprehensive picture of the situation and helping to better understand social realities and processes. Berg
(2001) points out that qualitative research is interested in understanding “how people
learn about and make sense of themselves and the other.” (p. 7). Qualitative research is
used in cases when we need to explore the detailed understanding of an issue in a group
of population by empowering individuals to share their story because we want to
understand how they address that issue (Patton, 2002). According to Creswell (2007),
qualitative research is conducted because a problem or issue in a group of the
population needs to be explored and because quantitative measures and the statistical
analysis simply do not fit the problem. Continuing, Creswell (Ibid.) highlights that
qualitative inquiry requires a considerable time in the field and the data analysis and
sorting large amount of data in qualitative research is a complex and time-consuming
process.

Setting

The study took place in three of the largest cities in Sweden, where the largest number
of immigrants live. The sampling frame was higher educated young Swedish adults,
hence the target setting where the universities. The research was conducted at
Stockholm University, Gothenburg University and Malmö University.

Participants

Considering that we are seeking to understand a phenomenon from the point of view of
a particular group of people, in order to determine the sampling frame, purposive
sampling was used. The research question and aim helped in distinguishing the unit of
analysis and the essential criterion desired in the study unit. Maxwell (1997) defines
purposive sampling as a type of sampling, where “particular settings, persons, or events
are deliberately selected for the important information they can provide that cannot be
gotten as well from other choices” (p. 87). Purposive sampling begins with a purpose in
mind, thus the sample is chosen to comprise people of interest and exclude those that do
not suit the purpose (Patton, 1990). People are chosen based on predetermined
characteristics (Ibid.). According to Oliver (2006) advantage of purposive sampling
is that the researcher can determine participants who are most likely to provide data
that are accurate and relevant to the research question. Oliver (Ibid.) states that the
subjectivity of the researcher’s decision making is a primary disadvantage of
purposive sampling. It is a cause of possible bias and a significant hazard to the
validity of the research conclusion. In order to decrease these effects, following
Oliver’s (Ibid.) suggestion, we attempted to assure that there is an internal
uniformity in between the objectives and epistemological basis of the research, and
the criteria used for selecting the purposive sample.

The research was conducted with young adults with a Swedish background (native
Swedes) with higher education, between the ages of twenty to thirty. Relying on the
Swedish Ministry of Employment (2011), the term Swedish background or natives
included those young adults born in Sweden with one or two native born parents. The
reason why people with higher education were chosen as a target population is because
the researcher was interested on the attitudes and perception of the group that mostly
support immigration. According to Dandy & Pe-Pua (2010) university educated people
are more supportive of immigration that those without an university education. Many
other authors (Pass & Halapuu, 2012; Dandy & Pe-Pua, 2010; Betts, 2005; Bulbeck,
2004) state that students are more likely to support immigrants, multiculturalism and
cultural diversity, than people without a university education. This reaction is
more noticeable in richer and more equal countries, than in poorer and more unequal countries (Pass & Halapuu, 2012). Based on human capital theory, higher levels of education make people more qualified thus achieving economic security and not feel economically threatened by immigrants (Mayda, 2006). Additionally, education broadens people’s horizons and contributes to political and social engagement, generating tolerance towards immigrants (Pass & Halapuu, 2012).

There were 247 students who saw the questionnaire, 76 of them started answering, from which 59 dropped out. Overall, there were seventeen young Swedish adults who decided to participate in this research and complete the questionnaire, which gives a response rate of 22.3%. The participant’s age varied between 20 to 30 years old. Nine of the respondents were male and seven of them were female. All the participants had higher education, most of them finished university and some were still studying. Most of them live in one of the big cities in Sweden: Stockholm, Gothenburg, Mälmö or their outskirts. All of the participants were born in Sweden. They had both parents born in Sweden. Three of the participants had one parent from non-Swedish background. One participant has a father born in New Zealand, one whose father was born in Iraq, one whose mother was born in France and one indicated that his mother comes from a Swedish background but was born abroad. The average time to complete the survey was 30 minutes. All the participants were included in the analysis process except for one excluded female from Gothenburg because of not sufficient completing on the questionnaire.

At the end of the questionnaire, participants were asked if they were willing to participate further in the research. Eight of the participants responded positively and left their contact information. Afterwards, they were contacted and telephone interviews were conducted with five of them (participants no: 7, 9, 12, 13, 15). Participant no. 7 was a twenty-one years old male, who was finishing his studies on bachelor level. He was born in Sweden as both of his parents as well and was living in Stockholm. Participant no. 9 was a twenty-two years old female, who was still studying. She was born in Sweden as both of her parents as well and was living in Stockholm. Participant no. 12 was a twenty-five years old female, studying on bachelor level. She was born in Sweden, as both of her parents and was living in Stockholm. Participant no. 13 was a twenty-four years old female, studying on bachelor level. She was born in Sweden, her father was born in Sweden and her mother was born in Thailand where her parents were living for a couple of years. Currently she lives in Malmö. Participant no. 15 was a twenty-five years old female, studying on bachelor level. She was born in Sweden, as well as her mother and her father was born in Iraq. She was living in Gothenburg.

Instrumental or intervention materials

A questionnaire posted on a web was used as data collection instrument. The questionnaire with open-ended questions was uploaded in the web page QuestionPro - http://www.questionpro.com/. Which is a web based software for creating and distributing surveys. The link to the questionnaire was published on the official Facebook page of the Student Unions, pointing out that eligible to participate in the survey are young adults with a Swedish background (born in Sweden with one or two native born parents), between the ages of twenty to thirty.

Web questionnaires are a form of data collection that “allows respondents to complete questionnaires that are delivered to them and administrated over World Wide
According to Horner (2008) web surveys is a mode of collecting questionnaires that has become a replacement for face-to-face interviewing. Using Internet questionnaires has several advantages, e.g. cost savings, ease and speed of administration, the ability to provide a high level of anonymity which increases self-esteem, at the same time reducing social anxiety and desirability (Das, Ester, & Kaczmirek, 2011; Fox, Marry & Warm, 2003). Another big advantage of Internet questionnaires is not being limited by geography (Das, Ester, & Kaczmirek, 2011). Some studies (Fielding, Lee, & Grant, 2008; Fricker, Schonlau, 2002) express that web questionnaires tend to report lower response rates. However, Das et al. (2011) argue that internet questionnaires for the more general population are those who tend to produce a lower response rate unlike specified population. In order to prevent the low response rate, the link to the questionnaire was posted two times on the Unions’ Facebook pages.

The questionnaire was uploaded in a web-based in order avoid the interviewer effect, having in mind the non-Swedish origins of the researcher. The interviewer effect means that in semi-structured interview participants respond differently depending on how they perceive the interviewer (Denscombe, 2007). Which in the case of this study is avoided given that the survey has been web-based. Despite the advantages of using web-based questionnaire there are disadvantages as well. One of the most concerning issues about the web-based questionnaires, is the homogeneity of sampling (Fox, Murray & Warm, 2003). This issue in the research was avoided, by stating in the Facebook post and on the informed consent, the eligible people to participate. The background questions in the questionnaire helped in determining if there are participants that do not belong in the target population. In case there were, they would be excluded from the process of analysis. Anyhow, there were no such participants. According to Wilson & Dewaele (2010) the key issue in internet-based research is credibility. In internet-based research, the researcher’s control decreases, therefore it is less convincing that responses are sincere or if participants have given their true identity (Hewson, Yule, Laurent, & Vogel, 2003). However, Gosling, Vazire, Srivastava, & John (2004) investigating the effect of anonymity on the quality of responses, came to conclusion that responses to internet questionnaires were no less serious than to traditional surveys. An additional risk is that, when questionnaires are not administrated in person respondents may interpret questions in a different manner from the researcher (Fox, Murray, & Warm, 2003).

Prior to uploading, the questionnaire was pilot tested with three people in order to test and clarify the questionnaire.

The second empirical part of the research was conducted using telephone interviews. As reported by Lechuga (2012) the interview is one of the most usual and effective data collection tool, in qualitative research. Even though, telephone interviews in qualitative research are represented as a less attractive alternative to face-to-face interviews (Lechuga, 2012; Novick, 2008). Sturges & Hanrahan (2004) and Cachia & Millward (2011) argue that telephone interviews are an effective and valid tool of data collection. Telephone interviews provide an array of possible advantages for qualitative research. Recorded advantages are: decreased research cost, larger geographical access to participants (Knox & Burkard, 2009), increase anonymity and meanwhile increased disclosure by the participants (Novick, 2008; Lechuga, 2012; Sturges and Hanrahan 2004; Creswell, 1998). Telephone interviews have been “shown to yield high-quality information and data” (Lechuga, 2012, p. 253).
However, telephone interviews have disadvantages that should be considered. Many authors (Novik, 2008; Lechuga, 2012) as a clear disadvantage of telephone interviews indicate the loss of nonverbal (visual) and body language data, which can provide richness and depth of verbal data. Novik (2008) also indicates the loss of contextual data and data distortion, due to lack of above mentioned visual data (Fontana & Frey, 2005).

**Measurement instruments**

The first empirical part of the research was conducted using an open-ended questionnaire, with the possibility of follow up questions for those participants who accept to collaborate further with the researcher. Das, Ester, & Kaczmirek (as cited in Schuman & Presser 1979) consider that there are two main advantages of open-ended questions. First, by giving the participants the opportunity to provide a response in their own words, they share a more specific and detailed picture of their opinion, experiences, interpretation and reaction on the topic. Second, open-ended questions are especially useful for explorative research when the researcher wants respondents' answers without influencing them. Das, Ester, & Kaczmirek (2011) is concerned that “open-ended questions are burdensome because they take longer to answer and require respondents to formulate their own responses” (p. 218). However, according to Fricker, Galeisc, Tourangeau, & Yan (2005) people who provide a response can answer at their own tread and take as much time as they need to provide a more through an answer. Studies have shown that open-ended surveys some time can provide higher-quality responses than paper surveys (Das, Ester, & Kaczmirek, 2011). However, Bird (2009) stats that analysis of open-ended questionnaires can be challenging having in mind the largest variety of answers that may be provided for any of the questions. For cost and time efficiency, the questionnaire was distributed in English.

The second or the follow up empirical part of the research was conducted using semi-structured interviews. In accordance with Bisman & Highfield (2012) where the goals of a research study are mainly exploratory, and especially when perceptions and feelings are essential, semi-structured interviews are a useful method due to the capability to explore several leads and to sift for more details or request clarification, matching with the constructivist attribute of the research. Semi-structured interviews are performed on the basis of a loose framework consisting of open-ended questions that determine the area to be explored at least in the beginning, and from which the interviewer or the participant may pursue a concept or response in more details (May, 2011). Semi-structured interview allows people to respond more on their own terms (Bisman & Highfield, 2012). Semi-structured interviews are appointed in case the researcher needs to explore and acquire an in-depth understanding of the feelings, motivations and reasoning of a particular group of people (Denscombe, 2007). Patton (2002) states that when conducting an interview we have to keep in mind that the interview is affected by the level of awareness and the emotional state of the interviewee.

The beginning of the topic guide was consisted of follow-up questions for each of the five participants, based on their answers to the questionnaire, followed by the questions that the researcher wished to attain more details. The interviews lasted approximately twenty minutes. Which was enough time for the researcher to cover all the necessary questions.
Data analysis

Thematic analysis was executed on the full data set, open-ended questionnaires as well as telephone semi-structured interviews. According to Boyatzis (1998) thematic analysis is a process that can be used with all qualitative methods for encoding qualitative information. Thematic analysis can be used to process, analyze and interpret information regardless of the ontology or epistemology of the research (Boyatzis, 1998). It increases the ability to communicate findings and interpretation of meaning, allowing more complete understanding of the phenomenon (Ibid.).

To begin with this phase, all collected data were printed and organized. Bryman (2012) points out that thematic analysis “lacks a clearly series of procedures” (p. 581). However, being a beginner in thematic data analysis, the researcher followed Braun & Clarke (2006) steps and suggestions for doing the analysis:

- **Familiarizing with the data** - The entire data was read through several times in order to be familiar with all aspects of the data, meanwhile generating an initial list of ideas what is in the data and what is interesting.
- **Generating initial codes** - Sifting through the sorted data, initial codes were constructed by identifying, highlighting and sorting relevant phrases and words (codes).
- **Searching for themes** - Having the list of the codes identified from the data, in this phase the analysis continued with sorting and combining the codes into potential themes. This phase ended with a collection of themes and sub-themes.
- **Reviewing themes** - The review of themes was conducted first at the level of coded data continuing after to the themes. All the themes were read and evaluate if they appear to form a coherent pattern.
- **Defining and naming themes** - The themes that will present the analysis were defined by going back to collect data and each theme, organizing them into internally consistent account.
- **Producing the report** - When the themes were defined and adding the final analysis, the report was written.

Ethical considerations

“Social research should be ethical” (Denscombe, 2007, p.141). Keeping in mind the importance of ethics in social research, researchers are expected to respect the rights of the participants, avoid harm and operate with integrity during the whole process (Denscombe, 2007). During this research all the necessary steps were taken in order to ensure that the research is ethical.

Special attention was given to inform and ensure the respondent’s anonymity, privacy and data secrecy. Before sending the questionnaire to the University Unions, a research consent letter (Appendix 1) was sent to them. Informing them: “What is the purpose of collecting the information? Who is the information for? How will it be used? What will be asked in the interview? How will the response be handled, including anonymity? What risks and/or benefits are involved for person being interviewed?” (Patton, 2002, s.407). Attaching as well the questionnaire that would be distributed to the participants.

After receiving an approval from the University Unions, the questionnaire link was sent to them. Informed consent is a crucial ethical element in surveys as well as
Internetsurveys (Das, Ester, & Kaczmirek, 2011). In the beginning of the questionnaire an informed consent (Appendix 2) was written for the participants. The consent introduced the researcher, why the research is conducted, the purpose of the questionnaire, assuring the participants that data will be used only for research purposes, who is eligible to participate, how much time will it take to complete the questionnaire, assuring them that there are no anticipated risks and no benefits, also assuring participants of complete anonymity and confidentiality. Furthermore, informing the participants that participation in this study is completely voluntary, and they can skip questions which do not feel comfortable answering or withdraw at any time. Giving them the opportunity to ask questions that they have regarding the research as well. At the end of the informed consent a check box with “I Accept” was inserted. In order for the participants to continue further to the questionnaire, they had to click the box, implying that a participant has understood the information and has given his/her consent to participate.

All the above mentioned information given to the participants in the informed consent was fulfilled. Participation in this research did not have any physical or psychological risks for the participants. Participation in the research was voluntary and participants were able to withdraw and discontinue at any time without penalty. Participants had the right to decline to answer any question if they felt uncomfortable. The questionnaire was web based and participants were identified with numbers, enabling anonymity of the respondent. Security Sockets Layer (SSL) was enabled on the survey, making the URL for the survey https://instead of http://. Security Sockets Layer (SSL) is a cryptographic protocol that provides communication security over the Internet (QuestionPro, 2013). Hyper text transfer protocol with security sockets layer (HTTPS) provides authentication of the web site and associated web server that one is communicating with, which protects against Man-in-the-middle attacks. Additionally, it provides bidirectional encryption of communications between a client and server, which protects against eavesdropping and tampering with and/or forging the contents of the communication (Ibid.). To conclude using SSL helped in protecting participants’ anonymity and confidentiality, meanwhile making the data more accurate as well. Only the researcher had access to the questionnaire database. At the end of the empirical phase, all the collected data were downloaded and deleted from the web.

While the Internet makes people’s communication easily accessible for researchers and eliminates the boundaries of time and distance, such research builds in ethical issues (Brownlow & O'Dell, 2002). On the other hand, Orton-Johnson (2010) states that, it cannot be assumed that research using the Internet is essentially more hazardous than other methods of research. Anyway, Bryman (2012) highlights the importance of specific ethical issues when conducting research by using the Internet as a method of data collection. Following Bryman’s (2012) and The Association of Internet Research (AOIR) recommendations, the researcher followed the ethical guide, expectations and considerations established by the AOIR Ethics Working Committee (see: http://aoir.org/reports/ethics2.pdf).

In the beginning of telephone interviews an informed consent (Appendix 3.) was read to the participants. Reminding them again about the purpose of the study, procedures, confidentiality, the voluntary nature of participation and verbal consents were obtained. The researcher offered to post a copy of the consent form to the participants by e-mail, but the participants felt that is not necessary.
Moreover, as mentioned above in the beginning of the methodology section, a project plan for the research was submitted to Ethics Committee of Southeast Sweden (Etikkommittén Sydost) for an advisory ethical evaluation. An advisory statement from Etikkommittén Sydost was received on the 29th of May 2013 and their advice and recommendations were taken into consideration.

**Procedures**

This section of the research is basically a repetition of the empirical research procedure explained above. However, this part is written chronologically, how the empirical research was carried. This is done in order to be easier for the readers to visualize how the research was exactly carried out and in case of replication to ensure the reliability of the research.

In the *theoretical part* of the study a deductive analytical approach was used. In accordance with Merriam (2002) a qualitative research does not start with a hypothesis to support or test, it rather follows deductive reasoning, moving from the general to the specific (Bui, 2009).

To begin with the empirical part of the research, a questionnaire with open-ended questions was formed relying on which one would help answer the research questions and grasp the aim of the research. The questionnaire at the beginning consisted of background questions. Whereas the body of the questionnaire consisted of questions divided in three topics: immigrants and immigration, integration and social interaction.

Informed consents (Appendix. 1) were sent to the Stockholm, Malmö and Gothenburg University Unions, informing them about the research and requiring consent to approach to students. At the same time, asking them for help in distributing the questionnaire to the students. All the three Unions accepted the request offering to post the questionnaire on their Facebook fan pages.

As stated above in the section of intervention materials, prior to uploading the questionnaire, pilot interviews were carried out with three people in order to test and structure better the questionnaire. Continuing, the questionnaire with open-ended questions was uploaded in a web base (http://www.questionpro.com/ - an online research web page).

The link to the questionnaire was sent to the Unions, stressing that in the Facebook post they should point out that eligible to participate are young adults between the age of twenty to thirty years old, with a Swedish background (born in Sweden with one or two native born parents). The survey was online for a period of one month, from the 1st until 30th of June 2013. After this period, the collected data were downloaded and deleted from the web. All the data was printed organized and analyzed using thematic analysis.

Eight of the participants that were willing to participate further in the research were contacted and asked if they were still willing to participate further in the research. Five of them (participants no: 7, 9, 11, 13, 15) agreed and a telephone interview was arranged at a time that was appropriate for them. The interviews were audio-recorded with the participants’ consent. Soon after the interviews were conducted, they were transcribed a (verbatim) and analyzed using thematic analysis again.
RESULT

This chapter will present the results of the empirical research of the study. This chapter is structured in sections according to the research questions, beginning with immigrants and immigration, integration, social interaction and multiculturalism.

As mentioned in the methodology section there were two empirical parts of the research. At first data was collected using web-based questionnaire. There were seventeen young Swedish adults who decided to participate in this research and complete the questionnaire. The participants’ age varied between twenty to thirty years old. Eight of the respondents were male and eight of them were female. All the participants had higher education, most of them finished university and some were still studying. All of the participant live in one of the big cities in Sweden, which are Stockholm, Gothenburg, Malmö or their outskirts. All of the participants were born in Sweden. They had both parents born in Sweden, except three of the participants, who had one parent from non-Swedish background. All the participants were included in the analysis process except for one excluded female from Gothenburg because of not sufficiently completing the questionnaire.

The second part was done using in-depth telephone interviews. Participant no: 7, 9, 12, 13 and 15 from the previous questionnaire were participants in the telephone interview.

Immigrants and immigration

Definition of immigrants and words associated to “immigrant”

Participants in this research were asked to reflect upon various concepts. Upon asking about the first association to the word immigrant, three main themes were exposed by the participants: poverty, Middle East and war. The most common image that comes into young Swedish adult's mind is a “person from the Middle-East” (participant no. 10), or “war” (participant no. 2), and “all the beggars in Stockholm” (participant no. 1). Participant no. 12 and 14 did not give a particular word that comes to their minds when they hear the word “immigrant” but elaborated this question beyond.

“I think that the word has got a negative connotation. That I think is because of the way people from other countries have been and still are exposed in the media and by politicians. I have a problem with this word because it is often used without definition. When I hear the word I directly listen to what comes next, and (sadly) often the people using the word are referring to Muslims in combination with some discussion about the economy or terrorism or something else racist” (Participant no. 12)

“The view that the media gives and the one I see in my work. They don’t always match. Politicians views on immigrants as lazy, like the bonus system for students that study faster. As if they didn’t do their best before when there was no bonus system...” (Participant no. 14).

When asked about their way to define the word immigrant, the participants addressed several concepts. One of the repeating concepts was the sense of permanency. Participant articulated the notion in which an immigrant “lives permanently in a foreign country” (participant no. 16) or “moves there to stay permanently” (participant no. 12).
Another concept was movement to another country with particularity to Sweden. Most of the participants pointed that an immigrant is a person who “moves to another country” (participants no.2; 3; 5; 6; 7; 9; 10; 11; 12; 13; 14; 15; 17), some of them (participant no: 2; 6; 10; 11; 13) being particular to Sweden. “A person living permanently in Sweden, but born outside of Sweden” (participant no. 2). Continuing, another concept was choice or force to leave the country of origin. Participant no. 14 stated that immigrants “leave their place of origin (by choice or because they have to”).

Ethnic and tradition heritage was one of the concepts which stemmed from this question as well. A participant pointed out that an immigrant is “a person who lives in Sweden [but – LA] who isn’t ethnically Swedish” (participant no. 6) and “a person who is not born in their country of residence and isn’t raised to share that country’s mainstream culture” (participant no. 8). The last concept, which emerges from this question, was the sense of belonging. Participant no. 11 stated that an immigrant “lives in another country but still feels they belong to some other place”.

**Impact, benefits and concerns**

Participants gave their opinion about the impact immigrants have on the Swedish society. Six of the participants indicated that immigrants have a positive, e.g. “making Swedish society more international, getting to know people, cultures, ideas from around the world” (participant no. 14), “makes our society more diverse and more rich” (participant no. 12), “bring a lot of knowledge and experience” (participant no. 15).

“Maybe there is some bad impact. But I will always believe that all that is bad mostly if not only, depends on how they get treated when they arrive to their new country. Personally I experience only the good impact they make.” (Participant no. 9)

In the interview participant no. 9, was asked if she could describe her experience, she added:

“I work in a library and I meet a lot of immigrants coming there, bringing books with them home to learn the language, I meet those who fight to adjust, the ones who have the power of embracing the new environment and I am always impressed. Because I cannot be sure I would be one of them if I ever had to leave my country.”

Two participants indicated negative impact while others did not give a clear answer.

“Create a crime wave, cost incredible amount of money, destroyed Swedish culture, atomized people and weakened our society” (participant no. 6).

Upon reflecting on what are Sweden’s benefits from immigrants, the concept of the labor force was emphasized, culture, food, knowledge were repetitive concepts as well.

“Immigrants bring to Sweden culture, food, language, people with other experiences and knowledge, workforce, etc.” (Participant no.15).

“Apart from an olympic medal in political correctness the news is a lot more exciting. The newspapers would be a lot thinner without all the crime to report. Also shareholders benefit greatly from all the cheap labour” (Participant no. 6).
While expressing their concerns regarding immigrants, the participants were divided into two groups: those who were concerned about the effects on the native population and those who expressed concern about the effects on the immigrants. Two main concepts steaming from the participants who were concerned about the native population were: labor market fear and lack of resources.

“There are too many of them for the country to support. Unemployment rate in the country is rather high and it won’t go down as long as we keep the rate of immigrants coming to Sweden so high” (Participant no. 10).

While concepts steaming from the participants who expressed concern about the effects on the immigrants were: segregation (participant no. 1, 7, 17) and they do not feel welcomed (participant no. 15).

“I am more concerned about how they feel than about how the society gets affected. I don’t think “we”, as in the country of Sweden, do enough work to make them feel welcome, to ease their way into society. I mean both the government and the everyday people. A very few people do a lot of the work and most of us are doing nothing…..” (Participant no. 9)

**The level of immigration in Sweden**

The concept of humanitarism sharpened when the support of immigration was mentioned. Nine of the participants support immigration because “people should help those in need” (participant no. 2). The concept of labor force was mentioned as well. Five of the participants highlighted that “Sweden needs workforce” (participant no. 5). There were participants who supported immigration because of the both above reasons. Three of the participants oppose immigration.

“….Sweden does not have enough resources to receive more immigrants” (participant no. 11).

Regarding the number of immigrants in Sweden there were many different opinions. Five participants asserted that the number of immigrants “it’s good” (participant no. 2, 4, 13, 14, 17). Two of them think that it should stay the same.

“……going much higher would probably aggravate issues with homogenous conclaves of alien cultures within the society. This is already an issue as is.” (Participant no. 8).

Three of the participants think that the number of immigrants in Sweden is high:

“The population of Sweden is increasing too fast for the society to adjust to. The rate of immigration in Sweden is way to high” (participant no. 10)

Some other opinions were:

“I don’t have any numbers, and I guess you notice it more in some cities than others, but I can’t see the number as a problem, just the way we’re dealing with” (participant no. 9)
“I have friends from southern parts of Stockholm where there are more immigrants and they have a problem with the number. But I live in an area where there are no immigrants (which is not good), I have no problem” (participant no. 7)

**Swedish immigration policy**

All participants had a negative opinion regarding Sweden’s immigration policy. They all considered that improvements are needed. Two different voices were apparent. Half of the participants indicated that it needs improvement because “…it creates segregation” (participant no. 9, 15) and it “…should be more generous” (participant no. 3).

“The party “Sverigedemokraterna” and their policy is awful and human hostile. I also think that the other parties are to kind and to quiet about both the rhetoric and the work of “Sverigedemokraternas”. The fact that the Reva-project exists and why it does is an uncomfortable reality today.” (Participant no.12)

The participant number 15 in the questionnaire wrote “To strict”. During the interview she was asked if she could elaborate this answer. She stated:

“I think it’s horrible that the police are starting to go after paperless people. It’s also very hard to get asylum in Sweden which is horrible, especially since many people will get treated very bad if they have to return to their home countries.”

Whereas the other half of the participants thought it is negative because “…there seems to be no concern about how much the Swedish economy can withstand” (participant no. 10).

“It needs to be reformed, I'm not racist in any way, but I want to feel safe in my own country. When there is a majority of non-Swedes in a Swedish city, something is obviously wrong, in my opinion” (participant no. 11).

Participants were asked, if they could make changes to the Swedish immigration policy, what would it be? On of the mentioned measurements was increased funding for better inclusion. Participants suggested more investment in “changing the image of immigrants in the media and culture life” (participant no. 8), in “better ways to make them part of society” (participant no. 7), “improving the programs in helping newly arrived immigrants with integration into Swedish society” (participant no. 17), “creating useful activities to help immigrants integrate into the labor market” (participant no. 14). On the other hand, the concept of lowering the immigrant number was supported by five of the participants. They suggested that the immigrant number should be reduced by “stricter control……we should take in a lot less refugees and asylum seekers” (participant no. 11), and “lower the rate of immigrants to Sweden to manageable numbers” (participant no. 10).
Integration

Acculturation expectations

In order to find out young Swedish adults' acculturation expectations, they were asked to choose one of the options regarding the strategy that immigrants should follow when integrating into Swedish society. There were given the definitions of assimilation, integration, segregation and marginalization, without indicating the terminology. Eleven of the participants chose integration, two chose assimilation, one segregation, one chose marginalization and participant 12 did not answer. In the interview with participant number 12, the researcher asked again this question. The answer was:

“My answer here is actually none of them, if that is okay. Instead I would like to add my opinion which is that everyone moving here should be able to live as they prefer, as long as it doesn't affect others/harm anyone. It may be necessary to collect some information about the Swedish culture if you move here but it I don't think it should not be a demand that you have to identify with the Swedish culture”

Integration factors

When reflecting about the factors that influence the integration of immigrants in Sweden. Young Swedish adults pointed many factors, but the two most mentioned were: language and the area where they live. Followed by: education, contact with the natives and job market. One of the participants also stated: “The high rate of immigration. If it was lower the country could easily adjust for and help the immigrants a great deal more” (participant no. 10)

Social integration

Regarding immigrants’ social integration into the Swedish society. Participants in the survey were divided between two opinions.

Those who think that immigrants are enough socially integrated into the Swedish society.

“Some are, especially the younger immigrants who go to school with ethnically Swedish people” (participant no. 15)

While the other half of them thought they are not enough socially integrated.

“….native people don’t reach out so much and sometimes the immigrants themselves choose to spend time with each other...” (participant no. 14).

On the telephone interview the researcher got the opportunity to ask participant no. 7: Why do you think immigrants are not socially integrated?

“Well they are not because I as mentioned earlier, they live in separate areas were they don’t have much contact with swedish people. I remember when I was little my perents used to take me to other parts of the city were immigrants livet
just so I can see other people and cultures. Although that is not the best option….”

Participant no. 13 stated: “Some are, some are not”. Through the interview she was asked if she could give more details regarding this question. Her answer was:

“The society has failed to integrate them properly. When people come to a new country and the country gives them permission to stay it’s their responsibility to make sure the refugees get the opportunity to be integrated. Here the government has failed to do so, most big cities are very segregated.”

While participant no. 9, 12 and 15 were asked: How do you think immigrants’ social integration can be improved? Their suggestions were:

“More of these natural meeting places, just like the library. Less segregation at school, I think prejudices are planted at a low age so if the kids goes to classes with a mix of immigrants and natives, they learn more about the similarities then the differences, I believe.” (Participant no.9)

“…. Perhaps we need to change something in our schools to learn from early ages that people are no different because of the amount of money you have in your wallet, the color of your skin, your gender and so on.” (Participant no. 12)

“… the government has a lot of responsibility but most change comes from the people living in the reality. It is a strong belief that it makes a lot of difference, the way I behave, what I tell my children, how I respond to immigrants. Being a good example for others to follow.” (Participant no. 15).

With regard to the mutual respect of immigrants and native people, the lack of respect from both sides was mentioned by six of the participants. The other participants had different opinions and statements:

“…immigrants have poor respect for the native Swedes, those who have had a possibility to integrate tend to have more respect, in general.” (participant no. 16)

“I think that the respect for immigrants from natives is not good at all generally. All around me I read and hear disrespectful things about different people and especially people from other countries than Sweden. Our society replicate a lot of prejudices which are derogatory.” (Participant no. 12).

Exclusion, segregation and discrimination

While contemplating upon exclusion, eleven of the participants think that there is exclusion and one main concept was women’s exclusion (participant no. 14). They placed the blame about this to different factors, like: language barriers (participant no. 2); their own fault (participant no. 11); government (participant no. 3); companies (participant no. 3, 4). Participant no. 7 stated that exclusion is “politicians fault” and when he was asked: Why do you think so? He answered:
“Well the biggest problem is that many parties see immigrants as a bad thing. Like the Democratic party for example. Also with the media constantly reporting of crimes that happened in immigrant parts. I know that what I hear in the media it I not totally true even though there are some....”

When comes to segregation within the Swedish society, young Swedish adults stressed the concept of geographical segregation. A participant pointed, “I think that immigrants are quite segregated, there is always some part of the biggest cities where almost only immigrants live...” (Participant no. 15), which participant no. 10 called “ghettos”. Participant no. 7 mentioned as such neighborhood Norrätälje in Stockholm, participant no. 15 mentioned Angred in Gothenburg and participant no. 13 mentioned Möllevängen in Malmö.

Twelve of the participants in the research thought that immigrants in Sweden are discriminated in different degrees. The repeating concepts were discrimination in the jobs' market, apartment searching and the REVA-project.

“Yes, I think immigrants are ethnically discriminated in many ways here in Sweden. It is for example harder for someone with a surname “not sounding Swedish” to get a job or even get to come to an job interview, the labor market is in that way (and many other ways as well) very discriminating. This leads to unemployment among immigrants and the scary thing here in Sweden nowadays is that politicians often put the blame on different groups such as ‘young immigrants...’” (participant no. 12)

The third concept was the prejudice of Muslims/Arabs and the last but not least, the concept of racism.

“...Many people have stuff already made up in their heads about immigrants, and it’s many who sees all of those with a little bit darker skin as crazy Muslims...” (Participant no. 7).

“...We have a party in the Swedish government whose fundamental believes dates back in WW2 and the nazis” (participant no. 4).

**Responsible parties for integration**

Participants expressed their opinion on, who they think is responsible for immigrant’s integration into society. They mentioned many factors like: the immigrants (participant no. 2, 14), the society (participant no. 3, 5, 7, 12, 14, 15), politicians (participant no. 5, 8, 10, 14, 16), corporations (participant no. 5, 8), media (participant no. 8) and the government (participant no. 3, 6, 7, 9, 13, 15).

**Social interaction**

When talking about the surrounding where the participants live, diversity was a concept that was dominant. Most of the participants live in a “fairly diverse” (participant no. 11) surroundings, but there were two of them who recently “moved to a very Swedish neighborhood” (participant no. 6).
The concept of *language fluency* was labeled from one of the questions. Ten of the participants stated that they have contact with immigrants “on daily basis” (participant no. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 12, 13, 14, 17), they contact “*usually in Swedish*” (participant no. 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 17) pointing out that their Swedish is “*not fluent*” (participant no. 2, 3, 4, 15). Another highlighted concept was the lack of contact due to “*absence of immigrants*” (participant no. 7) in the region where they live or because they “*prefer to interact with Swedes and have minimal contact with them*” (participant no. 6).

Two main concepts were addressed from the question of immigrant friends. The concept of friendship. Twelve Swedishyoung adults have immigrant friends who have known them for six months to fifteen years, which is “…*significantly shorter than Swedish friends*…” (Participant no. 8). They usually communicate in Swedish. The concept of *avoidance* was voiced. One participant stressed, “… *thankfully I am no longer forced to interact with immigrants*…” (Participant no. 6).

**Multiculturalism**

One of the questions was: What they think about multiculturalism in Sweden? Participants did not elaborate this question that much. The most given answer was that they like multiculturalism.

> “I study archeology and I am interested in other cultures and I think having more cultures is better, makes life more interesting and brings us different perspectives. We meet different people, try different foods that if it was not for immigrants I would have never tried. So me personally I like multiculturalism” (participant no. 7).

However, participant no. 11 stated “*It has failed*” and participant no. 8 “*Somewhat condescending in what it glorifies. Festivities and foodstuff aren't really the sum of a culture*…”

Young Swedish adults described their attitude towards immigrants as “*it’s been the same*” (participant no. 5, 9). Some of them elaborating more:

> “I have nothing against as long as they respect the Swedish law and our high secularism” (participant no. 10).

> “Generally benevolent with strong confidence in the values my culture has to offer and with some skepticism towards unfamiliar customs….” (Participant no. 8)

Participants indicated that they have obtained their knowledge about immigrants from three main sources: *personal interaction with immigrants, social circle and the media.*

> “… initially from personal experience but later on from websites such as flashback.org and friatider.se” (participant no. 6).

The next chapter will discuss the methodology that was used in the study and the results of the study.
DISCUSSION

The aim of this research is to determine how young Swedish adults with higher education perceive immigrants and their integration in Sweden. The purpose is to reveal Swedish young adults perceptions and attitudes towards immigrants; the social interaction between immigrants and the Swedish society; as well as Swedish immigration policy. In order to accomplish this aim information was collected from Swedish young adults with high education.

Results from this study show that young Swedish adults define an immigrant as a person who is born in one country but moves to another (particularly in Sweden) with an intention to reside there permanently. Swedish young adult think that there are benefits from the presence of immigrants, showing some concerns as well. Two of the biggest reasons that Swedish young adults support immigration are: humanitarianism and labor force. Regarding their acculturation expectations, they support integration with a small exception towards other strategies as well. They think that immigrants in Sweden are “half way” integrated, geographically segregated, discriminated and prejudiced in different degrees and immigrant woman are the most excluded category. Swedish young adults, for different reasons, have a negative opinion regarding Sweden’s immigration policy, suggesting many changes if they would be able to intervene. Young Swedish adults, with a little number of exceptions, socialize with immigrants and have contact with them in daily basis. They usually communicate in Swedish even though as they stated their language is not fluent. When it comes to immigrants and host people social interaction their opinions are divided in between. Some of them think that they interact enough and the others think they do not, but many of them agree that there is a lack of respect from both sides.

Discussion of methods

In order to begin with the study and write the background, a literature search was conducted. The literature was chosen using the key words: immigration, immigrant’s integration, integration of immigrants in Sweden, immigration in Sweden, social integration in Sweden, perceptions, attitudes towards immigrants in Sweden. The searched databases were: OneSearch–Beta, ProQuest, Dissertation.se, DIVA, LIBRIS, SwePub and OneSearch databases. The searched results were refined by including only peer-reviewed articles published in the last ten years, with exception of very small number of articles that were one or two years older.

The study is exploratory in nature because it investigates how people cope in the context under question, why they have the opinion that they do, and what concerns them without any predisposed hypothesis. As study approach for the research, empirical phenomenology is chosen because it is intended to describe social reality from the point of view of the participants in the study or better say, from the point of view of the person who is experiencing it.

Qualitative research design is considered to be as the best fit for this study because it investigates in depth a problem or issue in a group of population that needs to be explored, and understand the contexts in which participants in that study address the problem (Creswell, 2007). Furthermore, because statistical analysis does not fit the studied subject in this research. It is broadly acknowledged by many authors (e.g. Denzin, 1983; Denzin and Lincoln, 1995; Marshall and Rossman, 1989) that qualitative
research lacks the ability of generalization. However, studies conducted to examine a particular phenomenon in a unique setting can contribute to the development of a body of knowledge accumulating about that particular phenomenon of interest (Maxwell, 1997). Creswell (2007) highlights that qualitative inquiry requires a considerable time in the field, which in this study is decreased by using a web-based questionnaire. Creswell (Ibid.) states that the data analysis and sorting large amount of data in qualitative research is a complex and time-consuming process, which is not a particular concern for this research because the amount of data is not large and unmanageable.

Having in mind the research question and aim, it can be distinguished that we already have the similar characteristics of the participants that are of particular interest in the research, thus purposive criterion sampling is considerate to be the right sampling methodology. The target population was young adults with a Swedish background (native Swedes) with higher education, between the ages of twenty to thirty hence universities were a target setting. The chosen universities are the Stockholm University, Malmö University and Gothenburg University since these are the three cities where the biggest numbers of immigrants live. The term Swedish background or natives included those young adults born in Sweden with one or two native born parents. However, a question can be raised, if participants with one foreign born parent were affected by their parent immigrant background? In the data analysis there is no noticeable difference from the participants who had both parents born in Sweden. Based on this conclusion, it can be assumed that if a target population would have been young adults with Swedish background, born in Sweden with two native born parents, it would have not affected the results.

Data is collected using a semi-structured questionnaire with open-ended questions, posted in a web base. The questionnaire is structured with the possibility of follow up questions for those participants who accept to collaborate further with the researcher. The follow up is conducted using telephone interviews. Using open-ended questionnaires offers to participants the opportunity to respond in their own words and to express their own personal perspective, helping the researcher to understand their point of view (Patton, 2002). A web-based questionnaire was used as a data collection instrument in order to avoid the interviewer effect, also considering the low costs, time efficiency and access to a large population of potential participants. The link to the questionnaire was published on the official Facebook page of the Student Unions pointing out the eligibility of participants in the research. This may have created a sampling bias for young Swedish adults who are not members of Student Unions official Facebook pages.

There were 247 students who saw the questionnaire, 76 of them started answering, from which 59 dropped out. Overall, there were seventeen young Swedish adults who decided to participate in this research and complete the questionnaire, which gives a response rate of 22.3%. The average time to complete the survey was 30 minutes. The questionnaire was posted in the month of June. Which may have affected the response rate, because that is when summer holidays begin. Galesic (2006) states that dropouts of the respondents before finishing the questionnaire pose specific challenge and problem to web research. This research is not an exception. As reasons for higher dropout Galesic (2006) counts “open questions, matrix questions, longer loading time, and inappropriate visual design” (p.2), length of data collection period. Fatigue and boredom are other reasons that lead to dropout as well (Ibid.). Galesic (2006) highlights as a reason, the low interest about the research topic. In addition Grove, Dillman,
Eltinge, & Little (2002) explain that some potential respondents may have gained access with no intention of responding. Also not to forget the unanticipated technical issues that may occur in the web-base. However, having in mind that this is a qualitative research with open – ended questions, the researcher was aiming between fifteen to twenty participants. Furthermore, considering as well the telephone interviews that help in achieving a more complete picture of participant's perspective, strengthening the findings and enriching the research.

The informed consent states that answering the questionnaire will last depending on how long the participants are willing to elaborate the questions. The survey report from the web base indicates that the average time to complete the survey was 30 minutes. Despite this indication it cannot be concluded that those average time is correct because the report shows approximately how long the participants were logged on the questionnaire, not how long they were actually answering.

While discussing about the instruments of data collection, two limitations can be mentioned. First, using an online questionnaire limits the depth of the response of those participants who are not willing to participate further in the research. Second limitation is that the researcher does not have the possibility to do follow-up interviews with participant that are chosen by the researcher but is limited to only those participants are willing to leave their contact. Whereas, as limitation for the telephone interview can be mentioned the loss of nonverbal data. Online focus group is another data collection methodology, which can be used to conduct this research and could generate slightly different results. Online focus group is a methodology that reveals the participant’s internal thinking obtaining a greater depth of information.

The collected data are analyzed using thematic analysis. Thematic analysis is considered to be suitable to process, analyze and interpret information for all qualitative methods regardless of the ontology or epistemology of the research.

Prior to sending the questionnaire to Student Unions an informed consent is sent, informing them about the research in details and asking them for their collaboration. Before beginning the questionnaire an informing consent page appears for all the participants as well. For cost and time efficient, the questionnaire was formulated in English, which may create a nonresponse bias.

An important ethical consideration is to inform and ensure the respondents of their anonymity, privacy and data secrecy, which is essential to achieving reliable data as well. Participation in this research does not have any physical or psychological risks for the participants. Participation in the research is voluntary and participants are able to withdraw and discontinue at any time without penalty. They have the right to decline to answer any question if they felt uncomfortable. The questionnaire is web based and participants are identified with numbers, enabling anonymity of the respondent. Security Sockets Layer (SSL) is enabled as a safeguard for the questionnaire. Only the researcher has access in the questionnaire database. At the end of the empirical phase, the collected data from the questionnaires is downloaded and deleted from the web. Also, the telephone interviews are transcribed verbatim and deleted from the voice recorder.
The research project plan was reviewed by The Ethics Committee of Southeast Sweden (Etikkommittén Sydost), and it is discussed, peer reviewed from the beginning by a supervisor and at the end by other researchers as well.

**Discussion of results**

The result of the analyzed data was separated in subsections giving every question of the survey an important part on the study. It is important to mention that, it was noticed that the participants who were willing to take part further in the research and participated in the in-depth telephone interview, had more positive attitudes and perceptions towards immigrants and immigration compared to the other participants.

Young Swedish adults define immigrants as people who are born in one country but moves to another (particularly in Sweden) with an intention to reside there permanently. Based on the many definitions regarding immigrants, some of which were cited in this study as well, it can be said that the definition given by Swedish young adults is an appropriate definition. Possessing the host country’s ethnic and traditional heritage was one of the themes emerging from a question. Which makes us believe that Rodriguez-Garcia (2010) conclusion that immigrants are considered as not having the same right to completely belong to the nation or to the civil society, is correct. As a consequence, based on the social identity theory (SIT) the sense of belonging has behavioral outcomes and consequences in the receiving society as well as immigrants. Which could result in fragmentation of society (Kallas & Kaldur, 2007).

The first images about the word *immigrant* that emerged from the participants show the stereotypes attached to this word. Brzezinska (2007) explains stereotyping of immigrants in Sweden. Eliassi (2010) as well, supports the fact that immigrants are negatively stereotyped. One of the biggest creators of stereotypes is media (Brzezinska, 2007; Entzinger & Biezeveld, 2003; Hammaren, 2010). As noted from our participants, media is one of the main sources from where they attain their knowledge about immigrants. According to Kim (2012) people who display prejudice and stereotypes towards other ethnic group, tend to avoid contact and interaction with those groups. Kim’s (2012) conclusion is not supported in this study because almost all the participants, except three of them, have immigrant friends and have contact with immigrants. Furthermore, integrated theory of prejudice, argues that a realistic threats that leads to prejudice is economics (Stephan & Stephan, 1996; 2000). Swedish young adults indicating the benefits of immigration, think that immigrants bring labor force, culture and knowledge. In the other hand labor market is their concern as well, together with lack of resources. Contradicting Mayda’s (2006) human capital theory that people with higher levels of education do not feel economically threatened by immigrants. It can hypothesis that Swedish young adults are basing their economic fear on the fact that nowadays there are more and more immigrants who are getting higher education.

Regarding the number of immigrants, there are Swedish young adults who do not give particular opinion but just state that the number is fine, some think that the number should stay the same and not go higher because it would create problems. Whereas, there are those who think that Sweden should learn how to deal with the immigrants who are already in Sweden. However, none of the participants in the research does not state that Sweden should accept more immigrants contradicting the their statement that they support immigration on humanitarian bases and labor force immigration. Whereas those who oppose immigration rely on the fear that Sweden does not have enough
resources to receive more immigrants. Based on the group threat theory, anti-immigrant sentiments and behaviors result from perceived group threat, broadly defined here as concerns that immigrants challenge the well-being of the majority group. Whitley & Kite (2010) concludes that there is a relationship between national identification and negative attitudes towards immigration, because people are always concerned for the national interest and immigration is perceived as bad for the national interest. This supports the conclusion that Swedish young adults who were concerned about Sweden’s resources showed negative attitude regarding immigration.

Swedish young adults have an apparent negative opinion about Sweden’s immigration policy. However, this negative opinion is divided in two directions. Most of them think that it needs improvement because it is too strict and it creates segregation highlighting the presence of the political party “Sverigedemokraterna” and the REVA project. The others half think that it is too generous. It worth stressing that the criticism of the immigration policy maybe linked to the decreasing confidence of politics in general.

Regarding Swedish young adults acculturation expectations, they support integration with an unnoticeable support towards other strategies as well. Berry (2011) highlights the big importance that the dominant society has in the acculturation process and creation of a multicultural society. He states that when the dominant society accepts the fact that immigrant groups want to maintain their cultural identity and welcome them in the society by engaging in a relationship with them, integration is defined. Integration is the most appropriate strategy to follow by both immigrants and receiving society thus it can be concluded that Swedish young adult have an appropriate acculturation expectation.

There are many identified factors that influence the integration of immigrants. Swedish young adults identified many of them, but two striving factors are language and the area where they live. Language is an important indicator of socio-economic integration (Entzinger & Biezeveld, 2003), it affects the successful participation in the labor market as well as social interaction hence integration. Lack of language knowledge is the main barrier for integration as it affects in defining him/her as “the other” and in crating stereotypes (Korkmaz, 2006). Based on the empirical research, it can be concluded that, in Sweden the capacity to speak the native language is considered as the most important aspect of being Swedish. Which is supported by Loden (2008) as well.

When it comes to social integration, Swedish young adults’ opinions are divided in half. Half of them state that immigrants are enough socially related, whereas the other half think they are not. It is known that lack of social integration causes social exclusion. Swedish young adults stress that in Sweden there is presence of immigrants’ social exclusion and women are the most excluded category. They think that social exclusion is a product of language barriers, government policies, employers and immigrant themselves. The importance of language was mentioned earlier when we discussed about integration. It is worth mentioning that the Swedish integration policy aims at system integration, i.e. that immigrants have the right to live under equal conditions, have access to jobs and exercise political influence to the same extent as the native population (Eliassi, 2010). However, the analysis of social exclusion in Sweden by Baski (2008) supports the conclusions of Swedish young adults, that in Sweden immigrants suffer more often from social exclusion. Regarding the employers Swedish young adults statement is supported by Korkmaz’s (2006). Korkmaz (Ibid.) concludes that in Sweden immigrants are having difficulties regarding employment. And last but
not least, according to acculturation theory, immigrants as well can be factors of social exclusion if they choose separation or marginalization as acculturation strategy.

Participants in the study stated that they live in a fairly diverse neighborhood. However, many of them pointed out the geographically segregated parts in the big cities where only immigrants live, which according to Sadikot (2011) is problematic in Sweden. Bunar (2007) argues that guiding principles for urban renewal policy (URP) is responsible forbidding areas where only people with immigrant origin live thus creating social, ethnic and discriminatory segregation in the big-cities. Sadikot (2011) states that housing segregation is one of the issues that has a big impact in isolating social classes and ethnic groups hence separating people from integrating with each other. Housing segregation creates physical distance depriving communication and association between groups. It is important to mention that Helms (1994) notes that segregation is a factor that contributes to racism. Swedish young adults are very aware of this segregation and state that it is a factor that influences immigrants’ integration and it is a source of many problems. Especially, participant no. 7 who during the interview constantly placed the emphasize on segregation as a phenomenon that is creating many problems in Sweden.

Young Swedish adults think that immigrants in Sweden are still ethnically discriminated. The most noticed discrimination is in the job market, housing and with the REVA-project. One of the participants declared “it’s harder to get a job or an apartment if you have a foreigner sounding name” (participant no. 10), which is what Eliassi (2010) concluded in his study. Korkmaz (2006) states “immigrants are having difficulties regarding employment based on certain levels of hidden discriminatory behavior of the natives” (p. 63). The right to equality of treatment among immigrant workers is rooted in international normative standards, which have been incorporated into national legislation in Sweden. Discrimination is especially censured in the Universal Declaration on Human Rights and in many international conventions, as the crucial instruments determining basic human rights. As it is stated in the background, Sweden has ratified these conventions, particularly the Convention for the Elimination of Racism and Racial Discrimination (CERD), the ILO Discrimination (Employment and Occupation) Convention No.111, 1958; the ILO Migrant Workers (Supplementary Provision) Convection, No.143 (1975) which is considered with equality of labor market opportunity and treatment in the workplace. In Sweden there are four laws that ban discrimination on the ethnicity and religion ground. Accordingly, discrimination is not part of the legislation, however Attstrom (2007) states that in practice this is not totally applicable, within private as well as public enterprises. The REVA project is not elaborated in the background section because it came to the fore later, from the participants.

The abbreviation REVA stands for Legal Certainty and Effective Enforcement (Rättssäkerhet och Effektivt Verkställighetsarbete). REVA is a cooperative operation between the Swedish Migration Board, the National Police Board and the Correctional System, which seeks to raise the effectiveness of enforcement of deportation. REVA is co-funded by the European Return Fund. Under this project, which has been running for some time now at the behest of the Swedish Government, ‘right of residence’ checks are carried out along with ticket inspections in the Stockholm underground. “These checks have led to a wide-ranging debate in Swedish society and it seems likely that they are based on people’s skin color and appearance” (Ulvskog & Hedh, 2013, http://www.europarl.europa.eu/sides/getDoc.do?pubRef=-//EP//TEXT+WQ+E-2013-
The Swedish police claim that the checks are carried out only for justifiable reasons and are not based on a person’s appearance, language or name (“REVA”, 2013, para. 2). “Opposition to REVA has to be placed not just in the context of the growth in far-right movements, restrictive migration policies and popular and structural racism in Swedish society, but also in the development of new urban movements that have entered the public scene in recent years” (Djampur, 2013).

As responsible for immigrants integration Swedish young adults see immigrants themselves, Swedish people, political programs, corporations, media and the most emphasized the government. Integration is a two-sided process in which immigrants and the receiving society equally carry responsibilities (Entzer & Biezeveld, 2003). In regards to institutional structure and the way it responds to newcomers, the receiving society has most significant role in the results of the process. Granting of legal and political rights, welfare benefits and a welcoming atmosphere of the receiving society play a significant role in the successful integration of immigrants. As long as immigrants embrace integration as acculturation strategy. All of the above mentioned factors that impact integration belong to the group of immigrants or receiving society.

Swedish young adults did not give a broad or in-depth answer about multiculturalism. Verkuyten’s (2005) argues that members of native-born culture tend to be less supportive of multiculturalism comparing to members of immigrant cultures because multiculturalism is identity supporting for minority ethnic groups and identity threatening for the dominant group. However, from the gathered responses, it can be concluded that Swedish young adults like and embrace multiculturalism.

A very important phenomenon that should be addressed is racism. Even though in the questionnaire there was no question regarding this issue, some of the participants where concerned about it. Swedish young adults think that racists and racism are present in the Swedish society. Many authors (e.g. Kallas & Kaldur; Wiesbrock; Envall) argue that Sweden is one of the countries that have given a big effort in creating good integration policies for immigrants, but racism and xenophobia have been always evident. Swedish young adults statements can be proven true when considering the presence of extreme parties such as The Sweden Democrats in the Riksdag and hate crime reports of Bra (The Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention). It is harrowing to conclude that the results from the empirical research of this study show that there is presence of racism among Swedish young adults as well. One of the participants in this study showed opened racism, another one shows signs of xeno-racism and the third one xenophobia leaning more towards Islamophobia. Based on this finding it can be concluded that immigrants in Sweden might be at risk of discrimination, which also could generate bigger problems and bring social unity at risk. Hence, it is of enormous importance that the Swedish integration policy targets native population as well.

All the findings from this study are shown in the result chapter and discussed above in the discussion. In the following section will be shown the most important finding from this study and what is this study’s contribution.
CONCLUSION

The aim of this research is to determine how young Swedish adults with higher education perceive immigrants and their integration in Sweden. The purpose is to reveal Swedish young adults' perceptions and attitudes towards immigrants; the social interaction between immigrants and the Swedish society; how Swedish young adults perceive their country’s immigration policy.

In conclusion Swedish young adults define immigrants as people born in one country but move to another (particularly in Sweden) with an intention to reside there permanently. Swedish young adults think that their country has many benefits from the presence of immigrants, showing some concerns as well. Regarding their acculturation expectations, they support integration as the best acculturation strategy, with an insignificant exception towards other strategies as well. They think that immigrants in Sweden are “half way” integrated, geographically segregated, discriminated, prejudiced in different degrees and immigrant women are the most excluded category. Swedish young adults, for different reasons, have a negative opinion regarding Sweden’s immigration policy, suggesting many changes if they would be able to intervene. Young Swedish adults, with a small exception, socialize with immigrants and have contact with them in daily basis. They usually communicate in Swedish even though as they stated their language is not fluent. When it comes to immigrants and host people social interaction their opinions are divided in between. Some of them think that they interact enough and the others think they do not, but many of them agree that there is a lack of respect from both sides.

The findings from this research make several contributions to the current literature of immigrants’ integration. First, considering the lack of research in English, regarding natives’ perceptions and attitudes towards immigrants, it is an addition to the literature particularly in Sweden. Second, it shows Swedish young adults' awareness, perceptions and attitudes towards immigrants’ integration, exclusion, segregation and discrimination. Third, it shows how much do young Swedish adults support immigration and multiculturalism.

As a very important subject that should be studied in the near future, considering that a big debate has been going around it and there are no studies carried yet, is the REVA project. Moreover, information is necessary regarding racism, xenophobia and Islamophobia among Swedish adults young, including those who do not have higher education, as well.
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Appendix 1

Lindita Aliti

Student Union

Professorsslingan 37:1101
11417 Stockholm
Mob: 0700986922
E-mail: lindita.aliti@gmail.com

RESEARCH CONSENT

My name is Lindita Aliti, and I am student of the Social Work International Master Program at the Linnaeus University. Currently I am working on my Degree Project entitled: Swedish young adults perceptions of immigrants and their integration in Sweden. This research will be conducted under supervision of Ph.D., Assistant Prof. Esther Friedman (Department of Social Work at Linnaeus University).

The purpose of the research is to gives a view of how young Swedish adults with high education perceive immigrants and immigrant’s integration in Sweden. Further, understand if there is social cohesion between Swedish young adults with high education and immigrants. Their perception on immigrants and host societies social cohesion. How according to young Swedish adults, their (Swedish) society and institutions manage to encounter immigrants.

The empirical part of the research I wish to conduct, involves young adults with a Swedish background (native Swedes) with higher education, between the ages of 20 to 30 years old. Participation of the students in this research is totally voluntary, confident and with no anticipated risks. If given a consent by you, a link to the questionnaire (attached) together with an Informed Consent (attached) for the participants, will be sent to you in order to forward by e-mail to students.

I am hereby seeking your consent to approach a number of students of …..University to provide participation for the research.

Upon completion of the study, I undertake to provide you with a bound copy of the full research report. If you require any further information, please do not hesitate to contact me on mob. number: 0700986922 and e-mail address: lindita.aliti@gmail.com

Thank you for your time and consideration in this matter.

Sincerely,

Lindita Aliti
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INFORMED CONSENT LETTER

Title: Swedish young adults' perceptions of immigrants and their integration in Sweden

Researcher’s Name and Contact Information:
Lindita Aliti
Students of the International Master Programm of Social Work at Linnaeus University
Phone number: 0700986922
E-mail: lindita.aliti@gmail.com

Purpose of the study:

I am Lindita Aliti, a student at Linnaeus University. Currently I am conducting a research project as part of my Master Degree Project. My Degree Project is under the supervision of Ph.D., Assistant Prof. Esther Friedman (Department of Social Work at Linnaeus University). I would like to know if you would be willing to take part in a research study on Swedish young adults' perceptions of immigrants and their integration in Sweden. The aim of this research is to analyze the perceptions of young Swedish adults on immigration, immigrants, integration, to learn more about Swedish society as a receiving society while encountering immigrants from a different backgrounds and living together.

Eligibility of participation:

You are being invited to take part in this research if you are a young adult between the age of 20-30 years old. You have a Swedish background, i.e. born in Sweden with one or two Swedish born parents.

Procedures:

You will be asked to complete an online questionnaire that will ask you about your perceptions regarding immigrants and their integration in Sweden. We are also interested in your opinion regarding immigration policy and social interaction with immigrants.

Answering the questionnaire will last depending on how long you are willing to elaborate the questions.

Confidentiality:

Your identity in this research is totally confidential. Your responses will be anonymous. The results from the research may be published for scientific purposes but will not include any identifiable references to you. Instead, your questionnaire will contain an identification number.

Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary. It is your choice whether to participate or not and you may withdraw at any time without giving a reason. Also, you are free to not answer the questions if you choose.
There are no anticipated risks from participating in this research.

There will be no direct benefits to you, but your participation invaluable to our project as we seek to find out more about immigrant integration in Sweden and Sweden as a receiving country and society.

**Information about this study:**

You have the opportunity to ask, and to have answered, all your questions about this research by e-mailing or calling the researcher, whose contact information is listed at the top of this letter. All inquiries are confidential.

**Participant’s Agreement Statement:**

By checking the *I accept* box, I confirm that I have read and understood the information and have had the opportunity to ask questions. I hereby voluntarily agree to participate in the above-mentioned research project.

I agree
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INFORMED CONSENT LETTER

Title: Swedish young adults' perceptions of immigrants and their integration in Sweden

Researcher’s Name and Contact Information:
Lindita Aliti
Students of the International Master Programm of Social Work at Linnaeus University
Phone number: 0700986922
E-mail: lindita.aliti@gmail.com

Purpose of the study:

I am Lindita Aliti, a student at Linnaeus University. Currently I am conducting a research project as part of my Master Degree Project. My Degree Project is under the supervision of Ph.D., Assistant Prof. Esther Friedman (Department of Social Work at Linnaeus University). I would like to know if you would be willing to take part in a research study on Swedish young adults' perceptions of immigrants and their integration in Sweden. The aim of this research is to analyze the perceptions of young Swedish adults on immigration, immigrants, integration, to learn more about Swedish society as a receiving society while encountering immigrants from a different backgrounds and living together.

You are being invited to take part in this research following an online questionnaire you filled in June, regarding the above mentioned research. In the questionnaire you declared that you are willing to participate further in the research if necessary and you left our contact information.

Procedures:

You will be asked to answer some follow up questions based on your answers from the online questionnaire. The interview will be conducted through the telephone and depending on your answers, it will not take more than twenty minutes.

Confidentiality:

Your identity in this research is totally confidential. The results from the research may be published for scientific purposes but will not include any identifiable references to you. Instead, your questionnaire will contain an identification number.

Your participation in this research is entirely voluntary. It is your choice whether to participate or not and you may withdraw at any time without giving a reason. Also, you are free to not answer the questions if you choose.

There are no anticipated risks from participating in this research.
There will be no direct benefits to you, but your participation invaluable to our project as we seek to find out more about immigrant integration in Sweden and Sweden as a receiving country and society.

**Information about this study:**

You have the opportunity to ask, and to have answered, all your questions about this research by e-mailing or calling the researcher, whose contact information is listed at the top of this letter. All inquiries are confidential.

**Participant’s Agreement Statement:**

Do you confirm that you have understood the information and have had the opportunity to ask questions. Do you hereby voluntarily agree to participate in the above-mentioned research project.
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QUESTIONNAIRE

Age:

Gender:

Education:

City where you live:

Your country of birth:

Your father’s country of birth:

Your mother’s country of birth:

Please answer the questions below, and elaborate as much as you feel like. There is no right or wrong answer. Please answer the question according to what is true for you.

1. Write what comes into your mind first when you hear the word “immigrant”?
2. Can you give a definition of the word immigrant?
3. What kind of impact have immigrants into the Swedish society?
4. What are Sweden’s benefits from immigrants?
5. What concerns you regarding immigrants?
6. Do you support the idea of immigration in Sweden? Why?
7. What do you think of the number of immigrants in Sweden?
8. What is your opinion about Sweden’s immigration policy?
9. If you could make changes to the Swedish immigration policy, what would it be?
10. Immigrants in Sweden should:
   a. Identify completely with the Swedish culture and surrender their original cultural identity.
   b. Maintain their own culture heritage on condition that it is nested within shared national boundaries.
   c. Maintain their unique cultural patterns and discard the patterns of the Swedish community.
   d. Reject both their own culture and Swedish culture.
11. What factors influence the integration of immigrants in Sweden?
12. Are immigrants socially integrated into the Swedish society?
13. What is your opinion about the mutual respect of immigrants and natives in Sweden?
14. Are immigrants in Sweden excluded? If yes, who’s fault you think it is?
15. How much are immigrants segregated into Swedish society?
16. Are immigrants ethnically discriminated in Sweden? Please, if you can elaborate your answer!
17. Who do you think is responsible for immigrants' integration into the Swedish society?
18. How ethnically diverse is the surrounding where you live?
19. How often do you interact with immigrants? Usually, do they speak Swedish?
20. Do you have friends who are immigrants? If yes, how long have you known them?
21. What do you think about multiculturalism in Sweden?
22. Please describe your attitude towards immigrants over time?
23. Where from have you obtained your knowledge about immigrants?

Will it be OK with you to be contacted for further participation in the research?

a. Yes
b. No

If yes, please fill in a phone number/email, you feel comfortable to contact you.

______________________________

Thank you for your time and participation!