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I. Icelandic populations statistics: Population evolution in Iceland

- 1703: ~ 50,000
- 1787: ~ 40,000 – following eruption of Laki in 1783
- 1926: > 100,000
- 1968: > 200,000
- 2007: > 300,000
- 2020: > 366,000

- Until 2000: Foreign population percentage < 2.5%

Source: Statistics Iceland
Immigration per 1000 inhabitants:

1. Malta: 54.6
2. Luxembourg: 40.5
3. Iceland: 33.5

- EU average: 5.4

Source: Eurostat
Population evolution in Iceland

Until 2000: Foreign population percentage very small ( < 2.5%)

Population Increase since 2000

- Net immigration
- Natural increase
- Total
Population Iceland
(Source: Statistics Iceland, 27.04.2020)

- End of 1st quarter 2020: **366,130**
  - Capital region: 234,400 (64%)
  - **Foreign citizens: 50,940 (13.9%)**

- Increase by **1,870** from previous quarter (0.5%)
  - Natural: 460
  - Net migration: **1410 (75%)**
    - Emigration: 1720
    - Immigration: **3130**
      - Immigrants with Icelandic citizenship: **510**
      - Non-Icelandic: **2620 (84%)**
        - Poland: 820
        - Lithuania: 220
Iceland’s Foreign Population: Composition by Continent

Source: Statistics Iceland
Europe's Foreign Population: Composition of the dominant continent: Europe

Source: Statistics Iceland
II. Theory – plural composition of society: The importance of the Host Country Perspective:

- Immigration
- Government policy
- Immigrant Perspective
- Host Country Perspective

FACULTY OF LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE, HUMANITIES, ARTS AND EDUCATION
**Attitude** to multiculturalism:

…refers “to the acceptance of and support for, the culturally heterogeneous society” (van de Vijver et al., 2008, p. 93)

Multiculturalism as an **ideology**:

…entails that cultural differences should be accepted and valued by all groups of society. Ideologies are **normative** in nature and ideologies will determine acculturation options for minorities.

=> **Interactive Acculturation Model (IAM)**, by Bourhis et al. (1997):
Interactive Acculturation Model

Multiculturalism *Ideologies* as identified by Bourhis et al (1997):

- The ideologies differ regarding approaches of how to accommodate immigrants.
- These range from low to increasing pressure put on immigrants by the nation state to adopt values of the main society and leaving less room for cultural expression (van de Vijver et al., 2006).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principle:</th>
<th>Pluralism ideology</th>
<th>Civic ideology</th>
<th>Assimilation ideology</th>
<th>Ethnist ideology</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adoption of public values and laws of the host country by immigrants</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect of private values of the immigrants</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public funds spent on private activities of immigrants</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
III. Selected findings - Quantitative Survey

- **N = 3630 native Icelanders**
  - 51.1% women
  - $M_{age} = 50.8$ $SD = 15.6$

- Spread across all regions of Iceland

- Range of questions (Trust in Institutions, Equality, School system …)
- Some more specific on attitudes to/ contact with foreign population.
Immigrants moving to your municipality have to learn Icelandic.

- $M = 1.73 \quad SD = 0.94$ Mode of 1 (Scale 1 = agree strongly, 5 = disagree strongly)
- Learn Icelandic!

**Should learn Icelandic**

- Strongly agree: 1811
- Agree: 1266
- Neither/nor: 249
- Disagree: 198
- Strongly disagree: 61

86%
Disagreement regarding speaking Icelandic to their children

- $M = 3.48$  $SD = 1.27$ Mode of 4 (Scale 1 = agree strongly, 5 = disagree strongly)
Assessment: Impact of Foreigners

- Strong agreement: Foreigners have made a positive impact in the municipality
- $M = 1.96$ $SD = 0.85$ Mode of 2 (Scale 1 = agree strongly, 5 = disagree strongly)

80%
Assessment: Reporting about Foreigners

- Reporting about Foreigners:
  - $M = 3.46$  $SD = 0.86$  Mode of 4 (Scale 1 = too positive, 5 = too negative)
  - (Too) positive – 10.6%; undecided – 36.1%; (Too) negative – 48.3%
Expectations of Foreigners - Behaviour

- Adopt local customs and values
  - $M = 2.87$  $SD = 1.26$  Mode of 2  (Scale 1 = agree strongly, 5 = disagree strongly)

... should take on customs & values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neither/ nor</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither/ nor</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>24.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Adoption of local customs:

- $M = 2.87$ $SD = 1.26$
- Two-way between Group ANOVA
  - Main effect **Age** $F (2, 3517) = 95.5$, $p < .001$; partial $\eta^2 = .05$
  - Main effect **Gender** $F (1, 3517) = 7.09$, $p < .001$; partial $\eta^2 = .002$
I have invited foreigners to my home:

- Never: 21.5%
- Once or twice: 8.5%
- A few times: 34.4%
- Many times: 34.4%
Social Contact

- Been invited by foreigners to their home:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Once or twice</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few times</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Many times</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Factors influencing social contact: (Series of Chi-Square tests)

- **Reciprocity**: Inviting and being invited are associated
- **Prior experience**: Those who have lived abroad are more likely to be invited and have invited.

- Note: 67% have never lived abroad
- $\chi^2 (1, n=3588)= 94.94, p < .001, \phi = .16$ (invite)
- $\chi^2 (3, n=3582)= 126.50 p < .001, \phi = .19$ (be invited):
Factors influencing social contact: (Series of Chi-Square tests)

- **Age** -
  - $\chi^2 (32 \ n=3582)= 54.67, 50 \ p < .001$, $\phi = .12$ (been invited)
  - Age & foreign experience connected (oldest age group has travelled less)
  - Gender – does NOT play a role
Factors influencing social contact: (Series of Chi-Square tests)

- **Municipality – having lived abroad:**
Factors influencing social contact:
(Series of Chi-Square tests)

- Municipality – having been invited:
IV. Conclusion:

- Host country perspective – initial insights:
  - Degree of Openness
  - Interaction – social contact

- Prior experience & opportunity facilitates contact

- Importance placed on learning *Icelandic language*

Limitations of quantitative research

- In general
- Specific to this questionnaire


Questions?
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