

# Factors influencing society's attitudes towards internal and external EU immigrants

MINDAUGAS BUTKUS, ALMA MAČIULYTĖ-ŠNIUKIENĖ,  
VIDA DAVIDAVIČIENĖ

Department of Business Technologies, Vilnius Gediminas Technical University, Saulėtekio Ave. 11, LT-10223 Vilnius  
E-mail mindaugo.butkaus@gmail.com

KRISTINA MATUZEVIČIŪTĖ

Department of Economics, Šiauliai University, Višinskio St. 19, LT-76352 Šiauliai

---

In open economy migration is a natural process. However, constantly growing immigration flows to the EU countries pose certain challenges for host countries. In 2015, over 1 million people – asylum seekers, refugees and other immigrants – crossed the border of the EU. In addition, there is a significant movement from less developed to more developed countries within the EU. This process causes citizens' discontent of some host countries, as well as the fear of economic, social, political and security instability. In order to achieve integration of immigrants and seeking to formulate a successful migration policy it is appropriate to determine factors influencing society's attitudes towards immigrants. During the last decade this topic is relevant in the political and scientific field; however, there is a lack of systematic research carried out integrating not only economic but also demographic, cultural, political and religious factors influencing society's attitudes. In this research we employed a logistic regression model to estimate factors that increase or decrease the probability for a positive attitude towards internal and external immigrants in the EU. As a source for raw data we used the European Social Survey Database. The research results revealed that society's attitude towards internal EU immigrants was more positive compared with that towards external immigrants. Factors increasing the probability for EU citizens to possess a positive attitude towards immigrants are higher education level and sufficient income. The influence of these factors does not differ much regarding internal and external immigrants. We estimated that women, families with children, people that live in cities and young generation are the members of society that have the most positive attitude.

**Keywords:** internal migration, external migration, individual attitudes, attitudes toward immigrants

---

## INTRODUCTION

One of the major changes in the European society during the last decade was the increase in immigration. Data from the Migration Policy Institute (MPI) shows that total annual asylum applications in the EU Member States and European Free Trade Association (EFTA) countries from 2008 to 2015 have increased by 443.92 percent (from 256,155 to 1,393,285 applications). There were 3.8 mil. new immigrants in the EU in 2015 and immigration from non-member countries accounted for 50% of this number. This poses the citizens' dissatisfaction with the EU's immigration policy. This could lead to political instability and undesirable consequences in countries and all the EU, like Brexit in Britain. For the EU's social, economic, political stability and security it is appropriate to adjust the immigration policy herewith changing citizens' attitudes towards immigration and immigrants. Therefore, it is necessary to identify the factors that determine these attitudes. It is also important as citizens' general negative attitudes towards immigrants and ethnic minorities are the key factor that hinders integration, as research findings by Constant, Kahanec and Zimmermann (2008) show.

Many studies have examined citizens' attitudes towards immigration and immigrants. The majority of them are focussed on the immigration issue in the United States, and the minority of them were carried out in other countries, including the EU countries. The studies are usually dedicated to investigate one or two groups of factors. So there is the lack of systematic research, which would include socio-economic, demographic and other determinants, when the EU's immigration structure is changing towards increasing the share of external immigration and towards new countries of origin. According to the MPI data, in 2008, the EU and EFTA received most of asylum applications from immigrants from Iraq (12.58%), Russia (8.71%), Somalia (7.57%) and, in 2015, 27.54% of applicants were from Syria. India, China, Morocco, Pakistan and Ukraine are top origin countries of newly arrived non-EU citizens during the period of 2010–2013. Changes of immigrants' structure could also lead to changes in society's attitudes towards immigrants and immigration.

According to the above-mentioned context, the aim of this paper is to determine factors that affect society's attitudes towards immigrants and compare them regarding internal and external EU immigration.

## THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK OF ATTITUDES TOWARDS IMMIGRANTS

Attitudes towards immigrants and immigration have been in focus during the last decade. The studies that explain the determinants of society's attitudes towards immigration are diverse. Some of them (Mayda 2006; Dustmann, Preston 2007; Hainmueller, Hiscox 2007; Facchini, Mayda 2009, 2012; Boeri 2010; Facchini et al. 2011; Paas, Halapuu 2012; Gang et al. 2013; Hatton 2016) emphasize the importance of economic competition, while others (Chandler, Tsai, 2001; Schweitzer et al. 2005; Mayda 2006; Dustmann, Preston 2007; Facchini et al. 2011; Gang et al. 2013; Murray, Marx 2013; Bullard 2015) emphasize cultural, political and other aspects of life. It can be stated that immigrants while moving to another country also always face the process of integration in a host country. O'Rourke and Sinnott (2006), Mayda (2006) confirm that skill level, nationalist sentiment, patriotism and especially chauvinism, protectionism, gender, age have a significant impact on attitudes towards immigrants and at

the same time influence the process of their integration. The authors estimated that national mobility, employed status and religion are unrelated with attitudes towards immigration. Other researchers, like McDaniel et al. (2011) and Paas and Halapuu (2012), find that religious conservatism is linked to more negative attitudes towards immigrants. The study of Facchini and Mayda (2006) revealed two main findings: 1) the income distribution effects on attitudes (as perceived by individuals) towards immigration are less pronounced than pointed out in the existing literature; 2) individual skill and income have opposite effects on individual attitudes (in countries where natives are on average more skilled than immigrants, individual income is negatively correlated with pro-immigration preferences, while individual skill is positively correlated with them). The research results of O'Rourke and Sinnott (2006) reveal several differences in the attitudes towards immigrants for Western economies and Eastern Europe. The authors indicate that chauvinism has more effect on Western attitudes, and in the East being a native-born resident and having native-born parents is more important. Effect of skills on attitudes is extremely large and negative in the West, but statistically insignificant in the East. Age is more influential in the West compared with the East. Catholics in the Western countries are less anti-immigrant than others, but this factor has no effect on attitudes in the East. Facchini et al. (2011) identify that attitudes towards immigrants vary according to the language spoken at home – people speaking English favour migration more. Paas and Halapuu (2012) add that income, institutional trust, living location, also education influence attitudes towards immigrants. Just and Anderson (2015) pay attention to the citizenship influence on the attitude towards immigrants. The authors state that the native-born status and citizenship have negative and statistically significant effects on people's attitudes towards new arrivals. Although many authors in their studies found that high-skilled people are less anti-immigrant than low-skilled people, Facchini and Mayada (2005) revealed that the level of individual skills is positively correlated with pro-immigration preferences only in countries where natives are on average more skilled than immigrants. And this correlation is negative in economies where immigrants are relatively skilled compared with the native population.

The results of analysed studies show that the authors analyse different factors influencing attitudes towards immigrants and immigration. In addition, the data used in these studies cover different periods and different countries, so the estimated results may vary. The meta-analysis carried out by Hainmueller and Histox (2009), as well as theoretical assumptions reveal the general statement: the most positive and tolerant attitudes are associated with youth, high socio-economic status, high educational attainment and left-wing political sympathies. However, more factors that affect attitudes towards immigrants and the studies with findings that do not correspond with the above mentioned statement can be distinguished (see Table 1).

It should be noted that in Table 1 rows with the word "*Denied*" present the studies that have denied general statements or have proved the contrary to these statements. Furthermore, the studies have revealed other factors which may cause attitudes towards immigrants. Pass and Halapuu's (2012) research results showed that people living in smaller towns and rural areas pose more negative attitudes towards immigrants as compared to people living in cities. People's trust in the institutions (parliament, legal system, police, etc.) of the country of residence correlate with positive attitudes towards immigrants.

Table 1. Factors that determine attitudes towards immigrants and general statements

| Factor                     | General statement  | Research results regarding general statement | Research  |
|----------------------------|--|--|---|
| Qualification or education | High-skilled people are less anti-immigrant than low-skilled   | Proved                                       | Espenshade, Calhoun 1993; Citrin et al. 1997; Chandler, Tsai 2001; Scheve, Slaughter 2001; McDaniel et al. 2011; Paas, Halapuu 2012; Gang et al. 2013; Percival, Currin-Percival 2013; Gallega, Pardos-Prado 2014; Goldstein, Peters 2014; Strabac et al. 2014. |
|                            |  | Denied                                       | Baker et al. 2008.  |
| Age                        | Young people are less anti-immigrant than older  | Proved                                       | Hainmueller, Hiscox 2007; The Opportunity Agenda 2012; Goldstein, Peters 2014; Strabac et al. 2014 (but not in all countries).  |
|                            |  | Denied                                       | O'Rourke, Sinnott 2006; Percival, Currin-Percival 2010 (no impact); Paas, Halapuu 2012; Percival, Currin-Percival 2013; Gallega, Pardos-Prado 2014.   |
| Multicultural experience   | People who have already lived abroad, and those either born abroad or with foreign-born parents or have foreign-born friends are less anti-immigrant | Proved                                       | Finney, Peach 2004; Mayda 2006; O'Rourke, Sinnott 2006; Paas, Halapuu 2012; Murray, Marx 2013; Gallega, Pardos-Prado 2014; Goldstein, Peters 2014.  |
| Religion                   | Members of minor religion groups are less anti-immigrant than members of majority affiliations   | Proved                                       | McDaniels et al. 2011; Paas, Halapuu 2012.  |
|                            |  | Denied                                       | Sniderman et al. 2000; Scheve, Slaughter 2001; Sniderman et al. 2004; Goldstein, Peters 2014.   |
| Gender                     | Women are more anti-immigrant than men   | Proved                                       | Schweitzer et al. 2005; McDaniels et al. 2011; Paas, Halapuu 2012; Strabac et al. 2014 (but not in all countries).  |
|                            |  | Denied                                       | Citrin et al. 1997; Bulard 2015.  |
| Income                     | People with higher income are less anti-immigrant  | Proved                                       | Paas, Halapuu 2012; Gallega, Pardos-Prado 2014; Goldstein, Peters 2014 (little);  |
|                            |  | Denied                                       | Paas, Halapuu 2012.   |
| Employment status          | Unemployed persons are more anti-immigrant than employed   | Proved                                       | Gallega, Pardos-Prado 2014.   |
|                            |  | Denied                                       | Percival, Currin-Percival 2010 (no impact); Facchini et al. 2011 (no impact); Paas, Halapuu 2012 (no impact).   |

In general, according to summarized findings of empirical studies, it can be argued that the society's attitudes towards immigrants in the EU may vary depending on the following: 1) personal characteristics of the citizens, like gender, marital status, education level, religiosity, etc.; 2) the place of residence that determines the level of multicultural experience and interactions with immigrants; and 3) the socio-economic security, like income, employment status, etc. So, in order

to accelerate integration of immigrants and seeking to formulate the EU migration policy that would lead to concordant society it is important to determine factors influencing attitudes towards immigrants in the EU countries.

## VARIABLES, HYPOTHESES AND MODEL

The results of theoretical and empirical studies on immigration clearly show that a positive/negative attitude towards immigration is potentially related to many socio-economic factors at the micro level. In accordance with previous studies concerning this topic, in this analysis binary logistic regression was chosen as the most suitable statistical tool for empirical estimation of factors influencing attitudes towards immigrants and comparing them regarding immigration from and outside the EU member states. The ESS database was used as the source of raw data. The attitude towards immigration inside and outside the EU was originally in raw data measured in various Likert-type scales, ranging from 1–4 to 0–10 scales. To simplify interpretation, all the above-mentioned scales are re-encoded into only two values, using a simple mathematical division. In cases when scales had an uneven number of answer possibilities, the “leftover value” in the neutral middle was counted as a negative attitude. To this end, dependent variables, describing European peoples’ attitude towards immigrants from and outside the EU member states, i. e. their positive or negative nature of answers to questions regarding immigrants is encoded into a binary form. The positive attitude was described as value “1” and the negative one as “0”.

The factors potentially influencing the attitude towards immigrants, i. e. independent variables in the model, are presented in Table 2.

Table 2. Socio-economic factors (independent variables) potentially influencing the attitude towards immigrants

| Variable name                 | Description   |
|-------------------------------|---|
| <i>Education level</i>        | Four dummy variables are assigned: “basic education”, “high school diploma”, “vocational school diploma” and “higher education”. “Primary education” is chosen as a benchmark group.  |
| <i>Employment status</i>      | We use two dummy variables: “people without job looking for one” and “people who are neither working nor looking for a job”. “Working people” is chosen as a benchmark group.   |
| <i>Insufficient income</i>    | This variable is described only by the subjective opinion of the respondents: “0”, people who answered they can manage (or even manage well) their income; “1”, people who encounter difficulties managing their family’s income. |
| <i>Female</i>                 | Coded into a binary form: “0”, male and “1”, female.  |
| <i>Marital status</i>         | Consists of three dummy variables: “divorced”, “widowed” and “never married” people. “Married people” is chosen as a benchmark group.   |
| <i>Children</i>               | “1”, families having children; “0”, families without children.  |
| <i>Religious</i>              | “1”, people who consider themselves religious; “0”, irreligious people.   |
| <i>Countryside</i>            | People who live in cities encoded as “0” and people living in countryside as “1”.   |
| <i>Central/Western Europe</i> | Citizens of Northern and Eastern European countries are encoded as “0”, people of Central and Western European countries as “1”, both representing about half of the whole sample.  |
| <i>Age</i>                    | Three dummy variables are assigned to the following groups: “from 21 to 40”, “from 41 to 60” and “61 and above”. “Up to 20” is chosen as a benchmark group.   |
| <i>Lack of safety</i>         | “Feeling safe walking home after dark” assigned to “0” and the opposite of that to “1”.   |

From a theoretical point of view, we can predict a possible impact of independent variables, i. e. a factor, on the attitude towards immigrants but not what affects attitude differences regarding immigrants from and outside the EU member states. Thus we can predict that in general the attitude towards immigrants from the EU member states is more positive than towards those outside the EU, but we cannot hypothesize whether there are any differences in the factors that shape this attitude. The hypotheses of our research that correspond to the above-mentioned independent variables are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Research hypotheses

| No. | Hypothesis formulation   |
|-----|--|
| 1.  | People with a higher level of education possess more probability for a positive attitude towards immigrants.   |
| 2.  | People who work are more likely to have positive attitudes towards immigrants.   |
| 3.  | People who are satisfied with their family's financial situation are more likely to have positive attitudes towards immigrants.  |
| 4.  | Females are more likely than males to have positive attitudes towards immigrants.  |
| 5.  | People who are married possess a higher probability for a positive attitude towards immigrants than those never married, divorced or widowed.  |
| 6.  | Families without children are more likely to have positive attitudes towards immigrants than families who have children.   |
| 7.  | People who consider themselves religious are more likely to have a positive attitude towards immigrants than people who do not consider themselves religious.  |
| 8.  | People living in cities are more likely than people living in the countryside to have positive attitudes towards immigrants.   |
| 9.  | Natives from Central and Western European countries are more likely to have positive attitudes towards immigrants than people from Eastern and Northern Europe, because citizens from former countries are likely to have more experience with immigrants compared to citizens from the latter group of countries. |
| 10. | Younger people are more likely to have positive attitudes towards immigrants than older people.  |
| 11. | People feeling safe will have more likely positive attitudes towards immigrants.   |

The regression model for empirical estimations is composed as follows:

$$P(Y) = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-(\beta_0 + \beta_1 x_1 + \dots + \beta_{11} x_{11} + \varepsilon)}} .$$

Here  $P(Y)$  is a probability of occurrence of a positive attitude over a negative attitude towards immigrants, as the negative attitude in the model is considered as the benchmark value.  $x_1, \dots, x_{11}$  mark all eleven independent variables, i. e. factors, in the model starting from the education level.  $\beta_1, \dots, \beta_{11}$ , as usual, mark the regression coefficients, giving information how strongly and in which direction independent variables affect the odds ratio of the dependent variable.

## ESTIMATION RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

On the whole, the ESS database consists of about 47 thousand respondents. Rather scarce is data about marital and work statuses (data about these factors is available for a bit more than 60% of all questioned respondents). Incomplete data (nevertheless, for some of variables we had data from almost 99.9% of respondents) reduces the sample size for our research to about 26 thousand. In general, it appears that 60.1% of people in the EU have a positive attitude towards immigrants from the EU member states, but there are by 10 percentage points less people with a positive attitude towards immigrants from the non-EU member states.

The estimation results of binary logistic regression model linking factors with odds ratios of the positive attitude towards immigrants from and outside the EU member states are presented in Table 4. Both estimated models are not particularly descriptive, the pseudo  $R^2$  is about 0.1, but according to the goodness-to-fit test it is "better than nothing at all". To test

Table 4. Estimation results of the models

| Factors in the model               | Dependant variable: attitude towards immigrants from the EU member states |         |                     |       | Dependant variable: attitude towards immigrants outside the EU member states |         |                     |       |
|------------------------------------|---|---------|---------------------|-------|--|---------|---------------------|-------|
|                                    | Estimated $\beta$ coefficient (B)   | Exp (B) | 95% C.I. for Exp(B) |       | Estimated $\beta$ coefficient (B)  | Exp (B) | 95% C.I. for Exp(B) |       |
|                                    |   |         | Lower               | Upper |  |         | Lower               | Upper |
| Constant                           | 0.791   | 2.21    |                     |       | -0.824   | 0.44    |                     |       |
| Education level                    |   |         |                     |       |  |         |                     |       |
| <i>Basic education</i>             | 0.264   | 1.30    | 0.75                | 2.26  | 0.266  | 1.31    | 0.74                | 2.29  |
| <i>High school diploma</i>         | 0.663**   | 1.94    | 1.15                | 3.28  | 0.625**  | 1.87    | 1.10                | 3.20  |
| <i>Vocational school diploma</i>   | 1.057***  | 2.88    | 1.56                | 5.32  | 1.031***   | 2.80    | 1.52                | 5.17  |
| <i>Higher education</i>            | 1.329***  | 3.78    | 2.13                | 6.70  | 1.154***   | 3.17    | 1.79                | 5.62  |
| Employment status                  |   |         |                     |       |  |         |                     |       |
| <i>Jobless looking for a job</i>   | 0.215   | 1.24    | 0.54                | 2.87  | 0.294  | 1.34    | 0.62                | 2.89  |
| <i>Jobless not looking for one</i> | 0.082   | 1.09    | 0.81                | 1.45  | 0.239*   | 1.27    | 0.97                | 1.67  |
| Insufficient income                | -0.418**  | 0.66    | 0.47                | 0.93  | -0.421**   | 0.66    | 0.47                | 0.91  |
| Female                             | 0.237*  | 1.27    | 0.97                | 1.66  | 0.311**  | 1.37    | 1.06                | 1.75  |
| Marital status                     |   |         |                     |       |  |         |                     |       |
| <i>Divorced</i>                    | -0.147  | 0.86    | 0.39                | 1.93  | 0.447  | 1.56    | 0.74                | 3.29  |
| <i>Widowed</i>                     | -0.413  | 0.66    | 0.30                | 1.49  | 0.119  | 1.13    | 0.53                | 2.40  |
| <i>Single</i>                      | -0.245  | 0.78    | 0.35                | 1.76  | 0.324  | 1.38    | 0.65                | 2.93  |
| Children                           | 0.179   | 1.20    | 0.80                | 1.78  | 0.537***   | 1.71    | 1.17                | 2.50  |
| Religious                          | -0.075  | 0.93    | 0.71                | 1.21  | -0.076   | 0.93    | 0.72                | 1.19  |
| Countryside                        | -0.250*   | 0.78    | 0.59                | 1.03  | -0.262**   | 0.77    | 0.59                | 1.00  |
| Central/Western Europe             | 0.055   | 1.06    | 0.82                | 1.37  | 0.258**  | 1.30    | 1.02                | 1.65  |

Table 4. Continued

| Factors in the model     | Dependant variable: attitude towards immigrants from the EU member states |         |                     |       | Dependant variable: attitude towards immigrants outside the EU member states |         |                     |       |
|--------------------------|---|---------|---------------------|-------|--|---------|---------------------|-------|
|                          | Estimated $\beta$ coefficient (B)   | Exp (B) | 95% C.I. for Exp(B) |       | Estimated $\beta$ coefficient (B)  | Exp (B) | 95% C.I. for Exp(B) |       |
|                          |   |         | Lower               | Upper |  |         | Lower               | Upper |
| Age                      |   |         |                     |       |  |         |                     |       |
| <i>from 21 to 40</i>     | -0.562**  | 0.57    | 0.36                | 0.89  | -0.315   | 0.73    | 0.48                | 1.11  |
| <i>from 41 to 60</i>     | -0.614**  | 0.54    | 0.32                | 0.93  | -0.110   | 0.90    | 0.54                | 1.49  |
| <i>61 and above</i>      | -0.657**  | 0.52    | 0.29                | 0.93  | -0.486*  | 0.62    | 0.36                | 1.06  |
| Lack of safety           | -0.524***   | 0.59    | 0.43                | 0.83  | -0.565***  | 0.57    | 0.41                | 0.78  |
| N                        | 25579   |         |                     |       | 27607  |         |                     |       |
| -2 Log likelihood        | 1464.42   |         |                     |       | 1631.53  |         |                     |       |
| Pseudo R <sup>2</sup>    |   |         |                     |       |  |         |                     |       |
| <i>Cox &amp; Snell</i>   | 0.068   |         |                     |       | 0.087  |         |                     |       |
| <i>Nagelkerke</i>        | 0.095   |         |                     |       | 0.118  |         |                     |       |
| Hosmer and Lemeshow test |   |         |                     |       |  |         |                     |       |
| $\chi^2$                 | 6.094   |         |                     |       | 5.513  |         |                     |       |
| <i>p</i> -value          | 0.637   |         |                     |       | 0.698  |         |                     |       |

\* indicates significance at the 10 percent level;

\*\* indicates significance at the 5 percent level;

\*\*\* indicates significance at the 1 percent level.

whether the models fit the data, the Hosmer–Lemeshow test was employed. The model fits well if the test statistic produces a non-significant chi-square value. In case of our models, the *p*-value of the chi-square was 0.637 and 0.698 indicating the chi-square value as insignificant by all commonly used confidence levels (the lowest of them being  $p < 0.1$ ).

As many research papers emphasized and our estimation results show, the level of education is a very important factor affecting peoples' attitude towards immigrants. Despite the fact that we do not see any differences in the attitudes between the groups of people with the primary and basic education level, the estimation results clearly show that, in general, with a higher level of education the probability of having a positive attitude towards immigrants is rising. These results are in favour of proving our hypothesis H1. It is worth mentioning here that with a higher education level the probability of having a positive attitude towards immigrants from the EU member states is rising faster than in the case of immigrants from outside EU. If there are no clear differences between the probabilities indicating education that reaches the vocational school diploma degree, they become more significant with a higher education degree. People with a higher education degree, according to the model estimation, 3.8 times more likely have a positive attitude towards immigrants from the EU member states and 3.2 times more likely towards immigrants outside EU than those with the lowest education level. So, in general, more educated people possess a more positive attitude towards immigrants, but the probability of that is higher in the case of internal EU migration compared with the external one.



Surprisingly, employment and marital status as well as religiosity were estimated as statistically insignificant factors not affecting the attitude towards immigrants at the 95% confidence level. People in general do not connect their own labour market status with immigrants. The insignificant religiosity factor could be related to the secularized society in the EU. Thus we should reject hypotheses H2, H5 and H7 because we do not have a clear statistical evidence that the factors corresponding to these hypotheses affect the attitude towards immigrants.

A confident feeling about household income increases the probability to have a positive attitude towards immigrants. People with insufficient income, according to the model estimation, 1.5 ( $1/\text{Exp}(B)$ ) times more likely have a negative attitude towards immigrants than those who have a confident feeling about their household income. Thus we do not reject the hypothesis H3. Peoples' satisfaction with their family's financial situation has the same effect on the attitude towards immigrants from the EU member states as well as on those from other countries.

We do not have clear statistical evidences to support the view that male and female have significantly different attitudes towards immigrants from the EU member states (estimated differences can be considered as important just at a lower 90% confidence). But we estimated that female 1.4 times more likely have a positive attitude towards immigrants outside the EU compared with male. Thus we have partial evidences not to reject our hypothesis H4, because we see gender differences in the attitudes just in the case of immigration outside the EU.

We have similar estimation results in the case of the variable *Children*. We do not see differences in the attitudes towards immigrants from the EU member states between families that do not have children and families that have children, but these differences are statistically grounded in the case of immigrants outside the EU. The estimation results are in favour to reject our hypothesis H6, because we estimated that the families with children 1.7 times more likely have a positive attitude towards immigrants from outside the EU than the families without children, i. e. contrary to our initial statement.

Analysing the estimations on the variables *Countryside* and *Central/Western Europe* we see the results that are in line with the two variables discussed previously. We do not have a statistical evidence that would support the view of significantly different attitudes towards immigrants from the EU member states between people living in countryside and somewhere else and between citizens of Central and Western Europe countries and citizens of Northern and Eastern European countries. In the case of immigrants from outside the EU, we estimated that people from countryside almost 1.3 times more likely have a negative attitude towards them than people living in other places and, on the contrary, citizens of Central and Western Europe countries almost 1.3 times more likely have a positive attitude than citizens of Northern and Eastern European countries. Thus we have partial evidences not to reject our hypotheses H8 and H9.

Having in mind the last four factors we can conclude that gender, family structure, country of residence and place of residence in the country are important factors affecting attitudes towards immigrants outside but not from the EU member states.

Opposite to what was mentioned above we see in the case of age influence on the attitudes. We estimated no differences in the attitudes towards immigrants outside the EU among the age groups, but we have a clear statistical evidence that in the age group up to 20 years the probability of a positive attitude towards immigrants from the EU member states is higher by almost 1.9 times compared to all other groups combined, i. e. the probability of having a negative attitude does not change with the age above 21 years. This suggests that we have partial evidences not to reject our hypothesis H10.

It seems that our research provides a statistically strong empirical evidence that supports the neighbourhood safety theory statement that people feeling safe will likely have more positive attitudes towards immigrants. In both cases we have almost identical results – people that do not feel safe, according to the model estimation, 1.9 (1/Exp(B)) times more likely have a negative attitude towards immigrants from and outside the EU member states than those who feel safe. Thus we do not reject the hypothesis H11.

## CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we investigated the determinants of individual attitudes towards internal and external immigration in the EU. In order to support integration of multinational societies, the implementation of policy measures that supports the improvement of people's attitudes towards immigrants is necessary. These attitudes influence immigration policy in destination countries. The theoretical analysis reveals that attitudes towards immigrants in the EU may vary depending on the following: 1) personal characteristics of citizens, like gender, marital status, education level, religiosity, etc.; 2) the place of residence that determines the level of multicultural experience and interactions with immigrants; and 3) the socio-economic security, like income, employment status, etc.

We estimated that women, families with children, people that live in cities and young generation are the members of society that have the most positive attitude towards immigrants. Our research results are in line with many previous studies that emphasized the importance of education to positive attitudes towards immigrants. We also estimated that employment and marital status as well as religiosity are statistically insignificant determinants. Importance of gender and children in the family occur only in the case of immigrants outside the EU, the part of immigrants that attain a more negative attitude compared with immigrants within the EU. Some of our estimations are contrary to the results of previous studies and that justify the importance of continuing future research.

Received 11 October 2016  
Accepted 10 November 2016

## References

1. Baker, T.; Valentino, N. A.; Suhay, E. 2008. "What Triggers Public Opposition to Immigration? Anxiety, Group Cues, and Immigration Threat", *American Journal of Political Science* 52(4): 959–978.
2. Boeri, T. 2010. "Immigration to the Land of Redistribution", *Economica* 7: 651–687.
3. Bullard, S. M. 2015. *Attitudes toward Refugees Entering the United States of America*. Honors Theses. Paper 323 [online]. Available from: [http://aquila.usm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1282&context=honors\\_theses](http://aquila.usm.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1282&context=honors_theses)
4. Chandler, C. R.; Tsai, Y. M. 2001. "Social Factor Influencing Immigration Attitudes: An Analysis of Data from the General Social Survey", *Social Sciences Journal* 38: 77–188.
5. Citrin, J.; Green, D. P.; Muste, C.; Wong, C. 1997. "Public Opinion toward Immigration Reform: The Role of Economic Motivations", *Journal of Politics* 59: 858–881.
6. Constant, A. F.; Kahanec, M.; Zimmermann, K. F. 2008. *Attitudes towards Immigrants, Other Integration Barriers, and Their Veracity*. IZA Discussion Paper No. 3650 [online]. Available from: <http://ftp.iza.org/dp3650.pdf>
7. Dustmann, Ch.; Preston, I. P. 2007. "Racial and Economic Factors in Attitudes to Immigration", *The B. E. Journal of Economic Analysis & Policy* 7(1) (Advances), Art. 62.
8. Espenshade, T. J.; Calhoun, C. A. 1993. "An Analysis of Public Opinion toward Undocumented Immigration", *Population Research and Policy Review* 12: 189–224.

9. Facchini, G.; Mayda, A. M. 2009. "Does the Welfare State Affect Individual Attitudes toward Immigrants?" *Review of Economics and Statistics* 91: 295–314.
10. Facchini, G.; Mayda, A. M. 2012. "Individual attitudes towards skilled migration: an empirical analysis across countries", *World Economy* 35: 183–196.
11. Facchini, G. F.; Mayda, A. M.; Mendola, M. 2011. *What Drives Individual Attitudes towards Immigration in South Africa?* [online]. Available from: <http://siteresources.worldbank.org/INTLM/Resources/390041-1212776476091/5078455/Facchiniindividualattitudes.pdf>
12. Facchini, G.; Mayda, A. M. 2006. *Individual Attitudes towards Immigrants: Welfare-State Determinants Across Countries*. CReAM Discussion Paper Series CDP No. 04/06 [online]. Available from: [https://opportunityagenda.org/files/field\\_file/millennials\\_attitudes\\_immigrants.pdf](https://opportunityagenda.org/files/field_file/millennials_attitudes_immigrants.pdf)
13. Finney, N.; Peach, E. 2004. *Attitudes towards Asylum Seekers, Refugees and Other Immigrants*. Commission for Racial Equality Research study [online]. Available from: [http://icar.livingrefugeearchive.org/asylum\\_icar\\_report.pdf](http://icar.livingrefugeearchive.org/asylum_icar_report.pdf)
14. Gallego, A.; Pardos-Prado, S. 2014. "The Big Five Personality Traits and Attitudes towards Immigrants", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 40(1): 79–99.
15. Gang, I. N.; Rivera-Batiz, F. L.; Yun, M.-S. 2013. "Economic Strain, Education and Attitudes Towards Foreigners in the European Union", *Review of International Economics* 21(2): 177–190.
16. Goldstein, J. L.; Peters, M. E. 2014. "Nativism or Economic Threat: Attitudes Toward Immigrants During the Great Recession", *International Interactions* 40: 376–401.
17. Hainmueller, J.; Hiscox, M. J. 2007. "Educated Preferences: Explaining Attitudes Toward Immigration in Europe", *International Organization* 61: 399–442.
18. Hatton, T. J. 2016. "Immigration, Public Opinion and the Recession in Europe", *Economic Policy* 2016: 205–246.
19. Just, A.; Anderson, Ch. J. 2015. "Dual Allegiances? Immigrants' Attitudes toward Immigration", *The Journal of Politics* 77(1): 188–201.
20. Mayda, A. M. 2006. "Who Is Against Immigration? A Cross-Country Investigation of Individual Attitudes toward Immigrants", *Review of Economics and Statistics* 88(3): 510–530. DOI: 10.1162/rest.88.3.510.
21. McDaniel, E. L.; Nooruddin, I.; Shortle, A. F. 2011. "Divine Boundaries: How Religion Shapes Citizens' Attitudes toward Immigrants", *American Politics Research* 39(1): 205–233. DOI: 10.1177/1532673X10371300.
22. Murray, K. E.; Marx, D. M. 2013. "Attitudes Toward Unauthorized Immigrants, Authorized Immigrants, and Refugees", *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology* 19(3): 332–341.
23. O'Rourke, K. H.; Sinnott, R. 2005. "The Determinants of Individual Attitudes towards Immigration", *European Journal of Political Economy* 22: 838–861.
24. Paas, T.; Halapuu, V. 2012. "Attitudes towards Immigrants and the Integration of Ethnically Diverse Societies", *Eastern Journal of European Studies* 3(2): 161–176.
25. Percival, G. L.; Currin-Percival, M. 2013. "Exploring the Contextual Determinants of Individual Attitudes toward Immigrants and Criminal Activity and their Spillover Policy Implications", *International Migration* 51(6): 1–23.
26. Scheve, K. F.; Slaughter, M. J. 2001. "Labor Market Competition and Individual Preferences over Immigration Policy", *Review of Economics and Statistics* 83(1): 133–145.
27. Schweitzer, R.; Perkoulidis, Sh. A.; Krome, S. L.; Ludlow, Ch. N. 2005. "Attitudes towards Refugees: The Dark Side of Prejudice in Australia", *Australian Journal of Psychology* 57(3): 170–179.
28. Sniderman, P. M.; Pierangelo, P.; Rui, J. P.; de Figueiredo, J.; Piazza, T. 2000. *The Outsider: Prejudice and Politics in Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

29. Sniderman, P.; Hagendoorn, L.; Prior, M. 2004. "Predispositional Factors and Situational Triggers: Exclusionary Reactions to Immigrant Minorities", *American Political Science Review* 98(1): 35–50.
30. Strabac, Z.; Aalberg, T.; Valenta, M. 2014. "Attitudes towards Muslim Immigrants: Evidence from Survey Experiments across Four Countries", *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 40(1): 100–118.
31. The Opportunity Agenda. 2012. *Public Opinion Research: Millennials' Attitudes Toward Immigrants and Immigration Policies* [online]. Available from: [https://opportunityagenda.org/files/field\\_file/millennials\\_attitudes\\_immigrants.pdf](https://opportunityagenda.org/files/field_file/millennials_attitudes_immigrants.pdf)

MINDAUGAS BUTKUS, KRISTINA MATUZEVIČIŪTĖ, ALMA MAČIULYTĖ-ŠNIUKIENĖ, VIDA DAVIDAVIČIENĖ

## Veiksniai, lemiantys visuomenės požiūrį į ES vidinę ir išorinę migraciją

### *Santrauka*

Migracija atviros ekonomikos sąlygomis yra natūralus procesas. Tačiau nuolat augančios imigracijos srautai į ES juos priimančioms šalims kelia tam tikrų iššūkių. 2015 m. daugiau kaip milijonas žmonių (prieglobsčio prašančių asmenų, pabėgėlių ir kitų imigrantų) kirta ES sieną. Be to, vyksta didelis judėjimas iš mažiau išsivysčiusių į labiau išsivysčiusias ES šalis. Šis procesas sukelia priimančiųjų šalių piliečių nepasitenkinimą, taip pat ir ekonominį, socialinį, politinį nestabilumą bei nesaugumą. Siekiant suformuoti veiksmingą migracijos politiką, užtikrinančią sėkmingą imigrantų integraciją, tikslinga nustatyti veiksnius, lemiančius visuomenės požiūrį į imigrantus. Pastarąjį dešimtmetį ši tema analizuojama tiek politiniame, tiek moksliniame lygmenyse, tačiau pasigesta sisteminių tyrimų, integruojančių ne tik ekonominius, bet ir demografinius, politinius bei religinius veiksnius, lemiančius visuomenės požiūrį į migraciją. Šiame tyrime, naudojant logistinės regresijos modelį, įvertinami veiksniai, kurie didina arba mažina teigiamo požiūrio į vidaus ir išorinę ES migraciją tikimybę. Tyrimas remiasi Europos socialinės apžvalgos duomenimis. Rezultatai atskleidė, kad visuomenės požiūris į ES vidaus migraciją yra pozityvesnis, palyginti su išorine migracija. Pagrindiniai veiksniai, lemiantys didesnę pozityvaus požiūrio į imigrantus tikimybę, yra aukštesnis asmenų išsilavinimo lygis ir didesnės pajamos. Esminių skirtumų tarp šių veiksnių poveikio požiūriui į vidinę ir išorinę migraciją nenustatyta. Taip pat nustatyta, kad pozityvesnį požiūrį į imigrantus turi moterys, šeimos su vaikais, miesto ir jaunesni gyventojai.

**Raktažodžiai:** vidinė migracija, išorinė migracija, individualus požiūris, požiūris į imigrantus