

IZA DP No. 2977

## Young People's Attitudes towards Muslims in Sweden

Pieter Bevelander  
Jonas Otterbeck

August 2007

# Young People's Attitudes towards Muslims in Sweden

**Pieter Bevelander**

*MIM, IMER, Malmö University  
and IZA*

**Jonas Otterbeck**

*IMER, Malmö University*

Discussion Paper No. 2977  
August 2007

IZA

P.O. Box 7240  
53072 Bonn  
Germany

Phone: +49-228-3894-0

Fax: +49-228-3894-180

E-mail: [iza@iza.org](mailto:iza@iza.org)

Any opinions expressed here are those of the author(s) and not those of the institute. Research disseminated by IZA may include views on policy, but the institute itself takes no institutional policy positions.

The Institute for the Study of Labor (IZA) in Bonn is a local and virtual international research center and a place of communication between science, politics and business. IZA is an independent nonprofit company supported by Deutsche Post World Net. The center is associated with the University of Bonn and offers a stimulating research environment through its research networks, research support, and visitors and doctoral programs. IZA engages in (i) original and internationally competitive research in all fields of labor economics, (ii) development of policy concepts, and (iii) dissemination of research results and concepts to the interested public.

IZA Discussion Papers often represent preliminary work and are circulated to encourage discussion. Citation of such a paper should account for its provisional character. A revised version may be available directly from the author.

## ABSTRACT

### Young People's Attitudes towards Muslims in Sweden<sup>\*</sup>

Since the 1950's, the Muslim population in Sweden has grown from just a few individuals to approximately 350,000 of which one third is of school age or younger. With the use of multiple regression technique, the principal objective of this study has been to clarify and examine young people's attitudes towards Muslims, and the relationships between these attitudes and a large number of background factors. The material employed in the analysis comprises a representative sample of 9,498 non-Muslim youths (4,680 girls and 4,818 boys) between 15–19 years of age. The main results of the study show that when controlling for several background variables simultaneously, many variables affect the attitude towards Muslims. The country of birth, socio-economic background and school/program factors are found to have an effect on the attitude towards Muslims. Moreover, especially socio-psychological factors, the relationship to friends and the perceptions of gender role patterns are found to be important. In addition, local/regional factors like high levels of unemployment, high shares of immigrants in a local environment also have an effect on the attitude towards Muslims. No differences in the attitude of boys and girls were measured. The article gives some support for the contact hypothesis and hypotheses on different kinds of social dominance. Finally, the influence of negative discourses on Islam and Muslims are discussed.

JEL Classification: Z12, F22

Keywords: attitudes, Muslims, young people, religion

Corresponding author:

Pieter Bevelander  
IMER  
Malmö University  
205 06 Malmö  
Sweden  
E-mail: [pieter.bevelander@imer.mah.se](mailto:pieter.bevelander@imer.mah.se)

---

<sup>\*</sup> The research for this paper has been financed by the Living History Forum, Sweden. For our first report, in Swedish, see Otterbeck & Bevelander 2006. An earlier version of this article was presented at the IZA Annual Migration Meeting (AM<sup>2</sup>) Bonn, IZA May 21/22, 2007 and comments by the participants as well as by Prof. Cas Mudde are highly appreciated.

## **Introduction**

The Swedish Muslim population has increased substantially during the last quarter of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. Although we have no exact statistical records by religion in Sweden, it is estimated that the number of individuals with a Muslim background has increased from just a couple of families in the 1950s, via approximately 100,000 at the end of 1980s, around 200,000 in 1996, to approximately 350,000 individuals in 2000. The majority of the Muslims in Sweden has gained access as refugees or as family to refugees, only a small part as labour migrants. In Sweden we find Muslims with their roots in for example: Turkey, the Balkans, Eastern Mediterranean, North-Africa, East-Africa, West-Africa, Iran, Iraq, Afghanistan, Pakistan, Southeast-Asia, Central-Asia, Finland and the Baltic countries. There is also an increasing Swedish born Muslim population since many young Muslims who have immigrated to Sweden raise families. Approximately one third of the Muslim population is in school ages or younger (Anwar, Blaschke & Sander 2004).

To integrate into another society, economically, socially, politically and culturally takes time. To evaluate and translate home country educational credentials and labour market experience can be a long process. For some Muslims this integration has gone better than for others. Bosnians, generally having a Muslim background, is one of the immigrant groups in Sweden with highest labour market attachment despite the relatively short stay in the country. For immigrants from Iraq, on the contrary, we find strikingly low employment integration (Bevelander & Lundh 2007). It is obvious that Muslims are not a homogeneous group in Sweden. Rather, we can talk of a diverse Muslim population with different backgrounds when it comes to ethnicity, citizenship, educational history, class, etc, but Muslims are often ethnified, i.e. turned into an ethnic group and ascribed a homogeneous culture (Roy 2004).

Still, religious belonging is one of the central factors for the formation of social relations and (imagined) communities (McGuire 2002) even in the strongly secularized Swedish society. There is strong evidence suggesting that especially Muslims are perceived as a

religiously distinct group by non-Muslims in Sweden. Further, individuals with a Muslim background tend to consider their Muslim identity as important and crucial (Ouis & Roald 2003). To be religiously different can create barriers and aggravate daily life and can lead to lower chances in the housing- and labour market (Carlsson & Rooth 2006). Sometimes even structures in laws, educational systems and other societal sectors cause religious minorities to get into difficult situations (Otterbeck 2004), for example religious rules on slaughter of animals, religious education, uniforms, etc. At the same time the Swedish society slowly adapts to the demographic changes in an ongoing process (Otterbeck & Bevelander 2006).

Due to this new demographic situation and due to the rising discussions about racism and Islamophobia the Forum for Living History and the Crime Preventing Board in Sweden conducted a major questionnaire resulting in a report (*Intolerans* 2004). The focus was on youth and their attitudes to Jews, homosexuals, foreigners and Muslims (see further presentation below). The empirical material was very rich and complex and it was decided that a second wave of analyses was to be conducted. This article is one of the results of this effort.

The main aim of this article is to study the attitudes of non-Muslim youth on Muslims in Sweden. Furthermore, since few studies have been conducted in a more explorative way, this study will explore to what extent these attitudes could be explained by a number of background factors (a) demographic factors, (b) socio-economic factors, (c) local/regional factors, (d) school factors, (e) psychosocial factors, (f) parental factors, (g) friend factors, (h) exclusion factors and (i) gender factors.

The next section of the article elaborates on different explanations for differences in attitudinal behaviour and tracks earlier studies and their results. Then it gives a background to how Islam is perceived in Sweden. Then, a section describing the data, methods and variables used for our analysis follows. The results are then presented, followed by a concluding discussion.

## Theory and earlier research

There are a number of theoretical propositions that have been brought forward to explain the mechanisms behind negative or positive attitudes towards others and more extreme variations of this like xenophobia, racism and Islamophobia. In the following we give a short overview of some crucial theoretical concepts which stem from the individual level, the group level or the societal level. This is followed by an account of some studies with focus on attitudes towards Muslims.

### *The individual level*

One of the most well known studies focusing on individual prerequisites and characteristics is Adorno et al. (1950). This study connects the so called authoritarian personality to anti-democratic behaviour combined with anti-Semitism, ethnocentrism, etc. A more recent variation of this theoretical proposition was used by the social-psychologist Tajfel who developed the so called social identity theory (Tajfel 1982). This theory presents the idea that ethnocentrism, negative attitudes and discrimination is based on the tendency individuals have to categorize themselves in so called “in” and “out” groups. This in turn depends on a deeper need to get or uphold status which can be achieved by comparing in- and out-groups. The more an individual identifies with his/her in-group, the stronger negative attitude he/she will have against an out-group. At the same time, this theory does not explain divergence in attitudes between different out-groups (for example different immigrant or ethnic groups). Neither does it explain why certain individuals systematically have a higher negative attitude than others.

Studies of youth active in right wing movements or, at least, circles, tend to stress that these youths long to identify with a strong in-group excluding out-groups members in harsh ways, tend to have a long history of failure in school, have parents with lower education than average, tend to feel alienated by the middle class ideals governing schools and tend to object to these ideals in a countercultural way (*Intolerans* 2004).

Other theories concentrate on the development of tolerance in adolescence and concentrate on the personal development of the individual. Robinson et al. (2001) stress the importance of socialisation and especially parental practices (not only verbal tolerance) and education for the development of a tolerant mind. Further, young adolescents seem to be more intolerant towards those holding opposing beliefs than older adolescents who tend to be more tolerant and understanding. At the same time individuals are not either tolerant or intolerant according to Robinson et al (2001), both attitudes coexist in all individuals. Rather, tolerance is situational.

#### *Group and societal level*

A more sociological explanatory concept is the so called realistic conflict theory which stresses real conflicts of interests between groups and competition for scarce resources like education, employment and housing (Sherif 1966). A development of this theory is the so called power-threat-hypothesis. According to this, a negative attitude towards certain groups is due to that these groups are seen as economic competitors and challenge the social and political power of another (Blalock 1967). A more socio-ecological variation emphasizes the environment individuals live in and is more or less a variation of the power-threat-hypothesis. A feeling of threat increases with immigration of new groups. These groups become more visible which diminishes the social distance to the majority. When the symbolic dominance is felt to be threatened, racism and intolerance flourish. For example, visibly religious otherness might be perceived as a threat (McLaren 2003).

Another variant of the above is called defended neighbourhoods theory which states that a fear of losing ones identity increases with a faster pace of change in neighbourhood composition (Dustmann, Fabbri & Preston 2004). Finally, and in contrast to the rather negative focus of Dustmann et al. (2004), according to Allport's contact hypothesis attitudes towards other groups are more positive when contacts between groups increase, especially when individuals have the same socio-economic background and try to obtain the same goals (Allport 1958). This theory has generated much discussion and suggestions about the kind and the quality of the contact needed if a positive result is to

be gained. Researchers tend to agree that especially having friends among the ones who are constructed as the other, tend to be strongly associated with tolerance (McLaren 2003).

### *Structural level*

While the above discussed theories try to address individual qualities on a micro-level and individuals' encounters and strategies on a meso-level, another set of theories is based on a more structural understanding of prejudices and racism. The theories attempt to uncover how economic, political and social power over states and institutions (re)produce discursive orders, benefits and resources along ethnic, racial, cultural, religious or other lines, securing the power position of a presumed elite. These theories often focus on how cultures (and religions) are essentialised, seen as separate from each other, and finally are ordered in hierarchies (Fredrickson 2003). A common trait is that theories on racism today often stress the focus put on culture, rather than race, and how culture is made the functional equivalent of race in the sense that it becomes inherent in the individual classified as belonging to a specific culture (Balibar 2002; Solomos & Back 1999:20). These orders, at times invisible but always present, saturate public discourse and are manifested in stereotypes, jokes, popular culture but also in laws, politics, and discrimination on the labour and housing market. The orders often have long histories and are in the West European and North American case more often than not interconnected with the colonial period. Thus, while the studies above focus on personal characteristics or interpersonal relations, these theories focus on discourses and power relations with a long history and that are well spread.

### **The general attitude to Islam and Muslims**

Earlier quantitative research on attitudes towards Islam and Muslims in Sweden is primarily on the adult population. The first study of Swedes' attitudes towards Islam and Muslims was done in 1990 by Hvitfelt (1991) and the result of this study was that almost 65 percent of the Swedish population was fairly to very negative towards Islam. 88 percent was of the opinion that the Islamic religion was incompatible with the Swedish

democratic system and 62 percent had the view that the religion led to female repression. Finally, 53 percent were of the opinion that the immigration of Muslims should be reduced. Hvitfelt's study makes use of bivariate analysis but refrains from theoretical explanations apart from vague references to negative stereotypes in media (see below) and studies on prejudice. The general conclusion is that higher education, female sex and younger age generally leads to a higher degree of tolerance of Islam, but that even the tolerant are rather negative. It should be noticed that this study was performed in connection with a period, the late 1980s, in which the non-European immigration to Sweden had increased dramatically which certainly affected the discussion about Muslims in Sweden. One example of this is how certain members of the new right wing populist political party, New Democrats (Ny Demokrati), depicted the increase in number of Muslims as a threat against Swedish culture and prosperity.

Later studies on the attitudes to Muslims and Islam are mainly commissioned by the Swedish Integration Board (Integrationsverket). An example of this is the report "Dialogue with Swedish Muslims" (Samtal med svenska muslimer 2003) a part of which has the aim to study how Muslims experienced their situation the immediate period after September 11, 2001. The study claims that the respondents felt a more negative climate against Islam and Muslims both in media and among non-Muslims, but also an increasing interest around the Islamic religion in general. But since we don't have earlier studies, it is difficult to say if a more negative climate really occurred, nor is it possible to say if a possible negative effect was permanent or just temporal. Further, when Åslund and Rooth (2005) analyzed the effect of September 11 on the probability to leave unemployment by immigrants with a Muslim background, contrary to what was expected by the result of the attitudinal studies discussed earlier, they found no increase in discrimination. The study by the Swedish Integration Board makes no explicit references to theoretical perspectives when interpreting results.

Other attitudinal studies commissioned by the Integration Board, *The Integration Barometer* (2005 and 2006), studied the attitudes of the general public with the use of a couple of indicators. These studies show that the ones who have a more positive attitude

towards Muslims and Islam are women more than men, individuals living in large cities more than those living in smaller cities and the country site, and those with higher education more than the ones with lower education. In the latter study also an age effect was measured; the younger the respondents were, the more positive towards Muslims and Islam. One question is similar to Hvitfelt's study, in *The Integration Barometer* 39 (2005) and 37 percent (2006) of the respondents think that we should restrict Muslim immigration, compared to 53 in Hvitfelt's. Otherwise, compared to Hvitfelt's study, most questions in *The Integration Barometer* are about Muslims rather than about Islam. This seems to have the effect that the attitudes are not as harsh. It is also possible that the population in Sweden has grown more accustomed to Muslims during the 15 years that has passed between the questionnaires and that this might have had an effect.

The results of the Swedish studies on attitudes are largely in line with those found in other European countries like Germany and Switzerland. The theoretical base of *The Integration Barometer* primarily stems from Wilhelm Heitmeyer's project, *Deutsche Zustände* (2002, 2003, 2004 and 2005). This study operates with ideas on social dominance similar to the meso-level theories mentioned above and also with theories on authoritarian personalities. Heitmeyer found that men had a less positive attitude towards Muslims than women. Furthermore, a more negative attitude was measured with increased age and a more positive with increased education. Political affiliation showed that individuals more to the right had less positive attitude than those more to the left, who were more positive. Higher levels of unemployment and a larger share of immigrants living in the different states were correlated with a less positive attitude towards Muslims. In the latest study a difference between "east" and "west" Germany is observed, with a more negative attitude towards Muslims by people living in "west". In addition, these studies show that individuals that are more affected by social dominance, e.g. the feeling that one's existence is becoming less secure by the settlement of others, are less positive to Muslims. Finally, individuals with authoritarian perceptions are also slightly less tolerant to Muslims than others. For Switzerland, Cattacin et al. (2006) found that approximately 30 percent of the population had Islamophobic attitudes, which is

slightly higher than for Germany (20–25 percent). Moreover, Cattacin's study found little correlation between Islamophobia and racism, xenophobia and anti-Semitism.

To our knowledge only one study for the Netherlands focussing on youth and attitudes towards Muslims and Islam is conducted (Dekker, van der Noll & Capelos 2007). In this study, 581 students in the age of 14–16 were asked about their opinions about Islam and Muslims, but also about individuals with Turkish and Moroccan descent. More than half (54 %) were negative towards Muslims. Lack of positive, direct contacts with Muslims was seen as the most important factor for this result. Other factors explaining the result were if the individuals hold negative stereotypical ideas about Muslims, get negative messages by family and friends about Muslims, and or have the conviction that Muslims and Islam were a threat to security.

The only study for Sweden that has focused on attitudes on Muslims by young people is the already mention report *Intolerance (Intolerans 2004)*. Using the same questionnaire as the present article, the Intolerance report tried to measure the attitudes of young people in Sweden towards Muslims, Jews, homosexuals and immigrants. Contrary to earlier studies and certainly compared to the study performed in 1990 by Hvitfelt, this study showed that young people generally were rather tolerant. Only 5 percent are intolerant, out of which 1.7 percent is extremely intolerant. When it comes to attitudes specifically towards Muslims, 8 percent are intolerant. Moreover, this study also tried to link a number of background factors with a so called intolerance measure in this study. The results of these cross tabulations are that individuals with higher intolerance towards Muslims are for example: boys, youth having parents with lower socio-economic background, youngsters that are enrolled in lower level educational programs, young people living in country site and those born in Sweden. However, like earlier studies this study did not make use of more sophisticated statistical methods. The design of the questionnaire is however thoroughly based in micro and meso-level theories on attitudes with clear references to Heitmeyer's study and to Scandinavian studies on racist and prejudiced attitudes of youth.

## **The representation of Islam in media**

Besides these studies of individuals' attitudes, other studies have discussed the representation of Islam. According to a number of research reports, youth in Sweden live in a media climate that is not particularly sympathetic towards Islam. For example, the news, popular culture and textbooks are often being accused of superficial portrayals of Islam (Berg 1998; Hvitfelt 1998; Otterbeck 2005). In brief, when Islam is seen as something negative (which is not always the case) it is presented as a threat, uniform and homogenous, expanding, undemocratic, patriarchal and different. Analyzing TV-news during 1991–1995, Hvitfelt (1998) shows that while 25 percent of all news is connected to violence, this for news relating to Muslims and Islam is 85 percent. Observe that Muslims can both be depicted as perpetrator or victim. Naturally, these results have been affected by the fact that the period 1991–1995 was a turbulent period in several Muslim societies with many violent developments – this also holds for the period during which the data for this study was collected, namely 2003. TV-news focus heavily on negative and crisis like events. But regardless of the many actual conflicts, the TV-news discourse created on Muslims and Islam is to a high degree connected with violence and conflict.

In popular culture easily available in Sweden, the stereotypes of Muslims are gender specific. Males are active in a negative way, engaged in violence and the oppression of women, they are treacherous and self-righteous, while women are suppressed and are seen as a collective without freedom of action. In contrast, the key words of modernity are tied to “the Western man” (in singular, definite tense) and at times to “the Western woman” who are both perceived as individuals who can take initiatives, have control, are rational and goal-oriented. These images can often be found in movies, novels, cartoons, computer games, etc (Berg 1998).

Studies on textbooks show how representations of Islam changes over time and especially how these changes can be explained by changes in the society the authors of textbooks live in (Härenstam 1993; Otterbeck 2005). But despite the increase in the number of Muslim youth in primary and secondary education, still a so called “we (Swedish,

Christian) and them (Muslims)-perspective” dominates many textbooks in the subject of religion. Islam is to a high degree presented as a theocratic, politicized, undemocratic, misogynic and traditional religion far from the high ideals of “Western humanism” (Otterbeck 2005).

If searching on the internet for Islam critical voices one does not have to become disappointed. Besides many striking attacks on Islam and Muslims in discussion sites of leading newspapers, there are more systematically Islam hostile homepages from right wing populist parties (National Democrats and Swedish Democrats) as well as from many smaller organizations and private pages (Lagerlöf 2006). Most of these homepages mediate the view that Muslims don’t want to integrate in Swedish society and that Muslims and Islam have come to take over Sweden or “Swedishness” and want to dominate Sweden and convert Swedes to Islam. So, Muslims should leave the country or even be exterminated.

Even if we, in the above, take away nuances, the main is that the information on Muslims and Islam that is mediated to youth in Sweden through different channels is more or less stereotypical and often has a negative connotation.

The above discussed societal factors, an increasing population with a Muslim background and the relatively slow integration process of some Muslim groups, a relatively negative media climate on Muslims and Islam, as well as the fact that relatively few studies have been undertaken on this subject, makes studies on the attitudes of the majority on the Muslim minority of great importance. Young people, both non-Muslim and Muslim, are going to be the workers and employers, politicians, etc. in the future and their attitudes towards each other, and the determinants behind these attitudes, are therefore of great importance.

## Data, model and method

In this study we analyze the attitudes towards Muslims by young non-Muslims in Sweden. The data used is based on classroom questionnaire performed during the month of December 2003 among pupils in the two highest levels of primary school and the three following levels at upper secondary schools.<sup>2</sup> The individuals that answered the questionnaire are pupils between the ages 15–19. Cluster sampling on the total population in these ages was used to have an equal number of primary and secondary schools as well as having schools from different parts of the country. The total sample consists of 230 schools, 762 classes and 13,898 individuals. Classes that would not be in the study as well as internal drop out left us with a basic material that comprises a representative sample of 10,599 individuals. This makes up for approximately 2 percent of the total population in these age categories in Sweden. Of these, 565 individuals have indicated that they are Muslims and are therefore excluded from the analyses. An internal reduction of 536 individuals who have not answered all questions used in this analysis, does that the material for our analysis comprises 9,498 individuals, 5,680 girls and 4,818 boys.<sup>3</sup>

The dependent variable in this study is a constructed attitudinal scale or index based on eight separate statements indicating a more positive or negative attitude towards Muslims. In appendix I these separate statements are given as well as the means, percentages for the five answering alternatives and standard deviations for girls and boys. The answering alternatives on these statements were: yes, this is correct; this is relatively correct; unsure/doesn't know; this is rather incorrect; no, this is incorrect. Since a large correlation in the answers between the statements could be measured, an attitude index is made.<sup>4</sup> The index is constructed so that an increasing level indicates a more positive attitude towards Muslims.

---

<sup>2</sup> The Swedish school system has 9 obligatory grades followed by a 3 year upper secondary school where students can choose between different programs.

<sup>3</sup> See *Intolerans* (2004) for more on the initial questionnaire, method of selection, etc.

<sup>4</sup> The internal correlation is 0.90 measured as the Cronbach alfa coefficient which is on a satisfactory level. Since some of the statements were stated in the opposite direction, we reversed the coding for all statements in the same direction.

The independent variables<sup>5</sup> are based on the questions asked in the questionnaire and to a large extent formulated in line with the earlier discussed theoretical propositions at the individual, group and societal level. Some of these questions are dealing with *demographic characteristics* like age, gender and country of birth, whereas others are connected to the *socio-economic background* of the respondents. In this case the socioeconomic status of the parents, split in eight categories, was used, if the individual lives in a single-parent family or not and if one or both parents were unemployed were used as indicators for socioeconomic background. According to earlier studies and the above mentioned theories, we expect that increased age, being a girl, being born outside Sweden and having a higher socio-economic background is correlated with a more positive attitude towards Muslims. If one or both parents are unemployed and if the adolescent lives in a single parent household should lead to economic stress in the family and is expected to have a negative effect on the attitude towards Muslims. *Local and regional factors* are primarily based on which municipality an individual lives in. Moreover, this variable is categorized in various ways to “catch” different aspects assumed to be connected to attitudes towards Muslims. This variable is categorized in type of municipality (appendix III), level of unemployment in municipality, share of foreign born population in municipality, the relative share of the manufacturing sector in the municipality and finally a dummy variable constructed on the basis of if a municipality had right wing populist mandates in local parliament or not.<sup>6</sup> The local and regional indicators are assumed to measure differences in regional and local context of the individual. Economic stress factors at this level and a more negative regional/local attitude towards immigrants in general is expected to be measured by these included variables. In other words, we expect a correlation between increased negative attitudes towards Muslims and the higher the unemployment rate is, the higher relative share of the manufacturing sector in the municipality is, as well as the higher the percentage of immigrants living in the municipality is. Individuals living in municipalities with a right wing mandate in local parliament are expected to be more negative towards Muslims. *School factors* like how comfortable the pupil is at school and the respondent’s grade

---

<sup>5</sup> See appendix II for overview and for construction of all indexes and the questions asked, see appendix IV.

<sup>6</sup> The population and labour market indicators are based on data from Statistics Sweden. The political indicator is based on statistics of the local elections of 2002.

level are included as index variables. The kind of program the respondent is following, categorized in four levels, is also integrated in the model. This variable is assumed to catch the effect of socioeconomic background on the level of attitudes towards Muslims. According to earlier studies, these variables certainly have a strong connection to the socioeconomic background of the parents (Lange & Westin 1981). Moreover, *social psychosocial indicators* are all index questions and constitute the following: aggressiveness, restlessness, risk preference and nervousness. These factors are assumed to measure the individual psychosocial behaviour of the adolescents. The expectation is that the more aggressive, restless, risk preferable and nervous the individual is, a more negative attitude towards Muslims should be measured. Other indexes included in the model deal with *parental factors* which is assumed to measure contact between parents and adolescents. Here it is expected that a “better” parent contact of the adolescent is connected to a more positive attitude towards Muslims. *Friend factors* are assumed to measure the influence of friends on behaviour. We measure general friend relations with an index and this factor is assumed to measure the effect of friends on the attitude towards Muslims. Better friend relations in general are expected to be connected to a more positive attitude towards Muslims. Moreover, we also measure if the individuals know a Muslim (or Muslims) personally. This variable is assumed to measure a better knowledge about individuals having Islam as religion and we expect that those who know a Muslim are more positive towards Muslims than those who do not know a Muslim. To know (in Swedish “att känna”) is a broader category than to have as a friend. Still it is a neutral to positive expression when you state that you know someone, which is less likely to say of someone you dislike. Societal belonging at a general level is measured by inclusion of the question if the respondent has *feelings of exclusion from society*. It is expected that a higher belonging is correlated with a more positive attitude towards Muslims. Finally, *gender role patterns* are included and assumed to measure if attitudes towards gender role patterns are congruent with attitudes towards Muslims. It is expected that more traditional gender role patterns is connected to more negative attitudes towards Muslims if the attitude is based on a general xenophobia. But if it is rather based on specific stereotypes about Muslims and Islam generally including the idea of Muslim men and Islam as utterly misogynic and Muslim women as oppressed one ought to find a

correlation between progressive attitudes to gender roles and a negative attitude to Muslims.<sup>7</sup>

Many questions in the questionnaire that are included in the model are on an ordinal level and recoded to scales with the use of factor analysis. With the use of multiple regression technique, OLS, we estimate the effect of the various variables on the constructed index of attitudes towards Muslims. Variables based on constructed indexes are standardized. The model presented in the analysis includes all variables presented earlier as well as a separate analysis for girls and boys.

## **Results**

The following result presentation starts with describing some selected results on both separate statements and the composed index based on our eight statements. After this, we discuss the results of the multivariate analysis on the composed index. This will make it possible to draw other conclusions than through the descriptive analysis.

### *Descriptive analysis*

The attitudes towards Muslims has, as described earlier, been captured with eight separate statements were the answers have got numerical values from 0 to 4. Appendix I shows the means, standard deviations and percentages for the answering categories of the separate statements for girls and boys. A higher mean, close to 4, implicate a more positive attitude towards Muslims. The results show that some statements yield a more positive attitude than others. These statements are: “It would be entirely okay to have a steady Muslim as a neighbour” and “It should be forbidden for Muslims to vote in elections”. Other questions, on the other hand, indicate clearly a more negative attitude towards Muslims. These are the statements: “There are far too many Muslims in Sweden” and “Most Muslims only want to live on social security”. Generally the mean for boys is lower than for girls and have a somewhat more negative attitude towards Muslims.

---

<sup>7</sup> Test for multicollinearity of both the variables *feelings of social exclusion from society* and *gender role patterns* gave a correlation of 0.23 and 0.44 respectively.

The percentages by category are also presented in the table of appendix I. The 0 category means a very positive attitude and the 4 category a very negative one. The reason for inclusion of these percentages is that the means calculations could disclose possible outliers. No real outliers are measured and the table reflects the earlier findings of the means. Boys are more negative towards Muslims than girls and some questions yield more negative or positive results for both sexes.

**Table 1, Means and standard deviations for adolescent attitudes towards Muslims, selected variables**

		Mean	St. Dev.
<i>Gender</i>	Girls	2,91	0.840
	Boys	2,56	0.963
<i>Grade</i>	Grade 8 (15 years old)	2,69	0.903
	Grade 9 (16 years old)	2,71	0.925
	Secondary 1th grade	2,69	0.921
	Secondary 2th grade	2,79	0.921
	Secondary 3th grade	2,86	0.921
<i>Program</i>	University preparing	3,02	0.819
	University and professional preparing	2,76	0.853
	Professional preparing	2,49	0.937
	Individual	1,77	0.953
<i>Region of birth</i>	Sweden	2,72	0.931
	North/West/Eastern Europe	2,76	0.880
	Southern Europe	2,80	0.871
	Outside Europe	2,84	0.840
<i>Parental socioeconomic background</i>	Non skilled worker	2,47	0.920
	Skilled worker	2,57	0.894
	Lower civil servant	2,68	0.875
	Intermediate civil servant	2,90	0.893
	Higher civil servant	3,04	0.826
	Fri occupations with academic education	3,13	0.866
	Entrepreneur	2,71	0.922
	Agricultural worker	2,70	0.892
<i>Municipality type</i>	Stockholm	2,91	0.893
	Gothenburg	2,80	0.897
	Malmoe	2,73	0.924
	Other larger cities	2,79	0.967
	Medium sized cities	2,75	0.891
	Large municipalities	2,58	0.908
	Smaller municipalities	2,61	0.916
Country site	2,64	0.977	

In the following we analyse the results of the composed index on attitudes towards Muslims for selected background variables. The calculated means for boys and girls show that boys have a somewhat less positive attitude towards Muslims. The index for age/grade show that increased age/grade is connected to a more positive attitude towards Muslims. Young people born in Sweden are, relatively those born abroad, less positive towards Muslims. Besides, youth born outside Europe are more positive than those born in Europe. When it comes to type of program, the analysis shows that those who attend university preparing levels have a more positive attitude towards Muslims and those who attend the individual level (lowest) have the least positive attitude towards Muslims. Moreover, the analysis shows differences in attitudes when the informants are split by socio-economic background of the parents. Youth whose parents have non-skilled or low skilled occupations, have a less positive attitudes towards Muslims. Especially, young people with parents that have academic occupations show a more positive attitude towards Muslims. The geographic division used in this study shows that respondents living in large cities, other major cities and medium sized cities have a more positive attitude towards Muslims than those who live in other regions. Moreover, those who live in Stockholm are more positive than those in Gothenburg who are in turn more positive than those in Malmoe.

In conclusion, the results of the descriptive analysis indicate that the attitude towards Muslims is different for various background factors. This first look at the results, as in earlier studies using descriptive analysis, shows that males/boys are less positive towards Muslims than women/girls. Furthermore, increased age/grade and socio-economic background seems to be correlated with a more positive attitude which also is in line with the previous studies mentioned above (Hvitfelt 1991; *Integrationsbarometer* 2004 and 2005). Differences measured for region of birth and region of living was also measured in earlier studies focussing on adults attitudes towards Muslims. A more sophisticated method of understanding the effects of the above discussed variables and other characteristics on the attitude towards Muslims is to regress these factors simultaneously, which we do in the next section.

*Multivariate analysis*

In the following table (table 2) the results of three regressions are presented which include all background variables. The first regression shows the results for both girls and boys. Given that earlier studies showed a difference in attitudes towards Muslims by sex the second and third regression is for girls and boys separately. The results indicate that some variables have no statistical significant effect on the attitude towards Muslims by young people, whereas other variables show either positive or negative effects. In the following we discuss the results by variable group.

**Table 2, Adolescent attitudes towards Muslims, Multivariate regression.**

	All	Girls	Boys
Boys	0.034	-	-
Grade 9	-0.007	0.058	-0.067
1e Grade Secondary	-0.052	-0.086*	-0.020
2e Grade Secondary	0.026	0.013	0.059
3e Grade Secondary	0.084**	0.102**	0.107**
North/West/Eastern Europe	0.100***	0.052	0.135***
Southern Europe	0.159**	0.147	0.173*
Outside Europe	0.178***	0.167***	0.206***
Skilled worker	0.009	-0.004	0.031
Lower civil servant	0.040	0.044	0.034
Intermediate civil servant	0.133***	0.123***	0.136***
Higher civil servant	0.162***	0.143***	0.173***
Fri occupations with academic education	0.143***	0.191***	0.098
Entrepreneur	0.040	0.028	0.064
Agricultural worker	0.093	0.133	0.071
Single parent family	-0.016	0.012	-0.056*
Mother unemployed	0.032	-0.006	0.053
Father unemployed	-0.029	-0.098	0.058
Gothenburg	-0.052	-0.181**	0.172
Malmoe	0.245**	0.384**	0.091
Other larger cities	0.054	0.067	0.057
Medium sized cities	-0.016	0.024	0.031
Large municipalities	0.049	0.084	0.049
Smaller municipalities	-0.038	-0.083	0.036
Country site	0.073	0.103	0.080
Share unemployed	-0.012*	-0.007	-0.019**
Share immigrants	-0.005***	-0.003*	-0.007***
Size manufacturing sector	-0.004***	-0.001	-0.007***
Right wing populist mandate	-0.178***	-0.136***	-0.204***
Mean grade level	0.142***	0.191***	0.090***
Well being at school	0.084***	0.065***	0.102***

University- and occup. Preparing program	-0.033	0.104	-0.103*
Occupational preparing program	-0.186***	-0.016	-0.346***
Individual program	-0.332***	-0.338***	-0.385***
Restlessness(index)	-0.040***	-0.049***	-0.031*
Aggressiveness(index)	-0.062***	-0.042***	-0.080***
Risk preference(index)	0.013	0.010	0.016
Nervousness(index)	0.057***	0.046***	0.068***
Parent communication(index)	-0.048***	-0.042***	-0.051***
Parent knowledge recreational activities(index)	-0.016	-0.025*	-0.008
Parent reaction problematic behaviour(index)	0.054***	0.046***	0.057***
Friend relations(index)	0.009	0.024*	-0.001
Know Muslim	0.095***	0.129***	0.073***
Does not know Muslim	-0.165***	-0.123***	-0.203***
<i>Feelings of exclusion from society</i> (index)	-0.128***	-0.128***	-0.128***
<i>Gender roll patterns</i> (index)	-0.316***	-0.321***	-0.308***
<i>Constant</i>	2.874***	2.674***	3.072***
<i>Adjusted R<sup>2</sup></i>	0.369	0.352	0.352
<i>Number</i>	9498	4680	4818

\*\*\*significant<0,001, \*\*significant<0,005, \*significant<0,010

*Demographic factors:* When it comes to age/grade the results of the regression for both girls and boys show few differences in effect of age/grade on the attitude towards Muslims. With the exception of those who attend the highest grade of secondary schooling (consequently also age) no significant effect could be measured on the attitude towards Muslims, which is in line with the means shown in the earlier section. However, the regressions for girls and boys separately show that for boys attending the second year of secondary schooling, a significant positive effect is measured. Girls attending the highest level of primary schooling have also a significant positive attitude towards Muslims.

Boys born outside Sweden have a more positive attitude towards Muslims relative to boys born in Sweden. For girls we find that girls born outside of Europe have a more positive attitude towards Muslims than those born in Europe. Moreover, young people who know a person that is a Muslim have a significantly more positive attitude towards Muslims relative to somebody who does not know a Muslim. Also, individuals born outside Sweden and especially born in southern Europe and outside Europe knows a

Muslim far more often than individuals born in Sweden. A possible explanation for these results could be that young people from outside Europe to a larger extent are living in areas and attend schools with relatively more Muslims.

Interestingly, the results indicate no difference in attitude towards Muslims between boys and girls. This is different from what was measured in the earlier discussed descriptive section. This result is mainly due to the inclusion of the variable stereotypical gender role ideas in the model.

*Socioeconomic factors:* While we in the earlier section presented a more stepwise, “the higher, the more positive”, connection between attitudes and socioeconomic background, the regressions presented in the table show that only pupils with parents having academic occupations have a more positive attitude towards Muslims. For all other occupations we find no statistically significant effect. Boys living in single parent families have a more negative attitude towards Muslims than those who live with both parents. For girls no significant effect of this variable could be measured.

*Local and regional factors:* In earlier reports it is indicated that the more urban environment a person is living in, the more positive one is towards Muslims. As described in an earlier section, this study uses a different geographical division for region of living and finds for boys no statistically significant difference in attitude towards Muslims by region of living. For girls however, we find an interesting difference with the cities Gothenburg and Malmoe on one side, and all other regions (including Stockholm), on the other. Girls in Gothenburg have a somewhat less positive attitude towards Muslims, while girls in Malmoe clearly have a more positive attitude. For the other regions, no statistical significant difference could be measured relative the reference category Stockholm.

However, economic factors at the local level have a certain importance for young peoples’ attitudes towards Muslims. Boys who live in municipalities with a relatively larger manufacturing sector, a higher level of unemployment and a higher share of

immigrants living in the municipality, have a more negative attitude towards Muslims than boys who live in municipalities with the opposite conditions. One possible explanation for this result could be that a relative larger manufacturing sector exposed for competition is related to larger business cycle variation and fluctuations in unemployment. One interpretation could be that some boys in these municipalities blame this situation on immigration in general and Muslims in particular. For girls we do not find significant results for these variables.

Finally, our categorisation of municipalities into a binary variable wherein either a municipality has right wing populist political seats in local government or not, show that young people that live in municipalities where these parties have seats have more negative attitudes towards Muslims than young people living in municipalities without such seats. A possible explanation could be that the attitude towards Muslims by young people is also affected by other negative attitudes on immigrants and Muslims in the local community.

*School factors:* School- and program factors are important explanatory factors for the attitude towards Muslims by the pupils. An increased individual grade is correlated with a more positive attitude towards Muslims. Pupils who attend the individual program (lowest), have a more negative attitude towards Muslims relative the other secondary programs. In line with earlier studies we also find a strong correlation between the occupational distribution of the parents and school performance of pupils.

*Social psychological factors:* Social psychological factors like restlessness and aggressiveness also affect the attitude towards Muslims of both girls and boys. This is in line with earlier research that has indicated that so called intolerant youth are more restless. It is most likely that these young people also have negative attitudes towards Muslims. A hypothetical explanation for the result that was found for “increasing nervousness” and increasing positive attitude could be that this is a proxy for emotional sensitiveness and a more nuanced concept of reality, which in turn could lead to an increased tolerance towards those who are perceived as different.

*Family factors:* In the model also questions were included that measured the effect of degree of confidential communication with parents, parent knowledge about the recreational activities of their child and the reaction of parents on problematic behaviour of their children, on the attitude towards Muslims. According to the analysis, pupils with parents who reacted strongly on their problematic behaviour have a more positive attitude towards Muslims. Surprisingly we found the opposite signs for the other measurements.

*Friend factors:* If girls have good relationships they have a more positive attitude towards Muslims relative to if they have less good relationships. This relation was not found for boys. One explanation for this could be that among boys “good relationships” can be related to having company of intolerant groups of friends (*Intolerans* 2004) which statistically is less likely for girls.

*Feelings of exclusion from society:* The question on feelings of exclusion from society is based on idea that tolerance against immigrants and minorities varies with the degree of trust to other human beings and is asked with the aim to measure to what extent pupils feel in- or excluded from society on a general level. The analysis shows that this variable has a significant effect on the attitude towards Muslims for both boys and girls. The higher the feeling of exclusion, the more the negative attitude is measured.

*Gender roll patterns:* Finally an index measuring gender roll patterns among pupils is included in the model. The idea behind this inclusion is that the attitude towards Muslims could be influenced by “gender roll ideals” by both girls and boys. The results show that both boys and girls with more stereotypical, inflexible gender roll perceptions have a more negative attitude towards Muslims relative to those who have other perceptions about gender roles.

## Summary and discussion

Earlier Swedish and international statistical studies on attitudes towards Muslims have included relatively few explanatory variables and used only basic statistical tools to measure variation in attitudes towards Muslims. As a complement to earlier studies this study shows, with the use of multiple regression technique, that many variables have a significant, either positive or negative effect on the attitude towards Muslims by young people. Returning to the earlier studies and the theoretical considerations described initially, various propositions in these are supported by the results of the study. We have divided this discussion into three levels well aware of them overlapping each other.

Starting at the individual level and in line with earlier studies, we find that individual characteristics have important influence on the attitude towards others, in this case Muslims. Socio-psychological factors like aggressiveness and restlessness play an important part in the explanation of held attitudes. This was an expected result in line with the analysis in intolerance report (2004), theories on attitudes of right wing youth but also socio-psychological theories like Tajfel's. Moreover, our analysis shows that individuals holding stereotypical understandings of gender and a negative perception of society, have more negative attitudes to Muslims. Interestingly, and in contrast to bivariate analyses, no difference between girls and boys was measured.

Robinson suggested that tolerance was interconnected with socialisation and parental practices, but also with successive maturity. In the present study, the socio-economic background of parents affected the attitude of youths. If the result from earlier studies of the adult population is taken into account – parents with less education and lower socio-economic statuses are more likely to hold negative attitudes towards Muslims – it is to be expected that these youths' attitudes are in line with their parents' and that the prejudices are likely to be part of their socialization. The opposite situation also holds. The children of the ones with a higher socio-economic status and higher education are generally more tolerant. The age hypothesis is more difficult to confirm. We can not observe a successive increase in tolerance, rather no significant difference between the ones between the 8<sup>th</sup>

grade (about 14 years old) to the 2<sup>nd</sup> grade of the gymnasium (17 years) can be measured. But, the oldest respondents, the ones in 3<sup>rd</sup> grade, are in fact the most tolerant.

When analysing the results solely on an individual level, attitudes primarily depend on the social situation of the individual, his or hers psychic well-being and possibly on age. The results of our analysis further indicate a clear support for the contact hypothesis which is based on the idea that increased contact with the other induces more positive attitudes towards others. Girls and boys that know a Muslim are clearly more positive towards Muslims than those who do not know a Muslim. Taken all together, these negative attitudes would then be caused by the life situation of the individual rather than by a specific Islamophobia. However, we argue for a need to take other possibilities into account for a fuller, more complex understanding.

At the group and societal level, measuring the general friend factors, we find a more ambiguous result. For girls, friend factors have a significant positive effect on the attitude towards Muslims. For boys we do not find an effect of this factor. This difference between the sexes could be due to that boys are more involved in intolerant groups of friends. Besides, we found that economic, political demographic factors show to be important factors for explaining the attitude towards Muslims, especially for boys. Increased number of immigrants and higher unemployment level correlates with a more negative attitude towards Muslims by boys and can be seen as threats to the status quo and increased competition for scarce economic resources in the area where one lives. This result supports the theoretical propositions of the power-threat hypothesis. We also find support for the idea that even ideas at the regional level, in this case right wing political ideas that have been translated into actual political parties and seats in the local government, could affect young individuals attitudes towards Muslims. Also this is in line with the power-threat-hypothesis but more on a political level.

While the immediate reaction might be that these analyses are sufficient when explaining the attitudes of the intolerant, those who propose a structural analysis prefer to make additions to be able to answer questions like why specifically Muslims are targeted.

There is a claim that negative discourses on Islam and Muslims are especially strong and that there is a widespread Islamophobia in society reproduced in for example different kinds of media and popular culture. Why is this not visible in our study, or is it? The previous study on the same statistical material shows that the attitudes to Jews, homosexuals, Immigrants and Muslims are similar, albeit marginally harsher against Muslims (*Intolerans* 2004). In our analysis it is clear that it is the well adjusted children of the well educated and employed who are the most tolerant. Could it be that they also hold a competence for expressing tolerance in questionnaires, thus concealing other forms of othering According to Olivier Roy (2004) one of the principal misconceptions of Muslims is that Muslims are perceived as a group not a mere population with diverse interests. Étienne Balibar (2002) further claims that a dominating form of new racism is when cultural identity is ascribed to individuals and when group categories are closed, not allowing hybridity and transformation. Thus the mere fact that the questionnaire groups Muslims together as “Muslims” helps the middle class to avoid exposing the foundation of their cultural assumptions, i.e. that Muslims are primarily different, in line with Balibar’s proposed neo-racism. Tolerance against the other is a norm, helping to avoid the difficult question of the creation of the other. This line of reasoning can not be tested with the help of our material but it would be interesting to design questionnaires taking these theoretical ideas into account.

Concluding, our analysis shed some light on what factors seem to be relevant explaining the attitude towards Muslims by young people. Since these results are highly contextual and difficult to generalise to other time and places we are highly careful in stating that the measured effects will last in different environments. Our recommendation is therefore increased future research in this topic, both comparative and longitudinal, that could confirm or refute the results of this study.

## References

- Adorno, T.W., E. Frenkel-Brunswik, D.J. Levinson & R. Nevitt Sanford, 1950, *The authoritarian personality*, New York: Norton.
- Allport, G.W., 1958, *The Nature of Prejudice*, Cambridge: Addison Wesley.
- Anwar, Muhammad, Jochen Blaschke & Åke Sander (eds), 2004, *State Policies Toward Muslim Minorities: Sweden, Great Britain and Germany*. Berlin: Edition Parabolis.
- Balibar, Étienne, 2002, "Finns det en 'nyrasism'?" i E. Balibar & I. Wallerstein, *Ras, nation, klass: Mångtydiga identiteter*. Göteborg: Daidalos.
- Berg, Magnus, 1998, *Hudud – Ett resonemang om populärorientalismens bruksvärde och världsbild*. Stockholm: Carlson.
- Bevelander, Pieter & Christer Lundh, 2007, "Employment Integration of Refugees: The influence of Local Factors on Refugee Job Opportunities in Sweden", IZA-Discussion paper No. 2551.
- Blalock, H.M., 1967, *Toward a Theory of Minority Group Relations*, New York: Wiley.
- Carlsson, Magnus & Dan-Olof Rooth, 2006, "Evidence of Ethnic Discrimination in the Swedish Labour Market Using Experimental Data", Iza-Discussion paper No. 2281.
- Cattacin, S., B. Gerber, M. Sardo, R. Wegener, 2006. "Monitoring misanthropy and rightwing extremist attitudes in Switzerland, an explorative study". Research report – PNR 40+, Geneva: University of Geneva.
- Dekker, Henk, Jolanda van der Noll & Tereza Capelos, 2007, *Islamofobie onder jongeren en de achtergronden daarvan*, Mimeo, Universiteit Leiden, Departement Politieke Wetenschap.
- Dustmann, C., F. Fabbri & I. Preston, 2004, *Ethnic Concentration, Prejudice and Racial Harassment Towards Minorities in the UK*.
- Fredrickson, George M, 2003, *Rasism – En historisk översikt*. Lund: Historiska media.
- Heitmeyer, Wilhelm (red.), 2002, *Deutsche Zustände, Folge 1*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Heitmeyer, Wilhelm (red.), 2003, *Deutsche Zustände, Folge 2*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Heitmeyer, Wilhelm (red.), 2005, *Deutsche Zustände, Folge 3*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.

- Heitmeyer, Wilhelm & Andreas Zick, 2004, "Anti-Semitism, Islamophobia and Group-focused Enmity in Germany." Research note at Institute for Interdisciplinary Research on conflict and Violence, University of Bielefeld.
- Hvitfelt, Håkan, 1991, "Svenska attityder till islam" i S. Holmber & L. Weibull (red.) *Politiska opinioner, SOM-undersökningen 1990*. SOM-rapport 6, Göteborgs universitet.
- Hvitfelt, Håkan, 1998, "Den muslimska faran – om mediabilden av islam" i Y. Brune (red.) *Mörk magi i vita medier – svensk nyhetsjournalistik om invandrare, flyktingar och rasism*. Stockholm: Carlssons.
- Härenstam, Kjell 1993, *Skolboks-islam: Analys av bilden av islam i läroböcker i religionskunskap*. Göteborg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.
- Integrationsbarometer 2004: En rapport om allmänhetens inställning till integration, mångfald och diskriminering 2003 och 2004*, 2005. Integrationsverkets skriftserie V. Norrköping: Integrationsverket.
- Integrationsbarometer 2005: En rapport om allmänhetens attityder, erfarenheter och kunskaper inom områdena integration, mångfald och diskriminering*, 2006. Integrationsverkets rapportserie 2006:05. Norrköping: Integrationsverket.
- Intolerans – Antisemitiska, homofobiska, islamofobiska och invandrarfientliga tendenser bland unga*, 2004, Forum för Levande Historia och Brottsförebyggande Rådet, Stockholm.
- Lagerlöf, David, 2006, "Bland judiska konspiratörer och muslimska koloniserare – antisemitism och islamofobi på nätet" i *Rasism och främlingsfientlighet i Sverige – Antisemitism och islamofobi 2005*. Integrationsverkets rapportserie 2006:02. Norrköping: Integrationsverket.
- Lange, Anders. & Charles Westin (1981) *Etnisk diskriminering och social identitet. Forskningsöversikt och teoretisk analys*. Stockholm,: Liber/Publica.
- McGuire, Meredith, 2002, *Religion: The Social Context*. Belmont: Wadsworth.
- McLaren, Lauren, 2003, "Anti-Immigrant Prejudice in Europe: Contact, Threat Perception, and Preferences for the Exclusion of Migrants" in *Social Forces*, vol. 81, No. 3, March.

- Otterbeck, Jonas, 2004, "The Legal Status of Islamic Minorities in Sweden" in R. Aluffi B.-P & G. Zincone (eds) *The Legal Treatment of Islamic Minorities in Europe*. Leuven: Peeters.
- Otterbeck, Jonas, 2005, "What is reasonable to demand? Islam in Swedish Textbooks" in *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies*, vol. 31, no. 4, July.
- Otterbeck, Jonas & Pieter Bevelander, 2006, *Islamofobi – en studie av begreppet, ungdomars attityder och unga muslimer utsatthet*, Stockholm: Forum för Levande Historia.
- Ouis, Pernilla & Anne Sofie Roald, 2003, *Muslim i Sverige*. Stockholm: Wahlström & Widstrand.
- Robinson, Julie, Ritvka Witenberg & Ann Sanson (2001) "The Socialization of Tolerance" in M. Augoustinos (ed.) *Understanding Prejudice, racism, and Social Conflict*. London: Sage.
- Roy, Olivier, 2004, *Globalised Islam: The Search for a New Ummah*. London: Hurst.
- Samtal med svenska muslimer – Situationen för svenska muslimer efter terroristattacken i USA den 11 september 2001*, 2003. Integrationsverkets rapportserie 2003:3. Norrköping: Integrationsverket.
- Sherif, M. 1966, *Group conflict and co-operation: their social psychology*, London: Routledge and Paul Kegan.
- Solomos, John & Les Back, 1999, *Theories of Race & Racism: Reader*. Florence, KY, USA: Routledge.
- Tajfel, Henri, 1982, "Social identity of intergroup relations", *Annual Review of Psychology*, no. 1.
- Åslund, O. & Rooth D-O., 2005, "Shifts in attitudes and labor market discrimination: Swedish experiences after 9-11", *Journal of Population Economics*, 18:603-629.

## Appendix I

### Adolescent attitudes towards young Muslims, Mean of index, Standard Deviation, and the percentage by answering category.

<b>Girls</b>								
<b>Statement</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>St. Dev.</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	
Most Muslims are decent people...	3,00	0.980	36,8	35,4	21,2	4,1	2,4	
It would be entirely okay to have a steady Muslim as a neighbour...	3,57	0.841	72,8	17,0	6,6	1,7	1,9	
Muslims in Sweden should have the right to build Mosques ...	2,56	1.352	33,6	21,2	25,2	7,4	12,7	
There are far too many Muslims in Sweden...	2,54	1.286	32,9	16,5	31,5	10,0	9,1	
You can not trust a Muslim...	3,02	1.090	46,9	18,4	27,0	4,6	2,9	
It should be forbidden for Muslims to vote in elections...	3,37	1.031	66,9	11,5	16,3	2,3	3,1	
Most immigrated Muslims are very likely law-abiding...	2,67	1.074	29,2	34,2	25,3	7,1	4,2	
Most Muslims only want to live on social security...	2,41	1.158	23,2	20,6	36,4	13,9	6,0	
<b>Boys</b>								
<b>Statement</b>	<b>Mean</b>	<b>St. Dev.</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	
Most Muslims are decent people...	2,68	1.110	25,8	35,3	25,4	7,9	5,7	
It would be entirely okay to have a steady Muslim as a neighbour...	3,28	1.087	58,9	22,5	10,9	2,7	5,0	
Muslims in Sweden should have the right to build Mosques ...	2,24	1.469	27,9	18,5	24,2	8,7	20,7	
There are far too many Muslims in Sweden...	2,12	1.354	22,4	14,9	31,1	15,4	16,2	
You can not trust a Muslim...	2,69	1.206	35,0	20,0	30,3	8,5	6,2	
It should be forbidden for Muslims to vote in elections...	3,08	1.257	57,3	12,5	18,8	4,0	7,4	
Most immigrated Muslims are very likely law-abiding...	2,38	1.260	22,3	28,1	26,0	12,7	10,8	
Most Muslims only want to live on social security...	2,03	1.294	17,7	16,8	31,5	18,7	15,3	

## Appendix II

### Independent variables

<i>Variables</i>	<i>Categories</i>	<i>Variables</i>	<i>Categories</i>
<b>Demography</b>		<b>School/program factors</b>	
<i>Gender</i>	Girls, Boys	<i>Mean grade level</i>	Index
<i>Grade</i>	Grade 8 (15 years old) Grade 9 (16 years old) Secondary 1th grade  Secondary 2th grade Secondary 3th grade	<i>Well being at school</i>	Index
<i>Region of birth</i>	Sweden  North/West/Eastern Europe Southern Europe Outside Europe	<i>Program</i>	University preparing University and professional preparing Professional preparing Individual
<b>Socioeconomic background</b>		<b>Social psychological factors</b>	
<i>Parents socioeconomic background</i>	Non skilled worker  Skilled worker Lower civil servant  Intermediate civil servant Higher civil servant Fri occupations with academic education Entrepreneur Agricultural worker	<i>Restlessness</i>	Index
<i>Single parent family</i>	No, Yes	<i>Aggressiveness</i>	Index
<i>Mother unemployed</i>	No, Yes	<i>Risk preference</i>	Index
<i>Father unemployed</i>	No, Yes	<i>Nervousness</i>	Index
<b>Local/Regional factors</b>		<b>Family factors</b>	
<i>Municipality type</i>	Stockholm Gothenburg Malmoe Other larger cities Medium sized cities Large municipalities Smaller municipalities Country site	<i>Parent communication</i>	Index
<i>Unemployment level (municipality)</i>	continuous	<i>Parent knowledge recreational activities</i>	Index
<i>Share foreign born (municipality)</i>	continuous	<i>Parent reaction problematic behaviour</i>	Index
<i>Size manufacturing sector (municipality)</i>	continuous	<b>Friend factors</b>	
<i>Right wing populist mandate in municipality</i>	No, Yes	<i>Friend relations</i>	Index
		<b>Knows Muslim</b>	No, Yes
		<b>Exclusion</b>	
		<i>Feelings of exclusion from society</i>	Index
		<b>Gender role factors</b>	
		<i>Gender roll patterns</i>	Index

## Appendix III

### Municipality types

<b>Municipality type</b>	<b>Population</b>	<b>Definition</b>
Stockholm	527	>200.000
Gothenburg	366	>200.000
Malmoe	96	>200.000
Other larger cities	3546	50.000-200.000
Medium sized cities	2774	20.000-50.000
Large municipalities	1268	10.000-20.000
Smaller municipalities	407	<10.000 inv.
Country site	694	<7 individuals per km <sup>2</sup>

## Appendix IV

### Overview of questions included in the various indexes

Index	Questions	Answering alternative
<b>Restlessness</b>	<i>Finally here come some questions about yourself. Cross if the following statements are correct with how you are!</i>	
	I have often thought that it is difficult to sit still a longer period, for example a lecture.	5 answering alternatives: yes, this is correct; this is relatively correct; unsure/doesn't know; this is rather incorrect; no, this is incorrect
	If I am forced to wait a while on for example a buss I will easily get extreme restless.	
	I will get uninterested if not is happening new all the time.	
	It happens often that I do things impulsively without thinking so carefully.	
Sometimes I do something unexpected and crazy without planning..		
<b>Aggressiveness</b>	I get easily angry.	5 answering alternatives: yes, this is correct; this is relatively correct; unsure/doesn't know; this is rather incorrect; no, this is incorrect
	I feel often anger inside me.	
<b>Risk preference:</b>	Sometimes it is fun to take some risk just for the sake of excitement.	5 answering alternatives: yes, this is correct; this is relatively correct; unsure/doesn't know; this is rather incorrect; no, this is incorrect
	I like to test climbing even if this can be risky.	
<b>Nervousness</b>	I absolutely would like to test to jump "bungy jump".	4 answering alternatives: no, not at all to often
	<i>The following questions deal with how you felt the last couple of months. Mark the best alternative that fits with you!</i>	
	I have felt myself depressive and down.	
<b>Mean grade level</b>	I felt myself troubled.	4 answering alternatives: not pass, pass, high pass and very high pass
	I have had difficulties to sleep.	
	<i>What had you for grade last term in the following subjects?</i>	
	Mathematics	
	Swedish	
	English	
	Chemistry/Natural Science	

<b>Well being at school:</b>	<p><i>Mark if the following statements about school fit or fit not for you!</i></p> <p>I usually feel very comfortable in school.</p> <p>I like to do my home work properly.</p> <p>I like most of the teachers.</p>	<p>5 answering alternatives: yes, this is correct; this is relatively correct; unsure/doesn't know; this is rather incorrect; no, this is incorrect</p>
<b>Parent communication:</b>	<p><i>Cross how you think that the following statements fit for you!</i></p> <p>I can usually talk about everything with mamma (for example problems)</p> <p>I can usually talk about everything with daddy (for example problems)</p>	<p>5 answering alternatives: yes, this is correct; this is relatively correct; unsure/doesn't know; this is rather incorrect; no, this is incorrect</p>
<b>Parent knowledge recreational activities:</b>	<p>My parents usually know where I am if I go out in the evening/night.</p> <p>My parents usually know who I meet if I go out in the evening/night.</p>	<p>5 answering alternatives: yes, this is correct; this is relatively correct; unsure/doesn't know; this is rather incorrect; no, this is incorrect</p>
<b>Parent reaction problematic behavior:</b>	<p>If I would shirk from school and my parents say this they would be angry and disappointed.</p> <p>If I would come home drunk on a Friday evening my parents would be discontented.</p>	<p>5 answering alternatives: yes, this is correct; this is relatively correct; unsure/doesn't know; this is rather incorrect; no, this is incorrect</p>
<b>Gender roll patterns:</b>	<p><i>Do you think it suitable or not for boys and girls respectively to show the following different types of feelings, behavior and characteristics?</i></p> <p>A real boy has to be cool and strong and a real girl has above all to be pretty.</p> <p>A girl that does not use make-up is actually not pretty.</p> <p>It is more suitable for a girl to cry than for a boy.</p> <p>A real boy should fight for his honour otherwise he is not worth any respect.</p> <p>A girl who has been together with many boys is not worth respect.</p> <p>A boy who is scared for mice and spiders is actually a real softy.</p>	<p>5 answering alternatives: yes, this is correct; this is relatively correct; unsure/doesn't know; this is rather incorrect; no, this is incorrect</p>
<b>Feelings of exclusion from society:</b>	<p><i>Now some questions that deal with your future and some other things. Mark for the following statement that best suites your opinion or feeling!</i></p>	

Most politicians do not really bother in the problems of ordinary people.

5 answering alternatives: yes, this is correct; this is relatively correct; unsure/doesn't know; this is rather incorrect; no, this is incorrect

Those who decide think in the first place on their own interests.

I think the future is unsure and I prefer not to think about it.

In these days it is difficult to know who one can trust.

A lot is so complicated in today's society that it is easy to be confused.

To be successful in society one is almost enforced to do some things illegally

**Friend relations:**

*Mark for the following statements about friends and if they fit with you or not!*

I can talk about everything with the friends (problems) I most of all meet...

5 answering alternatives: yes, this is correct; this is relatively correct; unsure/doesn't know; this is rather incorrect; no, this is incorrect

My friends help me willingly if I need help with something...

My fiends mean actually a lot to me...

I really respect the opinions of my friends...

I feel often disappointed of my friends...