CHAPTER 3:

Students' attitudes toward freedom of movement and immigration in Europe

Chapter highlights and summary

Surveyed students endorsed freedom of movement for European citizens within Europe.

- Large majorities of students across the European participating countries strongly agreed or agreed with statements regarding freedom of movement for European citizens within Europe and tended to strongly disagree or disagree with statements regarding restriction of movement. (Table 3.1)
- Strong variation across countries was observed for statements on restriction of movement. (Table 3.1)
- Students with a higher level of civic knowledge (at or above Level B on the civic knowledge scale) were more in favor of freedom of movement than were students with a lower level of civic knowledge (below Level B). (Tables 3.2, 3.3).
- Male students were more in favor than female students of restricting freedom of movement. (Table 3.3)

Differences related to students' endorsement of equal rights for immigrants were evident across the European participating countries.

- Most students largely agreed with statements regarding immigrants' rights. (Table 3.5)
- Most of the European participating countries recorded no strong difference between their ICCS 2009 students' and their ICCS 2016 students' attitudes toward equal rights for immigrants. (Table 3.6)
- In all countries, female students held more positive attitudes toward immigrants' rights than males did. (Table 3.7)
- In most countries, students from an immigrant family expressed more positive attitudes toward immigrant rights than students from a non-immigrant family did. (Table 3.7)
- Students' attitudes toward equal rights for immigrants were associated with higher levels of civic knowledge (at or above Level B). (Table 3.7)

This chapter provides findings on students' attitudes toward European citizens having the freedom of movement that allows them to work and live throughout Europe. The chapter also considers findings on students' attitudes toward equal rights for immigrants (e.g., voting, education). These constructs reflect the content domain related to students' attitudes toward civic principles that is included in the affective-behavioral dimension of the ICCS 2016 assessment framework (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Losito, & Agrusti, 2016).

Students' attitudes toward freedom and restriction of movement for European citizens within Europe

Freedom of movement and residence for persons in the European Union (EU) has underpinned the development of EU citizenship since the Treaty of Maastricht in 1992, which had as its ultimate aim the creation of an integrated economic area for EU citizens. The provisions that support the right of persons to move and reside freely within the territory of the EU member states are included in Directive 2004/38/EC.

The European Commission's annual report of 2016 on workforce mobility within the EU showed that, in 2015, almost 12.5 million EU-28 citizens of working age were residing in a member state other than their country of citizenship within the EU/EFTA region.¹ Six countries were hosting almost 75 percent of the EU-28 movers: Germany (2.7 million), the United Kingdom (2.1 million), Spain (1.4 million), Italy (1.1 million), and France and Switzerland (both around 950,000). The countries with the highest proportions of the EU-28 movers in relation to the overall population were Luxembourg (43%), Switzerland (19%), Cyprus (15%), Ireland (10%), and Belgium (14%) (Fries-Tersch, Tugran, & Bradley, 2016).

In the EU citizens' consultation of 2015 (European Commission, 2016a), about 2,100 respondents from 18 to 71-plus years of age shared their experiences of EU citizenship. According to this consultation, almost all respondents declared that they had moved freely in the EU once in their lifetime. They listed holidays as the main reason for moving, followed by work-related reasons and visiting family or friends. Respondents also expressed positive opinions about free movement, agreeing that it promotes cultural diversity (81% of respondents), fosters mutual understanding (77%), creates an EU identity (70%), and brings economic growth (61%).

Findings from the Standard Eurobarometer 85 survey (European Commission, 2016b) also highlighted general positive feelings toward free movement, with respondents considering the free movement of people, goods, and services within the EU as the union's most positive feature. Of the European countries participating in ICCS 2016, Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, and Sweden all recorded majorities of respondents (60 percent on average) agreeing or strongly agreeing that free movement within the EU is the EU's most positive outcome. In Belgium, Italy, and Malta, however, less than 50 percent of respondents believed that free movement is the EU's most positive result.

The ICCS 2016 European regional questionnaire included a six-item question designed to elicit students' attitudes toward European citizens having freedom to pursue work in EU member countries or toward having that freedom restricted. Although used in ICCS 2009, this question was heavily modified for ICCS 2016.

Three of the six items related to students' attitudes toward freedom of movement within Europe: (a) "Allowing citizens of European countries to work anywhere in Europe is good for the European economy;" (b) "Citizens of European countries should be allowed to work anywhere in Europe;" and (c) "Allowing citizens of European countries to work anywhere in Europe helps to reduce unemployment."

1 The European Free Trade Organization is an inter-governmental organization aimed at promoting free trade and economic integration among its four member states: Iceland, Liechtenstein, Norway, and Switzerland.

The remaining three items focused on students' attitudes toward restriction of migration within Europe: (d) "Citizens of European countries should be allowed to work in another European country only if their skills are needed there;" (e) "Citizens of European countries who wish to work in another country should be allowed to take only the jobs that no one in the other country wants to do;" and (f) "Only a limited number of people should be allowed to move for work from one European country to another."

Students were asked to "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," or "strongly disagree" with the six statements. The resulting scales had an average reliability at the international level—Cronbach's alpha of 0.74 for students' attitudes toward freedom of movement within Europe, and 0.63 for students' attitudes toward restriction of movement within Europe (see item maps in [Figures 3.1](#) and [3.2](#), Appendix C).

Nearly all surveyed students agreed with the three statements related to freedom of movement within Europe. On average across the European countries, 94 percent of students thought that allowing citizens of European countries to work anywhere in Europe is good for the European economy (see [Table 3.1](#)). Students also expressed general agreement with the items stating that citizens of European countries should be allowed to work anywhere in Europe (European ICCS 2016 average: 92%) and that allowing citizens of European countries to work anywhere in Europe helps to reduce unemployment (European ICCS 2016 average: 89%).

On average, the country percentages were lower for the remaining items on restriction of movement (63% for item d and about 37% for items e and f). These results indicate a general tendency among the participating students to endorse freedom of movement throughout the countries of Europe.

Students' agreement with the statement that citizens of European countries should be allowed to work in another European country only if their skills are needed ranged from averages of 45 percent to 87 percent. The national percentages of agreement with this item were particularly high in Bulgaria, Croatia, and Norway; the lowest such percentages were found in Belgium (Flemish), Finland, the Netherlands, and Slovenia.

On average across the European participating countries, 36 percent of students agreed with the statement that European citizens wanting to work in another country should be allowed to take only the jobs that no one else in that country wanted to do. The national average percentages of students agreeing with this statement ranged from 23 percent to 54 percent. The percentages in Malta, Norway, and Sweden were more than 10 points above the European ICCS 2016 average. Finland and Latvia recorded the lowest percentages.

The national average percentages for students' agreement with the statement that only a limited number of people should be allowed to move for work from one European country to another were also on the low side (European ICCS 2016 average: 37%). The only country where the national agreement percentage was more than 10 points above the European ICCS 2016 average was Belgium (Flemish). The percentages in Denmark, Lithuania, Malta, and Norway were significantly above the European ICCS 2016 average. The lowest recorded percentage was in Estonia, while Croatia, Finland, and Italy recorded percentages significantly below the European ICCS 2016 average.

[Table 3.2](#) shows the associations between students' attitudes toward freedom of movement within Europe and variables reflecting students' gender, students' background (from an immigrant family or from a non-immigrant family), and civic knowledge. We found no significant differences between gender groups and between students from an immigrant family or from a non-immigrant family. In all but two countries, students at or above Level B on the civic knowledge scale showed significantly higher scale scores than the students below Level B (about three scale score points on average). The two countries that recorded no significant differences for these variables were Belgium (Flemish) and the Netherlands.

Table 3.1: Students' attitudes toward freedom and restriction of movement within Europe

Country	Percentages of students who agreed or strongly agreed with the following statements:						Only a limited number of people should be allowed to move for work from one European country to another
	Allowing European citizens to work anywhere in Europe is good for the European economy	European citizens should be allowed to work anywhere in Europe	Allowing European citizens to work anywhere in Europe helps to reduce unemployment	European citizens should be allowed to work in another European country only if their skills are needed there	European citizens should be allowed to take only the jobs that no one in the other country wants to do		
Belgium (Flemish)	93 (0.6) ▽	85 (0.8) ▽	89 (0.6)	53 (1.3) ▼	32 (1.2) ▽	49 (1.2) ▲	
Bulgaria	93 (0.6)	93 (0.6)	88 (0.8)	76 (1.0) ▲	40 (1.6) Δ	35 (1.3)	
Croatia	96 (0.4) Δ	97 (0.3) Δ	94 (0.5) Δ	75 (1.1) ▲	27 (1.4) ▽	31 (1.2) ▽	
Denmark†	93 (0.5)	89 (0.6) ▽	87 (0.6) ▽	58 (1.0) ▽	38 (0.9) Δ	39 (1.0) Δ	
Estonia¹	96 (0.4) Δ	94 (0.6) Δ	91 (0.6) Δ	54 (1.4) ▽	29 (1.0) ▽	25 (1.2) ▼	
Finland	97 (0.3) Δ	95 (0.4) Δ	91 (0.6) Δ	45 (1.3) ▼	23 (0.9) ▼	30 (1.0) ▽	
Italy	97 (0.3) Δ	97 (0.3) Δ	92 (0.6) Δ	67 (1.0) Δ	37 (1.1)	33 (1.2) ▽	
Latvia¹	89 (0.7) ▽	92 (0.6)	86 (0.8) ▽	68 (1.2) Δ	25 (1.2) ▼	35 (1.3)	
Lithuania	96 (0.4) Δ	97 (0.4) Δ	89 (0.7)	65 (1.0)	35 (1.3)	41 (1.2) Δ	
Malta	94 (0.4)	92 (0.4)	88 (0.5) ▽	70 (0.8) Δ	47 (0.9) ▲	45 (0.9) Δ	
Netherlands†	90 (0.7) ▽	88 (0.8) ▽	85 (0.8) ▽	52 (1.3) ▼	30 (1.4) ▽	36 (1.3)	
Norway (9)¹	95 (0.3) Δ	88 (0.5) ▽	88 (0.5)	87 (0.5) ▲	51 (0.8) ▲	40 (0.7) Δ	
Slovenia	95 (0.5)	95 (0.4) Δ	91 (0.7) Δ	48 (1.1) ▼	31 (1.1) ▽	35 (1.1)	
Sweden¹	92 (0.5) ▽	91 (0.5) ▽	89 (0.6)	70 (1.1) Δ	54 (1.1) ▲	37 (1.1)	
European ICCS 2016 average	94 (0.1)	92 (0.1)	89 (0.2)	63 (0.3)	36 (0.3)	37 (0.3)	
Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requirements							
North-Rhine-Westphalia (Germany)¹	93 (0.7)	92 (0.7)	86 (1.1)	59 (1.8)	42 (1.6)	43 (1.8)	

National ICCS 2016 percentage:

- ▲ More than 10 percentage points above European ICCS 2016 average
- △ Significantly above European ICCS 2016 average
- ▽ Significantly below European ICCS 2016 average
- ▼ More than 10 percentage points below European ICCS 2016 average

Notes:

- () Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.
- (9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.
- † Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
- ¹ National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.

Table 3.2: National average scale scores indicating students' attitudes toward freedom of movement within Europe by gender, immigrant background, and level of civic knowledge

Country	Scale score average by gender group										Scale score average by immigrant background										Scale score average by level of civic knowledge																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																
	Male students					Female students					Non-immigrant family					Immigrant family					Civic knowledge below Level B (below 479)					Civic knowledge at or above Level B (479 and above)																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																											
	9	6	3	0	3	6	9	9	6	3	0	3	6	9	9	6	3	0	3	6	9	9	6	3	0	3	6	9																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																									
Belgium (Flemish)	48 (0.3)							48 (0.3)							48 (0.3)																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																																						

■ Difference between comparison groups statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

□ Difference between comparison groups not statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

Notes:

0 Standard errors appear in parentheses.

Score averages that are significantly larger ($p < 0.05$) than those in the comparison group are displayed in **bold**.

(9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

‡ National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.

^ Number of students too small to report group average scores.

When we looked for potential associations between students' attitudes toward restriction of movement within Europe and students' gender, we found strong significant differences between male and female students in all countries, with males being more in favor than females of restriction (see [Table 3.3](#)). On average, we observed a difference of three scale score points across countries.

In several countries, namely Belgium (Flemish), Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Norway, Slovenia, and Sweden, students from an immigrant family were more likely to agree with statements on restriction of movement than the students from a non-immigrant family were ([Table 3.3](#)).² Compared to students with a lower level of civic knowledge (below Level B), students at or above Level B of the civic knowledge scale were the students less in favor of restriction of movement. On average, the difference was seven scale points.

Students' attitudes toward immigration

During 2015, 4.7 million people migrated to one of the EU-28 member states (Eurostat, 2017). Among these people, according to the Eurostat estimates, were 2.7 million citizens of non-member countries and 1.9 million people whose citizenship was not that of the EU member state to which they migrated.

On average, the people who answered the 2016 Standard Eurobarometer 86 survey (EB86) (European Commission, 2016c) considered immigration to be the most important issue at the European level, followed by terrorism. (The percentage for immigration had dropped by 13 percentage points since the 2015 survey, however.) Among the European countries participating in ICCS 2016, more than 60 percent of respondents in Estonia, Malta, and Bulgaria identified immigration as the most relevant issue. The national percentages for immigration as the main issue were between 50 and 60 percent in Denmark, Latvia, Lithuania, the Netherlands, Slovenia, and Sweden.

In EB86, a large majority of the 2016 respondents (61%) regarded immigration of people from other EU member states positively. However, 56 percent of respondents expressed negativity about people from outside the EU immigrating to EU member states, although the proportion of respondents who considered this kind of immigration in a positive way increased in the interval between the 2015 and 2016 surveys.

Of the European countries participating in ICCS 2016, those where respondents felt most positive about immigration of people from other EU member states were Sweden, Finland, and Lithuania. Countries where respondents expressed predominantly negative feelings were Latvia and Italy. As for immigration of people from outside the EU, majorities of respondents in Estonia, Latvia, and Bulgaria felt negative about this development. Of the European countries participating in ICCS, Sweden was the country that recorded the lowest average percentage of negative feelings.

Findings from the European Social Survey suggested that public attitudes toward immigration are closely linked to people's educational backgrounds (Masso, 2009; Paas & Halapuu, 2012) and that young people and people with higher levels of education show more favorable attitudes toward immigrants than older and lesser educated people do. Both the 2016 EB86 survey (European Commission, 2016c) and the European Social Survey found that Europeans prefer migrants from the same racial or ethnic group as themselves and tend to hold negative feelings toward migrants from poorer countries outside Europe. In relation to the effects of migration, Europeans emphasized migration's negative impact on their daily lives (e.g., crime and the quality of health and welfare services). General issues related to culture aroused less concern, although comparisons showed a slight strengthening in this concern over time (Heath & Richards, 2016).

² As mentioned in the previous chapter, students from an immigrant family generally also came from a lower socioeconomic background than students from a non-immigrant family did.

Table 3.3: National average scale scores indicating students' attitudes toward restriction of movement within Europe by gender, immigrant background, and level of civic knowledge

Country	Scale score average by gender group					Scale score average by immigrant background					Scale score average by level of civic knowledge				
	Male students		Female students			Non-immigrant family		Immigrant family			Civic knowledge below Level B (below 479)		Civic knowledge at or above Level B (479 and above)		
	9	6	3	0	3	6	9	9	6	3	0	3	6	9	
Belgium (Flemish)	50 (0.3)					49 (0.3)						54 (0.4)			48 (0.3)
Bulgaria	52 (0.4)					50 (0.4)						55 (0.4)			48 (0.3)
Croatia	52 (0.4)					48 (0.3)						55 (0.5)			49 (0.3)
Denmark [†]	51 (0.3)					49 (0.3)						54 (0.4)			50 (0.2)
Estonia [†]	50 (0.3)					46 (0.4)						53 (0.5)			47 (0.3)
Finland	50 (0.4)					44 (0.3)						55 (0.5)			46 (0.3)
Italy	51 (0.3)					49 (0.3)						54 (0.4)			48 (0.2)
Latvia [†]	51 (0.3)					48 (0.2)						52 (0.4)			48 (0.2)
Lithuania	52 (0.4)					48 (0.3)						56 (0.4)			48 (0.3)
Malta	54 (0.3)					50 (0.2)						56 (0.3)			49 (0.3)
Netherlands [†]	49 (0.4)					48 (0.3)						52 (0.7)			47 (0.3)
Norway (9) [†]	55 (0.2)					53 (0.2)						57 (0.3)			53 (0.1)
Slovenia	49 (0.3)					46 (0.3)						54 (0.4)			46 (0.3)
Sweden [†]	54 (0.3)					50 (0.3)						57 (0.7)			51 (0.2)
European ICCS 2016 average	51 (0.1)					48 (0.1)						55 (0.1)			48 (0.1)

■ Difference between comparison groups statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

□ Difference between comparison groups not statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

Notes:

0 Standard errors appear in parentheses.

Score averages that are significantly larger ($p < 0.05$) than those in the comparison group are displayed in **bold**.

(9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

¹ National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.

^ Number of students too small to report group average scores.

Some studies analyzing adolescents' attitudes toward immigrants have highlighted how parents' and peers' tolerance and xenophobia as well as inter-group friendships affect relative changes in students' pro-immigrant and anti-immigrant attitudes (Davies, Tropp, Aron, Pettigrew, & Wright, 2011; Degner & Dalege, 2013; Gniewosz & Noack, 2015; Miklikowska, 2017; van Zalk, Kerr, van Zalk, & Stattin, 2013).

Research investigating adolescents' attitudes toward immigrants' rights and nationalism has shown that greater religious diversity and more restrictive citizenship policies tend to be associated with adolescents' lower levels of support for immigrants' rights (Barber, Fennelly, & Torney-Purta, 2013). Research findings also highlight that adolescent females tend to hold more positive attitudes than adolescent males toward immigrant rights (Amadeo, Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Husfeldt, & Nikolova, 2002; Diaz-Veizades, Widaman, Little, & Gibbs, 1995; Torney-Purta, Lehmann, Oswald, & Schulz, 2001; Toth, 1995; Watts, 1996; Westin, 1998).

The IEA Civic Education Study (CIVED 1999) used eight items to measure attitudes toward immigrants. Five of these items were included in a scale (Schulz, 2004). Students at both lower and upper secondary school level reported mostly positive attitudes toward immigrants' rights (Amadeo et al., 2002; Torney-Purta et al., 2001). The ICCS 2009 student questionnaire encompassed a slightly modified version of the five items used in the CIVED scale. The results showed that students from an immigrant family expressed higher levels of endorsement for equal rights and opportunities for immigrants than students from a non-immigrant family did (Schulz, Ainley, Fraillon, Kerr, & Losito, 2010).

For ICCS 2016, we included, because of the particular relevance of this topic for the European context, a question in the student questionnaire that measured students' endorsement of equal rights for immigrants. The rationale behind this question was to measure students' endorsement of the principle of providing equal rights and opportunities to immigrants. Because many ICCS countries have very little immigration, the items referred to immigration to any country, not just to the one the students were living in.

The following five Likert-type items (with response categories "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," "strongly disagree") were used to measure the European students' attitudes toward equal rights for immigrants: (a) "Immigrants should have the opportunity to continue speaking their own language;" (b) "Immigrant children should have the same opportunities for education that other children in the country have;" (c) "Immigrants who live in a country for several years should have the opportunity to vote in elections;" (d) "Immigrants should have the opportunity to continue their own customs and lifestyle;" and (e) "Immigrants should have all the same rights that everyone else in the country has." These five items formed a scale with a high average reliability for the combined international sample (Cronbach's alpha = 0.80), with the higher scores on the scale reflecting greater endorsement of equal opportunities for immigrants (see the item map in [Figure 3.3](#), Appendix C).

On average, majorities of students agreed that immigrant children should have the same opportunities for education that other children in the country have (European ICCS 2016 average: 93%), and that immigrants should have all the same rights that everyone else in the country has (European ICCS 2016 average: 88%). The statements on immigrants being able to vote in elections, continue their own customs and lifestyle, and continue speaking their own language recorded lower percentages of agreement (European ICCS 2016 averages respectively of 75%, 73%, and 68%) (see [Table 3.4](#)).

In the European countries that participated in both ICCS 2009 and 2016, the average student tended to agree with statements endorsing equal rights for immigrants. In Sweden, country mean scores were more than three points above the European ICCS 2016 average. Latvia recorded the lowest national average ([Table 3.5](#)).

Table 3.4: Students' attitudes toward equal rights for immigrants

Country	Percentages of students who agreed or strongly agreed with the following statements:				
	Immigrants should have the opportunity to continue speaking their own language	Immigrant children should have the same opportunities for education that other children in the country have	Immigrants who live in a country for several years should have the opportunity to vote in elections	Immigrants should have the opportunity to continue their own customs and lifestyle	Immigrants should have the same rights that everyone else in the country has
Belgium (Flemish)	58 (1.2) ▼	94 (0.5) △	77 (1.0) △	66 (1.2) ▽	88 (0.8)
Bulgaria	71 (1.2) △	86 (0.9) ▽	55 (1.4) ▼	75 (1.1) △	76 (1.1) ▼
Croatia	79 (1.1) ▲	95 (0.5) △	78 (1.0) △	84 (0.9) ▲	92 (0.7) △
Denmark [†]	60 (1.0) ▽	95 (0.4) △	86 (0.7) ▲	78 (1.0) △	90 (0.7) △
Estonia [‡]	62 (1.2) ▽	94 (0.5)	68 (1.1) ▽	59 (1.1) ▼	85 (0.8) ▽
Finland	68 (1.0)	91 (0.7) ▽	78 (0.9) △	65 (1.0) ▽	89 (0.7) △
Italy	65 (1.0) ▽	94 (0.5) △	76 (1.1)	73 (1.0)	92 (0.6) △
Latvia [‡]	50 (1.3) ▼	88 (0.7) ▽	58 (1.3) ▼	54 (1.4) ▼	78 (1.0) ▽
Lithuania	80 (1.0) ▲	95 (0.5) △	70 (1.0) ▽	82 (0.8) △	88 (0.7)
Malta	79 (0.9) ▲	90 (0.6) ▽	67 (0.9) ▽	72 (0.8)	83 (0.7) ▽
Netherlands [‡]	51 (1.5) ▼	92 (0.5)	80 (0.9) △	70 (1.2) ▽	87 (0.9)
Norway (9) [‡]	76 (0.9) △	96 (0.3) △	84 (0.6) △	81 (0.7) △	92 (0.4) △
Slovenia	73 (1.2) △	95 (0.4) △	82 (0.9) △	79 (1.0) △	92 (0.7) △
Sweden [‡]	82 (1.2) ▲	95 (0.5) △	88 (0.9) ▲	83 (1.0) △	94 (0.7) △
European ICCS 2016 average	68 (0.3)	93 (0.1)	75 (0.3)	73 (0.3)	88 (0.2)
Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requirements					
North-Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) [‡]	82 (1.3)	93 (0.8)	83 (1.2)	79 (1.3)	92 (1.0)

National ICCS 2016 percentage:

- ▲ More than 10 percentage points above European ICCS 2016 average
- △ Significantly above European ICCS 2016 average
- ▽ Significantly below European ICCS 2016 average
- ▼ More than 10 percentage points below European ICCS 2016 average

Notes:

- () Standard errors appear in parentheses. Because results are rounded to the nearest whole number, some totals may appear inconsistent.
- (9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.
- † Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.
- [‡] National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.

Between ICCS 2009 and 2016, the national scores on the students' attitudes toward immigrants scale decreased in four countries—Bulgaria, Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. We recorded small significant increases in Belgium (Flemish), and Norway. The country with the highest increase in average scores between 2009 and 2016 was Norway (2.8 score points). The strongest decrease was found in Bulgaria (-5.6 score points). As shown in Table 3.5, the European average for common countries in ICCS 2016 was slightly lower than in 2009—by more than half a score point.

In all participating countries, female students generally held more positive attitudes toward immigrant rights than males did (see Table 3.6). The statistically significant difference was two score points on average. In nine countries, students from an immigrant family expressed more positive attitudes toward immigrant rights than did those from a non-immigrant family. The statistically significant scale point difference was about three score points on average. The highest differences that we recorded (four score points or more) were for Belgium (Flemish), Denmark, Finland, Italy, the Netherlands, Norway, and Sweden.

In every country, students' scores on the scale were greater for students with a higher level of civic knowledge scores (at or above Level B) than for students with a lower level of civic knowledge (below Level B). On average, the difference was about two scale points.

Table 3.5: National averages of students' endorsement of equal rights for immigrants

Country	2016		2009	Differences (2016-2009)	
Belgium (Flemish)	47 (0.2)	▽	46 (0.3)	1.6 (0.8)	
Bulgaria	46 (0.3)	▽	52 (0.2)	-5.6 (0.7)	
Croatia	50 (0.2)	△	–	–	
Denmark [†]	49 (0.2)		48 (0.3)	0.0 (0.7)	
Estonia ¹	46 (0.1)	▽	48 (0.2)	-1.7 (0.7)	
Finland	48 (0.2)	▽	48 (0.3)	-0.2 (0.7)	
Italy	49 (0.2)		48 (0.3)	0.1 (0.8)	
Latvia ¹	43 (0.2)	▼	47 (0.2)	-3.4 (0.7)	
Lithuania	49 (0.2)	△	51 (0.2)	-1.6 (0.7)	
Malta	48 (0.2)		49 (0.3)	-1.0 (0.8)	
Netherlands [†]	47 (0.3)	▽	–	–	
Norway (9) ¹	51 (0.2)	△	48 (0.4)	2.8 (0.8)	
Slovenia	50 (0.3)	△	50 (0.3)	-0.3 (0.8)	
Sweden ¹	53 (0.4)	▲	52 (0.4)	1.5 (0.9)	
European ICCS 2016 average	48 (0.1)				
Common countries average	48 (0.1)		48 (0.3)	-0.6 (0.2)	

Benchmarking participant not meeting sample participation requirements				
North Rhine-Westphalia (Germany) ¹	53 (0.5)	–	–

2016 average score +/- Confidence interval
2009 average score +/- Confidence interval

National ICCS 2016 average:

- ▲ More than 3 score points above European ICCS 2016 average
- △ Significantly above European ICCS 2016 average
- ▽ Significantly below European ICCS 2016 average
- ▼ More than 3 score points below European ICCS 2016 average

Notes:

() Standard errors appear in parentheses.

Statistically significant changes ($p < 0.05$) between 2009 and 2016 are displayed in **bold**.

(9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

¹ National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.

– No comparable data available.

On average across items, students with a score in the range with this color have more than a 50% probability of indicating:

No strong agreement with positive statements
Strong agreement with positive statements

Table 3.6: National average scale scores indicating students' attitudes toward equal rights for immigrants by gender, immigrant background, and level of civic knowledge

Country	Scale score average by gender group				Scale score average by immigrant background				Scale score average by level of civic knowledge			
	Male students		Female students		Non-immigrant family		Immigrant family		Civic knowledge below Level B (below 479)		Civic knowledge at or above Level B (479 and above)	
	9	6	3	0	9	6	3	0	9	6	3	0
Belgium (Flemish)	46 (0.3)				47 (0.3)				48 (0.5)			
Bulgaria	45 (0.4)				47 (0.3)				46 (0.4)			
Croatia	49 (0.3)				50 (0.2)				49 (0.5)			
Denmark [†]	48 (0.3)				48 (0.2)				46 (0.5)			
Estonia ¹	45 (0.2)				46 (0.2)				44 (0.5)			
Finland	46 (0.3)				48 (0.2)				43 (0.7)			
Italy	48 (0.3)				48 (0.3)				47 (0.4)			
Latvia ¹	43 (0.3)				43 (0.2)				43 (0.3)			
Lithuania	49 (0.3)				49 (0.2)				47 (0.3)			
Malta	47 (0.3)				48 (0.2)				47 (0.2)			
Netherlands [†]	46 (0.3)				46 (0.2)				45 (0.3)			
Norway (9) ¹	50 (0.3)				51 (0.2)				49 (0.4)			
Slovenia	49 (0.3)				50 (0.3)				49 (0.4)			
Sweden ¹	52 (0.6)				52 (0.4)				50 (0.8)			
European ICCS 2016 average	47 (0.1)				48 (0.1)				47 (0.1)			

■ Difference between comparison groups statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

□ Difference between comparison groups not statistically significant at $p < 0.05$.

Notes:

0) Standard errors appear in parentheses.

Score averages that are significantly larger ($p < 0.05$) than those in the comparison group are displayed in **bold**.

(9) Country deviated from International Defined Population and surveyed adjacent upper grade.

† Met guidelines for sampling participation rates only after replacement schools were included.

¹ National Defined Population covers 90% to 95% of National Target Population.

^ Number of students too small to report group average scores.

References

- Amadeo, J., Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Husfeldt, V., & Nikolova, R. (2002). *Civic knowledge and engagement: An IEA study of upper secondary students in sixteen countries*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Barber, C., Fennelly, K., & Torney-Purta, J. (2013). Nationalism and support for immigrants' rights among adolescents in 25 countries. *Applied Developmental Science*, 17(2), 60–75. doi: 10.1080/10888691.2013.774870
- Davies, K., Tropp, L. R., Aron, A., Pettigrew, T. F., & Wright, S. C. (2011). Cross-group friendships and intergroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 15(4), 332–351. doi:10.1177/1088868311411103
- Degner, J., & Dalege, J. (2013). The apple does not fall far from the tree, or does it? A meta-analysis of parent-child similarity in intergroup attitudes. *Psychological Bulletin*, 139, 1270–1304. doi:10.1037/a0031436
- Diaz-Veizades, J., Widaman, K., Little, T., & Gibbs, K. (1995). The measurement and structure of human rights attitudes. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 135(3), 313–328.
- European Commission. (2016a). EU citizenship consultation 2015. *Common values, rights and democratic participation*. Brussels, Belgium: Author. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/justice/citizen/document/files/2015_public_consultation_booklet_en.pdf
- European Commission. (2016b). *Standard Eurobarometer 85 "European citizenship" report*. Brussels, Belgium: Author. Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/STANDARD/surveyKy/2130>
- European Commission. (2016c). *Standard Eurobarometer 86 "Public opinion in the European Union, first results"*. Brussels, Belgium: Author. Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu/COMMFrontOffice/publicopinion/index.cfm/Survey/getSurveyDetail/instruments/STANDARD/surveyKy/2137>
- Eurostat. (2017). Migration and migrant population statistics. *Eurostat statistics explained* [Website]. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/statistics-explained/index.php/migration_and_migrant_population_statistics
- Fries-Tersch, E., Tugran, T., & Bradley, H. (2016). *Annual report on intra-EU labour mobility: Final report, December 2016*. Brussels, Belgium: European Commission. Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu/social/BlobServlet?docId=17165&langId=en>
- Gniewosz, B., & Noack, P. (2015). Parental influences on adolescents' negative attitudes toward immigrants. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence* (online publication). doi:10.1007/s10964-015-0291-3
- Heath, A., & Richards, L. (2016). *Attitudes towards immigration and their antecedents: Topline results from Round 7 of the European Social Survey* (ESS Topline Results Series, Issue 7). London, UK: European Social Survey. Retrieved from http://www.europeansocialsurvey.org/docs/findings/ESS7_toplines_issue_7_immigration.pdf
- Masso, A. (2009). A readiness to accept immigrants in Europe? Individual and country-level characteristics. *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, 35(2), 251–270.
- Miklikowska, M. (2017). Development of anti-immigrant attitudes in adolescence: The role of parents, peers, intergroup friendships, and empathy. *British Journal of Psychology*, 108(3), 626–648. doi:10.1111/bjop.12236
- Paas T., & Halapuu V. (2012). *Attitudes towards immigrants and the integration of ethnically diverse societies* (NORFACE Migration Discussion Paper No. 2012-23). Retrieved from http://www.norface-migration.org/publ_uploads/NDP_23_12.pdf
- Schulz, W. (2004). Scaling procedures for Likert-type items on students' concepts, attitudes and actions. In W. Schulz & H. Sibberns (Eds.), *IEA Civic Education Study: Technical report* (pp. 193–126). Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Kerr, D., & Losito, B. (2010). *ICCS 2009 international report: Civic knowledge, attitudes and engagement among lower secondary school students in thirty-eight countries*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).
- Schulz, W., Ainley, J., Fraillon, J., Losito, B., & Agrusti, G. (2016). *IEA International Civic and Citizenship Education Study 2016: Assessment framework*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Torney-Purta, J., Lehmann, R., Oswald, H., & Schulz, W. (2001). *Citizenship and education in twenty-eight countries: Civic knowledge and engagement at age fourteen*. Amsterdam, the Netherlands: International Association for the Evaluation of Educational Achievement (IEA).

Toth, O. (1995). Political-moral attitudes amongst young people in post-Communist Hungary. In L. Chisholm, P. Buchner, H.-H. Kruger, & M. du Bois-Reymond (Eds.), *Growing up in Europe: Contemporary horizons in childhood and youth studies* (Vol. 2, pp. 189–194). Berlin, New York: Walter de Gruyter.

van Zalk, M.H.W., Kerr, M., van Zalk, N., & Stattin, H. (2013). Xenophobia and tolerance in adolescence: Cross-Influence processes in friendships. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 41(4), 627–639.

Watts, M. W. (1996). Political xenophobia in the transition from socialism: Threat, racism and ideology among East German youth. *Political Psychology*, 17(1), 97–126.

Westin, C. (1998). Immigration, xenophobia and youthful opinion. In J. Nurmi (Ed.), *Adolescents, cultures and conflicts: Growing up in contemporary Europe* (pp. 225–241). New York, NY: Garland Publishing.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.